

**Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP) Meeting
Boston, MA**

September 2, 2015

DRAFT MOTIONS

Framework Adjustment 55

1. Motion: Raymond/Canastra

The GAP supports approval of the new sector application for Sustainable Harvest Sector II.

1A. Motion as perfected: Raymond/Canastra

The GAP supports approval of the new sector application for Sustainable Harvest Sector II. The GAP recommends that the Groundfish Committee recommend that the Council modify the regulations pertaining to sector management to remove the requirement that new sector applications be approved through a regulatory action (framework or amendment) and instead may be approved by GARFO after consultation with the Council.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (7/0/2).

2. Motion: Raymond/Odell

The GAP recommends that the Committee include in FW 55 an option to create a mechanism that would allow sectors to transfer EGB cod to the WGB cod fishery (i.e., mirror the current ability to transfer EGB haddock to the WGB haddock fishery.)

Rationale: To be consistent with the options for haddock. With large disparities expected between the GB cod and EGB cod assessments, this is a management solution to a failed process.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (6/0/3).

At-Sea Monitoring

3. Motion: Odell/Soule

In regards to the June 2015 Council motion which directed GARFO to utilize administrative action in FY 2015 to improve the efficiency of the ASM program to reduce costs, the GAP recommends that the Committee request GARFO prepare a detailed explanation along with supporting technical analysis (in a comprehensive manner) before the next Council meeting to enable managers to have a clear understanding of how and why the Council motion fell short.

Rationale:

- There are specific regulatory requirements (30% CV specified) requirements contained in Amendment 16 and then there is an additional layer of applied by NMFS (80% of discards) not contained in regulations. Notably, NMFS sets a coverage rate at a level sufficient to estimate 80 percent of the discarded pounds of all stocks and sectors combined, with a precision level of CV30.
- GARFO reported in a letter dated August 18th that the results of their detailed analysis determined the council motions could not be implemented due to "not meeting the statistical standards". But no additional information was provided. This analysis is needed to understand what the limitations of the Council motions were and to make changes to ASM moving forward in the framework action.

Motion **carried** on a show of hands (10/0/0).

4A. Motion: Raymond/Odell

The GAP requests that the Committee recommend an analysis of the ASM coverage level that would result from a calculation of the 30% CV without including the standard that requires 80% of the discarded pounds of all stocks and sectors combined.

Rationale: The regulations recommended by the Council in FW48 specify a CV of 30%. The additional standard was added by NMFS.

4B. Motion as friendly amended:

The GAP requests that the Committee ask NMFS to explain the rationale for using the standard that requires 80% of the discarded pounds of all stocks and sectors combined. Further, the GAP requests that the Committee recommend an analysis of the ASM coverage level that would result from a calculation of the 30% CV without that standard.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (10/0/0).

5. Motion: Soule/Parker

The GAP recommends that the ASM requirements are removed for trips in Broad Stock Areas 2 and 4.

Rationale: There is virtually no groundfish caught on trips in those areas, based on maps in PDT memo on ASM, dated 8/31/15. Keeping the requirement would unduly burden vessels fishing in those areas (e.g., skate in Area 2, skate and monkfish in Area 4).

5A. Motion as perfected.

The GAP recommends that the ASM requirements are removed for trips in Broad Stock Areas 2 and 4 for extra-large mesh trips targeting monkfish, skates, and dogfish (through FW 55). The GAP requests that a more detailed PDT analysis be conducted for BSA 1 as was provided in the memo, to determine if this is appropriate for BSA 1 (including pounds of groundfish discarded).

Motion **carried** on a show of hands (10/0/0).

6. Motion: Soule/Raymond

The GAP recommends to the Committee that the concept of establishing sector-specific management uncertainty buffers or discards rates (option #5 in PDT memo) be further developed for FW 55.

Rationale: Sectors would be better off accepting an increase in pounds of assumed discards for a stock in exchange for reduced coverage rates. This way, there are cost-savings available to sectors.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (7/0/2).

7. Motion: Smith/Martens

The GAP recommends to the Committee that the concept of establishing sector specific coverage requirements (option #4 in PDT memo) be further developed for FW 55.

Rationale: Allows coverage rates to be more fine-tuned to where a sector is actually fishing, rather than having coverage driven by a stock in an area where they do not fish.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (10/0/0).

8. Motion: Raymond/Brown

The GAP requests that the Committee recommend development of an ASM alternative that would set a fixed discard rate (in a range of %) at a level lower than 20% (that may include a requirement of 100% dockside monitoring to improve catch accounting).

Rationale: This is a follow-up to Motion #6. 20% is the ASM rate for FY 2015. Would like a fixed rate (range would be about 5-15%) with a target rather than absolute CV target. Dockside monitoring may be a way to reduce industry costs, since monitors would generally come to one location per port. We need to understand that a higher level of coverage is likely needed, but this would reduce costs.

8A. Perfected motion

The GAP requests that the Committee recommend development of an ASM alternative that would set a fixed ASM rate (in a range of %) at a level lower than 20% (that may include a requirement of 100% dockside monitoring to improve catch accounting).

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (3/2/5).

9. Motion: Odell/Soule

The GAP requests that the Committee recommend development of an ASM alternative that would set a fixed ASM rate (in a range of %) at a level lower than 20%.

Rationale: ASM is focused on discards, dockside monitoring is for catch.

The motion **fails** on a show of hands (1/3/6).

10. Motion: Brown/Canastra

The GAP recommends to the Committee that the total cost of ASM will not exceed 4% of the value of the fishery.

Rationale: Would be consistent with cost recovery provisions for LAPPs in MSA. There should be a cap on costs, so that they will not escalate.

10A. Perfected motion

The GAP recommends to the Committee that an analysis be done that would consider a cost cap for ASM.

11. Motion to postpone motion 10A: Odell/Brown

The motion carried on a show of hands (8/0/0).

12. Motion: Martens/Snell

The GAP recommends the following list of issues, not addressed in PDT Memo, that the Committee and PDT should consider in analyzing ASM costs and impacts on the groundfish fleet:

1. Costs: The costs to boats fishing from remote ports are substantially higher than the costs experienced by vessels fishing from more centralized locations.
2. Costs: Those that land limited numbers of fish due to the size of their boat, gear used, or area fished cannot as easily absorb the costs of ASM.
3. Access: For very remote ports, there may not be any observer providers that are willing to provide service to those ports. Since ASM is required, this seems to be a major issue for fishermen outside of metropolitan areas.
4. Data: Captains will be incentivized to shorten trips that are selected for observers and lengthen trips that are not selected due to costs. This will significantly impact data collected.
5. All trips are not equal, and having a coverage rate based on trips, as opposed to days fished or pounds landed, potentially impacts the dayboat fleet disproportionately.

Rationale: Want better information about potential impacts to fishermen in remote ports. We have requested that the Committee task the PDT to look at option #4 and #5. This list should be considered in analysis of those and other ideas.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (4/2/3).

13. Motion: Parker/Raymond

The GAP supports full retention (of allocated species) in the fishery and recommends an analysis of its effect on cost and efficiency. If this analysis slows down FW55, it should be a longer-term issue to be considered. The intent is to help inform sectors in how to construct their monitoring programs.

Rationale: This may be a solution to lowering ASM costs and be a systemic improvement. This would be full retention of the allocated groundfish species.

The motion carried on a show of hands (9/0/1).

14. Motion to reconsider Motion 10A: Brown/Canastra

The motion carried 6/0/1.

15. Motion 10A. Perfected motion

The GAP recommends to the Committee that an analysis be done that would consider a cost cap for ASM.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (5/0/3).

Amendment 18

16. Motion: Martens/Smith

The GAP recommends that the Committee not take final action on Amendment 18, considering the final alternatives that are currently in the document, we believe that the time and analysis that would be required to move this Amendment forward could be better used addressing more pressing issues such as ASM and the upcoming stock assessment process.

The motion **failed** on a show of hands (2/5/1).