



## New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116

John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph.D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

### MEETING SUMMARY

#### Recreational Advisory Panel

Hilton Garden Inn, Logan Airport, Boston, MA

February 22, 2019

The Recreational Advisory Panel (RAP) met on February 22, 2019 in Boston, MA to discuss: 1) recreational measures for fishing year 2019 for Gulf of Maine cod, Gulf of Maine haddock, and Georges Bank cod; 2) Council priorities for 2019; 3) planning for public listening sessions for a possible limited access program for the recreational groundfish party and charter fishery; and 4) other business, as necessary.

**MEETING ATTENDANCE:** Frank Blount (Chairman), Barry Gibson (Vice Chair), Tom DePersia, Michael Pierdinock, Michael Plaia, Jonathan Sterritt, Joseph Carpino, Patrick Paquette, and Kevin Twombly; Dr. Jamie Cournane and Robin Frede (NEFMC staff); Scott Steinback (NEFSC); and Terry Stockwell (Groundfish Committee Chair). In addition, 13 members of the public attended, among them were Tom Nies (NEFMC), Emily Keiley and Moira Kelly (GARFO), Rick Bellavance, Mark Godfroy, and Melanie Griffin (Groundfish Committee/Council members), and Greg Ardini (NEFSC).

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:** Discussions were aided by the following documents and presentations: (1) Meeting memorandum dated February 7, 2019 and meeting agenda; (2) Presentation: Council staff; (3a) Recreational measures for fishing year 2019 - Presentation: NEFSC staff; (3b) Recreational measures for fishing year 2019 - Discussion document with tables and figures (4) DRAFT background document for public listening sessions for a possible limited access program for the recreational party/charter fishery; (5a) Recreational Advisory Panel meeting summary, Oct. 29, 2018; (5b) Groundfish Plan Development Team draft meeting summary, Feb. 13, 2019; and (6) Correspondence.

The meeting began at 10:00 a.m.

#### **KEY OUTCOMES:**

- The RAP recommends to the Groundfish Committee an additional option, “option 6a”, to consider for fishing year 2019 management measures as its primary recommendation, if the model run projects achieving but not exceeding the Gulf of Maine haddock and Gulf of Maine cod sub-annual catch limits:
  - Gulf of Maine haddock: 15 in minimum fish size, season open year-round, and a 15 fish bag limit, and
  - Gulf of Maine cod: 19 in minimum fish size, season open April and August, and a 1 fish bag limit

- The RAP recommends to the Groundfish Committee an additional option, “option 6b”, as a back-up recommendation for fishing year 2019 management measures, if the model run projects achieving but not exceeding the Gulf of Maine haddock and Gulf of Maine cod sub-annual catch limits.:
  - Gulf of Maine haddock: 15 in minimum fish size, season open year-round, and a 15 fish bag limit, and
  - Gulf of Maine cod: 21 in minimum fish size, season open April and August, 1 fish bag limit
- The RAP clarifies to the Groundfish Committee the intent of the RAP’s proposed Gulf of Maine cod and Gulf of Maine haddock measures is to maintain one fish cod possession for some portion of the year.
- The RAP recommends to the Groundfish Committee that for fishing year 2019 management measures for Georges Bank cod: decrease the minimum fish size to 19 in and retain the 10 fish bag limit.

***PRESENTATION: RECREATIONAL MEASURES FOR GULF OF MAINE COD AND HADDOCK AND GEORGES BANK COD, MR. STEINBACK***

*2018 recreational catch and effort data for GOM cod and GOM haddock:*

Mr. Steinback provided an overview of recreational fishery catch and effort data for Gulf of Maine (GOM) cod and GOM haddock for fishing year 2017 and preliminary fishing year 2018, explaining that the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) estimates are converted back to the “old” estimates.

Highlights from the data summary are as follows:

- Effort and catch were lower than predicted – in part due to MA state closure for cod
- Catch estimates by mode – charter boats seem to have found a way to target haddock while avoiding cod, cod catch declined for all modes, haddock catch increased for head boats but declined for the other two modes
- Cod and haddock catch frequencies – most trips caught only 1 cod, a few caught 2, drops off sharply after that; for haddock much wider distribution, bump up at 8 haddock
- Cod and haddock size frequencies – a third of cod catch are fish  $\geq 18$  in.; a third of haddock catch  $\geq 17$  in. (current min fish size), most in 15 in. range

*Questions and Comments on the Presentation:*

One advisor asked how cod/haddock targeting is determined, whether this is according to the permit type or by what anglers report. Mr. Steinback clarified that targeting information comes from MRIP data as reported by anglers, and not from logbooks. He explained that this would include bluefin tuna trips that catch some cod if the angler reported cod/haddock as target species. Mr. Steinback also clarified that catch frequency data comes from MRIP numbers, and that logbook effort data is incorporated but not logbook catch data. He explained that size frequency information for the released fish comes from observers aboard charter vessels. Mr. Steinback also clarified that the kept cod are almost all fish that are released dead, and a small number of fish kept illegally.

One advisor asked for an explanation of how the MRIP numbers were converted, given the recent changes to MRIP. Mr. Steinback explained that the numbers were based on “old” MRIP numbers because the assessments are based on the old numbers. The 2018 catch estimates are based on the new MRIP numbers, which in generally have gone up under the new method of calculating catch estimates. Mr.

Steinback calculated the 2018 estimates in the old MRIP currency in order to remain consistent with the recent assessments. He also noted that due to the change in the way estimates are calculated, 2018 is the most uncertain year, and noted that this year there will be a new assessment.

*Bioeconomic model and 2019 options for recreational measures for GOM cod and GOM haddock:*

Mr. Steinback next provided an overview of the bioeconomic model used to evaluate potential recreational measures, including the history of its use and accuracy of the model predictions compared to MRIP estimates for each year. He emphasized that the 2019 model data is very uncertain, explaining that in addition to the problem they always face of only having May-Oct data and using a previous year proxy for Nov-Dec and Mar-Apr, there are new additional uncertainties with MRIP calibration to the “old” data currency, and that the projections are three years removed from the terminal model year, with a new assessment to occur this year. Mr. Steinback noted that more smaller fish are being pulled into the projections. He clarified that there is not a consistent pattern of the model underpredicting or overpredicting, but rather this changes every year.

Mr. Steinback then provided the options for recreational measures for 2019 for GOM cod and GOM haddock. Starting with the status quo measures, he explained that the model run for this year predicts higher haddock mortality than with the same measures last year, due to an increase in haddock size, and predicts lower cod mortality because anglers are encountering smaller cod as in the projections. Mr. Steinback explained that all options show a 100% chance of staying under the sub-ACLs for cod and haddock with the simulations run 100 times, and that there is some uncertainty depending on whether the distributions are correct. He told the RAP he can run additional options, but that he felt these were good options to start with.

*Questions and Comments on the Presentation:*

One advisor asked whether the years with more uncertainty correspond with years where the data has high PSE (percent standard error). Mr. Steinback explained that the PSEs are not that bad, since the data is aggregated across modes so there is a larger sample size. Another advisor asked to confirm that smaller fish are not being encountered in the commercial fishery, and wondered if anglers are encountering smaller fish because there are areas where recreational fishing occurs but is not open to the commercial fleet, which is perhaps providing a safe haven for smaller fish. Mr. Steinback noted that the commercial fishery is not targeting small fish. In response to a question, Mr. Steinback explained that there are four different haddock mortality rates by season and size based on a recent study, and that in general a 19 in. or greater fish has a lower mortality than smaller fish, and mortality is significantly lower in the spring than the fall when the water is warmer. Nate Ribblett (Eastman’s) in the audience said he runs the six pack charter boat that participated in the haddock mortality study, and explained that the study found that water temperature is what causes mortality for haddock, vs. barotrauma for cod mortality. He said while there is spring mortality with cold water temperatures, the mortality is a lot lower than in the fall when warm water temperatures cause mortality, especially for smaller haddock. One advisor asked whether mortality would be the same for cod as haddock. Mr. Ribblett explained that these mortality rates are specific for haddock, that from tagging and tracking fish they found that haddock are affected by water temperature, while cod are affected by barotrauma.

In the audience, Kevin Scola (charter fishery participant) asked why MRIP data is not collected in January and February. Mr. Steinback answered that he did not know for certain but that historically sampling has not been done in January and February from Maine to Virginia, as it was determined not to be justified for the costs because of the low fishing effort during that time, He noted the circumstances have changed and MRIP may want to consider collecting data then. In response Mr. Scola noted huge

fleets fishing in January and February down south that have been for years, and that MRIP is missing out on this data. Mr. Scola also asked if there is any explanation for the decline in effort from 2017 to 2018. Mr. Steinback answered that is likely due to the cod closure the fleet was under from 2014-2015.

One advisor said he is interested in April and August as open seasons for cod, and asked whether the model looked at that for options. Mr. Steinback said that April is tricky because only the second part of April has been open for haddock so there are assumptions that have to be made about the catch for the entire month, but that it is likely not a lot of effort and is similar to October effort and catch.

Discussion:

One advisor said he is interested in looking at an option that would have a 15 haddock possession limit and 15 in. size and for cod would have April and August or September open. Mr. Blount brought up the idea of having a trigger in which the Regional Administrator could open up April for cod if the catch is projected to be under the sub-ACL. Another advisor felt that given the underutilization of cod for the 2018 sub-ACL, that they can safely have a one fish cod possession without exceeding the sub-ACL. Mr. Blount clarified that this would be for next April, and so next year when the regulations change, they will not have any idea of what happens in April the following year (through 2020). Several advisors agreed with wanting to see options for a 15 in. haddock size limit, as they said this will help to utilize the stock and reduce discards, and thought that anglers should be allowed to decide whether to keep 15 in. or 17 in. haddock.

One advisor asked whether there is a reason why haddock is closed in March and April. Mr. Steinback explained that he ran the model with keeping March and April open, but no runs with May because of his understanding that May would have too high mortality rate based on Council comments. He also explained there is little data for March and April which makes it difficult to predict mortality. Another advisor asked that for a new 15 haddock possession limit, if the model assumes vessels will stop fishing once the possession limit is reached, and whether the model assumes for behavior that anglers keep smaller haddock or can the model account for some anglers not keeping smaller haddock. He explained he is concerned about continued fishing effort to look for larger fish, as this has been a problem before for cod discards. Mr. Steinback answered that if behavior changes from 2018 with more highgrading, this could be incorporated in the model if they had estimates of highgrading, would underestimate both haddock and cod mortality. Another advisor said that private anglers' behavior is different than charter vessels in that they don't move around as much to look for fish, and said he thinks private anglers will be happy with a 15 in. haddock size limit.

One advisor asked if any options looked at more than one cod possession limit, in trying to maximize utilization. Mr. Steinback said he did look at two cod possession, and there is a huge difference (75% increase) in mortality due to more encounters. Mr. Blount noted that cod are underutilized because the cod are smaller, since the stock is managed by weight but the catch is in numbers.

Dr. Courneane noted the Groundfish Plan Development Team's (PDT) discussion on the data, explaining that the PDT does not normally discuss recreational measures as in depth due to timing, but had time this year with the delays from the federal shutdown. She referred to the discussion document with additional information, which notes the different process for determining recommendations for recreational measures this year because of the delay from the shutdown, in which the recommendations will go through Council's Executive Committee. She clarified the Council does not anticipate doing this again in future years.

Public Comment:

Mr. Scola said he would recommend considering May as well for haddock, noting that summer effort in August will be higher, and that April is closed for the first half for haddock.

Mr. Ribblett asked if the RAP considered a 15 haddock possession limit at 17 in. He is concerned that a 15 in size limit for haddock in the spring would cause higher cod mortality, because charter boats work by the hour and not by the limit, so once the boat gets its haddock limit they will go target other stocks. He has proposed a 17 in. haddock size limit in the spring when haddock mortality is lower and 15 in. limit in the fall when mortality is higher.

**AGENDA ITEM #1: FY 2019 RECREATIONAL MEASURES FOR GULF OF MAINE COD AND HADDOCK AND GEORGES BANK COD**

**Motion #1: Gibson/DePersia**

The Recreational Advisory Panel (RAP) recommends to the Groundfish Committee an additional option, “option 6a”, to consider for fishing year 2019 management measures:

- Gulf of Maine haddock: 15 in minimum fish size, season open year-round season, and a 15 fish bag limit, and
- Gulf of Maine cod: 19 in minimum fish size, season open April and August, and a 1 fish bag limit

The RAP recommends “option 6a” as its primary recommendation if the model run projects achieving but not exceeding the Gulf of Maine haddock and Gulf of Maine cod sub-annual catch limits.

*Discussion on the Motion:*

Most of the RAP supported a 15 fish possession limit and 15 in. minimum fish size with a year-round open season for haddock, in an effort to allow anglers to more fully utilize the haddock resource. Some advisors were concerned that a 15 in. minimum fish size for haddock would result in increased discard mortality of both cod and haddock, as they felt that anglers might prefer keeping haddock that are larger than 15 in. The RAP was interested in looking at a model run with an option to allow cod possession in both the spring and the fall, in order to balance the needs of different constituents of the party/charter fishery for their customers’ preferred seasons for fishing. The RAP felt that opening April and August for a one fish cod possession limit at 19 in. minimum fish size would be a good compromise between generally lower fishing effort in April and higher effort in August, which they hope should keep catches below the sub-ACL. Some advisors said that allowing cod possession, even if only one fish, is very important to drawing in customers for charter vessels. Others felt that one fish cod possession is not enough of a draw for a fishery, and particularly given the uncertainty over cod stock status, thought the RAP should focus instead on allowing the fishery greater access to haddock.

*Public Comment:*

Bruce Sweet (Gloucester charter boat captain) supported the motion, saying that the message that cod is coming back from the management measures in place would be a good message for customers, and stressed that they have been losing customers to other regions because of the cod closure.

*Motion #1 carried on a show of hands (6/2/0).*

## **Motion #2: Pierdinock/DePersia**

The Recreational Advisory Panel (RAP) recommends to the Groundfish Committee an additional option, “option 6b”, as a back-up recommendation for fishing year 2019 management measures:

- Gulf of Maine haddock: 15 in minimum fish size, season open year-round, and a 15 fish bag limit, and
- Gulf of Maine cod: 21 in minimum fish size, season open April and August, 1 fish bag limit

The RAP recommends “option 6b” as a back-up to “option 6a” if the model run projects achieving but not exceeding the Gulf of Maine haddock and Gulf of Maine cod sub-annual catch limits.

### *Discussion on the Motion:*

The RAP discussed the need for a back-up recommendation in case the model run for their preferred option would not work. Mr. Steinback indicated that raising the minimum fish size for cod from 19 in. to 21 in. should result in lower cod mortality and increase the likelihood of staying under the sub-ACL.

*Motion #2 carried on a show of hands (6/2/0).*

## ***PRESENTATION: RECREATIONAL MEASURES FOR GULF OF MAINE COD AND HADDOCK AND GEORGES BANK COD, MR. STEINBACK, CONTINUED***

*2018 catch and effort data for GB cod:*

Mr. Steinback provided an overview of the recreational fishery catch and effort data for Georges Bank (GB) cod for fishing year 2017 and preliminary fishing year 2018.

Highlights from the data summary are as follows:

- GB cod trips declined from 2017, while catch increased slightly
- Catch frequencies – 60% of trips in MRIP caught 1 cod, only seven trips encountered 9 cod, not a single trip was restricted by the 10 fish limit
- Size frequencies – lot of fish under 23 in., also some much larger >28 in., lots of uncertainty with very few observations
- Intercepted trips – only 100 trips encountered cod, 100 measured kept fish plus imputed length, only 30 released lengths plus some imputed
- Percent Standard Error (PSEs) – over 50% (MRIP threshold) for some data, but these are for harvested fish with very few observations

### *Questions and Comments on the Presentation:*

One advisor asked if there is any GB cod activity for November and December. Mr. Steinback answered that there is some effort data for November but not December. Another advisor asked if there have been any plans for MRIP sampling to occur in January and February, or any eVTRs that can be used to verify catch from these months. He noted cod from the Gulf of Maine migrate south and this is not taken into

consideration. Mr. Steinback explained that MRIP is creating a team to address regional needs, and said there is a possibility that these kinds of issues could be recommended in this group.

Mr. Scola in the audience asked why there is less data for GB cod, and that it is frustrating to not have the same level of data as for GOM cod. Dr. Cournane explained that unlike the bioeconomic model for GOM cod and GOM haddock, there is not a model for GB cod, and clarified that the status for both cod stocks is overfishing/overfished. An advisor pointed out that the GOM cod and haddock fishery is one of the only recreational fisheries in the nation with a bioeconomic model.

*Discussion:*

One advisor said it seems like the bag limit should be lower or they should have lower minimum size, so that boats can catch a few fish and go home. Another advisor observed that GB cod catch has been relatively steady except for an increase in 2016, and at that time GARFO moved the size limit to 23 in., and so he recommends lowering the size limit. An advisor asked if there are there other fisheries operating that also would target GB cod, and it was answered that GB cod is caught as bycatch in the tautog fishery. One advisor asked if they need to change the bag limit and size limit to protect GOM cod that migrate to Georges Bank and whether they need to restrict catch in Georges Bank for this reason. Dr. Cournane explained that the goal of the measures is the same as for GOM is trying to achieve but not exceed the GB cod catch target, and the question is whether measures could be relaxed or should stay where they are currently.

**Motion #3:** Plaia/Paquette as friendly amended

The Recreational Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that for fishing year 2019 management measures for Georges Bank cod: decrease the minimum fish size to 19 in and retain the 10 fish bag limit.

*Discussion on the Motion:*

The RAP felt that nothing in the data presented by Mr. Steinback suggested a need to restrict the GB cod fishery, given that no trips in the data had reached the 10 cod possession limit in FY 2018 and that the 2018 catches seemed to be below the catch target. They felt that lowering the minimum fish size from the current 23 in. to 21 in. would allow the fishery to achieve but not exceed the GB cod catch target. Some advisors were uncomfortable with the idea of relaxing the measures for the GB cod fishery while the GOM fishery is currently at zero possession, and a discussion on cod stock structure followed.

*Motion #3 carried on a show of hands (7/0/1).*

**Motion #4:** Twombly/Pierdinock

The Recreational Advisory Panel (RAP) clarifies to the Groundfish Committee the intent of the RAP's proposed Gulf of Maine cod and Gulf of Maine haddock measures is to maintain one fish cod possession for some portion of the year.

*Discussion on the Motion:*

The RAP clarified that while year-round haddock access is important to the fishery, the RAP's priority is to allow one fish cod possession for part of the year.

*Motion #4 carried on a show of hands (6/2/0).*

**AGENDA ITEM #2: 2019 COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

Dr. Cournane provide an overview of 2019 Council groundfish priorities.

*Discussion:*

There was no further discussion

**AGENDA ITEM #3: RECREATIONAL FISHERY DATA**

Dr. Cournane provided an overview of MRIP data collection, APAIS (intercept) data collection, and FES (effort) data, including what times of the year these data collections occur. She presented party/charter VTR data on effort and landings by wave, noting that the number of permits and trips in the Gulf of Maine and Georges Bank for 2016-2018 are only for groundfish permits and only include non-confidential data (must be at least 3 permits). Dr. Cournane asked the RAP for feedback on whether they find this type of data useful for consideration in management recommendations.

*Discussion:*

Several advisors said they appreciate this information to know how many vessels and trips are impacted. One advisor asked if it would be possible to know how many vessels are keeping other species, to know which are reliant on groundfish. Dr. Cournane noted that reliance is subjective, but that they could try to identify this. Another advisor thought there is a lot of focus on data for the for-hire fleet, but not as much for the recreational private angler when this is more unknown. Several RAP members agreed the MRIP data needs improvement.

***AGENDA ITEM #4: PUBLIC LISTENING SESSIONS FOR POSSIBLE LIMITED ENTRY IN THE PARTY/CHARTER FISHERY***

***PRESENTATION: COUNCIL'S PUBLIC LISTENING SESSIONS ON THE POSSIBILITY OF LIMITED ENTRY IN THE GROUND FISH PARTY AND CHARTER FISHERY, DR. COURNANE***

Dr. Cournane provided an overview of planning for the Council's public listening sessions on the possibility of limited entry in the recreational groundfish party and charter fishery. Dr. Cournane explained the Council could create an opportunity to gather public comments to help determine the Council's next steps – which may include a limited entry amendment. The results of the public comment period would be summarized for the Council to consider at a future meeting, most likely in early 2019. A draft overview document for the listening session and listening session planning ideas (i.e., logistics and meeting locations) were presented, and she asked for feedback from the advisors on the draft.

*Discussion:*

One advisor thought that in general for the public, less information is usually more. He elaborated that for the statistics included in the document he thinks it's good to show the number of permits by state, but is not sure that catch statistics are needed, as this may be misleading since the concern is not about a party/charter quota. Another advisor said he likes having the catch statistics included as it helps to draw conclusions. An advisor suggested the document could address the concern for the history of south shore vessels having no cod possession for several years and whether that might keep them out of the future fishery.

Several advisors thought that including information on the history of why limited entry might be needed would be helpful. Some advisors thought the reasons behind considering limited entry is years ago when the fishery was doing well those involved were concerned that there could be too much new entry, and think it is better to limit when participation in the fishery is low like it is now than waiting until it's high. They characterized this thinking as trying to avoid a situation of zero cod possession. Other advisors thought this was more about those in the fishery not wanting new entrants. Staff clarified that the Council does not know why there is an interest in limited entry, and that these listening sessions are a pre-step to doing an amendment, and noted this could be spelled out more in the document. Staff also suggested this could be added to the "what should comments address" section, the question of what the objectives would be of a program if developed.

One advisor said that this document should also address those not yet in the fishery but who might be interested or may not know they are interested yet, as those are who will be most negatively impacted by limited entry. Another advisor agreed that the document should address not just the party/charter fishery but also public interest in recreational fishing as a public resource, and advised the RAP that they should not pass judgement on people's reasons for interest in the fishery.

The advisor also said that the question of limited entry is a completely different question from the question of having more fish, and emphasized there should not be any discussion in this document about sub-ACLs. Mr. Scola in the audience said he didn't think they could have limited access without trying to have some type of catch share or sub-ACL, and warned of the history of groundfish sectors and qualifying criteria and to not make these same mistakes with the party/charter fishery. One advisor asked if limited access is tied with an allocation. The Chair answered that this will depend on what comes out of the listening sessions. Ms. Keiley (GARFO) further clarified that it's not required, but if the Council is interested in tying limited access to a catch share it legally can do so.

Regarding the proposed times and days for the listening sessions, some advisors said they would like to see more meetings, and that these should be held starting at 6 during weekdays or on weekends to accommodate typical work schedules.

***AGENDA ITEM #5: RECREATIONAL MANAGEMENT ISSUES***

***PRESENTATION: ADDRESSING RECREATIONAL MANAGEMENT ISSUES, MR. NIES***

Mr. Nies (NEFMC Executive Director) provided a summary of the discussion held at the January Council meeting on addressing recreational management issues. He explained that this was intended to be a brainstorming session and that they had not been expecting to come up with answers right away. He also said the hope was to have already had the planned NMFS recreational workshops, but those have been postponed because of the federal government shutdown. Mr. Nies noted that for Council priorities related to recreational fisheries, limited access for the party/charter fishery has come up numerous times with varying views on whether it is a good or bad idea, which is the reason for the Council's interest in holding listening sessions. He summarized the recreational management issues into several categories – 1) measures for GOM cod and haddock, and other stocks; 2) MRIP estimates accurately reflecting removals; 3) other broader recreational management issues; and 4) general fishery management issues. Mr. Nies provided a summary of the Council meeting discussion, explaining that the Council discussed whether there should be designated recreational fishery assignments for some committees and advisory panels, for example, Herring and Habitat. The Council also discussed if a task-specific committee would be appropriate for some recreational priorities. Mr. Nies said the Council had some feedback, and will discuss this again in June 2020. Some Council members considered having dedicated recreational fishery assignments on various committee and advisory panels assignments, although there was less support for this. The Council supported the idea of a stand-alone committee for specific recreational issues (for example, limited access in the party/charter fishery), and opposed having a stand-alone recreational committee.

Discussion:

One advisor said he would find it difficult to serve on other advisory panels because of commitment constraints, but thinks RAP members should be able to comment on other measures like for herring and habitat. He thinks the RAP works well and has a diversity of interests (party/charter, private anglers) but it needs to be able to make sure its comments reach the Council. Mr. Nies noted that in the past the Council has had the RAP comment on actions like the Habitat Amendment, but often they are commenting at the end of the process, and so the idea of having recreational designees would allow them to comment earlier in the process. Another advisor thought it would be a great idea to have recreational representation on advisory panels, and said the RAP works well so he not sure if another task-specific committee is necessary. One advisor suggested combining the approaches and having separate recreational representatives on other advisory panels who could report back to the RAP, and vice versa.

The RAP meeting adjourned at approximately 4:20 p.m.