

# **Groundfish Advisory Panel**

Boston, Massachusetts

April 1, 2019

## **MOTIONS**

### **Motion 1: Soule/Goethel**

The Advisors recommend to the Committee that in Section 4.1.1.2 (Knowing the Total Monitoring Coverage Level at a Time Certain) under Section 4.1.1.2.2/Option 2 (Administrative Measure for Knowing Total Monitoring Coverage Level at a Time Certain) recommend the time certain as three weeks prior to the annual sector enrollment deadline by NMFS.

Motion 1 carried 7/0/0.

Additional comment: The GAP also felt that a discussion should occur with third party monitoring providers to ensure adequate time for training.

### **Motion 2: Goethel/Soule**

The Advisors recommend to the Committee that in Section 4.1.1.3 (Funding for the Groundfish Monitoring Program) to move Section 4.1.1.3/Option 2 (NMFS-Funded At-Sea Monitoring Option) to considered but rejected.

Motion 2 carried 3/1/3.

### **Motion 3: Goethel/Soule**

The Advisors recommend to the Committee to develop an option that would use the NEFOP-level (SBRM) of at-sea coverage to determine the discard rates.

Rationale: Under the purpose and need statement – minimizes cost to NMFS and industry.

### **Motion 4: Raymond/Odell**

To table Motion 3 until discussion occurs later in the day regarding Section 4.2 (Commercial Fishery Measures).

Motion 4 carried 7/0/0.

**Motion 5: Goethel/Brady**

In Section 4.2.1 (Groundfish Sector and Common Pool Monitoring Program Revisions), the Advisors do not support Section 4.2.1.1.2/Option 2 (Dockside Monitoring Program) – which would be a mandatory program for groundfish sectors and the common pool.

Rationale: This expresses a lack of support, but this would not mean removing from the document. Some would still like to see Option 2 analyzed.

Motion 5 failed 3/4/0

**Motion 6: Raymond/Soule**

The Advisors recommend to the Committee that in Section 4.2.1 (Groundfish Sector and Common Pool Monitoring Program Revisions) to revise Section 4.2.1.1.12/Option 2 (Dockside Monitoring Program) to only include 100 percent coverage of all trips.

Motion 6 carried 4/3/1 (the Chair broke the tie).

**Motion 7: Raymond/Odell**

The Advisors recommend that NEFOP coverage would continue to be combined with ASM coverage to fulfill the total monitoring coverage rate.

Motion 7 carried 7/0/0.

**Motion 8: Raymond/Odell**

To “unable” Motion 3.

Motion 8 carried 7/0/0.

**Motion 9: Goethel/Soule**

The Advisors recommend to the Committee to develop an option that would use the NEFOP-level (SBRM) of at-sea coverage to determine the discard rates.

Rationale: Under the purpose and need statement – minimizes cost to NMFS and industry.

Motion 9 carried 6/0/1.

**Motion 10: Raymond/Odell**

The Advisors support a fixed coverage level based on a percentage of trips (Section 4.2.2.1.2 Option 2: Fixed Total At-Sea Monitoring Coverage Level Based on a Percentage of Trips) as an alternative to the No Action (a variable rate determined using the CV standard while meeting certain criteria).

**Motion 10** friendly: Raymond/Odell

The Advisors support a fixed approach to determining a coverage level for the sector program rather than the No Action (a variable rate determined using the CV standard while meeting certain criteria).

Motion 10 carried 7/0/0.

**Motion 11:** Goethel/Soule

The Advisors recommend to the Committee that the sector monitoring standards should be applied at the vessel level for analysis.

Motion 11 carried 7/0/0

Additional comment: For the analysis, examine at the vessel level and sector level.

**Motion 12:** Raymond/Smith

The Advisors request the Committee task the Plan Development Team to investigate the possibility of decoupling the ASM program from the NEFOP program, to allow sector managers and monitoring providers to work toward more balanced coverage within each sector (rather than using the Pre-Trip Notification System, PTNS, for ASM).

Motion 12 carried 7/0/0.

**Motion 13 friendly:** Goethel/Brady

The Advisors recommend to the Committee that if the vessel select the electronic monitoring (EM) option, selection be made by the vessel, not by the sector, and that selection is made for the entire year, but may be changed once during the fishing year.

Motion 13 carried 7/0/0

**Motion 14:** Raymond/Soule

The Advisors request that the Committee/Council provide clarification of which aspects of the current monitoring program require additional “accuracy” and the level of monitoring that would be required to “prevent overfishing” (see A23 statement of purpose and need).

Motion 14 carried 7/0/0.

**Motion 15:** Odell/Brady

The Advisors recommend to the Committee that the range of alternatives for Amendment 23 be considered following the completion and full discussion of the Plan Development Team analyses, related to the "problem" (and magnitude of the problem) concerning "accuracy" of catch (landings and discards).

Motion 15 carried 6/0/1.

**Motion 16:** Goethel/Soule

To add a section to the alternatives that differentiates NEFOP/Observer responsibilities from ASM responsibilities.

Motion 16 carried 7/0/0.

**Motion 17:** Goethel/Brady

To change such that EVIC (EPIRB Visual Inspection Card) are issued on the first observed trip of the fishing year, and the card will be good (will not expire) until the first piece of equipment inspection date (e.g., EPIRB or life raft expiration date).

**Motion 17a:** Raymond/Odell

To move to substitute that the Groundfish Committee Chair/Council request the Observer Program meet with fishing industry in a workshop to minimize issues with observers (safety checks, gear, etc.).

Motion 17a to substitute carried 6/1/0.

Motion 17b as the main motion carried 5/1/1.

**Motion 18:** Odell/Brady

To request the Committee/Council ask NMFS that for FY2019 the target coverage level be based on the Council's policy as approved by NMFS in FW55, the result would be based on Georges Bank yellowtail flounder at the 20% target coverage level.

Rationale: Council policy was not based on "approaching an overfished condition" as described for Georges Bank winter flounder in the FY2019 coverage analysis.

Motion 18 carried 5/0/1 (one Advisor out of the room).