



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

Groundfish Advisory Panel

Four Points by Sheraton, Wakefield, MA

September 18, 2018

The Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP) met on September 18, 2018 in Wakefield, MA to discuss and make recommendations on: 1) draft alternatives and analysis in Framework Adjustment 58: Specifications/Management Measures; 2) an update on Amendment 23: Groundfish Monitoring; 3) a draft list of possible groundfish priorities for 2019 for the Council; and 4) other business as necessary.

MEETING ATTENDANCE: Ben Martens (Chairman), Jackie Odell (Vice Chair), Bonnie Brady, David Goethel, Paul Parker, Mike Russo, and Geoffrey Smith; Dr. Jamie Cournane and Robin Frede (NEFMC staff); and Terry Stockwell (Groundfish Committee Chair). In addition, approximately 10 members of the public attended, including Sarah Heil, Mark Grant, Emily Keiley, Dan Linden, Liz Sullivan (GARFO), Terry Alexander, Rick Bellavance, Libby Etrie, and Melanie Griffin (Groundfish Committee/Council members).

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION: Discussions were aided by the following documents and presentations: (1) Meeting memorandum and agenda dated September 7, 2018; (2) Presentations: Council staff; (3) TRAC/TMGC presentation: Transboundary Management Guidance Committee Chair; (4a) Framework Adjustment 58: Specifications and Management Measures - Draft alternatives under development (September 14, 2018); (4b) Memo from Groundfish PDT to SSC re GB yellowtail flounder ABCs, including a memo from the Scallop PDT (August 9, 2018); (4c) Memo from Groundfish PDT to SSC re Rebuilding strategies for several groundfish stocks (August 13, 2018); (4d) Memo from Groundfish PDT to the Committee re development of alternatives for Framework Adjustment 58 (September 14, 2018); (5) Amendment 23: Groundfish Monitoring - Memo from Groundfish PDT to the Committee re progress report on Amendment 23 (September 10, 2018); (6a) Groundfish Committee meeting summary, June 1, 2018; (6b) Fishery Data for Stock Assessments Working Group meeting summaries from June 25, Aug. 6, and Sept. 7, 2018, located here: <https://www.nefmc.org/committees/fishery-data-for-stock-assessment-working-group>; (6c) SSC meeting summary, Aug. 15, 2018 as two SSC memos to Executive Director Tom Nies re 1) GB yellowtail flounder and 2) rebuilding strategies, located here: <https://www.nefmc.org/committees/scientific-and-statistical-committee>; and (7) Correspondence.

The meeting began at approximately 8:45 a.m.

KEY OUTCOMES:

- The GAP recommends to the Groundfish Committee (Committee) to accept the US/CA 2019 quotas for Eastern Georges Bank cod (650mt), Eastern Georges Bank haddock (30,000mt), and Georges Bank yellowtail flounder (140mt) as carefully negotiated by the US TMGC.
- The GAP recommends to the Committee that revised rebuilding plans follow guidance and flexibility as prescribed by National Standard 1, specifically, to focus attention on fishing mortality rates rather than fixed rebuilding time periods.
- For the stocks examined by the Plan Development Team (PDT), the GAP recommends to the Committee that the state waters component percentages remain at status quo and accept the PDT recommendations (Table 1 of PDT memo dated September 14, 2018) for the other components (i.e., other federal fisheries) except for the use of research catch of GOM cod in 2017 in the evaluation.
- The GAP recommends to the Committee to support in Section 4.2.1.2 Option 2: Exempt vessels fishing in NAFO waters from Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP) commercial minimum fish sizes.
- The GAP recommends to the Committee that dockside monitoring is a function of enforcement and should continue to be done by enforcement, and recommends to the Committee to develop alternatives for dockside monitoring that complement at-sea monitoring (e.g., observers/EM) to increase affordability and value for the commercial groundfish fishing industry.
- The GAP recommends to the Committee that the PDT analyze coverage levels with and without NEFOP as a component of the target coverage level.
- The GAP recommends to add to the list of 2019 Council priorities for discussion, examine the issue of leased fish and possible changes to management system, and process for U.S./Canada quota trading.

AGENDA ITEM #1: FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT 58

PRESENTATION: TMGC GUIDANCE COMMITTEE REPORT, MR. STOCKWELL

Groundfish Committee Chair Mr. Stockwell provided a brief overview of the Transboundary Management Guidance Committee (TMGC) 2019 guidance report, including a summary of the U.S./Canada TMGC and Steering Committee meetings. He provided an overview of the TMGC recommendations for total allow catch (TAC) for the three stocks managed under the U.S./Canada resource sharing understanding – Georges Bank (GB) yellowtail flounder, Eastern GB cod, and Eastern GB haddock – and explained the discussion surrounding these stocks at the meetings. Mr. Stockwell also provided a summary of recommendations for 2019 Transboundary Resource Assessment Committee (TRAC) Terms of References (TORs).

Questions and Comments on the Presentation:

One advisor asked for further explanation of the recommendations for 2019 TRAC TORs for alternatives to the models for Eastern GB cod. Mr. Stockwell explained that the TRAC would like room to be able to explore other models outside of a benchmark process so that this can occur sooner, given that the TRAC assessment scientists do not feel that the current models considered are providing the best information. Another advisor asked whether there was any interest by the TRAC in looking at fishery dependent data in the Eastern GB area for cod and seeing how it compares to survey indices. Staff explained that “various indicators” mentioned in the TOR includes both fishery data and survey indices, and that the TRAC would like to look at annual catch patterns in the Eastern GB area. Several advisors had questions about the concerns the TRAC noted for the 2013 Eastern GB cod year class with the size and potential of this

year class. Staff explained that this is a word of caution from the TRAC because the signals from the 2013 year class haven't been as strong recently and they haven't seen any newer recruits or large year classes since 2013.

One advisor brought up the concerns regarding GB yellowtail flounder that the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) had about the NMFS 2018 spring survey not being representative in terms of stations sampled and missing key yellowtail flounder areas, and asked how this fit into the TMGC discussion on yellowtail flounder recommendations. Mr. Stockwell explained that for TMGC the U.S. delegation tried to stay away from referring the SSC because the SSC is not recognized as a part of U.S./Canada process, and explained that the U.S. delegation did try to argue for dropping the 2018 spring survey which would have resulted in a higher recommendation, but Canada did not support this. The advisor also asked for further explanation on the range of exploitation rates the TRAC/TMGC considered for the empirical approach for yellowtail flounder. Mr. Stockwell explained that the TRAC migrated away from the range that went up to 16%, and that this year considered a range of recent exploitation rates up to 11%. He explained there was some concern with inconsistencies in the TRAC's approach to this, but pointed out that the TRAC has been clear that these exploitation rates are too high and the TMGC should be cautious. Mr. Stockwell also addressed questions about the TMGC recommendations for yellowtail flounder, explaining that the recommended yellowtail flounder quota will likely result in status quo catches for the U.S. fishery while it is half of the TAC last year. He noted that the groundfish fishery catch for yellowtail flounder is the lowest ever and scallop fishery bycatch for 2017 was higher than the groundfish fishery catches.

One advisor asked what the reasons were for the differences between countries this year, given the difficulties with negotiations for TMGC recommendations. Mr. Stockwell explained that this was due in part to the different political climates for each country, particularly because Canada's current conservation-minded government is concerned with its rebuilding plans.

U.S./Canada Total Allowable Catches

Motion #1: Goethel/Odell

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee to accept the US/CA 2019 quotas for Eastern Georges Bank cod (650mt), Eastern Georges Bank haddock (30,000mt), and Georges Bank yellowtail flounder (140mt) as carefully negotiated by the US TMGC.

Discussion on the Motion: The seconder of the motion explained the intent for including "carefully negotiated" is to point out that the GAP is not just accepting these numbers and is recognizing that there was negotiation involved. The maker of the motion additionally explained that the intent is that the GAP accepts but does not endorse these numbers, and said he has concern that this process is becoming more political than scientific. Mr. Stockwell clarified that the challenge is with the two different scientific processes between the countries and not the two different governments, since Canada must follow the TRAC advice whereas the U.S. has the SSC to provide additional scientific advice.

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

PRESENTATION: FW58, DR. COURNANE

Staff provided a brief overview of Framework Adjustment 58 (FW58), which includes the following measures: specifications for FY2019 for US/Canada stocks (GB yellowtail flounder, Eastern GB cod, and

Eastern GB haddock); revised/new rebuilding plans for several stocks (GB winter flounder, Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic (SNE/MA) yellowtail flounder, witch flounder, Gulf of Maine (GOM)/GB windowpane flounder, and ocean pout); exemptions to Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP) commercial minimum fish sizes for vessels fishing exclusively in Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) waters; and additional guidance on sector overages. Staff walked through the draft alternatives to date as drafted by the PDT from the Committee's recommendations and explained that the PDT will revise these based off GAP and Committee recommendations at today's meetings. Staff also presented the PDT's preliminary abbreviated sub-component analysis for stocks that had either been identified by the Council as being a special case (GB cod, GOM cod, GOM winter flounder, witch flounder, and Atlantic halibut), or had much lower 2017 catches than previously estimated for the 2016 stock assessments used in the rebuilding plan option projections (GB winter flounder), as well as PDT recommendations for revising sub-components for these stocks. Staff explained that this was an effort to complete the sub-component analysis earlier in the framework process. The goals of the GAP's discussion were to provide guidance on development of the draft alternatives and possibly make recommendations to the Committee on the draft alternatives.

Questions and Comments on the Presentation:

One advisor brought up the recent Exempted Fishing Permit (EFP) for maximized retention Electronic Monitoring (EM) vessels, noting that the states had pushed back on how to deal with several vessels that would not have minimum fish sizes, and asked whether the GAP or Committee had thought through the issues of how to handle state enforcement of minimum fish sizes with regard to the NAFO minimum fish size exemption. Ms. Griffin (Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries (MADMF)) explained that MADMF has expressed concerns with minimum fish size exemptions for many years, and that they have worked with the vessels participating in the maximized retention EM EFP, with the main concern to make sure that enforcement has the tools to handle this. Staff explained that there has been an EFP application submitted to allow NAFO boats to be exempt from minimum fish sizes, and Ms. Etrie noted that NMFS had indicated the notice for the EFP should be available for the Council meeting. Another advisor clarified that this is talking about allowing the NAFO vessels to be able to bring in a different type of product of frozen fish and is not just a change in minimum fish size, and emphasized there is a difference between allowing vessels to access the market for a different product versus exempting vessels from minimum fish sizes.

The GAP went through each of the sections of the FW 58 alternatives for discussion.

Rebuilding Plans

Discussion:

One advisor said that the rebuilding plans should be able to take advantage of the flexibility under the new National Standard 1 guidelines, and pointed out that for some stocks this will be the second time around developing rebuilding plans, and so the GAP and Council should think about what lessons have been learned from these. She recommended the rebuilding plans focus on setting a level for F_{MSY} that goes with the maximum time allowed for stocks with projections, and should not be overly prescriptive. Another advisor asked about the correspondence from Tom Nies to NMFS on rebuilding plans for some stocks [GB winter flounder], and whether there has been a response from the Agency. Mr. Grant explained that the letter had questions about the new National Standard 1 guidelines, particularly on whether the Council can discontinue rebuilding plans if stock status improves, and said the Agency does not have a response yet but plans to discuss this more in depth and have a response soon. The advisor pointed out the paragraph in the letter on fixed rebuilding timelines, which recommends focusing on

keeping fishing below a level and not on assigning arbitrary timelines. Mr. Grant clarified that NMFS' guidance is to keep fishing below F_{MSY} and use the rebuilding timeline as way to check progress to determine whether the fishing rate needs to be adjusted to promote rebuilding.

Several advisors asked how they should handle stocks like witch flounder with a long lifespan where it may not be possible biologically to rebuild in these short timelines, and whether there is flexibility for these stocks. Staff explained that the PDT did discuss this and felt that for some stocks like ocean pout where there isn't enough information on lifespan they should set rebuilding as undefined, and for northern windowpane the Science Center might soon have age data process to understand the lifespan. But staff explained that witch flounder is slightly different because there is age data available and it is a landed species, but without a model the assessment doesn't consider age data anymore. Staff further explained that flexibility factors like biological limitations can be used to justify going beyond the maximum rebuilding timeline but these need to be carefully articulated, noting that the GARFO letter on rebuilding plans gives ideas for what to do for these stocks which suggest additional management measures.

Motion #2: Odell/Goethel

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that revised rebuilding plans follow guidance and flexibility as prescribed by National Standard 1, specifically, to focus attention on fishing mortality rates rather than fixed rebuilding time periods.

Rationale: Variability outside of the control of managers, such as changing environmental conditions, have been prevalent. Concerns are also consistently raised about the reliability of projections. Therefore, offering more rather than less flexibility is important. For example, applying $75\%F_{MSY}$ and considering each stock on a case-by-case basis.

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

Annual Catch Limits

Discussion:

One advisor asked which of these stocks will have an increase in annual catch limit (ACL) and which will have a decrease. Staff explained that the GB cod acceptable biological catch (ABC) will increase next year because fewer fish are going into eastern area so there will be more in the U.S. portion, but that other stocks have no change in ABC because there were no assessment updates this year. The advisor pointed out that under the PDT's recommendation for revisions to sub-components that some stocks would have a decrease in the groundfish fishery allocation while the overall ABC is declining. Staff explained that these numbers were determined using a straight three-year average approach the PDT adopted, but that the PDT also includes caveats for some of the stocks. Another advisor said he feels that the states have a handle on these stocks [halibut, GOM cod, and GOM winter flounder].

Motion #3: Goethel/Odell

For the stocks examined by the Plan Development Team (PDT), the Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that the state waters component percentages remain at status quo and accept the PDT recommendations (Table 1 of PDT memo dated September 14, 2018) for the other components (i.e., other federal fisheries) except for the use of research catch of GOM cod in 2017 in the evaluation.

Rationale: We have a good handle on other federal fisheries - in terms of observer data and estimated catches - contributing to the other sub-component. For the state waters sub-component, we should continue to make clear that the states should control these catches as planned.

Motion #3 carried on a show of hands (6/0/0).

NAFO Regulatory Area

Discussion:

Andrew Walsh (Tremont Fisheries), who fishes in the NAFO regulatory area and is proposing to the Council and NMFS an exemption from minimum fish sizes for vessels fishing in the NAFO area, explained his rationale for pursuing this exemption. He explained that vessels fishing in the NAFO area are required to follow the NAFO Conservation Enforcement Measures (CEM) which include minimum fish sizes, and that as a U.S. fisherman fishing in NAFO waters, he and others operating vessels in the NAFO area want to be able to follow these regulations in NAFO waters, but instead they are currently bound by the minimum fish sizes of the U.S. He explained that because of this they are missing out on opportunities to expand into the frozen fish market as the fish have to be headed and gutted at sea to preserve quality, but this puts them below the U.S. domestic minimum fish sizes. Mr. Walsh said that Canadian NAFO vessels dominate the yellowtail flounder frozen market and are selling to the U.S., and that he would like to be able to compete with these imports for the frozen market, and further explained that his intention is not to compete with the fresh fish market which typically has different buyers.

Several advisors asked Mr. Walsh clarifying questions, and agreed that an exemption to minimum fish sizes for vessels fishing in the NAFO area should be included in FW 58 in order to give U.S. fishermen every opportunity to access this quota. One advisor said he accepts this but does not believe that this won't eventually impact the U.S. market. Staff asked the GAP how they would like to treat stocks that have no minimum fish sizes in NAFO, or are not managed by NAFO (such as Atlantic halibut). Ms. Etrie explained that GARFO allows vessels to fish for Atlantic halibut in the NAFO area, but puts additional regulations on these vessels under their High Seas permit. One advisor recommended including in the FW 58 document further explanation on how NAFO regulations work for stocks without minimum fish sizes.

Motion #4: Odell/Russo

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee to support in Section 4.2.1.2 Option 2: Exempt vessels fishing in NAFO waters from Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP) commercial minimum fish sizes.

Rationale: To allow U.S. fishermen, including associated businesses and vessels, the opportunity to compete in a frozen H & G market consistent with the June 7, 2018 industry letter to the Council that the GAP discussed. It would be clarified in the alternative that the minimum fish sizes would be as specified in the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures (CEM) – which may change on an annual basis. NAFO regulations would still apply.

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

Guidance on Sector Overages

Discussion:

Ms. Heil (GARFO/Groundfish Committee member) provided an update on this item, explaining that during the initial development of FW 58 NMFS didn't have Sector 9 rulemaking available, and that this item was included for FW 58 as a placeholder since this had never happened before and NMFS didn't know if it could reconcile Sector 9 overages with the current guidance. She explained that during Sector 9 rulemaking, NMFS determined that the guidance on sector overages from A16 was sufficient to reconcile overages. Ms. Heil said that GARFO will compile the correspondence on Sector 9 rule making and lessons learned from this case, but that NMFS doesn't think there are any emergency issues that need to be addressed by FW 58, and instead the Council can consider whether there is anything to change regarding guidance on sector overages over the long term.

No further discussion or motions.

AGENDA ITEM #2: AMENDMENT 23/GROUNDFISH MONITORING

PRESENTATION: A23, MS. FREDE

Staff provided an overview of the PDT's progress report on Amendment 23 (A23), including an update on the timeline for A23 development, a summary of a PDT memo from September 10, 2018 which includes an overview of the draft alternatives, an overview of ongoing PDT analyses to address Committee recommendations related to fixed coverage level analysis and development of dockside monitoring (DSM), and an additional analysis to address a Committee recommendation to analyze groundfish fishing activity west of 72 degrees 30 minutes west longitude to see whether it would be appropriate to exempt these vessels from at-sea monitoring (ASM) and DSM, several questions for the Committee to consider regarding development of alternatives, as well as a draft glossary of key term for A23. Staff also provided an update on the work of the Fishery Data for Stock Assessment Working Group, as this group is related to A23 and monitoring. The goals of the GAP's discussion were to provide guidance on development of the draft alternatives and PDT analyses and possibly make recommendations to the Committee on the draft alternatives.

Questions and Comments on the Presentation:

One advisor asked clarifying questions about the analysis of fishing activity west of 72 degrees 30 minutes west longitude. Dr. Linden (GARFO and PDT member) who completed the analysis, addressed these questions. He also answered questions on the coverage level and bias analysis he worked on as well, and clarified that this analysis was a simple simulation exercise with the goal of helping to show how catch estimates change over the years depending on catch composition each year and under different coverage levels. Dr. Linden noted that part of this analysis shows that for some stocks (highly utilized stocks) there isn't much of a problem with bias with regard to discard rates. He also explained that the PDT is working on a way to determine actual estimates of bias to provide a baseline level of bias in the fishery, to further help with analyzing the effects of different coverage levels on catch estimates. Another advisor asked whether there are other ways to address bias, for example, through a change in enforcement levels. Dr. Linden explained that this is a difficult question to address without some sort of study to determine the number of OLE officers that would be needed and said while it's likely that increased enforcement would lower bias, it is hard to say what the relationship is exactly, noting that this is a similar problem with the EM audit model and the question of how much review rate is needed to encourage compliance. One advisor felt that they need to know what level of precision and accuracy of

monitoring data is needed, but that some amount of variability will have to be accepted, because even at 100% there still are problems with bias with respect to observers.

One advisor asked whether there is a process through NMFS to discuss designing monitoring to be comprehensive, and whether the PDT needs more guidance on developing draft alternatives to incorporate flexibility for sectors. The advisor also asked whether the PDT had discussed the intersection of DSM and enforcement. Staff explained that the PDT has discussed the overlapping role of DSM and enforcement and has had discussions with Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) about this, but clarified that the PDT interprets DSM as serving a compliance role and not enforcement, emphasizing that a clear determination of the objectives of DSM will be important for developing a DSM program. Mr. Grant noted that the PDT and NMFS have been working with OLE on lessons learned from the Carlos case for DSM and monitoring in general. Another advisor expressed concern that with ASM and DSM that there won't be a fishery left to monitor because of the costs and said he thinks DSM should be left to enforcement, particularly when considering that DSM goes beyond the groundfish fishery as there are concerns with misreported landings in other fisheries.

One advisor asked whether the PDT has developed analyses to address the Committee recommendation, "Develop alternative methodologies to the CV standard for determining total monitoring coverage level." Staff clarified that the PDT has not yet but plans to develop ideas for this alternative to bring to a future GAP and Committee meeting. Another advisor asked if the PDT has been thinking about integrative monitoring systems, as in DSM paired with ASM or EM, since in other regions this design has helped to minimize costs. The advisor also mentioned that at the last meeting the GAP had a discussion of uncertainties in the fishery, and said he thinks the GAP needs to go back to this discussion to identify where the main problems are – for example, is the problem with dealers cheating or with stock area misreporting, or with illegal discarding of legal sized fish – as he believes this is an important step to start with an honest appraisal of these problems and then design a monitoring program to address these.

Motion #5: Goethel/Brady

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that dockside monitoring is a function of enforcement and should continue to be done by enforcement.

Rationale: This is an enforcement issue – landing illegal fish could occur in any fishery – not just groundfish – DSM would too narrowly focus on groundfish. More resources should be put in enforcement activities.

Discussion on the Motion: One advisor questioned whether this is the same as No Action for DSM. The maker of the motion said he thinks this is different from saying there is no DSM program for the groundfish fishery because he would want to specify who is doing DSM, and clarified that the intention is not to define what OLE should do, but to specify that this should not be a function of monitoring.

Motion #5 carried on a show of hands (3/0/3).

Motion #6: Parker/Smith

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee to develop alternatives for dockside monitoring that complement at-sea monitoring (e.g., observers/EM) to increase affordability and value for the commercial groundfish fishing industry.

Discussion on the Motion: Several advisors discussed whether DSM should include both the common pool and sectors, as there were concerns about the affordability of DSM for the common pool. Staff clarified that the scope of A23 can include the common pool as well as sectors. The maker of the motion explained that his intention is for this to be a higher level discussion about finding DSM program designs that complement at-sea monitoring, and that are more comprehensive than focusing on how much dealers are misreporting since this is likely a small amount. The seconder of the motion agreed that a DSM program that just monitors landings and verifies dealer reports is not worth it, but a more comprehensive one would be. Another advisor explained that she views A23 as setting a bar for what to achieve for both coverage level and data quality and then sectors can choose which tools work best for them, and said she supports this in terms of what tools sectors could choose to use.

Motion #6 carried on a show of hands (3/2/1).

Motion #7: Martens/Odell

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that the Plan Development Team analyze coverage levels with and without NEFOP as a component of the target coverage level.

Discussion on the Motion: Ms. Etrie provided information on upcoming planned changes to how the Pre-Trip Notification System (PTNS) is deployed next year and explained that this may result in higher Northeast Fisheries Observer Program (NEFOP) coverage to achieve Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology (SBRM) requirements, and will likely vary by sectors in terms of proportion of coverage as NEFOP trips versus ASM trips. The maker of the motion said he thinks it will be cleaner to look at monitoring coverage levels without NEFOP, so the PDT will be able to look at EM and ASM and know what minimum rate is needed to achieve a target. He further explained that given the upcoming PTNS changes which could result in, for example, a trawl vessel having much higher NEFOP coverage than a longline vessel, that the PDT should just focus on ASM in the analysis of coverage levels to exclude these potential large differences.

Motion #7 carried on a show of hands (5/0/1).

AGENDA ITEM #3: 2019 INITIAL COUNCIL PRIORITIES

Staff explained that at this meeting the GAP can recommend additional items to be considered for the list of 2019 Council priorities, and that this list will be taken up at the December Council meeting to decide the finalized list of 2019 Council priorities.

Motion #8: Goethel/Brady

To add to the list for discussion, examine the issue of leased fish and possible changes to management system.

Motion #8 carried on a show of hands (4/0/2).

Motion #9: Odell/Brady

To add to the list for discussion, process for U.S./Canada quota trading.

Discussion on the Motion: One advisor asked whether anything has changed for this issue since this was last discussed several years ago. Mr. Alexander explained that the Council ran out of time to develop it at the time and that there was also less of a need or interest in pursuing trading, but that now there is more of a sense of urgency with the U.S. needing more yellowtail flounder quota and Canada needing more haddock.

Motion #9 carried on a show of hands (5/0/1).

AGENDA ITEM #4: 2019 OTHER BUSINESS

Staff explained that the temporary provision to the scallop fishery flatfish accountability measures (AMs) sunset this year for three stocks (GB yellowtail flounder, SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, and northern windowpane flounder), and the Scallop Committee is interested in continuing these and hoping the Groundfish Committee will take it up. Under the temporary provision, the scallop fishery would be subject to AMs for each of these stocks if its sub-annual catch limit (sub-ACL) and the total ACL is exceeded.

Discussion: One advisor said this should be considered for a year or two, but not continue indefinitely. Staff explained that there have been changes to the scallop flatfish AMs to be gear modifications and no longer area closures.

The Groundfish Advisory Panel meeting adjourned at approximately 12:50 p.m.