

**Red Crab Committee
Revere, MA
August 12, 2010**

Meeting Summary

Members and others present:

Committee Members: Mr. Goethel (Chair), Ms. Tooley, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Avila, Mr. Blount, Mr. Fair, and Mr. Preble. Also present were Mr. Allen, Ms. Bigelow, Ms. Kelly, Mr. Wetmore and Mr. Williamson.

Committee Chairman Dave Goethel opened the meeting by noting changes to the schedules, explained the ACL and AM requirements arising from the 2006 amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the National Standard Guidelines and read from the amendment as guidance for assuring that Amendment 3 would comply with the requirements. He then gave an overview of the review process that the Committee would follow.

PDT Chairman Dick Allen gave an overview of the fishery for the benefit of Committee members who might not be familiar with the red crab fishery and recent developments in the fishery.

Chairman Goethel then led the Committee in a review of the options identified in Amendment 3. The Committee considered and voted on the following motions as indicated:

Motion Tooley/Avila: The preferred alternative under the Effort Control Options would be 4.1.1 – hard TAL without days-at-sea.

The motion carried unanimously.

Motion Preble/Alexander: The preferred alternative for the trip limit alternatives would be 4.2.1. – eliminate trip limit.

The motion carried unanimously.

PDT Chairman Allen reviewed the current trap limit language and explained that the purpose of the proposed change in language was to allow combination red crab and offshore lobster boats to haul traps in both fisheries on the same trip, as they did prior to the implementation of the red crab FMP in 2002.

Motion Tooley/Preble: Preferred alternative would be 4.3.1. – the alternative to modify trap limit language. It should include the 3 bullets at top of pg. 34 of the draft Amendment, which provide the suggested language.

The motion carried unanimously.

Motion Alexander/Tooley: Preferred alternatives for the Accountability Measures would be 4.4.1.1 (Proactive - In-season Closure Authority Granted to the Regional Administrator), 4.4.2.1 (Reactive – Next Year In-Season Adjustment Option), 4.4.3 (Combinations of Both Proactive and Reactive AMs).

The motion carried unanimously.

Motion Tooley/Preble: Preferred alternatives regarding the specification setting process would be 4.5.1 (Modify Process for Setting Specifications to Include the SSC) and 4.5.3 (Modify the Specification Components to Fit the Effort Control Alternative chosen).

The motion carried unanimously.

The Committee agreed to allow the PDT Chairman to modify the document to reflect MS Act and any new requirements appropriate to the alternatives in the amendment.

Motion Blount/Avila: Move section 4.7 (Measures to Control Female Harvest) to 4.6 and delete the parts of the sentences which state “the ACL could be set to zero or as close to zero as is practicable. In any year in which the ACL was zero.” (The effect of this motion was to move the alternative related to measures to control female harvest from the “Considered and Rejected” category, where it was placed by the staff at the request of the NMFS Regional Office, to the active consideration category.)

The motion carried unanimously.

Motion Preble/Avila: Preferred alternative for the specifications under the “Hard TAL with No DAS” alternative would be 5.1.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moira Kelley from NERO suggested that the specifications be clarified to indicate that the TAL would apply only to the limited access red crab fleet.

Moira also offered the opinion of the NERO staff that the measure to allow females to be harvested would require an Environmental Impact Statement either now or when the Council received and accepted specifications from the SSC that would allow a female harvest.

Moira also requested that the Amendment 3 document make clear the rationale for the TAL and ACL being equal to the ABC, implying that there is no management uncertainty and therefore no need for a buffer.

Moira also raised the question of whether the Council intended to continue the Interactive Voice Reporting system that is currently required by the FMP. Although the IVR is

primarily a days-at-sea monitoring tool, it is also helpful in monitoring the cumulative landings of the fleet. All present agreed that the IVR requirement should remain in the FMP because it reduces management uncertainty by providing an additional source of monitoring for landings.

The Committee requested the staff to include more description and rationale for the management measures in Section 4 of the document. The Committee would rather have repetition in the document than flip from one section to another to connect a management measure with its description and rationale.

That concluded the business before the Committee and the meeting was adjourned.