

# New England Fishery Management Council Groundfish Advisory Panel

Draft Meeting Summary

June 10, 2013

The Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP) met in Providence, RI. The GAP discussed recent work on Amendment 18 to the Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2 alternatives for groundfish gear elements. GAP members present were Mr. Bill Gerencer (Chair), Ms. Jackie Odell (Vice-Chair), Mr. Carl Bouchard, Mr. Richard Canastra, Mr. Aaron Dority, Mr. Ben Martens, Mr. Jim Odlin, Mr. Paul Parker, Ms. Maggie Raymond, Mr. Geoff Smith and Mr. Hank Soule. They were supported staff members Dr. Jamie Cournane, Ms. Rachel Feeney, and Dr. Fiona Hogan (NEFMC), Mr. Brett Alger (NMFS NERO) and Mr. Chad Demarest (NMFS SSB).

Discussions were guided by a presentation of Development of Amendment 18 to the Multispecies FMP, SSB draft report titled “Indicators of Fleet Diversity in the New England Groundfish Fishery”, SSB draft report titled “Trends in Groundfish Fishery Concentration, 2007-2013”, PDT memo regarding groundfish permit banks dated June 3, 2013, Goals and objectives of the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Groundfish Committee meeting summary dated January 24 – 25, 2013, Joint Groundfish Committee and Advisory Panel meeting summary dated March 6, 2013, Groundfish Committee meeting summary dated April 16 – 17, 2013, Habitat Committee meeting summary dated December 4, 2012, Habitat Committee meeting summary dated March 19, 2013, charts showing where non-ground cable trawl gears would be required and a series of correspondence received by the New England Fishery Management Council.

## **PDT Amendment 18 Related Updates**

Staff provided the GAP with an update on the development of Amendment 18 (A18) that included recent activity and PDT work. The Joint Groundfish Committee and Advisory Panel meeting tasked the GAP with developing recommendations on whether and how to revise the goals and objectives of Amendment 18. Staff provided some questions regarding the goals and objectives to guide the GAP discussions. Staff referenced a letter from the Regional Administrator (dated April 9, 2013) suggesting the Council narrow the focus of A18 to focus on accumulation caps to facilitate quick implementation of the Amendment. Staff provided the GAP with some guidelines on how to set goals and objectives; objectives are specific steps to achieve a particular goal and are not always necessary meaning the GAP could decide to only have goals. It was noted that if goals were revised in the general vein of what was originally scoped for then re-scoping would not be necessary. Staff presented a tentative timeline for A18 that would see implementation occur in 2015 but this was dependent on any revisions to goals and objectives.

The PDT discussed the potential revision of the goals and objectives and provided the GAP with some suggestions. Possible accumulation caps could include PSC, permits, ACE, landings, individual stocks, aggregate stocks, and could cap at the individual, business entity, or sector level. Implementing a cap would not turn the groundfish fishery into a limited access privilege program, as long as ACE is assigned to a sector and not individuals.

The PDT developed a questionnaire that was sent to all known permit banks within New England that was designed to determine if they're fostering diversity; the PDT assumed that the context of this evaluation was in the absence of accumulation limits and fleet diversity. The definition of a public permit bank from A17 was used but no standard definition for a private permit bank was available; questionnaires were sent to both types of permit banks. Based on the responses, the PDT estimates the

permit banks hold 95+ federal groundfish permits with 189+ vessels receiving ACE from the permit banks. The missions are diverse and unique but permit banks want certain industry segments to remain viable. Some permit banks also provide business planning in addition to just distributing ACE; some focus on or require collaborative research or have gear requirements. In terms of distribution, ACE has been distributed to diverse groups.

NMFS SSB (SSB) staff presented a summary of two papers regarding indicators of fleet diversity in the New England Groundfish Fishery and trends in groundfish fishery concentration from 2007 – 2013. The first paper used ecological indicators as a representation of diversity in the groundfish fishery. The analysis applied ecological theory to the fishery by considering each combination of vessels size, homeport, etc. as a species and measured fleet diversity using the Shannon Index and the Simpson's Index. Each index has its own caveats, e.g. the Simpson's index down weights the rarer species. A total of 920 species were traced throughout the time period. The fleet diversity indicators for all active groundfish permits reduced from 75 and 115 in 1994 to 62 and 95 in 2011 for the Simpson's Effective Diversity and Shannon Effective Diversity respectively. The analysis indicates that despite vessels leaving the fleet, diversity was retained. The trend in decreasing diversity changed after 2008; it became less steep. Even as vessels and unique combinations of species are lost the representation is becoming more even. The Shannon Index suggests an uptick for vessel sizes over 75 ft. starting in 2008, a decline in the 50 – 75 vessel size range and a potential decline in the less than 50 ft. size class but that class is generally trendless. Distribution has grown more even; the rare species have increased in their share or the dominant species have declined in their share. Species richness has remained constant.

A GAP member requested clarification on how the 920 species given the number of active boats being about 1000 and wanted to know how the number of species affected the analysis. SSB staff explained that you multiply the four different gear types times the 23 counties times the inshore/offshore resulting in 920 species. The Simpson's index underweights rare species; the Shannon index might be more appropriate. Even if the number of species was reduced the same trends would be seen and it would still indicate that richness was maintained from 2008 to 2011. A unique species was based on the core species present, e.g. all vessels in the 30 – 50 ft. size class using trawl gear in inshore areas would fit into one species. The first year in the analysis was chosen because that was when VTRs were implemented. A GAP member concluded that we've been very successful at equally sharing the pain. Another GAP member thought the fishery could lose about twenty percent of the boats in one year and maintain diversity unless the boat was home ported in ME. SSB staff considered it hard to maintain higher species richness when the active fleet size decreased from 1150 to 390 vessels. As the fleet size shrank the distribution hasn't changed in favor of any particular niche. The richness has stayed pretty constant despite the number of possible vessels fishing in these species classes has changed.

SSB staff presented trends in groundfish fishery concentration from 2007 – 2013. An important caveat to this analysis is that it is currently not possible to track permits once they enter the CPH category; this is an administrative issue. It is difficult to draw firm conclusions from the analysis because some of the trends may be due to permits moving into the CPH category. The 2013 data is also incomplete. Ownership was defined more restrictively than in the sector year end reports; ownership groups were defined as unique combinations of owners associated with a single business. The number of MRIs remained constant until 2010, after which a steady decline was noted; it is difficult to conclude this declining trend isn't resulting from more permits entering the CPH program. PSC share held at the individual and owner group's aggregated PSC has remained largely constant throughout the time series examined; aggregated PSC has increased from approximately two percent in 2007 to approximately ten percent in 2013.

If CPH data were included they would change the observed trends; at this point it is hard to tell if the observed trend is more related to permits entering the CPH program and not to owner consolidation. The

number of permits entering the CPH program is increasing; inclusion of those permits would improve the analysis. A GAP member noted that, based on the analysis without CPH permits, all the consolidation seemed to have occurred prior to A16. SSB staff confirmed that permit sales increased from 2007 – 2010 but appeared to have flattened out in 2011 and 2012, which is consistent with the trend in the number of permits held by permit groups. A GAP member also noted that there was a correlation between the decline in the number of ownership groups in 2012 and the number of vessels. SSB staff clarified that the problem with the CPH program is in interpretation of concentration not necessarily a problem with concentration. A GAP member valued the analysis because it was important to look at what happened after implementation of A16 to determine if there was an increase in ownership share. SSB staff explained that the first year of sectors and PSC was 2010; PSC allocations for each MRI were applied backwards to 2007 to 2009 in order to compare trends in equal currency. The number of active vessels in 2013 was 390.

**Motion:** Amendment 18 Goals to support a forward-looking management approach.

The primary objective of the goals for Amendment 18 is to prioritize and advance industry leadership and participation in achieving federal management goals. Sectors and permit banks are maturing as a valid mechanism to formally interface with industry groups. They are uniquely suited to manage/facilitate the regional application of the necessary and built-in flexibility of national rules and guidance. The goals of Amendment 18 will be best approached from the most local level with Council and NOAA oversight.

1. Promote a diverse groundfish fishery, including different gear types, vessel sizes, geographic locations, and levels of participation through sectors and permit banks.
2. Enhance sector management to effectively engage industry to achieve management goals and improve data quality
3. Promote resilience and stability of fishing businesses by encouraging diversification, quota utilization and capital investment.  
(Mr. Parker/Mr. Soule).

*Rationale:* We tried to craft a motion from the GAO that makes it clear that we need to rethink the goals of the amendment from the vantage point that the existing ones say maintain, prevent, prohibit and these types of actions are difficult to agree upon at a federal level so we've gotten bunged down in determining what those mean. We've tried to accomplish to set up goals for the more forward thinking and future looking approach using words like promote, enhance and make it clear that we do have these entities called permit banks and sectors that are good for delivering bottom up community scale outcomes. These would replace the existing goals for A18.

The GAP generally supported the motion. One GAP member considered that sectors and permit banks were already taking actions to promote diversity and try to stabilize the small businesses that are members of sectors. Another GAP member considered that three of the existing goals had already been met based on presentations seen at the meeting. The amount of fish available for sectors to catch was considered to be the real problem facing sectors. Goals were considered to be separate to management tools such as accumulation caps; that was the reason why accumulation caps were omitted from the goals.

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

**Motion:** The GAP makes the following recommendations regarding Amendment 18:

- 1) Conduct an analysis of an ownership cap on multispecies permits. Any ownership cap should not disenfranchise current owners.

- 2) Do not impose restraints on the flow of allocation trades or leases between individuals, sectors, and/or vessel classes.
  - 3) In fisheries with high bycatch of groundfish, including State waters fisheries, allocate sub ACLs of groundfish and establish AMs.
  - 4) Allow entire groundfish allocation to be split off from other permits.
  - 5) Revise upgrade restrictions to allow permits to be placed on larger, safer platforms to increase vessel range in response to ACL volatility.
- (Ms. Raymond/Mr. Soule)

*Rationale:* This reiterates what the GAP has supported at previous meetings.

A GAP member suggested splitting the motion into separate parts to gain more support. The maker of the motion was not open to a friendly amendment that would include PSC allocation in addition to permits because of serious disadvantages to limiting PSC or ACE; the allocations are all linked to one permit and that method might require breaking that link, which would be difficult to do in A18. Also an individual or entity might have to sell a permit to get below a cap. It was suggested that a PSC cap should be looked at in aggregate and not by individual species to avoid that problem; the instability of quotas was also a concern because of large changes in quotas may put someone over the cap.

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

**Motion:**

1. Any analysis and consideration of ownership caps in the multispecies fishery must take into account the full range of potential ACL reductions current and future to ensure such caps do not prevent businesses from remaining viable.
2. Develop mechanisms for flexibility in any cap concepts in order to address unintended obstacles to profitability – survival of fishing businesses that may result from ACL reductions.

(Ms. Odell/Ms. Raymond)

*Rationale* – Considering the large fluctuations in stock assessments, caps may disallow someone from being able to recoup losses from significant downward changes in quotas; ACLs are unknown from one year to the next. It impacts ability to remain profitable.

There was some questioning on what the analysis would actually provide but the general concern was supported. The maker of the motion did not intend that the ownership cap could be waived in the event of a very low ACL; it was to try to deal with caps in a highly volatile environment.

Some public comment on the motion included:

- Chad Demarest, NEFSC SSB – The thing that jumps out at me is an analysis to what end? I guess the analysis would explore different levels of caps, e.g. 15% 20% 25% or 50%, but I'm not sure what metrics you would use to decide if that was good or bad. What are we trying to do with the cap? To the point about instability and such, I think we would probably conduct the analysis like I did in that paper, which is just the percent share and not on pounds so that hopefully we're allowing for the possibility of increasing pounds in some of the smaller stocks right now. I would encourage the GAP to think about what they want to accomplish with an ownership cap. Then that would allow us at the SSB to maybe get at what people's driving forces are in the analysis. The permits are tricky because the permits in the scallop fishery represent almost the same thing across each permit and a permit in the GF fishery represents radically different things across

permits. So a permit cap would be very challenging to analyze because you'd have to calculate, like if you put a permit cap of 30 permits in an ownership group you'd have to try to analyze what the most ideal combination of permits might be for those 30 permits, what happens if someone owns the best 30 permits. It seems like an inefficient way to think about the fishery but maybe I'm off again.

A couple of GAP members were not in favor of ownership caps because they could be destructive and had the high potential for loopholes. The GAP agreed by consensus to split the motion.

**Motion:** Any analysis and consideration of ownership caps in the multispecies fishery must take into account the full range of potential ACL reductions current and future to ensure such caps do not prevent businesses from remaining viable. (Ms. Odell/Ms. Raymond)

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

**Motion:** Develop mechanisms for flexibility in any cap concepts in order to address unintended obstacles to profitability – survival of fishing businesses that may result from ACL reductions. (Ms. Odell/Ms. Raymond)

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (7/0/3).

A GAP member raised some important issues and felt that these needed to be considered immediately before A18. These included GOM/GB haddock spillover (NMFS recently denied a request for emergency action on this issue), eastern US/Canada reporting and the assumed discard rate.

**Motion:** to request Council staff assess and provide examples of US solutions that provide access to capital for individuals, new entrants, sectors and community entities (Mr. Parker/Mr. Odlin)

*Rationale* – Access to capital is an issue in our fishery; entities might not be buying more quota right now but in the long-term and this may bring more stability to the fishery.

Staff and a GAP member requested the motion be more specific regarding the type of information being requested and to be clear that they were not requesting sources for a funding program. The maker of the motion was not looking for funding sources but merely a comprehensive report outlining examples of other existing programs that lend money to fishermen that include who can participate and inception of the program. A GAP member pointed out that the NMFS Fishery Obligation fund would require an act of Congress to implement.

**Motion as perfected:** to request Council staff assess and provide examples of US solutions that provide access to capital for individuals, new entrants, sectors and community entities, e.g. halibut new entrant finance program called Community Quota Entities, NMFS fishery obligation fund financing for quota (Mr. Parker/Mr. Odlin)

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

**Motion** The GAP recommends that the committee and the Council address the following in the next regulatory action:

- 1) The GOM/GB haddock spillover problem - that is the extreme difference between the ACLs for each stock, and the strong potential for GB haddock spillover to cause an overrun of GOM ACL
  - 2) Return the eastern US/CA reporting to statistical areas as has been the practice since Amendment 16, but is not currently in place
  - 3) address the problem of assumed discards especially on stocks with very low ACLs - that is assumed discards are being applied at the sector level, and vessels that don't ever encounter certain species (e.g. GOM YT) are charged discards if they fish anywhere in the Gulf of Maine. Potential solutions to explore are full retention of allocated species, or area specific discard rates.
- (Ms. Raymond/Mr. Bouchard)

The GAP agreed to split the motion into three separate motions.

**Motion:** The GAP recommends that the committee and the Council address the following in the next regulatory action: the GOM/GB haddock spillover problem - that is the extreme difference between the ACLs for each stock, and the strong potential for GB haddock spillover to cause an overrun of GOM ACL

The haddock spillover issue will be the subject of a GF PDT conference call on June 17, 2013. A GAP member thought twenty percent to be an appropriate percentage of haddock spillover. Even if only one percent spillover was considered to be happening that would still be a huge improvement for the industry. There was general support for having the Council continue working on the issue. If the Council did not pick a percentage of spillover then this was considered to be a denial of spillover occurring.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (8/2/0).

**Motion** The GAP recommends that the committee and the Council address the following in the next regulatory action: return the eastern US/CA reporting to statistical areas as has been the practice since Amendment 16, but is not currently in place

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (5/1/4).

**Motion:** The GAP recommends that the committee and the Council address the following in the next regulatory action: address the problem of assumed discards especially on stocks with very low ACLs - that is assumed discards are being applied at the sector level, and vessels that don't ever encounter certain species (e.g. GOM YT are charged discards if they fish anywhere in the Gulf of Maine). Potential solutions to explore are full retention of allocated species, or area specific discard rates.

(Ms. Raymond/Mr. Bouchard)

Discard rates were expected to change after new minimum sizes are implemented on July 1 but there would most likely be a lag in the change being seen in the applied discard rates. Full retention would eliminate the need for an assumed discard rate if there are no discards. The GAP had previously voted to implement full retention in conjunction with one hundred percent dockside monitoring.

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

Staff requested clarification regarding the intent of the first revised goal for A18, i.e. that the intent was to allow sectors and permit banks to figure out how to promote diversity amongst themselves as opposed to

including divert measures in the amendment. There was no assumption that the Agency wouldn't have an oversight role in the process but rather to not turn goals into management options.

### **Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2 alternatives for groundfish gear elements**

The GAP was being asked to review some of the alternatives for groundfish gear elements for the Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2 (OA2) in order to benefit from their expertise with gear. Staff provided an overview of the gear alternatives for OA2. Overall swept area is down but trawl gear still comprises a large portion of the total. Modification of ground cables has been focused on but will affect catchability. Modified gear used in the Pacific has been tested on different seabed type and may not provide the same level of benefit here. The Council added no ground cable options at the April 2013 meeting.

The assumption of whether existing closed areas would be opened in OA2 depended on region; some of the existing areas were identified as vulnerable habitat and in some cases were recommended to remain closed. Based on previous discussions the CAI and lightship areas wouldn't be maintained as gear areas but the Joint Groundfish and Habitat Committees had not finalized areas for analysis. There was some dissatisfaction with the process; some considered that this was an attempt to build in the maximum amount of inefficiency. The Habitat PDT has discussed the costs and benefits of displacing effort into other areas to protect vulnerable habitat and the potential increase in time spent fishing because of reduced catchability of modified gear. There was some support for gear modifications because they were an alternative to closing large areas, which was not preferred. Staff explained that SMAST video survey data were used in the analysis and an area was designated to be in a particular sediment type based on the largest substrate type that was observed in a quadrat. However, some areas, e.g. sections of Georges Shoals, were based on modeling because of limited data. A comparison of the effects of fishing effort on substrate to adjacent closed areas has not been completed. This type of analysis was desirable especially in cases where the areas being proposed for protection had similar substrate to those in a heavily fished area. That information was available to the Habitat PDT. There was some opposition to proposed closures that would end the GB winter flounder fishery, as this was restricted to a couple of the areas up for closure. The analysis of displaced effort and revenue was complicated but will be completed.

**Motion:** For the Georges Shoals and Great South Channel habitat management areas, include an option for modified ground cables that would not exceed 45 fathoms in length per side and that would be elevated off the seafloor using 20 cm diameter discs at 5 fathom spacing. (Ms. Raymond/Ms. Odell).

*Rationale* – the Great South Channel refers to the areas described in GAP document 12 titled “Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2: Habitat Management Areas where no-ground cable trawl gears might be required”. This motion was passed by the Habitat AP at a meeting last October. Along with the no ground cable option this was discussed by enforcement and the sense was that this motion was preferable.

The GAP was informed that the 20 cm discs were available and were already being used on the west coast. A GAP member was strongly opposed to closing vulnerable habitat that would cause all the yield of GB winter flounder to be lost to the fleet because it was all coming out of the Georges Shoals area.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (6/0/4).

**Motion:** in the no ground cable option that the maximum length of bridles be 30 fathom. (Mr. Odlin/Ms. Raymond)

*Rationale:* You need at least 30 fathom; this was based on discussing the issue with trawl fishermen and net manufacturers.

It was clarified that bobbins were required on ground cables and not on the bridles.

**Motion as friendly amended:** in the no ground cable option that the maximum length of bridles be 30 fathom per side. (Mr. Odlin/Ms. Raymond)

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (8/0/2).

**Motion:** Because the clam fishery is prosecuted only in substrate comprised of high energy sand, the clam fishery should be exempt from all HMAs in the GB regulated mesh area (Ms. Raymond/Mr. Odlin).

*Rationale*– referring to areas described in GAP document 12 titled “Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2: Habitat Management Areas where no-ground cable trawl gears might be required”. The clam fishery is prosecuted in high energy sand and shouldn’t be impacted with negative habitat effects.

The SASI model looked at trawls, scallop and clam dredges separately. Based on the distribution of the fishery and how the gear works, a blanket assumption was made in the SASI model that hydraulic clam dredges can only be used in sand habitats and the smallest class of the gravel habitats and can’t operate gear in cobble or boulder areas. Assuming the clam fishery can only operate on the sandy habitats and the objective is to protect cobble areas in those habitat management areas then that could still be accomplished with this type of strategy outlined in the motion.

Some public comment included:

- Dave Wallace, Clam Industry Representative – Ms. Bachman just gave you a few that I was going to give you and that is we fish in areas where there is no structure. Our critters don’t live there and our gear isn’t designed to retain anything larger than an inch or so in diameter or it retains everything an inch or so in diameter. So we don’t tow it in any structure at all most of where we fish, 99% of it is sand. Most of that is in shallow waters so it’s high energy sand. This clam industry is the second largest fishery in New England. We generate a huge amount of revenue and we employ a huge number of people; we just maintain a very low profile. Everything that we catch goes into a processing plant. We are highly constrained by PSP closures; just north of Nantucket Sound north is closed and everything east of 69 degrees is closed except you can get a special permit to fish on Georges Bank if you meet a whole series of PSP requirements; there are only a few vessels that are capable of doing that. The rest of the fishery fishes on and around Nantucket Shoals and if the area that is proposed is closed then those vessels will have a significant problem in remaining viable. As all of you understand the only reason that this closure is proposed is because it does not affect groundfish vessels and it doesn’t affect scallop vessels; it’s a substitute for the Great South Channel being closed which would not affect us at all but would affect groundfish fishermen and scallop fishermen in a dramatic way and therefore we thought it was acceptable not to have to be in conflict with our fellow fishermen and not oppose that closure so that they have a fair opportunity to keep Great South Channel open. So we are suggesting that the exemption for us, which does not cause ecological harm, is a fair and reasonable compromise in this whole affair.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (5/1/4).

**Motion:** GAP recommends that the Habitat PDT analyze the different substrate impacts between geographically proximate bottom types in open and closed areas to determine actual differences between fished and non-fished areas to better inform decision making (Ms. Raymond/Mr. Canastra).

*Rationale* – for example the area just west of existing closed area to see what substrate looks like in that area in a heavily fished, highly productive area, the substrate is still there and apparently not heavily impacted by fishing and compare that to the substrate right beside it to the east in CAII it's very different. Yea this area whose bottom is much more complex west of CAII and yet fishing continues to be there at a substantial level and productivity is good and substrate is unharmed so I'd like to see some of that brought out in the discussion of these areas when the council gets to decision making.

There was general support for the motion so that they could see what habitat that had been closed for 20 years looked like compared to fished areas. Staff supported the analysis request and identified data that could be used to compare areas, e.g. video surveys of the northern edge and HABCAM work on GB. Staff could utilize a project in the WGOM that compared similar stations inside and outside and assessed the seabed type, the different species of fish, sizes of fish and how the fish use the habitat; the Habitat PDT could utilize that data for areas that the Council identifies for analysis.

A GAP member considered the water column to have more impact on fish than a boulder to hide behind. The fact that fish move and are no longer found in closures designed to protect them was being examined by the CATT and some comments regarding new distribution of fish was consistent with the CATT findings.

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

Staff explained that an analysis of the impacts of trap gear on seabed would be difficult but they were going to try to capture it. A GAP member supported a recommendation for research to see if there are ecological impacts from the change from mobile gear to fixed gear that is known to occur in closed areas, e.g. lobster traps in the Gulf of Maine. If closed areas are to be used to promote productivity of groundfish then an impact analysis should be completed to see if lobster traps impact groundfish productivity.

### **Other Business**

The Council passed the following motion at the April 2013 meeting:

“That the Council convene an electronic monitoring working group consisting of 2 current members of the Council, 2 NERO representatives chosen by the Regional Administrator and 2 NEFSC representatives chosen by the Science Director, 2 members of the Groundfish Advisory panel, NOAA General Counsel, a representative from NOAA enforcement and 2 members of the industry.

The objective of this working group would be to identify any existing barriers or necessary steps to NMFS approving sector operations plan(s) that rely on electronic monitoring as a primary mechanism to achieve the Council's identified compliance and catch attribution goals for this program (separate from the biological sampling program).

The working group will provide a brief progress update at the June Council meeting and will present a full overview at the September Council meeting of existing barriers, identified next steps, respective responsibilities of each participating entity and anticipated timelines to implementation of electronic monitoring.

The motion, as perfected, **carried** unanimously on a show of hands (17/0/0).”

Two GAP members were needed to staff the EM committee. The Chair indicated that Mr. Hank Soule and Mr. Geoff Smith volunteered to be working group members.

The meeting adjourned at 16:23 pm.

DRAFT