

**New England Fishery Management Council**  
**Groundfish Oversight Committee**  
**Meeting Summary**  
August 26, 2008

The Groundfish Oversight Committee (Committee) met in Peabody, MA to continue development of Amendment 16 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP). The Committee discussed Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM III) results, management measure development, recreational fishery ACL/AM issues, sector monitoring, the draft measures text for the CAII Haddock SAP, and an interim action for groundfish management. Committee members present were Mr. Rip Cunningham (Chair), Mr. Terry Stockwell (Vice-Chair), Mr. Frank Blount, Mr. Mike Leary, Ms. Sally McGee, Ms. Sue Murphy, Mr. Jim Odlin, Dr. David Pierce, Mr. Dave Preble, and Mr. Erling Berg. They were supported by staff members Mr. Tom Nies and Ms. Anne Hawkins (NEFMC), Mr. Doug Christel and Mr. Tom Warren (NMFS NERO), and Mr. Gene Martin (NOAA General Counsel).

Discussions were guided by a PDT memo dated August 22, 2008, the draft Amendment 16 management measures, and a list of outstanding Committee motions that required Council review.

### **GARM III Update**

Council staff presented an overview of the proceedings of the GARM III meeting. The available information was in the first PDT memo, and Paul Rago from NEFSC would present the final findings at the September Council meeting. The exact mortality changes that would be needed were not known.

A Committee member objected to the closed-room review at the GARM, and thought that the panel should have taken more questions from the audience. He also praised the contributions of Dr. Butterworth and asked whether the GARM answered questions provided by the Council Chair. Staff answered that it was unclear until the final report was released. Another member expressed concern over the necessary mortality reduction for windowpane flounder, since that stock is not a directed fishery. Some other members wanted to know what discussion would be had about the scallop and fluke fisheries, since the groundfish stocks that interact in those fisheries are still stocks that are highlighted as needing attention. Other members asked various additional questions about the assessments for particular stocks.

The Chair asked whether NMFS had advised what to do when some fisheries outside the Council's jurisdiction may take more than the allowable catch of a given managed species. Staff responded that it was possible that even with a fishing mortality of zero, the SNE/MA winter flounder stock would not rebuild by 2014, and that NMFS should be prepared to answer those questions at the Council meeting. Ms. Murphy stated that NMFS had discussed that issue and that nothing in the law or guidance allowed for an extension of the rebuilding timeline. She said it might be a different story if the stock was worse than thought when rebuilding started. The agency does not yet have an opinion on what to do if the science shows the stock is worse than previously thought and it would therefore have been impossible to rebuild within ten years from 2004.

**Motion:** To ask the Executive Committee to ask the NEFSC to provide the Council with a response to the July 24 letter from John Pappalardo to Dr. Robert O'Boyle regarding

conclusions and recommendations of earlier assessment review panels (data methods, assessment methodology, and biological reference points) to be considered as part of GARM III and relevant to the Council's understanding and use of GARM findings for assessment of scientific uncertainty and risk. (**Dr.** Pierce/Mr. Odlin)

Mr. Martin stated that it was inappropriate for the Committee to ask for information on behalf of the Council without the Council's prior authority. He felt that at least the Executive Committee should address whether this action was appropriate, and stated that the agency was now at least informally aware of the request.

The Chair ruled the motion **out of order**.

The Chair stated that he could ask the Council Chair to pursue a response to his letter, and clarified that the NEFSC should respond to the letter, not Dr. O'Boyle. Council staff offered to ask Dr. Rago to address these questions during the GARM presentation at the upcoming Council meeting.

Public comment included:

- Maggie Raymond: Associated Fisheries of Maine. I have a question about the GB cod assessment that was preferred by the third review panel. They were in favor of using the split time series and that gave different results than those used by the TRAC. One of the curious results of that, was that by splitting the time series that attributed 80% of the GB cod to the eastern area.

Council staff responded that the different models are not easily compared.

**Motion:** The Committee recommends to the Council that the Council request a new benchmark assessment for all of GB cod to be conducted with the Canadians as soon as possible and to be completed in time for next year's TRAC. (Mr. Odlin/Mr. Stockwell)

A Committee member supported this motion and stated concern that the TRAC assessment for Georges Bank cod differed so greatly from the GARM numbers. Other members were confused by the discrepancies between the two assessments, which were completed within months of each other. Council staff stated that the TRAC recommended a joint benchmark assessment to be conducted in the Spring of 2009, which still needed to be approved by the steering committee.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (8-0-1).

## **Management Measure Development**

The PDT Chair presented recent work by the PDT on the development of management measures. A Committee member stated that the law allows at least a year to develop a plan for newly overfished stocks, and argued that four newly overfished stocks should therefore be removed from the effort control development until a later time, since one month would not be long enough to create a reasonable and sound plan. Another stated that if the Category B DAS program was continued, the only stocks left to fish would be haddock and redfish.

There was some discussion about an interim rule. One Committee member stated that a good approach would be if interim DAS reductions lasted through May, but other parts of the new rule

were implemented in January. Another stated that many of the figures in the PDT tables were moot because NMFS would likely make a huge reduction that was not accounted for in the tables. Ms. Murphy stated that it was common knowledge that the agency was considering an interim action. She said it was safe to assume that if that action were to go forward, f-rebuild would be the mortality target for the interim measures. An interim action could be in place for up to a year if Amendment 16 was not implemented by then. In response to a Committee member's question, she also said that she believed NMFS would be seeking guidance from the Council in the development of the interim measures, but she was not sure of that. The agency's position would be that the newly overfished stocks be included in this Amendment.

Council staff clarified that the PDT measures developed to date had not been re-calculated to account for the numbers in the new GARM assessments. Option 4 would therefore not go far enough for effort reduction for all stocks. Several Committee members agreed that option 2 was likely to shift effort to the small areas that are 1:1 DAS counting.

**Motion:** To remove option 2 (enclosure 1, PDT memo dated August 22, 2008) from the list of effort control options for Amendment 16 development. (Dr. Pierce/Mr. Preble)

Council staff asked whether this motion should be interpreted to mean that no options would incorporate differential DAS, or whether this particular option was being rejected because it failed to meet mortality targets. Some Committee members agreed that it was important to take away incentives for fishermen to shift effort inshore, especially when compounded with rising fuel costs. Ms. Murphy joined a Committee member in stating that it would be too preliminary to throw options away. It would be necessary to look at the GARM III results and consider whether the effort control options should be reconfigured.

The motion was **withdrawn** without objection.

**Motion:** To direct the PDT to continue development of effort control measures to address GARM III results and recommendations and avoid options that will promote a shift of fishing effort inshore and/or increase discarding. (Dr. Pierce/Mr. Preble)

A Committee member stated that he would not object to this motion, but wondered whether it would be possible. Another argued that a 50% reduction in DAS would shift effort inshore and force a closure. One thought this would spark an interesting discussion among the Committee and PDT.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (5-4-0).

**Motion:** That the PDT develop measures that encourage the harvest of healthy stocks. (Mr. Odlin/Mr. Stockwell)

A Committee member felt that this was good guidance, but asked for specific ideas of how to accomplish this. Some others felt that these were feel-good motions that did nothing to improve management. Others still worried about effort shifts when healthy stocks were targeted.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (8-1-0).

A Committee member asked whether the PDT had examined ocean pout. The PDT Chair responded that fishing mortality seems to have been low with pout and the stock was not responding, and that there may be more details in the final GARM report. Another member stated

that it was necessary to look closely at ocean pout discards, since he did not believe pout could be caught in a 6.5 inch codend, so the discards must be somewhere else.

**Motion:** To have the PDT develop an alternative that relies on DAS reductions and does not include any trip limits. (Mr. Leary/Mr. Blount)

The maker of the motion stated that the PDT did this for Amendment 13 – calculated how many days could be used without trip limits to see what the severity of measures might be. A Committee member stated that he had a concern with area management, and that they were looking at zero possession in the South for some stocks, which may cause effort shifts.

Public comment included:

- Maggie Raymond: Associated Fisheries of Maine. I was going to speak in favor of the motion until what Mr. Blount just said. My concern is that I think that would shift effort inshore particularly on GOM cod, for example if you couldn't fish any of your days in Southern New England. To the original motion, I wanted to know if they could also determine, rather than reduce the DAS, to make them all differential, so the days don't leave the permit forever but you just have to use them all at a differential rate. People may want to hold on to them.

**Motion as perfected:** To have the PDT develop an alternative that relies on differential counting of DAS and does not include any trip limits.

A Committee member stated that he had a problem with this motion because discards on many species can be avoided. To throw out zero possession limits in lieu of a DAS reduction is too far-reaching, since gear modifications can solve a lot of problems.

The motion as perfected **carried** on a show of hands (7-2-0).

A Committee member clarified that, unless the Committee had another chance for discussion before NMFS implemented an interim rule, she was interpreting this guidance to mean that trip limits should be avoided if at all possible.

### **Recreational Fishery ACL/AMs**

Council staff asked the Committee to clarify their previous motions regarding recreational/commercial allocations in order to resolve discrepancies.

**Motion:**

- 1) To recommend that the Council remove the recreational/commercial allocation options as currently shown in Amendment 16.
- 2) The Committee recommends that for any stock not fully utilizing the ACL after deduction for state landings, and/or any stock where recreational catch is less than five percent, we will not do a commercial recreational allocation at this time.
- 3) In those cases that meet the five percent requirement for an allocation, consider the following options for years to determine the allocation:
  - GOM cod, GOM haddock, Pollock: FY 96-06 or FY01-06
  - GB cod: FY 96-06, or no allocation

- SNEMA WFL: FY 82-06
- GOM WFL: FY 82-06, or 50 percent of the available catch.  
(Mr. Preble/Mr. Odlin)

A Committee member clarified that the passage of this motion would change the draft document as it was.

Public comment included:

- Maggie Raymond: Associated Fisheries of Maine. I haven't been paying much attention to this, but am curious why there isn't an allocation in all those options that uses the same time frame. It would be a lot easier if you had one option for all those species that included the same years.

The Chair responded that the longer time frame for two species was chosen because some members as much data as possible should be used, and those two stocks had older data.

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

## **Other Business**

### *Sector Monitoring*

Council staff presented two options for incorporating the Archipelago report on sector monitoring into the Amendment: a broadly-worded description of monitoring aims or a list of specific requirements for monitoring programs. The Archipelago report cannot be included verbatim because of discrepancies and redundancies with current management plans. NMFS staff provided the Committee with unresolved questions concerning the development of monitoring.

**Motion:** The Committee recommends the Council accept the concept of a broadly defined sector monitoring requirements alternative. (Mr. Odlin/Mr. Stockwell)

Several Committee members stated that they supported the broadly-defined version, because the point of sectors was to be self-regulating and this would give them more flexibility and control. Ms. Murphy stated that the NMFS would need consistency across the board to some extent, and stated that she would like to hear from industry about their preferences. She reasoned that the Council's acceptance of a more defined alternative would give the industry some knowledge of what they would need to do in advance. She stated that the Regional Administrator ultimately has the authority to approve/disapprove the sector operations plans based upon the monitoring programs that are developed. Without some guidance, sector managers could have widely differing plans and that would cause problems for the agency. Another Committee member disagreed that the intent of the Committee was to let sectors be self-monitoring and self-policing. He thought that sectors should promote stewardship and get their participants to live by the rules, but that given the available quotas, self-policing was not a viable concept for sectors. NMFS staff answered Committee questions about the agency's position on monitoring, including concerns with electronic monitoring, and clarified that no decision had been made yet on observer coverage levels.

Public comment included:

- Gary Libby: Midcoast Fishermen's Association. In favor of this motion. In order to keep sectors from being postponed we need to keep moving ahead. This gives us a starting point, and if we find problems on the way we can work through them.
- Maggie Raymond: Associated Fisheries of Maine. With regard to at-sea monitoring in 2012, I would like to keep the option open to have electronic monitoring on trawl vessels. I visited Archipelago and they are actually using EM on some trawl vessels in other parts of the country. I think that system will be much improved in 2012 and there might be a different opinion about the use of EM when they are done testing it. For cost-saving, again, you put human lives at risk every time you send observers out there and you should not do that if you can do the job in another way.
- Jackie Odell: Northeast Seafood Coalition. I support this motion. There has been strong communication between all the sector proponents, and they have the interest to work together to find a cost-effective way to operate these sectors. There are groups organized through GMRI to keep this conversation going. We have hired consultants to help look at what kind of programs can be implemented. Broadly-defined objectives are critical to allow for some flexibility.

A Committee member asked whether it had been resolved if the industry-funded observers would be \$1,200/day, or whether a cheaper option was possible. Ms. Murphy stated that she is working with the Observer Program to determine the necessary level of consistency with the existing program, but that unnecessary elements could be reduced. Council staff made clear that all catch would be reported by monitors on sector trips – not only groundfish catch. Several Committee members thought this was necessary, but one stated that monitoring other types of catch was overly burdensome to the sectors with no necessity. Ms. Murphy cited the draft Amendment 16 document and noted that it indicates groundfish caught on non-groundfish days count against the sector's TAC, but does not have to be reported on a triply basis.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (6-1-1).

**Motion:** Move to recommend the Council include a narrowly defined sector monitoring option alternative as one of the two options for sector monitoring. (Dr. Pierce/Ms. Murphy)

NMFS staff clarified that the Office of Law Enforcement would like landings to be weighed every step of the way.

Public comment included:

- Terry Alexander. Our wharf is small – don't cull, etc. To sell fish at the exchange, they wouldn't accept our weights anyway. Costs add up – it takes you down to 30 cents. Having the RM weigh landings is a bad idea.
- John Williamson: Ocean Conservancy. It may be a bad idea to be taking alternatives out of the mix at this point during development. What the sectors will need to be given is a set of standards to be met in data acquisition. You don't have to specify the mechanisms that need to be used. If having this second alternative helps to flesh out the needs, this should be included in the document for practical development.
- Maggie Raymond: Associated Fisheries of Maine. With both of these options in, we'll have to write ops plans that include both possibilities, which is an enormous amount of work and there really isn't time for it.

Ms Murphy stated that she seconded this motion to enable further public consideration for both options. She pointed out that the Committee could select a preferred option and have both options available for public comment. Council staff pointed out that the details of a narrowly-defined plan would have to be determined by the Committee, and that time was short for creating such a plan. A Committee member noted that the status quo monitoring system currently in place would be another option in the Amendment. Another member stated that an informal monitoring working group was creating a plan for what a monitoring system for sector would need to look like, and that she might defer to that group to create details. Cindy Smith from GMRI explained that she was staffing the group in question, that they are looking at options used for monitoring in Pacific and Atlantic Canada, and that the group would be working through the fall and winter to develop a mutually agreeable monitoring plan.

The motion **failed** on a show of hands (3-6-0).

NMFS and Council staff outlined remaining elements that should be considered for the development of a monitoring system based on the Archipelago report, including whether it would remain necessary to submit VTR reports. A Committee member stated that VTRs would be an important element of any monitoring program, and should not be replaced by electronic monitoring data. He stated concern that reliance on electronic reports would not lead to useful information. A GMRI representative stated that the industry has shown interest in developing an electronic version of the VTR, which should not be confused with the electronic monitoring in question.

**Motion:** The Committee recommends that any sector monitoring program adopted will not replace the current VTR and dealer reporting requirements of the existing law. (Mr. Odlin/Mr. Leary)

One Committee member said that he was not sure the monitoring reports would even go to NMFS, so they could not replace VTRs. Ms. Murphy replied that the agency would foresee getting the information along with the sector manager and other people. The member responded that third party monitoring information should be available to NMFS if it is needed, but does not necessarily need to be reported regularly. Ms. Murphy stated that the agency will need to know what the discard catch is, since they have ultimate responsibility to ensure that TACs are not exceeded.

Public comment included:

- Vito Giacalone: Northeast Seafood Coalition. One of the issues is between the interpretation of the Archipelago report, and having NMFS be the first-line receiver of the information coming from the third-party monitoring system. Is it a convenience extended to NMFS and the Office of Law Enforcement to use this information? How does that get put into the regulation? If there was a glitch and the information did not get to NMFS, would that be a violation? If the bar is enforceable, it makes people timid to want to improve it. The question is whether it is punishable if information is not available, not whether the information can be shared.

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

Ms. Murphy stated that the Committee was on record saying that observer coverage would not need to be 100%, but that they had not decided what level is necessary. Coverage levels would depend on sectors' plans and what NMFS OP will need to meet minimum SBRM requirements.

She requested that it be left up to the sectors to suggest coverage levels, and NMFS (Center) will work with them. A Committee member replied that he hoped sectors were not asked to enforce the SBRM requirements, since that should be NMFS' responsibility. He said there should be some sort of waiver program if monitoring were not available for a given trip. Ms. Murphy stated that the Office of Law Enforcement was recommending 100% DM coverage but acknowledged the need for waivers/exceptions. A Committee member stated that he would like both observer and DM coverage to be at least 80%. Another member expressed concern that there was more and more information that would be unknown when vessels signed up for a sector, and that would lead to uncertainty over costs and landings.

**Motion:** To recommend the Council consider a third-party at-sea observer levels for sector monitoring at 20% or 50%. (Mr. Odlin/Mr. Stockwell)

Mr. Martin asked whether this recommendation would be in place of SBRM requirements, and noted that those requirements apply to the third-party monitoring in the scallop fishery. Council staff pointed out that the SBRM looks at the fishery as a whole, but it was likely that higher levels of coverage would be necessary to achieve the same CV on smaller groups of sector boats. Ms. Murphy stated that the agency had held all along that this program would need to meet SBRM standards at a minimum. She pointed out that the correct coverage level might be between the two amounts stated in the motion. A Committee member argued that coverage would need to be more than 20% since it was important to determine catch, not landings, and he therefore couldn't support the motion. The Chair pointed out that the Committee had passed a motion regarding discard rates, in which sectors that desired to determine their own rate had to develop a third-party monitoring system acceptable to NMFS. The maker of the motion stated that he understood that the coverage levels should be negotiated with each sector.

The motion was **withdrawn** without objection.

#### *CAII Haddock SAP*

Council staff presented an option in the draft Amendment regarding the modification of the CAII yellowtail flounder SAP in order to allow the targeting of haddock.

**Motion:** The Committee accepts option 2 (page 71, modifications to a CAII SAP, August 22, 2008 draft amendment) as an option for CA II SAP modifications. (Mr. Odlin/Mr. Leary)

Ms. Murphy asked whether the PDT looked at this option and whether the suggested season was correct. The PDT chair answered that January 31<sup>st</sup> is when the Canadian fishery starts to wrap up.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (7-0-2).

#### *Interim Measures*

The Committee Chair stated that it may be useful to request interim measures from NMFS, and to suggest what some of those interim measures ought to be. One Committee member suggested that a possible option would be the leasing of Category B DAS, and pointed out that measures would have to be devised quickly.

**Motion:** To recommend that the Council request that the NMFS implement an interim rule focused on adjustments to the DAS allocation in response to GARM III. The Committee

recommends that the Council should prioritize measures for sectors and other mitigating measures in Amendment 16 rather than the DAS allocation. The Committee also recommends that the Council should support interim rule provisions for the DAS allocation to stand for the duration of FY 2009. (Ms. McGee/Mr. Preble)

A Committee member opposed the motion, stating that there are other more useful mechanisms than DAS reductions that would not create such a severe cut in effort. The maker of the motion stated that it would be wise to change rules for DAS only once for the year rather than to change and pro-rate DAS mid-year. She argued that people will fish harder early on if they anticipate changes in the allocation. Ms. Murphy asked whether the motion intended that the Council should no longer work on common pool vessels, and the maker replied that changes in DAS allocations to the common pool should come under the interim rule and be carried forward in Amendment 16.

**Motion to amend:** To recommend that the Council request that the NMFS implement an interim rule focused on adjustments to the DAS allocation in response to GARM III. The Committee recommends that the Council should prioritize measures for sectors and other mitigating measures in Amendment 16 rather than the DAS allocation. The Committee also recommends that the Council should support interim rule provisions for the DAS allocation to stand for the duration of FY 2009.

NMFS should first look at zero retention of ocean pout, Northern windowpane and southern windowpane flounder, halibut, SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, SNE/MA winter flounder, GOM winter flounder, and CC/GOM yellowtail flounder. The NMFS should include as mitigating measures: 18 inch haddock minimum size, extend the US/CA haddock SAP, expand the CAI hook SAP, and remove the tax on DAS transfers. Scallop and fluke fishery will require zero retention of all groundfish, and look at gear restricted areas to minimize bycatch of SNEMA yellowtail and SNEMA winter flounder. Further to also look at an appropriate trip limit for GB cod, white hake, and pollock, and to look at these items first and then determine DAS reduction necessary. (Mr. Odlin/Mr. Stockwell)

A Committee member stated that he would have to give this motion much thought, since it was a major move, and was also uncomfortable that the public was not informed this action may be taken. Another asked whether CC/GOM yellowtail should be moved into the trip limit category, since zero possession would create a lot of discards. Mr. Martin stated that either one would still have to be consistent with National Standards and other provisions of the law. Several Committee members expressed the opinion that it was important to move this motion to the Council regardless of whether it was perfected, so that the opportunity to comment was not lost. If time and schedule permitted, the issue should be further examined at a later meeting. One Committee member disagreed and did not care to pass a measure to the Council that was not well thought-out and consistent with previously adopted measures.

Public comment included:

- Maggie Raymond: Associated Fisheries of Maine. Would like to speak directly to Dr. Pierce's comments. I own a 70 ft. steel trawler that lands one half million lbs. of fish per year. I have all my landings data and the only time with any yellowtail landings at all was when we participated in the CAII SAP experiment. That is just an example of how it's possible to fish without catching yellowtail and winter flounder. I do think this zero retention would work on these species. Ocean pout can't be caught in 6 ½ inch mesh. I don't even know what a windowpane flounder is. I think this approach will work for

- these species. Several of us industry people met over lunch and came up with this idea. People from Gloucester and Maine all agreed this would be a good approach to go forward, so there is industry support. We do support an interim action and understand that it is necessary. I urge you to support this amendment. If there is time we'll try to improve on it
- Gary Libby: Midcoast Fishermen's Association. Would the State of Maine's directed halibut fishery close if we went to 0 retention, or just for federal multispecies boats? Keep that halibut fishery open.
  - Jackie Odell: Northeast Seafood Coalition. I think this is well thought-out compared to the data we don't have and the panic we have been put in because we need something right now, and NMFS is already working on their EA or EIS. I hope we have until October to digest the results of the GARM and come up with a better recommendation based on the results of that data. I would also hope to work some of those zero retention stocks into a trip limit, but at this point this is the best thing we have to put forward.
  - Shaun Gehan: Fisheries Survival Fund. I don't think FSF has a position on this, but we'll be at the council meeting and speak to it more specifically then. The point of the zero retention limits is to give you a running start. It's a good concept and I'd like to see it move forward to broader discussion. I realize there won't be an analysis of whatever you send to NMFS – you are just saying look at these things first, and I think that's an appropriate role for the council.
  - John Williamson: Ocean Conservancy. I don't have enough information to have an opinion on whether this suite of measures is worth including or not. I would not support the amendment but urge the much simpler main motion. I think we recognize the Council is not in the driver's seat on this and there's a strong incentive to keep it simple. You would be better off focusing on one or two qualifications you would like to have included.
  - Eric Brazer: CCCHFA. We support this motion. We have a unique opportunity to play a role in what's coming down the pike for next year.

A Committee member stated that he did not believe that zero retention would not create bycatch problems. Council staff noted that there are already no-retention rules for several stocks in place, and was not sure that zero retention would change anything except the small amount of landings that currently occur.

The motion to amend **carried** on a show of hands (4-3-1).

The motion as amended **carried** on a show of hands (5-1-2).

Staff brought up concerns about whether there would be time to have the A16 alternatives decided before the October Council meeting if too much time were to be spent on the interim measures.

#### *Outstanding motions*

The Chair presented the Committee with a list of passed motions that were still pending Council action. He proposed grouping them by topic in order to facilitate presentation to the Council.

Public comment included:

- Maggie Raymond: Associated Fisheries of Maine. I was going to bring up this issue under the open period for public comment at the Council meeting. I think the scallop fishery will be in some serious trouble soon with respect to groundfish bycatch issues. I think there is a solution to the problem and I'd like to float it out here. Under A16 every groundfish permit assigned an allocation of groundfish based on history or some other formula. I am proposing the Council consider allowing scallop vessels to absorb a groundfish permit for the purpose of dealing with their bycatch. I think we would have a double win. Groundfish permits do not catch everything they are capable of catching, and they in turn would be able to manage their scallop fishery, which has the potential of being shut down. I am suggesting we do something different, and quickly, because I don't see how else they will be able to manage their yellowtail bycatch. The Council already voted not to let the scallop fishery form sectors in Amendment 15. But the Council could allow them to join groundfish sectors.

A Committee member replied that this would be a good proposal to develop, and asked if it would be possible for NMFS and the PDT to think about the issue.

- Shaun Gehan: Fisheries Survival Fund. Looked at regs for DAS leasing. Unless there is some specific scallop regulations, you can only lease to someone who has a limited access. Make this frameworkable – it could be a big win for both fisheries

The meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.