

**DECEMBER 2, 2005**

**DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

**PARTICIPANTS:** Bobby Lane, Vito Giacalone, Jackie Odell, John Pappalardo, David Borden, Maggie Raymond, Barbara Stevenson, Carlos Raphael, and observers Jim Odlin and Carl Bucchard.

Committee members met on Friday December 2, 2005 in Portland Maine to complete discussions pertaining to committee participation, meetings, administration, and to begin to develop the goals and objectives of a capacity reduction “strawman” for widespread industry review and discussion.

**GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:**

- To reduce capacity, both active and latent days at sea (DAS), in the multispecies fishery
- To get into biological compliance with the law
- To maintain the diversity of the fleet
- To ensure that those remaining in the industry are able to repay the loan (benefits to those remaining in the industry must outweigh the costs)

**POTENTIAL COMPONENTS OF THE CAPACITY REDUCTION STRAWMAN:**

- The strawman could be 2 tiered to account for DAS and vessels. Tier 1, the industry should buy back DAS. Industry responsibility should solely be for buying DAS, not vessels or other permits. Tier 2, the public/ non-profit organizations should buy back vessels or other considerations should be used for the removal of the vessel from the fishery.
- The strawman could have 2 options to address groundfish permits and other endorsements. Option 1 would include a multispecies fishery capacity reduction program only. Option 2 would include multispecies and other permits that may apply.
- The strawman could have 2 phases of capacity reduction. Participants noted their concerns with having to legislate for different phases.
- The strawman may want to consider allowing permit holders to keep their multispecies DAS allocation for flexibility purposely; however, the strawman would need to ensure that those that keep their DAS have to pay in. A participant questioned whether everyone would need to pay into the program to keep their DAS.
- A strawman could consider a percentage to be paid back (i.e. 5%) where a certain percentage could be targeted to the buyout (i.e. 3%) and the remainder (i.e. 2%) could go towards leasing days that wouldn't be used.

- A participant suggested the strawman may want to consider offering people (A DAS permit holders) money not to fish for a specified period of time. This could allow young people (new participants) to enter the fishery when stocks are rebuilt.

### **GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

#### **MULTISPECIES DAS AND FLEET STRUCTURE:**

- Capacity was defined primarily as the pool of DAS that are available, not specifically in relation to vessels.
- A capacity reduction program should not only consider the number of DAS removed from the fishery but needed to engineer whose days were removed from the fishery (i.e. small, medium, large vessels' DAS), while trying to also retain the diversity of the fleet
- A participant noted that “currency” of a DAS should be taken into account.
- Reduction of capacity in multispecies, both active and latent DAS (A, B, C days), was discussed at length.
- A participant questioned whether “currency” should be considered on other stocks.
- Participants discussed capacity of the fleet in relation to a rebuilt resource, also the net benefit to the resource.
- It was recommended that the formula to this proposal be very simple.
- Participants noted that no specific gear type should be given consideration; they questioned whether specific vessel sizes should be considered; and also questioned what the structure of the fleet should look like when the stocks are rebuilt.
- Participants questioned whether there was a magic number that could be arrived at for a multispecies capacity reduction program.
- Participants discussed the need to reach out to all multispecies permit holders (A, B and C days). The referendum process and weight of the votes was discussed. Participants discussed the current structure of the DAS system, and questioned whether a future Council vote could undo the benefits associated with a capacity reduction program.
- A participant questioned whether a permit going up for sale should be able to participate in the program or referendum.
- Participants questioned whether vessels or days were being bought back. What the classification of the days were (A, B C), the usage of the current days –A v. B. It was noted that some vessels may have A & B, while others may have only C.
- It was noted that the industry should get the credit for the capacity reduction as soon as possible and that the industry needs to avoid possible cross cutting of DAS by NMFS during the 2008 Benchmark Assessment.

#### **MULTISPECIES DAS v. VESSELS:**

- A participant noted that the buying back of vessels should not be included in the strawman.
- Participants discussed vessel scarping. Some noted that if a vessel were to be scrapped, the fishermen should decide on another vessel to scrap (to be able to

- upgrade his vessel for a much cheaper price or should receive a voucher) or allow the vessel to be sold out of the fishery (international, to replace vessels from devastated areas)
- A participant stated the need to buy “effort” and questioned what the actual platform, vessel, meant. It was noted that the industry would receive greater benefit, if they focused their monies on buying back DAS (effort) and not vessels.
  - Participants discussed a bid for the permit, trailer bid for the vessel. The federal government could take the permit, separate endorsements, and reissue the permit without multispecies.
  - A participant noted their concern with the language, of a day v. permit.

#### OTHER FISHERIES:

- Participants discussed other fisheries that would benefit from a multispecies capacity reduction program.
- Fisheries participating in the capacity reduction were discussed at length. It was noted that monkfish should be included but that this Committee couldn’t solve all the potential issues in other fisheries.
- A participant questioned whether the strawman would want to consider recreational/ and or the party-charter sector. State permits were also raised. It was noted that this should be dealt with by the Council.

#### COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION:

- Participants discussed the inclusion of Geoff Smith, Ocean Conservancy, to the committee. It is the Committee’s hope that Geoff Smith will represent and assist in communication with the C DAS permit holders.
- Participants discussed the inclusion of meeting “observers.” It was decided that 2 people per meeting from the public should be allowed to observe and that members of the Council’s Ad Hoc Capacity Committee should also be allowed to observe. These people should contact David Borden or Jackie Odell prior to the meeting scheduled.

#### COMMITTEE STAFF:

- Participants discussed the need to hire a staff person to assist in the creation of the multispecies capacity reduction strawman and to also assist with the data gathering.
- It was recommended that the Council staff designated to Ad Hoc Capacity Committee should participate in this Industry Committee.

#### NEW ENGLAND FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL PARTICIPATION:

- Participants discussed what the Council could do in tandem with this Industry Committee. It was discussed that the Council needs to lay the groundwork for such a program to be successful and also could assist with Technical Guidance.
- It was noted that information pertaining to landings by gear, vessel size, targeted species, landings by Port, is information that is critical to this process.
- Information pertaining to monkfish permit holders and the connection between multispecies is needed from the Council.

- Information regarding the number of days (A, B, C) in the fleet and a permit mix (A, B or permit holders with only C days) is needed.

**TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE:** Monday December 19<sup>th</sup> New Bedford MA; Monday January 16<sup>th</sup> Gloucester MA; Monday January 30<sup>th</sup> Portland ME; *To be finalized at next meeting:*  
Monday February 13<sup>th</sup>; Monday February 27<sup>th</sup>

Minutes are not final until approved at a subsequent meeting.