

Beaty, Julia

From: Meghan Lapp <Meghan@seafreezeltd.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 5:01 PM
To: Beaty, Julia
Subject: RE: Draft meeting summary - please review by Thursday

Hi Julia,

Sorry this is late, but I have been sick since Sunday and either out of commission or out of the office. So I am only reading through your notes now. I would make a request that from now on, instead of saying "One AP member" or "a few AP members", that you would identify who said what. I think it provides a more detailed and accurate account of the meeting, and if the notes are taken individually like that it wouldn't require any extra effort. Obviously if there is a consensus statement, that is different. But if a consensus statement is made, that needs to be noted at the meeting so that everyone can agree/disagree to that statement going down on the record as such.

Also, I am confused as why the lanternfish discussion was at the beginning of the summary. That discussion was towards the end, and I wouldn't include that with the AP recommended alternative to prohibit possession alternative, because it wasn't part of that discussion. It makes it seem like that was a central part of the discussion when it was really more of an add on at the end of after we had categorized all the species currently on the list. In that way, the summary is misleading and I would correct that. I would make the note that after the discussion/classification on all the Council list of species had ended, there was a lanternfish discussion initiated by one AP member and put all the lanternfish info there.

I would not say either that the "AP agreed that some of these species, including sand lances and lanternfish are very important forage species and should be protected from fishing impacts" in the prohibit possession alternative. I personally haven't looked at lanternfish because they were never part of the amendment discussion until that day. I never agreed that they are "very important forage species", because I wasn't presented with diet data to back that up. I also would never say or agree that any species should be "protected from fishing impacts", unless there was a very good reason for doing so. So, I can't agree to that statement being a consensus statement. You can say "some AP members agreed" but that is definitely not a consensus statement.

I believe also that during the discussion of EFPs there was a discussion of if there was a Council review of an EFP there would have to be a time limit on it. I.e., to expedite the action through the council. I believe another AP member made reference to the research steering committees and how that process itself can take forever. There was an emphasis on the need to expedite the process, and I think that should be noted.

Sorry this isn't more comprehensive but I've been rushing through it to try to get something to you by the end of the day and I have been too sick to think the past few days.

Thanks,
Meghan

Meghan Lapp

Fisheries Liaison, Seafreeze Ltd.

Tel: (401) 295-2585, Ext. 15

Cell: (401) 218-8658

Meghan@seafreezeltd.com

From: Beaty, Julia [mailto:jbeaty@mafmc.org]

Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2016 3:20 PM

To: Advisors - Ecosystems

Subject: Draft meeting summary - please review by Thursday

Dear EOP AP,

Please review the attached draft summary of our recent meeting and send me any suggested edits by 8 am this Thursday, March 31st. I apologize for not getting this to you sooner.

Thanks,

Julia

Julia Beaty

Fishery Plan Coordinator

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council

800 North State Street, Suite 201

Dover, DE 19901-3901

302-526-5250

jbeaty@mafmc.org

