

Moore/~~first~~ Warrens
who seconded the
motion

Motion #13

1:58pm 04/05

Agenda Item F.1.e
Supplemental Motion in Writing
April 2006

ask Rod for his rationale
statement for his motion. (he was
reading from something)

MOTION #1 BY ROD MOORE - AGENDA ITEM F.1

1. Move that the Council adopt 2007 - 2008 ABCs for overfished species as shown on Table 2.1 of Agenda Item F.1.a, Attachment 3, as follows:

Pacific Ocean Perch:	900 mt and 911 mt
Widow Rockfish:	5,334 mt and 5,144 mt
Canary Rockfish:	172 mt and 179 mt
Bocaccio:	602 mt and 618 mt
Cowcod S. Of 36°:	17 mt for both years
Cowcod - Monterey:	19 mt for both years
Darkblotched:	456 mt and 487 mt

2. Move that the Council adopt rebuilding OYs for overfished species as follows:

Pacific Ocean Perch:	405 mt
Widow Rockfish:	456 mt
Canary Rockfish:	44 mt
Bocaccio:	218 mt
Cowcod (combined):	8 mt
Darkblotched:	229 mt

Substitute motion for #13
14 - Anderson Cedargreen
2:09 PM - see "CO"
for rationale

Anderson rational - sig implications in the study

Rod - ~~that~~ agreed w/ most, need to be responsible to everyone; include communities

POP - maybe,

wider ROCK - the high end, the GMT shows median rebuild tone of 250. does not think one year makes a major difference, but does for ~~the~~ impacts on the communities. He would oppose the Moore friendly amendment to change to 368. sig was →?

M.V. 2:19

JD → ask median? covered for all areas (yes P.A.)

Frank Lockhart F.H.

canary - 44 is SQ, 21 is well below SQ.

Can we add something in between there, ~~is~~ is it too large? or add something or request GMT to analyze in better →

Frank/Darrel - have GMT analyze something in between.

Did PA said we have already narrowed down these options and understand canary has a "flat line", trails out; rather keep it 2 options to analyze the decision in June. other alternative is to have GMT look at it, ² already in option 1; just needs further fleshing out.

FL asked for 32 and 44 mt (Anderson/Cedergren ok).

Curt asked for range of contingencies? - yes - P.A. said he wanted to narrow the options down to 2 alternatives to formulate mgmt measures, would we still be in same predicament of trying to reallocate impacts between different sectors. This would give us better insight. PA said the focus would be the impacts to communities.

JD asked if GMT could add odd analysis of rebuilding alternatives (consider the best new alternative in the mix). PA said yes, but trying to keep it so we can manage a fairly definitive set of analysis. JD said just 1 more rebuildm alt.

motion 14 passed