



New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116
John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph.D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

DRAFT MOTIONS

HERRING COMMITTEE MEETING

January 11, 2017

The Herring Committee met to provide input on: 1) final preferred alternatives for Framework 5; 2) final preferred alternatives for IFM Amendment; and 3) input of initial range of alternatives to consider for ABC control rules in Amendment 8.

MEETING ATTENDANCE: Peter Kendall (Chair); Vincent Balzano, Rick Bellavance, Peter Christopher, Mark Gibson, Doug Grout, Peter Hughes, Matt McKenzie, Cate O’Keefe, John Pappalardo, Eric Reid, Terry Stockwell, and MaryBeth Tooley.

Absent members: John McMurray

The Committee was supported by Council staff Ms. Deirdre Boelke (Herring Plan Development Team (PDT) Chairman), Dr. Rachel Feeney and Dr. Fiona Hogan (Council staff), Ms. Carrie Nordeen, Mr. Dan Luers, and Mr. Mitch McDonald (NMFS/GARFO). In addition, over twenty members of the public attended.

DRAFT MOTIONS:

- **MSE ABC Control Rule Discussion**

Motion 1: Stockwell/Reid

Committee recommends to the Council that the following potential ABC control rules be removed from further consideration in Amendment 8:

- biomass based for 3 years with max of 15% inter annual restriction;
- constant catch;
- conditional constant catch;
- biomass based for 5 years

Vote: 11:0:0, carries

- **Framework 5**

Motion 2: Stockwell/Gibson

Recommend to the Council that No Action for Framework 5 be preferred for Sections 2.1 and 2.2.

Vote: 11:0:1, carries

- **IFM Amendment**

Motion 3: Stockwell/Reid

Recommend to the Council that it postpone selection of preferred alternatives for herring alternatives until the EM pilot program is completed and a report is provided to the Council.

Motion withdrawn



New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116
John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph.D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

DRAFT MOTIONS

HERRING ADVISORY PANEL MEETING

January 10, 2017

The Herring AP met to provide input on: 1) final preferred alternatives for Framework 5; 2) final preferred alternatives for IFM Amendment; and 3) input of initial range of alternatives to consider for ABC control rules in Amendment 8.

MEETING ATTENDANCE: Mr. Bert Jongerden (Chairman), Mr. John-Paul Bilodeau, Ms. Beth Casoni, Mr. Doug Feeney, Mr. Dick Huntley, Mr. Jeff Kaelin, Mr. Raymond Kane, Ms. Meghan Lapp, Mr. Brandon Mitchell, Mr. Gerry O'Neill, Mr. Jim Ruhle and Mr. Donald Swanson. Mr. Peter Kendall the Chair of the Herring Committee was also in attendance.

Absent members: Mr. Zack Klyver, Mr. Peter Moore, and Mr. Chris Weiner.

The AP was supported by Council staff Ms. Deirdre Boelke (Herring Plan Development Team (PDT) Chairman), Dr. Rachel Feeney and Dr. Fiona Hogan (Council staff), Ms. Carrie Nordeen and Mr. Dan Luers (NMFS/GARFO). In addition, about six members of the public attended.

DRAFT MOTIONS:

- **FRAMEWORK 5**

Motion 1: Kaelin/Ruhle

AP recommends to the Committee that for Section 2.1, GB haddock accountability measures for the herring fishery, the preferred alternative be 2.1.1 No Action.

Rationale: This motion takes the proactive AMs off the table, it is too hard to predict when and where haddock bycatch is going to be an issue each year, and the potential economic impacts are too great. This option provides the best opportunity for the fishery to operate offshore under the current bycatch avoidance program.

Vote: 9:1:1, carries

Motion 2: Bilodeau/Kaelin

For Section 2.2 the AP recommends that the Committee consider adoption of Alternative 2.2.2 the 80/20 split, as well as recommend the Council adopt a 2% sub-ACL for GB haddock, and the in-season monitoring of the split should be based on a new bycatch rate for the second period.

Rationale: This motion would preserve a winter fishery while still protecting haddock. A restart is needed for the bycatch rate for the second period or the rate would be too high, there would be a race to fish and would be useless to have the split all together.

Motion withdrawn

Motion 3: Kaelin / Bilodeau

AP recommends to the Committee that for Section 2.2, Implementation of GB haddock AM, the preferred alternative be Alternative 2.2.4 (Amend how estimated catch is calculated in the herring fishery – incorporate state portside data).

Rationale: It is very important that the Council support a way to incorporate state portside data in the haddock bycatch projections in the herring fishery. This motion supports the thought that CVs would likely be minimized and improve our estimate of bycatch if they are incorporated.

Motion withdrawn

By consensus, the AP supports consideration of incorporating state portside data in the estimate of bycatch catches in the fishery, i.e. haddock catch caps.

Motion 4: Kaelin/O'Neill

AP recommends to the Committee that for Section 2.2., Implementation of GB haddock AM for the herring fishery, the preferred alternative be Alternative 2.2.1 No Action.

Rationale: While some members on the AP support the idea of splitting the sub-ACL, the AP is not in favor of adopting the 80/20 split at this time before we have a better way to track bycatch. Due to the uncertainty of observer coverage rates and the methods that would be used to estimate the cap, the AP does not support splitting the sub-ACL.

Vote: 10:1:0, motion carries

- **IFM AMENDMENT**

Motion 5: Kaelin/Lapp

The AP recommends the Committee consider recommending the Council postpone action on the IFM Amendment until completion of the EM pilot project, and until the Agency has evaluated the value of the state shoreside monitoring program.

Rationale: This motion provides the time and information needed to assess what the actual costs are going to be moving forward.

Vote: 9:0:2, motion carries

- **MSE ABC CONTROL RULE DISCUSSION**

Motion 6: O'Neill/Ruhle

The AP recommends the Committee consider removing the potential control rule alternatives listed below from further consideration in Amendment 8:

- **biomass based for 3 years with max of 15% inter annual restriction;**
- **constant catch;**
- **conditional constant catch;**
- **biomass based for 5 years**

Rationale: Based on the initial analyses presented at this meeting, the AP agrees with the PDT that the first 3 control rule alternatives listed above have generally poor performance and should not be considered further. In addition, the 5 year biomass based control rule alternative seems too long and at this time the AP recommends that alternative not be considered further either.

Vote: 9:0:1, carries