



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*

MEETING SUMMARY –DRAFT

Herring Committee

Webinar

September 24, 2020

The Herring Committee met on September 24, 2020 at 9:30 AM via webinar primarily to review analyses and identify recommendations for preferred alternatives for Framework 8 and identify initial recommendations for 2021 herring work priorities.

MEETING ATTENDANCE: Rick Bellavance (Chair), Vincent Balzano, Peter deFur, Emily Gilbert (GARFO), Ritchie White, Melissa Smith, Melanie Griffin, Cheri Patterson, Scott Olszewski, John Pappalardo, Matthew McKenzie and Peter Hughes; Bert Jongerden (Advisory Panel Chair); Deirdre Boelke (PDT Chair), Rachel Feeney, Chris Kellogg, and Janice Plante (NEFMC staff); Mitch MacDonald and Aly Pitts (GARFO staff). In addition, about 15 others attended.

KEY OUTCOMES:

- For Framework 8, recommended preferred alternatives for all aspects of the specifications package and a modified herring incidental possession limit option as well as eliminating the Area 1B seasonal closure.
- For 2021 Council priorities, recommended a rebuilding program (if required) as highest priority, as well as continuation of Framework 7 development, and an additional item to review and potentially modify the herring accountability measures.

OPENING REMARKS

There were no changes to the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM #1: FRAMEWORK 8 PART 1 (SPECIFICATIONS)

Herring Advisory Panel (AP) Bert Jongerden reported on the motions from the September 22 AP meeting. There were no questions.

AGENDA ITEM #1: FRAMEWORK 8 PART 1 (SPECIFICATIONS)

Staff presented an overview of the specifications alternatives in Framework 8, particularly regarding the Overfishing Limit (OFL) and Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC), management uncertainty, border transfer, research set-aside, and carryover. The SSC recommendations for OFL and ABC and draft impacts analysis by the PDT were presented.

Framework 8 – Part 1 – Fishery Specifications

Motion 1: Smith/Olszewski

Recommend the Council select Alternative 3.1.1.2 as the preferred alternative for setting OFL/ABC in the 2021-2023 specifications (Alternative 2).

Rationale: This alternative is consistent with the previous specifications package, and utilizes the recommendations determined by the SSC.

Vote: 11:0:0, motion carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Motion 2: Smith/Patterson

Recommend the Council select Alternative 3.1.2.1.4 as the preferred alternative for determining management uncertainty (Option 4 = 4,669 mt), with an associated trigger of 3,012 mt for the potential rollback of 1,000 mt to the Area 1A sub-ACL (0.645 ratio of original management uncertainty buffer).

Rationale: Consistent with the previous specifications package, it provides a balance between risk of exceeding the set-aside and direct harvest opportunities. Additionally, it increases the trigger value for the 1,000 mt transfer slightly to 3,012 mt, should catch rates increase in the coming fishing seasons in Canada.

Vote: 11:0:0, motion carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Motion 3: Smith/Hughes

Recommend the Council select Alternative 3.1.3.2, and set border transfer at 0 mt, as the preferred alternative (Alternative 2).

Rationale: This provision hasn't been utilized in the last few years, and considering the low quotas expected for the next two years, there does not appear to be incentive for food fish to go to market in

Canada over choosing the domestic bait market. Additionally, this preferred alternative is supported by the AP. This is not a long-term recommendation but makes sense currently with low quotas in place.

Vote: 11:0:0, motion carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Motion 4: Griffin/Smith

Recommend the Council select Alternative 3.1.4.2 as the preferred alternative for RSA allocations in FY2021-2023 (Alternative 2: 3% for FY2021 and 0% for 2022 and 2023).

Rationale: RSA allocation has already been granted for FY2021 and projects are ongoing. However, with the increasingly reduced sub-ACLs for all HMAs, it will be difficult for RSAs to project adequate funding options for research projects. Additionally, discussions are still ongoing regarding the RSA review process for Atlantic herring; this timeframe presents the opportunity to pause and re-evaluate options for the RSA program moving forward. This does not extinguish the RSA program for Atlantic herring but pauses funding for a short-term period.

Vote: 11:0:0, motion carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Motion 5: Hughes/Balzano

Recommend the Council identify Alternative 1 as preferred for carryover of unharvested catch, up to 10% of a sub-ACL.

Rationale: AP supports this option and under low quotas we need as much fish as possible to support American fishermen.

Motion to amend: Smith/Patterson

Recommend the Council identify Alternative 3 as preferred for carryover of unharvested catch, up to 5% of a sub-ACL.

Rationale: Herring is at a sensitive status and there is a need to balance what is best for the resource and the fishery. Five percent helps with this balance under the current low biomass situation.

Vote: 8:3:0, motion carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	N	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	N
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	N	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Vote on main motion: 9:2:0, motion carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	N	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	N	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Motion 6: Griffin/Hughes

Recommend the Council select as final preferred in Section 3.5.1, Option D (3.5.1.4) as modified – Implement a two-step herring incidental limit (40,000-lb. at 90% of the Area 2 sub-ACL) then 2,000-lb. at 98% of the Area 2 sub-ACL with a 2,000-lb backstop limit at 95% of the total ACL. This would apply to both Herring Management Areas 2 and 3.

Rationale: This option better aligns the mackerel and herring fisheries and allows for a period of continued mackerel fishing as supported by the Herring AP. The present low quotas challenge potential realized benefits (i.e., short period between triggers) but should not prevent providing for this potential optimization. Industry has shown an ability to work together to stay under low quotas and will continue to need to communicate. Area 3 is included as an area with similar potential to support continued mackerel fishing under a higher incidental limit. Covid-19 has delayed implementation of the Industry Funded Amendment; hopefully, increased monitoring in this fishery will be up and running soon when this action would be effective in 2021 to address potential concerns about monitoring to support this measure.

Vote: 8:1:2, motion carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y

Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Abs	John Pappalardo, MA	Abs
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	N	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Motion 7: Smith/Griffin

Recommend the Council select Alternative 3.5.2.2 as the preferred alternative for modifying the Area 1B seasonal closure (Alternative 2 – eliminate the seasonal closure).

Rationale: Currently, Area 1B has the lowest sub-ACL within all the HMAs. The removal of the seasonal closure could allow for directed mackerel harvest during the early winter months, when mackerel is present, and allow for the most efficient utilization of the Area 1B sub-ACL.

Vote: 7:4:0, carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	N
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	N	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	N
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	N

Motion 8: Smith/Gilbert

Recommend the Council prioritize Framework 7 (GB spawning action) and development of a rebuilding plan (if required) in 2021 and combine the issues into one action to help streamline the process.

Rationale: The Committee assumes development of one action compared to two is preferred in terms of staff resources. In addition, these issues are both related to developing measures to help rebuild the herring resource.

Vote: 10:1:0, motion carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	N	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Motion 9: Hughes/Balzano

Recommend the Council consider additional 2021 herring work priorities: 1) review and potentially adjust the herring accountability measures; and 2) reference the previous MSE model and results to review and potentially adjust the ABC control rule.

Rationale: It is important to revisit how overages are accounted for with the current herring accountability measures. This fishery needs more flexibility and reexamination of the MSE is warranted.
Intent: If a rebuilding plan is required that would be the top priority for 2021.

Motion to split the motion: Hughes/Griffin

Vote: 11:0:0, carries

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	Y
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	Y	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Y	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	Y
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Y	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Y

Split motion Part 1:

Recommend the Council consider additional 2021 herring work priorities: 1) review and potentially adjust the herring accountability measures.

Vote: 5:4:2, motion carries,

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	N
Vincent Balzano, ME	Y	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	Y
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	N	Scott Olszewski, RI	Y
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Abs	John Pappalardo, MA	Y
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	N
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	Abs	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	N

Split motion Part 2:

Recommend the Council consider additional 2021 herring work priorities: 2) reference the previous MSE model and results to review and potentially adjust the ABC control rule.

Vote: 1:8:2, motion fails

Rick Bellavance, RI (Chair)		Matt McKenzie, CT	N
Vincent Balzano, ME	N	Dan McKiernan/Melanie Griffin, MA	N
Peter deFur (MAFMC)	N	Scott Olszewski, RI	N
Emily Gilbert (NMFS)	Abs	John Pappalardo, MA	N
Peter Hughes (MAFMC)	Y	Cheri Patterson, NH	N
Patrick Keliher/Melissa Smith, ME	N	Ritchie White, NH (ASMFC)	Abs

Other Business

NOAA Fisheries (GARFO) explained that questions come up about whether MWT vessels can fish for mackerel in Area 1A during the seasonal closure (June-Sept) that prevents MWT vessels from fishing for herring. To date, GARFO has prohibited fishing for mackerel during this season because the species are known to cooccur. When the Council discussed a similar restriction in Amendment 8 (i.e. the proposed inshore 12-mile buffer), the intent was clear that MWT vessels could not fish for herring or mackerel. While the existing definition of fishing includes possession, GARFO is requesting the Council clarify the intent of the Area 1A seasonal restriction. The Committee did not pass a motion related to this topic and decided to defer the issue to the full Council meeting next week.



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*

MEETING SUMMARY –DRAFT

Herring Advisory Panel

Webinar

September 22, 2020

The Herring Advisory Panel (AP) met on September 22, 2020 at 12:30 PM via webinar primarily to review analyses and identify recommendations for preferred alternatives for Framework 8 and identify initial recommendations for 2021 herring work priorities.

MEETING ATTENDANCE: Bert Jongerden (Chair), John-Paul Bilodeau, Beth Casoni, Jeff Kaelin, Ray Kane, Zach Klyver, Meghan Lapp (Vice-Chair), David Mussina, Gerry O'Neill, and MaryBeth Tooley; James Ruhle was absent; Deirdre Boelke (PDT Chair), Rachel Feeney, Chris Kellogg, and Janice Plante (NEFMC staff); Emily Gilbert and Aly Pitts (GARFO staff). In addition, about ten members of the public attended.

KEY OUTCOMES:

- For Framework 8, recommended preferred alternatives, for almost all fishery specifications, and increasing the herring incidental possession limit and eliminating the Area 1B seasonal closure.
- For 2021 Council priorities, recommended as highest priorities: develop a herring rebuilding program, review the ACL structure, and reconsider the results from the Management Strategy Evaluation to develop measures that would add fishery flexibility, leave Framework 7 on the list, and other measures that would meet the Executive Order.

OPENING REMARKS

There were no changes to the agenda. Under Other Business, the AP will be updated on other herring-related work ongoing.

AGENDA ITEM #1: FRAMEWORK 8 PART 1 (SPECIFICATIONS)

Staff presented an overview of the specifications alternatives in Framework 8, particularly regarding the Overfishing Limit (OFL) and Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC), management uncertainty, border transfer, research set-aside, and carryover. The SSC recommendations for OFL and ABC and draft impacts analysis by the PDT were presented.

Framework 8 – Part 1 – Fishery Specifications

Motion 1: Kaelin/O'Neill

Recommend the Committee select Alternative 1 (No Action) for OFL/ABC as preferred in Section 3.1.1.

Rationale: The projections (Table 2 and 3) highlight that the impacts on the SSB are negligible but have 44% more harvest opportunity for the fishery compared to Alternative 2. Current ABCs are a 90% decline from average ABCs from recent years. These drastic reductions have come very quickly. Recruitment is more influenced by environment than fishing mortality. There is low risk to the stock if NO Action OFL/ABC is used.

- Concerns with the motion:
 - General support for the fishery and the need for lobster bait but concern about the continued declines in quota and uncertainty about stock recovery. Important to err on the conservative side when the biomass is at this level to protect the resource. There are lots of reasons to protect this resource including the long run benefits for the fishery; should listen to recommendations of the SSC.

Motion to substitute: Klyver/Kane

Recommend the Committee select Alternative 2 for OFL/ABC as preferred in Section 3.1.1.

Rationale: Given multiple years of decreasing quotas and catches and record poor years of recruitment, the quota should be set to allow the greatest chance of rebuilding the Atlantic Herring SSB (Spawning Stock Biomass). Furthermore, all efforts should be made to follow the rational of the SSC and not increase the ABC or catch in 2023, to increase the TAC from 2022, with such uncertainty in stock status. Given that it is not known if the stock has hit the bottom or could be in a continued decline, it is greatly hoped that these reductions will prevent overfishing and allow the stock to recover.

- Concerns with the substitute motion:
 - Though the Council will likely agree with the SSC recommendation, there is little difference in terms of stock benefits between the two options. There were concerns about the Amendment 8 control rule (more punitive than necessary and provides minimal and highly uncertain benefits) and a desire to revisit the Management Strategy Evaluation (there was no adaptive strategy in the Management Strategy Evaluation, and these low quotas were not thought to be likely during that process).
- Support of the substitute motion:
 - The fishery is seeking federal aid and we should be taking measures to rebuild the stock for the long-term health of the stock and fishery.

Vote: 3:6:0, motion to substitute fails

JP Bilodeau	No	David Mussina	Yes
Beth Casoni	No	Gerry O'Neill	No
Jeff Kaelin	No	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	Yes	MaryBeth Tooley	No
Zach Klyver	Yes		
Megan Lapp	No	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	

Vote: 6:3:0, main motion carries

JP Bilodeau	Yes	David Mussina	No
Beth Casoni	Yes	Gerry O'Neill	Yes
Jeff Kaelin	Yes	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	No	MaryBeth Tooley	Yes
Zach Klyver	No		
Megan Lapp	Yes	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	

Motion 2: Tooley/Kaelin

Recommend the Committee select Option 3, 5-year average (2015-2019) equal to 4,587 mt as the management uncertainty buffer as preferred in Section 3.1.2.

Rationale: There is little difference between the motions and the 5-year option is close to status quo and within the range of Canadian New Brunswick weir catch over time.

Vote: 9:0:0, motion carries

JP Bilodeau	Yes	David Mussina	Yes
Beth Casoni	Yes	Gerry O'Neill	Yes
Jeff Kaelin	Yes	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	Yes	MaryBeth Tooley	Yes
Zach Klyver	Yes		
Megan Lapp	Yes	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	

Motion 3: Tooley/Kane

Recommend the Committee select Alternative 2, set border transfer at 0 mt as preferred in Section 3.1.3.

Rationale: General support having some set-aside available for use by the fishery in Maine, but at such low quotas, this activity is not feasible. When quotas increase, this allocation could be revisited and included in future actions.

Vote: 8:0:1, motion carries

JP Bilodeau	Abs	David Mussina	Yes
Beth Casoni	Yes	Gerry O'Neill	Yes
Jeff Kaelin	Yes	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	Yes	MaryBeth Tooley	Yes
Zach Klyver	Yes		
Megan Lapp	Yes	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	

No Motion on RSA

The Advisory Panel opted to not develop a motion on the Research Set-Aside alternatives but had several comments.

- At the last mtg, the AP deferred discussion due to questions on the feasibility of the program under low quotas. Staff noted that researchers have indicated that the program is getting more challenging and that research is not functioning with RSA revenue alone. NMFS feedback is that there are relatively high administrative burdens associated with this relatively small program with RSA set-aside that is not always used. Indirect benefits of collaboration continue. Some AP members preferred No Action without more input from researchers and strongly support continuing the shoreside monitoring program. An AP member volunteered to reach out to researchers for more input.
- AP members felt that it would be no trouble to harvest the RSA quota and expected RSA usage to improve; the question was more about whether it would raise sufficient funds for research.
- It was noted that there is no mackerel RSA program, but the mackerel catch is reported and some vessels have contributed some mackerel revenue towards funding research (shoreside monitoring).

Motion 4: Klyver/Mussina

Recommend the Committee select as preferred Alternative 2 for carryover of unharvested catch: prohibit carryover for FY 2019 and 2020 in Section 3.4.

Rationale: Given the present low stock status all remaining catch that goes uncaught should be left in the ecosystem to provide an additional safeguard, to increase recruitment, and help rebuild the stock with the idea that the fishery will benefit in the future.

Motion to substitute: Tooley/Kaelin

Recommend the Committee select as preferred Alternative 1 (No Action) for carryover of unharvested catch: allow up to 10% of unharvested catch to carryover in Section 3.4.

Rationale: The industry supported a prohibition in recent years because the differences in quotas from year to year were very high, so there were risks to overfishing sub-components. But now, we are at low quotas and the same risks are not present. There are many reasons full quotas are not harvested in an area in a particular year and this flexibility is important.

- Support of the substitute motion:
 - Since the catch has already been accounted for in the assessment, there is little risk to harvesting it and allowing 10% carryover is relatively small and that every pound will matter.

Vote: 6:3:0, motion to substitute carries

JP Bilodeau	Yes	David Mussina	No
Beth Casoni	Yes	Gerry O'Neill	Yes
Jeff Kaelin	Yes	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	No	MaryBeth Tooley	Yes
Zach Klyver	No		
Megan Lapp	Yes	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	

Framework 8 – Part 2 – Adjust measures that potentially inhibit mackerel fishery from achieving OY

Motion 5: Tooley/Kaelin

Recommend the Committee select Option D as preferred to increase the herring incidental possession limit in Section 3.5.1, but slightly modify Option D: In herring management Areas 2 and 3, implement a 2-step incidental possession limit (Step 1: at 90% of the sub-ACL a 40,000 lbs. incidental herring possession limit would be triggered and Step 2: at 98% of the sub-ACL then a 2,000 lbs. incidental possession limit would be implemented). The incidental possession limit that is triggered when 95% of the total ACL is estimated to be caught would remain in place.

Rationale: Consistency with mackerel plan is important to reduce confusion at sea; this option is not the same as the mackerel plan, but very similar. There are real challenges in monitoring these in-season triggers under low quotas and this may need to be changed in the future, but for now we should try this. The industry is still going to need to communicate to work together to stay under low quotas.

- Comments
 - It is hard to predict future behavior based on the past when there were higher herring quotas.
 - This approach would not be as complicated as Option E and more workable.
 - It would give opportunities to find clean mackerel at all times of year, but especially when quotas are close to getting caught.
 - The midwater trawl fleet does not make trips when herring catch is limited to 2,000 lb per trip.
 - Although the fishery will not last long under a 40,000 lb limit, it would give an opportunity for the boats to catch mackerel.
 - Appreciate the work and efforts to get the herring and mackerel plans to better mirror each other.
 - GARFO provided input on the monitoring challenges under low quotas, and highlighted that the final sub-ACL for Area 2 will likely be reduced in half after overages from 2019 are accounted for.
 - One AP member commented that it is too late to develop for this action, but when quotas are this low it may be possible to explore a lottery system for herring catch after Step 1 is triggered to help reduce the risk of exceeding the sub-ACL.

- Very important to identify ways to increase revenue when possible right now with the severe herring quota reductions and other measures that will further reduce revenues for this fishery, IFM and Amendment 8. Even if the fishery only gets 5 more trips, that is more revenue that would be possible under the current system.

Vote: 7:0:0, motion carries

JP Bilodeau	Yes	David Mussina	Yes
<i>Beth Casoni</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>	Gerry O'Neill	Yes
Jeff Kaelin	Yes	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	Yes	MaryBeth Tooley	Yes
Zach Klyver	Yes		
<i>Megan Lapp</i>	<i>Acting as Chair</i>	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>

Motion 6: Kaelin/O'Neill

Recommend the Committee select Alternative 2 as preferred to eliminate the seasonal closure of Area 1B, in Section 3.5.2.

Rationale: Would be better for the industry to be in that area in the winter for several reasons: that is when mackerel are typically in the area, the seasonal closure has likely caused user conflicts in the area by closing the area in the winter. There are bycatch caps in place to address bycatch concerns of river herring and shad.

Motion to substitute: Mussina/Klyver

Recommend the Committee select Alternative 1 (No Action) as preferred to maintain the seasonal closure in Area 1B as preferred, in Section 3.5.2.

Rationale: Eliminating the seasonal closure of Area 1B goes against the intent of Amendment 8, which considers the protection of marine ecosystems. With the Atlantic herring population at such low numbers and poor recruitment, it makes little sense to open this area from January through April to the commercial fishery. This area is open to the fishery from May to December. The month of May provides the ability to catch fish in time for the lobster industry. River herring winter along the backside of the Cape and need continued protection from midwater trawling. By May, river herring have left Area 1B to return to their natal waters to spawn. Maintaining the seasonal closure of Area 1B not only protects our ocean's ecosystem, but it also protects the ecosystems of our coastal waters.

- Support of the substitute motion:
 - The Area 1B quota is so low that it can be easily harvested later in the year (December).
 - There is an inshore mackerel fishery off the Cape that harvests this quota typically later in the year, what if this change closes the mackerel fishery earlier in the year before those vessels participate?
- Support of the main motion:
 - This closure was implemented to quell concerns about the herring fishery being in this area during January-April.
 - There are many factors that impact RH recruitment (e.g., drought); the catch caps will limit bycatch.

Vote: 3:4:0, motion to substitute fails

JP Bilodeau	No	David Mussina	Yes
<i>Beth Casoni</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>	Gerry O'Neill	No
Jeff Kaelin	No	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	Yes	MaryBeth Tooley	No
Zach Klyver	Yes		
<i>Megan Lapp</i>	<i>Acting as Chair</i>	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>

Vote: 4:3:0, main motion carries

JP Bilodeau	Yes	David Mussina	No
<i>Beth Casoni</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>	Gerry O'Neill	Yes
Jeff Kaelin	Yes	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	No	MaryBeth Tooley	Yes
Zach Klyver	No		
<i>Megan Lapp</i>	<i>Acting as Chair</i>	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>

2021 Herring work priorities

Motion 7: Tooley/O'Neill

Recommend the highest herring work priority for 2021 be development of a rebuilding program. Other topics that could be added to that action would be: 1) review of the ACL structure (division of the ACL into herring management areas and accountability measures); and 2) reconsider the results from the MSE to create flexibility in the fishery. Continuing Framework 7 would be a low priority.

- Concern with motion:
 - Framework 7 should be continued as a priority. Protecting herring egg mats is important.
 - Some interest to add another item that would be a science priority to investigate why the herring population has fallen so precipitously.

Perfect motion (removed reference to Framework 7)

Recommend the highest herring work priority for 2021 be development of a rebuilding program. Other topics that could be added to that action would be: 1) review of the ACL structure (division of the ACL into herring management areas and accountability measures); and 2) reconsider the results from the MSE to create flexibility in the fishery.

Vote: 7:0:0, perfected motion carries

JP Bilodeau	Yes	David Mussina	Yes
<i>Beth Casoni</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>	Gerry O'Neill	Yes
Jeff Kaelin	Yes	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	Yes	MaryBeth Tooley	Yes
Zach Klyver	Yes		
<i>Megan Lapp</i>	<i>Acting as Chair</i>	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>

In June 2020, the AP developed a list of 6 potential items that could be considered during discussion of the Executive Order to promote seafood competitiveness. The AP reviewed that list and decided to prioritize the list for Committee consideration.

Motion 8: Kaelin/O'Neill

Recommend that the Committee prioritize several items for the Executive Order related to the herring plan:

#3: Inability to catch haddock quota on GB as overall issue. Specific to the herring plan, the haddock catch cap should not be constraining when haddock TAC is so large. Catch cap should be revisited or removed.

#4: IFM implementation – too expensive. Delay until more herring TAC available at a minimum, or seek other temporary funding sources.

#6: Remove measure approved in Amendment 8 that would prohibit MWT gear from fishing in coastal areas from Maine to RI.

- Support of the motion

- The other ideas would remain on the list but be lower priorities. However, permit splitting and baseline restrictions are too broad. Climate issue is huge, but we are spending tons of time on wind through RODA. Is green energy from wind worth eliminating fisheries? This is too big for the EO.
- There is no longer money in the herring fishery to pay for industry-funded monitoring. Higher rates of coverage should be paid for by NMFS.
- Maybe another item for the list would be to get more of the management uncertainty buffer back to the US fishery if the Canadian fishery does not harvest that quota, why limit it to 1,000 mt?
- Concern with the motion
 - Why prioritize the list – all items were discussed and there was not consensus on the full list.

Vote: 4:3:0, motion carries

JP Bilodeau	Yes	David Mussina	No
<i>Beth Casoni</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>	Gerry O'Neill	Yes
Jeff Kaelin	Yes	James Ruhle	absent
Ray Kane	No	MaryBeth Tooley	Yes
Zach Klyver	No		
<i>Megan Lapp</i>	<i>Acting as Chair</i>	<i>Bert Jongerden (if needed)</i>	<i>Left meeting</i>