

## Herring AP and Committee Input on Range of Alternatives for GB Haddock/Herring Action – June 1/2, 2016

2.1 GB Haddock catch cap			Herring AP input	Herring Committee input
2.1.1	No Action	1% of US ABC		
2.1.2	Modify the cap	Likely an increase – GF PDT plans to look at 2-5%		
2.1.3	Modify the cap – with variable percentage	Higher in years when haddock biomass is high and lower when gf fishery utilizing more of their sub-ACL	Recommend including a minimum cap of 1%	
2.1.4	Increase cap with potential transfer to GF fishery mid-year	Initial allocation would be higher to herring fishery – but some may be transferred back to gf during the year - Used in Scallop FMP for YT flounder		
2.1.5	Terminate sub-ACL	No sub-ACL - all herring catch under other sub-component (now at 1%)		<b>Motion 4a:</b> Recommend Alt 2.1.5 not be developed in this action.
2.1.6	Others?		None	None
2.2 GB Haddock AMs for the herring fishery			Herring AP input	Herring Committee input
2.2.1	No Action	In-season closure of an area on GB to directed MWT fishing with payback provision		
2.2.2	Modify the AM area	Based on GF commercial fishing area, haddock abundance, or areas with higher catch rates from observer data, other ideas?		<b>Motion 6:</b> Recommend prioritizing developing options for the AM area based on areas with higher GB haddock catch rates for the herring fishery.
2.2.3	Establish an AM season	In-season or subsequent year – season with higher bycatch rate	AP does not support subsequent year AM	<b>Motion 7:</b> Recommend Alt. 2.2.3 not include a subsequent year option.
2.2.4	Modify the payback provision	Pound for pound payback only if certain conditions exist		<b>Motion 8:</b> Recommend Alt. 2.2.4 not be developed in this action.
2.2.5	Others?		None	None

Herring AP and Committee Input on Range of Alternatives for GB Haddock/Herring Action – June 1/2, 2016

2.3 Implementation of GB Haddock AMs			Herring AP input	Herring Committee input
2.3.1	No Action	In season when catch estimate above sub-ACL		
2.3.2	AMs trigger subsequent year	AM does not trigger until complete year of data available and final estimate for the year is available.	AP does not support development of subsequent year AM	<b>Motion 9:</b> Recommend Alt. 2.3.2 not be developed in this action.
2.3.3	AMs trigger when catch estimate has cv of 30%	AM does not trigger unless catch estimate has minimum of 30% cv.	AP recommends this alternative be modified to be in-season only, not subsequent year AM	<b>Motion 10:</b> Recommend Alt. 2.3.3 not be developed in this action.
2.3.4	Seasonal split of sub-ACL (80% / 20%)	80% of sub-ACL allocated on May 1 and the remaining 20% is not available until November 1. If fishery exceeds 80% of subACL before Nov 1 AM in place until Nov 1, and potentially again if remainder of sub-ACL harvested later in the year.	AP recommends that this alternative should only be coupled with an increase in the catch cap – not stand alone	<b>Consensus #2,</b> recommend that specifying a seasonal split of a sub-ACL be added to the list of items that can be adjusted by the specifications process.
2.3.5	Change AM trigger	Am only triggers if certain conditions exist		
2.3.6	Transfer of haddock to herring fishery mid-season	Mid-season take haddock from GF and allocate to herring fishery	<i>Staff has identified issues with this alternative and developed 2.1.4 instead</i>	<b>Motion 9:</b> Recommend Alt. 2.3.6 not be developed in this action.
2.3.7	Amend how haddock catch is estimated using portside data			
2.4 Proactive AMs			Herring AP input	Herring Committee input
2.4.1	No Action	List of items in place already that help reduce bycatch and keep the fleet under the sub-ACL: voluntary bycatch avoidance, possession limit of GF, prohibition on haddock discards and sale	AP does not support development in this action	
2.4.2	Required bycatch avoidance program	Could participation be required		
2.4.3	Seasonal closed area	Discrete closed area that would close during season with high bycatch rate.		

**DRAFT Herring Committee Motions (June 2, 2016)**

**IFM Amendment**

**1. Motion Kaelin/Tooley**

To recommend that the Council amend Herring Alternative 2.3 to add the use of electronic monitoring and portside sampling coverage on purse seine vessels in addition to midwater trawls.

*Rationale: It is unfair to add monitoring costs to only one sector of the fleet (midwater trawl vessels).*

The motion **failed** on a show of hands (1/7/1).

**2. Motion (Pierce/Kaelin)**

To recommend that the Council add an alternative to Section 2.0: “Would apply a combination of monitoring coverage based on permit category or gear type:

- “Would apply ASM coverage on Category A and B vessels using midwater trawl, purse seine and small mesh bottom trawl gear. Choose an ASM coverage target of 25%, 50%, 75%, or 100%.”
- “After the goals of the sea herring/mackerel electronic monitoring pilot program are reached, midwater trawl and purse seines can choose to continue with ASM or use EM/portside sampling. The EM/portside sampling would be at a rate of 50% or 100%.”

*Rationale: This option would provide flexibility for vessel owners to choose between at-sea monitoring and electronic monitoring/portside sampling, and allows the fleet to operate in a more cost-efficient manner. This addition would also delay potential implementation of EM until after the pilot program is completed.*

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (8/0/1).

**3. Motion (Kaelin/Grout)**

To recommend that the Council approve the IFM Draft Environmental Assessment as amended (including updated impacts analysis) for public hearings.

*Rationale: The analysis in response to Motion #2 should be incorporated in the Draft EA before the document is made available for public comment. The Committee is concerned with the potential dates for public hearings in the summer during the height of fishing season, which may impact attendance/feedback on proposed IFM measures.*

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (9/0/0).

### **GB Haddock-Herring action**

#### **Consensus Statement #1**

To recommend that the Council approve the action plan and purpose and need statement for the Georges Bank Haddock – Atlantic Herring framework as drafted (p.8):

- Acknowledging that the current accountability measures negatively impact the mackerel fishery as well,
- Removing the second sentence of the first paragraph in the draft Purpose and Need section (do not relate the purpose to the currently large GB haddock biomass).

#### **4. Motion (Grout/McKenzie)**

To recommend that the Council not develop Alternatives 2.1.4 (increase GB haddock catch cap with potential mid-year transfer of unused quota to the groundfish fishery) or Alternative 2.1.5 (terminate the sub-ACL allocation for the herring fishery and account for haddock catch within the “other subcomponents” sub-ACL) in the Draft Discussion Document.

*Rationale: For alternative 2.1.4, allocations should not be moved between fisheries. Alternative 2.1.5 provides no incentive to avoid haddock catch, because there would be no cap or associated AM.*

#### **4a. Motion to amend (Tooley/Kaelin)**

To recommend that the Council not develop Alternative 2.1.5 (terminate the sub-ACL allocation for the herring fishery) in the Draft Discussion Document.

*Rationale: The Committee was someone split on whether to develop Alternative 2.1.4 in this action, but there was no support for Alternative 2.1.5 so the motion was amended to take one idea at a time.*

The motion to amend **carried** on a show of hands (6/1/2).

Main motion as amended **carried** on a show of hands (9/0/0).

#### **5. Motion (Grout/Tooley)**

To recommend that the Council not develop Alternative 2.1.3 (modify the cap to a variable percentage) in the Draft Discussion Document.

*Rationale: the GB haddock catch cap percentage should not be based on utilization by the groundfish fishery, having flexibility to move catch between fisheries can be done in a more simplified manner. The*

*Committee agreed with the AP that a minimum or baseline of haddock catch should be maintained with this alternative if it is developed, for example 1% as a minimum allocation.*

The motion **fails** on a show of hands (4/4/1).

## **6. Motion (Tooley/Grout)**

For Alternative 2.2.2 (modify the AM area), the Committee recommends prioritizing developing options for the AM area based on areas with higher GB haddock catch rates in the herring fishery.

*Rationale: the AM area closures should be focused on where bycatch in the herring fishery has occurred rather than where the commercial groundfish fishery has caught GB haddock. Focusing on the highest bycatch rate areas only could provide more flexibility to the herring fishery to operate in other areas with lower haddock catch rates.*

The motion **carries** on a show of hands (7/0/2).

## **7. Motion (Kaelin/Grout)**

In Alternative 2.2.3 (establish an AM season), do not develop the option of establishing an AM season in a subsequent year.

*Rationale: The Committee agrees with the AP recommendation that AMs should be in-season. Therefore, the option in this alternative that would develop a seasonal closure in a subsequent year should not be considered.*

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (7/0/2).

## **8. Motion (Grout/McKenzie)**

To recommend that the Council not develop Alternative 2.2.4 (modify the payback provision) in the Draft Discussion Document.

*Rationale: Of the three ideas considered in Section 2.2, this would be the most complicated to develop. Considering the desire to streamline this action, this concept should not be developed at this time. The Committee prioritizes modifying the current AM area or season, over modifying the pound for pound payback part of the current AM.*

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (7/2/0).

**9. Motion (Grout/Tooley)**

To recommend that the Council not develop Alternative 2.3.2 (AMs trigger in a subsequent year) and Alternative 2.3.6 (transfer of haddock to the herring fishery mid-season) in the Draft Discussion Document.

*Rationale: Staff have identified challenges with moving catch in this direction, allocating haddock to the groundfish fishery, and potentially taking that back mid-season (Alternative 2.3.6). For Alternative 2.3.3, the Committee agrees with the AP that there shouldn't be subsequent year AMs.*

The motion **carried** (5/0/3).

**10. Motion (Balzano/McKenzie)**

To recommend that the Council not develop Alternative 2.3.3 (AMs trigger when catch estimate has a cv of 30% or less) in the Draft Discussion Document.

*Rationale: The concept is too complicated, and concerns about the unknowns about the payback.*

The motion **carried** (8/0/0).

**Consensus Statement #2**

For Alternative 2.3.4 (seasonal split of sub-ACL 80/20), revise to allow a seasonal split to be set through the specifications process.

**11. Motion (Kaelin/Grout)**

To recommend that the Council not develop alternatives for Section 2.4 (Proactive AMs) in the Draft Discussion Document.

*Rationale: there is not a need to develop proactive AMs, given the current voluntary avoidance program and other measures under no action.*

The motion **fails** (1/6/1).