

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
ATLANTIC HERRING SECTION

The Westin Alexandria
Alexandria, Virginia
January 31, 2017

Approved May 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call To Order, Chairman Ritchie White..... 1

Approval Of Agenda 1

Other Business 1

Approval Of Proceedings, October 2016 1

Public Comment 1

Consider Approval Of Draft Addendum I For Public Comment 5

Plan Development Team Report 6

Adjournment 18

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Motion to approve agenda** by Consent (Page 1).
2. **Motion to approve proceedings of October, 2016** by Consent (Page 1).
3. **Move to approve the request of the New England Fishery Management Council to add a non-voting member seat for the development of Addendum I** (Page 1). Motion by Terry Stockwell; second by Doug Grout. Roll Call Vote: In Favor – ME, RI, CT, NY; Opposed – MA, NJ; Null – NH. Motion carried (Page 5).
4. **Move to approve Draft Addendum I for public comment with the exception of Section 3.2; items reviewed by the PDT but not developed** (Page 16). Motion by Terry Stockwell; second by Dennis Abbott. Motion carried (Page 16).
5. **Move that the Herring Section recommend to the ISFMP Policy Board to write a letter to the GARFO Office requesting that the states of Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts be granted access to the VMS pre-landing report** (Page 16). Motion by Doug Grout; second by Terry Stockwell. Motion carried (Page 17).
6. **Motion to adjourn** by Consent (Page 13).

ATTENDANCE

Section Members

Terry Stockwell, ME, proxy for P. Keliher (AA)	Mark Gibson, RI, proxy for J. Coit (AA)
Steve Train, ME (GA)	Mark Alexander, CT (AA)
Rep. Jeffrey Pierce, ME, proxy for Sen. Langley (LA)	Dr. Lance Stewart, CT (GA)
Doug Grout, NH (AA)	Sen. Craig Miner, CT (LA)
G. Ritchie White, NH (GA)	Steve Heins, NY, proxy for Jim Gilmore (AA)
Dennis Abbott, NH, proxy for Sen. Watters (LA)	Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)
Sarah Ferrara, MA, proxy for Rep. Peake (LA)	John McMurray, NY, proxy for Sen. Boyle (LA)
David Pierce, MA (AA)	Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Andrzejczak (LA)
Raymond Kane, MA (GA)	Tom Baum, NJ, proxy for D. Chanda (AA)
Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)	Christopher Zeman, NJ, proxy for T. Fote (GA)

(AA = Administrative Appointee; GA = Governor Appointee; LA = Legislative Appointee)

Ex-Officio Members

Staff

Robert Beal
Toni Kerns

Ashton Harp
Max Appelman

Guests

Ali Murphy, NMFS
Ed O'Brien, MD LA proxy

Vincent Balzano, Saco, ME

The Atlantic Herring Section of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Edison Ballroom of the Westin Hotel, Alexandria, Virginia, January 31, 2017, and was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman G. Ritchie White.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN G. RITCHIE WHITE: I would like to welcome everyone to the Atlantic Herring Section; call the meeting to order. Before we get started with the agenda, we have two new commissioners present. I would like to welcome Mark Alexander; Connecticut, and Ray Kane from Massachusetts. I don't know if I can see that far, but I think we have New Jersey, Chris Zeman sitting in for Tom Fote; but he may not be at his seat.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Starting with the agenda, is there any changes to the agenda? Terry.

OTHER BUSINESS

MR. TERRY STOCKWELL: Yes, I would like to move the other business of adding a New England council member as a non-voting member of the Section to the beginning of the meeting rather than at the tail end.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Is there any objection to the change in the agenda? Seeing none; we will make that change.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Are there any changes or additions to the October, 2016 minutes? Seeing none; we consider those proceedings approved by consent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Next public comment, is there anybody that would like to address the Section on items that are not on the agenda? Seeing none; then we're going to move into

considering non-voting representation for the New England Fisheries Management Council; and Terry will speak to that.

MR. STOCKWELL: This issue became apparent before the New England Council's Hearing Committee in Full Council meeting, which met last week; with specific reference to Addendum III. As the TC has identified in their overview of management alternatives, every one of the ones that are proposed may require NMFS involvement.

This is a joint managed species; we do set the specs together. There are state managers certainly, and at least one other council member that sits on the New England Council and the Hearing Committee; but there are many times where we cannot advocate for the council's position because we're advocating for that of our specific states.

I am going to make a motion to move that the Atlantic Herring Section approve the New England Fishery Management request to add a member of the council as a nonvoting member of the commission's Herring Section during the development of Addendum I.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: We'll get that up on the board; and oh a second, sorry. Doug Grout second, so we'll get that up on the board. Are there any comments? Yes, David.

DR. DAVID PIERCE: I was at the council meeting when we voted to do this. But after giving it further thought, I still wonder about the rationale and the reasons why we need to have another New England Fishery Management Council member at this table; in this particular case as a nonvoting member.

As noted by Terry, there are the state directors who are intimately involved with sea herring management at the state and federal level. We have the Chair of the Herring Committee, I think you're still Chair, Doug aren't you? I am still looking for some good rationale as to why there

should be someone else present to deal with federal fisheries considerations.

We have the National Marine Fisheries Service here at our Section meetings, giving us all the necessary guidance as to whether what we are proposing to do puts us in conflict with the federal rules; or just as inappropriate should be a joint action between the Section and also the council. I'm still looking for a good reason why, and I would like the maker of the motion to provide a more compelling case if he would.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Any other? Dennis and then Terry.

MR DENNIS ABBOTT: I am opposed to this motion. I am opposed to this motion for a number of reasons, both process and the very fact of having a member. We just received a letter from the New England Fisheries Management Council on Friday. I think that is really too late to even be put on the agenda in the first place; and here we are a couple days later having had little time to absorb the ramifications of adding a council member, and we've already got it at the head of our agenda this morning.

I don't have a problem necessarily with a council member sitting at the table for a specific purpose, but this says that they will become a permanent member; non-voting member, but however a permanent member. I don't think the very fact that we are creating Amendment 3, warrants the inclusion of a member.

Second or third, the letter doesn't state who will be sitting on the board. Is it going to be the Chairman of the Herring Board of the Council? Is it going to be the Executive Director, or is it going to be an industry member? Could it be someone with close ties? I don't see that we need them. As Dr. Pierce previously stated, we already have members on the board.

If they chose to speak from a different position, as we've seen Terry Stockwell do; I think in

lobsters. He simply goes to the back of the room and establishes that he's speaking for the Council. I don't think it is necessary. It would be my recommendation, and if necessary I'll make a motion to postpone.

But I think that the Commission should develop a policy about including outside members to the Commission. We have to remember, this is the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; it isn't the Council, or whatever. I think they have enough voice, and when their voice needs to be heard they have plenty of opportunity to do that.

If we wanted a nonvoting member, I would be more strongly in favor of possibly an advisory board member coming to sit for a specific purpose; but not to add somebody at this point who is going to become a permanent non-voting member until the Commission takes action otherwise. Yesterday I spoke with the Executive Director. I think that he indicated to me that we didn't have a policy established for doing this with Sections; although we do with Boards. I'll close there and ask Robert if he can clarify for my understanding.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Do you want to clarify that Bob?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: I would be happy to. Mr. Abbott is correct. The Charter provides that a management board can invite council representatives to sit as voting members. The Charter is pretty clear that it is the Chair or Executive Director of the Council or their designee; so they are allowed to assign proxies if a board wanted to invite them.

We have two examples of that in the Commission; one is the New England Council sits on the Lobster Board, and they vote on Jonah Crab issues. They've abstained on lobster issues; since there isn't a lobster FMP at the Council. The South Atlantic Council sits on the South Atlantic Board and votes on a number of issues on that board; because there is a lot of overlap between the species that the South Atlantic

Council works on and our South Atlantic Board work on.

Those are the two examples. The second point is that there is no guidance on Sections. Sections are kind of a unique animal; they were formed under Amendment 1 to the Compact and we don't have guidance in any of our guiding documents on how or if council representatives can be included on Sections. But Doug and I have had some conversation.

There is a lot of conversation, or a lot of discussion in the Charter about the importance of coordinating with the councils on these joint and overlapping complementary plans that we have. I think however the Section wants to include the Council in a nonvoting capacity is probably appropriate. You are not violating any provisions if this Section decides to approve this motion; but again, the Charter is silent on Sections and including councils.

MR. STOCKWELL: As we struggle to move forward with improving the management process between the different bodies here on the east coast, the two councils and Commission, to deal with climate change, socioeconomic issues and dual management. I think it would be a travesty not to include the Council in the discussion of this specific addendum.

It is not for the entirety of membership on the Section, it is specific to the development of this addendum; which is from the Council's perspective, and I'm speaking with my council hat on, of interest to the Council because of the management alternatives that have impact on the federal permittees.

This is no different to me than the Commonwealth of Massachusetts asking for additional representation on the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council for demersals on the Council. It is broadening our ability to collaborate with other members for joint management of stocks that are important to all of us.

The non-voting member seat is only because the sections are not allowed to have a voting member. I would welcome to have a council member to vote on this as well; but our charter does not allow for that. I urge the Commission and the Section to approve this. Let's try it out and see if it works, if not there is no reason to consider a council seat on the Herring Section in the future.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Question for you, Terry. Since the Council is interested in broadening our ability to work together. Have there been any discussions about having a Section member sit on the Council?

MR. STOCKWELL: Reciprocity is something the Council has always considered. We recently populated the Habitat Committee with the Commission's Lobster Chairman, David Borden. We have commission members sitting at all our seats and it is something I could certainly bring back to the Executive Committee with Chairman Grout.

MR. DOUGLAS E. GROUT: I want to speak in favor of this motion. A couple points here that I want to make clear to the Section here. One, National Marine Fisheries Service is not represented on this Section, so that input is not provided here. Two, this is not a permanent one; it is very specific to provide a seat so that they can have some input and provide the Council's perspective on Addendum I. It doesn't say that this is a permanent seat on here.

They've asked for it for this specific issue. We've been partners in management for years, co-managing this species. This is the first time that they've felt this issue was important enough to move forward and try and at least provide the Council's input to the Section here on this particular management measure. We have not ever requested a seat on the Council. We do have Bob or Toni that represents the Commission at every council meeting.

As in this case, they are also ex officio members; non-voting members and they do bring up the Council's position. I am in the same boat as Terry, as sometimes I think it is important to have a council member here for this particular issue; because there are times where I need to represent the state and not so much the Council's position on matters.

I believe that this is important, and I hope you all consider allowing the Council to have an ex officio non-voting seat. One final point is the Charter, as Bob says, does speak quite extensively about the importance of coordinating with the councils on overlapping fisheries.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: David is next.

DR. PIERCE: Clarification, Terry noted my position on fluke, scup and sea bass, and said that my position relative to management of those three species conflicts with what I'm just suggesting for this particular motion. My request for those three species was joint management authority for those three species, the New England Council and the Mid-Atlantic, so it is entirely different.

To the point made by Doug. It is a good point regarding the National Marine Fisheries Service not being a Section member. Perhaps the motion should read that the non-voting member should be the National Marine Fisheries Service; for the purpose of developing Addendum Number I. If that is the intent of the maker of the motion, to make sure that we have the Service at the table as a non-voting member, then that's a different story.

But right now as noted by Dennis, this is open and there is no clear indication as to who in the world would be that non-voting member for the purpose of Addendum Number I. Again, I'm not going to vote in favor of this. I understand why the maker of the motion made it, but still it is not clear enough and I don't see the benefit of it.

MR. ADAM NOWALSKY: Good morning. As I understand this, we would have this nonvoting member purely for the purpose of development of Addendum I, which we're slated to take final action on at the next meeting. We're essentially going to have that individual here for one meeting; is what I'm basically looking at.

Given that we have the public comment period, the opportunity potentially for public comment on motions at the meeting, in order to support this motion, I would need some understanding about what that person, what that position would be able to provide by seated at the table; as opposed to being able to provide public comment during the time when this issue is opened for public comment, as well as having time for public comment at the next board meeting.

MR. ABBOTT: I am considering a motion and a motion to amend. My one motion would be to postpone this until May. On the other hand, I think I've been told that Vincent Balzano is here for the purposes of this meeting. An assumption is made that he is going to be sitting at the table.

I'll start off with an amendment. The amendment would say to act as a non-voting seat, not for the development of Addendum I, but for this meeting. That would give us time, probably if necessary a further motion to give this issue more of a chance to be vetted out through the Commission.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Did you make that amendment?

MR. ABBOTT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Is there a second? Seeing none; motion fails. Unless there is someone that has not spoken yet, I think it is time for us to vote. Seeing that; all those in favor. Do you need the motion read? All those, Doug.

MR GROUT: Could we have time to caucus?

CHAIRMAN WHITE: You may. Okay, are we ready? All those in favor, please raise your right hand. Opposed –made a mistake, this is a final action so it has to be a roll call vote. Sorry about that. Ashton.

MS. ASHTON HARP: Maine.

MR. TERRY STOCKWELL: Yes.

MS. HARP: New Hampshire.

MR. DENNIS ABBOTT: Null.

MS. HARP: Massachusetts.

MR. RAYMOND KANE: No.

MS. HARP: Rhode Island.

MR. MARK GIBSON: Yes.

MS. HARP: Connecticut.

MR. MARK ALEXANDER: Yes.

MS. HARP: New York.

MR. JOHN McMURRAY: Yes.

MS. HARP: New Jersey.

MR. ADAM NOWALSKY: No.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Motion passes 4-2-1-0. Okay, Dennis.

MR. ABBOTT: The motion that just passed says that for the development of Addendum I. What will be the sunset date for this participation?

CHAIRMAN WHITE: The passage; the passage or the failure.

MR. ABBOTT: It will sunset following the completion of Addendum I.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: I believe that is what the motion says. Is there a different interpretation you're suggesting?

MR. ABBOTT: Your interpretation is saying that it will end following the adoption of Addendum I?

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Yes, I believe that's what it says; Terry.

MR. STOCKWELL: That was the intent.

MR. ABBOTT: Thank you that's good.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Okay, is Vincent Balzano here? Yes there he is. Vincent is one of the most distinguished commercial fishermen in the state of Maine, and I think he's going to be a great addition to sit at this table. Vincent. Do we have a seat for him?

MR. ABBOTT: He's both a good herring fisherman and also a good shrimp fisherman this year.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: He is for sure. Okay welcome, Vincent and I'll be looking for your hand to be raised.

MR. VINCENT BALZANO: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you to the Section for granting the Council's request. This is an important issue to the Council, and I will say that we have not had an opportunity to officially review or discuss the document; so it will be more a catching up and maybe a few questions then it would be for official comment from the Council.

**CONSIDER APPROVAL OF DRAFT ADDENDUM I
FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Okay next agenda item, Consider Approval of Draft Addendum I for Public Comment. Ashton.

MS. HARP: Good morning. Today I'm going to review Draft Addendum I to Amendment 3 of the Atlantic Herring Fishery Management Plan. Addendum I was initiated to improve performance in Area 1A fishery. In recent years the Area 1A, Trimester 2 fishery has harvested herring at a rate that if left unrestricted would exceed the seasonal quota in weeks, not months.

The increase in Area 1A fishing effort and vessel capacity is in reaction to a significant decrease of readily available herring in Area 3. Area 3 fishermen have reported finding some Atlantic herring schools, but in deep waters and intermixed with haddock schools. Attempts to spread the Trimester 2 quota throughout the season using the existing days out program have proven to be ineffective.

In 2016 the state of Maine implemented measures that were more restrictive than those of the Commission. The Section initiated the Draft Addendum I at the October, 2016 meeting to consider alternative management measures in order to improve the performance of the Area 1A fishery.

The intent of this addendum is to develop additional measures that ensure the seasonal quota is spread throughout the entirety of each trimester; that the measures are consistent between the states, and they address excessive capacity. The Section proposed nine alternatives in Draft Addendum I at the October meeting.

PLAN DEVELOPMENT TEAM REPORT

MS. HARP: The Plan Development Team reviewed each alternative, and ultimately developed options for six out of the nine proposed alternatives; as shown in this table. The first column describes the alternative. The second column illustrates what are the PDT developed management measures. A green cell means yes, a red cell means no.

The next columns indicate NMFS and ACCSP, so whether or not they may be involved in the development of these options. I will walk

through the management options for Alternatives 1 through 6, and will provide reasoning's on why the final three do not have management options in this document.

For reference, the coastwide Atlantic herring annual catch limit is divided amongst four management regions. ASMFC's Atlantic Herring Section manages Area 1A; therefore it is the focus of this presentation and the document. The Area 1A fishery has two primary effort controls, the first is seasonal quotas.

The majority of the Area 1A Sub-ACL has been allocated during the months of June through September, known as Trimester 2. This time period largely overlaps the peak months for lobster landings as shown in this figure. Herring is the most widely used bait type for lobster traps. The second effort control is the available landing days; known as the days out program.

This table shows the landing days during Trimester 2 of the Area1A fishery from 2011 to 2016. At the start of the season managers make planned landing day adjustments based on the fishery performance from previous years. In this table you will note that in 2013, 2015, and 2016, landing days were restricted before the end of the season; and this is indicated by cells that have a zero in them. I've reviewed the intent of the addendum and the current management measures, and would now like to review some pertinent data related to the forthcoming alternatives and management options. As shown in this table, purse seine and midwater trawl vessels on average account for 99 percent of the Atlantic herring landings in Area 1A.

Depending on the season, the gear ratio will be different, so during Trimester 2, 99 percent of the landings are from purse seine vessels; whereas in Trimester 3, midwater trawls account for 55 percent of the landings. The number of purse seine vessels directing on herring in Area 1A has declined with exception.

In 2016 there were two additional vessels when compared to 2015. As a high volume fishery, two additional vessels can greatly increase the capacity of the fishery, given purse seiners account for 80 percent of the landings on average. However, the fishery has had upwards of eight purse seine vessels in the fishery within the last five years; so seven is not unprecedented.

During June through October of the 2011 through 2015 fishing season, the average price of herring per metric ton in Area 1A was slightly more than \$300.00. In 2016, the per metric ton price peaked at around \$600.00; due to lack of supply and consistent demand. Traditionally herring during the summer months is harvested in Area 1A and 3.

Collectively these two areas comprise more than half of the overall Atlantic Herring annual catch limit. Reduced Area 3 landings have put additional pressure on Area 1A. However, the Area 1A Sub-ACL by itself cannot meet the current needs of the bait market. The PDT attempted to look at carrier and transfer-at-sea activity, but quickly realized measures that were included in Amendment 5 to the federal Atlantic herring fishery management plan would make this a bit of a challenge.

Carrier vessels were provided more flexibility as a result of Amendment 5, which was implemented in 2014. A vessel can now declare if it is going to become a carrier on a trip by trip basis via VMS. The VTR reporting requirements for carrier vessels were eliminated. As a result the carrier activity from 2014 through 2016 shown in the top table is incomplete and represents minimum amounts.

Although VTR reporting requirements were eliminated, there were some carriers that continued to provide the VTR reports, and that's the data that is shown in the cells for 2014 through 2016. I just want to continue to note that it is an incomplete picture of carrier activity in those years. Amendment 5 also established

at-sea herring dealer permits, which allows a carrier vessel to sell herring instead of solely acting as a transporter. In 2016 five permits were issued.

The majority of options under each management alternative are linked to federal permit categories; therefore these tables summarize effort and participation for those permit categories that can fish in Area 1A. Those permit categories include permits A, C and D. As shown in the top table, vessels with a Category A permit harvest the majority of Atlantic herring in Area 1A.

To obtain a Category A permit, a vessel must meet certain landings and history criteria. The bottom table illustrates the number of vessels that have a federal permit, and also the percentage indicates the amount of those permits that are active. The number of active Category A vessels has fluctuated between 21 and 26 vessels in recent years. Category C and D permits are for incidental catch, and participation among these vessels has been decreasing.

Now I'm going to move into the draft management alternatives for Draft Addendum I. I'll review six management alternatives, and these were designed to improve the stability of the fishery and stabilize the rate of harvest during the fishing season. The PDT would like to note that the adoption of all six may not be necessary to meet this goal.

The first one is state vessel landing reports. To complete the majority of the other alternatives, states will need access to more timely reporting. Currently the days out program relies on weekly landing reports; which are not ideal in a high volume fishery.

Option B would require additional reporting requirements on behalf of harvesters that land herring from Area 1A and also land out of Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts port. The harvester would be required to report catch

within a 24 hour period to the state, likely through ACCSPs eTrips, so this would require some outreach on behalf of the states to familiarize harvesters with the new reporting system, as well as take time to work with ACCSP to roll out eTrips for this specific fishery.

Alternative 2 is: prohibit the landings of herring caught in Area 1A during a day out of the fishery. Option 1 is status quo. As we know the days out program pertains to all harvesters, and it just says; a vessel may land once per calendar day on any day that is open to landing, i.e. not a day out.

Similar to current spawning closures, the PDT has developed Options B and C. Option B is, harvesters are prohibited from landing or possessing herring caught in Area 1A during a day out of the fishery; and harvesters is highlighted in red, because originally in the document that was sent out they said all directed herring vessels but it should have said just harvesters to make it a bit more general.

Option B is very similar to Option A, except for a change in wording where it says or possessing. Option C is specific to Category A, limited access permits. It basically says the days out program only applies to Category A vessels, meaning that if vessels of Category C or D permit then they are not required to comply with the days out program if Option C is chosen.

Alternative 3 is weekly landing limit per vessel. As we know, currently the Commission has not issued any weekly landing limits per vessel, so Option B and C were developed. The PDT expects a weekly landing limit per vessel to stabilize landings in the fishery. Option B would apply the weekly landing limit to Category A vessels, and Option C would apply the weekly landing limit to Category A and C vessels.

The PDT notes that Option C would require more work on behalf of the states to track Category C vessels in addition to A vessels. In addition, Category C vessels are already restricted as a condition of their federal permit to catching no

more than 55,000 pounds per day. Landings by Category C vessels in the last five years have not exceeded 700 metric tons; and in 2015 Category C vessels only landed 77 metric tons.

In comparison to Option B, Option C would therefore require additional staff resources to track those vessels. For both options, harvesters would be required to notify states of their intent to fish in Area 1A, and the gear type they will be using 45 days prior to the start of the fishing season. Forty-five days was chosen, because it allows states the time to record the expected number of vessels and gives the TC a proper amount of time to calculate weekly landing limits and the landing day scenarios. These would then be presented at the days out meeting, which is generally one month prior to the fishing season.

Alternative 4 is landing restrictions on transfers at sea. Currently status quo is a vessel with the proper permits can transfer or receive Atlantic herring at sea. The PDT considered placing landing restrictions on those transfers at sea. Option B allows harvesters to land herring, meaning if you harvest the herring then you can land such herring.

This option would have significant economic impacts on vessels that operate solely as carrier vessels; because it essentially eliminates them from the Area 1A fishery. Option C is a replicate of the regulations that were implemented in Maine in 2016. It restricts carrier vessels to receiving one transfer per week from a harvester vessel, and allows carriers to land once during a 24 hour period at any Maine, New Hampshire or Massachusetts port.

The PDT has some concerns with the traceability of Option C, because carrier vessels do not report catch on federal VTR reports. Option C would require New Hampshire and Massachusetts to develop a reporting mechanism for harvesters to report transfers at sea, and/or develop some kind of carrier permit to track these carrier vessels.

Alternative 5 is a small mesh bottom trawl days out program. Currently the days out program applies to all Atlantic herring harvesters. The PDT developed a small mesh bottom trawl days out program that would operate in a similar fashion to the existing days out program; meaning that the Section members from all three states would still meet to determine the number of days out for each vessel, they would just do it for small mesh bottom trawl gear in addition.

Although harvest of Atlantic herring by small mesh bottom trawl fleet is small, at less than 1 percent of the Sub-ACL, there is interest in targeting herring for the weekend recreational bait market. Generally the days out program does not allow landings on the weekend, because the large volume market prefers early week landing days.

This days out program acknowledges other markets and allows the small mesh bottom trawl fleet to have differential landing days. To opt into the program a vessel would have to have a Category C or D permit and use small mesh bottom trawl gear. Harvesters would also be required to notify each state 45 days prior to the start of the fishing season to declare into the fishery.

This is just a little example to show like how the days out program could work, based on different gear types. The purse seine vessels would have landing days at the beginning of the week, the small mesh bottom trawl could have landing days at the end or over the weekend as they like, they could also overlap in landing days as well.

Alternative 6 is clarification of the days out procedure. Currently the FMP says that if states cannot come to a days out decision then the matter will come before the Section at the next scheduled meeting or special meeting. The Section has requested to clarify the method of agreement in the number of landing days available the decision is not made. Option B1 entitles each state to one vote, whereas the

majority wins; since there are three states participating. Option B2 would require a consensus vote. If there was still an issue where states could not agree, then default landing days would kick in; and currently these are not designated in the FMP. Option C1 would apply a previously agreed upon landing day scenario.

Whatever was previously agreed upon would rollover if the decision could not be made, or if no decision had been made; say it was the beginning of the fishing season, then seven available landing days would be made available. Option C2 would say that if a decision is not made then the default landing day scenario is zero days. There would basically be no fishing until a decision could be made.

That concludes the management alternatives that were developed by the PDT for Draft Addendum I. The next portion of the presentation is overview of the alternatives that were considered by the PDT but not developed.

The Section members were made aware of the PDTs concerns' regarding these alternatives, and a regional working group was convened on January 5th. The working group discussed the two alternatives under Section 3.2 and recommend they be removed from the document. A tiered weekly landing limit was another alternative that the PDT did not develop management options for. Instead, a portion of the regional working group suggested scoping questions be developed and these were developed under Section 4; and I'll review both of these sections now.

The first alternative that does not have any management options is, restrict a vessel from using a different gear type midseason within Area 1A. The method to implement this alternative would mean that if any vessel fishes, let's say in Area 3 using midwater trawl gear that vessel could not then switch midseason to become a purse seine vessel in Area 1A. If this was implemented, a vessel would have to

declare into the Area 1 fishery at the start of the season, possibly 45 days before.

But the PDT feels that this alternative has the potential to increase the Area 1A participation. For example, a midwater trawl vessel that may have formerly fished in Area 3, may declare into the Area 1A fishery as a purse seine vessel at the start of the season, instead of even attempting to fish in Area 3.

Therefore, the PDT feels that this alternative could have an unintended, negative impact on the Area 1A fishery and the lobster bait market. As shown, also in the white paper that was presented at the October meeting, the bait market relies on landings from both Area 1A and 3, and the Area 1A Sub-ACL alone cannot meet this demand.

The second alternative that was considered by the PDT, but options were not developed, was to develop an Area 1A set-aside of the small mesh bottom trawl fleet. The PDT noted that states currently lacked the ability to monitor small mesh bottom trawl landings as reporting does not include mesh size.

Also, the PDT most importantly feels that ASMC could, or the Section could recommend the Commission send a letter to encourage the Council to consider this action in the next specifications package, since we are talking about the ACL. Given we don't have the proper methods to report on how much catch is coming in, implementation is not preferred given accurate reporting is not possible. The next section is Section 4, and at the working group meeting the PDT presented concerns regarding a tiered weekly landing limit. Most notably the group did not have enough time or guidance from stakeholders to begin the process of developing options. In addition the PDT noted that vessels with a Category A permit, which harvests the majority of the Sub-ACL, have already met certain landings and history criteria to receive such permit.

Therefore, this has the potential to negate future fishing opportunities that have previously been instated by the National Marine Fisheries Service. At the meeting there was some interest in having a better understanding of what a tiered system may look like. The PDT had previously concluded that stakeholder input would be a valuable first step in this process. Following the meeting, Maine also agreed. I am going to present some draft scoping questions to gather input on the next slide.

I just want to note that after the meeting the PDT was notified that the Maine Legislature has taken the first step to implement such a program. The Legislature proposes to establish a control date for Atlantic herring, and to allow for the Commissioner to establish differential landing limits. Similar legislation actions would be required from each state prior to implementation.

This slide shows the initial scoping questions for the tiered weekly landing limit. Following each public hearing on Draft Addendum I, staff could hold an additional session to discuss these scoping questions. The feedback generated from these questions could be used to develop options in a future management document; either an addendum or an amendment, however not this addendum.

Feedback on Draft Addendum I and the scoping questions could be presented at the May meeting. The questions are very general, for example are harvesters interested in a tiered weekly landing limit, and if so, how would the tiered system be created? Would it be vessel size, would it be harvester history permit category? How many tiers are needed?

If there is a control date based on harvester history, what is that date? If its vessel size, what range of vessels do we want to include in each tier? Then also, should each tier be designated a portion of the seasonal quota; if so what percentage? These kinds of basic questions the PDT felt that they needed guidance from

stakeholders before developing any options for them. The Board would have to consider if they wanted to have Section 4 included in this document in Draft Addendum I for public comment.

I want to review the addendum timeline. This addendum was initiated at the October meeting. There was a working group held in New Hampshire at the beginning of January. We are all here today to kind of meet and discuss Draft Addendum I, and possibly approve it for public comment. In blue are issues that are a little bit extra from a regular addendum.

At this meeting the Section can also consider the working group recommendations to remove Section 3.2 and also consider whether or not they want to include Section 4, the scoping questions in this document. If this document is approved then the Section will solicit public comments on it in March and April, and states will conduct public hearings. We will all meet back in May and review the public comments if the scoping questions are included in the document or as an appendix to the document, or as a separate document; but still go out for public comment. Those would all be presented in May as well. June 2017 is what I've noted for the provisions of Addendum I to be implemented. It will need to be discussed, I guess probably at the next meeting if that is a possibility, because the meeting will be in May and the fishery starts June 1st, but that can be up for further discussion. With that I will take questions on Draft Addendum I as it was presented today.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Thank you, Ashton. As you can see this has been a complicated process in the states that have not been involved in trying to manage the flow of herring during a second trimester. We've been struggling with this for a number of years. As you can see there are complicated potential solutions to that; having said that questions for Ashton, David.

DR. PIERCE: Yes, 2016 was an especially difficult year as noted by Ashton in her presentation; slowing down landings making available a constant flow of herring for lobster bait. I am glad we have the addendum before us, and much of it was of course initiated at the request of the state of Maine; and thanks to the state of Maine for offering it up.

Question, the working group Ashton, in particular the Plan Development Team did a great job putting this together, and there is some data that I hadn't seen before that is extremely useful. My question pertains to those data. Leading up to my question, I just want to highlight how I got to the question, and that is we're concerned about Trimester 2 primarily; June through the end of September for availability of lobster bait.

I notice in Table 3B for that time period June through September that 99 percent of the overall landings for Trimester 2 are from purse seines. Then I note that in Table 4B that there were only five purse seines. Five purse seines permit holders responsible for 99 percent of all of those landings, and then I noted in the table following that the average total revenue was about 1.5 million dollars per permit holder, and it went up dramatically in 2016 as opposed to previous years.

My question is, of the five permit holders how many companies are we talking about, because my question is specific to the scoping comments; and I'll get to that later on. But how many companies are responsible for 99 percent of all of the purse seine landings? Actually that is all the landings basically, not just purse seine landings, so all the landings taken from Area 1A during that time period. How many companies, do we know, Ashton?

MS. HARP: I'm sorry; I do not know the answer to that question.

DR. PIERCE: Okay perhaps Terry would know. There are also carriers involved as well; carriers

who have permits and they can sell their sea herring. I would also love to know, especially for the public hearings that we're going to have, how many carriers are owned by the same companies? To give the Section a better feel for right now, who has the major portion of all of the herrings available for harvest? It is an important issue. It is important for us to know and understand as we move this addendum forward. Is it safe to say two companies?

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Trying to determine whether that information is available, you know due to privacy. I'm not sure whether we can get that or not; but I guess we can pursue that.

DR. PIERCE: Yes, I would appreciate pursuing that question in preparation for the public hearings, because I'm sure that it will come up; since we are talking about measures that will promote, perhaps, those existing participants, and those few companies for continuing to have the lion share of what's available for harvest.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Terry, to that point.

MR. STOCKWELL: To that point, Mr. Chairman. Actually David, directly behind you is two different purse seiners from the state of Maine. There are three others plus another company that came from New Jersey. There are six different entities, six separate entities last year.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Thank you, Terry. Doug.

MR. GROUT: I have just a couple of questions for Ashton, and then a comment about a part of our problem statement. I'll go with a couple questions first. One of the things that I understand that the reason we're putting forward an Option 3.1 harvest reporting requirement, primarily is because not all states have access to the federal vessel monitoring system pre-reports, pre-landing reports; is that the case?

MS. HARP: Yes, this alternative does state that NOAA has VMS pre-landing reports that supply

all of the daily catch data, but it is extremely restricted program to get into, and the states do not have access to the data at this time. If the states have access to the VMS pre-landing reports then we wouldn't have to develop state-specific harvester reports that are included in Alternative 1.

MR. GROUT: Do you know if any state has had access to them at all, and if so how did they obtain that?

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Terry to that.

MR. STOCKWALL: Yes to that point, Mr. Chairman. State of Maine has access, Doug.

MR. GROUT: One of the things that is suggested actually in the document is that the Commission write a letter to NMFS requesting that the three states here have access to that. Maybe you could help us craft that letter with the language that the state of Maine used to get that access.

MR. STOCKWELL: I would be happy to. I do have one related comment. On the state landing reports last year that were used by the state of Maine in our emergency rule making was to monitor the rate of catch, not the quota. We relied on the GARFO quota monitoring program. We were just concerned that with the weekly limit that we had that it was something better than the meatball guesstimate of what was coming in. The industry did their reporting and it was very close.

MR. GROUT: Good, thank you. My second question is primarily to help clarify to the Section. When we go down to Item 3.1.6, clarification of days out procedure, this is something that we're just trying to clarify; some of the ways in which we make decisions and what are the ramifications if we can't come to a decision between the three states? If we can't come to a decision, what would be the status quo procedure? I'm not sure it's clear in the document from my standpoint. Because for example, if we don't establish a days out at our

May meeting for Trimester 2, because we can't come to a decision. Under the status quo option, what would be the landing days?

MS. HARP: That is something the PDT discussed, and it's just not clear in the document. It's very hard to provide a kind of a status quo measure when there is no specific notation that it says it is seven available landing days; although we know that the Section has defaulted to seven available landing days in the past. But it is not specifically written in the document.

MR. GROUT: Okay, I took it that it said that if the states can't come to an agreement there will be no change to the landing days; we maintain the previous agreement.

MS. HARP: Once again, for those specifically, it is hard to even default to a status quo if the language is not there. This would provide a method forward to clarify that. The PDT had trouble thinking about what the status quo was, when it wasn't specifically written out in the document.

MR. GROUT: My final comment and actually I think I sent you an e-mail about that; was just a minor, but I think important language change, a language change we need to put in the problem statement. It says in the problem statement, and let me get to it exactly; give me a minute. In the last sentence of the problem statement it says; the intent of this addendum is to develop additional measures that ensure the seasonal quota is spread out throughout the entirety of each trimester.

I am not sure that that is really the issue or the problem here. If you look at the beginning of the problem statement, we're referring to the issues with Trimester 2, because there is so much demand. That is when the peak demands for harvesting is, for lobster bait, excuse me, I would suggest.

While I don't think we need to limit the measures to just Trimester 2 that in the problem statement

we say that it be spread throughout the entirety of Trimester 2, as opposed to throughout the entirety of each trimester. Again, I don't see a problem with applying these measures to other trimesters if we so choose. But I think this will make the problem statement clearer and more appropriate.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Thank you, Doug, I think that makes sense and we can make that change. Any other questions? Terry.

MR. STOCKWELL: Yes, to that point, Mr. Chairman. Doug and I have had conversation about this a couple times. I understand his intent, I just want to make sure it is an understanding of the Section and staff that these measures could be applied to other trimesters; should the Section so intend. At our working group meeting and prior we had some interest from industry to use some but not all of the measures in the third trimester, and I wouldn't want to preclude that by any kind of limiting language.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: David.

DR. PIERCE: Yes, regarding the statement of the problem. There is a reference to our using this addendum as a way to address excessive capacity within the fishery. My question is, the part of the document, the references are asking those questions that Ashton highlighted for us, asking those questions as part of a scoping process.

Are those specific questions that specific possible initiatives down the road; is that the one that is being offered up in a strange way to address excessive capacity? In other words, I'm just trying to find how this document overall addresses excessive capacity without our dealing with the differential trip limits for different permit holders. Again just Plan Development Team perspective, I would appreciate that on this question of addressing excessive capacity.

MS. HARP: I'm sorry; I was conferring with him about something. Just so I understand the question, you wanted to know how the scoping questions relate to addressing excessive capacity in the fishery.

DR. PIERCE: Yes, addressing capacity to me suggests that we're somehow going to be limiting the effort within the fishery specific to permit holders; new permit holders. Again that is about the scoping. That is specific to the scoping. If it is specific to the scoping then perhaps the statement of the problem is incorrect.

Because the addendum will be addressing the other aspects of the problem, not excessive capacity; I want to make sure that if we adopt this or bring it to public hearing we don't confuse the public relative to what exactly are we proposing to deal with excessive capacity.

MS. HARP: Okay I understand completely. That is one of the challenges with including these questions in the document for Draft Addendum I. When in reality the management options that could come from these would be in a different management document. It would likely have a different problem statement; it would have different data relative to them.

Not to say that it would be completely different, but it would be a little bit different. The regional working group included the scoping questions as an appendix to Draft Addendum I, so they could go out to the public for scoping.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Terry.

MR. STOCKWELL: To that point, Mr. Chairman. Good question, David. One of the measures should it be adopted by the Section to move forward for public comment does address capacity, and that is the landing restriction on transfers at sea. It has huge implications. The working group tried to wrap their head around the tiered weekly landing limit, and Ashton's

report about the state of Maine's legislative action is spot on.

In my conversations with the Chair and with Ashton, we advocated for the thought of moving ahead for scoping to find out really what does the public think about this; and should Maine Legislature approve this it will help inform state of Maine's next steps. My perspective, it doesn't bind the Section into doing anything other than take it out for scoping. I am certainly not prepared at this time to select any preferred alternatives. I would like to hear more what the public has to say.

MR. GROUT: This is sort of a follow up to one of my questions. Where we're trying to clarify what the document says about our decision process, I would like to add a third alternative to the C options. I'm moving to include an option.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Doug, excuse me. We're still in questions.

MR. GROUT: Oh, I'm sorry I'll wait, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: I'll recognize you when we move out of questions; and we may be there. Are there any further questions? Seeing none; we're there, Terry.

MR. STOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman would you like to have a motion to move ahead the public hearing document that Doug can then amend?

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Well, I already told Doug that he was in the process of that and I would recognize him first and I will follow up and recognize you second.

MR. GROUT: Under the clarification process for default landing day scenario we have two options, one if we can't make a decision there be seven landing days, the other one would be zero landing days. The way I see it there have been a number of times where we've already established landing days in the middle of the season, and if we couldn't come to a decision I

would like to have an option in here that there would be no change to the current landing days.

I would move to include a third option under the C category called default landing day scenarios- no change to current landing days. Just a description of this is the default landing day scenario; and you don't have to put this in the motion, unless you want to, but the default landing day scenario until an agreement is reached is no change to the current number of allowable landing days. If I can get a second to this I will be glad to speak to it.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Doug, question to you. In reading Option C2, doesn't that cover what you are trying to accomplish?

MR. GROUT: Mr. Chairman, no it doesn't because for example, if we decide to make changes. If we have a meeting, let's say in June we set, for example, three landing days. Then we come to July and we have a meeting to potentially change those landing days. You would have an alternative to maintain the existing landing days, as opposed to having seven landing days or zero landing days as whatever the default option is.

I think we need to have the capability of doing that. The same thing happens, there is a variety of times when I think it would be unofficial that we have the same landing days as opposed to if we were going to choose three, have zero landing days; or seven.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Ashton.

MS. HARP: I just want to point out one thing, and you may have already seen this. But I just want to do it, because the header of Option C2 is a little bit deceiving because it says seven landing days. The PDT did change the language under that to specifically say like this is what would be the regulations we would follow.

It says, the default landing day scenario until an agreement is reached, is the previously agreed

upon number of landing days; so to say if we already agreed on three landing days and we can't make a decision, then we're going to keep three, or seven landing days if the number of landing days has not been set for the current fishing season.

If we immediately start out on June 1st, and we can't decide landing days, then it will be seven. I just wanted to see if that kind of covers the other Option C that you said, because there is actually like two options included in Option C2, it is not just seven.

MR. GROUT: I guess the header fooled me; the description of it doesn't make it clear. Maybe if that is the case that we come up with a more clear header to this, because clearly saying it would be seven landing days in the header does not get into the nuance of if we already have some in place it would be the existing landing days. Because the way I look at things, before we set the initial landing days in June, our landing days are zero, because we have no quota in there. We have no quota in Period 1.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Do you want to go forward with this motion?

MR. GROUT: It is already made and seconded, and we can just vote on it one way or the other. I mean I think it's already been brought to the board and it's been seconded.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: If you're willing to withdraw and the seconder is willing to withdraw and there is no objection to that then we don't have to vote.

MR. GROUT: Dave, are you willing to withdraw?
DR. PIERCE: Yes.

MR. GROUT: Okay, thank you, and I'll withdraw.
CHAIRMAN WHITE: Are there any objections?
Toni.

MS. TONI KERNS: I just have a quick question. In reading this, do we need to define what

previously agreed means? Just thinking about it out loud, is previous mean from the year before or is it just what the three states come up with earlier in the year?

MS. HARP: I did think about that. We could say, as Doug had said, we could say existing landing days instead of previously agreed upon; but also to touch on your point, I did put or seven landing days if the number of landing days has not been set for the current fishing season. I was thinking that specifically if it's a June 1st then we're starting at nothing. We wouldn't go back to Trimester 3 for Trimester 2.

MR. STOCKWELL: Are you ready for a motion, Mr. Chairman? I move to approve Draft Addendum I for public comment with the exception of Section 3.2; items reviewed by the PDT but not developed.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Dennis. Do you want to speak to it, Terry?

MR. STOCKWELL: Now is not the time to cherry-pick our alternatives. Let's take it out, hear what the public has to say, meet back in May and make an informed decision at that point.

DR. PIERCE: I have no problem bringing it out; we've had some good discussion already. I hope the answers to my questions can be provided; notably the number of real participants in this fishery. If we're voting on this however, I want to suggest a clarification; and that is in the Section 3.1.6 clarification of days out procedure.

All the different options pertaining to the days out program, very specifically stated the days out program. However, when we go to Section 3.1.2 we note that if we select one of the options within that section we are replacing the days out, all right so no longer does days out have any relevancy.

I just wanted to highlight for the benefit of Ashton, so that when this document is presented and eventually revised it would reflect the fact

that those particular options for clarifications of days out procedure now have to have another way of being described, because it is no longer days out; because the options in 3.1.2, some of them anyway, pertain to no fishing days.

Now the no fishing days isn't highlighted specifically in the text, but the text in some of the options; maybe just one. You can't fish on those days. It is not just a day out of landing; it is no fishing, no landing. I just wanted to highlight that as a need for eventual clarification depending upon how we eventually decide to approve this document.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Any other comment from the Section? Seeing none; any members of the public like to speak? Seeing none; do we need caucus time? A minute to caucus, okay are we ready to vote? I'm going to take a shot here. **Are there any objections to this motion? Seeing none; it passes unanimously.** Thank you. Any other business that is not on the agenda? Doug.

MR. GROUT: Per my previous discussion here about the states getting access to the pre-trip notification on VMS. **I would like to make a motion that the Herring Section writes a letter to the GARFO Office requesting the three states involved in this, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Maine be granted access to the pre-trip notification; VMS data for the purpose of managing the fishery.**

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Is there a second? David. Is there any objection to that motion? Toni.

MS. KERNS: Before you find out if there is objection can we perfect it slightly and just say move that the Herring Section recommend to the Policy Board a letter be written?

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Thanks for that correction. Is there any objection to the new motion? **Seeing none; the motion is passed, and Bob will be sending out a letter, any other new business? David.**

DR. PIERCE: Yes, under Section 3 in the document, Table 12. The Plan Development Team, Ashton notably highlights for us that part of the document, or those parts of the document that may require the National Marine Fisheries Service involvement; notably implement state vessel landings reports, prohibit landings of herring caught in Area 1A during a day out of the fishery, and landing restrictions on transfers at sea.

I'm assuming that we will be getting from the National Marine Fisheries Service, I guess this can also be by way of Vincent, the extent to which the National Marine Fishery Service, hence the Council, needs to be involved in the discussion of and implementation of these specific management alternatives.

It is still not clear to me the nature of the involvement of the Service and the Council. I don't think I need to make a motion to this effect, but can we be assured that we'll be asking the National Marine Fisheries Service for it to weigh in on these particular issues; so we know before we get to public hearings that we can do these things, independent of the councils and the Service.

MS. HARP: Yes, we will be working with them as we have throughout the development of this document. They are very aware of what's going on. I will say that the way that we worked out some of the alternatives, means some of the options that we initially thought would require NMFS involvement don't really require them as much.

As far as the prohibit landings of herring caught during a day out of the fisheries alternative, we changed it to landings. At the last meeting it would have required involvement from the National Marine Fisheries Service; because it said to modify the program to restrict fishing days.

The PDT met and thought, well that would definitely involve NMFS involvement and that

would take a long time, so the Commission changed it to restricting landings. Some of these we have crafted so that we know that they could be implemented, but it still would be helpful to have the coordination of NMFS.

DR. PIERCE: With that said, I notice that one of the options does specifically relate to no fishing days, and I believe the state of Maine and Massachusetts for that matter and New Hampshire, did go with no fishing days in 2016; as an important change in our approach. If indeed we are talking about and we do adopt, a prohibition on fishing days as well as landing; and I think we're going to have to.

Then that probably would require the services involvement, I think. But again, I can't speak for the Service or for the Council for that matter in this particular instance, because it hasn't been delved into by either the Full Council or the Service. Again, I am stressing the need for us to know when the Service would say, specifically the service, when they would say right; we don't need any federal involvement. The states can handle this issue by themselves.

I suspect we can, because we did it in 2016. But I don't think the Service spoke up on that and expressed an opinion as to whether or not it was something we could have done without federal involvement. Anyways, I made my case and I hope we can get all of that clarified before the hearings.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Vincent.

MR. BALZANO: David, to kind of answer your statement or question is, my background information that I had gotten from Tom, our Executive Director was that Table 12 was the area of the document that gave them great concern; and that our plans are to review it at the April Council meeting and then report back. Other than that I will report to Tom and to the Council the concerns, and maybe they can expedite it. We do have a couple committee

meetings between there and then, but that is still not Full Council vetting.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Doug and then Terry.

MR. GROUT: Once this document goes out for public comment, I fully expect that National Marine Fisheries Service will be providing comments on this. I think this is the mechanism; our formal public comment process is a mechanism for them to provide input at the National Marine Fisheries Service level.

Just to clarify, Dr. Pierce, we still don't have the ability to restrict fishing. In the state of New Hampshire our authority does not extend out into federal waters; but according to our legal counsel, we can restrict landing a product that was caught on a no fishing day, because it doesn't prevent them from fishing.

They can fish out in federal waters on a no fishing day; they just can't land in New Hampshire under one of these provisions; if the product was caught on a no fishing day. I think that's a very important distinction here if we're moving forward with this process that we try to emphasize, and I believe that's the way it's written in the document; that we're prohibiting landing of a product that was caught on a no fishing day in our particular state. It doesn't mean that the vessel could go to Rhode Island or New Jersey and land that product.

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Terry.

MR. STOCKWELL: I'll be brief. Just to remind the Section that the motion that was originally made when we were all in Bar Harbor was a result of a series of meetings that Maine DMR had with our herring fishery. About half of the proposed management alternatives were those that were implemented in Maine last year through the Commissioner's emergency rule making authority.

The other half were measures proposed by Maine industry, so may require NMFS

involvement may not. As I said earlier, much of the angst that came from the TC and our federal partners were related to the landing reports, and we clearly did not use them for monitoring the quota.

MS. ALISON MURPHY: My name is Ali Murphy from the National Marine Fisheries Service. I just wanted to comment that NMFS supports the goals and objectives of the Section's addendum here; and that we're following what the Section is doing and as Mr. Grout pointed out, we do intend to provide comment during the public comment period on any issues that the National Marine Fisheries Service thinks there are with any of the options. I just wanted to say that we are tracking the options for consistency with the federal plan. One other point if I may make on the previous motion that was just up on the screen. I believe that letter would need to go to our Office of Law Enforcement and not to the GARFO Office. If it does come to the GARFO Office though, we can pass that along to our Office of Law Enforcement.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN WHITE: Thanks for that clarification. Any other business? Seeing none; motion to adjourn. Seeing no objection; we're adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 o'clock a.m., January 31, 2017.)