

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

1050 N. Highland Street • Suite 200A-N • Arlington, VA 22201 703.842.0740 • 703.842.0741 (fax) • www.asmfc.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlantic Menhaden Management Board

FROM: Atlantic Menhaden Advisory Panel

DATE: January 14, 2022

SUBJECT: Feedback on Options to include in Draft Addendum I to Amendment 3

The Advisory Panel (AP) met virtually at 5:00 PM on January 12, 2022 to review Draft Addendum I to Amendment 3 and provide feedback on whether any strategies or options should be considered that are not included in the addendum currently. AP members in attendance represented commercial harvesters and processors, recreational anglers, and conservation coalition members.

Participating AP Members:

Vincent Balzano (ME)

Melissa Dearborn (NY)

Jeff Kaelin (NJ)

Jeff Kaelin (NJ)

Leonard Voss (DE)

Bob Hannah (MA)

Meghan Lapp (RI, Chair)

Peter Himchak (VA)

Scott Williams (NC)

The following is a summary of the meeting and discussion had by the AP members, organized by management topics in the Draft Addendum.

Commercial Allocation

In considering the first step of setting the minimum commercial allocation (Section 3.1.1) via the tiered approach (either two-tiered or three-tiered) options, one AP member requested that the Board consider an additional sub-option that would apply any available percentages of the Total Allowable Catch not used in the fixed minimum to state allocations, rather than the Episodic Event Set Aside (EESA) program. One AP member noted that the statement of the problem should be adjusted to note that, since 2013 states with directed fisheries have worked within their quota and not used quota transfers or EESA to increase their share of coastwide landings, although fish remained in the area, each year, after their quota was reached. Lastly, this AP member also suggested the Board should consider a research set-aside quota option that would set aside some amount of the coastwide quota annually, similar to the EESA program.

Two AP members noted that in evaluating the timeframe options (Section 3.1.2), they had concern that the second highest year option may still be more of an outlier given it uses total landings that are higher than any year the TAC was specified. One AP member applauded the PDT for thinking "outside the box" when developing the weighted time frames options, using AM 2 allocations and more recent landings in mixed weighted options, sort of the old and new fisheries performances.

Separately, one AP member noted concern about using 2020 landings data to base allocations on, given the COVID-19 pandemic's impact on commercial fishing across the coast. They indicated that landings from many states for 2020 should be considered outliers given the restrictions implemented in the commercial industry to reduce crew and staff's potential exposure to COVID-19.

EESA

Draft Addendum I includes options that could allow the Board to increase the percentage of the EESA of the TAC up to 5% (Section 3.2.1). One AP member suggested that as part of this option, the Board should consider expanding the range of qualified states that can declare into the EESA program south of New York, possibly coastwide, as a sub-option. An additional AP member agreed, noting that if a state experiences an 'episodic' event as outlined in Amendment 3, it does not make sense to limit which states can participate, if an episodic event is possible throughout the species range. Lastly, one AP members asked whether it was essential for the EESA be continued when other sections of the Addendum are designed to allocate more quota to New England areas.

Incidental Catch and Small-Scale Fisheries (IC/SSF) Provision

In discussing permitted gear types in the IC/SSF provision (Section 3.3.2), a number of AP members expressed concern about the current Amendment 3 language that allows some gear types to be considered 'small-scale'. In particular, there was concern that the purse seine gear specifications under this provision allow for gear that can catch well above the 6,000 pound trip limit. An AP member suggested to help further evaluate this issue, include in the Addendum a breakdown of state-by-state information on seine size limits and regulations, and the sizes of seines normally used by states in their directed fisheries.

Other Comments

AP members indicated they wish to meet again once the Draft Addendum has been approved for public comment, and following the public hearings, in order to provide recommendations to the Board on their preferred options.

The AP adjourned at 6:30 PM.