



Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

1050 N. Highland Street • Suite 200A-N • Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0740 • asmfc.org

MEMORANDUM

April 30, 2026

To: Atlantic Menhaden Management Board
From: Tina Berger, Director of Communications
RE: Advisory Panel Nomination

Please find attached a new nomination to the Atlantic Menhaden Advisory Panel – Eric Lorentzen, a seine net fisherman from Massachusetts. Eric is also an active lobsterman who uses menhaden as bait. He replaces Bob Hannah on the panel. Please review this nomination for action at the next Board meeting.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (703) 842-0749 or tberger@asmfc.org.

Enc.

cc: James Boyle

Atlantic Menhaden Advisory Panel

Maine

Michael Dawson (comm. inshore purse seine)
39 Lakeview Drive
Bristol, ME 04539
Phone: 207.380.4036
kamano@tidewater.net
Appt Confirmed 1/27/22

Vincent Balzano (comm. trawl & purse seine)
31 Vines Road
Saco, ME 04072
Phone (day): 207.282.3627
Phone (eve): 207.332.6492
vbalzano@mainerr.com
Appt Confirmed 2/1/17

New Hampshire

1 Vacancy – recreational

Massachusetts

Patrick Paquette (rec/for-hire/comm)
61 Maple Street
Hyannis, MA 02601
Phone: 781.771.8374
basicpatrick@aol.com
Appt Confirmed 10/26/16

Eric Lorentzen (comm. seine)

**173 Spring Street
Hull, MA 02045
Phone: 774.217.0501
ericreedlorentzen@gmail.com**

Rhode Island

Meghan Lapp (comm.)
100 Davisville Pier
North Kingstown, RI 02852
Phone: 401.218.8658
FAX: 401.295.5825
Meghan@seafreezeld.com
Appt Confirmed 10/26/16

David P. Monti (rec/for-hire)
399 Greenwood Avenue
Warwick, RI 02886
Phone (day): 401.480.3444
Phone (eve): 401.737.4515
dmontifish@verizon.net

Appt Confirmed 10/26/16

Connecticut

1 Vacancy – recreational

New York

William Caldwell (comm. seine)
75 East Tiana Road
Hampton Bays, NY 11946
Phone: 631.767.8257
Caldwell691@gmail.com
Appt Confirmed 1/27/22

Melissa Dearborn (processor)
Regal Marine Products, Inc.
198 West 9th Street
Huntington Station, NY 11746
Phone (day): 631.385.8284
Phone (eve): 631.385.7753
FAX: 631.271.5294
regalmar@optonline.net
Appt. Confirmed 7/17/01
Appt. Reconfirmed 1/23/06
Appt Reconfirmed 5/10

New Jersey

Paul Eidman (rec)
9 Williamsburg Drive
Tinton Falls, NJ 07753
Phone: 732.614.3373
paulfish@reeltherapy.com
Appt Confirmed 10/26/16

1 Vacancy – comm. trawl and purse seine

Delaware

William R. Wilson (rec)
18483 Cedar Drive
Lewes, DE 19958
Phone (day): 302.644.3454
Phone (eve): 302.344.5853
FAX:(302.644.3454
birdcarver@aol.com
Appt Confirmed 12/17/03
Appt. Confirmed 12/07

Leonard Voss Jr. (comm. gillnet/pot/dredge)
2854 Big Oak Road

Atlantic Menhaden Advisory Panel

Smyra, DE 19477
Phone: 302.423.6564
shrlvss@aol.com
Appt Confirmed 10/26/16

Maryland

David Sikorski (rec)
4637 Willowgrove Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21042
Phone: 443.621.9186
davidsikorski@mac.com
Appt Confirmed 2/3/15

John W. Dean (comm/pound net)
49925 Hays Beach Road
Scotland, MD 20687
Phone: 301.904.8078
Selbysuzi1121@aol.com
Appt Confirmed 2/3/15

Virginia

Jimmy Kellum (commercial purse seine)
144 Kellum Drive
Weems, VA 22576
Phone (day): 804.761.0673
Phone (eve): 804.438.5618
FAX: 804.438.5306
Kellum.maritime@gmail.com
Appt Confirmed 11/3/09

Peter Himchak (commercial purse seine)
Omega Protein
PO BOX 85
Tuckerton, NJ 08087
peter.himchak@omegaprotein.com
Appt Confirmed 10/26/16

Jeff Deem (rec)
6701 Newington Road
Lorton, VA 22079
Phone: 703.550.9245
deemjeff@erols.com
Appt Confirmed 10/26/16

North Carolina

Scott Williams (rec)
7104 Stonehaven Drive
Waxhaw, NC 28173

Phone: 704.989.7211
Scott.williams.charlotte@gmail.com
Appt Confirmed 10/26/16

Barbara Garrity-Blake (non-traditional)
134 Shore Drive
P.O. Box 91
Gloucester, NC 28528
Phone: 252.342.8028
garrityblake@gmail.com
Appt Confirmed 8/3/22

South Carolina

1 Vacancy – recreational

Georgia

Ken Hinman (conservation)
Wild Oceans
PO Box 258
Waterford, VA 20197
Phone: 703.777.0037
Fax: 703.777.1107
khinman@wildoceans.org
Appt. Confirmed 2/19/02
Appt. Confirmed 2/06
Appt Reconfirmed 5/10

Florida

Charles W. Hamaker (rec)
5648 Floral Avenue
Jacksonville, FL 32211
Phone (day): 904.630.3025
Phone (eve): 904.725.3775
FAX: 904.630.3007
charlesh@cou.net
Appt. Confirmed 7/17/01
Appt. Reconfirmed 1/2/06
Appt Reconfirmed 4/22/10

PRFC

Richard H. Daiger (comm/rec gillnet)
173 Oyster House Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: 804.472.2184
Appt. Confirmed 7/17/01
Appt. Reconfirmed 1/2/06
Appt Reconfirmed 5/10



ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

Advisory Panel Nomination Form

This form is designed to help nominate Advisors to the Commission’s Species Advisory Panels. The information on the returned form will be provided to the Commission’s relevant species management board or section. Please answer the questions in the categories (All Nominees, Commercial Fisherman, Charter/Headboat Captain, Recreational Fisherman, Dealer/Processor, or Other Interested Parties) that pertain to the nominee’s experience. If the nominee fits into more than one category, answer the questions for all categories that fit the situation. **Also, please fill in the sections which pertain to All Nominees (pages 1 and 2). In addition, nominee signatures are required to verify the provided information (page 4), and Commissioner signatures are requested to verify Commissioner consensus (page 4). Please print and use a black pen.**

Form submitted by: Nichola Meserve State: MA
(your name)

Name of Nominee: Eric Lorentzen

Address: 173 Spring Street

City, State, Zip: Hull, MA 02045

Please provide the appropriate numbers where the nominee can be reached:

Phone (day): 774-217-0501

Phone (evening): 774-217-0501

FAX: _____

Email: ericreedlorentzen@gmail.com

FOR ALL NOMINEES:

1. Please list, in order of preference, the Advisory Panel for which you are nominating the above person.

1. Atlantic menhaden
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

2. Has the nominee been found in violation of criminal or civil federal fishery law or regulation or convicted of any felony or crime over the last three years?

yes _____ no X

3. Is the nominee a member of any fishermen's organizations or clubs?

yes X no _____

If "yes," please list them below by name.

Mass. Lobstermen's Association

Rhode Island Anglers Association

Mass. Striped Bass Association

Stellwagen Bank Charter Boat Associations

4. What kinds (species) of fish and/or shellfish has the nominee fished for during the past year?

Atlantic menhaden

Lobster

5. What kinds (species) of fish and/or shellfish has the nominee fished for in the past?

FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN:

1. How many years has the nominee been the commercial fishing business? 27 years

2. Is the nominee employed only in commercial fishing? yes X no _____

3. What is the predominant gear type used by the nominee? seine

4. What is the predominant geographic area fished by the nominee (i.e., inshore, offshore)? Inshore (i.e., Boston Harbor)

FOR CHARTER/HEADBOAT CAPTAINS:

1. How long has the nominee been employed in the charter/headboat business? _____ years

2. Is the nominee employed only in the charter/headboat industry? yes _____ no _____

If "no," please list other type(s) of business(es) and/occupation(s): _____

3. How many years has the nominee lived in the home port community? _____ years

If less than five years, please indicate the nominee's previous home port community.

FOR RECREATIONAL FISHERMEN:

1. How long has the nominee engaged in recreational fishing? _____ years

2. Is the nominee working, or has the nominee ever worked in any area related to the fishing industry? yes _____ no _____

If "yes," please explain.

FOR SEAFOOD PROCESSORS & DEALERS:

1. How long has the nominee been employed in the business of seafood processing/dealing? _____ years

2. Is the nominee employed only in the business of seafood processing/dealing?

yes _____ no _____ If "no," please list other type(s) of business(es) and/or occupation(s):

3. How many years has the nominee lived in the home port community? _____ years

If less than five years, please indicate the nominee's previous home port community.

FOR OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

1. How long has the nominee been interested in fishing and/or fisheries management? _____ years

2. Is the nominee employed in the fishing business or the field of fisheries management?
yes _____ no _____

If "no," please list other type(s) of business(es) and/or occupation(s):

FOR ALL NOMINEES:

In the space provided below, please provide the Commission with any additional information which you feel would assist us in making choosing new Advisors. You may use as many pages as needed.

Nominee Signature: Eric Lorentzen

Date: 4-29-26

Name: Eric Lorentzen
(please print)

COMMISSIONERS SIGN-OFF (not required for non-traditional stakeholders)

Daniel J. McKernan
State Director

Janet R. Redke
State Legislator

Raymond W. Kay
Governor's Appointee

James Boyle

From: Tom Lilly <foragematters@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2026 8:31 AM
To: James Boyle
Subject: [External] Fw: Potential bad consequences of action the ASMFC menhaden board might take next Tuesday May 5th, and a more helpful alternative.
Attachments: Bay catch two.pdf

James could you send this out to the PDT and the former Protective Options Work group members In advance of the board meeting Tuesday?

To the PDT and the Protective Options WG

Please take action at the board meeting May 5th to prevent the proposed addendum from moving any of the reduction fishing from the summer, where it does the least harm, to the spring or fall where it will do the most harm. The spring fishing needs to end as for decades it has prevented our bay forage base from rebuilding and Marylanders and their striped bass and ospreys have paid the price year after year. If this addendum doesn't end but increase the spring or fall fishing ,it will be a disaster for our Maryland and Virginia bay ecology and related economy. There may be a better way.

The thing that stands out here is found in the bimonthly bay catch chart, attached. The reduction fishery catches 71% of the bay catch in July and August, that is 36,000mt. So if the board lowered the cap by 50% to 25.000mt they could easily catch this much in just July and August alone

Ending the fishing in the spring and fall would benefit a bay full of wildlife including our endangered Ospreys whose chicks are being lost by the thousands each year from starvation. It would largely carry out the objectives of the protective options WG.. It would benefit thousands of bay watermen and would revive our depressed

charter business (as in NJ and NY etc.) and their communities. The board could be reversing the hurtful loss of income to businesses and jobs in the two states and beyond due the failure of striped bass. It would mean the world to hundreds of thousands of Virginia and Maryland recreational fishermen, their families, friends and children and to millions of Marylanders and Virginians who simply want to see our bay wildlife restored. They have waited for 21 years, while their wildlife has declined year after year, for the ASMFC to act for the benefit of the bay and the USA .

Please discuss this among your state's menhaden delegates and convince them to speak up at the board meeting Tuesday with all the reasons why the bay and the people of Virginia and Maryland need a 50% bay cap reduction and having all the reduction fishing take place in the July and August where it will do the least harm and not in the spring or fall... Thanks Tom Lilly Whitehaven Md 443 235 4465

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Table 3. Purse seine reduction Bay harvest shown as cumulative percent across the season for the past five years (2020-2024). Source: NOAA CDFRs.

Purse Harvest by Date Relative to the Annual Harvest (as CumPct)

Date	Year					Overall Average		
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020-24	2015-24	2000-24
15-May	12.34%	4.24%	2.08%	0.00%	0.02%	2.45%	4.27%	2.45%
31-May	20.32%	13.62%	5.02%	0.01%	0.38%	10.69%	18.08%	11.49%
15-Jun	28.92%	16.91%	21.77%	3.39%	5.30%	19.79%	28.09%	19.79%
30-Jun	33.15%	27.76%	30.96%	12.69%	13.40%	29.36%	40.19%	30.01%
15-Jul	35.33%	29.48%	46.23%	20.95%	22.62%	36.13%	46.09%	36.13%
31-Jul	44.73%	49.68%	55.46%	49.87%	46.25%	48.02%	56.91%	48.63%
15-Aug	55.52%	70.63%	67.08%	58.85%	65.03%	60.72%	68.08%	60.72%
31-Aug	73.02%	83.05%	84.91%	76.31%	84.82%	74.91%	81.21%	75.38%
15-Sep	80.56%	93.33%	97.00%	88.22%	92.22%	84.55%	90.54%	84.55%
30-Sep	81.02%	99.15%	100.00%	97.53%	99.69%	90.69%	95.88%	91.11%
15-Oct	83.47%	99.63%		97.69%	99.98%	94.66%	97.51%	94.66%
31-Oct	90.25%	99.69%		97.72%	100.00%	97.54%	98.88%	97.95%
15-Nov	99.33%	100.00%		100.00%		99.74%	99.91%	99.74%
30-Nov	100.00%					100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Red Cells are at least 15% below the 5-year average

13.4%
71%
15.2%

Table 4. Menhaden purse seine fishing effort (number of net sets) in proximity to the 12 osprey nesting locations (N=571 nests) in 2024. Sources: Osprey Nesting Efficiency: Watts, 2024. Menhaden Fishing Effort: NOAA CDFRs.

Location	Osprey Nesting Deficiency		Purse Seine Sets in Proximity to Osprey Study Areas																		
			May		Jun		Jul		Aug		Sep		Oct		Nov		Total				
	Color	Status	Rate	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Reeton Bay	Red	Major	< 0.6	59	7.88%	7	0.54%	9	0.66%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	75	1.20%
Mobjack Bay	Red	Major	< 0.6	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	21	1.14%	1	0.12%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	22	0.35%
Eastern Shore	Yellow	Moderate	0.6 - 0.8	3	0.40%	8	0.62%	3	0.22%	1	0.05%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	15	0.24%
Plinkatank R	Yellow	Minor	0.8 - 0.9	1	0.13%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.02%
Poquoson R	Red	Major	< 0.6	0	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
York R	Red	Major	< 0.6	0	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Subtotal by Area and % of Total Effort				63	8.41%	15	1.17%	12	0.89%	22	1.19%	1	0.12%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	113	1.81%
Total Purse Seine Sets 2020-2024				749		1,286		1,355		1,844		818		91		114		6257			
Choptank R (MD)	Red	Major	< 0.6	Purse Seines Prohibited																	
Patuxent R (MD)	Red	Major	< 0.6																		
Upper Rappahannock R	Green	Surplus	> 1.1																		
Upper James R	Green	Surplus	> 1.1																		
Elizabeth R	Yellow	Moderate	0.6 - 0.8																		
Lynhaven R	Yellow	Minor	0.8 - 0.9																		

71% of 51,000
15 36,210
~~20% of 51,000 = 10,200~~

Cap 50% x 51,000 = 25,500
40% x " = 20,400
30% x " = 15,300
71% x " = 36,210
20% " = 10,200
BAY CATCH TWO



CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION
Saving a National Treasure

April 30, 2026

James Boyle
Fishery Management Plan Coordinator
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
1050 N. Highland Street
Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 22201

Re: CBF Comments on Menhaden Draft Addendum II

Dear Mr. Boyle and members of the Menhaden Management Board:

On behalf of our 200,000 members, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF) appreciates the opportunity to provide public comment on Draft Addendum II. Atlantic menhaden are foundational to a thriving Chesapeake Bay and broader Atlantic coast ecosystem. Unfortunately, Chesapeake Bay menhaden science remains “woefully inadequate,”¹ according to the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) as warning signs surrounding Chesapeake Bay and its menhaden resource are intensifying. CBF and our members commend the Board for responding to these real concerns and urge the Board to approve Draft Addendum II for public comment to advance much-needed conservation action.

Chesapeake Bay Menhaden Science

CBF has gone to great lengths to operationalize Chesapeake Bay menhaden science, a persistent and concerning deficiency given the volume of menhaden removals concentrated in and around the nation’s largest estuary. However, Virginia legislators have repeatedly rejected proposals to fund and initiate the cooperatively designed VIMS study plan.² Unfortunately, the reduction industry has successfully employed various tactics to stall this sorely needed science and have not publicly supported these impartial, credible menhaden science funding proposals in the Virginia legislature.

CBF is encouraged that federal funds, which we supported, are flowing for Chesapeake Bay menhaden research. However, deploying this federal funding is expected to face delays

¹ Mark Luckenbach, VIMS. April 2025. VIMS Menhaden Petition Comment to VMRC. https://www.cbf.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/vims_menhaden-correspondence.pdf

² VIMS. October 2023. Atlantic Menhaden Research Planning. <https://rga.lis.virginia.gov/Published/2023/RD528/PDF>

The reduction industry was involved in designing the components of this study plan and previously supported it. Yet, when Virginia legislation was considered to fund this work, the industry worked against it and not once publicly supported it.

and is insufficient to complete the scope of necessary work. This underscores the need for additional Chesapeake Bay menhaden science resources and the reality that the politically powerful reduction industry has systematically obfuscated scientific efforts in Virginia.

Sustainably managing this critical forage fish in the nation's largest estuary that provides essential nursery habitats for key ASMFC managed species should be a universally supported objective. However, the reduction industry's demonstrated political influence to block common-sense conservation measures and delay science indicates otherwise. This Commission has prided itself in managing fisheries according to the best available science. In the absence of science, risk-averse strategies must be employed, particularly in sensitive ecosystems such as the Chesapeake Bay. When a single fishing operation with a 68% allocation share systematically subverts efforts to improve science, managers are left with the responsibility to promote risk-averse management strategies.

Draft Addendum II Comments

CBF supported initiation and development of Draft Addendum II for over a year because of the intensifying indicators of problems with the menhaden resource in Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay is showing clear signs of stress due to compounding impacts of climate change, development, habitat loss, and impaired water quality. One of the few ways natural resource managers can mitigate these stressors and support the productivity of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem, coastal communities, fisheries, and struggling predators is by advancing conservation-minded menhaden management strategies within this estuary.

Draft Addendum II appropriately responds to these stressors given the data limitations. However, there are two key omissions that must be added to the draft Addendum before it is approved for public comment:

1. No Rollovers: CBF believes this is an important alternative that deserves additional input and consideration and is consistent with the status quo/no action options typically included in management documents. If the highly-efficient menhaden reduction industry cannot fully utilize a quota period, that is indicative of a biomass availability problem. Rolling over unused quota *could* exacerbate those changing resource dynamic impacts on both menhaden dependent communities and predator species.
2. Final Quota Period Overage Deducted from Total Bay Cap: this option was originally proposed—and included in Draft Addendum II—to achieve some level of accountability in the final quota period. If there are quota periods, there must be accountability provisions for all of those periods.

CBF supports the restoration of these alternatives into Draft Addendum II to gather complete and productive public input. Additionally, the PDT removed these options based on their interpretation of the Board's intent—the Board should clarify their intent around these options and add any necessary clarifying language into the Addendum.

Thank you for consideration of these comments, and CBF looks forward to continuing to engage on Draft Addendum II and supporting conservation-minded strategies to mitigate ecologic and economic challenges within the struggling Chesapeake Bay estuary.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Will Poston', is written over a light gray rectangular background.

Will Poston
Forage Campaign Manager
Chesapeake Bay Foundation

cc: Alison Prost, Senior Vice President for Programs, CBF

Chris Moore, Virginia Executive Director, CBF



New England Fishermen's Stewardship Association
500 Southborough Dr. Suite 204
South Portland, ME 04106

April 29, 2026

Atlantic Menhaden Management Board
Joe Cimino, Chairman
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 22201

Dear Commissioners,

The New England Fishermen's Stewardship Association appreciates the opportunity to provide comments regarding the ongoing development of Draft Addendum II to Amendment 3 of the Atlantic Menhaden Fishery Management Plan. NEFSA agrees with the Plan Development Team's recommendation that the Commission should not move forward with this addendum at this time and instead should refer the underlying scientific questions to the Technical Committee for thorough analysis prior to initiating or advancing additional management measures.

NEFSA strongly supports the principle that fishery management actions must be based on the best available science. The Plan Development Team has acknowledged that the Technical Committee is the appropriate body to conduct a detailed evaluation of the central hypothesis driving this addendum. At present, the scientific basis for the proposed measures, particularly the interception theory, remains unresolved and inadequately tested. Proceeding with an addendum before this analysis is completed risks implementing measures that are not supported by empirical evidence.

The available data do not support the interception theory. Maryland pound net landings have declined alongside a substantial reduction in fishing effort rather than as a result of reduced fish availability. Catch per unit effort has remained largely stable over time, indicating that active fishermen are still finding fish at consistent rates. In addition, statistical analyses show a positive relationship between Virginia purse seine activity and Maryland pound net harvests, which directly contradicts the interception theory. If the interception hypothesis were valid, the data would show the opposite pattern, meaning reduced Maryland catch when Virginia effort is high. The current record does not support that conclusion.

Emerging scientific analysis also indicates that environmental drivers such as river discharge, stratification, and hypoxia may significantly influence menhaden availability within the Chesapeake Bay. These findings suggest that variability in catches may be linked to ecosystem conditions rather than fishing pressure alone. This further supports the need for a comprehensive Technical Committee review before any management action is taken.

There are still critical analytical gaps that must be addressed. These include whether declines in Maryland landings are driven by reduced fish availability or reduced fishing effort, the need for a full catch per unit effort based diagnostic analysis across the dataset, and a complete evaluation of the relationship between reduction fishing timing and availability to other sectors. These are fundamental scientific questions that should be resolved before regulatory measures are proposed or advanced.

Federal funding has been allocated for Chesapeake Bay menhaden research that is specifically designed to address issues such as localized depletion and fish availability. NEFSA believes it is prudent for the Commission to allow this research process to proceed and inform future decisions rather than implementing measures in advance of the science.

Based on these considerations, NEFSA respectfully recommends that the Board pause further action on Draft Addendum II and refer the underlying scientific questions to the Technical Committee. The Commission should direct a comprehensive and data driven analysis of catch per unit effort trends, fishery co movement and timing relationships, and environmental drivers of availability, and should incorporate forthcoming research results before reconsidering management measures.

NEFSA supports a science first approach to fisheries management. The current record indicates that the central assumptions underlying this addendum have not been sufficiently validated. Advancing regulatory measures before completing the necessary scientific analysis would be premature and risks unintended consequences. A more deliberate approach grounded in Technical Committee review and robust data will better serve both the resource and the stakeholders who depend on it.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Joyce
Director of Advocacy
New England Fishermen's Stewardship Association