PROCEEDINGS OF THE

ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

ATLANTIC HERRING MANAGEMENT BOARD

Webinar
August 5, 2020

Approved October 19, 2020

Proceedings of the Atlantic Herring Management Board
August 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Move to approve agenda** by Consent (Page 1).

2. **Move to approve proceedings of May 5, 2020** by Consent (Page 1).

3. **Move to elect Megan Ware as Vice-chair to the Atlantic Herring Management Board** (Page 8). Motion by Dan McKiernan; second by Dennis Abbott. Motion carried (Page 9).

4. **Motion to adjourn** by Consent (Page 9).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Megan Ware, ME, proxy for P. Keliher (AA)
Cheri Patterson, NH (AA), Chair
G. Ritchie White, NH (GA)
Dennis Abbott, NH, proxy for Sen. Watters (LA)
Dan McKiernan, MA (AA)
Raymond Kane, MA (GA)
Sarah Ferrara, MA, proxy for Rep. Peake (LA)
Conor McManus, RI, proxy for J. McNamee (AA)
Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)

Matt Gates, CT, Administrative proxy
Robert LaFrance, CT, proxy for B. Hyatt (GA)
Jim Gilmore, NY (AA)
Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)
John McMurray, NY, proxy for Sen. Kaminsky (LA)
Joe Cimino, NJ (AA)
Tom Fote, NJ (GA)
Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Houghtaling (LA)
Allison Murphy, NMFS

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

Ex-Officio Members

Renee Zobel, Technical Committee Chair
Jeff Kaelin, Advisory Panel Chair

Delayne Brown, Law Enforcement Representative
Jonathan Deroba, Technical Committee Representative

Staff

Robert Beal
Toni Kerns
Maya Drzewicki
Max Appelman
Kristen Anstead
Chris Jacobs

Jeff Kipp
Sarah Murray
Kirby Rootes-Murdy
Mike Schmidtke
Deke Tompkins

Guests

Karen Abrams, NOAA
Fred Akers
Rep. Thad Altman, FL (LA)
Steve Atkinson
Jerald Ault, Univ Miami
Dave Bethoney, U MASS
Alan Bianchi, NC DENR
Deidre Boelke, NEFMC
Jason Boucher, DE DFW
Jeff Brust, NJ DEP
Mike Celestino, NJ DEP
Benson Chiles, Chiles Consulting
Matt Cieri, ME DMR
Allison Colden, CBF
Caitlin Craig, NYS DEC
Jane Crowther, Omega Protein
Jessica Daher, NJ DEP
Pamela D'Angelo
Maureen Davidson, NYS DEC
Justin Davis, CT (AA)
Jeff Deem, Lorton, VA

Monty Deihl, Ocean Fleet Svcs
Russell Dize, MD (GA)
John Duane, Wellfleet, MA
William Dunn
Maddie Dwyer, MD DNR
Paul Eidman, Tinton Falls, NJ
G. Warren Elliott, PA (LA)
Lynn Fegley, MD DNR
Marianne Ferguson
James Fletcher, Wanchese Fish Co
Tony Friedrich, SGA
Mel Gardner
Lacie Gaskins, Reedville, VA
Pat Geer, VMRC
Emily Gilbert, NOAA
Brooke Goggins
Willy Goldsmith, SGA
Zoe Goozner, Pew Trusts
Joseph Gordon, Pew Trusts
Zach Greenberg, Pew Trusts
Jon Hare, NOAA

Guests (continued)

Pete Himchak
Kyle Hoffman, SC DNR
Rusty Hudson, DSF
Aaron Kornbluth, Pew Trusts
Phil Langley, PRFC
Thao Le, NOAA
Tom Little, NJ Legislature
Bob Lombardi
Mike Luisi, MD DNR
Loren Lustig, PA (GA)
Chip Lynch, NOAA
John Maniscalco, NYS DEC
Nichola Meserve, MA DMF
Roy Miller, DE (GA)
Derek Orner, NOAA
Penelope Overton
Patrick Paquette, MSBA
Olivia Phillips, VMRC
Mike Ruccio, NOAA

Eric Schneider, RI DEM
Bret Scholtes, Omega Protein
Tara Scott, NOAA
Alexei Sharov, MD DNR
Dave Sikorski, CCA
Melissa Smith, ME DMR
David Stormer, DE DFW
Helen Takade-Heumacher, FL FWS
Mary Beth Tooley, Lincolnville, ME
Corinne Truesdale, RI DEM
Sarah Vogelsong, *Virginia Mercury*
Mike Waine, ASA
Craig Weedon, MD DNR
Anna Weinstein, Audubon Society
Kelly Whitmore, MA DMF
Catlyn Wells, SC DNR
Kelly Whitmore, MA DMF
Chris Wright, NOAA
Erik Zlokovitz, MD DNR

The Atlantic Herring Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened via webinar; Wednesday, August 5, 2020, and was called to order at 1:15 p.m. by Chairwoman Cheri Patterson.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRWOMAN CHERI PATTERSON: Good afternoon everyone, we will be starting the Atlantic Herring Management Board webinar now.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: I'm Cheri Patterson, the Chairperson, and I would like to move forward with asking if there are any changes to the agenda that any Board member would like to present. Please raise your hand.

MS. TONI KERNS: I see no hands, Cheri.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Thank you, then the agenda is approved by consent.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: I would also like to approve the proceedings from the May 2020 meeting, or webinar. Is there any objection to this request for approval by the Board? Please raise your hand.

MS. KERNS: I see no hands raised.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: The proceedings are approved by consent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Next, we'll move to achieving some public comment for items that are not on the agenda, please. Please raise your hand so I can recognize you.

MS. KERNS: For those members of the public, just to make sure everybody knows how to raise your hand. You just click on that little hand button on the webinar if you wanted to comment. Cheri, I do not see any hands raised.

MS. PATTERSON: Didn't we have somebody that wanted to?

MS. KERNS: I think that was (broke up) during the assessment.

MS. PATTERSON: Okay, thank you. No public comment.

REVIEW OF THE 2020 ATLANTIC HERRING MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT AND PEER REVIEW REPORTS

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: So, we will move forward with Reviewing the 2020 Atlantic Herring Management Assessment and Peer Review Reports. I would like to turn that over to Ms. Deroba, and the materials were sent out in the supplemental materials e-mail for everybody else. Thank you. Mr. Deroba, sorry about that.

MR. JONATHAN J. DEROBA: I was going to awkwardly just ignore it, but thank you. I will dive right in. A little bit of background. Prior to this year the herring was previously assessed October, 2018. It was a benchmark assessment. It is assessed using the assessment model typical of New England, the ASAP model of forward projecting statistical catch at age model. It has two fishing fleets, a mobile fleet, and a fixed-gear fleet. You'll see the fixed fleet is highlighted in bold there, noting that over 90 percent of that fleet is Canadian. Just keep that in the back of your mind. That will become important when we get to reference points.

It has four surveys, three NMFS bottom trawl surveys, and an acoustic time series that is collected during the fall bottom trawl survey. Natural mortality is constant at 0.35 among time and age. The model doesn't have any ability to estimate a stock recruit relationship, so MSY reference points were based on an F40 percent proxy.

I will go through the assessment term of reference by term of reference, as it was laid out during the review.

Term of Reference 1, estimate catch from all sources. I make a note there that discards have only been available since 1996, but they're generally less than 1 percent of landings, so kind of ignore that little hiccup.

There is the catch time series divvied out, color coded by each of those fishery fleets that I mentioned, mobile fleet in black, mobile fleet being trawls and purse seines for the most part. Then the purple is the fixed fleet, which again is largely Canadian. I would like to highlight one aspect of these catches, and that is if you look at the table on the right.

Typically, the fixed fleet is catching 1-7 percent of the total catch, except in the last two years, 2018, 2019, where it's catching 21 to almost 30 percent of the total. That is expressed graphically on the left with the purple bar representing the proportion of the fixed, and the black bar representing the proportion by mobile.

Again, I mention this because it's going to become important when we get to biological reference points. The proportion of the total coming from the fixed gear has increased quite a lot in the last two years. Term of Reference 2 is, evaluate indices of abundance. This is the spring NMFS Bottom Trawl Survey time series, at least over the range of years where we're using the Bigelow vessel, so 2009 through 2019.

Generally speaking, a decline. I won't say too much about these, as I like to let people interpret as they see fit. Here is the fall Bottom Trawl Survey time series, again for the Bigelow years. The anomalous blip there in 2016, I believe was the result of a few large catches. A couple tows caught a lot of herring, which is why you see this increased blip with increased uncertainty.

This is the Summer Time Bottom Trawl Survey, which the time series begins in 1983. This survey has used, I think it uses the Gloria-Michelle, but I can't remember for sure. But it

has used the same vessel throughout the entire time series, so there are no vessel effects here to worry about. This is the full time series for the Summer NMFS Bottom Trawl Survey.

This is the Acoustic Index time series. The Acoustic Index again is collected during the fall bottom trawl survey. The units of measure here on the vertical axis are acoustic backscatter, so it has no absolute biomass interpretation. Term of Reference 3 was to apply the ASAP model, so estimate the time series that we typically would. I made no changes to the ASAP configuration, other than to add two years of data. Here are the retrospective patterns. We're fortunate enough not to have a retrospective pattern to worry about in our management track. The fishing mortality rate retrospective pattern is in the top row. The left column is in absolute units of fishing mortality. The right is relative to the full time series estimates, and the lower row is spawning stock biomass.

Here are the time series of biomass estimates, so total biomass time series is reddish brown. Blue dash is spawning stock biomass, which is what we use for stock status determination, and exploitable biomass in green. The time series of fishing mortality, F. report is what we use for stock status determination, and that represents the average fishing mortality over ages 7 and 8.

We use those ages, because they are fully selected by the mobile fleet, which catches the majority of the total catch. Again, the black line is the one that is of greatest interest in what we use for a stock status. Here is the recruitment time series. Obviously, the elephant in the room is the last seven years have been well below average, including I believe the time series low somewhere in there.

Term of Reference 4 is the biological reference points. This is where we start to make some changes to what we did previously, and I'll get into why here in just a second. Previously what we would do to define biological reference points is premise your F40 percent and SSB40 percent on life history traits, such as weights at age averaged over the last five years.

To define selectivity for the biological reference points, we would take the total F at age, meaning the sum of fishing mortality at age, from each of those fleets that I mentioned, mobile and fixed. Average that over the last five years, and rescale it to have a maximum of 1. Another way to say this, it's not exactly equivalent, but it's essentially a catch-weighted mean selectivity.

Each fleet has a very different selectivity. The mobile fleet selectivity at age is on the left, the fixed fleet selectivity is on the right. If you take a sort of catch-weighted mean of these two things. The more catch comes from the mobile fleet, the more the combined selectivity will look like the selectivity on the left.

But if more catch comes from the fixed fleet, as I noted earlier, the greater that combined selectivity will look like the selectivity curve on the right. When we do long term projections, and for some of the short-term projection years, recruitment is sampled from the entire time series F above estimates, so from '65 to in this case 2017, because we exclude the last two years, because they are very poorly estimated.

Of importance here is in short term projections we would use this combined selectivity curve to define the reference points. We would use this combined single-selectivity curve in short-term projections, and use that to define an ABC and OFL. From the ABC we deduct a recent average fixed-gear catch.

Remember I said the fleet is largely Canadian. They don't have a formulaic approach to setting annual catch quotas, so in order to account for that they are catching fish from the same stock. We would take our ABC from short term projections, and take a recent average of fixed-gear catches, deduct that from the ABC to arrive at an ACL, as a way to account for that source of mortality. The implication here is that the combined selectivity that I described earlier includes just the right amount of fixed-gear catches, largely Age 2 fish is what that fleet

catches. The implication is that there is just enough Age 2 fish being caught that it equates to this recent average, and appropriately accounts for some anticipation of the fixed fleet catches, again largely Canadian catches.

This illustrates the problem we ran into. If you do the combined selectivity as I described, using sort of a catch weight and mean of the selectivity's from each of the fleets, the dash line in the graphic there is what you end up with for selectivity at age, which is this weird wonky shape that has an excessive amount of Age 2 selection.

The problem here is that the reference points are now being unduly effective by the catches of a foreign fleet that don't have a formulaic method for specifying annual quotas that we're able to anticipate. Also, a consequence of this sort of 2020 wonky looking combined selectivity is that if we were to do short term projections using the selectivity, any combined selectivity really.

The assumption is that the Canadian fixed gear fleet would adhere to the U.S. Harvest Control Rule, whatever that may be, and that is not true. If we were to use the combined selectivity there pictured with the dashed line, the short term projections would have far too many Age 2 fish being caught, and it would make the assumption that the Canadian fleet would respond to status changes in the same way that we would, and that is not true.

The solution was to base the biological reference points on the mobile fleet selectivity pattern only. The mobile fleet is a U.S. only fleet. It removes the effect of the Canadian foreign fleet. The graph there showed the difference between what we did in 2018, and the mobile fleet selectivity. You can see they are quite similar, because prior to 2018 and 2019, 95 plus percent of the catch was mobile fleet.

Given that that is no longer the case, we ran into those problems. I want to point out here though, the reference points are going to be based on the mobile fleet selectivity only. Reference points are just goalposts. I'll get into some more details about the

short-term projections, but the short-term projections will still include the Canadian fixed-gear catches.

It's just that the goalposts we're setting for ourselves are now premised on a mobile fleet selectivity pattern. Here are the previous biological reference points. F40 percent was 0.51, the SSB proxy, the corrected value you'll see a corrected value there in parentheses is 266,000 metric tons. In doing this management update, I found out that I flat out just screwed up somehow, and screwed up the SSB proxy in the last assessment.

The updated reference points using the mobile fleet selectivity are 0.54 for F40 percent, and 269 metric tons for SSB proxy, so quite similar, if I had gotten it correct the last time. Now even though the reference points and the goalposts, so to speak, that we have for the stock and fishing mortality are premised on a selectivity pattern that is only the U.S. mobile fleet.

The short-term projections will still explicitly include both fleets. Just as the ASAP Assessment model had two fleets, our short-term projections now have two fleets. Fixed catches are going to be set equal to a recent average, similar to before, except now then instead of taking that recent average after the projections are done, we take the recent average first, and plug that explicitly and directly into the short-term projections. The probability of overfishing will be based on comparing the mobile fleet fishing mortality rate to the reference points as I described, and that are premised on the mobile fleet selectivity.

But they will be explicitly responsive to any changes in Canadian catch. All else being held constant, if Canadian catches were to go up the probability of overfishing would also go up, and respond accordingly, and vice versa. The probability of overfished is based on comparing SSB to the SSB proxy as it always was.

Those are the only real changes to the projection methodology. In short, instead of using a combined selectivity to define the reference points, we're just using the mobile selectivity. Then instead of having this implicit amount of Canadian fixed fleet catches in the short-term projections, we're removing the fixed fleet explicitly, and having two fleets in the short-term projections, so that the effects of each fleet are carried forward separately and explicitly throughout the entire process.

Here is the stock status plot or Kobe plot. The vertical access is fishing mortality rate in 2019 over the Fmsy proxy. The horizontal axis is SSB in 2019 over the SSB proxy, so the horizontal dash line of 1 would be where F equals FMSY. The vertical dash line is where SSB would equal half SSBmsy.

The crosshairs there, I believe are the 90 percent probability intervals from the stock assessment. There is a triangle just offset from the center of the crosshairs. Should a retrospective adjustment been necessary, that is what the adjustment would be. But obviously the retrospective wasn't severe enough to warrant that.

If this were to become official, the stock would be declared overfished, but overfishing would not be occurring. On to some short-term projection results. As I said, the fixed and mobile fleets are now both explicitly included. For these projections the fixed-gear catches equal their recent ten-year average in all years.

The exact values there are under the second bullet, and the mobile fleet fishing mortality rate is based on the New England Council's Harvest Control Rule that I believe has been finalized. I'll let that there a second, so folks can soak it in, or spit it back out if they choose. Term of Reference 6 was review research priorities from previous assessments and SSC discussions.

I pulled out those that were called the high priority research areas during the 2018 assessment, so the first line was further research on the use of acoustic technology. To my knowledge, no progress has been made there in the last two years. We don't have a

dedicated acoustic program anymore at the Science Center, so advancing that one will be a bit rough.

Second bullet, at least major bullet is to evaluate the data collected in the study fleet program. I am working with the Cooperative Research Branch of the Science Center, to see if the depth preferences for Atlantic herring are systematically changing through time. For example, are they occupying benthic habitats more frequently than they use to? Then the last bullet was to evaluate the ability of state-space models to utilize in the region more generally. In the 2018 benchmark we had a state-space model, which even if you don't know exactly what that means, it's sort of the state of the art, next generation type of stock assessment model.

We had one available in 2018, but most of the Working Group members weren't comfortable with the statistics behind it, and weren't comfortable sort of diagnosing it, and so it wasn't adopted. But anyway, the recommendation was to do some follow up work on how state-space models function, and are they reliable, and so on and so forth.

That research recommendation is actually one that the ICES community that Europe is heavily involved with, Australia, most major regional management bodies are going this way. There is lots of local, national, and international projects going on in that research priority. Moving beyond the terms of reference here.

I don't actually know if the reviewer report has been made public yet. If it's not, it certainly will be, I would assume within days. The reviewer comments were largely positive. They only had one or two research recommendations. I believe one was about continued evaluation of acoustics.

The second was continued research on how to define reference points in a multi-fleet context, particularly when one of those fleets doesn't

have a formulaic way of setting annual quotas that you can anticipate, so how best to account for that mortality in determining reference points. That is all I had, and I'm happy to take some questions.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Thank you very much. Are there any questions from the Board?

MS. KERNS: Cheri, you have Conor McManus.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Conor, go ahead.

MR. CONOR McMANUS: Thank you, Jon for your presentation, really informative. I guess I was just curious. Is there any belief that the selectivity curves for the fleets are changing through time? I saw in the figure legend it said 1969. I wasn't sure if those are based off more historical information, or if there is evidence that the selectivity curves are rather stable.

MR. DEROBA: The 1960 whatever label you saw in the graph is a default label that is produced by an R package, which I should probably fix. It's not indicative of much. But to answer your question. No, there is no indication that selectivity of either fleet is shifting systematically through time. If it were, it would likely manifest in residual patterns in the age composition fits in the stock assessment, and the residuals are actually quite good in this stock assessment, at least for the age compositions. There are no obvious indications of time-bearing selectivity.

MR. McMANUS: Great, thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Anybody else from the Board before I go out to the public?

MS. KERNS: I don't see any hands, Cheri.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Are there any questions for Mr. Deroba from the public?

MS. KERNS: We have a question from Jeff Kaelin, but Jeff, you somehow lost your audio. We need to send you a PIN. We're going to send you a PIN. Tina, can you do that?

MS. TINA BERGER: Just sent.

MS. KERNS: Okay, and perhaps we can come back to Jeff, or if you can text your question to somebody that would have audio ability, we could read your question off for you, Jeff.

MR. DEROBA: You can even e-mail me, Jeff, if you're able to do that from your truck with your phone.

MS. KERNS: Jon, just so you know, we can take control back from you if we need to. Cheri, I don't see any other hands raised for questions at this moment.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Okay, is Jeff able to type in his question, maybe?

MS. KERNS: Well, Cheri, he's in his truck, because I think he had lost power. He is on his telephone. I think it's a lot harder to type in a question on your phone.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Okay, Jon, are you going to be with us for the rest of this meeting, in case Jeff does come back to us?

MR. DEROBA: I can be if you think it imperative. I have a plumbing issue that has required me to shut water off for my entire house at the moment. I would prefer to go fix that. But if you would like me to hang out for a bit to see if Jeff can get online, I can do that.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: No, go ahead and fix your personal issues.

MR. DEROBA: Jeff knows how to find me, and he knows I'm happy to answer his questions at any time. I'm happy to do that, Jeff, if you can hear me, or anybody else for that matter.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Thank you very much, Jon, good luck.

MR. DEROBA: Thank you, good luck to all those without power.

PROGRESS UPDATE ON THE 2020 AREA 1 FISHERY

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Okay, next I would like to go to looking at the Progress Update on the 2020 Area 1 Fishery. The Area 1A sub-annual catch limit is 2,957 metric tons after adjusting for the research set-aside. The 30-metric ton fixed-gear set-aside, and the fact that Area 1A closes at 92 percent of the sub-ACL.

In October 2019, the Board implemented seasonal allocations for this year's fishery, which the season was allocated between June through September at 72.8 percent of the ACL, and October through December was designated at 27.2 percent of the sub-ACL. Also, in May of 2020 the Board set effort controls for the Area 1 fishery, which is in your briefing materials, and the fishery did begin in mid-July. It started in Maine on July 19, and in New Hampshire and Massachusetts on July 20. If we could get an overview of the current Area 1A fishery, Renee, we can move on to your presentation.

MS. RENEE ZOBEL: Everybody can see the presentation. I will have staff help advance me through this. Cheri gave a little bit of an update of what this year has looked like thus far, so this is just a reminder. My very high tech, very flashy presentation you'll be seeing today looks very similar to the one that I gave (breaking up) recently.

Just as a reminder to the Board (breaking up) on Friday. We are currently sitting at four landing days for Category A vessels, and a six-truck limit, which is 240,000 pounds weekly per vessel, so there is a landing limit per vessel per week. For Category C and D small mesh bottom trawl vessels, (breaking up) five landing days.

Currently no use of carriers and harvester vessel to harvester vessel transfers only. As of this morning, the best available numbers that we have would be understanding that this fishery is still open for the week. We were sitting at about 872 metric tons taken for the week, which is 1,922,590 pounds. There were five vessels reporting to date this week.

We've had a range of 5-10 vessels participating thus far. I'm actually confirming something, bear with me

one second to make sure. I understand what the state of Maine sent to me appropriately. Oh, can you guys hear me okay? I'm hearing that I'm breaking in and out.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Yes, you are breaking in and out. If you want to come into my office and finish it up, you can.

MS. ZOBEL: Okay, bear with me one moment. All right, sorry about that. Am I a little bit clearer now? We've had 5-10 vessels participating per week. As Cheri stated earlier, the sub-ACL for Area 1A is a little bit higher than this. This is the June 1 through September 30th amount of that catch, which is 2,152 metric tons. With the value as of today that sets us at about 1,600 metric tons taken to date, with 540 metric tons remaining.

We will update again on Friday, as far as the catches overall for this fishery, and determination of whether the Board would like to decide to make a change headed into next week. This is just the visual through GARFO. Their last official quota monitoring update ran through the end of last Thursday, so last week's catches. We were sitting at about 738 metric tons total for the 1A fishery to date at that time. That is all I have; I am happy to take any questions.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Toni, Renee and I are sharing a microphone, so if you can just guide us if there are questions.

MS. KERNS: Will do, Megan Ware has a question.

MS. MEGAN WARE: Can we go back maybe one or two slides. I'm still a little confused, one more slide. Is that 872 metric tons, is that landings cumulative over the three weeks we've been open, or just for this week?

MS. ZOBEL: Megan, I'm going to be honest. I worked up this presentation this morning, and this is the VMS, it was a little tricky earlier in the

year, so I was asking for information out of Maine, which you guys have been gracious to help with the reporting program. My understanding was, I was asking for the amount for this week. But I very well may have gotten the cumulative amount. As soon as I started this presentation, I realized we may have crossed paths. If you have information that says that this is the cumulative that would be helpful.

MS. WARE: Okay, give me a second here to do some messaging. I'm getting a message that it is cumulative, that information.

MS. ZOBEL: All right, so that made a lot more sense. As soon as I started into this presentation, and I apologize for the confusion to the Board members. We're juggling a lot of balls at once, and I asked for something and wasn't probably very clear about it, so we were both thinking we were asking for something else.

I'll give you, bear with me one second and I'll give you what remains for the period, which will be significantly more. My apologies on that. We have about 1,300 metric tons left in the fishery then. Everything else is true, but that was the cumulative value and not the weekly value, so my apologies for that confusion. We have caught less than half of what is available for June through September, currently.

MS. KERNS: We have Dennis Abbott with a question.

MR. DENNIS ABBOTT: I'm looking at the NOAA Fisheries report dated 7/31, which said that the cumulative catch at that point was 736 metric tons. Are we saying it's now, the total is 872, meaning we only caught 140 tons this week so far?

MS. ZOBEL: As of this morning that is correct.

MR. ABBOTT: They're still not catching many herring.

MS. ZOBEL: If anybody from the state of Maine or any industry can field that question. I'm hearing in general that the fish have still been difficult to find, but others may have better insight on that.

MS. KERNS: We have Megan Ware.

MS. WARE: Yes, Renee, I'm not sure I have better information than that, other than I think that the landings have continued to be on the pace that we've seen them so far this year. We haven't seen a spike in the landings yet.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Are there any other questions from the Board for Renee or Megan?

MS. KERNS: I do not see any hands raised.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Okay, thank you. We will be having a conference call on Friday, to see if we're going to need to do any further adjustments on the Days-Out meeting. I also wanted to remind the Board. I should say, thank you, Renee for that presentation. I wanted to remind the Board that Jon's presentation of the management track assessment was just keeping us up to date on the results of that assessment.

We're not looking to approve the assessment at this time, because the New England Fisheries Management Council hasn't seen it yet. Therefore, there is no formal recommendations to consider at this point in time. It was just informational.

MS. KERNS: Cheri, Ritchie had raised his hand. I don't know if he wanted to ask a question. There it is, his hand is up again.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Go ahead, Ritchie.

MR. G. RITCHIE WHITE: I was just questioning the need for the Friday call, given the rate of harvest. It seems like another week there is no issue, then we're going another week.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: I would agree with that, but I'm Chair, so is there any other individuals on the Board that see a need to meet on Friday, and can we postpone it for another week?

MS. KERNS: We have Dan, then Megan, and then Ray Kane.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Dan, go ahead.

MR. DANIEL McKIERNAN: Yes, Cheri. I agree with Ritchie. We can postpone another week.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Megan.

MS. WARE: I agree as well.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Ray.

MR. RAYMOND W. KANE: I agree as well.

MR. ABBOTT: I do, Cheri.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Thank you, Dennis. Is next Friday the 14th okay for people's schedule? The 8:30 to 10:00 o'clock slot, will that work, Max or Toni?
MR. MAX APPELMAN: Yes, that should be fine.

MS. KERNS: Yes, we'll send out a notification cancelling the call, and announcing the call for the following Friday.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Thank you, Toni, and thank you Board members. Our presentations are done.

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Information has been passed on, so if we could move on to the next agenda item on Election of a Vice-Chair. I believe we have Dan, who would like to make a motion.

MR. McKIERNAN: Yes, thank you, I would like to nominate Megan Ware as the incoming Vice-Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: The motion is to elect Megan Ware as Vice-Chair to the Atlantic Herring Management Board.

MR. ABBOTT: I'll second the motion.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Seconded by Dennis, thank you.

MR. ABBOTT: And cast one vote for Megan Ware.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Is there any opposition to this nomination? Please raise your hand if there is opposition.

MS. KERNS: I do not see any hands raised.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Thank you, and congratulations, Megan.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Is there any other business that the Board members would like to bring forward, please raise your hand?

MS. KERNS: I don't see any hands raised.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Have we heard back from Jeff at all?

MS. KERNS: His hand is raised, but again he's still not connected.

MS. BERGER: He did reply in the question area that he was fine.

MS. KERNS: He did just raise his hand again though, so I feel bad about this. I'm so sorry, Jeff. We can send you an audio pin again. We'll see if we can work with you, so that you can be able to speak in time for the Menhaden Board meeting, and then if you do have questions, we'll try to answer those. You can always call me via the office line.

MS. BERGER: Jeff, your audio PIN number, if you can't retrieve it, is 27906.

MS. KERNS: Bear with us for one second, Cheri. We will try to make this technology work for everyone. I understand this is hard where people are having power outages and such. I think he's fine. He just said that he's all good. I think you're good to perhaps adjourn the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Okay, thank you. Is there any opposition to adjourning this meeting? Please raise your hand if there is opposition, or if there is further business.

MS. KERNS: I don't see any hands raised.

CHAIRWOMAN PATTERSON: Okay, meeting is adjourned. Thank you everyone.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m. on August 5, 2020.)