



Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Atlantic Menhaden Management Board
FROM: Atlantic Menhaden Advisory Panel
DATE: November 1, 2022
SUBJECT: Advisory Panel Recommendations on Draft Addendum I Options

The Advisory Panel (AP) met via webinar on October 18, 2022 to formulate comments and provide recommendations on Draft Addendum I to Amendment 3. Panel members in attendance represented commercial harvesters and processors, recreational anglers, and conservation coalition members. The following is a summary of the meeting and the discussion had by the AP members. The AP did discuss preferred management options in the document and, given a consensus was not reached on many issues, all viewpoints are presented.

AP Attendance:

Meghan Lapp (RI, Chair)
Vincent Balzano (ME)
Michael Dawson (ME)
Will Caldwell (NY)
Melissa Dearborn (NY)
Peter Himchak (VA)
Jimmy Kellum (VA)
Barbara Garrity-Blake (NC)
ASMFC Staff: James Boyle and Emilie Franke

3.1: Quota Allocation

Step 1: Fixed Minimum

6 AP members support Option B: Three-tiered fixed minimum

- One AP member commented that the tiered approach best aligns with the goals and objectives of the addendum
- Four AP members commented that the tiered system would best support their respective states of NY and ME.

Step 2: Timeframe

4 AP members support Option 2: 2018, 2019, & 2021

- Two AP members commented that this option represents the current cycle of menhaden distribution and aligns with the comments they saw in the public hearings in ME.
- Two AP members commented that if this option was not feasible, then they would accept Option 3A Sub-option 1, which weights recent years more heavily (75/25). They also opposed Options 4A and 4B due to the wide variations in menhaden availability in certain areas in some years.

2 AP members support Option 3A Sub-option 2 (50/50)

3.2: Episodic Event Set Aside

2 AP members support Option 1: Status Quo (1%)

- One AP member commented that the allocation options in the addendum already address increasing quota in the northeast.
- Another AP member commented that 1% is already a lot of fish.

2 AP members support Option 2: Increase the set aside (1-5%)

- One AP member added their support for Sub-option 2 and commented that increasing the set aside would suit the objective of the EESA to respond to the northern influx of fish.

3.3: Incidental Catch/Small-Scale Fishery

Timing

1 AP member supports Option 1: Status Quo

- Another AP member commented that NY does not separate quota by sector, and they do not oppose Option 2 if it helps other states that wish to separate quota.

Gear Types

1 AP member supports Option 1: Status Quo

- The AP member commented that the restricted purse seine size is relatively small and that maintaining purse seines in the IC/SSF is critical to ME lobster fishers for bait, especially later in the season. The member added that the large turnout in both ME public hearings regarding this document was largely due to the unanimous and vocal support to keep the use of purse seines.

2 AP members support Option 2: Remove Purse Seines

- Two AP members commented their preference for Option 2, but would accept Option 1. Both members were adamant in their opposition to Option 3 (Non-directed only), as it would eliminate the IC/SSF fishery in NY due to the exclusive use of beach seines.

Trip Limits

3 AP members support Option 1: Status Quo

Catch Accounting

1 AP member supports Option 1: Status Quo

Other Comments

- One AP member wanted to express their desire to have beach seines considered separately from haul seines due to the vast differences between the gear types, particularly when describing the NY fishery.
- AP member Jeff Kaelin was unable to attend the meeting and shared the written comment for Lund's fisheries with the AP to express his preferred management options, which is included in the briefing materials as an organization letter.