

SUMMARY MINUTES

**Joint ASMFC Atlantic Herring Section
and
New England Fishery Management Council Herring Committee
Holiday Inn, Warwick, RI
April 5, 1996**

Mr. Pierce explained the format for the meeting and discussed the agenda. Mr. Lapointe called the roll; a quorum was present. Mr. Pierce asked for general public comments before proceeding to the next agenda topic (see Attachment).

Peter Moore asked the Section/Committee to discuss research issues.

Jeff Kaelin supported Mr. Moore's suggestion on behalf of the Maine Sardine Council and explained that the Maine Sardine Council could harvest an additional 10,000 MT to meet their needs during the upcoming fishing year.

Rich Ruais asked Mr. Lapointe if ASMFC had been provided a copy of the ICCAT letter which expressed a concern about the reallocation of herring because herring formed an important part of the forage base for tuna species. Mr. Lapointe replied that he'd not seen the letter but would distribute it to Atlantic Herring Section members.

Mr. Jay Smith from the Maine lobster Association stated that his association is concerned about the potential increase in mid-water trawl effort for herring and read from a prepared statement. He stated that lobstermen are concerned about their supply of lobster bait. Putting fish on IWPs doesn't make sense unless we are sure that the stocks are very abundant.

Mr. Dave Linney, a tuna fisherman from Maine, expressed concern about the herring stocks in the inshore areas near Port Clyde. He stated that he was worried about increased non-traditional effort for herring. He was concerned about the ability of inshore areas to attract and hold tuna fish which he attributed to the lack of bait on Jeffreys Ledge and the Kettle Bottom areas. He added that the presence of herring was an important factor in the tendency of sport fish to react to live bait. He noted that the tuna fishery is an economically important industry with at least 300 chum boats and a lot of shore-side support industries. He stated that the abundance of herring was probably important to rebuilding groundfish stocks.

Mr. Peter Barbera stated that he has been involved in JVs for herring for many years, that only a small portion of herring are being harvested from Georges Bank and that he did not want to see jvs shut down. He thought herring management should be concerned with the resource and market issues. He stated that there were plenty of fish and would be happy to supply lobster bait. He has supplied Maine lobstermen with bait in the past and sometimes could not sell herring for bait because the market was already fully supplied.

Mr. Pierce asked for approval of the minutes of the last meeting. Mr. Nelson made the following motion with a second from Mr. Smith moved to accept the minutes from the last meeting. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Technical Advisory Committee Report

David Stevenson stated that he would like to ground the discussion of IWP allocations with some facts. He noted there are many important aspects of the size distribution and the behavior of herring stocks about which there is very little information. The last Gulf of Maine stock assessment was in 1989 and that approach assessments for individual spawning stocks was abandoned in 1991 because the fishery independent estimates of abundance, in this case the spring bottom trawl survey was unreliable because herring migrate south out of the Gulf of Maine at that time of year and mix with the Georges Bank herring. Fish mixing from the two stocks cannot be identified as to which stock they are from. Based on the larval survey the NMFS conducted (which is no longer conducted) it is very clear that when the Georges Bank and Nantucket Shoals stocks started to rebuild that the major increase in larval abundance occurred on Nantucket Shoals rather than Georges Bank. The total stock biomass estimates, however, have increased dramatically to 3.6 million metric tons (MT), doubling in about two years. With an 80% confidence the herring spawning stock biomass falls between 1.5 and 3 million MT s. The assessments provide a spawning stock biomass estimates and concluded that a 25% removal rate on adults only, which is considered a safe rate of removals given an available biomass to be harvested. From this number the domestic U.S. and Canadian expected harvests are deducted leaving us with an adult surplus for allocations. Some of this is put into reserve and the remainder is allocated in the different management areas. The only guidance provided by the management plan is that no more than 50% of the total allocation should come from a single area. Since last summer, the Secretary of Commerce makes joint venture allocations (as opposed to IWP allocations) from only Area 3.

The total adult mean biomass was 2.7 million MT , but rather than base the IWP allocations on that point estimate, the lower end of the 80% confidence limit was chosen to which to apply a 25% fishing mortality rate and a 20% natural mortality rate to arrive at 1.9 million MT. An additional conservative factor was the choice of a 1994 stock biomass estimate. In the document we estimated the 1994 catch at about 65,000 MT although the estimate might be increased to 75,000 MT. The difference of 10,000 MT is insignificant given the size of the stock. At this point the science stops and policy decisions take over, because at this point decisions, such as area allocations, can longer be based on science. However, the Area 1 allocation was made on the basis that it should not exceed the prior year's allocations based on a previous assessment. The majority of the surplus biomass was put into reserve. The percentages were 30% for Area 1, 40% for Area 2 and 30% for Area 3. These allocations were made because the majority of the growth in stocks took place on Georges Bank. Of the three areas, the potential for over-exploiting localized spawning grounds is the greatest in the Gulf of Maine (Area 1) where the harvest rates are also the greatest. In response to a question from Mr. Nelson, Mr. Stevenson explained that only 8,500 MT of the 32,000 MT IWP were taken. If there were more boats fishing and more processing capacity then a higher level of the IWP allocation might have been taken.

Mr. Stevenson explained that the next part of history presentation was not discussed by the Technical Advisory Committee. He explained that he tried to estimate the quantity of herring that has been removed from the Jeffreys Ledge fishery. He used the Maine database of herring landings for the last four years. There is also reason for concern about some of the smaller herring spawning populations along the Maine coast. The Massachusetts landings data only goes up to 1993 so there is not current data on Massachusetts landings by area because of the lack of NMFS interview coverage. Mr. Stevenson described the catch areas for which Maine compiled catch data. Jeffreys Ledge is south of these areas, however, fish caught on Jeffreys Ledge and landed in Maine is accurately included in the Maine landings data. He noted that he would be talking about mobile gear catches only because there is no longer a fixed gear fishery. The largest landings came from areas 9 (Mt. Desert Rock), 14, 15 Monhegan Island, 16 (Seguin and Kettle Bottom),

although the landings from area 9 are not as important. Most Massachusetts landings went into Gloucester and the majority of those landings came from Jeffreys Ledge. He stated that it was important to consider landings from August through December because it is important to look at the landings when fish are on the spawning grounds. The landings from Jeffreys Ledge have gone up from 3,000 MT in 1992 to almost 11,000 MT in 1995. There are other areas on the Maine coast where the landings have decreased over the same period. About 2/3 of the catch occur after the fish have spawned. Catches prior to spawning do not give fish the opportunity to spawn.

In Massachusetts landings, Area 514 includes some Jeffreys Ledge fish. Assuming that the numbers in 1995 have not changed a lot from 1993 based on Gloucester, purse seines accounted for 32,000 MT and mid-water trawl for 6,000 MT. These data are less valuable because they are old. The two tables show the breakdown of domestic versus IWP landings. Mr. Stevenson then explained how he combined the landings data to estimate removals from Jeffreys Ledge. He explained some of the problems caused by the movement of fish and that the landings from Kettle Bottom, Monhegan should be combined to produce landing from the Jeffreys Ledge spawning stock. However, we do not know whether herring spawn around Kettle Bottom or Monhegan. In the 1960's about 40,000 MT was taken from Jeffreys Ledge. In the 1970s about 30,000 MT was taken primarily by pair trawls. The Jeffreys Ledge stock was reduced from about 30,000 MT to about 7,000 MT and recruitment became a problem. The plan developed by the New England Council in the late 1970s sought to rebuild the Jeffreys Ledge and the Georges Bank spawning stock. It sought to get the Jeffreys Ledge stock up to the level of about 120,000 MT to support a sustainable yield of about 50 - 60,000 MT. Today, we would not recommend such a high removal rate, because the size of the spawning stock is unknown. If it were at peak strength of 120,000 M, we could safely remove 25-30,000 MT. At present, we are removing between 15,000 and 30,000 MT depending whether we can include removals from Kettle Bottom. In response to a question from Steve Driscoll, Mr. Stevenson explained that he is including only fish taken from the ledge and not those near the beach. He attempted to account for landings taken between the ledge and the beach. Mr. Pierce added that the bottom line is that the historical msy was estimated at 50 to 60,000 MT. If we assume that the spawning stock is about 120,000 MT, then we are near the historical MSY.

Spenser Fuller noted that the old FMP was based on building up the stock size to 100 to 120,000 MT. He asked if any one of the areas is likely to have less than 100,000 MT of spawning biomass.

Mr. Stevenson responded that Jeffreys Ledge did not comprise all of Area 1, adding that not too much weight should be given to the old assessments, however, the historical landings data could be used to compare with current landings.

Mr. Pierce noted, however, that in the 1970s there was much high fishing mortality on juvenile herring and that today's stock might be able to sustain higher fishing mortality because is directed mostly at adult fish.

Mr. Fuller estimated that today we are taking 16 times less fish than in the 1970s because we are taking primarily adult rather than juvenile fish.

Ms. Alden asked about the fishing mortality rate on the pooled stock and pointed out that Mr. Stevenson was trying to estimate the fishing mortality on only a portion of the stock.

Mr. Kaelin stated that Mr. Stevenson's analysis of historic yields is the kind of analysis that the Maine Sardine Council has performed. This analysis has generated a concern about the fact that, historically, once landings reach 50 to 60,000 MT in the Gulf of Maine, the landings seem to drop in subsequent years.

Peter (last name unknown) owner of a mid-water vessel, stated that this meeting is focused on a special interest group. The purse seines move with the fish. You must look at all the catch including the juvenile catch to be fair. You must look at the whole coast of Maine. It is not only the Jeffreys Ledge fish we are catching there, but Gulf of Maine fish.

Peter Moore thought the discussion was fair but that it left out the tagging data that showed tremendous mixing between Nantucket Shoals and Georges Bank stocks with Jeffreys Ledge fish.

Vaughn Anthony has said that the only time you know which fish belong to which stocks are when they are engaged in spawning. He thought the TAC needed to take a closer look at the information presented by Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Pierce responded that the TAC is very aware of the complications to assessing individual stocks caused by the mixing of herring and that's why the section is in the dilemma of how to deal with the IWP allocations. We need to take advantage of the recent abundance but at the same time don't want to jeopardize the inshore stocks. He said that it might be useful to review the IWP requests that have been made by the individual states. The governors, however, will have the final say in the allocations.

INTERNAL WATERS PROCESSING (IWP) ALLOCATIONS

Ms. Alden said that Maine could not provide a number because there were two applications but only one had included numbers. Resource Trading had applied for 30,000 MT from Maine, 5,000 MT in the winter and the rest in the summer. David Ellenton had applied for an allocation but has not yet specified the amount.

Mr. Nelson reported that New Hampshire had applications from World Wide Trading Inc. for 5,000 MT of herring and 5,000 MT of mackerel. Resource Trading was looking for an overall allocation of 30,000 MT; 15,000 MT in the summer-fall fishery and 15,000 MT in the winter-spring fishery.

Mr. Pierce reported that Massachusetts had received requests from Resource Trading for 30,000 MT and from World Wide Trading for 10,000 MT.

Mr. Borden stated that Rhode Island received the following requests 30,000 MT from Resource Trading Company, 7,000 MT from Town Dock, 5,000 MT from World Wide Trading and two other requests for 5,000 MT each. The total of the requests in Rhode Island is 42,000 MT.

New York has requested 15,000 MT with no specifics provided about applicants and New Jersey 15,000 MT.

The discussion of IWPs continued into the afternoon. Charlie Good and Maggie Raymond spoke in favor of providing opportunities for IWPs for displaced groundfish boats. Glen Robbins stated that he has fished for herring for a long time and that he thinks the stocks off of cape cod, Cape Anne and Jeffreys Ledge have declined substantially. He claimed that some of the inshore spawning areas are gone including along plum island. And that some draggers caught spawning herring for bait. He repeated that the fish are not there any longer. The stocks will decrease wherever there is pressure.

Vito Calomo, Executive Director of the Gloucester Fisheries Commission read a statement strongly opposing JVs and IWPs because of the large investments made in shore-side processing in the

Gloucester area. Mr. Nelson asked Mr. Calomo where the Gloucester boats are fishing currently. He responded that a lot of the boats are now fishing off of Rhode Island and for a Russian JV vessel.

Bob Blair described the details of the Gloucester herring project which is trying to establish export businesses for herring. Ms. Alden asked Mr. Blair when he expected the investment venture to begin operation. He responded that he expected that some of the operations could start tomorrow and will be able to pack 200,000 pounds of fish. He added that they would be willing to buy fish from boats from outside of Gloucester. The processing capacity could double within two months and double again within six months. In response to a question from Ms. Alden, Mr. Blair stated that some of the vessels have the capacity to bring herring from Georges Bank. He added that they believed that the fish should be brought from Georges Bank and that the inshore stocks needed careful management. In response to another question he stated that they already had markets for the fish.

Mr. Drake asked about the levels of the frozen herring. He stated that he was unaware of any large inventories of food-quality herring.

Mr. Fuller of Resource Trading Co. commented that removals of herring should be thought of in terms of numbers, rather than pounds, of fish. Herring is a commodity traded on a world-level market.

Mr. Pierce asked what should be the appropriate percentage breakdown for allocating the total allowable catch (TAC) to different areas.

Mr. Borden asked if everyone is comfortable with the 425,000 MT overall TAC.

Mr. Nelson asked whether the 50,000 MT estimate of domestic landings might be too low given the anticipated increase in fishing activity in Gloucester.

Mr. Stevenson responded that the information from Gloucester was new and that perhaps the estimate would have to be increased.

Mr. Borden asked Mr. Stevenson what was the current estimate of total landings in the Gulf of Maine. Mr. Stevenson replied that it might 80-90,000 MT including the harvest from New Brunswick.

Mr. Borden noted that it would probably exceed the scientific advice for the TAC for the Gulf of Maine which might be about 60 to 70,000 MT.

Mr. Pierce commented that a large component of landings in the Gulf of Maine might be herring from Nantucket Shoals and Georges Bank and therefore a high level of landings might not represent catches in excess of a TAC for only the Gulf of Maine. He noted that the domestic fishery is unconstrained except for spawning area closures.

Mr. Borden suggested that the reserve was too conservative and therefore should be reduced.

Mr. Pierce asked how this might relate to the splits of the overall IWP allocation among the areas.

Mr. Borden made the following motion with a second from Mr. Drake:

Move that TAC be allocated as follows: 25% for Area 1, 50% for Area 2

and 25% for Area 3.

Ms. Alden commented that in the past the reserves were calculated separately for each area.

Mr. Pierce commented that the next step would be to determine how much would be put into the reserve.

Mr. White asked how the proposal would affect the Gulf of Maine.

Mr. Pierce discussed the history of the area allocations. He noted that there has been a rule that more than 50% should be allocated to any single area.

Mr. White questioned the size of the allocation in the Gulf of Maine given that there was concern about the level of fishing pressure there.

Ms. Alden asked what would happen to the reserve if the operations catch up to the reserve.

Mr. Pierce stated that situation has not yet occurred but that the section would have to reconvene to decide on whether to allocate from the reserve.

Mr. Borden explained that if the domestic fishery exceed estimates, that the amount of the reserve would be reduced.

Mr. Nelson noted that the stocks in Areas 2 and 3 have increased and therefore why would the Area 3 allocation decrease.

Mr. Borden replied that Area 2 fish are predominantly from Nantucket Shoals, but that he did not oppose changing the percentages by about 5%.

Mr. Russell explained that reducing the reserve from 74 to 70 percent would keep the IWP amounts for Areas 1 and 3 the same as last year and that this was appropriate because the status of the Georges Bank stock was more questionable than the Nantucket Shoals stock.

Mr. Borden commented that the reserve for Georges Bank should increase to keep the JV allocation within the 20,000 MT level discussed with Canadian representatives.

Ms. Alden commented that the 25% for the Gulf of Maine seemed too high.

Mr. Borden responded that the individual states do not have to allocate their percentage shares of the overall Gulf of Maine IWP allocation.

Mr. Nelson stated that he favored maintaining the Gulf of Maine allocation at 25%.

Mr. Fuller commented that we are taking 16 times less fish than we were in the mid-1970s and that we should think of the allocations in terms of the number rather than the weight of fish.

Mr. Kaelin stated that the high TAC seemed inconsistent with the comfort level among the U.S. and Canadian managers which produced the 20,000 MT allocation for Georges Bank in previous bilateral meetings.

Dave Lee commented that if the herring are not out there, there is not a whole lot to take.

Bob Blair asked why we are talking about 425,000 MT of fish as an IWP allocation when the

Gulf of Maine people are very concerned about their stock. The Resource Trading proposals for about 120,000 MT are going hurt domestic markets.

Mr. Fuller described some of the limitations on the growth of IWPs such as a decrease in the available number of IWP platforms, limitations on the markets.

The motion carried unanimously.

IWP RESERVES

Ms. Alden made the following motion with a second from Mr. Nelson:
that we put 89% of the Gulf of Maine into reserve and make 11% (12,000 tons) available as the initial allocation for IWPs.

Mr. Borden commented that he would like to know the state shares before he voted on this issue.

Mr. Pierce responded that the approach used last year did not include New Hampshire although it had a previous allocation.

Ms. Alden explained that the number represented the IWP total and was not meant to be an allocation to each of the three states. She commented that she suggested this number to represent a realistic estimate of the total allocation.

Mr. Nelson stated that he seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion and that even if this were the amount for each of the three states it would not exceed the applications. He added, that the 89% sent the message that there is concern over the level of IWP allocation, but that a 75 to 80% allocation might accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. Pierce commented that given the information about increased domestic processing capacity, that he favored a relatively low initial allocation for Massachusetts.

Mr. Smith asked if everyone understood that if the initial allocation were used up that additional allocations would be made from the reserve but that it might discourage additional IWP processing vessels from participating.

Steve Driscoll made the following motion with a second from Mr. Borden
to amend the motion to reduce the reserve from 89 to 80%

Mr. Pierce explained that the motion to amend would result in an initial IWP allocation of 20,000 MT for the Gulf of Maine.

The motion carried on a vote of 3 in favor and 1 abstention from Maine.

Mr. Borden made the following motion with a second from Mr. Nelson:
move that we allocate 5,000 MT to the state of New Hampshire, 8,000MT to Massachusetts and 8,000 MT to Maine

Ms. Alden suggested a perfection to the motion:
move that the allocation be amended to be 5,000 MT to the state of New Hampshire, 6,000 MT to Massachusetts and 10,000 MT to the state of Maine.

The amendment was accepted.

Mr. Fuller announced that he would withdraw the Resource Trading Co. application from the state of New Hampshire.

Mr. Ellenton stated that World Wide Trading also would withdraw its request to New Hampshire.

Mr. Nelson commented that if these applicants have withdrawn their requests, New Hampshire has no need of an IWP allocation.

Mr. Moore expressed dismay and explained that the reason for the withdrawals were that the operations would not be viable if the scale of the allocations are reduced. He added that the withdrawals mean that there would be no opportunity for participating in herring IWPs many fishermen in New Hampshire.

Mr. Nelson commented that he needed written statements withdrawing the applications before he could suggest reallocating New Hampshire's share.

The motion failed, with Maine and Massachusetts voting against the motion and New Hampshire and Rhode Island voting in favor.

Ms. Alden made the following motion with a second from Mr. Borden
move to allocate 8,000 MT to Massachusetts, 0 MT to New Hampshire and 13,000 MT to Maine.

The motion carried 3-1, with New Hampshire voting against the motion.

Mr. Nelson asked if there are unused allocations, do the governors have the authority to transfer the allocations to other states.

Mr. Borden stated that the governors could transfer the allocations as long as they were made within the same sector.

Mr. Nelson commented that if the governors did not have this authority, the plan should be amended to include this authority.

Mr. Borden cited a section of the plan stated that the states can transfers allocation to others states which are in the same sector.

The effect of the motion is to make 21,000 MT available for initial allocation.

In response to a question from Mr. Borden, Mr. Pierce explained that none of the Massachusetts 's requests for IWP allocations were for south of Cape Cod.

Mr. Borden made the following motion with a second from Mr. Nelson:
move that the initial allocation be 15,000 MT for Rhode Island, 7,500 MT for New York and 7,500 MT for New Jersey.

Mr. Smith questioned having such a large reserve.

Mr. Borden responded that they are less than requested last year.

Mr. Ellenton commented that World Wide Trading had only applied for 5,000 MT in each of New York and New Jersey. He asked whether allocations could be given to the states if there were not

applications for the IWP requests.

Mr. Borden commented that the section had a rule that there had to be applications before the state could make an IWP allocation.

Mr. Borden with the agreement of Mr. Nelson amended his motion as follows:
move that the initial allocation be 15,000 MT for Rhode Island, 5,000 MT for New York and 5,000 MT for New Jersey.

Mr. Borden, with the agreement of Mr. Nelson further amended the motion to read:
move that the initial allocation be 42,000 MT for Rhode Island, 5,000 MT for New York and 5,000 MT for New Jersey.

The motion does not include any allocation of herring from area 2.
The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Borden made the following motion with a second from Mr. Nelson:
move that 20,000 MT of the Georges Bank allocation be put into the initial JV allocations with the remainder to be put into reserve.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Borden noted that the states have great latitude about the terms and conditions of an IWP allocation

HERRING PDT

Mr. Lapointe briefly summarized the role of the herring PDT and the idea of bringing a Public Information Document (PID) to public meetings in mid to late summer.

SPAWNING AREA CLOSURES

Mr. Borden explained that in waters of Rhode Island there are not any spawning areas.

Mr. Stevenson stated that there was not time to fully discuss all the issues concerning spawning area closures. He noted that it made sense to allow fishing in Areas 2 and 3 during the spawning closures, however, such a provision might be unfair to boats from Gloucester and vicinity. These boats would not be allowed to land herring from Area 1. He suggested redefining the regulations so that they apply to only Area 1. He asked whether the plan would have to be amended to implement his suggestion.

Mr. Pierce commented that another alternative would be to implement the 25% tolerance for spawning herring [fish may be landed provided that no more than 25% of them are spawning.

Ms. Alden noted that the tolerance was appropriate for purse seine gear because spawning fish could be released with a very high survival rate. She added that there is nothing magical about the 25% level, other than it is currently in the plan.

Mr. Nelson said that New Hampshire law enforcement agencies would have difficulty in enforcing the tolerance. He added that some areas may have recovered because of spawning closures.

Mr. Jaffee commented that NMFS received a letter from the NEFMC suggesting that NMFS consult ASMFC in allowing fishing to continue during the spawning closure period.

Mr. Pierce commented that he did not want the wrong signal be sent to the Canadian industry by allowing fishing during this period.

Mr. Lapointe asked whether this issue could be resolved by the TAC and the section over the phone because of the lack of time left in the meeting.

Ms. Alden made the following motion with a second from Mr. Nelson
move to recommend to NMFS that it amend the PMP to allow normal fishing practices to occur during the spawning closures in Areas 2 and 3.

HERRING RESEARCH NEEDS

Members of the audience expressed concern about the amount of time that was taken in discussions about IWP allocations, leaving no time for the critical issue of data needed to better manage the herring resource. They said that the herring industry was willing and able to help but that it wanted to ensure that the research was done in an efficient, coordinated fashion.

Herring Section members committed to another Section meeting with the New England Fishery Management Council to address research issues.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

**PASSED MOTIONS FROM THE
ATLANTIC HERRING SECTION MEETING**

5 APRIL 1996

Borden / Drake

Move that TAC be allocated as follows: 25% for Area 1, 50% for Area 2 and 25% for Area 3.

Driscoll / Borden

that we put 80% of the Gulf of Maine into reserve and make 20% (21,000 tons) available as the initial allocation for IWPs.

Alden / Borden

In Area 1, move to allocate 8,000 MT to Massachusetts, 0 MT to New Hampshire and 13,000 MT to Maine.

Borden / Nelson

In Area 2, move that the initial allocation be 42,000 MT for Rhode Island, 5,000 MT for New York and 5,000 MT for New Jersey.

Borden / Nelson

In Area 3, move that 20,000 MT of the Georges Bank allocation be put into the initial JV allocations with the remainder to be put into reserve.

Alden / Nelson

move to recommend to NMFS that it amend the PMP to allow normal fishing practices to occur during the spawning closures in Areas 2 and 3.

Summary of 1996/97 Atlantic Herring IWP/JV Allocations
(All allocations in metric tons)

Area	Total Allowable Catch	Reserve	IWP	JV	State Breakdown
All	425,000	332,000 (78.1%)	73,000	20,000	N/A
Area 1	106,250	85,250 (80.2%)	21,000	N/A	13,000 - Maine 8,000 - Massachusetts
Area 2	212,500	160,500 (75.5%)	52,000	N/A	42,000 - Rhode Island 5,000 - New York 5,000 - New Jersey
Area 3	106,250	86,250 (81.2%)	N/A	20,000	N/A

**DRAFT AGENDA
ATLANTIC HERRING SECTION
5 APRIL, 1996
INN AT THE CROSSING (HOLIDAY INN)
801 GREENWICH AVE.
WARWICK, RHODE ISLAND
10:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.**

- 1) INTRODUCTIONS, CHANGES TO AGENDA
- 2) PUBLIC COMMENT
- 3) TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT
- 4) 1996/97 INTERNAL WATER PROCESSING / JOINT VENTURE ALLOCATIONS
- 5) PLAN DEVELOPMENT TEAM REPORT
- 6) SPAWNING AREA CLOSURE ISSUES
- 7) OTHER BUSINESS
- 8) ADJOURNMENT

Directions to meeting hotel : The Inn at the Crossing is located within sight of I-95 at Exit 12A in Warwick, Rhode Island. The hotel telephone number is (401) 732-6000.

The above agenda items may not be taken in the order in which they appear and are subject to change as necessary; other items may be added.

ATLANTIC HERRING PLAN DEVELOPMENT TEAM

06/28/96

Mr. Emory Anderson
NMFS, NE Fisheries Center
Woods Hole Laboratory
166 Water St.
Woods Hole, MA 02543
Phone: (508) 548-5123
Fax: (508) 548-1158

Dr. Steve Cadrin
MA DMF
Route 6A
18 King's Hwy.
Sandwich, MA 02563
Phone: (508) 888-1155
Fax: (508) 888-6842

Dr. J.M. Gates
Dept. Of Env. & Natural Resource Econ.
University Of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881-0814
Phone: (401) 792-4584
Fax: (401) 782-4766

Ms. Cindy Gray
RI Fish, Wildlife & Estuarine
150 Fowler Street
Wickford, RI 02852
Phone: (401) 294-4524
Fax: (401) 294-9640

Dr. John Griffin
Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Worcester, MA 01609
Phone: (508) 831-5563
Fax: (508) 831-5896

Mr. George Lapointe
ASMFC
1444 Eye St., NW
6th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 289-6400
Fax: (202) 289-6051

Mr. John Mason
NY DEC Mar. Res.
205 Belle Meade Rd.
E. Setauket, NY 11733
Phone: (516) 444-0452
Fax: (516) 444-0434

Mr David G. Simpson
CT DEP DMF
P.O. Box 719
Old Lyme, CT 06371
Phone: (203) 434-6043
Fax: (203) 434-6150

Mr. Bruce Smith
NH Fish & Game
225 Main St.
Durham, NH 03824
Phone: (603) 868-1095
Fax: (603) 862-3305

Dr. David Stevenson
ME DMR
P.O. Box 8
West Boothbay Harbor, ME 04575
Phone: (207) 633-9500
Fax: (207) 633-9579

Atlantic Herring Section Roster

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

Friday, April 5, 1996
10:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Warwick, RI

Board Member	Affiliation	Present
Robin Alden	MEDMR ✓	✓
Richard B. Allen ✓	RI Gov. Apte.	A
Robert Babula	LEC Rep.	A
Louis Bassano	NJ Leg. Apte.	A
Ernest E. Beckwith, Jr.	CT Fisheries	E. Beckwith
David Borden ✓	RIDEM	✓
Larry Cantwell	NY Gov. Apte.	A
Gordon Colvin	NY DEC	A
C.J. Douglass	NH Leg. Apte.	Hand Done - [unclear]
Steven Driscoll	NH Gov. Apte.	✓
John Everett	NMFS	
Tom Fote	NJ Gov. Apte	A
Sen. Jill Golthwait	ME Leg. Apte	R. Alden - [unclear]
George Gunther	CT Leg. Apte.	A
Owen Johnson	NY Leg. Apte.	A
Robert McDowell	NJ F, G& W	ABSENT
John Nelson	NH F&G	✓
David Pierce, for Phil Coates	MA DMF	✓
Lance Stewart	CT Gov. Apte.	A
Anthony Verga	MA Gov. Apte.	A
Patten White	ME Gov. Apte.	✓

↑

←

Hand Done - [unclear]

R. Alden - [unclear]