



# Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

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

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Northern Shrimp Section

FROM: Northern Shrimp Advisory Panel

SUBJECT: AP Recommendations for Next Steps in Northern Shrimp Management

DATE: May 15, 2013

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on April 30, 2013 in Portland, ME. The two main agenda items were (1) discuss recommendations for the 2013/2014 season; and (2) discuss next steps for northern shrimp management. Below is a summary of that meeting.

### Attendees

#### *Advisory Panel Members*

Gary Libby, Chair  
Marshal Alexander  
Mark Bennett  
John Seiders  
Peter Kendall  
Arnie Gamage

#### *Other Public*

See attached sheet

#### *Staff*

Mike Waine, ASMFC staff  
Marin Hawk, ASMFC staff

### Recommendation for Upcoming Season

The AP reached consensus that it is worthwhile to operate a due no harm fishery in the next season. They also suggested that a do no harm fishery takes into account the economic harm to the industry if there is not a season. Additionally, they recommended having more consecutive landings days and less days out to bring some consistency to the industry.

The AP recommended considering more pre-season test tows to gain a better understanding of CPUE before the season starts.

Some AP members suggested that the size sorting grate system remain optional. Others suggested to make it mandatory, but only if there is incentive to use it. For example, allow trawlers that have a size sorting grate to go earlier or later in the season.

M13-038

## **Next Steps in Northern Shrimp Management**

*Management Areas*—The AP did not recommend the use of management areas at this time.

*Catch Controls*—The AP recommended allowing more consecutive fishing days because the limited fishing days this season made it difficult to catch anything and by the time the Section decided to remove the days out restriction it was too late. For example, by the end of the season the lobster traps had already taken the usable bottom creating gear conflicts for trawlers.

*Vessel Limits*— The AP thought this management option was relevant, but found it too difficult to make a recommendation at this point because they believe vessel limits are relevant the discussion about limited entry.

*Monitoring requirements*— The AP recommended enforcing reporting requirements for peddlers and other vessels that aren't already reporting through the federal system.

### **Limited Entry**

The AP wants a limited entry program that is based on historical participation in the fishery. The AP also feels that limited entry would help resolve some of the challenges that exist because the fishery operates at different times across its range. Simply put, limited entry would allow the industry to fish when they wanted to.

The AP discussed a previous proposal of a common pool with cooperative contributions that have individual or group allocations. This plan was originally discussed by the AP at its May 22, 2012 meeting, and was forwarded to the Section at that time. The AP discussed the program has potential to be useful for northern shrimp and would like to see it developed as a potential option.

The AP also discussed that latent licenses need to be addressed. More specifically, some AP members suggested people without boats that have licenses should not be reissued licenses.

An AP member informed the panel that New Hampshire is currently in the legislative process of creating a northern shrimp license. Although the timing is unknown this was noted as an important component if limited entry is to be implemented.

Some AP members were against limited entry because they want the flexibility to have young members to gain access and get into the fishery. There was a discussion that there needs to be an entrance and exit strategy into and out of the fishery.

