

**Northern Shrimp Section
Motions & Meeting Summary**

**June 7, 2011
Portsmouth, New Hampshire**

Motions

Move to delete “by all stakeholders” from the current Goal in Amendment 1.

Motion made by Mr. Stockwell and seconded by Dr. Armstrong. Motion passes.

Move to include “viable fishery on a sustainable resource” in objective 1.

Motion made by Mr. Olsen and seconded by Mr. R. White. Motion passes.

Move to add the word “natural” before distribution in objective 2.

Motion made by Mr. Olsen and seconded by Mr. R. White. Motion passes.

Move to remove objective 8.

Motion made by Mr. R. White and seconded by Mr. Damon. Motion passes.

Move that the Section recommend to the Policy Board that June 7, 2011 be the control date to the Northern Shrimp fishery, and future entrants may be treated differently than the current members in this fishery.

Motion made by Mr. Stockwell and seconded by Mr. R. White. Motion passes.

Move to require weekly mandatory reporting by primary purchasers.

Motion made by Mr. R. White and seconded by Mr. Stockwell. Motion passes unanimously.

Move that PDT include trip limit options to include daily and/or weekly trip limits that may be set at a Section meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Adler and seconded by Mr. R. White. Motion passes (2 in favor, 1 opposed).

Move that PDT analyze trip limit options by vessel catch history, gear type and vessel class.

Motion made by Mr. Stockwell and seconded by Mr. R. White. Motion passes.

Move to include harvest quotas including a catch share program, and limited entry in the adaptive management section of Amendment 2.

Motion made by Mr. Stockwell and seconded by Dr. Armstrong. Motion passes.

Move to task the PDT with including an option to allow closure of the fishery through Section action with the inclusion of public comment.

Motion made by Mr. Stockwell and seconded by Mr. R. White. Motion passes.

Move to task PDT to develop an option to allow in season modifications.

Motion made by Mr. Stockwell and seconded by Mr. Adler. Motion passes.

Move that PDT include vessel monitoring program under the adaptive management section of Amendment 2.

Motion by made Mr. Olsen and seconded by Mr. R. White. Motion passes.

Attendees

7 Section Members

Douglas Grout, Chair
Terry Stockwell – Proxy
for Senator Langley
Commissioner Norman Olsen
Dennis Damon – Proxy
for Pat White
Ritchie White
Bill Adler
Dr. Michael Armstrong –
Proxy for Paul Diodati

4 Advisory Panel Members

Vincent Balzano, Chair
Gary Libby
John Seiders
Peter Kendall

11 Other Public

Ben Martens
Francis Seiders
Arnold Gamage Jr.
Spencer Fuller
Marshall Alexander

Maggie Raymond
Stephen Lee
Lessie White, ME DMR
Jessica Fischer, NH F&G
Kelly Whitmore, MA DMF
Lt. Jeffrey Marston, NH F&G

Staff

Mike Waine, ASMFC staff
Bob Beal, ASMFC staff
Maggie Hunter, TC Chair

The main agenda items were (1) review public comment regarding the Public Information Document (PID) for Amendment 2 to the FMP for Northern Shrimp, (2) review the Advisory Panel (AP) recommendations regarding issues in the PID, and (3) task the Plan Development Team (PDT) to create a draft of Amendment 2 with selected potential management options. Below is a summary of that meeting.

The Section suggested changes to the goal and objectives of the Northern Shrimp FMP to maintain a viable fishery on a sustainable resource, while protecting historical participants. These suggestions will be included in Draft Amendment 2 for consideration. Clarification of the goal and objectives of the FMP provided the basis for selecting options to be included in draft Amendment 2.

For draft Amendment 2, the Section included several short-term options that could be implemented in the 2011/2012 fishery. As a first step towards limited entry, the Section set a control date of June 7, 2011, noting that any new entrants after this date may be treated differently than participants already in the fishery. The Section also noted that landings history prior to this control date may be considered as a limited entry program is developed. Additionally, the Section included mandatory weekly reporting by primary purchasers (including peddlers) noting that timelier reporting will help industry make better business plans and allow managers the ability to accurately monitor harvest. The Section also tasked the PDT to analyze trip limit options that would control landings rates and minimize the potential for discard mortality by evaluating landings by vessel catch history, gear type, and vessel size class.

The Section also included harvest quotas and limited entry in the adaptive management section of draft Amendment 2. Although implementing harvest quotas and/or limited entry for the 2011/2012 fishery would be a challenge, including them in the adaptive management section of draft Amendment 2 provides the flexibility to implement these options through a future Addendum to the FMP.

Lastly, options to (1) allow closure of the fishery through Section action with the inclusion of public comment (2) allow in-season modifications (e.g., days out) was included in draft Amendment 2 and (3) allow the fishing mortality target to be updated as the stock assessment is updated.



*Healthy, self-sustaining populations for all Atlantic
coast fish species or successful restoration
well in progress by 2015*

**Northern Shrimp Amendment 2
Public Information Document**
for
Public Comment Review
June 2011




Management History

- **1986 Fishery Management Plan**
- **2004 Amendment 1**
 - **Closed season and gear restrictions**
 - **Overfished and overfishing definitions**
 - **Since Amend 1, stock considered rebuilt**



Stock Status





Purpose of Amendment

- **To provide management flexibility**
- **Changes since Amendment 1 (2004)**
 - **Significant changes in population**
 - **Significant changes in participation**



Purpose of PID

- **Solicit comment**
- **Gather information**
- **“How would you like the northern shrimp fishery to look in the future?”**



Timeline for the Amendment

November 2010	Board Decides Need for Amendment
Winter 2011	Public Information Document Developed
Spring 2011	Public Meetings & Comment Period
Spring-Summer 2011	First Draft of Amendment Produced
Late Summer 2011	Public Hearings
Early Fall 2011	Section Review and Final Approval
Fall 2011	Full Commission Review and Final Approval
Fall 2011	Final Plan Produced



Written Comment Summary

- **26 written comments**
- **6 comments from groups/organizations**
 - **Maine Seafood Alliance**
 - **Associated Fisheries of Maine**
 - **Bar Harbor Town Council**
 - **Maine Lobstermen's Association, Inc.**
 - **National Marine Fisheries Service**
 - **Midcoast Fishermen's Association**



Public Hearing Summary

- **5 public hearings (105 total attendees)**
 - **Gloucester, MA (no attendees)**
 - **Ellsworth, ME**
 - **Portsmouth, NH**
 - **Portland, ME**
 - **Rockland, ME**
- **Note: comments summarized by hearing simply reflect comments received and not consensus - unless noted otherwise.**



Issue 1. Trip Limits

- **Currently no trip limits**
- **Problem: Fishery closed early last 2 years**
- **Objective: Control landings rate**



Trip Limit Comment

- 7 in favor of trip limits and 2 opposed.
- Ellsworth and Portsmouth in favor, and Portland and Rockland opposed.
 - Suggested trip limits were
 - 1,000 lbs
 - 3,000 lbs
 - 5,000 lbs
 - Suggested trap limit of 200 traps



Issue 2. F-Rate

- **Currently, fishing mortality rate (F) is fixed and based on stable period (1985-1994).**
 - $F_{50\%} = 0.22$ and $F_{\text{limit}} = 0.60$
 - $F_{50\%} = 0.29$ (based on updated assessment)
- **Problem: F set based on 2002 assessment. Updated assessments yield better F estimates**
- **Objective: Redefine F reference points indicating threshold and target levels.**



F-Rate Comments

- **All in favor of updating F with new assessments**
- **It was noted that F should be a target**
- **F should be lower not higher because not all landings were accounted for in stable period**



Issue 3. Limited Entry

- **Currently open access**
- **Problem: Unpredictable participation levels**
- **Objective: stabilize the fishery**



Issue 3. Limited Entry

- **Potential criteria (PID page 6)**
 - **A specific time period (participation based)**
 - **Demonstrated dependency on fishery**
 - **Linked to reporting period**
 - **Allocate licenses to state (distribute)**



Limited Entry Comments

- **5 comments and Portland, ME want to freeze permits at the 2011 level**
- **5 comments and 3 Maine hearings want to keep fishery open access**
- **5 found limited entry appropriate if based on historical participation and not recent entrants**
- **Several suggested to let individual states decide limited entry criteria**



Issue 4. Catch Reporting

- **Current reporting inadequate**
- **Problem: Short notice of closures**
- **Objective: Managers/fishermen could anticipate closures with better reporting**



Catch Reporting Comments

- **12 in favor of more timely reporting by,**
 - **Dealer**
 - **Harvester or**
 - **Vessel**
- **NH hearing in favor by dealer only**
- **1 opposed citing current reporting is fine.**



Issue 5. Gear Modifications

- **Current gear restrictions (Amend 1)**
 - **Min mesh size 1³/₄” stretch, 1” codend**
 - **Nordmore Grate System**
- **Problem: Retaining small shrimp**
- **Objective: Retain fewer small shrimp**



Gear Modification Comments

- **All supported gear modifications, but more testing is needed before implementing any gear changes**



Issue 6. Harvest Quota

- **Currently Managed using season and harvest target**
- **Problem: Fishing season does not control harvest in recent seasons**
- **Objective: Harvest Quota**
 - **Fishery closed when quota reached**
 - **Requires improved monitoring**



Harvest Quota Comments

- **4 comments and 2 ME hearings were opposed to fleet wide quota because it will create a derby fishery.**
- **2 comments and Rockland, ME hearing support hard TAC, but needs better reporting**
- **2 comments and NH hearing support current soft quota method**
- **All Maine hearings supported a system to extend the harvest for the trap fishery.**



Issue 7. Goal and Objectives

- **Amendment 1 Goals and Objectives**
 - **PID pages 8-9**
- **May need updating depending on Amendment 2 selected options**




Issue 7. Goal and Objectives

- **Change goal statement if needed**
- **Support for other objectives**
 - **Prevent growth overfishing**




Issue 8. Other Comments

- **ALL support a core season from January through March**
- **7 favor better science to evaluate shrimp population**
- **3 comments and 2 ME Hearings support establishing areas with area quotas**
- **3 comments and Rockland, Maine were in favor of at least one day out of fishery**
- **All ME hearings want individual states to manage allocate the shrimp resource**





Issue 1. Trip Limits





Landings

