

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
MENHADEN MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**Radisson Hotel Old Town
Alexandria, Virginia
January 30, 2007**

Approved May 9, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order	1
Approval of Agenda.....	1
Approval of Proceedings.....	1
Public Comment.....	1
Ches. Bay Reduction Landings.....	3
Collaborative Research	4
Other Business	6
Adjourn	8

INDEX OF MOTIONS

No Motions

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Terry Stockwell, ME, proxy for Lapointe (AA)	Jeff Tinsman, proxy for Emory ,DE (AC)
Pat White, ME (GA)	Howard King, MD DNR (AA)
Doug Grout, NH, proxy for Nelson (AA)	Keith McGuire, MD, proxy for Vasta, MD (GA)
Rep. Dennis Abbott, NH (LA)	Russell Dize, MD, proxy for Sen. Colburn (LA)
Ritchie White, NH (GA)	Jack Travelstead, proxy for Bowman VA MRC (AA)
David Pierce, MA, proxy for Diodati, (AA)	Catherine Davenport, VA (GA)
William Adler, MA (GA)	Neils Moore, VA, proxy for Sen. Chichester (LC)
Vito Calomo, MA, proxy for Rep. Verga (LA)	Fentress Munden, proxy for Pate, NC DMF (AA)
Everett Petronio, Jr., RI (GA)	Damon Tatem, NC (GA)
Gil Pope, RI, proxy for Rep. Naughton (LA)	Jimmy Johnson, NC, proxy for Rep. Wainwright (LA)
Mark Alexander, CT DEP, proxy for E. Smith, (AA)	John Duren, GA (GA)
Dr. Lance Stewart, CT (GA)	Gil McRae, FL (AA)
Gordon Colvin, NY DEC (AA)	April Price, FL (GA)
Pat Augustine, NY (GA)	Steve Meyers, NMFS
Peter Himchak, NJ DFW, proxy for Chanda (AC)	Jaime Geiger, USFWS
Erling Berg, NJ (GA)	A.C. Carpenter, PRFC
Dick Herb, NJ, proxy for Asm. Fisher(LA)	

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

Ex-Officio Members

Alexei Sharov, MD DNR

William Windley, MSSA

Staff

Vince O'Shea
Robert Beal

Braddock Spear
Chris Vonderweidt

Guests

Derek Orner, NMFS
John Clark, DE DN F&W
Craig Shirey, DE F&W
Bill Goldsborough, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Shaun Gehan, KDCS
Sharon Kim, KDCS
Arnold Leo, Baymen's Assn.

Dick Brame, CCA
Charles Hutchinson, MSSA
Clint Waters, MSSA
Tom Fote, TCAA
Jim Price, CBEF
Joseph W. Smith, NC NMFS

The meeting of the Atlantic Menhaden Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Washington Ballroom of the Radisson Hotel Old Town, Alexandria, Virginia, on Tuesday, January 30, 2007, and was called to order at 4:30 o'clock, p.m., by Chairman A.C. Carpenter.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN A.C. CARPENTER: Okay, I think we've got enough board members at their seats that we have a quorum so that we can call the meeting to order. This is the Atlantic Menhaden Management Board. I am A.C. Carpenter, the chair. And if I can have some quiet in the back, please, so that we can get this meeting going, please. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or deletions? Jack Travelstead.

MR. JACK TRAVELSTEAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like just one minute of the board's time under new business to bring them up-to-date on the status of some legislation in Virginia.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: That will be added under other business. Are there any other changes to the agenda? Seeing none, are there any objections? Seeing none, **the agenda is approved as published with the addition of the Travelstead item.** The next item is the proceedings from the October 25th, 2006, meeting. They were distributed prior to today's meeting.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

Are there any additions, deletions, corrections, changes on the minutes? I see no changes; therefore, **the proceedings are approved and stand as published.** Public comment is the next item on our agenda and this is the opportunity for the public to make their views known to the board on issues that are not on the agenda.

Any issues that are on the agenda we'll take

public comment at the appropriate time before any action by the board. Is there any public comment at this point? I see a couple of hands. If you will come to the microphone and, the public mic and identify yourself and then we can take your comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. CHARLIE HUTCHINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Charlie Hutchinson. I've been here before so some of you know me. I'd like to start by quoting something from the executive summary for the menhaden process. And it says that the goal of Amendment 1 is to manage the Atlantic menhaden fishery in a manner that is biologically, economically, socially and ecologically sound while protecting the resource and those that benefit from it.

I spent several hours today at the Economic and Social Sciences Committee meeting. I was surprised to find there even was such a thing since I never hear much about it in any of these board meetings or any of the technical committee meetings. It's my understanding from that – well, first of all, I should say that my impressions coming out of that meeting was that in general terms there was considerable concern by the people, the professionals that were there, that their message is not being heard.

With regard to the menhaden group, specifically, they said they had never been invited to participate. That doesn't sound particularly good. Given that, my objective here today is to ask this board to begin to get together and broaden your viewpoint a little bit beyond simply counting fish and take a hard look at the social and, specifically, the economics that are involved with this particular fishery.

In this morning's paper – and this is not going to be news to most of you but I'll say it anyhow – there was an article concerning the Chesapeake Bay restoration and the fact that the 2010 goal was not going to be met. No one was sure whether it would ever be met despite the \$28 billion of taxpayer money trying to do it. And what concerns me is that menhaden play a role in that program and nobody ever hears about it. I think it's about time they did. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thanks. Bob

Price, I think you had your hand up.

MR. JAMES PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Jim Price with the Chesapeake Bay Ecological Foundation. And I sent out, I guess you got a copy of a report earlier and I wanted to refer to that. The board should have received the report titled "Menhaden Decline Threatens Bay Striped Bass Fishery."

The report explained why increasing numbers of large striped bass has resulted in an unprecedented level of competition with the menhaden reduction fishery for the same size menhaden. By 2006 the reduction harvest in the bay, which is comprised mostly of immature menhaden, plummeted to its lowest level since the fishery first concentrated its efforts in the bay 35 years ago.

Increased competition between the reduction fishery and larger, older striped bass is significantly depleting the numbers of Age 1-plus menhaden in the bay. A 2006-2007 CBF study found that Age 1 menhaden are crucial to the health of the bay's older striped bass. The significant increase of the historical striped bass minimum size limit from 12 inches to 18 inches greatly increased the number of older resident fish which prey on Age 1-plus menhaden in the bay during most of the year.

For the first time since the reduction fishery concentrated its efforts in the bay during the 1970s, a major component of the bay's resident striped bass are competing with the reduction fishery for the same sized menhaden. This direct competition is depleting the forage size menhaden Ages 1 and 2 in the Chesapeake Bay.

Scientific data and peer-reviewed studies show that the low number of menhaden in the Chesapeake Bay is inadequate to maintain the historical weight and growth of the bay's older striped bass. Historically, significant striped bass predation on immature and adult menhaden in the Chesapeake Bay was confined to relatively brief spring and fall incursions of larger migratory striped bass.

And, also, I'm going to give you a short update on our predator-prey monitoring program that we initiated in 2004 to determine the age structure of Atlantic menhaden consumed by large migratory striped bass. It has found that the size of menhaden consumed off the coast of North

Carolina is declining.

Since fewer large migratory striped bass are being collected in our study off of the North Carolina coast in the winter, we have increased our sampling locations to include the coast of Virginia and the Maryland portion of the Chesapeake Bay. The percentage of adult menhaden in the diet of large, migratory striped bass collected along the North Carolina coast over the past two winters has dramatically declined. And striped bass have preyed more heavily on smaller menhaden.

Larger concentrations of striped bass are now found farther north feeding on menhaden in the Chesapeake Bay region. This winter migratory striped bass have preyed heavily on Ages 1 and 2 menhaden as they followed schools of immature menhaden up to the Bay Bridge in Maryland's portion of the Chesapeake Bay during December and January. And we're still getting samples that indicates this is continuing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Price. I have a question for you, Mr. Price. You quite often bring us reports that you have put together. Are you making any attempts to have any of your reports and data published in any kind of peer-reviewed journal or anything of that nature?

MR. PRICE: Yes, as a matter of fact I have a team of four people that are currently putting together the information that, to have a paper published on the findings that I've been giving to you over the past year.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thank you very much. And I think that's highly commendable that you're going to pursue that route. We appreciate your efforts. Any other public comment? Yes, sir, come forward.

MR. JEFF KAELIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Jeff Kaelin from Portland, Maine. I'm here for Omega Protein today. We're glad to see that we're going to focus on the collaborative research agenda and program. The only thing I wanted to say is that we've been doing some research and we think there are 21 ongoing funded and proposed research projects with about \$5 million worth of value. We've been asked to participate in one of them, after the design phase., That was the LIDAR study. We are looking forward to developing a cooperative

research program where the industry is involved at the hypothesis stage of projects going forward. We're still frustrated we haven't been able to get that process jumpstarted., but we're interested in doing that. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thank you for your comments. Any other public comments? Seeing none, we will move on to the next agenda item which is an update on the Chesapeake Bay reduction fishery landings. You've got it. Brad is going to present that information.

CHES. BAY REDUCTION LANDINGS

MR. BRADDOCK J. SPEAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To date the preliminary landings for 2006 in the Chesapeake Bay for the reduction fishery are approximately 65,000 metric ton. You recall Addendum III set a cap of 109,000 metric tons so it appears that it will come in well under that cap.

The Beaufort Lab is still editing that information and doesn't expect that number to fluctuate more than 5 percent up or down. And Joe Smith is in the audience if you have any questions about the dynamics of the fishery this past year or the stock itself.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Are there any questions or comments regarding Brad's report? Doctor –

DR. DAVID PIERCE: Pierce. Brad, would you refresh my memory? What was the take in 2005? How does this contrast, the 65,000?

MR. SPEAR: I'll have to check on that and get back to you in a second.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Is there any other questions or comments while Brad's checking on that? Pete Himchak.

MR. PETER HIMCHAK: I guess this question is directed at Joe in the back. The fishing year is defined as ending when? February 1st? Is there any fishing activity going on now? I've got landings through December 31st but when does the fishing year actually end?

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Let me ask Jack Travelstead to reply to that.

MR. TRAVELSTEAD: By law in Virginia the fishing ends the third Friday in November, opens, I think, the first Monday in May. So there is no fishing occurring now. There is some fishing that can occur beyond November but not in Chesapeake Bay, to the east of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel and three-mile limit.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Go ahead, Joe.

MR. JOSEPH SMITH: Mr. Chairman, just a couple points of clarification. Joseph Smith, National Marine Fisheries Service, Beaufort Lab. The fishery in the bay, Chesapeake Bay, ends at, like Jack said, that third Friday in November, right before Thanksgiving. Then the boats can fish outside the Bay Bridge Tunnel.

They did up until almost Christmas week. I think the Friday before Christmas they have to fish beyond three miles. They have to leave the Virginia Territorial Sea. There was no fishing between Christmas and New Years but the boats did make an attempt to fish the week after New Years but I think there was only one set made outside of three miles off the Virginia Coast. And the boats and the factory officially cut out the fifth of January. The reduction or the bait boats, the snapper boats, four in Chesapeake Bay, they cut out about mid to early November.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thank you, Joe. Joe, do you have an answer to the question about what the landings were in 2005?

MR. SMITH: I think Brad probably has that table but I think they were about 98,000 metric tons in '05; probably I think 95 in '04.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Go ahead.

MR. HIMCHAK: I had just one question for Joe. What about Beaufort Fisheries? Do they fish at all?

MR. SMITH: Jule Wheatley's factory hasn't fished since the '04 season, not last year or not in '05 nor '06. One of the boats has been sold. The other one is up on the auction block.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: All right, thank you very much. Let's move on to the next agenda item which is the update on the menhaden collaborative research program and Derek Orner is here to present that information.

Derek.

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH

MR. DEREK ORNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had a quick presentation. It's roughly about eight slides that I wanted to run through. There is three topics, really, to touch base on. The first one is kind of the update on where we're at for FY07, this coming year's competitive research program.

You know we do run a competitive program. It goes, every proposal that is submitted gets technically reviewed externally by three, at least three, members. Then we go through a panel review where all the technical review comments are compiled and sent to the panel. The panel looks at it as a program and then we find, basically, the top selected or top ranked proposals.

The current announcement right now for FY2007 is out. The Website there, it's in the handout coming around I believe. And there is two components to this year's announcement. There is kind of our traditional fisheries research program, which is roughly about a \$1,000,000 split about \$500,000 for continuations, renewals or multi-year projects. And then there is roughly another \$500,000 that goes towards new initiatives or new projects.

Based on kind of the continuing resolution that we're in right now, you know, we're not really sure what those numbers will be. They could be a little bit lower. They could be a little bit higher depending on what comes out. The second one, there is a new initiative that we just started for FY2007 based on a lot of the feedback we were getting.

It was kind of initiating a cooperative research program. It's not specific to menhaden. It's specific to the Chesapeake Bay but we're looking at cooperative programs with blue crab, with menhaden, with oyster, or, you know, kind of a suite of species just to kind of jumpstart our program and see if we can get something initiated in the bay.

That program out of our office is looking at maybe \$100,000 to \$150,000 for the first year. We've already had a little bit of interest from other offices within NOAA of potentially adding

to that pot so it could be a little bit more than that. As I said, the announcement is out on the street right now.

Letters of intent are due into my office, to my e-mail address, by February 7th. Those letters are basically just a one-page summary of what they're going to be proposing and we'll provide kind of an initial feedback and what we're looking for or whether or not we see merit in the, just from the letter of intent. Full proposals are due March 12th. So they'll have roughly about a month after the letters of intent. We'll respond to those in about a week. And then PIs will have roughly about a month to submit a full proposal.

I mentioned the fisheries research program or component. What's on this slide and the text up here is the specific language for menhaden. Follows the same four priority areas that we've addressed in the previous year-year-and-a-half. We caught out specifically this year the Priority 3 of determining the exchange rates between the bay and Atlantic coastal system.

The previous two years' worth of funding we've gotten quite a few proposals and projects that are underway looking at specific abundance estimates within the bay or looking at recruitment levels in the bay, the estimates of removals. But the one kind of component that we've been lacking is looking at the exchange rate so we have a specific call for that component of the notice this year.

We're also looking for, just to let you know that we're looking for information on (indecipherable) which is an issue within Chesapeake Bay. We've started kind of a stock assessment fellowship program where we're looking at increasing the number of graduate students working on Chesapeake Bay-specific stock assessments, looking at something specific with croaker in FY2007. And then we're continuing our push with ecosystem-based management approaches and ecosystem-based reference points.

The other component I mentioned was this cooperative research initiative. I mentioned this is a new initiative. We'll see kind of where it goes. We've been working with some industry members with some fishermen trying to craft some of the initial language. Basically, right now we're following the guidance from the Northeast Fisheries Science Center and their

cooperative research program looking at both a short-term and a long-term component to the program.

I think I mentioned it's roughly \$100,000 to \$150,000, potentially more with some partnerships with our headquarters office. And the primary requirement for any proposal coming in, it has to have a member of industry or fishermen included along with academic or NOAA scientists involved in the proposal.

Kind of Item Number 2, just to give an update to the committee or to the board, is our, we have an annual NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office Fishery Symposium. This is all the work that we fund over the course of a previous year. When the final reports and final data submissions, everything, come in we hold a symposium very much like the American Fisheries Society Annual Meeting.

This year – we just finalized the dates yesterday – it's going to be April 10th through the 12th at Patuxent Wildlife Refuge in Laurel, Maryland. Day 1 – it's actually a three-day symposium. Day 1 is looking specifically at Chesapeake Bay resident species: blue crab, oyster, clam.

And it was mentioned earlier, we actually have two projects that will be presented this year looking at the trophic portfolios in Chesapeake Bay, kind of an economic study as well as stakeholder preferences looking at the social dynamics in Chesapeake Bay. So those two will be presented on Day 1.

Day 2 is the menhaden focus. I'll touch base a little bit more on that in the next slide. And Day 3 is, we're going to hold a Menhaden Technical Committee meeting so we get the technical committee members to the symposium to hear the update on the research. And then they'll follow on Day 3 with kind of an internal TC meeting.

Day 2, like I said, is going to be a specific focus on the menhaden research to date. The day is going to be broken into four parts to correlate with the four research priorities. Each session is going to have a moderator, a different moderator for each session with kind of a keynote or a summary presentation and then two or three specific presentations of work that has been funded and then kind of followed on with a brief question/answer and maybe a panel discussion.

So you have the program agenda, the template, broken out below. It's basically a full day, nine o'clock to about four or four-thirty agenda. The next item, last item I had on here was just to give you a brief update. I'm not expecting anyone to read what's on this slide there but it's just to let you know that we are in the midst of working on a menhaden research report.

It's in draft form right now and it's basically a compilation of all the different research projects that are being funded. Not everything that's out there is being funded by my office, the NOAA Chesapeake Bay office. I think it was mentioned earlier there's 21-24 or so different projects, you know, \$5 million worth.

You know there is quite a few that we're funding in our office but you know we're partnering with VMRC, with Maryland DNR, a number of collaborators. So what we're trying to do with this report is to pull all the different projects that are out there and get a short summary that we can then provide back to the management board and that's, I put in a draft or a sample in the handout. It's a four-page summary, basically, of the trophic interactions laboratory study that's going on down at VIMS. And that's what we're looking for putting in the report, you know, kind of a short synopsis of the research that's ongoing.

The last slide that I have here is kind of a sample calendar or timeline. It is, again, something we're going to be looking at, at the research symposium. A lot of questions being asked now, okay, we started the research program roughly two years ago, when should we expect to see some results or see some data coming in, see some reports?

That's a little bit of what the technical committee is going to be looking for after the research symposium on that third day is now that we've heard what research is out there, where the projects are at, where they need to go, we're going to try and, you know, finalize the report and the summaries as well as finalize kind of the timeline so you as the managers know when to expect certain components of the research. And with that I can take any questions if there are any out there.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Are there any questions for Derek? It looks like – Howard.

OTHER BUSINESS

MR. HOWARD KING: Yes, Derek, is some of the diet composition work that Jim Price mentioned in cooperation with East Carolina University, is that included in any of this work?

MR. ORNER: It's, actually, right now I do have it included in the draft report that we're working on. I've talked to Jim a little bit about it. I think there is a little bit more information we can get from him. But we have been working with Anthony a bit to get that in there. And I'll work with Anthony, too, to see if there is anything he wants to present, possibly, at this symposium.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Okay, so it looks like we've got a full day scheduled later in April that all of this will be brought together. And I'm assuming that that's going to be an open invitation; any of the board members or any interested public will be able to attend that day's if they want to get the complete details of all the reports.

MR. ORNER: Yes. And, actually, that's one of the reasons I put my e-mail on the first page, just to make sure if you are interested, you know, we will be sending out a broad announcement and registration but just so we don't miss you if you want to send me an e-mail we'll make sure we get you added to the list.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thank you. I have attended that symposium in other years when other subjects were being debated or discussed and it is a pretty use of one day's time to get caught up on all of that scientific work that is going on. So, I would recommend it to anybody that would like to. Pete.

MR. HIMCHAK: Derek, I just had one point for clarification. Now will the technical, will the ASMFC Menhaden Technical Committee be part of the reviewing process for the next year's funding of projects?

MR. ORNER: Yes, to the extent that we can use them. I've used them over the past two years. Obviously with conflict of interest certain members can't be included in the review. But we use them as part as the technical review. So they don't see anyone else's scores; they review one proposal individually and submit comments and scores back to me. And then that gets compiled for the panel.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Are there any other questions or comments about the status of the scientific work that's been ongoing and funded now? All right, thank you very much, Derek. We're down to other business. Howard, did you have something on this report or under other business?

MR. KING: It fits on both, I think.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: All right. Well, I have Jack Travelstead already under other business. I'll add you right after that if you'd like.

MR. TRAVELSTEAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Staff is passing out a copy of Virginia House Bill 2082. It is a bill that will allow Virginia to comply with Addendum III. It's passed out for your information. It was presented to the House Committee last week where it passed unanimously. I think the vote was 22 to nothing.

And just yesterday it made its way through the full House on a vote of 98 to 0. So it's halfway through the process. It will be presented to the Senate and go through that process in the weeks ahead. And I would expect similar results there. The staff here at ASMFC did get a chance to look at this bill in its earliest versions and Bob Beal and Brad Spear both provided some helpful comments to make sure that the language was clear.

I think it complies in every respect with Addendum III. There is a lot of language upfront that appears to be superfluous but it, actually what it does is it exempts the Secretary of Natural Resources' ability to close the fishery once the cap is reached from our Administrative Process Act which otherwise it would take about six months to close the fishery. So that's what the first four pages of the bill do.

The fun stuff is, I think, starts on Page 5 and it's all the language that you've already seen in Addendum III. But I just wanted the board to be up-to-date with where we were in Virginia. And we've not hit any snags nor do we expect to hit any snags in seeing the bill become law.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thank you, Jack.

Are there any questions for Jack? Seeing none, Howard, you had a comment or an item.

MR. KING: Yes, thank you. I think Charlie Hutchinson in the public comment raised an important point. Socio-economics related to the menhaden fishery and every other fishery, for that matter, is extremely important and more important in modern times. I know Virginia is interested in the socio-economic aspects of the menhaden fishery.

If it appears that there is no linkage between that socio-economic assessment and the technical committee, I would like the staff to see how they could establish that linkage. And so staff might be able to comment now. Bob, if you were able to do that.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Bob, do you have a reply?

MR. ROBERT E. BEAL: Vince and I were having a little sidebar discussion. Can you re-ask your question, Howard?

MR. KING: How can the management board either provide or have the benefit of a linkage between the socio-economic committee or that skill set blended with the technical committee assessments and brought before the board? How can we be apprised of socio-economic assessments of the menhaden fishery and resource?

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Bob, can you reply, please?

MR. BEAL: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Committee on Economics and Social Sciences is technically charged or tasked to do things by the Policy Board. So if there are specific questions that this management board would like to have that group look into, you know, the process would be to forward those recommendations on to the Policy Board and then the Policy Board would charge the CESS with that, answering those questions.

If there is, you know, if there is biological information or stock assessment information that comes out of the technical committee that the CESS would need to do their job we can, you know, try to get the tech committee chair to attend their meeting when they're discussing these issues. We can create the links and the

flow of information pretty well once we have the specific request from this board and a charge from the Policy Board.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: I will note that there are a couple of projects being funded, one dealing with economics and the other dealing with the socio issues, that is being funded through the work that Derek just reported on that may have some implications and be useful both to the, that committee and this board as well. Jack Travelstead.

MR. TRAVELSTEAD: Along those same lines let me make the board aware that we have requested and received a proposal for a very broad economic analysis by Dr. Jim Kirkley at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science on the menhaden and all of the various aspects, the water quality and its impact on other species.

The proposal which I would be glad to share with the board is one of the broadest economic studies I've ever seen. It's going to take about three years to complete at a cost of about \$780,000 which Virginia will foot the entire bill. Dr. Kirkley – I think most of you know him – he's a very well-respected economist in Virginia.

He has also engaged several other prominent economists in the United States to assist him on that project. I think one of them was Iver Strand who I think several of you know and others. But we look forward to funding that project. It still has to go through peer review but I think it will survive that process. But I'll send a copy to the staff and they can share it with the board.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thank you very much. Pete.

MR. HIMCHAK: Basically just for the record, I mean, the Menhaden Technical Committee had a CESS representative all through the development of Amendment 1, the fellow from North Carolina. And I can't recall his name. So, it has been an integral part of the Menhaden Technical Committee since the inception of the plan, the original plan that was written. We had to actually go out under contract to get the socio and economic data done for the plan. So I think it has been an integral part of the technical committee's operations.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Thank you for that, Pete. Is there any other business to come

before the board? Ritchie, you had the last word at the last meeting.

MR. G. RITCHIE WHITE: A question I should have thought of earlier, with the harvest being down so substantially in the bay, is there a reason for that? Just kind of curious. Was there less effort? Were the fish not there? And does that also equate to the overall harvest? Is the overall harvest down? So I don't know if we have that kind of information.

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: Let me see if Joe might be able to reply to that without causing him too much trouble back there.

MR. SMITH: Kind of an unusual year in the bay. As Brad said, best estimate right now, about 65,000 metric tons to come out of the bay. May and June, fishing was rather poor in the bay. The Omega fleet tended to fish in the ocean and off the Virginia capes and/or all the way up to New Jersey. They fished off the New Jersey coast in late May, the first time since the early '90s I guess.

The fish finally showed good in the bay around the 4th of July. There was good catches within the bay July and August. Then September and October were a lot like May and June. The catches were mostly outside of the bay. Total landings this past year, 157,000 metric tons versus 146 in '05. So, an unusual amount of fishing outside the bay in the ocean proper this year.

ADJOURN

CHAIRMAN CARPENTER: That's why they call it "fishing" and not "catching," I guess. All right, any other comments or questions to come before the board? Seeing none, this board is adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the Atlantic Menhaden Management Board meeting adjourned on Tuesday, January 30, 2007, at 5:10 o'clock, p.m.)

- - -