



## New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116  
John Pappalardo, *Chairman* | Paul J. Howard, *Executive Director*

# FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

## Herring Committee Meeting

Sheraton Ferncroft Hotel, Danvers MA

December 16, 2008

The Herring Committee met on December 16, 2008 to: continue development of management alternatives for Amendment 4 to the Atlantic Herring Fishery Management Plan (FMP); review and discuss stakeholder proposals/ideas regarding a catch monitoring program for the Atlantic herring fishery; review and discuss alternatives to establish ACLs and AMs for the Atlantic herring fishery; and discuss recent Council actions related to establishing criteria for midwater trawl access to groundfish closed areas.

**Meeting Attendance:** Frank Blount, Chairman; Dana Rice, Rodney Avila, Doug Grout, Mike Leary, Sally McGee, Jim Odlin, David Pierce, Terry Stockwell, Mary Beth Tooley, Erling Berg, Herring Committee members (Gibson absent); Dave Ellenton (Herring Advisory Panel Chairman), Peter Moore (Herring AP Vice-Chair), Peter Baker, Chris Weiner, Jennie Bichrest, Jeff Kaelin, Vito Calomo, Don Swanson, Herring Advisory Panel Members; Lori Steele, NEFMC staff; Carrie Nordeen, Gene Martin; NMFS NERO; Matt Cieri (ME DMR), Amy Van Atten, Sara Wetmore, and Tyler Staples (NEFSC Sea Sampling), Herring Plan Development Team Members; Roger Fleming (Herring Alliance), Zach Klyver, Lara Slifka and Tom Rudolph (CCCHFA), Shawn Gehan (Frulla et al.), Eoin Rochford (NORPEL), Steve Weiner, Pam Gromen (NCCMC), Jud Crawford (Pew), John Williamson (Ocean Conservancy), Greg Cunningham (CLF), Jim Kendall, Glenn Robbins, Gary Hatch, and several other interested parties.

As the meeting began and the Herring Committee reviewed the meeting agenda, Ms. Tooley stated that she believed that developing management measures to address midwater trawl access to groundfish closed areas was intended by the Council to be a lower-priority issue for the herring amendment. She suggested that the Herring Committee move the related agenda item to the end of the meeting day for discussion as time permits, after the Committee addresses issues related to catch monitoring and the Amendment 4 stakeholder proposals.

### 1. MOTION: MARY BETH TOOLEY/JIM ODLIN

That the Committee revise the agenda placing the first agenda item at the end of the day to address, given available time

**Additional Discussion:** Ms. Nordeen updated the Herring Committee on the status of NMFS' review of haddock bycatch in Closed Area I. While no determinations have been made yet, NMFS is reviewing available data at this time. Several Committee and audience members commented about the need to address this issue in the herring management action. Tom Rudolph noted that the Council motion referred to a herring management action in 2009, suggesting that this issue could even be addressed more expeditiously than Amendment 4, through a framework adjustment or possibly during the specifications process. Mr. Kaelin expressed concern about the impacts of these management measures on other fisheries like mackerel.

**MOTION #1 FAILED 4-5-0.**

### **Measures to Address Midwater Trawl Access to Groundfish Closed Areas**

Ms. Steele briefed the Herring Committee on this issue and identified the documents included in a packet of background/reference materials for the discussion. Dr. Pierce suggested that the Committee start by reconsidering the provisions established by the Council as part of Framework 18 to the Multispecies FMP, which granted midwater trawl access to the groundfish closed areas. While it is unclear why the 1% threshold was chosen at the time Framework 18 was developed, Dr. Pierce suggested that fine-tuning and clarifying the existing criteria may be helpful to ensure that midwater trawl access is reviewed more consistently by the Service and clarify how the criteria would be applied to individual fishing operations. He also emphasized the importance of enhancing monitoring in the area enough to ensure that adequate data are provided to make determinations about fishing activity and groundfish bycatch. He suggested that the Committee may want to consider some requirements for observer coverage in the groundfish closed areas.

Mr. Odlin advised the Herring Committee to approach this issue with due consideration to the true nature of the problem. He stated that his business relies on haddock and does not believe that midwater trawl bycatch is a significant enough issue to restrict the entire herring fishery. He suggested that measures be developed to require individual vessels to take responsibility for their own actions in the closed areas, such as requiring the vessels to pay for their own observer coverage if they exceed the 1% bycatch threshold. Mr. Avila agreed with this approach. Mr. Leary noted that he participates in a special access fishery for haddock that required a great deal of work to establish, and he feels that 100% observer coverage should be mandatory on every vessel that fishes in the groundfish closed areas. Ms. Tooley reminded the Herring Committee that this issue was re-considered previously in Framework 40B to the Multispecies FMP, which established the observer call-in requirements for the herring fleet.

#### **2. MOTION: DAVID PIERCE/DANA RICE**

That if, on any given trip, a vessel targeting herring in a groundfish closed area has regulated groundfish exceeding 1% of the catch of herring, that vessel will be required to have 100% observer coverage as a condition to gain further access to the closed areas. If the 1% bycatch allowance is exceeded again, that vessel would be denied access.

**Additional Discussion:** Committee members clarified that the motion was intended to represent one alternative (with possibly a few options/variations) for consideration in Amendment 4. The Committee also confirmed that the motion relates to all year-round closed areas for groundfish and all gear types that target Atlantic herring, and that the 1% should be the total of *regulated species* in the Multispecies FMP (not the small mesh multispecies like whiting and red hake).

Dr. Pierce also clarified that the intent of the motion is for NMFS to provide observer coverage on midwater trawl vessels that access the closed areas to the greatest extent possible; if resources are not sufficient for NMFS to provide 100% coverage on a vessel that exceeds the 1% threshold, then that vessel would be responsible for covering the additional observer costs if it continues to fish in the closed area. Mr. Odlin expressed concern that no time frame for the restrictions was included in the motion and opposed an indefinite time frame for 100% observer coverage and/or prohibitions from fishing in the closed areas.

Mr. Martin expressed concern about this motion from a legal perspective and noted that the proposed measures could force NMFS observers to play a quasi-enforcement role on vessels, which is not preferable to NMFS or the observers, and not what the observers are trained to do when working on fishing vessels. In addition, he noted that mandating penalties to individual fishing vessels based on sub-sampled estimates of bycatch may present a problem regarding when/how a violation would be determined and whether or not *due process* rights would be extended to the vessel. He stated that these are some reasons why the current regulations have not been enforced on an individual-vessel basis. Ms. Tooley stated that this approach may be just one alternative in the amendment and suggested that the Committee consider and develop these measures further, with additional guidance and feedback from NOAA GC. The Committee further considered clarifying the motion to reflect that the 1% threshold would apply to any tow or set, but this clarification ultimately was not adopted.

## **2A. MOTION TO AMEND: JIM ODLIN/RODNEY AVILA**

The time period required for 100% observer coverage would be for one year, and the time that the vessel would be denied access after the second incident would be for a period of one year

**Additional Discussion:** Mr. Odlin clarified that the penalties would apply for one year from the date the first and/or second incident occurs. Several members of the audience commented on the main motion as well as the motion to amend:

- Mr. Gehan supported the development of a range of alternatives to address this issue and suggested that it would be helpful to more clearly define the 1% threshold in the amendment (species to which it applies, total catch on board at any time versus total catch for a given trip, etc.).
- Mr. Ellenton asked about the relationship of these measures to the existing catch cap for haddock. Dr. Pierce clarified that the catch cap is established for herring fishing in all areas and that these provisions would be independent of the catch cap (although the catch in the closed areas would obviously still apply towards the cap).
- Dr. Crawford felt that a 1% threshold may not be appropriate for such a high-volume fishery and suggested that the Herring Committee consider bycatch relative to the abundance of individual species. He stated that what is important from a biological perspective, for example, is how much cod is being taken as bycatch in the herring fishery relative to how much cod there are in the ocean, not relative to how much herring is caught.
- Mr. Fleming felt that the motion is heading in the right direction but expressed concern that it could actually weaken the current regulations, which allow the Regional Administrator to take action after one event or based on the catch of an individual fishing operation. He also

expressed concern about the overall lack of observer coverage to monitor bycatch by herring vessels in the groundfish closed areas. He suggested that the Committee consider a range of alternatives to address this issue, including prohibiting access to the groundfish closed areas and allowing restricted access through Experimental Fisheries/Special Access Programs, similar to one element of the catch monitoring proposal submitted by the Herring Alliance.

- Mr. Rudolph agreed and suggested that the Committee consider an alternative that would require 100% observer coverage now to obtain the information necessary to determine whether access should continue to be allowed in the future. He also expressed support for alternatives that would provide access through EFPs and would consider bycatch based more on species abundance and less on percentages of total catch.
- Mr. Moore urged the Committee to develop measures that would not mandate a restriction on the entire fleet for the actions of one fishing vessel. He also suggested that areas of concern be identified and addressed through an alternative based on experimental fishing.
- Mr. Kendall emphasized that this is not a biological issue at this time and encouraged the Committee to consider the impacts of this action on the herring fishery participants.
- Mr. Mullen noted that the herring fishery is beginning to return to a fishery dominated by purse seine vessels and warned that continuing to restrict midwater trawl activity will likely increase fishing effort by purse seines, which will ultimately increase fishing pressure on the inshore Gulf of Maine stocks.
- Mr. Weiner stated that a significant amount of resentment has been expressed by groundfish fishermen who are prohibited from fishing in the closed areas. He suggested that the Committee approach this issue based on the notion that fishing in the groundfish closed areas is a privilege that should be granted to vessels/fisheries that demonstrate they can do so without catching groundfish.

**MOTION #2A TO AMEND CARRIED 8-2-0.**

**MAIN MOTION #2 AS AMENDED:**

That if, on any given trip, a vessel targeting herring in a groundfish closed area has regulated groundfish exceeding 1% of the catch of herring, that vessel will be required to have 100% observer coverage for one year as a condition to gain further access to the closed areas. If the 1% bycatch allowance is exceeded again, that vessel would be denied access for one year

**MOTION #2 AS AMENDED CARRIED 7-3-0.**

## **Measures to Establish Annual Catch Limits (ACLs) and Accountability Measures (AMs)**

Ms. Steele summarized some draft language to be included in Amendment 4 regarding the process for establishing ACLs and AMs in the Atlantic herring fishery. The amendment will modify the existing fishery specification process to provide for ACLs and AMs in the fishery. Ms. Steele noted that the draft language and proposed modifications are still under development and require further input from NMFS, the Council, the Herring PDT, and the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC).

- Mr. Stockwell emphasized that the herring fishery is already managed with quotas and felt that the plan already meets many of the ACL/AM requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act (MSRA).
- Dr. Pierce suggested that the language in the amendment provide more information about the precautionary approaches currently used to determine the management-area TACs for the fishery and expressed continued concern about the impacts of the Canadian fishery for herring on the U.S. fishery. He encouraged NMFS to initiate further negotiations with Canada regarding management of the shared herring resource.
- Ms. Tooley expressed concern about establishing payback measures for a TAC overage in a management area if there is not a resulting negative biological impact on the resource. Mr. Odlin agreed.
- Ms. McGee requested that additional discussion be added to the document regarding consideration of the importance of herring as a forage species when determining ACLs and AMs.
- Dr. Pierce suggested that references to annual catch targets (ACTs) be removed from the document at this time because they are not required by the MSRA.
- Ms. Tooley emphasized that improved monitoring and reporting for the fishery will help to ensure that ACLs are not exceeded. Mr. Stockwell agreed and reminded the Committee that the ASMFC management measures also help prevent the TACs from being exceeded in the GOM.

Public comment regarding the draft ACL/AM language in Amendment 4 was taken following the Committee discussion:

- Mr. Kaelin suggested that the current buffer between MSY and OY be described in more detail to illustrate the considerations for uncertainty and the precaution that is used when establishing the TACs.
- Ms. Gromen expressed support for Ms. McGee's request and emphasized the importance of forage-related considerations when establishing ACLs. She reminded the Committee that this was a major issue identified by the public during the scoping period for Amendment 4. She suggested that additional discussion of how forage is accounted for be added to the document, as well as available information about important forage grounds. She also suggested that the Council establish a timeline to meet the needs for managing forage throughout the region and that the amendment identify important forage-related issues and quantify how much of the resource is being allocated for forage.
- Mr. Rudolph stated that the herring fishery is currently being managed by TALs – total allowable landings, rather than TACs – total allowable catches (landings and bycatch). He

emphasized the need to improve catch monitoring in this amendment to ensure that all catch is accounted for.

### **Stakeholder Proposals for a Catch Monitoring Program for the Herring Fishery**

The Council received six stakeholder proposals with ideas/suggestions for catch monitoring in the Atlantic herring fishery – William McWha, Frulla et al., Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Herring Alliance, Massachusetts Department of Marine Fisheries (MA DMF), and the CHOIR Coalition (see attached table summarizing elements of proposals at the end of this summary). One representative for each proposal summarized the major elements of the proposal (Mr. McWha was not able to attend the meeting). Several Herring Committee members asked clarifying questions about the proposals.

Following a general discussion of the stakeholder proposals, Ms. Steele suggested that the Herring Committee begin to outline possible alternatives for consideration in the amendment, and she provided an example alternative:

- Goals/objectives from MA DMF proposal;
- Measures for maximized retention based on CHOIR/Herring Alliance suggestions (while addressing industry concerns about the benefits of test tows, presorting issues (dogfish, for example), safety issues, etc.);
- Measures for certified weighing/volumetric measurements standardized for the herring fishery (included in several proposals);
- Measures to eliminate the research set-aside and instead establish a portside sampling set-aside (3%) to significantly increase sampling (based on ME DMR portside sampling program including specific protocols/standards, requirements for follow-up analysis re. relationship between portside and at-sea monitoring data, and possible extrapolation to the entire fishery);
- Electronic reporting for limited access vessels (based on study fleet program with possible additions/modifications, including Frulla et al suggestions to utilize technologies to identify bycatch areas and slippage events);
- Measures to improve IVR/VTR reporting and measures to address transfers at sea (see Draft Amendment 4 Discussion Document October 2008 for possible options);
- At-sea (observer) sampling design based on 20% CV for herring, river herring and haddock (October 2008 Council motion) and emphasis in Amendment 4 on as much observer coverage as possible;
- Measures to improve at-sea sampling (develop options from bulleted list on p. 30 of Draft Amendment 4 Discussion Document October 2008);
- Measures/criteria for access to groundfish closed areas (including consideration of 100% observer coverage in closed areas and other provisions in the Herring Alliance proposal); and
- Establish a pilot program for electronic video monitoring to verify maximized retention and determine the most appropriate applications for the herring fishery (consider CHOIR and Archipelago information/recommendations)

Ms. Steele emphasized that the above example would simply serve as an outline from which more detailed measures could be developed. She noted that there are clearly many issues to be resolved regarding the details of the management measures and that the final alternative would require some additional modification/clarification, but this at least provides a framework with which the Council can move forward. She encouraged Herring Committee members to develop additional alternatives for the Draft EIS.

**3. MOTION: SALLY MCGEE/DANA RICE**

To include the Council staff example as an Amendment 4 alternative for a catch monitoring program in the herring fishery

**4. MOTION TO TABLE: MARY BETH TOOLEY/TERRY STOCKWELL**

To table the previous motion until after a Committee motion regarding goals/objectives

**MOTION #4 TO TABLE MOTION #3 CARRIED 6-4-0.**

Ms. Tooley proposed that a condensed list of goals/objectives from the MA DMF proposal be included as part of this alternative. (Several clarifications/perfections were made to the motion.)

**5. MOTION: MARY BETH TOOLEY/TERRY STOCKWELL**

To adopt the following as goals/objectives of the catch monitoring program (based on elements of the MA DMF proposal):

- (1) To create a cost effective and administratively feasible program for provision of accurate and timely records of catch of all species in the herring fishery
  - Review federal notification and reporting requirements for the herring fishery to clarify, streamline, and simplify protocols
- (2) Develop a program providing catch of herring and bycatch species that will foster support by the herring industry and others concerned about accurate accounts of catch and bycatch, i.e., a well-designed, credible program
  - Avoid prohibitive and unrealistic demands and requirements for those involved in the fishery, i.e., processors and fishermen using single and paired midwater trawls, bottom trawls, purse seines, weirs, stop seines, and any other gear capable of directing on herring
  - Improve communication and collaboration with sea herring vessels and processors to promote constructive dialogue, trust, better understanding of bycatch issues, and ways to reduce discards
  - Eliminate reliance on self-reported catch estimates
- (3) Design a robust program for adaptive management decisions
- (4) Determine if at-sea sampling provides bycatch estimates similar to dockside monitoring estimates
  - Assure sea sampling of at-sea processors' catches is at least equal to shoreside sampling

- Reconcile differences in federal and states' protocols for sea sampling and dockside sampling, and implement consistent dockside protocols to increase sample size and enhance trip sampling resolution

**MOTION #5 CARRIED 9-1-0.**

**TABLED MOTION #3 WAS BROUGHT BACK FOR A VOTE (AND PERFECTED DURING THE DISCUSSION):**

To include the Council staff example as one alternative in Amendment 4 for a catch monitoring program in the herring fishery:

- Goals/objectives as approved by the Herring Committee in previous motion (with continued discussion and possible further development/modification)
- Measures for maximized retention based on CHOIR/Herring Alliance suggestions (while addressing industry concerns about the benefits of test tows, presorting issues (dogfish, for example), safety issues, etc.)
- Measures for certified weighing/volumetric measurements standardized for the herring fishery (included in several proposals)
- Measures to eliminate the research set-aside and instead establish a portside sampling set-aside (3%) to significantly increase sampling (based on ME DMR portside sampling program including specific protocols/standards, requirements for follow-up analysis re. relationship between portside and at-sea monitoring data, and possible extrapolation to the entire fishery)
- Electronic reporting for limited access vessels (based on study fleet program with possible additions/modifications, including Frulla et al suggestions to utilize technologies to identify bycatch areas and slippage events)
- Measures to improve IVR/VTR reporting and measures to address transfers at sea (see Draft Amendment 4 Discussion Document October 2008 for possible options)
- At-sea (observer) sampling design based on 20% CV for herring, river herring and haddock (October 2008 Council motion) and emphasis in Amendment 4 on as much observer coverage as possible
- Measures to improve at-sea sampling (develop options from bulleted list on p. 30 of Draft Amendment 4 Discussion Document October 2008)
- Measures/criteria for access to groundfish closed areas (including consideration of 100% observer coverage in closed areas and other provisions in the Herring Alliance proposal)
- Establish a pilot program for electronic video monitoring to verify maximized retention and determine the most appropriate applications for the herring fishery (consider CHOIR and Archipelago information/recommendations)

**Additional Discussion:** Mr. Rudolph cautioned that electronic monitoring based on the NEFSC study fleet may not be ready to apply to the entire fishery. Ms. Tooley emphasized that any measures to require maximized retention must be feasible for this fishery and not necessarily based on those in other high-volume fishery. She stated that there are many legitimate concerns about maximized retention measures that must be addressed. Eoin Rochford from NORPEL reiterated these concerns and expressed additional concern about the negative impacts of the

proposed management measures on the herring fleet. He emphasized the importance of understanding how the fishery operates and noted that no one in the industry wants bycatch because it is a waste of time and money to catch non-target species. He urged the Committee to use common sense and gain a better understanding of how the fishery operates when developing additional management measures. A representative from the Massachusetts Striped Bass Association asked for clarification regarding the documentation of unidentified harvest returned to sea and encouraged the Committee to develop a thorough range of alternatives to consider in Amendment 4. Mr. Odlin expressed opposition to the motion. Ms. Tooley reiterated her concerns about some elements of the motion but agreed that it is important to move forward with an outline from which to further discuss these issues and develop appropriate management measures.

**MOTION #3 CARRIED 9-1-0.**

Ms. Steele encouraged the Herring Committee members to develop additional alternatives for consideration/analysis in the Draft EIS. Committee members expressed interest in discussing the elements of the stakeholder proposals at the next meeting, after they have had more time to review the proposals and consider the suggestions. The Herring Committee agreed that additional alternatives should be developed at the next meeting, anticipated for late January 2009.

*Intentionally Blank*

## Summary of Stakeholder Proposals

	<b>At-sea Observers</b>	<b>Dockside Monitoring</b>	<b>Electronic Monitoring</b>
<b>ASMFC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support a multi-faceted bycatch monitoring approach including at-sea sampling</li> <li>-Supports sea-sampling being increased to fully cover the gear types, range and seasonality of the fishery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support a multi-faceted bycatch monitoring approach including shoreside sampling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support exploring electronic monitoring as an efficient method to estimate 'slippage'</li> </ul>
<b>CHOIR Coalition</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support maximized retention, mandating that the vast majority of catch is landed</li> <li>- Support census and/or sub-sampling of entire landing to provide a certified landings report including landed weights for all species</li> <li>-Support Council approved catch monitoring and control plans (CMCP) designed and submitted by pelagic fishery vessels and dealers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support video-based monitoring to verify maximized retention</li> <li>-Support use of VBEM consisting of an onboard data-logging system including GPS, hydraulic pressure sensors, and winch-drum rotation sensors that provide a time-date-location stamped record</li> </ul>
<b>Herring Alliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support monitoring every tow on all trips</li> <li>- Support systematic sampling of pumped catch, representative of entire tow e.g. basket sampling</li> <li>- Support complete record of pre-sorted catch and residual catch in codend after pumping</li> <li>-Support federally trained and certified third party at-sea observers</li> <li>-Support heighten monitoring for MWTs in groundfish closed areas</li> <li>-Support estimating weight of catch by calibrated holding tanks</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support digital recording of trip, tow, and position of net in water column</li> <li>-Support video monitoring to record pre-sorting of catch</li> <li>-Support use of net sensors to estimate total catch, height of foot rope and provide time-stamped record of fishing activity</li> <li>-Support including VMS data to provide high-quality, real-time position cross-checked with observer data</li> </ul>
<b>Frulla et al</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support bolstering observer coverage, if necessary and appropriate, to accurately measure bycatch</li> <li>-Not opposed to enhanced coverage if resources are available and all fishery sectors are treated equitably</li> <li>-Support at-sea levels to attain 30% CV</li> <li>-Oppose 100% coverage</li> <li>-Oppose as infeasible observer coverage greater than SBRM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support federal port-sampling program to augment at sea levels to attain 20% bycatch CV</li> <li>- Support near 100% weighing of catch at point of first landing, production or transshipment</li> <li>- Support NMFS approved, vessel or dealer generated catch weighing plans including: volumetric weighing, truck/tanker weighing, plant-based weighing; certified flow scales; calibrated holding tanks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support integrating Study Fleet technology (computer, sensors, software) to monitor TAC in near real-time and to improve identification of high bycatch areas; and to increase reporting timeliness and quality</li> <li>- Support potentially linking computer to winch and pump operation to measure and report 'slippage'</li> <li>- Support making this technology a priority for research set-aside</li> <li>- Oppose video monitoring</li> </ul>

	<b>At-sea Observers</b>	<b>Dockside Monitoring</b>	<b>Electronic Monitoring</b>
<b>MA DMF</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support increased observer coverage to adequately assess and manage the fishery</li> <li>-Support supplementing SBRM baseline to account for river herring, groundfish bycatch</li> <li>-Support evaluation into appropriateness of 100% observer coverage in Groundfish closed areas</li> <li>-Support concentrated offshore monitoring effort of mid-water trawler bycatch during January-March and April-June due to high bycatch risk</li> <li>-Support monitoring in area north of Gloucester to off NH as it is seen as a potential "hot spot"</li> <li>-Support improved observer training to ensure correct classification of river herring and shad</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support more work to improve accuracy and make herring landings data official</li> <li>-Support weighmaster program to account for all landings pumped directly from vessels into tanker trucks</li> <li>-Support determining if dockside monitoring provides bycatch estimates similar to at-sea sampling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support research into the effectiveness of expanded electronic monitoring</li> </ul>
<b>William McWha</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports limiting the number of ports where herring can be landed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports mandatory 24/7 operation of VMS and/or GPS on all herring boats and associated dealer boats</li> <li>-Supports installing fish hold sonar sensors, expanding existing on-board fish finder equipment for stored and real-time data collection</li> </ul>

	<b>Funding</b>	<b>Reporting</b>	<b>Enforcement</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>ASMFC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support funding short-term, high coverage projects as an effective way to characterize bycatch and allow reduced future coverage levels</li> <li>-Support catch monitoring as top priority for research set aside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support reporting on a more timely basis to allow for improved accounting of landings by area</li> <li>-Support required completion of IVR report after every trip</li> <li>-Support considering VMS use as catch reporting tool</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Supports a bycatch monitoring program that focuses on estimating catch of small-bodied pelagic fish species</li> </ul>
<b>CHOIR Coalition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support a multi-stakeholder funding approach to mitigate funding costs for the industry (including government and non-governmental organizations)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support shore-based observers to certify and report weight and species composition of landings within 24 hours, providing near real-time data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support penalties and/or AM's specific to maximized retention non-compliance</li> </ul>	
<b>Frulla et al</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Oppose any costs imposed on industry which are punitively expensive without measurable improvements in quality and type of data collected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support goal of near real-time TAC monitoring and improvements to the quality and timeliness of reporting</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support requiring transshipments to either bring catch to shoreside weigh stations or apply for NMFS approved at-sea transfer weigh plan</li> </ul>
<b>Herring Alliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Would support public-private matching contribution to cover initial investment</li> <li>-Would support multi-stakeholder collaboration for congressional appropriation to cover initial investment</li> <li>-Support A&amp;B permit participation in the program and per-trip payment of observer cost</li> <li>-Support allocating 3%-3.5% gross industry revenues to monitoring</li> <li>-Support industry funded augmentation of federal NEFOP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support immediate transfer of observer and sensor data to NMFS for near real-time analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support 'compliance and enforcement' option facilitating observers' ability to carry out responsibilities</li> <li>- Support accountability for un-sampled, discarded or transferred tows</li> <li>-Support accountability for discarding unobserved pre-sorted catch</li> <li>-Support rule regulating deductions in the annual herring allocation if the net is dumped. Deductions to be based on the dumped amount in pounds, or an assumed 200 tons</li> </ul>	

	<b>Funding</b>	<b>Reporting</b>	<b>Enforcement</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>MA DMF</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support an industry working group analyzing pros and cons of industry funded observer program</li> <li>-Support avoiding prohibitive and unrealistic demands and requirements for those involved in the fishery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support required cross-checking IVRs and VTRs by NMFS</li> <li>-Support compulsory SAFIS dealer reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support designing a program for triggering management actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support changing fishing practices that may not allow adequate accounting of bycatch</li> <li>-Support monitoring of bycatch and discard in sea herring fishery and classification by gear-type</li> </ul>
<b>William McWha</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Supports partially funding observer coverage with proceeds of landed bycatch sold at target species prices</li> <li>- Supports industry funding derived from catch-based license fees for all who commercially catch, sell, transfer or buy herring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports immediate reporting of large bycatch events to onshore monitors</li> <li>- Supports rule requiring agreement between IFRs with VTRs and SAFIS weights</li> <li>-Supports assigning all boats a Qualcomm number (including boats interacting with catcher/dealer vessels)</li> <li>- Supports Qualcomm recording all at-sea transfers on both vessels; if observer is present, observer operates Qualcomm</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports year long loss of LOA as penalty for reporting non-compliance</li> <li>- Supports load forfeiture as penalty for hold-sensor tampering</li> <li>- Supports load forfeiture as penalty for vessel not leaving areas of high bycatch</li> <li>- Supports halting all herring trawler operations if shad and river herring returns do not increase within three years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports closing CAII to trawling vessels during spring river herring runs</li> <li>- Supports retiring herring trawling licenses over time and promoting weir fishery</li> <li>- Supports requiring vessels to move a determined distance away from areas of high-bycatch tows continued high-levels of bycatch</li> <li>-Supports eliminating discards; selling all landed bycatch at target species price; profits from these transactions will be donated to research or observer coverage</li> <li>- Supports linking Atlantic herring catch limits to river herring runs in Connecticut, Merrimack and Susquehanna Rivers</li> <li>-Supports creating TAC (Jan. – May 31 2009) for area from Point Judith, RI, east and south of Block Island, to the tip of Long Island and off the east coast of Cape Cod</li> <li>-Supports creating two vessel categories: ‘catch vessels’ and ‘catch/dealer vessels’</li> </ul>