

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Management Board

May 1, 2019
10:45 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.
Arlington, Virginia

Draft Agenda

The times listed are approximate; the order in which these items will be taken is subject to change; other items may be added as necessary.

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Welcome/Call to Order (<i>R. Ballou</i>) | 10:45 a.m. |
| 2. Board Consent | 10:45 a.m. |
| • Approval of Agenda | |
| 3. Public Comment | 10:45 a.m. |
| 4. Review Plan Development Team Analysis of Black Sea Bass Commercial Management Strategies to Address Fishery Shifts (<i>C. Starks</i>) Possible Action | 11:00 a.m. |
| • Review Advisory Panel Report | |
| 5. Review and Populate Advisory Panel Membership (<i>T. Berger</i>) Action | 12:10 p.m. |
| 6. Other Business/Adjourn | 12:15 p.m. |

The meeting will be held at the Westin Crystal City, 1800 S. Eads Street, Arlington, Virginia; 703.486.1111

MEETING OVERVIEW

Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Management Board

May 1, 2019

10:45 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

Arlington, Virginia

Chair: Bob Ballou (RI) Assumed Chairmanship: 10/17	Technical Committee Chair: Greg Wojcik (CT)	Law Enforcement Committee Representative: Snellbaker (NJ)
Vice Chair: Adam Nowalsky (NJ)	Advisory Panel Chair: Vacant	Previous Board Meeting: March 6, 2019
Voting Members: MA, RI, CT, NY, NJ, DE, MD, PRFC, VA, NC, NMFS, USFWS (12 votes for Black Sea Bass; 12 votes for Summer Flounder and Scup)		

2. Board Consent

- Approval of Agenda

3. Public Comment – At the beginning of the meeting public comment will be taken on items not on the agenda. Individuals that wish to speak at this time must sign-in at the beginning of the meeting. For agenda items that have already gone out for public hearing and/or have had a public comment period that has closed, the Board Chair may determine that additional public comment will not provide additional information. In this circumstance the Chair will not allow additional public comment on an issue. For agenda items that the public has not had a chance to provide input, the Board Chair may allow limited opportunity for comment. The Board Chair has the discretion to limit the number of speakers and/or the length of each comment.

4. Review Plan Development Team Analysis of Black Sea Bass Commercial Management Strategies to Address Fishery Shifts (11:00 a.m.-12:10 p.m.) Possible Action

Background

- In February, the Black Sea Bass Commercial Working Group (WG) presented a proposed statement of the problem and commercial management objectives to the Board highlighting two key issues with regard to commercial black sea bass management, as well as several potential management strategies for Board consideration. The issues identified were: 1) state commercial quota allocations set in 2003 do not reflect the current distribution and abundance of black sea bass; and 2) coastwide commercial quota management can limit harvest opportunities for some states if another state's harvest overage results in a coastwide fishery closure.
 - The Board supported further development of the strategies proposed by the WG, as well as additional management options brought forward by Board members. The Board formed a Plan Development Team (PDT) to perform analyses and further develop potential management options proposed by the WG and as specified by the Board to address the issue of commercial allocations to the states.
 - The PDT has developed a report for Board consideration including additional analysis and potential management options to address changes in stock distribution and abundance.
- (Supplemental Materials)**

- The Advisory Panels (APs) of the Commission and the Council met jointly on April 2, 2019 to review the work being developed by the PDT. The APs provided feedback on the potential management options being explored. **(Briefing Materials)**

Presentations

- Plan Development Team Report on Black Sea Bass Commercial Management by C. Starks
- Advisory Panel Report by C. Starks

Board Actions for Consideration

- Initiate a management document to address commercial black sea bass management

5. Review and Populate Advisory Panel Membership (12:10-12:15 p.m.) Action

Background

- Massachusetts has submitted a nomination to the Summer Flounder, Scup and Black Sea Bass Advisory Panel: Paul Caruso, a recreational angler. **(Briefing Materials)**

Presentation

- Nominations by T. Berger **(Briefing Materials)**

Board Actions for Consideration

- Consider approval of Advisory Panel nomination for Paul Caruso

6. Other Business/Adjourn

Summer Flounder, Scup, & Black Sea Bass 2019 TC Tasks

Activity level: High

Committee Overlap Score: High (Multi-species committees for this Board)

Committee Task List

- June 1st: Annual compliance reports due
- July 2019: In person meeting to develop recommendations on 2020 specifications (Coastwide Quota and RHLs) for summer flounder, scup and black sea bass
- November 2019: In person meeting on 2020 rec measures
- 2019 Scup Operational Assessment
 - TC – TBD 2019: Data Deadline and review of recreational data
- 2019 Black Sea Bass Operational Assessment
 - TC – TBD 2019: Data Deadline and review of recreational data

TC Members: Greg Wojcik (CT, TC Chair), Alex Aspinwall (VA), Julia Beaty (MAFMC), Joe Cimino (VA), Peter Clarke (NJ), Karson Coutre (MAFMC), Kiley Dancy (MAFMC), Steve Doctor (MD), Emily Gilbert (NOAA), Jeff Kipp (ASMFC), John Maniscalco (NY), Jason McNamee (RI), Kirby Rootes-Murdy (ASMFC), Gary Shepherd (NOAA), Caitlin Starks (ASMFC), Mark Terceiro (NOAA), Todd VanMiddlesworth (NC), Richard Wong (DE)

Summer Flounder SAW Working Group: Jason McNamee, Mark Terceiro

From: [David Dow](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Cc: [David Dow](#)
Subject: Comments on Summer Flounder and Atlantic Striped Bass Stock Assessments and Resulting Changes to Fishery Management Plans
Date: Friday, March 22, 2019 6:45:47 AM

I have some concerns regarding the conversion of the Summer flounder and Atlantic striped bass stock assessments by the ASMFC/NOAA Fisheries into management advice for these stocks at the Spring ASMFC meeting. The Statistical Catch at Age equilibrium model ignores the effects of eutrophication and climate change on SSB in inshore breeding areas for Atlantic striped bass (Chesapeake Bay; Delaware Bay and Hudson River Estuary); changes in natural mortality associated with shifts in predator and prey species in space & time, alterations in the marine food chain (microbial food web and grazing food chain which were explored in the NOAA Fisheries EMaX model); and changes in the inshore “productive capacity” of Essential Fish Habitat and the shifting baseline in the ocean which has created a complex dynamic system which is not at equilibrium.

I would urge the ASMFC Technical Committee to consider the recent paper by Kristin N. Marshall et al. 2019. Inclusion of ecosystem information in the US stock assessments suggests progress toward ecosystem-based fisheries management. ICES Jour. Marine Sci. 76 (1): 1-9. The authors urge usage of ecosystem information for stocks which are both overfished (changes in Spawning Stock Biomass) and subject to overfishing (exceed fishing mortality target). I feel that a backup adaptive. ecosystem-based fishery model for Atlantic striped bass recovery be developed in case the equilibrium model predictions turn out not to be useful. Certainly Nantucket Sound and Cape Cod Bay suggest that these systems are not at equilibrium which has effected stocks such as Sea herring and Gulf of Maine cod. and lead to great white sharks appearing off of our beaches to feed on seals which consume inshore forage fish migrating up from the Mid-Atlantic region.

Based on the EMaX (Energy Modeling and Analysis Exercise) carbon budget model for the Northeast Continental Shelf Ecosystem, I feel that the marine food chain should be included in the Essential Fish Habitat for pelagic fish species. The EMaX model had more primary production at the base of the food chain than yield of living marine resources at the top. so that we had to add the microbial food web to the grazing food chain to balance the carbon flow (i.e. the longer food chain lead to greater community respiration losses). Since the ocean has been warming rapidly in the waters surrounding Cape Cod where I live, this will include increased respiration at the base of the food chain and alter the role of forage fish in serving as prey for predators like Summer flounder and Atlantic striped bass. Summer flounder, black sea bass and scup are migrating into southern New England which could provide alternative targets to commercial and recreational fishing sectors.

Since Summer flounder are targeted by both the commercial and recreational sectors in state (0-3 miles) and federal (3-200 miles) waters, my major concern is in allocation of the quotas between the ASMFC; Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Councils using the best available science. The November 27-30, 2018 Northeast Fisheries Science Center’s SAW/SARC summary suggested that Summer flounder stocks were declining, so that I don’t want to see them get into the situation that Atlantic striped bass are facing. Five years is a long time between baseline stock assessments and changes in competition between predators feeding on forage fish and top down predation by Apex predators could change the marine food chain dynamics.

The Cape Cod Times published an Op-ed piece on March 5 entitled: “A Moratorium on the Horizon” which has generated some responses from saltwater anglers and Phil Coates (former Director of the Ma. Division of Marine Fisheries). It will take co-operation between commercial fishermen/women and saltwater anglers to develop a recovery plan for Atlantic striped bass and make sure that Summer flounder don’t end up in a similar situation as the catch quotas are increased and shifts occur in the ocean ecosystem both inshore and offshore. I have attached a Letter to the Editor that I had published in CapeCodToday.

Thanks for your consideration of these comments.

Dr. David Dow

Letter: Summer Flounder and Atlantic Striped Bass: Tale of Two Fisheries

from Dr. David Dow of East Falmouth

ARTICLE | **LETTERS TO THE EDITOR** | MARCH 17,
2019 04:45 AM | BY **CAPECODTODAY STAFF**

<letter-to-the-editor_17_260.jpg>

Letter to the Editor:

In November 27-30, 2018 the Northeast Fisheries Science Center conducted baseline stock assessments for these two species which are managed by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission inshore (0-3 miles) and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council offshore (3-200 miles). Both Summer flounder and Atlantic striped bass are targeted inshore by commercial fishermen/women and saltwater anglers. Summer flounder are also harvested by both fishing groups in federal waters. Even though the final report from the November 2018 stock assessment has been delayed because of the furlough of federal employees/contractors in NOAA Fisheries, Atlantic striped bass were assessed to be both overfished (relates to targets for spawning stock biomass) and subject to overfishing (relates to fishing mortality targets), while Summer flounder stocks were viewed as healthy and proposed catch quotas could be increased for both commercial and recreational sectors.

The worsening situation for Atlantic striped bass will require some type of recovery plan by the management agencies working with constituents (environmentalists/animal rights activists; fishermen/women and concerned public). The ASMFC's Technical Committee

is examining various recovery scenarios and will likely seek input from the Atlantic striped bass Management Board; NOAA Fisheries staff and academic scientists and key constituent groups. The Management Board includes some Cape Cod residents (like Rep. Sarah Peake).

There should be an opportunity for concerned citizens on Cape Cod to comment on how the proposed changes in the Atlantic striped bass recovery plan will effect them personally through some type of outreach program by the NOAA Fisheries Recreational Fisheries Coordinators/ASMFC or Massa. Division of Marine Fisheries Staff on the Management Board.

It is not my intention to get into the details of how all of this will be accomplished, but to make some comments based being the former Recreational Fisheries Coordinator in the Northeast and a member of the New England Fishery Management Council's Habitat Plan Development Team which helped develop Omnibus Habitat Amendment 2 which was approved in January 2018.

* Commercial and recreational fishing are important components of the "Blue Economy" on Cape Cod and important parts of our history which requires maintenance of our working waterfronts.

* There is a shifting baseline in the ocean surrounding Cape Cod from environmental stressors like nutrient enrichment; increased acidity in the water column and sediments and increased water temperature. One example is the interaction between forage fish/seals and Great White sharks which has caused concerns for swimming and skate boarding at beaches on the outer Cape. These large Apex predators have shifted in space and time and exert top down effects on the find chain supporting predators like Summer flounder and Atlantic striped bass. There has also been bottom up changes in the plankton/forage fish linkage that influences these first level predators.

* The production and recruitment of Summer flounder and Atlantic striped bass are supported by inshore Essential Fish Habitat

(eelgrass beds; salt marshes; shellfish beds; etc.) which is included as a component of the federal Magnuson-Stevens Sustainable Fisheries Act. EFH is included as a component of an adaptive, ecosystems-based fisheries management approach. In New England, EFH "productive capacity" doesn't include the marine food chain and the influence of environmental stressors like nutrient enrichment/climate change,

* Towns on Cape Cod are developing Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plans to reduce "N" loading from septic systems under section 208 of the Clean Water Act. This \$4-6 billion investment over the next 20-30 years is intended to improve both water quality and restore habitat (i.e. link between bay scallop harvests and eelgrass beds).

* The ASMFC; MAFMC, and Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries have to work jointly on a recovery plan for Atlantic striped bass in state waters with the key constituent groups and to make sure that Summer flounder with declining stock sizes in recent years doesn't slip into a similar situation. The MAFMC manages the Summer flounder fishery in federal waters (3-200 miles) where Atlantic striped bass fishing is banned, while the ASMFC and Ma. DMF manage both species in state waters (0-3) miles.

* The New England Fishery Management Council will need to coordinate its activities in the management of forage fish; primary and Apex predators as they migrate into southern New England waters from the Mid-Atlantic region. This will include redistribution in the quotas between commercial and recreational fishing which were recently addressed at the ASMFC/MAFMC Management Board meeting in Virginia. This complex bureaucracy may be slow to change in how it links science and monitoring —> fisheries management plans and public policy development —> public outreach and education.

* Since the science and monitoring that supports the baseline stock assessments is data rich, but information poor for non-experts, perhaps the MIT/WHOI Sea Grant Program could explain this to policy makers and

elected officials in a more understandable fashion. The Waquoit Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve has been successful in such science translation efforts.

Dr. David Dow

East Falmouth, Ma.



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

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council Joint Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Advisory Panel Meeting Summary

April 2, 2019

ASMFC Advisory Panel Members in Attendance:

- Meade Amory – VA (commercial)
- Paul Caruso – MA (recreational)
- Greg DiDomenico – NJ (commercial)
- Aaron Gewirtz, RI (commercial)
- Michael Hall – RI (commercial)
- Marc Hoffman – NY (recreational)
- Mark Hodges – VA (commercial)
- Kurt Martin – MA (commercial)
- *Michael Plaia – CT (recreational/commercial)
- James Ruhle – NC (commercial)
- Buddy Seigel – MD (recreational)
- Wes Townsend – DE (commercial)

MAFMC Advisory Panel members in attendance:

- Katie Almeida – MA (commercial)
- Carl Benson – NJ (commercial)
- Joan Berko – NJ (commercial)
- Jeff Deem – VA (recreational)
- Skip Feller – VA (recreational)
- Carl Forsberg – NY (recreational)
- Jeffrey Gutman – NJ (commercial/recreational)
- Gregory Hueth - NJ (recreational)
- Howard King – MD (recreational)
- Arnold Leo – NY (commercial)
- *Michael Plaia – CT (recreational/commercial)
- Robert Ruhle – NC (commercial)
- Robin Scott – NJ (recreational)
- Christopher Spies – NY (recreational)
- Steven Witthuhn – NY (commercial)
- Harvey Yenkinson – PA (recreational)

Additional attendees:

- Chris Batsavage (MAFMC & ASMFC member, NC)
- Vincent Cavaleri
- Emily Gilbert (NOAA)
- Sonny Gwin (MAMFC member)
- Emerson Hasbrouck (ASMFC member, NY)
- Thomas Heimann
- Mike Luisi (MAMFC & ASMFC member, MD)
- Steve Newellman
- Rob O'Reilly (MAMFC & ASMFC member, VA)
- Philip Simon

Staff: Caitlin Starks (ASMFC Staff), Julia Beaty (MAFMC Staff)

* Indicates member of both Council and Commission APs

Meeting Summary

The Advisory Panels of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) and the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) met jointly via conference call and webinar on April 2, 2019 to review and provide feedback on ongoing work at the Commission related to black sea bass commercial management. At the Commission's August 2018 Meeting, the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Management Board (Board) established a Working Group to identify management issues

related to changes in stock distribution and abundance, and propose potential management strategies for Board consideration. In February 2019, the Working Group reported to the Board and identified two issues: (1) state commercial allocations implemented in 2003 do not reflect the current distribution of the resource, which has expanded significantly north of Hudson Canyon, and (2) federal coastwide quota can limit harvest opportunities for some states if another state's harvest overage results in a coastwide fishery closure. The Board requested the Plan Development Team (PDT) perform additional analyses and develop management options to address these issues.

ASMFC Staff presented an overview of the potential management strategies being discussed and evaluated by the Commission's PDT, including status quo, and three new approaches to adjusting state by state commercial allocations:

1. A dynamic approach modeled after the Transboundary Management Guidance Committee (TMGC) approach
2. Trigger-based allocation approach
3. Auctioned seasonal quota (ASQ)

Advisors provided feedback on these potential management options, as well as general comments on black sea bass commercial management. The comments included in this summary do not represent consensus statements, but rather individual perspectives of AP members. Comments are not presented in their original order and were not transcribed verbatim. Additional comments submitted after the call by email are attached at the end of this summary, and are counted toward the totals for comments opposing or supporting each approach.

Status Quo Comments

10 supported status quo: Joan Berko (email comment), Steve Witthuhn (email comment), Jeffrey Gutman, Carl Benson, Robert Ruhle, Greg DiDomenico, Wes Townsend, Jim Ruhle, Katie Almeida, Jim Lovgren (email comment)

2 opposed status quo: Arnold Leo, Chris Spies (email comment)

Greg DiDomenico - We're in opposition to this whole thing. This seems to be an amendment out of pure convenience. It's counterproductive. There are competing interests regarding really important issues. Fairness. Investments. Bycatch. Discards. This continues to go from species to species without any real end to it. I'm in opposition to the approaches you've outlined.

Wes Townsend - I think we need status quo. There are so many unanswered questions and no economic impact studies. In Delaware 99% of the fish caught in the ocean are sea bass. This would devastate the few fishermen we have left. You're increasing Massachusetts and Rhode Island, two of the biggest dollar states. How is that equitable?

James Ruhle - I support status quo. If this conversation had taken place 2-3 years ago, I'd be reluctant to do that. I've been involved in this fishery for a long time. There is clear evidence that in the last 3 years the fishery has not shifted north, though it may have expanded its population. The traditional grounds of New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia are still producing fish. The global warming effect in the mid-Atlantic has been reversed. The TMGC system is flawed. This is the wrong time to be allocating based on a distribution shift that has not occurred. You need to look at study fleet data and observer data to support what I'm saying. The science just caught up with the biomass that has been exploding for several years. I don't doubt for a minute that northern states need a higher allocation. But it's got to be based on facts. Look at smaller increments - 2-3 years instead of 7 - it will paint a very different picture. Be very cautious.

Jeffrey Guttman - I agree with the recommendation for status quo. You should throw out the auction approach and TMGC. The trigger approach is best of the three. It accounts for historic quota and investment. But overall, I'd say status quo and table the amendment.

Katie Almeida - Status quo is probably best at this point. Of the three options, the only viable one might be the trigger option. I don't support it right now, but it might be worth looking into it more if people want to.

TMGC Comments

6 opposed TMGC - Carl Benson, James Ruhle, Robert Ruhle, Jeffrey Gutman, Meade Amory, Carl Forsberg
2 supported TMGC - Paul Caruso (email comment), Chris Spies (email comment)

James Ruhle - The U.S. has never benefitted from TMGC discussions with Canada. Except maybe we've been provided more fish but we're only taking 60% of the TAC.

Robert Ruhle - You'll be pitting north against south in a similar manner as the U.S. and Canada. I'm on NTAP (Northeast Trawl Advisory Panel). There are lots of issues with gear performance and catchability of NEFSC trawl survey. 49.5% of tows are invalid by their own admission. They are outside of the optimal geometric range of gear since 2008. We don't know how to fix those issues. I'd be cautious about relying too heavily on the NEFSC survey alone.

Jeffrey Gutman - How low could a state's allocation go in the TMGC approach? For example, could Virginia go from 20% to 5%? Virginia and North Carolina are still catching their quotas despite any shift in fish. Even with the 3% control rule, they could still slowly lose their quota over time. What would a lower limit be? 50% of the original allocation? Some states have the potential to be clobbered, even if they have been catching their current allocations. The whole approach seems flawed. When do we get to discuss the floor for this?

Meade Amory - TMGC has the potential to ruin certain states. So many things can be tweaked, so maybe we keep discussing it a little bit.

Michael Plaia - Under the TMGC, we need to weight them so the time period on reaching an equilibrium is more like 5 years rather than 8 years in your example.

Jeffrey Guttman - There is a lot of uncertainty. Conflicting results could come out of this. The quota is too low. I'm not sure how quickly you can get current information applied in the TMGC model, so there would be a lag. The fish are much farther south this year. Overall, this is a bad idea. It does not take historical investments - livelihoods, permits, vessels - into account. In many places, summer flounder, black sea bass, and scallops are the majority of commercial catch and income. Southern states are not having trouble catching their quotas. Northern states have other things they can still fish for - pollock, haddock, redfish. You're going to really decimate southern states under the TMGC approach. The two primary trawl fisheries in southern region are fluke and sea bass.

Carl Forsberg - There are too many questions with TMGC approach. It would lead to unfairness for the southern states.

Robert Ruhle - The TMGC approach is unfounded. There is no evidence that it is practical, and no monitoring of what is happening in real time. There is no way to have real-time monitoring of trans-boundary shifts. You could only look retrospectively.

Trigger Approach Comments

3 supported the trigger approach: Marc Hoffman, Jeff Deem, Arnold Leo

6 supported continued evaluation of trigger approach though they didn't necessarily prefer it: Katie Almeida, Carl Benson, Jim Ruhle, Carl Forsberg, Robert Ruhle, Jeffrey Guttman

Marc Hoffman - I'm conscious of states that are worried that their percent is going to change. You're not losing anything under trigger approach. The trigger approach with some manipulation might work because everyone is getting what they are getting now plus an additional amount.

Jeff Deem - I support the trigger-based option; it protects investment. If there's an expansion truly, then the expansion areas should get that excess.

Carl Benson – The trigger approach should be based on getting management to do what it is supposed to do: get to 100% of SSB target. After they get to 100%, then give to the states with less quota. That protects everyone who's been in the fishery all along.

Jim Ruhle - The trigger approach has some merits, but needs more research and evaluation. The Council needs to be deeper into this because 85% of the resource is caught in federal waters. Status quo is my primary choice right now.

Carl Forsberg - Maybe more research into trigger option could help. It doesn't seem like it would hurt anyone. Being from NY and having one of the smallest allocations, I'd like to see anything to help us up here.

Robert Ruhle - The trigger approach has merit but instead of trying to figure out how to divvy out possible increases, let's try to get the science on the stock more up to date. We need to get a handle on the stock itself before we figure out how to divvy up the pieces of it. We don't know what we're divvying up yet.

Arnold Leo - We're really in very dire need of greater flexibility in management tools. I think the options offered here, the trigger options, are very modest, but beginning to get flexibility. I would support the trigger option as a start towards flexibility. Sticking with status quo is not a good idea.

Jeffrey Gutman - Fisheries in the north weren't left out, they were just in other fisheries at the time the allocations were made. I don't know how much flexibility we need on the commercial side. It seems to be a manufactured crisis. I do hope the Council is listening. Most people were for status quo, some felt trigger was the only viable option of those put forth. And a lot of those who said trigger was viable also said they preferred status quo.

Meade Amory - Fluke took five years and we ended up with a compromise that was the trigger solution. We might end up with the same sort of result.

ASQ Comments

8 opposed ASQ - Michael Plaia, Jeffrey Gutman, Meade Amory, Marc Hoffman, Robert Ruhle, Carl Benson, Jim Ruhle, Carl Forsberg

1 supported ASQ – Kurt Martin (email comment)

Carl Benson - Auction is RSA - same issues, different name.

Jim Ruhle – The quota auction system is going to produce more Carlos Rafael's. We don't need that.

Carl Forsberg – The auction approach should be totally wiped off. I don't think those with more money should be able to have more fish.

General Allocation Comments

Marc Hoffman – The southern range has been moving south as well as the northern range moving further north and east because the biomass is exploding. Guys in Maine are not fishing for sea bass because they don't have a quota. It's becoming an invasive species and threatening lobster catch. Guys are going out 100, 200 miles and getting black sea bass in their traps. The biomass is much larger than the numbers we're using. I think we need a drastic increase in the quotas. Maine and New Hampshire should be considered more equally; they need more quota. They don't fish because they don't have the quota.

Comments on Distribution Shift

Greg DiDomenico - Do you have specific information or evidence that the southern range of this fishery is moving? Can you do analysis on whether the change is due to anything but management changes? I personally believe that's having a much broader impact on the location of catch than abundance. If we don't have evidence for that, that's a big concern for me. Do you have any disposition for any other analysis regarding the reason for discards in these other regions? One thing I see as a conflict in the objectives of this is the issue of discards. Future management actions might decrease discards in one area and increase them in another. That's important. I'd be uncomfortable going ahead without an analysis of that. There are several parts of the document that mention investment. Is there any analysis of vessels that invested in landing permits in other areas to overcome their small allocations? The agency has gone on record and done numerous workshops about resiliency. Disadvantaging certain regions will be disadvantageous from a resiliency perspective.

Robert Ruhle - What are you using to quantify a shift in effort? What data and what years? Is there anything considering 2015-present? There have been different regulations over time which have impacted fishing practices. A changing distribution of effort could be due to management. You would need to look at directed black sea bass trips only, not those with incidental catch.

Meade Amory - This whole idea of a shift north I find very hard to believe. We just finished 5 years of allocation revisions with flounder. There's an overall expansion of the black sea bass stock, period. Commercial fishermen have been seeing it for years. This year, boats are catching sea bass further south than ever before. Look at observer and VTR data. The idea that it is shifting north is just a ruse to move allocations north.

Wes Townsend - We've been very conservative on sea bass. It's booming. They're expanding. When the stock goes down, I think they will concentrate in the mid-Atlantic again.

Marc Hoffman - I don't think biomass is shifting. People say it's global warming, and everything is moving north. That concept is bogus. This biomass is growing. The SSB that we have registered - everyone has told me those surveys are only within 3 miles. They are moving north because there's room there. They are moving further north and east to find food.

Michael Plaia - I want to address Marc Hoffman's comments on the survey data. I just spent a couple of days in Woods Hole. There are a number of state-based surveys, but the NEFCS vessel, the Bigelow, cannot sample in shallow waters and much of state waters.

Carl Benson - I think the assumption that black sea bass and summer flounder are moving north is flawed. What's moving from the south to take up that space that black sea bass and summer flounder are occupying? If nothing, then it could be expansion, not just moving north.

Other Comments

Michael Plaia - I want to raise another issue with current state by state quotas and any changes. For some background where I'm coming from is a bycatch reduction, reduction in bycatch mortality. I think the Commission should subdivide the quotas between the pot and trawl fisheries. The pot fishery has very little dead discards. Same thing with the miniscule hook and line fishery. I think we should use these quotas to try and encourage industry to shift more to a trap fishery. Maybe we could do that by subdividing quotas by gear and gradually increasing quotas for trap and hook and line more than quotas for other gear types.

Marc Hoffman - I think we need a doubling or tripling of quota because biomass is much higher than we think. Please check where the trawl surveys are taking place. They definitely don't go out past 20 miles. There are no inshore lobstermen south of Cape Cod because the black sea bass have eaten them. People need to go out very far to catch lobster.

Harvey Yenkinson - I'm a recreational fisherman. The commercial regulations affect us. We are not as mobile as commercial fishermen. If regional depletion occurs, the recreational fishery suffers tremendously. We've suffered in Cape May because the stocks are shifting. The fluke assessment couldn't determine why the stock has shifted. I think fishing pressure has an impact on distribution. We don't have a system of allocating where fishing is allowed to occur. If the southern region is depleted, it will majorly impact the recreational fishery. Not an immediate concern for black sea bass, but it is for fluke. For example, there have been some scallop closed areas to address localized depletion. The Board needs to consider how to manage these fisheries so as not to unfairly compromise the recreational fishery.

Chris Spies - I recall a map of where fish are caught based on VTR reports. As I recall, 4 of the 5 top statistical areas are located right off Long Island. People are saying the states are still catching their fish, but they are catching them up here. New York is arguing that we are not getting fair access based on that. We have 7% of the quota. There's been no consideration given to guys up here who have lost businesses. I want to see that restored.

Robin Scott - I agree with Greg DiDomenico. We need to protect investments. The state of New Jersey is hurtling down the pike towards wind farms in primary migratory areas for summer flounder. I'm not sure how that will impact black sea bass. Summer flounder have been documented as avoiding electromagnetic fields. I think it's poised to annihilate the commercial and recreational fisheries.

Greg DiDomenico - Harvey Yenkinson made some comments that I absolutely object to. They are misplaced in regards to this amendment and are baseless accusations that are counter current to precisely what has happened in New Jersey. I would remind him that there is no commercial fishing on 13 reefs in federal waters. If he's seeing regional depletion, it's not from commercial fishing. I would ask all other AP members to ask him to strike those comments from the record.

Comments from the Public

Rob O'Reilly – Abundance should be considered in addition to biomass. The current regulations should also be considered. I had such reservations and skepticism about the TMGC approach that I was motivated to put forward the trigger option. I couldn't believe there was only one option moving forward and that was TMGC. Effort has been talked about a lot. We got VTR info for Virginia. 62% of trips taken by Virginia ITQ fishermen occurred south of Hudson Canyon. I was trying to think how that would be weighted. This is not exactly like the commercial summer flounder fleet. Even if biomass is greater north of Hudson Canyon, the fishermen certainly aren't going to go north. That's a disconnect with the TMGC. There are caveats about using survey data. What is the timing of everything? I could see

a situation where the assessment is not ready and we need to use surveys. I see the TMGC as bogging down management. It would be similar to what we went through with summer flounder. We need a more streamlined approach.

Mike Luisi - I've been listening intently since the beginning of call. The trigger approach could be thought about more in depth than just an even distribution across the states. I've thought about ways we could use that trigger-style management action to solve a problem, or to get closer to our ultimate goals.

Caitlin Starks

From: Beaty, Julia <jbeaty@mafmc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 3:17 PM
To: JOAN BERKO
Cc: Caitlin Starks
Subject: RE: BSB AP Meeting Comments

Thanks, Joan. We will add that to the summary.

Julia Beaty
Fishery Management Specialist
Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
800 N. State Street, Suite 201
Dover, DE 19901
302-526-5250
jbeaty@mafmc.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Fishthewizard <fishthewizard@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 3:04 PM
To: Beaty, Julia <jbeaty@mafmc.org>
Subject: BSB AP Meeting Comments

Hello:

The fishery management should remain status quo.

Joan Berko
NJ

Caitlin Starks

From: PAUL CARUSO <pkcaruso@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 5:12 PM
To: Caitlin Starks
Subject: Re: AP meeting today

Hello Caitlin,

Regrettably I had to leave the conference call early today. Very good job by the way.

If proper I would like to add the following comments:

I feel the TMGC methodology, as laid out in the WG Report Appendix I offers a reasonable solution to address the longstanding issue of stock biomass shift small commercial quota shares for some states that now have an abundance of available resource.

Regarding Appendix II, I do not support this proposal given that most states in the NE region have not traditionally participated in, or participate minimally, in the offshore winter fisheries.

Sincerely, Paul G. Caruso

Caitlin Starks

From: Jim Lovgren <jlovgren3@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2019 12:26 PM
To: Caitlin Starks
Cc: Julia Beaty
Subject: Re: AP Meeting Summary - Review by 4/10

Caitin Sorry I missed the call, I support Status Quo for the fishery, and still want the quota that the ASMFC stole from NJ back. When they did the original allocation plan NJ should have received 28 to 38 % of the quota, yet thanks to backroom dealing we got 20%. It sounds like there was a lively discussion about the proposals, Sorry I missed them, Jim

Caitlin Starks

From: Kurt Martin <timebandit100@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2019 12:51 PM
To: Caitlin Starks
Subject: Re: AP Meeting Summary - Review by 4/10

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello Caitlin:

I wanted to submit the following comments. There was quite a bit of discussion going on during the webinar/conference call. I will read over the meeting summary and submit suggestions if I have any.

Thanks,
Kurt Martin

I feel that it is important to wait for the new stock assessment to be approved prior to making any changes to quota distribution. Hopefully the stock assessment will take into account observer data, as not all the federal and state fish tows will accurately show population fluctuations pending time of year and sea temperature. Even though it seems that the population has increased and expanded its range, it is important to have scientific evidence that backs up this hypothesis. If the assessment shows that the population is more robust and the percentage of fish has fluctuated, than the quota distribution should be changed to reflect this.

Additionally observer data is important to account for live and dead discards and not just automatically assuming all fish discarded are dead. In shallow water, fish caught in pots, many of the fish thrown back over are still alive and swim off.

I would be in favor of hearing more ideas and options for having an auction. Comments from members on the phone call seemed to argue that it would be difficult to enforce. There are other fisheries such as monkfish that have a research set aside which allows fisherman to land more monkfish. With issuance of a Letter of Authorization to catch and land more fish, a fisherman could show it if he was checked by an Enforcement Officer.

In my experience, the Massachusetts sea bass fishery is robust and more quota would be easy to fill. In the past fisherman were required to decrease their catch. If the population is shown to be more robust the quota should be increased. It would be great to utilize more sustainable local fish.

Caitlin Starks

From: crispies@optonline.net
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2019 5:54 AM
To: Caitlin Starks
Cc: Julia Beaty
Subject: RE: Joint Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass AP Meeting scheduled for Tue 4/2 @1pm

Good morning Caitlin,

Below is what I would submit for my written comments:

I found the seabass report I mentioned during the webinar on Tues, April 2, and attached it to this email. The map I was referencing is on page 9 of the report, Figure 4.

The report shows that 77% of the seabass harvest comes from 6 Statistical Areas that are immediately adjacent to NY (areas 616, 613, 615, 537, 612 and 539). Despite this abundance of fish right off the shores of Long Island, NY gets only 7% of the quota. Also as noted in the January 17, BSB Working Group Report, CT gets only 1%, despite a growing population of the seabass in the LIS.

It was stated during the meeting that the other states, with larger quotas, but less fish in their immediate area (such as VA and NC) are still catching their quotas, as though they are catching them in their local waters. But that is not the case. Southern boats are traveling to northern waters to catch those fish, right next to NY boats, which cannot because of quota limitations. That is not fair and equitable access to the fishery.

Multiple times during the meeting I heard comments recommending "status quo." These came from fishermen in the states with the most quota, NC, VA, MA and RI. Of course, they recommend status quo, because they have the lion share of the fishery to enjoy to themselves. These fishermen suggest that NY fishermen historically fished for other species, while they had fished for seabass all along. It was suggested that NY's fishermen targeted species like cod, and then wiped them out, so now they are looking to seabass, and therefore they don't deserve additional access to the fishery. That's laughable, since the cod stock crash is up off of Massachusetts, which also happens to have a robust portion of the seabass quota. These fishermen are lobbying for status quo because they are trying to guard what has been theirs for 15 years (a disproportionate portion of the quota) which is understandable, and I don't begrudge them for doing so. I hope they in kind will understand that I am just looking for a fairer and more equitable share for NY's commercial fishermen.

Additionally, NY has 45 federal dealers. The next closest states are MA and RI with 29 each. Then there are hundreds more state licensed dealers as well. It was stated multiple times during the meeting that changing to a new system doesn't take into consideration the investments into the businesses that other states fishing industries have made. NY had investments into the fishing industry, which are all dying. No consideration has been given to them, with a paltry 7% quota of an abundant fishery, located directly off of our shores. We have the fish, the fishermen, the markets, the dealers and the surviving remnants of the infrastructure. The only thing limiting our fishermen's access to this plentiful fishery located literally right upon our shores, is our pitiful share of the quota.

As the Working Group Report indicates, the quotas set in 2003 were originally based off of historical landings during the 21 years between 1980 and 2001. It's been recognized that NY had a problem with reporting. Fair enough. However,

NY fishermen have been punished for the last 15 years now for it, and it's time for a little relief. Therefore, I do not support status quo. I believe new options, to allow more equitable access to the fishery need to be explored.

I like the idea of the TMGC approach outlined in Appendix I, however I don't believe including NJ in the Southern zone makes any sense. NJ is fishing the same body of fish located in the NY bight, as all of the northern state boats. More than one third (35%) of the entire coastal commercial BSB harvest comes from Statistical Area 616, which is located equidistant from NY and NJ. It stands to reason that both states boats, and others, are harvesting fishing together here and it makes no sense to include NJ into the Southern region. If this method is chosen, NJ should be part of the Northern region.

I prefer the method outlined in Appendix II, which uses coastwide measures when the fish are primarily being targeted in the offshore federal waters, and then state measures when the fish are being targeted in the inshore state waters. This method implemented after a new survey of stock distribution, re-evaluation and re-allotment of the individual state quotas seems the most fair and equitable way to manage the states fishermen and access to the resource.

Additionally, for that stock distribution survey, survey methods need to be employed which allow the survey boat to fish in shallower waters during the times when the fish are in shallower (summer months). Missing the large body of fish due to equipment limitations and then not counting those fish, and calling it the best available science is not acceptable.

Thank you,

Chris Spies
NY Recreational Angler and AP member

Caitlin Starks

From: Top Hook <ssofabed@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 3:17 PM
To: Caitlin Starks
Subject: Fwd: AP Meeting Mar 1 2019

Hi Caitlin

Thank for your presentation. My vote would be at this time status quo, until we have better DATA.. I'm also sending you a comment. I made regarding NEW YORK'S CATCH 22 dilemma on harvest mortality. just want make sure its on the record. AGAIN.

Steven R Witthuhn
AP
MRAC N.Y.

From: ssofabed@aol.com
To: kdancy@mafmc.org
Sent: 3/1/2019 12:20:57 PM Eastern Standard Time
Subject: AP Meeting Mar 1 2019

Good Morning Kiley

Thank you for your presentation: My concerns that I am writing to you about are the catch 22 that management as produce. The DISCARD RATE as now become a big part of my worries. THE AM'S are now more apart of the process. This practice is only one part of synergy that is adding to (recruitment) questions. Dealing with N.Y. commercial fluke quota. a 50lb daily limit presents a dilemma for the draggers that the harvest method its creating, is an unwanted DISCARD. We are using a bulldozer to fill up a flowerpot. 400lbs on deck 50 lb limit. we know they are looking for quality, better price. (Female FISH). This also presents the same problem with black seabass. 50lb quota. I do not know if Mesh size is the answer or its a ROD AND REEL ONLY. N.Y. fisheries given the 50 lb daily quota. So I feel this catch 22 issue must be addressed, unwanted waste.

Thank you A.P. Member Steven R Witthuhn
N.Y. MRAC Council

Catch 22 50LBS = Discards = AM'S a.k.a pay back.



Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

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

MEMORANDUM

April 11, 2019

To: Summer Flounder, Scup and Black Sea Bass Management Board

From: Tina Berger, Director of Communications

RE: Advisory Panel Nomination

Please find attached a new nomination to the Summer Flounder, Scup and Black Sea Bass Advisory Panel – Paul Caruso, a recreational angler from Massachusetts. Please review this nomination for action at the next Board meeting.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (703) 842-0749 or tberger@asmfc.org.

Enc.

cc: Caitlin Starks and Kirby Rootes-Murdy

M19-27

Summer Flounder, Scup and Black Sea Bass Advisory Panel

Bolded names await Board review and approval

Massachusetts

Joseph Huckemeyer (party/charter; targets both scup/sf)

137 Pleasant Street

Hyannis, MA 02601

Phone (day): 508.790.0660

Phone (eve): 508.428.4029

FAX: 508.790.1321

joseph@meganet.net

Appt. Confirmed 5/9/07

Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14; 8/18

James Tietje (charterboat; targets both scup and BSB)

227 Clinton Avenue.

Falmouth, MA 02540

Phone (day): 508.548.2626

FAX: 508.548.1569

patriottoo@aol.com

Appt. Confirmed 5/30/96

Appt. Reconfirmed 9/15/00

Appt. Reconfirmed: 3/20/07

Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14; 8/18

Kurt Martin (comm. fish weirs/traps/hand lines)

43 Rayber Road

Orleans, MA 02653

Phone: 508.237.5888

Timebandit100@hotmail.com

Appt. Confirmed 10/24/18

Paul G. Caruso (rec; targets SF and BSB)

42 Matthew Way

Marstons Mills, MA 02648

Phone: 774.238.6018

pkcaruso@comcast.net

Rhode Island

Frank W. Blount, Jr. (rec/comm/for-hire; targets all 3 species)

390 Bridgetown Road

Saunderstown, RI 02874

Phone (day): 401.783.4988

Phone (eve): 401.789.2374

francesflt@aol.com

Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Michael Hall (comm trawl offshore; targets all 3 species)

30 Old Richmond Townhouse Road

Carolina, RI 02812

Phone: 401.742.1353

Mikecapt1@cox.net

Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Aaron Gewirtz (comm gillnet inshore; targets all 3 species)

360 Pine Hill Road

Wakefield, RI 02879

Phone: 401.218.5764

NBF05@verizon.net

Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Travis Barao (rec; targets SF and BSB)

15 Gibbs Street

Rumford, RI 02916

Phone (day): 401.301.7944

Phone (eve): 401.270.7161

travisbarao@gmail.com

Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Connecticut

John (Jack) Conway (rec; targets SF)

34 Edward Road

North Branford, CT 06471

JConway@sikorsky.com

Appt. Reconfirmed 9/14

Appt. Reconfirmed 10/17/14

Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Kyle Douton (for-hire/tackle shop owner; targets all 3 species)

5 Rockwell Street

Niantic, CT 06357

Phone (day): 860.739.7419

Phone (eve): 860.739.8899

FAX: 860.739.9208

kyle@jbtackle.com

Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Michael C. Plaia (rec/comm/for-hire; targets all 3 species)
119 Currituck Road
Newtown, CT 06470
Phone: 203.512.4280
Makomike333@yahoo.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

New York

Bob Busby (party/charter; targets SF)
375 Burtis Place
PO Box 129
Peconic, NY 11958
Phone: 631.765.1768
Rbusby@optonline.net
Appt. Confirmed 5/9/07
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/17/14
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Paul Forsberg (party/charter; targets scup)
1133 Marina Drive
Tarpon Springs FL 34689
pgfviking1@gmail.com
Appt. Confirmed 5/9/07
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Marc K. Hoffman (recreational; targets BSB)
140-A Union Avenue
Lynbrook, NY 11563
Phone: 516.887.8202
Phone (cell): 516.244.2146
FAX: 516.887.8113
MKHoffman@optonline.net
Appt. Confirmed 5/9/07
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Mark King (comm; targets all 3 species)
PO BOX 1039
Mattituck, NY 11952
Phone: 631-298-8782
Phone (cell): 631-766-7299
d713k@aol.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/24/14

Arthur Kretschmer (comm; targets all 3 species)
P.O. Box 81
Mattituck, NY 11952
Phone (home): 631.298.5372

Phone (cell): 631.397.2533
marcialom@msn.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/24/14

New Jersey

James R. Lovgren (comm; targets all 3 species)
17 Laurelhurst Drive
Bricktown, NJ 08724
Phone (day): 732.899.1872
Phone (eve): 732.840.9560
FAX: 732.840.4496
JLOVGREN3@GMAIL.COM
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Greg DiDomenico (commercial offshore; targets all 3 species)
1636 Delaware Avenue
Cape May, NJ 08204
Phone: 609.675.0202
FAX: 609.898.6070
gregdi@voicenet.com
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Robert Meimbresse (for-hire; targets SF)
179 Mudjekeewis Trail
Medford Lakes, NJ 08055
Appt. Confirmed 5/9/07
Captbob626@comcast.net
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Bill Shillingford (recreational; targets SF)
20 Pinewood Court
Swainton, NJ 08210
Phone: 609.287.4689
Appt. Confirmed 5/9/07
BUCKTAIL8@aol.com
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Delaware

P. Wes Townsend (comm/pot; targets BSB)
PO Box 207
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Phone: 302.542.1150
Pakafish1@yahoo.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Jay Little (rec)
1641 Bowers Beach Road
Frederica, DE 19946
Phone: 302.632.4714
Lusefest@gmail.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/24/18

Robert Hass
RAHAAS@VERIZON.NET
302.236.2128
Appt. Confirmed 10/24/18

Vacancy – recreational bait/tackle; targets SF

Maryland

Victor Bunting Jr. (for-hire; targets BSB)
11123 Bell Road
Whaleyville, MD 21872
Phone: 443.614.6484
Victorbunting@rocketmail.com
Appt. Confirmed 5/9/07
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Allen “Buddy” Seigel (rec; targets SF and BSB)
1091 Ocean Parkway
Berlin, MD 21811
Phone (day): 443.340.2833
Phone (eve): 410.208.3887
buddyscrn@gmail.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Jeff Eutsler (comm; target SF)
11933 Gray’s Corner Road
Berlin, MD 21811
Phone (day): 443.497.3078
Phone (eve): 410.213.2436
Tandje1@comcast.com
Appt. Confirmed 2/2/16

Virginia

Mark Hodges (comm/pot; targets BSB)
2456 Bullock Trail
Virginia Beach, VA 23454-5219
Phone: (757) 463-5475
Email: mhodges@cox.net
Appt. Confirmed 5/9/07
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Steven Wray (for-hire/bait & tackle; targets SF & BSB)
2109 West Great Neck Road, Suite 100
Virginia Beach, VA 23451
Phone: 757.237.7517
FAX: 757.481.4925
captstv@yahoo.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

C. Meade Amory (comm trawl; targets all 3 species)
101 South King Street
Hampton, VA 23669
Phone (day): 757.722.1915
Phone (eve): 757.876.6466
FAX: 757.723.1184
meade@amoryseafood.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Dr. Ken Neill, III (rec; targets all 3 species)
117 Kenneth Drive
Seaford, VA 23696
Phone (day): 757.898.6832
Phone (eve): 757.890.2711
FAX: 757.890.0200
jackcrevelle@msn.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14

Kevin Smith (rec; targets SF)
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond VA 23229
Phone: 804.627.1575
kevin.m.smith@suez-na.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/24/18

North Carolina

Art Smith (processor; SF)
368 Hubs Rec Road
Belhaven, NC 27810
Phone (day): 252.721.0735
Phone (eve): 252.964.2195
artsmith@gotricounty.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/28/14
Appt. Reconfirmed 8/18

Brent Fulcher (comm. otter/bottom trawl;
target all 3 species)
P.O. Box 3321

New Bern, NC 28564
Phone (cell): 252.514.7003
Phone (work): 252.637.1552
bjseafood@earthlink.net
Appt. Confirmed 10/24/18

James Ruhle (comm. otter/bottom trawl; target
all 3 species)
P.O. Box 302
Wanchese, NC 27981
Phone: 252.423.0238
fvdaranar@aol.com
Appt. Confirmed 10/24/18

PRFC

John Dean (comm; targets SF)
49925 Hays Beach Road
Scotland, MD 20687
Phone: 301.904.8078
selbysuzi1121@aol.com
Appt. Confirmed: 11/25/96
Appt. Reconfirmed 7/26/00
Appt. Reconfirmed 2/07
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Dandridge C. Crabbe (charterboat; targets SF)
51 Railway Drive
Heathsville, VA 22473
Phone: 804.453.3251
dcrabbe@crabbescharterfishing.com
Appt. Confirmed 12/11/01
Appt. Reconfirmed 2/07
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/28/14

Nontraditional Stakeholders

Roman Jesien (habitat; BSB interest)
MD Coastal Bays Program
9919 Stephen Decatur Highway, Suite 4
Ocean City, MD 21842
Phone (day): 410.213.2297
Phone (evening): 410.228.5193
science@mdcoastalbays.org
Appt. Confirmed 1/31/07

Vacancy



ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

Advisory Panel Nomination Form

This form is designed to help nominate Advisors to the Commission's Species Advisory Panels. The information on the returned form will be provided to the Commission's relevant species management board or section. Please answer the questions in the categories (All Nominees, Commercial Fisherman, Charter/Headboat Captain, Recreational Fisherman, Dealer/Processor, or Other Interested Parties) that pertain to the nominee's experience. If the nominee fits into more than one category, answer the questions for all categories that fit the situation. **Also, please fill in the sections which pertain to All Nominees (pages 1 and 2). In addition, nominee signatures are required to verify the provided information (page 4), and Commissioner signatures are requested to verify Commissioner consensus (page 4). Please print and use a black pen.**

Form submitted by: DAVID PIERCE State: MA
(your name)

Name of Nominee: Paul G. Caruso

Address: 42 Matthew Way

City, State, Zip: Marston's Mills, MA 02648

Please provide the appropriate numbers where the nominee can be reached:

Phone (day): 774-238-6018 Phone (evening): 508-428-3567

FAX: _____ Email: pkcaruso@comcast.net

FOR ALL NOMINEES:

1. Please list, in order of preference, the Advisory Panel for which you are nominating the above person.

1. blue fish
2. summer flounder, black seabass, scup
3. _____
4. _____

2. Has the nominee been found in violation of criminal or civil federal fishery law or regulation or convicted of any felony or crime over the last three years?

yes _____ no X

3. Is the nominee a member of any fishermen's organizations or clubs?

yes X no _____

If "yes," please list them below by name.

Cape Cod Flyrodders Association

4. What kinds (species) of fish and/or shellfish has the nominee fished for during the past year?

Striped bass
bluefish
summer flounder

black sea bass
false albacore / bonito
quahog, oyster, soft shell clam

5. What kinds (species) of fish and/or shellfish has the nominee fished for in the past?

above plus
Atlantic cod
Blue fin tuna

Atlantic mackerel
Haddock
Tautog
Lobster

FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN:

- How many years has the nominee been the commercial fishing business? _____ years
- Is the nominee employed only in commercial fishing? yes _____ no _____
- What is the predominant gear type used by the nominee? _____
- What is the predominant geographic area fished by the nominee (i.e., inshore, offshore)? _____

FOR CHARTER/HEADBOAT CAPTAINS:

- How long has the nominee been employed in the charter/headboat business? _____ years
- Is the nominee employed only in the charter/headboat industry? yes _____ no _____
If "no," please list other type(s) of business(es) and/occupation(s): _____

- How many years has the nominee lived in the home port community? _____ years
If less than five years, please indicate the nominee's previous home port community.

FOR RECREATIONAL FISHERMEN:

1. How long has the nominee engaged in recreational fishing? 56+ years
2. Is the nominee working, or has the nominee ever worked in any area related to the fishing industry? yes no

If "yes," please explain.

former Senior Marine Fisheries Biologist for MADMF
former Commercial Fisherman 20 years

FOR SEAFOOD PROCESSORS & DEALERS:

1. How long has the nominee been employed in the business of seafood processing/dealing?
_____ years
2. Is the nominee employed only in the business of seafood processing/dealing?
yes _____ no _____ If "no," please list other type(s) of business(es) and/or occupation(s):

3. How many years has the nominee lived in the home port community? _____ years
If less than five years, please indicate the nominee's previous home port community.

FOR OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

1. How long has the nominee been interested in fishing and/or fisheries management? _____ years
2. Is the nominee employed in the fishing business or the field of fisheries management?
yes _____ no _____

If "no," please list other type(s) of business(es) and/or occupation(s):

FOR ALL NOMINEES:

In the space provided below, please provide the Commission with any additional information which you feel would assist us in making choosing new Advisors. You may use as many pages as needed.

Nominee Signature: Paul G. Caruso

Date: 3-6-19

Name: Paul G. Caruso
(please print)

COMMISSIONERS SIGN-OFF (not required for non-traditional stakeholders)

David Deice
State Director

State Legislator

Governor's Appointee