

# Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

## Horseshoe Crab Management Board

*October 24, 2018  
11:15 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.  
New York, New York*

### 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 (*M. Rhodes*) 11:15 a.m.
2. Board Consent 11:15 a.m.
  - Approval of Agenda
  - Approval of Proceedings from October 2017
3. Public Comment 11:20 a.m.
4. Set 2019 Harvest Specifications **Final Action** 11:30 a.m.
  - Review Horseshoe Crab and Red Knot Indices of Abundance for 2018 Adaptive Resource Management (ARM) Model Runs (*K. Anstead*)
  - Review Results of 2018 ARM Model Runs (*K. Anstead*)
  - Set 2019 Harvest Specifications (*M. Schmidtke*)
5. Progress Update on Horseshoe Crab Benchmark Stock Assessment (*K. Anstead*) 11:50 a.m.
6. Consider 2018 Fishery Management Plan Review and State Compliance Reports (*M. Schmidtke*) **Action** 11:55 a.m.
7. Elect Vice-Chair **Action** 12:05 p.m.
8. Review and Populate Advisory Panel Membership (*T. Berger*) **Action** 12:10 p.m.
9. Other Business/Adjourn 12:15 p.m.

The meeting will be held at the Roosevelt Hotel, 45 East 45<sup>th</sup> Street & Madison Avenue, New York, NY; 212.661.9600

# MEETING OVERVIEW

**Horseshoe Crab Management Board Meeting**  
**Wednesday October 24, 2018**  
**11:15 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.**  
**New York, New York**

Chair: Dr. Malcolm Rhodes (SC) Assumed Chairmanship: 10/17	Horseshoe Crab Technical Committee Chair: Rachel Sysak (NY)	Stock Assessment Subcommittee Chair: Dr. John Sweka (FWS)
Vice Chair: Vacant	Horseshoe Crab Advisory Panel Chair: Allen Burgenson (MD)	Law Enforcement Committee Representative: Doug Messeck (DE)
Delaware Bay Ecosystem Technical Committee Chair: Greg Breese (FWS)		Previous Board Meeting: October 17, 2017
Voting Members: MA, RI, CT, NY, NJ, DE, MD, DC, PRFC, VA, NC, SC, GA, FL, NMFS, USFWS (16 votes)		

## 2. Board Consent

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Proceedings from October 17, 2017 Board Meeting

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. Set 2019 Delaware Bay Horseshoe Crab Bait Harvest Specifications (11:30-11:50 a.m.) Final Action**

### **Background**

- The ARM Subcommittee met by conference call in October 2018.
- The Virginia Tech Trawl Survey was conducted in 2017, so the ARM Subcommittee used population estimates from this survey to estimate horseshoe crab abundance in the Delaware Bay region.
- The ARM model was run using estimated abundances of horseshoe crabs in fall of 2017 and red knots in spring of 2018 to provide a recommendation for harvest specifications for Delaware Bay states in 2019 (**Briefing Materials**).

**Presentations**

- Horseshoe Crab and Red Knot Abundances and Results of 2018 ARM Model Runs by K. Anstead.

**Board actions for consideration at this meeting**

- Consider ARM harvest recommendations and set specifications for the Delaware Bay states in 2019.

**5. Progress Update on Horseshoe Crab Benchmark Stock Assessment (11:50 a.m.-11:55 a.m.)****Background**

- A benchmark stock assessment is currently underway. Several workshops and developments have occurred since the last Board meeting which impact the progress and timeline of the assessment.

**Presentations**

- Progress Update on Benchmark Stock Assessment by K. Anstead.

**6. Consider Approval of the 2018 FMP Review and State Compliance (11:55 a.m. -12:05 p.m.)****Action****Background**

- State Compliance Reports were due March 1, 2018.
- The Plan Review Team reviewed each state report and compiled the annual FMP Review (**Supplemental Materials**).
- The Potomac River Fisheries Commission, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida have requested and meet the requirements of *de minimis* status.

**Presentations**

- Overview of the FMP Review by M. Schmidtke

**Board actions for consideration at this meeting**

- Accept 2018 FMP Review and State Compliance Reports.
- Approve *de minimis* requests.

**7. Elect Vice-Chair (12:05-12:10 p.m.) Action****8. Review and Populate Advisory Panel Membership (12:10 -12:15 p.m.) Possible Action****Background**

- Delaware nominated Lawrence Voss to be appointed to the Horseshoe Crab Advisory Panel (AP) as a representative of the commercial pot fishery (**Briefing Materials**).

**Board actions for consideration at this meeting**

- Approve the nomination to appoint Lawrence Voss to the Horseshoe Crab AP.

**9. Other Business/Adjourn**

## Horseshoe Crab

**Activity level: High**

**Committee Overlap Score:** Low (SAS overlaps with BERP)

### Committee Task List

- TC/SAS – October 2018-May 2019: Benchmark stock assessment
  - SAS – October 2018 – February 2019: data analysis and report writing
  - TC – February 2019: review benchmark assessment report
  - SAS – March 2019: 3 day Peer Review Workshop
  - SAS Chair – May 2019: Present the stock assessment to the Board
- TC – March 1<sup>st</sup>: Annual compliance reports due
- ARM & TC – Fall: Annual ARM model to set Delaware Bay specifications, review red knot and VT trawl survey results

**TC Members:** Rachel Sysak (NY, TC Chair), Gregory Breese (USFWS), Jeff Brunson (SC), Joanna Burger (Rutgers), Ellen Cosby (PRFC), Claire Crowley (FL), Justin Davis (CT), Jeffrey Dobbs (NC), Steve Doctor (MD), Amber Francis (NJ), Adam Kenyon (VA), Mike Millard (USFWS), Natalie Ameal (RI), Derek Perry (MA), Linda Stehlik (NMFS), Chris Wright (NMFS), Jordan Zimmerman (DE), Kristen Anstead (ASMFC), Michael Schmidtke (ASMFC)

**SAS Members:** John Sweka (USFWS, SAS Chair), Linda Barry (NJ), Jeffrey Dobbs (NC), Michael Kendrick (SC), Natalie Ameal (RI), David Smith (USGS), Rachel Sysak (NY), Richard Wong (DE), Kristen Anstead (ASMFC), Michael Schmidtke (ASMFC)

**DRAFT PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION  
HORSESHOE CRAB MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**The Marriott Norfolk Waterside**  
Norfolk, Virginia  
**October 17, 2017**

These minutes are draft and subject to approval by the Horseshoe Crab Management Board  
The Board will review the minutes during its next meeting

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Call to Order, Chairman Malcolm Rhodes .....1  
Approval of Agenda .....1  
Approval of Proceedings, October 2016.....1  
Public Comment.....1

Review Results of Eel and Whelk Bait Practices Survey.....1

2018 Benchmark Stock Assessment .....6  
    Review Terms of Reference.....7  
    Review Data Confidentiality Practices Within the Assessment.....8  
    Advisory Panel Recommendations..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Set 2018 Harvest Specifications for the Delaware Bay.....14  
    Review Horseshoe Crab and Red Know Indices of Abundance .....14  
    Review Results of the ARM Model Run Integration Biomedical Data and Recommendations  
    from the ARM Subcommittee, Technical Committee, and Advisory Panel.....15

2017 FMP and State Compliance Reports .....23

Populate Advisory Panel with Nontraditional Stakeholders.....24

Elect Vice-Chair .....25

Other Business .....25

Adjournment.....25

## INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of Agenda** by Consent (Page 1).
2. **Approval of Proceedings of October 2016** by Consent (Page 1).
3. **Move to accept the Terms of Reference for the 2018 Horseshoe Crab Benchmark Stock Assessment and add a Term of Reference evaluating the sub-lethal effects of biomedical bleeding** (Page 14). Motion by Stewart Michels; second by Colleen Giannini. Motion approved by consent (Page 14).
4. **Move to select Harvest Package 3 for 2018 Horseshoe crab harvest in Delaware Bay** (Page 15). Motion by Stewart Michels; second by Michael Millard. Motion carried (Page 15).
5. **Move to initiate an addendum that the ARM model incorporate the biomedical harvest using the Preferred Option** (Page 19). Motion by Mike Millard; second by Chris Wright. Motion fails (Page 21).
6. **Move to accept the Horseshoe Crab 2017 FMP Review and State Compliance Reports and approve *de minimis* requests for the Potomac River Fisheries Commission, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida** (Page 24). Motion by Robert Boyles; second by Rob O'Reilly. Motion carried (Page 24).
7. **Move to nominate John Maniscalco as Vice-Chair of the Horseshoe Crab Management Board** (Page 25). Motion by Dan McKiernan; second by Michelle Duval. Motion carried (Page 25).
8. **Move to adjourn**, by Consent (Page 25).

**ATTENDANCE**

**Board Members**

Ray Kane, MA (GA)	Michael Luisi, MD, proxy for D. Blazer (AA)
Rep. Sarah Peake, MA (LA)	Rachel Dean, MD (GA)
Dan McKiernan, MA, proxy for D. Pierce (AA)	Ed O'Brien, MD, proxy for Del. Stein (LA)
Bob Ballou, RI, proxy for J. Coit (AA)	Rob O'Reilly, VA, proxy for J. Bull (AA)
Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)	Catherine Davenport, VA (GA)
David Borden, RI (GA)	Kyle Schick, VA, proxy for Sen. Stuart (LA)
Colleen Giannini, CT, proxy for M. Alexander (AA)	Michelle Duval, NC, proxy for B. Davis (AA)
Sen. Craig Miner, CT (LA)	David Bush, NC, proxy for Rep. Steinburg (LA)
Lance Stewart, CT (GA)	Robert Boyles, Jr., SC (AA)
Sen. Phil Boyle, NY (LA)	Malcolm Rhodes, SC (GA)
Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)	Spud Woodward, GA (AA)
Russ Allen, NJ, proxy for L. Herrighty (AA)	Pat Geer, GA, proxy for Rep. Nimmer (LA)
Tom Fote, NJ (GA)	James Estes, FL, proxy for J. McCawley (AA)
Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Andrzejczak (LA)	Sherry White, USFWS
Stewart Michels, DE, proxy for D. Saveikis (AA)	Chris Wright, NMFS
Craig Pugh, DE, proxy for Rep. Carson (LA)	Martin Gary, PRFC
Roy Miller, DE (GA)	

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

**Ex-Officio Members**

Steve Doctor, Technical Committee Chair

Doug Messeck, Law Enforcement Representative

**Staff**

Robert Beal  
Toni Kerns  
Tina Berger

Mike Schmidtke  
Megan Ware  
Kristen Anstead

**Guests**

Loren Lustig, PA, Gov. Appointee Commissioner  
Mike Millard, USFWS

Andrew Shiels, PA, Administrative proxy



The Horseshoe Crab Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Hampton Roads Ballroom V of the Marriott Waterside Hotel, Norfolk, Virginia, October 17, 2017, and was called to order at 9:45 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Malcolm Rhodes.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIRMAN MALCOLM RHODES: I wanted to welcome everyone to the Horseshoe Crab Management Board meeting. If you are on another flight, please get on the correct plane. My name is Malcolm Rhodes; I'm taking over for Jim Gilmore, and wanted to welcome you all here.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: We had sent out materials previously; we had an agenda, and I was wondering if there were any additions or corrections to it. Seeing none; we'll move for approval by consent.

### **APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: We also received the proceedings from last October's meeting. Were there any corrections or changes to those? Seeing none; we'll approve those by consent.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: This is a time for public comment for any issues not on the agenda. Is there anyone from the public who wishes to speak to the Board?

### **REVIEW RESULTS OF EEL AND WHELK BAIT PRACTICES SURVEY**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Great, seeing none; we will move down to Item Number 4. Rachel is going to review the results of the eel and whelk bait practices survey.

MS. RACHEL SYSAK: Good morning everyone. I'll be presenting the Horseshoe Crab Technical Committee's report on Bait Use Surveys of the American Eel and the Channeled Whelk Fisheries.

We had two main goals with this survey. One was to discover how horseshoe crabs are used as bait in the trap pot gear, for both the American eel and the channeled whelk fisheries.

We wanted to look at things like preference, prevalence, and how the bait performed. The second goal was to provide information for the future viability of manufactured or artificial baits. We wanted to know things like the amount of horseshoe crab that was used, average cost per trap, and the industry's impression of manufactured baits.

For our methods, between January and February of 2017 surveys were mailed to all current permit holders in the eel and channeled whelk fisheries. The only exceptions to that were New York only mailed the survey to fishers that were active in the previous two years, and South Carolina does not currently permit the use of horseshoe crabs as bait.

However, they do have a small scale whelk fishery, and a description of that fishery and its bait practices was included in Appendix 3 of the bait survey report. For the survey responses, on this graph you can see the state on the left hand side and in blue are how many surveys were sent, and orange are the number of responses that were received.

Overall for the American eel surveys that were sent out; the return rate was 30 percent. Massachusetts and Connecticut do not currently have active American eel fisheries. For the responses for the channeled whelk fisheries, again in blue are the surveys sent and orange are the number of responses that were received back. The return rate for the voluntary surveys was 32 percent overall. For Massachusetts the survey was a requirement for permit renewal; so that's why they had such a high return rate. As you can see also from this chart, Georgia and Florida do not currently have channeled whelk fisheries.

One of the first things that we asked was how experienced the responders were. As you can see, the largest slice of this pie is over 20 years of experience, 33 percent had more than that and over 50 percent had at least 11 years of experience. Overall the respondents were experienced in their fishery.

The results for bait preference, the next couple of slides I'm going to try to use the same color scheme. You'll notice that the channeled whelk fishery responses on the circle chart are in purple and the American eel fishery are in green. Overall the channeled whelk fishery is using more horseshoe crabs as bait than the American eel fishery; 92 percent of channeled whelk fishers reported using horseshoe crabs as bait, versus only 23 percent of American eel fishers.

Now to expand on that in both fisheries most fishers were reporting using multiple primary baits in their pots. Only 8 percent of channeled whelk fishers reported only using horseshoe crabs, versus 1 percent of American eel fishers only using horseshoe crabs. For a brief summary of the other primary baits that they were using, these were the four main primary baits.

They included fish as racks or whole, shellfish, blue crabs and green crabs; and this was for both fisheries. To continue on how they were using horseshoe crabs. The American eel fishery uses more female crabs than male crabs; 66 percent of American eel fishers reported using female crabs versus 49 percent of channeled whelk fishers.

In addition to that most fishers are not using whole crabs, so both fisheries use a larger proportion of male crabs than female crabs; and this could be related to the fact that male crabs are smaller than female crabs. If you look at this circle chart; I know it's a little bit busy. But the darker green for the American eel fishery is less than a quarter female; and the lighter section is greater than a half of a male, and the same color scheme for the channeled whelk fishery.

We also asked them about bait saving devices, like bait bags. They were more common among channeled whelk fishers than American eel fishers; 92 percent of channeled whelk fishers reported some type of bait saver use, versus only 21 percent of American eel fishers. Most states, with the exception of Delaware, do not currently require the use of bait saving devices in these fisheries.

We also asked questions on the type of gear they were fishing. Coastwide the channeled whelk fishery has more fishing gear to bait on average. There was an average reported maximum of 212 pots in the water for channeled whelk fishers versus 165 pots for American eel fishers. Channeled whelk fishers were also fishing more pots per trip on average; they had 147 pots versus only 80 pots for the American eel fishers.

There were regional differences and gear composition for the channeled whelk fishery, Massachusetts through New York fish less pots on average than New Jersey through Virginia. For the American eel fishery, Maryland had several fishers that reported extremely high maximum pots in the water and pots used per trip; which kind of skewed some of those numbers. For how bait is needed seasonally, the coastwide channeled whelk fishery has two peaks, and a defined season that begins in April and ends after December. Peak fishing activity, as you can see from this chart, occurs between May through July, and September through December. This is just the number of responses.

For the American eel fishing activity, the coastwide fishery also has two peaks, but it occurs more continuously through the year. Peak fishing activity occurs between March through June and September through November. We asked about each fisheries manufactured bait usage. Both fisheries had low percentage of participants who had tried manufactured or artificial baits.

For the fishers that tried the baits, most of them reported poor results. As you can see on this pie chart, the orange are the people who have never used it, and that big chunk of blue are the people that said yes they used it, but had poor results. If you can see the tiny little sliver of red, those are the people that used it and thought it worked.

Based on Technical Committee discussions of the previous manufactured bait trials that we had, poor results might not have been solely based on bad performance. Fishers reported issues of cost, and issues of availability that also affected their view of manufactured bait. For information that is important for any viability of a future manufactured bait. Both fisheries and all current bait practices, the bait typically lasts for two days. On average it's costing \$1.50 or less per pot.

Overall the price per pot was generally more expensive in the whelk fishery than in the eel fishery. Based on these results that we received, manufactured bait, in order to be viable, would need to last at least two days; and it would need to cost \$1.50 or less to have a chance of success. It would also need to use either less than an eighth of a female horseshoe crab, or less than a quarter of a male horseshoe crab; to use less crabs per trap than the current bait practices, questions?

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Well first of all, I want to thank the Technical Committee for making the survey and getting all the results together. This was something that the Board asked the Technical Committee to do at the annual meeting last year; so this is helpful to all of us to understand kind of where we are with the baits, what they're used for and where we're going. I saw hands up over here, Emerson and Tom.

MR. EMERSON C. HASBROUCK: Hi Rachel, thank you for that presentation, it was very good; and thank you for doing that survey, it's very interesting. The one question I had was on one of your slides you showed that shellfish was a large component of alternative bait. What was

included in that category of shellfish? Was it basically bivalve mollusks or was it something else? What was grouped in there?

MS. SYSAK: We included complete breakdowns in the supplemental materials we sent out; but it was a mix, and it was very dependent on which state you were in. It was largely bivalve mollusks, but there were, I believe some shrimp and other things included in that category as well. We break down the full list in the report.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Tom.

MR. THOMAS P. FOTE: Rachel, we've done this kind of study before over the years. I think it's been three or four times we've done this study. Did you go back and look at the comparison of what the results on this were in compared to the other two studies, I think two or three. I'm not sure exactly the number, to see if we started getting more participation or less, as far as using artificial bait?

MS. SYSAK: I wasn't involved in any of the previous studies, and I wasn't aware that we looked at how bait was used. Are you talking specifically about the artificial bait studies that were previously done?

MR. FOTE: Yes.

MS. SYSAK: We didn't do a cross comparison. The Technical Committee felt that we should at least get a baseline of what current fishery practices were doing; and just an overall view of the manufactured bait that had been used. Certainly not everybody who participated in those previous bait trials might have responded on this report. Responses were anonymous. We weren't able to kind of go back and see if everyone who participated in the other trials participated in this. We only got a broad overview of just their impression of manufactured bait.

MR. FOTE: I want to follow up to that. When I was looking at the participation from surveys; and

since part of my background was marketing advertising, I really realized that Massachusetts skewed the numbers on one of those, in comparison to New Jersey who basically had a lot of things going out, a lot questionnaires going on and very small response.

If you looked at individual states, New Jersey's response was probably less than 3 percent or 4 percent or 5 percent of what was going on, and how did you weight those. Because you're looking at it in one way, Massachusetts kind of skewed the numbers for all the other states because it was mandatory.

MS. SYSAK: Right, so for our analysis of the results we did break it down by state. We did a lot of side-by-side analysis of how each state's results came out. In this particular presentation that I did, we took the overall results; because for the most part, even though yes there were a larger number of responses for Massachusetts, and a larger number of participants in Massachusetts.

But overall their results were very similar. The biggest differences that we saw was in the amount of gear that they used; so they had larger participation, but a smaller amount of gear that they reported on average and a smaller amount of gear per trip.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Roy Miller.

MR. ROY W. MILLER: Thank you, Rachel for the survey report. What is discouraging for me, and perhaps other members of the Board are the poor results for artificial baits. Our state spent a fair amount of money a number of years ago, funding University of Delaware studies on artificial baits; and we all had high hopes for artificial baits.

To see there, I think it was less than 1 percent or something; it was a very low percentage reported use. Did you receive any feedback on what the principal complaints were, and how that situation

could be rectified or is there a light at the end of the tunnel with regard to artificial baits?

MS. SYSAK: We had a lot of detailed discussions before we sent this survey out and we were discussing a lot of the complaints that we had received about artificial baits. That was why we tried to put this together in a way that we got at what the average cost was, how long it was used for, and how much horseshoe crab was in it; because the artificial bait trials, I believe that were used in the past, used based on these survey results about the same amount of horseshoe crab that the fishery was already using on its own.

In addition to that I know that there were reports of longevity issues, because I guess the type of manufactured bait that was sort of a puck dissolved fairly quickly; and didn't get to that two day soak time. Those were complaints, and also another complaint was that the cost was about the same or more than what was already available. That was once again why we sent this out; to just try to get a bigger picture of what would a manufactured bait need to actually be successful?

MR. MILLER: Could I follow up just a second.

MS. SYSAK: Sure.

MR. MILLER: The reason that's discouraging is I remember the trials, and there was much better bait integrity earlier on in the process; when it was still in the experimental research phase. Something happened between the experimental research phase and the production phase that decreased the integrity of that bait. I find that discouraging.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: I saw Rob O'Reilly.

MR. O'REILLY: Thank you for the report. I just wanted to make a correction about the states requirements. In Virginia, the timing might be off here, but I remember Bob Fischer from VIMS did a study. I want to say that by 2006 bait bags were

required in Virginia, where only a half of a female horseshoe crab could be used, and whole male crab. I just wanted to make that correction. The other situation is in that graphic where you look at the bait, and fish, and shellfish, and everything is sort of included.

It probably isn't weighed or weighted by regional differences. For example, not only are there regional differences, but also there are magnitude of differences in terms of the harvest. It may be good in a further follow up to something like that to look at the regional specific uses of bait relative to the expected amounts of bait; because of the harvest amount. I just wanted to add that so thank you very much.

MS. SYSAK: Thank you, also that we did break down everything by region, by state in the actual baits that we report if you wanted to look at the differences.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Are there any other questions? Bob.

MR. ROBERT BALLOU: I probably have the wrong name tag, sorry. Thank you, Rachel. Does the, I realize we call it artificial bait, or manufactured bait, same concept. Does the manufactured bait remain available; or did this survey hark back to the trial period, which I believe was a couple of years ago. I have a follow up, but I'm just wondering do you know whether the artificial bait remains available to the industry this year today, as an alternative to using actual horseshoe crabs?

MS. SYSAK: This is based mostly on the Technical Committee discussions, but to our knowledge it isn't in a wide available or large use at all in the past couple years. Past the trials it doesn't seem that any of them were successful.

MR. BALLOU: My follow, and thank you for that. I share much of what Roy Miller indicated, and that is I just feel that it's tough to do an analysis like this when you don't have a readily available alternative. Given Roy's comments about how

there seemed to be a transition in integrity that strikes me that the industry is obviously going with what is most available, and then of course price and efficacy all fold in.

Where do we go from here? I mean I think that is going to be a key part of the discussion either about to happen or currently happening. It strikes me that we've either got to just rely on market forces, which may well be influenced by an assessment, which may well reduce the availability of horseshoe crabs.

Then low and behold the market responds, or we try to nudge that issue by trying to work again through a bait trial process; to try to see if we can address the very issues that you raise, and an excellent analysis in terms of cost. I mean clearly this is not going to work unless it is cost effective and the efficacy is there, and the convenience is there.

I remembered thinking about the difference between just having a cooler full of hockey pucks versus having the back of your boat full with the crabs. It seems to me like we still have a door to knock on here; but I'm just not sure how best to proceed. This survey is great, but it's not compelling in terms of what it tells us.

It seems to me that we've got to figure out best how to move forward, and either that's going to happen through the pressure of a stock assessment and potentially some limitations on the availability of crab; or we're going to have to work to try to figure out how to encourage the availability of a product that is appealing to the industry, which then allows for a natural transition.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Colleen.

MS. COLLEEN GIANINI: I just wanted to speak to Roy's concerns too with some of the observations that I had during those initial artificial bait trials; specifically one of them being the economics of the cost per bait. In our experience that we had

in Connecticut, it required two times the amount of bait that the manufacturers thought would be necessary to result in catches that would be worthwhile.

Consistency was a problem in warm weather, and in areas with high flow. The bait seemed to disappear almost overnight. One of the other big issues with it was because it requires refrigeration, and not freezing, the availability of shore side walk-in refrigerators was a problem in our area. I'm not sure if other states have that issue. But freezing the artificial bait, at least the bait that we had with the manufacturer that made it, it essentially just freeze dried the product and that affected its performance as well.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: All right one more, Pat.

MR. PAT GEER: There is a company in North Carolina; I think it's called Kepley BioSystems that has got North Carolina Sea Grant money to look at what they're calling OrganoBait. They also have a large National Science Foundation Grant to develop these baits in like a cube, so it doesn't need refrigeration.

They're starting to look at, they've been looking at lobsters and blue crabs, but they also want to look at these fisheries as well; trying to eliminate horseshoe crabs. Has anybody heard of this company at all? I'm just seeing shaking heads. They've contacted us because of work they're doing, but there is a company that is out there trying to develop these, and they have a very large National Science Foundation Grant to do this.

The idea of this grant is to be able to create a business that can do this on a regular basis and have it be cost effective. They are just in the infancy of this project; so I don't know how successful they're going to be. But we should all be aware that there are other companies out there trying to do this.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thanks for the information. Stewart.

MR. STEWART MICHELS: Rachel that was an excellent and very thorough review of the fishery and their needs. Just to clarify, so currently the fishery is operating with the same amount of horseshoe crab. They are basically using the same amount of horseshoe crab now that was contained in that alternative bait.

MS. SYSAK: Yes. Some of that was because of the reasons that Colleen stated; which two times the amount that they thought would be necessary ended up being necessary, and consistency issues, so if it broke down they needed more. That was what ultimately made it the same amount that people are already using; and those are just for the baits that also included horseshoe crab in that mixture.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, great presentation, wonderful talk from the Board, lots of points brought up, historic and kind of looking towards for going in the future. Is there any more discussion on this topic?

#### **2018 BENCHMARK STOCK ASSESSMENT**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: All right seeing none; we'll move to the fifth topic, which is preparing for the 2018 Benchmark Stock Assessment. I'm turning it over to Kristen.

MS. KRISTEN ANSTEAD: Good morning. This morning I want to go over our plans for a benchmark stock assessment for next year, and then present the terms of reference for your consideration. This is just a reminder of the previous stock assessments that have been done for horseshoe crab.

In 2009 was our last benchmark, and at that time there was no formal set of reference points. I've included a table from the stock assessment overview of kind of the status of the horseshoe crab population in each of the regions. New England and New York both showed declining

population; and Delaware Bay and the southeast were having increasing populations at that time. There was an update done in 2013, and the results were consistent with the benchmark for the most part. During both of these times it was stated that biomedical should be considered to be included in the models for horseshoe crab. It was not included in that benchmark or that update. The reason that biomedical increasingly should be included as part of the coastwide and regional trends, is because proportionately it's making up more of the overall harvest.

You have your bait harvest in green, and then the lighter blue is the biomedical harvest. It's thought that 15 percent we attribute the 15 percent mortality to their harvest, so 85 percent we believe survive, and that's the light blue, the combined – all of the biomedical harvest. Then the small, dark blue is the mortality that we're attributing to them.

But as bait harvest has come down proportionately speaking, biomedical is making up more of this kind of coastwide numbers. This is where we are with biomedical facilities. I believe the 2009 benchmark, there were four facilities at that time. We now have six along the coast. We still have some data confidentiality issues; because while there are four in the Delaware Bay, which exceeds the Rule of Three, regionally we would still be getting into some confidentiality issues.

For example, if we did publish Delaware Bay numbers, Massachusetts could subtract what they harvest and then identify what South Carolina harvests. We will still have some data confidentiality issues, even though we have more facilities at this time. This is the table that's included in the FMP review every year of the number of horseshoe crabs harvested, bled and the 15 percent mortality applied to those.

That is in the bottom in the, I guess it's orange. The FMP establishes a mortality threshold of 57,500 horseshoe crabs; which has been

exceeded from 2007 to 2015. You can see for the first time that in 2016 it was not exceeded, and this was due to temporary changes in productivity. We're moving into the 2018 assessment with these concerns over New England and New York continuing to show declining trends and the continued need to include biomedical in a regional assessment. That is what we've been tasked with moving forward.

How we will present this still sort of remains to be seen. We're doing our data workshop January/February of next year; and once the SAS kind of looks at the data, looks at the potential models, sees the biomedical, we hope to have a better idea of how we'll move forward with this black box assessment.

#### **REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE**

MS. KRISTEN ANSTEAD: What I would like to do now is go through the terms of reference. I've abbreviated them.

If you want to see the full terms of reference they are on Page 58 of your meeting materials. But I've sort of summarized them. I'll just kind of talk about what's different from our standard TORs that are in our TC Guidance Document. These have been amended to kind of address this regional task; as well as the biomedical inclusion. Since we're tasked with doing a regional assessment, the first TOR will be to define and justify the use of population structure.

We're likely to also look at this population on a coastwide level; but if we are going to do it regionally we need to thoroughly examine how that should look. The TOR 2 is pretty standard characterized precision and accuracy of fishery independent and fishery dependent data; including biomedical data. TOR 3 will be to develop the models; and there are some sub-points under that. But I've put up the H bullet, because it is specific to horseshoe crab; which will be incorporate biomedical into the models used, and reassess the associated mortality of bled crabs on a coastwide and a regional level. As you

know right now we do the 15 percent mortality; and this is a benchmark, so this is an opportunity to go back to the literature, to look at different datasets, and really consider is 15 percent the best for the coastwide?

Should we be doing this regionally? Is what's happening in one region different from what's happening in other, and should they have different mortality associated with it? We'll go back to the drawing board for that. That's an explicit task for our TORs. Four and 5 are to characterize the uncertainty in the model and to perform retrospective analysis. TOR 6 is to recommend a stock status and reference points.

Then 7 are other potential scientific issues, and one that has been added as a sub-bullet here is to compare any model output for the Delaware Bay Region with the output from the ARM model. We currently use the ARM model to set the harvest specifications in the Delaware Bay. If the stock assessment is showing a different picture than the ARM model is, or the same, we need to discuss that in the stock assessment.

Then TORs 8-10 is the minority report if there is one, to make research recommendations, and also recommend a timing of the next assessment going forward. Then we have kind of the mirror of them in the peer review; and those are also pretty standard TORs. Now, I think we'll do the AP report.

#### **REVIEW DATA CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES WITHIN THE ASSESSMENT**

MR. MIKE SCHMIDTKE: The Advisory Panel met in September via conference call; and they have some recommendations that they would like to make in reference to the stock assessment process.

One thing that I just wanted to hit on before we move to that is related to the confidentiality practices within this assessment.

We've discussed with the SAS, the Stock Assessment Subcommittee has applied and is in the process of gaining confidential access to data; so they will have legal permission to view those data. When we get into the actual data workshop we're going to be having closed door sessions; where basically members that does not have confidential access, TC members, data providers that do not have that access will be asked to leave the room.

The only people in the room will be those that have confidential access. There will be a similar type of closed door process for the review as well. There are going to be some intricacies; but we're making our efforts to make sure that we're within the bounds that we're legally bound to for confidentiality purposes.

MR. SCHMIDTKE: Now I'm going to turn it over to Jim Cooper to present the APs recommendations for the stock assessment process.

DR. JIM COOPER: By the way, the Advisory Panel appreciates your work, and that of the staff in helping us put this together. There is one correction for you. There was a slide earlier about the number of biomedical companies; and there is an error on that slide. There is no biomedical company called HepTest in Virginia; that is an inaccuracy.

You can reference the FDA. The FDA decides who is a biomedical producer. They may be using horseshoe crabs for some type of scientific process; but they are certainly not part of the biomedical. We've alerted the staff to this, and we hope that this can be corrected in the future. Going on to the slide, our group of course is eager to see the 15 percent mortality reevaluated; and hopefully they will look at all types of information to try to arrive at a good opinion on that matter. You know the 15 percent mortality has been sort of held in great reverence since it was initially suggested from a study in Charleston; associated with a graduate student there, who observed that after a week that 3 of 15 crabs or 3 of 20 crabs did



not survive for the full week. That's where the original 15 percent came from.

We would suspect that this is most likely the highest possible or the highest mortality that one would expect from this kind. Our industry has found that it's probably close to 10 percent; that is a 90 percent survival. I understand that someone will be commenting on this a little bit later in the day, in this session.

But nevertheless, we can go on to that. The AP certainly recommended that not only would they look at horseshoe crab peer reviewed papers, with regard to mortality assessment and that type of thing, but look at other information as well. A couple of the peer reviewed papers that are out there we think suffer from the methodology issues. But I think the SAS can look into that appropriately.

We would also hope that marine resource studies that have been done by some of the states and some of them are really elegant studies, this is difficult work to do and we would hope that that would be looked at as well; and look at the historical data that the biomedical facilities have come up with over the years.

No one is more dedicated and striving more to guarantee the sustainability of the horseshoe crab than our industry. We have an enormous responsibility of protecting the world's injectable medication supply. We are indeed interested in good management decisions from this; and we work hard to make sure that we guarantee their sustainability.

Now we would hope that you would include a biomedical scientist in this SAS process. Their role would not be in looking at the modeling, but making sure that the methodology of some of these studies is evaluated properly; so that the numbers they get help them understand whether or not this represents what's going on in the biomedical community.

We would also recommend that the findings of the SAS would be reviewed in some way, or form or fashion, with appropriate confidentiality, be reviewed before any final submission. I want to assure you that what we want here is meaningful dialogue to be taking place with the biomedical community; as well as others, because we want good outcomes.

I've heard the rumor that an SAS stock assessment study on the Atlantic sturgeon was made based on one peer reviewed paper; and bad management decisions came out of that effort. We want to see that that is avoided here. We're anxious to have good dialogue here, and give the SAS as much information as they need; meaningful and truthful information, so that you can make good decisions. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, Kristen and Dr. Cooper. Are there any Board questions? Tom Fote.

MR. FOTE: I don't have a question, but I have a comment. We've complained about AP reports that didn't seem to be AP reports; and more part of what one person felt about the industry. This seemed to me to be a little bit that way; and I would like to make sure that doesn't happen again.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mike Millard.

MR. MIKE MILLARD: A question for Kristen on that Table 2 that had the biomedical numbers involved in it. Row C talks about the number of biomedical only crabs collected. Then Row E is labeled number of biomedical only crabs bled. The difference between collected and bled ranges from, I don't know something like 30,000 to 60,000. What is the disposition of those crabs that were collected but not bled?

MR. COOPER: Would you like me to answer that please?

MS. ANSTEAD: Well let me ask a clarifying question. Is this in reference to the biomedical crabs that aren't counted that are double use in some states, I think Massachusetts that the biomedical bleeds it and then they turn it over to bait?

MR. MILLARD: Well, the label on C says that this is not the double use crabs, this is biomedical only crabs; not those counted against state bait quotas.

MR. SCHMIDTKE: I can answer that just from viewing data annually for the FMP review. The disposition of crabs is reported; and generally crabs can be rejected for a variety of reasons such as size or such as injury. Injury can sometimes be specified. From our perspective, from the reporting perspective, what level of injury there is that occurs. It could be minor injury; it could be more than that.

Sometimes it is included, sometimes it isn't. It kind of varies from report to report. But generally those are crabs as we interpret with the reports that we received that those crabs are alive, as far as we can tell, and they're rejected for other reasons than mortality; because those that are rejected because they're dead are specifically reported to us. Those would be included within the observed mortality of biomedical only crabs from collection to release. That would be the fourth row down.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Follow up.

MR. MILLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair for a follow up. I guess that's what I'm getting at Mike is there is observed dead, and then there are crabs that are culled due to injury. Do we know the ultimate end to those injured crabs? Are they anywhere accounted for in here?

MR. SCHMIDTKE: That's something that has been discussed by the TC, as well as the Plan Review Team. With our current knowledge that we have, we don't know. That would be something that we

would have to ask; and that may require a specific study to actually investigate what would happen for rejected, non-bled crabs. I don't know that we have that information available to us currently.

MS. ANSTEADT: I'll just add that that last column is the amount observed in the observed mortality plus the 15 percent, so those are the only mortalities that are included in that final column.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Rob O'Reilly.

MR. ROB O'REILLY: The gentleman giving the Advisory report may have been talking about this; but I couldn't pick it up exactly. But there was a slide that listed Wako harvesting from the EEZ and landing in Virginia. My understanding is that hasn't happened in about five years, and there is no intent to do that in 2018 either. I'm not sure if that coincides with what the Advisory report was talking about; sounded like a different company name up there perhaps. But anyway, Wako has not made its presence in Virginia for about five years.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Dr. Cooper.

DR. COOPER: I'm trying to remember the slide. I think if I'm correct it listed two companies in Virginia, and Wako is an FDA licensed facility for making LAL reagent. There may be a representative here from there, but that's what I can tell you and I know this to be the case. The other company that is listed there, some of the principals sold their business to Wako more than a decade ago, so maybe that is the source of the inaccuracy. Does that answer your question?

MR. O'REILLY: Sure, thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Bob.

MR. BALLOU: A question for Kristen and then another question for Dr. Cooper if I may. First, Kristen on Term of Reference 6, it says recommend stock status as related to reference points if available. Why that caveat, if available?

MS. ANSTEADT: Well there was no formal stock status that came out of the last one. We are hopeful that we will have more data this time to be able to evaluate a larger suite of models; and we hope to get a formal reference point and stock status out of that. It's keeping it loose. But that is the goal as it is with every stock assessment; we hope to make that more than it was last time.

MR. BALLOU: If I could, Mr. Chair, could I ask Dr. Cooper a question regarding the AP report. First of all I thought the AP report was very well done and very helpful. I did note, and I'm pulling up the page right now. There is a fairly strongly worded comment from you, Dr. Cooper in the report, noting that the preference for peer reviewed literature (and this has to do with the biomedical evaluation of mortality, I believe) that a preference for peer reviewed literature could be a concern.

If I understand the comment correctly, in that it would miss the point of actually looking at the actual practices and the actual mortality occurring at the biomedical facilities. If I understand that correctly, and I would like you to comment on that, is the follow to that that what might really be needed is an independent, third party, scientific review of practices actually occurring at the biomedical facilities? If so, then I would like to ask through the Chair whether that's something that this Board could pursue.

DR. COOPER: Well, with respect to that comment. It's my personal opinion, and I believe the opinion of other AP members certainly from the biomedical community, and also from, and I've talked with this with Rick Robins as well who is from the other industry. We feel that there have been academic groups have done very difficult experiments and worked hard, to try to look at the mortality issue. But we have great question with their methodology used. We're stressing the animals far greater than what would have occurred at the biomedical facility. Now I know of some of the state marine resource

groups that are doing a lot of work, elegant studies, trying to address the mortality issue.

I would be amenable to the Board looking at an independent group, and looking carefully at the methodology of such studies that might be done. You know unfortunately the horseshoe crab is not amenable to study in a laboratory environment. It is a difficult creature to work with, and then after the bleeding introduce them into an environment that represents normal foraging and so forth, very difficult. It's a challenging study.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Bob, to your question. I think as we go into this stock assessment, they're going to be looking at that literature and perhaps next year is going to be the appropriate time when they've reviewed what literature is out there, see if they're good studies or if something more needs to be looked at. I think that would probably be the best time for the Board to task a subcommittee to look at that; if the rest of the Board agrees. Emerson.

MR. HASBROUCK: I had a similar concern as to what Bob just voiced. I would support any effort along those lines; whether it's soon or further down the road, but not too far down the road. My other question was Dr. Cooper in his presentation had mentioned that the industry is protecting the world's biomedical supply; which I think is a very admirable goal.

But I'm wondering, in terms of protecting the world's biomedical supply, what percent of the lysate that is collected along the east coast of the United States is used in the United States, and how much is exported to the rest of the world?

DR. COOPER: I'm not a marketing person, but I would estimate that the LAL consumed by, and LAL meaning the Atlantic Ocean product, consumed by the U.S. is probably about 40 percent; because our FDA really urges and requires the companies to use a lot of redundant testing. They in my opinion, perhaps consume

more reagent than is actually necessary to get the job done.

But in terms of answering your question, I would think that 40 percent of the LAL is U.S. and the rest is Europe, and to a great extent Japan. I think perhaps the amount of the reagent that is produced by the *Tachypleus* might take care of maybe 10 to 20 percent of the world's supply. Is that enough information?

MR. HASBROUCK: That answered my question, thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Any other Board members; any public comment, sorry, Stewart.

MR. MICHELS: Just a point of clarification on that 15 percent mortality estimate that is attributed to the biomedical harvest. I believe that value is not based on a single study; but actually on a range of studies that the Technical Committee reviewed, and they basically used an average of the observed mortality in those studies.

Then to the point of on the terms of reference, I was wondering, Kristen, do you think it would be possible to also include some kind of evaluation of the sublethal effects of bleeding on the horseshoe crab population? I know there has been some indication in the past that these animals may not spawn in the year that they're bled and such.

MS. ANSTEAD: Yes, I think some of that would be evaluated as part of kind of digging into this literature. We're going to do a call for data, maybe next week. We hope that any datasets out there that have to do with biomedical will be part of things that we get to consider going forward. But if you want to make that an explicit TOR to evaluate sublethal affects that is at the will of the Board.

MR. MICHELS: I would.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: We'll get to it. Are there any other Board members, any public that wants to? Okay. Please state your name and association.

MS. BENJIE SWAN: Hello everyone, Benjie Swan from Limuli Laboratories. I put some comments together that I will read. My comments, some of them will directly answer some of the questions that were raised today; and also kind of give a different way of thinking about biomedical mortality.

All right here goes. My comments are as follows: Regarding biomedical mortality. Dead horseshoe crabs are counted at the biomedical facility prior to bleeding and at release; accounting for mortality from collection to release. From this point on their mortality rate is not known, and difficult to ascertain because of their release into the wild.

At the onset of the industry, Anne Rudloe's study, 1983, established a 10 percent greater mortality rate for bled animals than un-bled. Her study had a large sample size of 10,000 horseshoe crabs, and the crabs were released into a small, enclosed bay, mimicking the biomedical return-to-sea policy.

More recently studies have attempted to improve on Rudloe's study, and to arrive at mortality rates. However, the resultant mortality rates are most likely higher than the actual value; since the bled animals were kept in recirculating tanks for two weeks or longer; rather than being released into their natural environment.

One study, intending to mimic the time horseshoe crabs are on deck, placed horseshoe crabs that were already captured and studied for two weeks into a barrel. The barrel was then placed on top of a roof for four hours in the sun; then covered for another four hours in the shade. They were eventually bled, and driven around in a hot van, and stored again.

Still, under these extreme conditions 16 of the 21 crabs lived, 76 percent survival. What should be gleaned from these studies are not the resultant rates, but other relevant facts. The most important fact is that horseshoe crabs are hardy animals; able to withstand hours out of the water in wide ranges of temperatures.

The studies also collectively show that the mortality rate is variable; depending on a variety of stressors, such as the amount of blood collected, time out of the water, and temperatures endured. Using best management practices, the survival of the collected horseshoe crabs is guaranteed to be high. Nevertheless, the number of crabs that die from bleeding is estimated to be 15 percent based on these studies; despite biomedical companies protest that horseshoe crabs do not die from bleeding. Other alarmist concerns want to push the mortality rate higher; suggesting there is a large, unaccounted numbers of dead animals due to culling at sea and the possible demise of the rejected horseshoe crabs.

However, these numbers are accounted and reported, and add very little to the overall mortality. Fishing vessels trawl in a manner that minimizes injury and death, and the small percentage of horseshoe crabs rejected at the biomedical facility, is for minor injuries that would almost be invisible to the untrained eye.

Regarding threshold numbers, establishing a threshold number for biomedical mortal crabs under the horseshoe crab fishery management plan in 1998 was misguided. First of all, the word threshold implies a limit. However, it was not the intention to limit the collection of horseshoe crabs for the manufacture of Limulus Amoebocyte Lysate.

Secondly, how the specific number of 57,500 was calculated remains a mystery. As reporting of biomedical numbers was not required prior to Addendum III in 2003. For 13 years, from 2004 to 2016, the average of the reported number of

dead horseshoe crabs was 5,086 horseshoe crabs, and the estimated mortal number calculated after release is 58,721; still close to the 57,500.

Over the years the number of biomedical only harvest crabs and in turn mortal crabs increase slightly. The increase can be attributed to management measures that resulted in fewer bait crabs utilized, and more males used to compensate for taking fewer females. My last point is a suggestion to incorporate synthetic lysate into the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission discussions and documents.

I find this to be completely out of the realm of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's jurisdiction. Managing the horseshoe crab research for bait harvest, and finding alternative sources of bait is part of the fisheries biologists/manager's expertise. To think about discussing the needs of human health in the testing of pharmaceutical products is beyond the scope of fisheries.

To promote a product that is not accepted as an alternative for LAL is irresponsible. To summarize; to continually suggest that mortality due to biomedical use is unaccounted for and substantial is contrary to the facts. The facts are that the mortality of horseshoe crabs associated with manufacturing lysate, is a very small number; compared to the number of horseshoe crabs used for bait and the total population.

Fact 2, that biomedical best management practices, especially our return-to-sea policy, ensure the utmost survival of the horseshoe crabs, and Number 3 that exceeding the threshold number is of no relevance and should be eliminated. That would be it. If anybody has any questions, I would be happy to answer them. Mike Schmidtke has a copy of my letter if anyone would like a copy.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you for your comments, any other comments? At this point we do need to accept the terms of reference. If

there are any additions to it or any other task, this would be the time to add them. Stewart.

**MR. MICHELS:** If I may, I would like to make a motion to accept the terms of reference, and add to the terms of reference an evaluation of the sub-lethal effects of bleeding on horseshoe crab.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Do we have a second? Colleen. Is there any discussion, any objection? **Seeing none; we will approve the Terms of Reference by consent**, and move on to Item 6, which is setting the 2018 Harvest Specs. Kristen. I guess I'll add that to read that into the record.

All right the motion was: **Move to accept the Terms of Reference for the 2018 Horseshoe Crab Benchmark Stock Assessment, and add a Term of Reference evaluating the sub-lethal effects of biomedical bleeding. Motion by Mr. Michels, second by Ms. Giannini, and it was approved by consent; now onto the next.** While we're bringing up the slide, you guys in the back, it's great to sit up here where you can actually read the little bars and see what they mean.

#### **SET 2018 HARVEST SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE DELAWARE BAY**

MS. ANSTEAD: Now I'm going to walk us through the 2018 harvest specifications for the Delaware Bay. We set the harvest specifications using the ARM model. We go through this each year; and I've just put up the goals of the ARM model, which is to manage the harvest of horseshoe crabs in the Delaware Bay to maximize that harvest, but also maintain ecosystem integrity for the stopovers for the birds, mainly the red knots.

#### **REVIEW HORSESHOE CRAB AND RED KNOW INDICES OF ABUNDANCE**

MS. ANSTEAD: I'll go through briefly in this presentation where we are with the red knots and the horseshoe crab populations; as well as review the harvest packages, and then tell you what the specifications are. First as a reminder of some of

the thresholds that are in the ARM model, we have two population thresholds.

One is for a female horseshoe crab and one is for red knots. The way the model functions is that there must be 80 percent carrying capacity of female horseshoe crabs available in the Delaware Bay to get female harvest of horseshoe crabs; so that's 11.2 million female crabs, or there is a red knot population threshold, which is 81,900 birds.

There is an additional threshold that there must be a two-to-one spawning-beach-sex ratio. We've never come close to not having that. But that is an additional threshold in the model that if that was not seen on the beaches that would also limit harvest. This is just to remind you that if both population estimates are below threshold, we don't have female harvest of horseshoe crabs in the Bay.

This is where we are with the red knots right now. The estimates come from mark-resight investigations. The red line is the population threshold. You can see that for 2017 the estimates were similar to 2016. There were 49,000 approximately birds, which is below the bird threshold of 81,900.

You can also see that even with the confidence intervals we haven't come close to the threshold in the last few years. It's worth noting that the stopover duration was shorter this year. It was 9.5 days, and last year it was 12.3. The estimates of horseshoe crab abundance come from the Virginia Tec Trawl Survey; but as you may recall that doesn't run every year.

In lieu of the survey for the years that we don't have it, the Committee developed a composite index, which is made up of a few surveys in that region. You can see how well they're tracking each other there. The Virginia Tec Trawl Survey is in the black lines; so it did run this year, so our population estimate is from that. Additionally that supplied an extra data point for kind of comparing the performance of the composite

index. The 2016 estimate of female horseshoe crabs is 7.7 million females; which is also under the threshold of 11.2 female horseshoe crabs.

These are the five harvest packages from the ARM, and they range from a full moratorium at Harvest Package 1, to a midrange male only harvest at 2; 500,000 male only harvest in Package 3, 4 is kind of the midrange female/male harvest, and then 5 would be the highest male and female harvest that we have.

The model looks through all possible states of the population; the juvenile abundance of horseshoe crabs, birds, males, females, and it builds a giant matrix of all possible combinations, and then applies the harvest packages to that and that is how we get our harvest. This is just a summary of where we are. The horseshoe crabs, that is 7.7 million females estimated in the Bay. The red knot abundance was 49,000; and therefore the harvest package is again Harvest Package 3, which it has been for the last several years. With that I will take questions.

**CHAIRMAN RHODES: Are there any questions from the Board? At this point we will need a motion to approve these specifications. Stewart Michels.**

**MR. MICHELS: So moved.**

**CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, and a second. Second by Mike Millard, is there any discussion? Do we have any opposition? All right well this motion is approved by consent also, so this is a motion to select Harvest Package 3 for 2018 horseshoe crab harvest in Delaware Bay; motion by Mr. Michels, second by Mr. Millard and approval by consent.**

**REVIEW RESULTS OF THE ARM MODEL RUN  
INTEGRATION BIOMEDICAL DATA AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ARM  
SUBCOMMITTEE, TECHNICAL COMMITTEE, AND  
ADVISORY PANEL**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Guys, I'm not going to say anything, but we'll move on to the next area of business right now; and this is Review the Results of the ARM Model Run and Incorporating the Biomedical Data. Is that you first Kristen?

MS. ANSTEAD: While she gets that up, I will just remind you that last year that we went, I think it might have been 2016; we went under short term review of the ARM model, where we were tasked with evaluating some different parts of it. It was not the full long term review; which would have been more thorough.

But one of the tasks we had last year was to look at incorporating biomedical data into the ARM model; particularly since we're talking about doing that for the benchmark. We felt it was appropriate to see if we could also put in the ARM model; so that all of the output is similar. We put forth a preferred option for including biomedical; as well as a minority opinion.

I will briefly review both of those and the Board had tasked us with seeing how that would affect the harvest package selection in the model performance. That is what I'm going to go through today. The preferred option for including biomedical is here. What we have on the left side are the current harvest packages that we just reviewed.

Then to the right would be how we would deal with biomedical going forward; if we included the biomedical data in the arm model under the preferred option. These are not real numbers, so biomedical data the confidentiality has not been breached by doing this. It was kind of taken from a fraction of what we're attributing to the coastwide, and applying a sex ratio to it. If these were real numbers what we would do would be taking a running average; so a three to five year average of what's harvested in the Delaware Bay, and we would update that number every few years. You couldn't really do the math to put an exact number on what that harvest is.

Biomedical is fairly stable for their harvest, so having an average that is only updated every so often is not so much a concern. We would still capture any major changes, but it would not have to be done every year. That harvest would be subtracted from the current harvest packages. Biomedical, this is not a quota; this is just explicitly showing that harvest is happening in the Delaware Bay from the biomedical industry, and by working that into the harvest packages.

You can see that for example, Harvest Package 3, which is the 500,000 male-only crabs for the bait fishery, would then be adjusted to subtract the biomedical from it. That is how that would operate. Again, our current harvest packages 1 through 5, I wanted to talk briefly about how often each is selected under the current ARM model.

You can see that Harvest Package 1, 3, and 5 are selected much more often than 2 and 4. This is under all scenarios. Yes, we always get Harvest Package 3, but that is because of the population thresholds. But if we were over those thresholds, you can see that the model actually chooses Harvest Package 5 more than the rest of them; and it rarely chooses Package 2 and 4.

That will be relevant here in a moment. Under this preferred option, when the ARM model was rerun, Harvest Package 1 was selected 99 percent of the time under the preferred option that it was under our current ARM model. Rarely did putting the biomedical data in, actually the model chose a different harvest package, so that was fairly consistent.

When it did, instead of a moratorium less than 1 percent, it went to that male-only harvest and less than 1 percent it went to the highest female-male harvest. That is how this table works. You can see that Harvest Package 2 and 3 didn't change at all by putting the biomedical data in. If the model under the current ARM model selected Harvest Package 3, it still selected Harvest

Package 3 by including biomedical data in those harvest packages.

Harvest Package 4 changed the most, 85 percent of the time it still had Harvest Package 4; but the other 15 it did go to the full moratorium. But again that is where these frequencies come into. Harvest Package 4 is chosen about 1 percent of the time; given all possible states of the populations. While that is the biggest change, it also is the package that gets selected very rarely.

We also put forth a minority opinion for dealing with biomedical data in the ARM model. This put the 15 percent mortality attributed to biomedical in the population dynamics model. Briefly, this is a simple version of how the population dynamics model works in the ARM model, where juvenile horseshoe crabs can stay as juvenile horseshoe crabs from year to year.

They can also go on to be pre-breeders, or they can skip that stage and go right to being adults. Then additionally some die. The same with pre-breeders, and then we get to the adult stage. Some stay in the adult stage, some get harvested as bait, and some die as well. The way the minority option would work is by including the 15 percent in that kind of red state as I have in the graph; so putting it right into the population dynamics model. This is the table you just saw. The green all the way to the right is how it would change under the minority opinions. You can see it's a little different from the preferred option. In general, still pretty similar results. Harvest Package 1, 3, and 5 were very similar. By including biomedical in the population dynamics model, those three packages very rarely changed to a different package by including biomedical. Harvest Package 2 now was never selected.

When it was selected it most likely went to 1, but it also sometimes went to 3. Then Harvest Package 4 also was 88 percent of the time was still selected as Harvest Package 4; but 12 percent of the time it went to that full male and female harvest. There was some change, but in general



that's fairly similar results to what we have already by including biomedical either way.

Just in summary, there was little change to the harvest packages by including biomedical under both the preferred and the minority opinion. The preferred option was the preferred option, because the ARM Committee felt that there was more transparency to it. You see what the biomedical harvest is with those harvest packages.

There were some concerns that this puts biomedical and bait harvest against each other; that the bait fishermen now see that the biomedical is taking away from their quota for the year. But it's also worth noting that they don't often reach that quota, and New Jersey doesn't harvest their portion of it.

There is a bit of a buffer there that it might not affect it as much, but it's still potentially baiting those two against each other. The minority opinion, oh I should also mention that if we go with the preferred option of including biomedical that would require an addendum; because the harvest packages are in the addendum. It would require an addendum to change them to have the biomedical harvest there.

The minority opinion was favored by some, because it doesn't require an addendum and it still maintains the same harvest packages, it's just putting that biomedical in the population dynamics model; but it is less transparent, because it's kind of hidden in the inner workings of the ARM model, rather than explicitly out there in the harvest packages.

These were presented to the various TCs that fall under the horseshoe crab; and they did maintain that the preferred option is recommended. Because of the benefits I just went through, neither one of them is more accurate. There are just two different ways of dealing with it; so both the Subcommittee and the TCs recommended that going forward.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Dr. Cooper, do you want to do the AP response? Mike.

MR. SCHMIDTKE: The Advisory Panel reviewed these results as well. The Advisory Panel looked at them and they agreed with the TCs and Subcommittee on the fact that there is very little change in the harvest packages, due to incorporation of biomedical mortality. The Advisory Panel would recommend that this mortality not be included in the annual runs of the ARM model.

If the Board does have a preference for incorporating biomedical mortality into the ARM, the Advisory Panel has recommended the minority option be the preferred option; sighting the benefits of protecting the confidentiality, since the mortality would be worked within the population dynamics model itself it would not be exposed to the public. We wouldn't be able to see that overt subtraction from the harvest packages; and in addition it would not lower the quotas. It would not impact the harvest packages themselves.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Any questions from the Board? Mike.

MR. MICHAEL LUISI: I guess this is a question for Kristen. Is there a table or someplace I can look to see what the effects of the different packages on the bait fishery are; related to the minority report or the minority opinion? You know you showed the one table that had the preferred option alternative with what is being taken out of the bait fishery; for the purposes of being accounted for by the biomedical industry.

However, under the minority opinion, does the package change the same way? The reason I ask is because I think it's very difficult when you look at what's being referred to as a non-quota for the biomedical industry; but then you're taking it away from established quota in the bait fishery. I certainly have concerns about putting the two forces together. I would just like to know what

those packages look like under the minority opinion.

MS. ANSTEAD: That was also a recognized concern among our talks; and that's why we went ahead and put forth the minority opinion. Those harvest packages are unchanged in the minority opinion. The crabs that die through biomedical are just put into the population dynamics model. Instead of subtracting what's harvested each year, when we do the ARM model we put in what was harvest.

Those were crabs that died, as well as their survival rate goes in there as well, just in general outside of bait harvest. This would just add that 15 percent mortality, so when we subtract what died that year, whether through bait harvest or natural mortality, it would just add an additional amount for the biomedical harvest from the running average of their actual numbers. The harvest packages would be unchanged. They would be as they are, and that is why it doesn't require an addendum.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Follow up.

MR. LUISI: Under Package 3 there would still be a 500,000 crab allowance for the bait industry under the minority opinion.

MS. ANSTEAD: Correct.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mike.

MR. MILLARD: Two comments. The first I would like to get out that I do support adding biomedical mortality into the ARM. I don't know if you're ready to take a motion on that a little later in this discussion; but I would be willing to do that. More importantly, back to the sensitivity analysis of the preferred option.

I appreciate that. That was helpful. It seems to me though that another sensitivity we could look at, because my understanding is that used 15 percent. For many meetings now we've discussed

and argued about the 15 percent. I'm wondering if we could task the TC to do a sensitivity analysis on that 15 percent figure; run a range through there from 5 percent to 10 percent, and see if that makes a difference. Maybe we can put this whole argument about what that exact percentage is to bed; if it doesn't really matter in our management scheme.

MS. ANSTEAD: The ARM model, the 15 percent that's used follows the benchmark. Part of this process of us reevaluating that number is if we come up with a different number for the Delaware Bay that will translate over to the ARM model. If it turns out that the Delaware Bay mortality is 8 percent in the new benchmark; that will then be the mortality used in the ARM model.

I do understand your point. If we decreased it to 5 percent, even for these sensitivity runs. I suspect that the harvest packages still wouldn't change that much. Because by using the 15 percent they barely changed anyway. But that can certainly still be ARM model Subcommittee task.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Follow up.

MR. MILLARD: Do I interpret that to say that we really don't need to be arguing about what the exact percentage is in our management scheme?

MS. ANSTEAD: I think we're looking forward to reevaluating it; because it is a number that comes up and it is contentious. I think we should be concerned about it, and it's an important number. We look forward to relooking at the data to see maybe if there is a more appropriate number for that.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Chris.

MR. CHRIS WRIGHT: I had the same question as Mike; whether or not they did a hypothetical run at 5 percent or 30 percent; because if it does go up, we might as well get that out in the open right now.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Emerson.

MR. HASBROUCK: I've got a concern similar to Mike Luisi's concern. I'm not sure that I've got it straightened out in my mind yet. If I understand it properly, if the biomedical harvest is included in the ARM model run, there really isn't any difference in which harvest package gets selected. Is that right?

MS. ANSTEAD: Correct.

MR. HASBROUCK: That's the first part. But the other part is that if the preferred option is chosen, then we'll be in a situation where a quota managed bait fishery, their quota will be reduced by a non-quota-restricted harvest. Is that correct?

MS. ANSTEAD: That is also correct. I think it's worth mentioning that the quota for say Harvest Package 3, which is always selected, the 500,000 would then be reduced to 464, so yes it is reduced but the biomedical is still a very small portion of the mortality that's being attributed to the Delaware Bay crabs. But, we've done these two options in case that that changes in the future; that we now have a method of dealing with that.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Did you have a follow up?

MR. HASBROUCK: John just asked something, so I'll ask that as my follow up; and I believe the answer is no, but let's just verify that. Has the quota been reached in the past several years, and if not how close has the bait catch come to that quota? Then thirdly, do we anticipate that bait catch may go up or down in the future?

MR. SCHMIDTKE: Within the Delaware Bay the quota has not been reached in recent years; and I looked in the hypothetical of the preferred option with those reduced harvest packages, if that level has even been exceeded. Even with the lowering that resulted from these alternative runs that level has not been exceeded since the ARM has been instituted.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Stewart.

MR. MICHELS: Correct me if I'm wrong. Is that because New Jersey simply chooses not to harvest their portion of the Delaware Bay?

MR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes, that is certainly a contributing factor.

MR. LUISI: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to that point raised by Emerson. A few years ago when female crab harvest was prohibited; and we went to male only. It took the industry a little time to rebuild that market that they had. Over the last few years, specifically to Maryland, we have been being able to access more and more of our male-only allocation. The market is there; so we foresee the issue of reducing our bait-crab allowance based on the biomedical industry subtraction as problematic to our continued efforts to keep that bait industry thriving at the point where it is.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Any other discussion? Mike, did you have a motion you wanted to make or not at this point?

**MR. MILLARD: Yes, I'll throw it out. I move that the ARM model incorporate biomedical mortality in the preferred option methodology.**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Do we have a second? All right, Chris Wright, discussion? Emerson.

MR. HASBROUCK: For clarification. If the Board approves that the ARM model incorporate, and I'll wait until the motion is up there, incorporate the biomedical harvest. Does that necessarily mean then that part of that process will be that the bait fishery quota will be reduced by the biomedical harvest, or is that going to be a separate motion?

MR. SCHMIDTKE: With the wording of this current motion using the preferred option, then yes that would mean that the bait quota would be reduced by the level that the biomedical mortality is evaluated at. Additionally, I believe we would

need to make this move for an addendum. Is that correct, Toni?

MS. TONI KERNS: Mike, that is correct. In order to change the parameters or the impacts of the ARM model, we would need to initiate an addendum to do so. I know Mike is talking to Sherry; so I'm not sure. We would need to initiate an addendum to change the parameters, so it would be an option in the addendum if we were to move forward with this.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: John.

MR. JOHN MANISCALCO: To be clear, we can't account for the biomedical harvest in the ARM model, but set harvest specifications only for the bait fishery. Is that correct?

MR. SCHMIDTKE: Using the preferred option that would require an addendum and that would have the reduction in the harvest package. That's the reason why it would require the addendum; is because we're changing the actual harvest packages. If we went with the minority option then there would be no change to the harvest package; and that's why that would not require the addendum.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mike Luisi.

MR. LUISI: Just for clarification purposes. We've already established the 2018 specifications, right. This would be an addendum that would be worked on for 2019 and beyond.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: That's correct, and also I believe we discussed this last year and the will of the Board was to wait until after the 2018 stock assessment was completed to look at this. But we can revisit, you know initiation of an addendum or initiating an addendum if that is the Board's will. Emerson.

MR. HASBROUCK: While I have no problem supporting the utilization of the biomedical harvest in running the ARM model. I can't

support this motion, in that it will end up reducing the quota of a quota managed fishery by the amount that is harvested by a non-quota managed fishery or harvest. I can't support this motion as it is.

MS. KERNS: Just to make sure we have the right words up there. Is the maker of the motion and the seconder of the motion okay if we say move to initiate an addendum that?

MR. MILLARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Any further discussion on this? Russ.

MR. RUSS ALLEN: I'm really struggling to figure out why we need to do an addendum right now; when we have a stock assessment coming up, and I know how this Board works with other species. We're going to say as this addendum moves on we're going to say, well why didn't we wait for the results of the stock assessment? For that reason I would be opposed to this motion at this time. But if it got tabled from we were actually going to maybe do an addendum or an amendment. I think that makes more sense.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Well are you making a motion to table this to time specific?

MR. ALLEN: No, I just put that out there for discussion; and if someone thinks that's the right thing to do we could do it, or we just vote it down now. That's fine with me, thanks.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Eric.

MR. ERIC REID: I'm not struggling at all. This is not the time to pass this motion, at all.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: All right, any further discussion on this? Does anyone need to caucus? Take two minutes to caucus. Are we ready to vote on the motion? Emerson.

MR. HASBROUCK: I have a question that might help us here; in terms of our discussion amongst the New York caucus, as well as speaking to our neighbors in New Jersey. If we initiate an addendum, is the harvest quota linked to including the biomedical catch in the ARM model, or can the addendum process separate that out; so that we can incorporate the biomedical harvest in the ARM model without having the bait fishery quota reduced by the biomedical harvest?

MR. SCHMIDTKE: Not using the preferred motion. That would not accomplish that. I think what you're getting at, Emerson, are you suggesting the potential of incorporating the biomedical harvest in addition to the current bait quotas? Is that what you're asking about, whether that's a possibility?

MR. HASBROUCK: I'm not sure of your question. But what I'm suggesting is that we incorporate the biomedical harvest when we run the ARM model, but that we do not reduce the resulting bait quota by the amount of the anticipated biomedical harvest.

MR. SCHMIDTKE: That would be the minority option. That would be the minority option where the biomedical mortality is incorporated into the population dynamics model itself; but the harvest packages, the quotas themselves do not change.

MR. HASBROUCK: Right, I understand that. Voting in favor of the motion then essentially moves forward the preferred alternative; and will not consider the minority opinion.

MR. SCHMIDTKE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mike.

MR. LUISI: One further clarification that came up in our caucus. Would we need to take action on the minority opinion, if this motion were to be opposed, if it didn't carry does the minority opinion then move forward or do we have to take

up some form of an action by the Board today on either the preferred or the minority opinion?

CHAIRMAN RHODES: At this point we do not need to make any action going forward. This was brought out as a follow up that they were tasked to look at the biomedical harvest with the ARM model. They came up with the two options. At this point it was for information, if the Board wanted to look at either option, or beginning an amendment.

That was at this point or we could take this as information, we'll get the stock assessment and next year we may revisit this same issue and look at the minority, the preferred or possibly a different option as we get more information. There is no further requirement if this does not pass. **That being said, all in favor of the motion could they raise their hands please; opposed same sign, abstentions, null votes? All right the motion fails 2 to 13.** Is there any other Board action on this? Bob.

MR. BALLOU: I'll give this a shot. I would like to move to incorporate the biomedical harvest using the minority option.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Okay, so you would move to initiate an addendum?

MR. BALLOU: No. That is not my intent.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Oh, I'm sorry. All right, do we have a second? Emerson. All right, discussion Bob?

MR. BALLOU: It's all been said. I feel that the first part makes sense to me. The second part that would be the preferred option, the addendum approach does not make sense to me. I would rather wait the outcome of the assessment. To me it makes sense to incorporate; but going with the minority approach.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Michelle.

DR. MICHELLE DUVAL: Procedurally we've set the specifications for 2018. I think our opposition to the previous motion was in line with New Jersey's concerns. While I support incorporation of biomedical mortality into the ARM model, and this type of approach, I kind of feel like this would still be getting the cart before the horse a little bit; in that we've set the 2018 specifications.

The stock assessment process is beginning in January. According to the timeline that I've read in the briefing materials, we're going to be presented with the stock assessment at the annual meeting next year; which is also the same time at which we would be setting specifications for the following year.

Bob, I guess the way I see it is that we've already set the specs for 2018, so if we were to use a minority option to incorporate biomedical mortality in the ARM model, we would be doing that for the 2019 specs. Yet presumably we would be setting those specs once we had received the information or the output from the stock assessment at this time next year. Does that make sense or am I confusing people?

CHAIRMAN RHODES: It makes sense. Tom.

MR. FOTE: I agree with everything you said, so it makes sense to me.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Rob.

MR. O'REILLY: I think you were asked this question and you answered about taking no action. What Michelle is indicating does make sense; and I think at least a number of us, the way we voted on the last motion, probably understand the implications, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Bob.

MR. BALLOU: I've been swayed by the discussion. I plan to vote against my own motion.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Would you like to withdraw it?

MR. BALLOU: Whatever you prefer, Mr. Chair. I would be happy to withdraw or just call the question; whichever you prefer.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Emerson, would you be all right with withdrawing?

MR. HASBROUCK: I will be fine with that.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Okay, Mike.

MR. MILLARD: Even in light of the withdrawn motion, I have a question I think that will help me. Maybe it's for you, Kristen. We often say let's wait for the upcoming stock assessment before we take any action; and I get that when we have the normal, biological reference points. I should probably know the answer to this, but it's not occurring to me right now. What is it that will come out of this stock assessment that will change the ARM model routine?

MS. ANSTEAD: The percentage that we're attributing to biomedical for their mortality could potentially change. Other than that the ARM model is not part of the stock assessment. The only thing we're tasked with, with the two of them as they relate to each other, is comparing any model output from the Delaware Bay Region with what comes out of the ARM model. The only number that will transfer over is a percent. If that changes from 15 percent, if it's reduced or increased that would then be changed also in the ARM model. Does that answer your question?

MR. MILLARD: Yes, I think so. The ARM model is insensitive, for the most part; the packages that it's going to pick are insensitive to any stock assessment results.

MS. ANSTEAD: They're not really related. I mean they are related to each other in that they're using data. But nothing from the benchmark gets fed into the ARM model except for that percent

mortality; if we even incorporate biomedical into the ARM model.

### 2017 FMP AND STATE COMPLIANCE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN RHODES: All right, is the Board comfortable where we are with this? Good. Seeing lots of nodding heads; we'll move on to the 2017 FMP and State Compliance Reports.

MR. SCHMIDTKE: We received state compliance reports to perform the 2017 fishery management plan review. The Plan Review Team conducted that review. Just as a brief reminder of the management history, the FMP was approved in 1998. There have been seven addenda; the most recent one being the institution of the ARM framework. You've already seen this graph, so I don't want to spend a whole lot of time on it.

But as you can see just going from 2015 to 2016 there was an increase in the bait harvest; and a decline in the biomedical collection, as well as a decline in the estimated biomedical mortality. In 2016 the total coastwide harvest was 787,223 crabs; with the majority of this coming from New York, Delaware, and Maryland. This was a 35 percent increase from 2015; and there were state specific increases in landings in Rhode Island, New York, Delaware through North Carolina, and Florida. Approximately 65 percent of the coastwide quota of 1.59 million pounds was landed. Biomedical facilities collected 426,195 crabs. This was a 21 percent decrease from the previous five-year average. There were temporary changes in production in 2016 that resulted in a lower number than has been seen over the past few years. The biomedical only mortality estimates, so these again the estimated mortality of crabs that were not then incorporated into the bait industry.

That estimate was 48,780 crabs; using the 15 percent number with the uncertainty of multiple studies that are used in formulating that number. We present a range from 5 percent to 30 percent mortality. You can see the associated numbers there. There is a text edit that I noticed as I was

making the presentation; but it's not in the actual text of the FMP review.

We did a little bit of consideration of what that 15 percent was actually incorporating; and the last two sentences of Page 6, and this is in the graph but not in the text. But those where it says up to the point of release, should be up to the point of bleeding. The 15 percent is meant to incorporate mortality associated from the process of bleeding on forward to release. That is a point of clarification there.

De minimis, states may apply for de minimis if their combined average bait landings for the last two years are less than 1 percent of the coastwide bait landings for the same two-year period. Measures in these states, they are not required to implement any harvest restriction measures; but they are required to implement the monitoring requirements from A, B, E, and F of the FMP.

The Potomac River Fisheries Commission, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida all requested and qualified for de minimis for 2017. New Jersey qualified, since they do not have a bait harvest; but they did not request de minimis status. The Plan Review Team has a few recommendations and statements regarding this year's review of the FMP and compliance.

There was a concern with the number of crabs that are unidentified by sex within the biomedical reports. There was a reporting format that was worked on collectively among the horseshoe crab Technical Committee, since many of those members are the ones that provide the data. We worked to develop that so that it's a bit clearer when those reports are submitted to the Plan Review Team; so that we can be able to identify what is in those reports a bit more clearly.

This new format will be included in the compliance report template for 2018. This is not asking for any new information; it's just a clarification of format. The Plan Review Team recommends continued funding for the Virginia

Tech Trawl Survey. This survey was funded in 2017, and we are in the process of attaining funding for 2018. But that has not been finalized, so we hope to hear good news on that sometime soon.

Other than that the Plan Review Team found all states to be consistent with the FMP; with the exception of the District of Columbia, who did not submit a report and has not done so for the last 15 or more years. The PRT would recommend to the Board that all states be found in compliance with the requirements of the FMP with the exception of the District of Columbia; and that the Board approve de minimis status for the Potomac River Fisheries Commission, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. With that I will take any questions.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mr. Boyles.

MR. ROBERT H. BOYLES, JR.: Mike, I seem to remember discussions about D.C. in years past. Is this something we could make a recommendation to the Policy Board to excuse the District of Columbia from its obligations and its membership on the Horseshoe Crab Board?

MR. MILLARD: As far as I understand that is something that has been talked about at previous meetings; and the hurdle that is in the way is that District of Columbia is not present at these meetings. As far as I know, we cannot excuse them without their presence, or the Board could not, excuse me.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Great question. Toni.

MS. KERNS: We'll just follow up with Brian and see if you want to be removed from the Board, if he wants to be removed from the Board then we can take him off the declared interest the next time we approve that the Policy Board can, then they'll be removed.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mr. Boyles.

MR. BOYLES: A question, maybe for our New Jersey delegation. I know they did not request de minimis. I would ask, is there interest in that and if so I would make the motion; if you're ready, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mr. Boyles.

**MR. BOYLES: Mr. Chairman, I would make, oh my cheat sheet is gone. I would make the motion that we accept the 2017 FMP review and approve the de minimis request of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and PRFC.**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Do we have a second? Mr. O'Reilly. Is there any discussion; any objection. **All right, the motion was to accept the Horseshoe Crab 2017 FMP Review and State Compliance Reports and approve de minimis requests for Potomac River Fisheries Commission, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; motion by Mr. Boyles, second by Mr. O'Reilly, and the motion passed by consent.**

#### **POPULATE ADVISORY PANEL WITH NONTRADITIONAL STAKEHOLDERS**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: All right on to the next, I believe Tina is going to speak to us about getting some nontraditional stakeholders on the AP.

MS. TINA BERGER: Hi there. Recently we sent out a notice of a call for nominations for nontraditional stakeholders to the Horseshoe Crab AP; based on the Board's fairly recent discussion about adding some shorebird interest to that AP. We received a number of nominations; and it would be our request to the Board that we get a couple of volunteers from the Board to sit in with staff and review those nominations, and make recommendations to the Board at its next meeting for the addition of candidates to the AP.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Basically, if I'm getting this correct, it's going to be creating a subcommittee from this Board looking at adding two nontraditional, probably at least one from the



shorebird group, if not both. If it's the will of the Board we'll get together a handful of Commissioners to populate that group; and go over the nominees. Is there any objection to that plan? All right seeing none; is that okay with you?

MS. BERGER: Yes, but I would be selfish and ask for a couple of people, two or three people to step up, maybe in addition to you, Malcolm, just to meet via conference call, so we can do that sooner than later.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: All right. Anyone who would be interested in reviewing those members, all right, Stewart, Pat, Bob. Thank you all very much.

#### **ELECT VICE-CHAIR**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: We are at the pin ultimate part of this. We need to elect a Vice-Chairman for the Board. Do we have any nominations? Yes.

**MR. DAN McKIERNAN: I would like to nominate John Maniscalco as the Vice-Chair.**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Second. **Second by Dr. Duval, any discussion, any objections, all right congratulations!**

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: With that is there any other business to be brought before the Board? Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Just really quickly. Just prior to the Board meeting, this is something I let staff know about. But I just wanted to make note of it here is that during some dealer checks that we had it was brought forward that one of our dealers found a couple of tickets from 2014 that resulted in 3,371 unreported horseshoe crabs from 2014. I passed this along to staff to let them know.

The statute of limitations in North Carolina is two years for a misdemeanor, so we are unable to take any action on this. But after talking to Mike and talking to Toni, it seems like that amount did

not put us over any, while it exceeded North Carolina's horseshoe crab quota, it did not put us over any quota limits from a coastwide perspective. But perhaps Toni or Mike wants to speak to that. I'm just bringing this up in the interest of full disclosure.

MR. SCHMIDTKE: What we discussed related to that was the possibility of a retrospective quota transfer. There have been quota transfers in the past, specifically from Georgia to North Carolina. We looked into that option, but with the timing of it being in 2014, as well as the fact that within that year the additional unreported crabs would not have exceeded the regional quota, so for that South Atlantic population. We do not need to have that quota transfer; that retrospective quota transfer, and we can just move forward from here and update the numbers that are within the landings history.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

CHAIRMAN RHODES: All right, any other business? Seeing none; I want to thank everyone for being efficient for the discussions at this meeting; for our Chairs who condensed a lot of information and have us all waiting for the stock assessment next year.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 11:46 o'clock a.m. on October 17, 2017)

**Relative Abundance and Distribution of Horseshoe Crabs in the Carl N. Shuster  
Horseshoe Crab Reserve:  
Supplemental Report to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission  
Horseshoe Crab and Delaware Bay Ecology Technical Committees**

David Hata and Eric Hallerman

Department of Fish and Wildlife Conservation  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

January 22, 2018

**Abstract**

Horseshoe crabs, *Limulus polyphemus*, are important to a diverse group of stakeholders, including biomedical companies, commercial fishers, and environmental interests. Decreasing abundances of horseshoe crabs and shorebirds led to management actions including harvest quotas and establishment of the Carl N. Shuster, Jr. Horseshoe Crab Reserve in 2001. We have conducted a trawl survey in the coastal Delaware Bay area, including part of the Reserve, to monitor the horseshoe crab population since 2002. Abundance of mature males and females appears to be increasing in the coastal Delaware Bay area through this time, but not within the Reserve. About half of the mature crabs, but only around a quarter of the immature and newly mature crabs have been observed within the Reserve. Size-frequency distributions suggest that horseshoe crabs first recruited to coastal waters outside of the Reserve, and that recruitment to the Reserve increased with age. We cannot separate the impact of conventional management actions from that of the Reserve, but the combination of approaches appears to be achieving their objectives of protecting and maintaining the spawning stock in support of horseshoe crab management efforts.

**Introduction**

Horseshoe crabs, *Limulus polyphemus*, occur along the Atlantic coast of the United States from Maine to Florida and in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, with the largest spawning concentration in Delaware Bay (Shuster, 1982; Shuster and Botton, 1985). In

the Mid-Atlantic region, they migrate to coastal embayments in the spring to deposit their eggs on intertidal sandy beaches (Shuster and Botton, 1985). Coincident with horseshoe crab spawning, migrating shorebirds stop over in the Delaware Bay area to feed on the eggs (Shuster and Botton, 1985; Tsipoura and Burger, 1999). The crabs also are caught for use as bait in eel and whelk fisheries, as well as by the biomedical industry (ASMFC, 1998). Intensive bait harvesting in the 1990s is believed to have reduced the horseshoe crab population to such low levels that shorebird populations declined as a result (USFWS, 2003; Morrison et al., 2004). Concerns regarding the possible over-harvesting of horseshoe crabs and the declining shorebird populations prompted New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland to implement state-level harvest restrictions (Walls et al., 2002). The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) followed by initiating a coast-wide fishery management plan (FMP) in 1998 (ASMFC, 1998).

In 2000, the ASMFC established a coastwide harvest cap with a 25% reduction from 1995-1997 reference period landings (RPL). The ASMFC also recommended that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) close federal waters within 30 nautical miles of Delaware Bay to horseshoe crab harvest to protect horseshoe crabs and promote the effectiveness of the FMP (ASMFC, 2000; NOAA, 2000). The ASMFC was concerned that horseshoe crabs could be harvested from the federally controlled exclusive economic zone and landed in states with less restrictive management, circumventing the management actions implemented by those three states. For example, in 1998 following restrictions imposed by the three states and prior to the harvest cap and federal area closure, 75,000 crabs were landed in Pennsylvania, which previously had no reported landings, and over a million crabs were landed in Virginia, whereas their RPL were only a fifth of that (ASMFC, 2000). The Carl N. Shuster, Jr. Horseshoe Crab Reserve, which became effective 7 May 2001, prohibits the taking of horseshoe crabs, but does not restrict harvest of other species (NOAA, 2001). Additional amendments to the FMP, and a unilateral moratorium imposed by New Jersey, reduced annual bait fishery harvests since 2004 by New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia to about 25% of the RPL (ASMFC, 2004a; ASMFC, 2006).

There is some debate over the effectiveness of closed areas as fishery management tools. Supporters of closed areas suggest that the protection they afford can

increase stock biomass, serve as a buffer against overfishing outside the reserves, and act as a source of recruitment and fishable biomass to the fished areas (Lauck et al., 1998; Jones, 2007). Opponents counter that they provide little, if any, benefit to fisheries that cannot be achieved by conventional management methods such as catch and effort controls (Shipp, 2003; Kaiser, 2005). However, they may provide the greatest benefit when they are used in conjunction with conventional fishery management methods (Hilborn et al., 2006). Regardless of whether closed areas are used alone or in concert with conventional management actions, they should be evaluated for the ability to fulfill their objectives. In 2002, a trawl survey was initiated that specifically targeted horseshoe crabs in order to provide relative abundance and demographic information for stock assessment purposes, and to provide quantitative feedback on management efforts. The purpose of this study was to describe the demographics and relative abundance of horseshoe crabs in the Delaware Bay area and the portion of the population within the Carl N. Shuster, Jr. Horseshoe Crab Reserve. We also examined characteristics of the Reserve to assess whether it could fulfill the objectives set for it.

## **Methods**

The coastal Delaware Bay area (DBA) survey extended in the Atlantic Ocean from shore out to 22.2 km (12 nautical miles), and from 39° 20' N (Atlantic City, NJ) to 37° 40' N (slightly north of Wachapreague, VA; Figure 1). This area was sampled from 2002 to 2011, and again in 2016 and 2017. The DBA survey area was stratified by distance from shore and bottom topography, important factors in determining horseshoe crab relative abundance in the Mid-Atlantic (Hata and Berkson, 2004). Troughs are components of the prominent ridge and swale topography of the Mid-Atlantic coast, and horseshoe crabs tend to be more abundant in troughs than in nontrough areas (Hata and Berkson, 2004). Troughs were defined as topographic features at least 2.4-m deep, at least 1.8-km long, and no more than 1.8-km wide. Therefore, the survey area was stratified by distance from shore into an inshore zone 0-5.6 km (0-3 nmi) from shore, and an offshore zone 5.6-22.2 km (3-12 nmi) from shore, and by bottom topography into trough and nontrough sites. The resulting strata were inshore-trough, inshore-nontrough, offshore-trough, and offshore-nontrough.

The horseshoe crab reserve (HCR) extends from the 3-nmi limit of state territorial waters to 74° 22.5' W, and from 38° 22.0' N to 39° 14.6' N (NOAA, 2001). This study utilized slightly different limits to correspond with the whole-minute latitude/longitude grid system employed by the trawl survey: from the 3-nmi limit east to 74° 22' W or to the 12-nmi territorial sea limit, and from 38° 22' N to 39° 15' N. We compared horseshoe crabs caught within the entire DBA survey area to those caught in the portion of the survey area that overlapped with the HCR area. Although a portion of the HCR extends farther offshore than the survey area (Figure 1), we believe there are relatively few horseshoe crabs within that unsampled portion during the survey timeframe (see Results). Reserve strata were offshore-trough, and offshore-nontrough. Annual station selection was based on the entire DBA, so the proportion of stations within the HCR was variable.

Sampling was conducted aboard a 16.8-m chartered commercial fishing vessel operated out of Ocean City, MD. We used a two-seam flounder trawl with an 18.3-m headrope and 24.4-m footrope, rigged with a Texas Sweep of 13-mm link chain and a tickler chain. The net body consisted of 15.2-cm (6-in) stretched mesh, and the bag consisted of 14.3-cm (5 5/8-in) stretched mesh. Tows were usually 15-minutes bottom time, but were occasionally shorter to avoid fishing gear (e.g., gill nets, crab and whelk pots) or vessel traffic, or when the net unexpectedly hit an underwater obstruction. Start and end positions of each tow were recorded when the winches were stopped and when retrieval began, respectively. Bottom water temperature was recorded for each tow.

Horseshoe crabs were culled from the catch, and either all individuals or a subsample were examined for prosomal width (PW, millimeters) and identified for sex and maturity. Maturity classifications were: immature, newly mature - those that are capable of spawning but have not yet spawned, and mature - those that are have previously spawned. Newly mature and mature males are morphologically distinct, and are believed to be classifiable without error. However, some error is associated with distinguishing newly mature from immature females. All examined females that were not obviously mature (i.e., bearing rub marks) or immature (too small or soft-shelled) were probed with an awl to determine presence or absence of eggs. Females with eggs but without rub marks were considered newly mature. Females with both eggs and rub marks were considered mature. Initial sorting classifications were: presumed adult males

(newly mature and mature), presumed adult females, and all immature. Up to 25 adult males, 25 adult females, and 50 immatures were retained for examination. The remainder were counted separately by classification and released. Characteristics of the examined subsamples were then extrapolated to the counted portions of the catch.

The average 15-minute tow in the DBA was 1.22 kilometers at 4.9 KPH. Net-spread was measured from 113 tows from 2011 to 2016, and averaged 9.6 meters. Net-spread was negatively correlated with tow speed ( $r = -0.245$ ;  $F = 7.06$ ;  $p = 0.009$ ), so speed was used to estimate net-spread for collections in which net-spread was not measured.

For each tow, catch density (catch/km<sup>2</sup>) was calculated from the product of tow distance (in km) and estimated net-spread (converted from meters to km) assuming that all fishing was done only by the net, and that there was no herding effect from the ground gear (sweeps):

$$\text{catch/km}^2 = \text{catch}/[\text{tow distance (km)} \times \text{net-spread (km)}].$$

Preliminary studies indicated that survey gear efficiency increases with size, but never reaches 100% efficiency. Therefore, population estimates should be considered low. Within each stratum, the mean catch per square-kilometer and associated variance were calculated assuming a normal-distribution catch-frequency model. Stratum mean densities and variance estimates were combined using formulas for a stratified random sampling design (Cochran, 1977) to produce a stratified mean density ( $\bar{X}_{st}$ ). Population totals were estimated by multiplying stratified mean density ( $\bar{X}_{st}$ ) by survey area (DBA = 5127.1 km<sup>2</sup>; HCR = 1934.5 km<sup>2</sup>):

$$\text{Population total} = \bar{X}_{st} \times (5127.1 \text{ km}^2 \text{ or } 1934.5 \text{ km}^2).$$

Standard deviations and coefficients of variation presented here were derived from the stratified mean density ( $\bar{X}_{st}$ ). The approximate 95% confidence intervals were calculated using the effective degrees of freedom (Cochran, 1977) and standard deviation of  $\bar{X}_{st}$ , then multiplied by area as above to calculate confidence limits of the population totals.

Within each region (DBA and HCR), annual size-frequency distributions, in intervals of 10-mm prosomal width, were calculated for each sex/maturity category by pooling size-frequency distributions of all stations in a stratum in a year to calculate the relative proportions for each size interval. Those proportions then were multiplied by the

stratum mean density that year to produce a stratum size-frequency distribution. Stratum size-frequency distributions then were multiplied by the stratum weights and added in the same manner as calculating the stratified mean density. Areas under the distribution curves then would represent the stratified mean density at each size interval.

Approximate ages were assigned to size groups following Smith et al. (2009). Within this report annual size-frequency distributions were averaged over all years for brevity and clarity.

## Results

Over the trawl survey time-series, the total Delaware Bay area horseshoe crab population ranged from a low of 17.8 million in 2003 to a peak of 65.0 million in 2009 (Table 1; Figure 2). The estimated population of mature females ranged from 2.8 to 7.8 million, while mature males ranged from 5.4 to 24.0 million. Over all years, mature males outnumbered mature females 2.4 to 1, whereas immature females outnumbered immature males 1.4 to 1. The ratio of newly mature males to females varied widely depending on year, but averaged 1.0 male per female.

About half of the mature crabs occurred in the Reserve, but only around a quarter of the immature and newly mature crabs occurred there. The population of mature females in the HCR ranged from 1.4 to 4.7 million, while males ranged from 1.7 to 10.7 million (Table 2; Figure 2). Mature males outnumbered mature females in the HCR 2.1 to 1 over all years. Over all years, an average of 52% of mature females and 45% of mature males were caught in the Reserve. About 23% of immature females and 18% of immature males occurred in the HCR, while 23 and 26% of newly mature females and males, respectively, occurred there.

The relative proportion of mature horseshoe crabs within the HCR appeared to be related to average water temperature. The apparent fraction of mature females and males in the HCR relative to the entire DBA was highest in 2009 when the average DBA bottom water temperature was lowest (Figure 3). This fraction decreased as average bottom water temperature increased (males:  $r = -0.739$ ;  $n = 12$ ;  $T = -3.46$ ;  $p = 0.006$ , females:  $r = -0.740$ ;  $T = -3.47$ ;  $p = 0.006$ ). No similar relationships were evident for any

other demographic groups. This may reflect seasonal movement of mature crabs from Bay spawning grounds in Spring and Summer to offshore coastal waters in the Fall.

The estimated population of mature males and females in the DBA appear to be increasing over the time-series (males:  $r = 0.804$ ;  $n = 12$ ;  $T = 4.28$ ;  $p = 0.002$ , females:  $r = 0.594$ ;  $n = 12$ ;  $T = 2.33$ ;  $p = 0.042$ ). However, the populations of mature males and females within the HCR do not appear to be increasing over time (males:  $T = 0.90$ ;  $p = 0.387$ , females:  $T = -0.05$ ;  $p = 0.958$ ). The numbers of mature males and females in the HCR do not appear to be correlated with numbers in the entire DBA (males:  $T = 1.67$ ;  $p = 0.126$ , females:  $T = 1.250$ ;  $p = 0.241$ ). In contrast, populations of newly mature crabs in the HCR are correlated with numbers in the entire DBA (males:  $r = 0.816$ ;  $T = 4.46$ ;  $p = 0.001$ , females:  $r = 0.647$ ;  $T = 2.68$ ;  $p = 0.023$ ).

Horseshoe crabs were generally distributed inshore and in the center of the DBA survey area. Average densities of mature horseshoe crabs diminished toward the northern and southern survey limits as well as toward the offshore limit (Figure 4). Densities of immature males and females were generally highest inshore, and south of the Delaware Bay mouth. Newly mature crabs were distributed similarly to immature crabs – primarily inshore and south of Delaware Bay and the Reserve. For all demographic groups, high densities around 38.8° N and 12 km from shore were associated with the deeper water of the Delaware Shelf Valley outside the Bay mouth.

Average annual size-frequency distributions indicate that most immature horseshoe crabs less than about 150-mm occurred outside the Reserve (Figure 5). Immature crabs appeared in the DBA region beginning around age 8. At larger sizes, and presumably older ages, horseshoe crabs became more uniformly distributed, appearing in the HCR beginning around age 10. Newly mature and mature crabs had unimodal and generally symmetrical size distributions, suggesting they matured at consistent sizes and, presumably, ages, although males apparently mature at a smaller size and younger age than females. Size ranges of newly mature and mature crabs were similar to each other, indicating that little growth occurred after maturity, so size distributions of mature crabs did not reflect age structure. The average annual size-frequency distribution of newly mature and mature crabs within the HCR mirrored distributions in the entire DBA.



## **Discussion**

Abundance estimates presented here were subject to an unknown degree of bias due to unknown gear efficiency. Preliminary studies conducted by us indicate that the population totals presented here are probably underestimates, with the degree of underestimation being greater for smaller crabs. However, we believe that the degree of underestimation did not differ between HCR and non-HCR regions, so that regional comparisons were not substantially affected.

Although abundance estimates were biased, they may not be unreasonable. Smith et al. (2006) estimated the spring 2003 Delaware Bay spawning population at 13.7 million males and 6.25 million females. They also calculated that about 70% of the spawning population, or 9.6 million males and 4.4 million females, overwintered outside of the Bay during the 2002-2003 winter. In comparison, we estimated populations of 11.3 million adult (newly mature and mature combined) males and 6.3 million adult females in the DBA in fall 2002 that could have spawned in spring 2003. Furthermore, the estimates may be reasonable considering that some of the adults we enumerated probably spawned in other coastal embayments adjacent to the survey area.

Catches of mature males and females appeared highest in the center of the survey area and decreased toward the survey area periphery. Abundance decreases north of Atlantic City, NJ, at the survey's northern boundary, and at depths greater than 30-meters (Botton and Haskin, 1984; Botton and Ropes, 1987). Survey depths were typically less than 29-m, but reached 42.7-m in the Delaware Shelf Valley. This distributional information indicates that the trawl survey coverage was reasonably adequate for monitoring abundance of the mature component of the Delaware Bay population, and for assessing the portion of that population within the Reserve. Average densities of mature crabs were higher at Reserve latitudes than outside, suggesting that they generally remain near Delaware Bay after spawning, although tagging studies indicate some movement of adults between Reserve and non-Reserve areas (Swan, 2005). Closed areas may have the greatest fishery management benefit for species with moderate degrees of adult movement (Botsford et al., 2003; Gell and Roberts, 2003). However, this trawl survey did not begin until after the Reserve was established, so we cannot evaluate whether the Reserve influenced distribution.

Although it appears sufficient for protecting mature crabs, the Reserve does not appear to be well suited for protecting younger crabs. Closed areas are often cited as a potential source of recruitment to fished areas. However, spawning occurs outside the Reserve in coastal embayments, and juveniles remain close to the spawning beaches for several years, moving to deeper water as they mature (Rudloe, 1981; Botton and Loveland, 2003; Smith et al., 2009). On average, about 75% of immature and newly mature crabs occurred outside the Reserve, and nearly all crabs less than about 150-mm occurred outside the Reserve. Abundance of immature crabs did not appear to diminish toward the southern survey boundary, so variability in their numbers may not be fully captured in the trawl survey. Furthermore, their distribution makes it unclear if they are of Delaware Bay, Chesapeake Bay, or mixed origin. In addition, the distribution of immature crabs south and inshore of the HCR, along with their unknown origin, suggests that the HCR is of limited value in protecting them.

The combination of the Horseshoe Crab Reserve and restrictions in New Jersey (harvest moratorium) and Delaware (no trawling allowed within state waters) effectively comprises a sanctuary for mature crabs that spawn in Delaware Bay, protecting about half of the male population, while harvest of females is prohibited in all coastal waters from New Jersey to Virginia. In addition, about 38% of the entire trawl survey area was within the Reserve. These values compare favorably with suggestions that closed areas should protect up to 50% of the population and cover 20-40% of the fishing grounds in order for any benefits to be realized (Lauck et al., 1998; Gell and Roberts, 2003). While protecting a large portion of the spawning population, this *de facto* sanctuary also protects the migratory corridor between coastal waters and Delaware Bay spawning grounds. Closed areas may be especially important at such vulnerable spatial bottlenecks (Gell and Roberts, 2003).

One suggested benefit of closed areas is that the protection they afford allows for the re-extension of size and age structures that had been truncated by fishing, and thereby re-extension of reproductive potential through increased fecundity (Gell and Roberts, 2003; Roberts et al., 2005). Although fecundity is correlated with size (Leschen et al., 2006), horseshoe crabs do not appear to grow much, if at all, after reaching maturity (Smith et al., 2009). We did not observe substantial differences in size structures

between adult crabs inside and outside the Reserve, suggesting that egg production would not be increased through this mechanism. Horseshoe crabs cannot be aged directly, but indirect methods using ages of epifauna or relative carapace wear exist (Botton and Ropes, 1988; Smith et al., 2009). We did not evaluate such characteristics during the trawl survey, but examination in the future may be useful for comparing the relative age structures of horseshoe crabs inside and outside the Reserve.

Closed areas have been recommended as fishery management tools with various potential benefits. However, whether any benefits are realized is dependent on the targeted species and the particular objectives of the closed area, as well as its characteristics. It is doubtful that any effects on stock size due to the Reserve could be separated from those solely due to harvest restrictions, especially given that initial harvest restrictions and Reserve implementation occurred near simultaneously, at least in biological terms. Horseshoe crabs may take ten years or more to mature, and a similar time span is expected before management actions are manifested as increases in stock size (Shuster and Sekiguchi, 2003; ASMFC, 2004b), and it appears that abundance of mature crabs in the Delaware Bay area is beginning to increase. Nevertheless, characteristics of the Reserve and mature horseshoe crab distribution appear to fit criteria necessary to accomplish its objective to protect the spawning stock in support of the FMP.

## References

- ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 1998. Interstate fishery management plan for horseshoe crab. Fishery Management Report Number 32. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Washington, DC.
- ASMFC. 2000. Addendum I to the fishery management plan for horseshoe crab. Fishery Management Report 32a. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Washington, DC.
- ASMFC. 2004a. Addendum III to the fishery management plan for horseshoe crab. Fishery Management Report 32c. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Washington, DC.
- ASMFC. 2004b. Horseshoe crab 2004 stock assessment report. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Washington, DC.
- ASMFC. 2006. Addendum IV to the fishery management plan for horseshoe crab. Fishery Management Report 32d. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Washington, DC.
- Botsford, L. W., F. Micheli, and A. Hastings. 2003. Principles for the design of marine reserves. *Ecol. Appl.* 13:S25-S31.
- Botton, M. L., and H. H. Haskin. 1984. Distribution and feeding of the horseshoe crab, *Limulus polyphemus*, on the continental shelf off New Jersey. *Fish. Bull.* 82:383-389.
- Botton, M. L., and R. E. Loveland. 2003. Distribution, abundance, and survivorship of young-of-the-year in a commercially exploited population of horseshoe crabs *Limulus polyphemus*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 265:175-184.
- Botton, M. L., and J. W. Ropes. 1987. Populations of horseshoe crabs, *Limulus polyphemus*, on the northwestern Atlantic continental shelf. *Fish. Bull.* 85:805-812.
- Botton, M. L., and J. W. Ropes. 1988. An indirect method for estimating longevity of the horseshoe crab (*Limulus polyphemus*) based on epifaunal slipper shells (*Crepidula fornicata*). *J. Shellfish Res.* 7:407-412.
- Cochran, W. G. 1977. *Sampling Techniques*, 3rd ed. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.
- Gell, F. R., and C. M. Roberts. 2003. Benefits beyond boundaries: the fishery effects of marine reserves. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 18(9):448-455.

- Hata, D., and J. Berkson. 2003. Abundance of horseshoe crabs (*Limulus polyphemus*) in the Delaware Bay area. *Fish. Bull.* 101:933-938.
- Hata, D., and J. Berkson. 2004. Factors affecting horseshoe crab *Limulus polyphemus* trawl survey design. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* 133:292-299.
- Hilborn, R., F. Micheli, and G. A. De Leo. 2006. Integrating marine protected areas with catch regulation. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 63:642-649.
- Jones, P. J. S. 2007. Point-of-view: Arguments for conventional fisheries management and against no-take marine protected areas: only half of the story? *Rev. Fish Biol. Fish.* 17:31-43.
- Kaiser, M. J. 2005. Are marine protected areas a red herring or fisheries panacea? *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 62:1194-1199.
- Lauck, T., C. W. Clark, M. Mangel, and G. R. Munro. 1998. Implementing the precautionary principle in fisheries management through marine reserves. *Ecol. Appl.* 8:S72-S78.
- Leschen, A. S., S. P. Grady, and I. Valiela. 2006. Fecundity and spawning of the Atlantic horseshoe crab, *Limulus polyphemus*, in Pleasant Bay, Cape Cod, Massachusetts, USA. *Mar. Ecol.* 27:54-65.
- Morrison, R. I. G., R. K. Ross, and L. J. Niles. 2004. Declines in wintering populations of red knots in southern South America. *Condor* 106:60-70.
- NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). 2000. Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act Provisions; Horseshoe Crab Fishery; Closed Area. *Fed. Regist.* 65:61135-61139.
- NOAA. 2001. Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act Provisions; Horseshoe Crab Fishery; Closed Area. *Fed. Regist.* 66:8906-8911.
- Roberts, C. M., J. P. Hawkins, and F. R. Gell. 2005. The role of marine reserves in achieving sustainable fisheries. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* 360:123-132.
- Rudloe, A. 1981. Aspects of the biology of juvenile horseshoe crabs, *Limulus polyphemus*. *Bull. Mar. Sci.* 31:125-133.
- Shipp, R. L. 2003. A perspective on marine reserves as a fishery management tool. *Fisheries* 28(12):10-21.

- Shuster, C. N., Jr. 1982. A pictorial review of the natural history and ecology of the horseshoe crab, *Limulus polyphemus*, with reference to other Limulidae. *In* Physiology and Biology of Horseshoe Crabs (J. Bonaventura, C. Bonaventura, S. Tesh, eds.), p. 1-52. Alan. R. Liss, Inc., New York.
- Shuster, C. N., Jr., and M. L. Botton. 1985. A contribution to the population biology of horseshoe crabs, *Limulus polyphemus* (L.), in Delaware Bay. *Estuaries* 8:363-372.
- Shuster, C. N., Jr., and K. Sekiguchi. 2003. Growing up takes about ten years and eighteen stages. *In* The American Horseshoe Crab (C. N. Shuster, Jr., R. B. Barlow, H. J. Brockmann, eds.), p. 103-130. Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Smith, D. R., M. J. Millard, and S. Eyler. 2006. Abundance of adult horseshoe crabs (*Limulus polyphemus*) in Delaware Bay estimated from a bay-wide mark-recapture study. *Fish. Bull.* 104:456-464.
- Smith, D. R., M. T. Mandt, and P. D. M. MacDonald. 2009. Proximate causes of sexual dimorphism in horseshoe crabs (*Limulus polyphemus*) of the Delaware Bay. *J. Shellfish Res.* 28:405-417.
- Swan, B. L. 2005. Migrations of adult horseshoe crabs, *Limulus polyphemus*, in the Middle Atlantic Bight: a 17-year tagging study. *Estuaries* 28:28-40.
- Tsipoura, N., and J. Burger. 1999. Shorebird diet during spring migration stopover on Delaware Bay. *Condor* 101:635-644.
- USFWS (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2003. Delaware Bay shorebird-horseshoe crab assessment report and peer review. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Migratory Bird Publication R9-03/02. USFWS, Arlington, VA.
- Walls, E. A., J. Berkson, and S. A. Smith. 2002. The horseshoe crab, *Limulus polyphemus*: 200 million years of existence, 100 years of study. *Rev. Fish. Sci.* 10:39-73.




Figure 1. Delaware Bay horseshoe crab trawl survey area and Carl N. Shuster, Jr. Horseshoe Crab Reserve. Contours indicate 5.6 and 22.2-km (3 and 12-nmi) from shore.




Figure 2. Plots of estimated abundance (in thousands) of horseshoe crabs by demographic group. Vertical lines indicate 95% confidence limits. Open symbols and dashed lines indicate the entire Delaware Bay area. Solid symbols and lines indicate the Horseshoe Crab Reserve. Data are from Tables 1 and 2. Note differences in y-axis scales.






Figure 3. Plots of the fraction of total numbers of horseshoe crabs in the Horseshoe Crab Reserve (HCR) relative to the entire Delaware Bay area (DBA) survey against average DBA bottom water temperature, by demographic group.




Figure 4. Average density (catch/km<sup>2</sup>) of horseshoe crabs in the Delaware Bay area survey by distance from shore (left panels) and latitude (right panels) by demographic group. Immature crabs are depicted in the top panels, newly mature crabs are in the middle panels, and mature crabs are depicted in the bottom panels. Vertical lines in the right-hand panels indicate the southern and northern limits of the Horseshoe Crab Reserve.




Figure 5. Size-frequency distributions of horseshoe crabs in the Horseshoe Crab Reserve (left panels) and Delaware Bay area (right panels), all years averaged, by demographic group. Females are depicted in the top panels, males are depicted in the bottom panels. Approximate age designations are from Smith et al. (2009).

Table 1. Estimated abundance, in thousands, of horseshoe crabs in the Delaware Bay area (DBA) trawl survey (Total), with upper and lower 95% confidence limits (UCL, LCL), coefficient of variation (CV), and standard deviation (sd). Estimates are given by demographic group and survey year. Abundance estimates were calculated using a normal-distribution catch-frequency model.

	Total	UCL	LCL	CV	sd		Total	UCL	LCL	CV	sd
Immature females						Immature males					
2002	8,222	11,875	4,568	0.21	344	2002	5,076	7,998	2,155	0.28	273
2003	4,089	6,860	1,317	0.32	255	2003	2,114	3,462	766	0.30	123
2004	7,376	10,616	4,135	0.21	305	2004	6,033	8,786	3,281	0.22	260
2005	5,104	7,521	2,687	0.23	227	2005	4,673	7,414	1,932	0.28	255
2006	13,714	20,988	6,439	0.25	672	2006	9,378	13,971	4,786	0.23	428
2007	13,692	27,335	48	0.41	1,088	2007	9,350	19,735	-1,035	0.45	828
2008	10,595	16,578	4,612	0.26	544	2008	6,897	10,443	3,350	0.23	314
2009	27,375	40,519	14,231	0.23	1,242	2009	26,435	38,730	14,140	0.23	1,162
2010	4,102	5,706	2,497	0.19	152	2010	2,781	4,423	1,139	0.29	156
2011	5,426	8,433	2,420	0.27	284	2011	3,301	5,219	1,382	0.28	182
2016	11,292	18,441	4,144	0.30	668	2016	8,185	13,512	2,858	0.31	498
2017	7,948	11,818	4,077	0.23	364	2017	5,082	7,829	2,335	0.26	257
Mature females						Mature males					
2002	4,779	7,431	2,128	0.26	243	2002	10,711	14,972	6,450	0.19	400
2003	3,308	4,851	1,764	0.22	144	2003	7,454	10,827	4,082	0.21	312
2004	2,767	3,919	1,615	0.20	109	2004	5,586	8,875	2,297	0.28	308
2005	2,957	4,323	1,592	0.22	124	2005	5,408	7,322	3,494	0.17	181
2006	5,867	10,517	1,218	0.31	353	2006	14,461	21,734	7,188	0.23	637
2007	6,553	9,864	3,243	0.25	313	2007	13,100	18,506	7,694	0.20	514
2008	7,172	13,336	1,008	0.40	561	2008	14,244	23,240	5,247	0.30	838
2009	3,230	5,523	936	0.33	211	2009	6,319	10,255	2,383	0.29	360
2010	5,588	8,698	2,478	0.26	289	2010	14,396	22,600	6,192	0.27	765
2011	5,388	7,629	3,147	0.20	205	2011	14,857	25,890	3,825	0.33	951
2016	5,735	7,770	3,700	0.17	193	2016	24,017	40,196	7,837	0.30	1,416
2017	7,785	12,033	3,537	0.27	403	2017	19,985	29,245	10,724	0.23	884
Newly mature females						Newly mature males					
2002	1,509	2,278	741	0.24	72	2002	561	925	196	0.31	33
2003	787	1,547	26	0.45	69	2003	78	222	-66	0.84	13
2004	367	613	120	0.32	23	2004	786	1,120	452	0.20	31
2005	531	908	154	0.34	36	2005	580	927	233	0.29	33
2006	2,122	3,705	540	0.33	139	2006	3,377	6,076	678	0.38	251
2007	2,129	3,584	674	0.33	135	2007	2,841	4,214	1,468	0.23	129
2008	2,697	4,780	613	0.36	192	2008	776	1,315	237	0.33	50
2009	883	1,366	399	0.26	45	2009	708	1,157	259	0.31	43
2010	1,770	4,532	-992	0.74	255	2010	1,464	3,180	-252	0.56	159
2011	882	1,495	269	0.34	58	2011	766	1,343	190	0.36	54
2016	1,583	2,304	863	0.22	68	2016	2,939	5,588	290	0.43	248
2017	1,502	2,323	680	0.27	79	2017	1,590	2,623	557	0.32	98

Table 1 (continued).

	Total	UCL	LCL	CV	sd
All					
2002	30,858	40,779	20,937	0.16	933
2003	17,829	25,380	10,279	0.20	691
2004	22,915	32,096	13,733	0.19	861
2005	19,253	26,127	12,380	0.17	646
2006	48,919	69,148	28,691	0.20	1,902
2007	47,665	75,120	20,210	0.26	2,403
2008	42,380	63,506	21,254	0.24	1,981
2009	64,950	91,590	38,310	0.20	2,523
2010	30,101	47,091	13,111	0.27	1,583
2011	30,621	45,933	15,309	0.23	1,371
2016	53,751	83,178	24,324	0.26	2,693
2017	43,891	62,296	25,487	0.21	1,755

Table 2. Estimated abundance, in thousands, of horseshoe crabs in the Horseshoe Crab Reserve (HCR) portion of the Delaware Bay area (DBA) trawl survey (Total), with upper and lower 95% confidence limits (UCL, LCL), coefficient of variation (CV), and standard deviation (sd). Estimates are given by demographic group and survey year. Abundance estimates were calculated using a normal-distribution catch-frequency model.

	Total	UCL	LCL	CV	sd		Total	UCL	LCL	CV	sd
Immature females						Immature males					
2002	1,676	4,117	-764	0.62	534	2002	1,185	3,485	-1,115	0.82	503
2003	217	700	-265	0.86	97	2003	25	90	-39	1.00	13
2004	2,208	4,581	-165	0.48	551	2004	1,374	2,859	-111	0.49	345
2005	1,012	2,752	-728	0.40	209	2005	818	2,723	-1,086	0.54	229
2006	6,691	18,072	-4,689	0.66	2,289	2006	3,438	9,247	-2,370	0.66	1,168
2007	1,131	1,994	269	0.32	189	2007	402	720	84	0.31	64
2008	2,257	4,724	-211	0.46	539	2008	1,375	3,022	-273	0.43	307
2009	1,051	3,527	-1,426	0.74	402	2009	487	1,345	-371	0.55	139
2010	1,412	1,977	846	0.17	124	2010	187	350	24	0.31	30
2011	1,476	2,837	116	0.29	221	2011	1,020	2,273	-232	0.39	203
2016	2,446	4,559	333	0.39	490	2016	1,809	3,455	164	0.41	382
2017	3,098	8,758	-2,562	0.23	364	2017	1,577	5,044	-1,890	0.26	257
Mature females						Mature males					
2002	2,038	3,995	82	0.41	428	2002	4,168	7,086	1,251	0.30	638
2003	1,790	3,335	245	0.34	311	2003	3,368	6,647	90	0.38	659
2004	1,412	2,326	497	0.28	205	2004	2,792	5,516	69	0.43	622
2005	1,838	2,793	883	0.12	115	2005	1,730	5,595	-2,135	0.52	464
2006	3,746	7,628	-136	0.24	466	2006	8,018	13,571	2,465	0.28	1,173
2007	2,156	4,280	32	0.40	449	2007	4,264	7,810	718	0.32	713
2008	4,664	11,057	-1,729	0.56	1,351	2008	8,101	16,584	-382	0.43	1,792
2009	3,004	8,826	-2,819	0.61	946	2009	5,413	15,112	-4,286	0.56	1,575
2010	3,695	6,565	824	0.32	606	2010	10,745	19,894	1,596	0.35	1,933
2011	2,112	3,090	1,135	0.21	227	2011	3,422	5,595	1,248	0.28	487
2016	1,836	2,900	771	0.26	250	2016	7,666	13,939	1,392	0.36	1,434
2017	1,626	3,985	-734	0.27	403	2017	3,342	7,615	-932	0.23	884
Newly mature females						Newly mature males					
2002	345	766	-76	0.52	92	2002	142	382	-99	0.72	53
2003	0	0	0	0.00	0	2003	0	0	0	0.00	0
2004	242	462	22	0.38	48	2004	345	560	130	0.28	49
2005	26	185	-133	0.48	6	2005	0	0	0	0.00	0
2006	615	1,332	-102	0.45	144	2006	2,402	6,751	-1,946	0.70	874
2007	105	223	-13	0.44	24	2007	696	1,106	286	0.25	90
2008	1,026	2,686	-635	0.66	351	2008	142	333	-50	0.57	42
2009	191	753	-371	0.92	91	2009	15	197	-168	0.98	7
2010	125	287	-38	0.53	34	2010	465	1,280	-349	0.72	172
2011	296	614	-23	0.39	59	2011	212	491	-68	0.48	52
2016	652	1,211	93	0.38	130	2016	636	1,488	-216	0.58	191
2017	143	491	-205	0.27	79	2017	673	2,163	-818	0.32	98

Table 2 (continued).

	Total	UCL	LCL	CV	sd
All					
2002	9,555	16,941	2,169	0.33	1,615
2003	5,401	10,384	418	0.36	1,002
2004	8,372	15,433	1,311	0.38	1,638
2005	5,425	13,158	-2,308	0.33	929
2006	24,911	53,095	-3,274	0.44	5,668
2007	8,754	14,815	2,693	0.29	1,325
2008	17,563	36,662	-1,536	0.46	4,175
2009	10,161	29,316	-8,995	0.59	3,111
2010	16,628	29,697	3,560	0.32	2,761
2011	8,538	14,156	2,920	0.24	1,046
2016	15,045	25,206	4,883	0.30	2,357
2017	10,458	27,951	-7,035	0.21	1,755

MEMO

To: Delaware Bay ARM Working Group  
From: Jim Lyons, USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, MD  
Re: Red Knot Stopover Population Estimate for 2018  
Date: 27 August 2018

**1 Acknowledgments**

We thank the many volunteers in Delaware and New Jersey who collected mark-resight data in 2018. We are grateful to A. DeRose-Wilson (Delaware DFW), A. Dey (New Jersey ENSP), and volunteers in Delaware and New Jersey for data entry and data management, and L. Usyk (bandedbirds.org) for data management.

**2 Methods**

Mark-resight data, including counts of marked and unmarked birds, were collected according to the methods for mark-resight investigations of Red Knots in Delaware Bay (Lyons 2016). Red knots have been individually marked with engraved leg flags at Delaware Bay and other locations for many years; each leg flag is engraved with a unique 3-character alphanumeric code (Clark et al. 2005). Surveys to locate flagged birds were conducted on each beach every three days according to the sampling plan (Table 1). During these resighting surveys, agency staff and volunteers surveyed the entire beach and recorded as many alphanumeric combinations as possible. While searching for birds marked with engraved leg flags, observers also periodically used a scan sampling technique to count marked and unmarked birds in randomly selected portions of Red Knot flocks (Lyons 2016).

Survey period	Dates	Survey period	Dates
1	≤10 May	6	23-25 May
2	11-13 May	7	26-28 May
3	14-16 May	8	29-31 May
4	17-19 May	9	1-3 June
5	20-22 May	10	4-6 June

As in previous years, all flag resightings were validated with banding data available in the data repository at <http://www.bandedbirds.org/>. Resightings without a corresponding record in bandedbirds.org of physical capture and banding (i.e., “misread” errors) were not included in the analysis (orange engraved flags from Argentina notwithstanding, see below). We also deleted resightings of 21 flagged individuals whose flag codes were accidentally deployed in both New Jersey and South Carolina (A. Dey, pers. comm.). Banding data from Argentina are not available in bandedbirds.org; therefore, all



resightings of orange engraved flags were included in the analysis without validation using banding data.

To estimate stopover population size, we analyzed the mark-resight data and data from the scan samples of the marked-ratio using the methods of Lyons et al. (2016). In this “superpopulation” approach, passage population size is estimated using the Jolly-Seber model for open populations to account for the flow-through nature of migration areas and probability of detection during surveys.

In the analyses for Delaware Bay, the days of the season were aggregated into 3-day sampling periods, the same sampling periods used in prior analyses (a total of 10 sample periods possible each season, Table 1). Data were aggregated to 3-day periods because this is the amount of time necessary to complete mark-resight surveys on all beaches in the study (data summary provided in Appendix 1).

With the mark-resight superpopulation approach, we estimated the number of birds that were carrying leg flags, and then adjusted this number using the estimated proportion of the population with flags to account for unmarked birds. The estimated proportion with leg flags is thus an important statistic. We used the scan sample data (i.e., the counts of marked birds and the number checked for marks) and a binomial model to estimate the proportion of the population that is marked. To account for the random nature of arrival of marked birds in the bay and the addition of new marks during the season, we implemented the binomial model as a generalized linear mixed model with a random effect for the sampling period. More detailed methods are provided in Lyons et al. (2016) and Appendix 2.

### **3 Summary of Mark-resight and Count Data Collected in 2018**

*Mark-resight encounter data.*—With birds from six countries reported, the 2018 Red Knot mark-resight database included a total of 3,820 individual birds recorded at least once by observers in Delaware Bay (Table 2). One assumption of the mark-resight approach is that individual identity of marked birds is recorded without error (see Lyons 2016 for discussion of all model assumptions). Using the banding data available from bandedbirds.org as described above, some of the recording errors are removed before analysis (i.e., flags that have never been deployed in the field). Field observers submitted 20,541 resightings in 2018; 699 were not validated with banding data, for an overall misread read of 3.4%. These invalid resightings were removed before analysis, but a second type of “false positive” is still possible, i.e., false positive detection of flags that were deployed prior to 2018 but were not in fact present in Delaware Bay in 2018. It is not possible to identify this second type of false positive by cross-referencing to physical captures (banding data) or other QA/QC methods.

*Marked-ratio data.*—In 2018, 502 marked-ratio scan samples were collected: 337 samples in Delaware and 165 in New Jersey (Appendix 3). There were days early in the season and in the middle of the season when the number of scan samples was relatively low (<10 samples), and there were no data on marked ratio collected in the last two

survey periods in which mark-resight data were collected (1-3 and 4-6 June). Because there were no scan samples with marked ratio data after 31 May (survey period 8), yet observations of marked birds continued into survey periods 9 & 10 (first week of June), we used the overall average proportion marked for all survey periods to estimate stopover population size in periods 9 and 10.

*Aerial and ground count data.*—Aerial and ground surveys were conducted on two dates in 2018: 23 and 26 May.

<b>Table 2. Number of flags detected in 2018 by banding location (flag color).</b>	
Banding location (flag color)	No. flagged individuals detected
U.S. (lime green)	2,731 (71%)
U.S. (dark green)	462 (12%)
Argentina (orange)	389 (10%)
Canada (white)	182 (5%)
Brazil (dark blue)	35 (<1%)
Chile (red)	21 (<1%)
Total	3,820 (100%)

#### **4 Summary of 2018 Migration**

The pattern of arrivals at Delaware Bay in 2018 was bi-modal; there were peaks of arrivals around 15 and 21 May (Fig. 1a). After the peak in arrivals at about 21 May, there was a steady decline in the proportion arriving at each sampling period. There was no evidence of a wave of late-arriving birds, a pattern that has been evident in some past years. Nevertheless, a substantial fraction of the total stopover population arrived after 21 May. The sampling occasions from 24 May to the end of the season, when taken together, accounted for approximately 30% of all birds in the stopover population.

Stopover persistence is the probability that a bird present in the bay during sampling occasion  $i$  is present in the bay at sampling occasion  $i + 1$ . Estimated stopover persistence was relatively high during the first half of the season; there was a slight decrease in stopover persistence, indicating some turnover in the population, around 21-24 May (Fig. 1b). After 24 May there was a large drop in stopover persistence, when a large fraction of the stopover population departed the study area. Following Lyons et al. (2016), we used the Jolly-Seber model to estimate stopover duration. In 2018, estimated average stopover duration was 9.7 days (95% CI 9.3–10.1 days).

Unlike 2017, when probability of resighting was relatively constant and relatively high (Appendix 5, Fig. A5c), in 2018, probability of resighting was highly variable among the survey periods (Fig. 1c). Resighting probability was low early in the season and then again during 17-22 May. During 17-19 May, the weather was cold and rainy, and some observers noted that poor weather had impacted survey efforts. (Appendix 6).

The estimated proportion of the 2016 stopover population with marks (leg flags) was 0.107 (95% CI 0.093–0.123, Fig. 2), slightly greater than the 2017 estimate (0.099). The estimated proportion marked was slightly greater than average in the early part of the season, and lowest in survey period 4 (Fig. 2).

## 5 Stopover Population Estimation

The passage population size in 2018 was estimated at 45,221 (95% CI: 42,568–49,508), slightly lower than the estimate in 2017 (49,405 [46,368–53,109]). This superpopulation estimate accounts for turnover in the population and probability of detection.

The time-specific stopover population estimates in 2018 increased steadily between 10 and 23 May, peaked around 23–25 May at 26,762 birds (23,988–30,022), and then declined steadily until nearly all birds had departed the study area in early June (Fig. 1d).

*Aerial surveys in 2018.*—The aerial survey conducted on 23 May 2018 detected 32,930 birds, a substantial increase from the aerial survey index in 2017 and greatest index since 2011 (Table 2). The aerial survey total was approximately 23% greater than the mark-resight estimate (26,762) for the corresponding 23–25 May mark-resight survey period (Table 3, Fig. 1d). The second aerial survey of 2018, on 26 May, resulted in a count of 21,200 birds, which was similar to the corresponding mark-resight estimate (21,543) for the survey period 26–28 May.

## 6 References

- Clark, N.A., S. Gillings, A.J. Baker, P.M. González, and R. Porter. 2005. The production and use of permanently inscribed leg flags for waders. *Wader Study Group Bull.* 108: 38–41.
- Lyons, J.E., W.P. Kendall, J.A. Royle, S.J. Converse, B.A. Andres, and J.B. Buchanan. 2016. Population size and stopover duration estimation using mark-resight data and Bayesian analysis of a superpopulation model. *Biometrics* 72:262–271.
- Lyons, J.E. 2016. Study design guidelines for mark-resight investigations of Red Knots in Delaware Bay. Unpublished report. 13 pp.

Table 3. Number of Red Knot detected during aerial and ground surveys of Delaware Bay in 2018. Data provided by A. Dey, New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife, Nongame and Endangered Species Program.

	Delaware	New Jersey	Total
<b>Aerial Surveys</b>			
23 May 2018	7,010	25,920	32,930
26 May 2018	11,500	9,700	21,200
<b>Ground Surveys</b>			
23 May 2018	6,239	24,338	30,577
26 May 2018	12,563	8,409	20,972

Table 4. Stopover (passage) population estimate using mark-resight methods compared to peak-count index using aerial- or ground-survey methods. The mark-resight estimate of stopover (passage) population accounts for population turnover during migration; peak-count index, a single count on a single day, does not account for turnover.

Year	Stopover population <sup>a</sup> (mark-resight $N^*$ )	95% CI Stopover pop- ulation $N^*$	Peak-count index [aerial (A) or ground (G)]
2011	43,570	(40,880–46,570)	12,804 (A) <sup>b</sup>
2012	44,100	(41,860–46,790)	25,458 (G) <sup>c</sup>
2013	48,955	(39,119–63,130)	25,596 (A) <sup>d</sup>
2014	44,010	(41,900–46,310)	24,980 (A) <sup>c</sup>
2015	60,727	(55,568–68,732)	24,890 (A) <sup>c</sup>
2016	47,254	(44,873–50,574)	21,128 (A) <sup>b</sup>
2017	49,405 <sup>e</sup>	(46,368–53,109)	17,969 (A) <sup>f</sup>
2018	45,221	(42,568–49,508)	32,930 (A) <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> estimate for entire season, including population turnover

<sup>b</sup> 23 May

<sup>c</sup> 24 May

<sup>d</sup> 28 May

<sup>e</sup> Data management procedures to reduce bias from recording errors in the field; data from observers with greater than average misread rate were not included in the analysis

<sup>f</sup> 26 May




Figure 1. Estimated Jolly-Seber (JS) model parameters from a mark-resight study of Red Knots in Delaware Bay in 2018: (a) proportion of stopover population arriving in Delaware Bay, (b) stopover persistence, (c) probability of resighting, and (d) time-specific stopover population size. Dates on the x-axis represent sampling occasions (3-day survey periods). Triangles in (d) are total counts made by aerial survey on 23 and 26 May 2018.




Figure 2. Estimated proportion of the Delaware Bay stopover population that has leg flags in 2018. Marked proportion was estimated from marked-ratio scan samples for each 3-day sampling period. The dates for the sampling periods are shown in Table 1. Sample size (number scanned, i.e., checked for marks) for each sample period is shown in the upper panel. The estimated proportion marked at each sample occasion (bottom panel) was estimated with the generalized linear mixed model described in Appendix 2. Solid and dashed lines are median proportion marked and 95% CI; circles show (number with marks/number scanned).

Appendix 1. Summary of 2018 mark-resight data (“m-array”). NR = never resighted.

Sample	Dates	Resighted	Next resighted at sample										NR
			2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1	7-10 May	125	47	37	2	8	2	4	0	0	0	25	
2	11-13 May	376		244	13	15	23	2	0	0	0	79	
3	14-16 May	1224			356	228	155	60	4	0	0	421	
4	17-19 May	671				290	130	50	3	0	0	198	
5	20-22 May	1172					553	149	14	0	0	456	
6	23-25 May	1586						828	34	3	0	721	
7	26-28 May	1644							281	4	2	1357	
8	29-31 May	511								15	3	493	
9	1-3 June	57									5	52	



## Appendix 2. Statistical Methods to Estimate Stopover Population Size Using Mark-Resight Data and Counts of Marked Birds

We converted the observations of marked birds into encounter histories, one for each bird, and analyzed the encounter histories with a Jolly-Seber (JS) model (Jolly 1965, Seber 1965, Crosbie and Manly 1985, Schwarz and Arnason 1996). The JS model includes parameters for recruitment ( $\beta$ ), survival ( $\phi$ ), and capture ( $p$ ) probabilities; in the context of a mark-resight study at a migration stopover site, these parameters are interpreted as probability of arrival to the study area, stopover persistence, and resighting, respectively. Stopover persistence is defined as the probability that a bird present at time  $t$  remains at the study area until time  $t + 1$ . The Crosbie and Manley (1985) and Schwarz and Arnason (1996) formulation of the JS model also includes a parameter for superpopulation size, which in our approach to mark-resight inferences for stopover populations is an estimate of the marked (leg-flagged) population size.

We chose to use 3-day periods rather than days as the sampling interval for the JS model given logistical constraints on complete sampling of the study area; multiple observations of the same individual in a given 3-day period were combined for analysis. A summary (m-array) of the mark-resight data is presented in an appendix.

We made inference from a fully-time dependent model; arrival, persistence, and resight probabilities were allowed to vary with sampling period [ $\beta_t \phi_t p_t$ ]. In this model, we set  $p_1 = p_2$  and  $p_{K-1} = p_K$  (where  $K$  is the number of samples) because not all parameters are estimable in the fully-time dependent model (Jolly 1965, Seber 1965, Crosbie and Manly 1985, Schwarz and Arnason 1996).

We followed the methods of Royle and Dorazio (2008) and Kéry and Schaub (2012, Chapter 10) to fit the JS model using the restricted occupancy formulation. Royle and Dorazio (2008) use a state-space formulation of the JS model with parameter-expanded data augmentation. For parameter-expanded data augmentation, we augmented the observed encounter histories with all-zero encounter histories ( $n = 2000$ ) representing potential recruits that were not detected (Royle and Dorazio 2012). We followed Lyons et al. (2016) to combine the JS model with a binomial model for the counts of marked and unmarked birds in an integrated Bayesian analysis. Briefly, the counts of marked birds ( $m_s$ ) in the scan samples are modeled as a binomial random variable:

$$m_s \sim \text{Bin}(C_s, \pi), \quad (1)$$

where  $m_s$  is the number of marked birds in scan sample  $s$ ,  $C_s$  is the number of birds checked for marks in scan sample  $s$ , and  $\pi$  is the proportion of the population that is marked. Total stopover population size  $\widehat{N}^*$  is estimated by

$$\widehat{N}^* = \widehat{M}^* / \widehat{\pi} \quad (2)$$

where  $\widehat{M}^*$  is the estimate of marked birds from the J-S model and  $\widehat{\pi}$  is the proportion of the population that is marked (from Eq. 1). Estimates of marked subpopulation sizes at each resighting occasion  $t$  ( $\widehat{M}_t^*$ ) are available as derived parameters in the analysis. We calculated an estimate of population size at each mark-resight sampling occasion  $\widehat{N}_t^*$  using  $\widehat{M}_t^*$  and  $\widehat{\pi}$  as in equation 2.

To better account for the random nature of the arrival of marked birds and addition of new marks during the season, we used a time-specific model for proportion with marks in place of equation 1 above:

$$m_{s,t} \sim \text{Binomial}(C_{s,t}, \pi_t) \quad (3)$$

for  $s$  in  $1, \dots, n_{\text{samples}}$  and  $t$  in  $1, \dots, n_{\text{occasions}}$

$$\text{logit}(\pi_t) = \alpha + \delta_t$$

$$\delta_t \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_{\text{occasions}}^2)$$

where  $m_s$  is the number of marked birds in scan sample  $s$ ,  $C_s$  is the number of birds checked for marks in scan sample  $s$ ,  $\delta_t$  is a random effect time of sample  $s$ , and  $\pi_t$  is the time-specific proportion of the population that is marked. Total stopover population size  $\widehat{N}^*$  was estimated by summing time-specific arrivals of marked birds to the stopover ( $B_t$ ) and expanding to include unmarked birds using estimates of proportion marked:

$$\widehat{N}^* = \sum \widehat{B}_t / \pi_t$$

Time-specific arrivals of marked birds are estimated from the Jolly-Seber model using  $\widehat{B}_t = \widehat{\beta}_t \widehat{M}^*$  where  $\widehat{M}^*$  is the estimate of the number of marked birds and  $\widehat{\beta}_t$  is the fraction of the population arriving at time  $t$ .

Appendix 3. Number of marked-ratio scan samples.




Figure A3.1. Number of marked-ratio scan samples collected in Delaware Bay in 2018 by field crews in Delaware (blue) and New Jersey (orange). In 2018, observers in Delaware and New Jersey collected 337 and 165 scan samples, respectively.

Table A3.1. Number of scan samples in each survey period (all DE and NJ sites). Red cells indicate no data. In many survey periods, scan samples were collected at only a fraction of all sites and may not be representative of the entire population. No scan samples were collected in the last two survey periods (9 & 10).

	< 10 May	11-13 May	14-16 May	17-19 May	20-22 May	23-25 May	26-28 May	29-31 May	1-3 June	4-6 June	
	Survey Period										
Location	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
brockenbridge gut	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	5
cooksnorth	0	0	11	13	16	0	1	0	0	0	41
cookssouth	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
eastpt	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
fortes	0	0	6	0	2	8	0	4	0	0	20
fowler's beach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
kimble	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
kimblenorth	0	0	3	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	9
kimblesouth	0	0	6	0	20	11	8	0	0	0	45
kitts hummock beach	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
mispillion harbor	10	33	54	34	34	50	65	36	0	0	316
norbury	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
norburycrk	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	7
north bowers beach	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
pickering beach	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
pierces	0	0	0	10	0	2	7	0	0	0	19
primehook beach	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
reedssouth	1	3	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	14
south bowers beach	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
ted harvey wildlife	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total scan samples</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>502</b>
<b>Number of sites with ratio samples</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

## Appendix 4 Minimum length-of-stay




Figure A5. Minimum length-of-stay (MINLOS) in 2018 ( $n = 3,820$  birds). This is a plot of raw data and is not a model-based estimate. MINLOS does not account for time present in the study area before first detection, or after last detection, and therefore is biased low as an estimate of true stopover duration. The mean and median MINLOS in 2018 were 5.0 and 3 days, respectively. Model-based estimates of stopover duration suggest that stopover duration in 2018 was approximately 9.7 days.

## Appendix 5. 2017 Superpopulation





Figure A5. Estimated parameter values at sampling points throughout **the 2017 season** for Red Knot stopover population analysis at Delaware Bay using mark-resight data and the Jolly-Seber model for open populations: (a) proportion of stopover population arriving in Delaware Bay, (b) stopover persistence, (c) probability of resighting, and (d) time-specific stopover population size. Triangle in (d) is total count made by aerial survey on 26 May 2017.

## Appendix 6



Site	Period										Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Big Stone Beach	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Brockenbridge Gut	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	10
Cedar Beach	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fowlers Beach	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	11
Kitts Hummock Beach	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	10
Mispillion Harbor	6	6	7	4	6	6	7	5	1	1	1	49
North Bowers Beach	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	8
Pickering Beach	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	10
Port Mahon	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	9
Primehook Beach	2	2	5	2	6	5	3	3	1	0	0	29
Slaughter Beach	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	12
South Bowers Beach	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	11
Ted Harvey Wildlife Management Area	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	10
<b>Total number of sites surveyed</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>101</b>

Figure A6. (top left) Mark-resight survey effort in Delaware during 2018. The data were aggregated into the same 3-day periods used for the mark-resight analysis to estimate population size. The weather during 17-19 May was cold and rainy and may have caused reduced sampling effort in the study area. The relatively low survey effort during this period corresponds to a relatively low estimated probability of resighting at this time (see Figure 1c). (bottom) Number of surveys at each site. While Mispillion Harbor and Primehook Beach were surveyed more than other sites, nearly every site was visited in nearly every survey period. These data were provided by A. DeRose-Wilson and are for Delaware sites only.

# Horseshoe Crab Harvest Recommendations Based on Adaptive Resource Management (ARM) Framework and Most Recent Monitoring Data

Report to the Delaware Bay Ecosystem Technical Committee by the ARM Subcommittee

October 2018

This report summarizes annual harvest recommendations. Detailed background on the ARM framework and data sources can be found in previous technical reports<sup>1</sup>.

## Objective statement

Manage harvest of horseshoe crabs in the Delaware Bay to maximize harvest but also to maintain ecosystem integrity and provide adequate stopover habitat for migrating shorebirds.

## Alternative harvest packages

These harvest packages were compared to determine which will best meet the above objective given the most recent monitoring data. Harvest is of adult horseshoe crabs of Delaware Bay origin.

Harvest package	Male harvest (×1,000)	Female harvest (×1,000)
1	0	0
2	250	0
3	500	0
4	280	140
5	420	210

## Population models

Population dynamics models that link horseshoe crabs and red knots were used to predict the effect of harvest packages. Three variations in the models represent the amount and type of dependence between horseshoe crabs and red knots. Stochastic dynamic programming was used to create a decision matrix to identify the optimal harvest package given the most recent monitoring data.

## Monitoring data

Sources of data for horseshoe crab abundance were a set of trawl surveys conducted by Virginia Tech University.<sup>2</sup> Red Knot abundance estimates are taken from a mark-resight estimate for red knot abundance<sup>3</sup>. These data and methods can be evaluated in the respective reports from those studies.

Horseshoe crab abundance (millions)			Red knot abundance (×1,000)	
Year	Male	Female	Year	Male and female
2017 (Fall)	19.9	8.4	2018 (Spring)	45.22



## Harvest recommendations

Decision matrix was optimized incorporating recommendations on red knot stopover population estimates and associated calibration of red knot threshold<sup>4</sup>.

Recommended harvest package	Male harvest (×1,000)	Female harvest (×1,000)
3	500	0

Quota of horseshoe crab harvest for Delaware Bay region states. Allocation of allowable harvest under ARM package 3 (500K males, 0 females) was conducted in accordance with management board approved methodology in *Addendum VII to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Horseshoe Crabs*. Note: Maryland and Virginia total quota refer to that east of the COLREGS line.

State	Delaware Bay Origin HSC Quota		Total Quota	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Delaware	162,136	0	162,136	0
New Jersey	162,136	0	162,136	0
Maryland	141,112	0	255,980	0
Virginia	34,615	0	81,331	0

---

## References

- <sup>1</sup> McGowan, C. P., D. R. Smith, J. D. Nichols, J. Martin, J. A. Sweka, J. E. Lyons, L. J. Niles, K. Kalasz, R. Wong, J. Brust, M. Davis. 2009. A framework for the adaptive management of horseshoe crab harvests in the Delaware Bay constrained by Red Knot conservation. Report to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Horseshoe Crab Technical Committee.  
ASMFC Horseshoe Crab Stock Assessment Subcommittee. 2009. Horseshoe crab 2009 stock assessment report. Report to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Horseshoe Crab Technical Committee.  
ASMFC 2009. Terms of Reference and Advisory Report to the Horseshoe Crab Stock Assessment Peer Review. Stock Assessment Report No. 09-02.
- <sup>2</sup> Virginia Tech Trawl Survey report, January 22, 2018
- <sup>3</sup> Jim Lyons' 2018 estimate in the 27 August, 2018 Memo
- <sup>4</sup> ARM's recommendations for improved estimates of red knot stopover population size and associated calibration of red knot threshold



# 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](http://www.asmfc.org)

---

## MEMORANDUM

October 3, 2018

**To: Horseshoe Crab Management Board**  
**From: Tina Berger, Director of Communications**  
**RE: Advisory Panel Nomination**

Please find attached a new nomination to the Horseshoe Crab Advisory Panel – Lawrence Voss, a commercial pot fishermen from Delaware. 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](mailto:tberger@asmfc.org).

Enc.

cc: Mike Schmidtke

M18-89

## HORSESHOE CRAB ADVISORY PANEL

Bolded names await approval by the Horseshoe Crab Management Board  
Bolded and italicized name denotes Advisory Panel Chair

October 9, 2018

### Massachusetts

Jay A. Harrington (comm/handpicker/raker)  
#6 Sherman Road  
P.O. Box 321  
South Orleans, MA 02662  
Phone: 508.255.0582  
[indeepH2O@gmail.com](mailto:indeepH2O@gmail.com)  
Appt. Confirmed 4/7/98  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/02; 10/06; 5/10; 8/18  
**Participation: Active**

Brett Hoffmeister (biomedical)  
Associates of Cape Cod  
331 Barlows Landing Row  
Pocasset, MA 02559  
Phone (day): 508.444.1426  
[BHoffmeister@acciusa.com](mailto:BHoffmeister@acciusa.com)  
Appt Confirmed 2/3/16  
Appt. Reconfirmed 8/18  
**Participation: Active**

### Rhode Island

**Vacancy (comm/otter trawl)**

### New York

John L. Turner (conservation)  
10 Clark Bouelvard  
Massapequa, NY 11762  
Phone (day): 631.451.6455  
Phone (eve): 516.797.9786  
[redknot@optonline.net](mailto:redknot@optonline.net)  
Appt. Confirmed 2/10/05  
Appt Reconfirmed 5/10  
**Participation: Active; attended last meeting in 2016 (only one meeting since)**

Peter Wenczel (pot/conch)  
675 West Shore Drive  
Southold, NY 11971  
Phone: 631.765.5669  
[pwenczel@optonline.net](mailto:pwenczel@optonline.net)  
Appt. Confirmed 4/7/98  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/02  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/06  
Appt Reconfirmed 5/10

**Participation: Inactive; attended last meeting in 2010**

### New Jersey

Benjie Swan (biomedical)  
Limuli Laboratories  
Dias Creek, 5 Bay Avenue  
Cape May Courthouse, NJ 08210-2556  
Phone: 609.465.6552  
[Swan24@verizon.net](mailto:Swan24@verizon.net)  
Appt. Confirmed 8/5/10  
**Participation: Active**

### Delaware

**Lawrence Voss (comm./pot)**  
**3215 Big Oak Road**  
**Smyrna, DE 19977**  
**Phone: (302)359-0951**  
[shrlvss@aol.com](mailto:shrlvss@aol.com)

**2 vacancies - dealer/processor & conservation/environmental**

### Maryland

George Topping (comm/trawl)  
32182 Bowhill Road  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
Phone: 443.497.2141  
[george@zztopping.com](mailto:george@zztopping.com)  
Appt. Confirmed 5/16  
**Participation: Active**

Jeffrey Eutsler (comm/trawl)  
11933 Gray's Corner Road  
Berlin, MD 21811  
Phone: 443.497.3078  
[jeffeutsler@me.com](mailto:jeffeutsler@me.com)  
Appt. Confirmed 2/4/98  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/02  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/06  
Appt Reconfirmed 5/10  
**Participation: Active**

William R. Legg (comm/pot/eel)  
110 Rebel Road  
Grasonville, MD 21638  
Phone: 410.820.5841  
Appt. Confirmed 4/7/98  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/02  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/06  
Appt Reconfirmed 5/10  
**Participation: Inactive; attended last meeting in 1998**

Allen L. Burgenson (biomedical)  
8875 Hawbottom Road  
Middletown, MD 21769  
Phone: 301.378.1263  
[allen.burgenson@lonza.com](mailto:allen.burgenson@lonza.com)  
Appt. Confirmed 8/21/08  
**Participation: Active**

#### **Virginia**

Richard B. Robins, Jr. (processor/dealer)  
3969 Shady Oaks Drive  
Virginia Beach, VA 23455  
Phone (day): 757.244.8400  
Phone (eve): 757.363.9506  
[richardbrobins@gmail.com](mailto:richardbrobins@gmail.com)  
Appt. Confirmed: 2/9/00  
Appt. Reconfirmed 1/2/06  
Appt Reconfirmed 5/10  
**Participation: Active**

#### **1 vacancy - comm/pot/conch**

#### **South Carolina**

*Chair -- Dr. James F. Cooper* (biomedical)  
P.O. Box 9435  
Greensboro, NC 27429-0435  
Alternate address:  
400 Club Course Drive  
N. Charleston, SC 29420  
Phone: 842.795.7316  
[jimandfran@earthlink.com](mailto:jimandfran@earthlink.com)  
Appt. Confirmed 5/21/97  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/1/01  
  
Appt. Reconfirmed 1/2/05  
Appt. Reconfirmed 5/10  
**Participation: Active**

Cindy Sires (comm/pot/trawl)  
7609 White Point Road  
Yonges Island, SC 29449  
Phone: 843.607.3287  
[troubleyi@aol.com](mailto:troubleyi@aol.com)  
Appt. Confirmed 8/5/10  
**Participation: Inactive; never attended meeting since appt in 2010**

#### **Nontraditional Stakeholders**

Jeff Shenot  
7900 McClure Road  
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772  
Phone: 301.580.4524  
[JUGBAY@msn.com](mailto:JUGBAY@msn.com)  
Appt. Confirmed 8/2018

Walker Golder  
7741 market Street, Unit D  
Wilmington, NC 28411-9444  
Phone (day): 910.686.7527  
Phone (eve): 910.619.6244  
[wgolder@audubon.org](mailto:wgolder@audubon.org)  
Appt. Confirmed 8/2018

#### **At-Large Seats**

Tim Brush (hydropower)  
Normandeu Associates  
917 Route 12, #1  
Westmoreland, NH 03467  
603-355-2333  
603-355-2332 fax  
[tbrush@normandeu.com](mailto:tbrush@normandeu.com)  
Appt. Confirmed: 10/21/97  
Appt. Reconfirmed 10/1/01  
Appt. Confirmed 8/05

Mari-Beth DeLucia (environmental)  
The Nature Conservancy  
2101 North Front St.  
Building #1 Suite 200  
Harrisburg, PA 17110  
(717)232-6001 x 215  
[mdelucia@tnc.org](mailto:mdelucia@tnc.org)  
Appt Confirmed 5/21/13



# 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: John Clark State: Delaware  
(your name)

Name of Nominee: Lawrence H. Voss

Address: 3215 Big Oak Road

City, State, Zip: Smyrna, DE 19977

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

Phone (day): 302-359-0951 Phone (evening): same

FAX: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: shrlyvss@aol.com

.....  
**FOR ALL NOMINEES:**

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

1. American Eel

2. Horseshoe Crab

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 \_\_\_\_\_ no X

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

American Eel

Striped Bass

Horseshoe Crab

Atlantic Menhaden

Blue Crab

American Oyster

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

In addition to the above:

Weakfish

White Perch

**FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN:**

1. How many years has the nominee been the commercial fishing business? 40 years

2. Is the nominee employed only in commercial fishing? yes X no \_\_\_\_\_

3. What is the predominant gear type used by the nominee? Crab pot

4. What is the predominant geographic area fished by the nominee (i.e., inshore, offshore)? Inshore

**FOR CHARTER/HEADBOAT CAPTAINS:**

1. How long has the nominee been employed in the charter/headboat business? \_\_\_\_\_ years

2. 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): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

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 RECREATIONAL FISHERMEN:**

1. How long has the nominee engaged in recreational fishing? \_\_\_\_\_ 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.

---

---

---

**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: Lawrence H. Voss

Date: 9/25/18

Name: Lawrence H. Voss  
(please print)

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

[Signature]  
State Director

[Signature]  
State Legislator

[Signature]  
Governor's Appointee