



Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

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

Coastal Sharks Advisory Panel Meeting Summary

Conference Call
April 29, 2013

Advisory Panel Members: Lewis Gillingham (Chair), Dan Dugan (DE), Ernest Bowden, Jr. (VA), Mark Sampson (MD), Sonja Fordham (Shark Advocates International), Tim Fitzgerald (Environmental Defense Fund), Terry Annibale (SC)

ASMFC Staff: Marin Hawk

The Coastal Shark Advisory Panel (AP) had a conference call to review Draft Addendum II to the Coastal Sharks FMP. The call began with the background and purpose of Draft Addendum II. The various options in the Addendum were then outlined and the AP discussed each issue at length. Below are their recommendations and discussion points.

Issue 1: Smooth Dogfish State-Shares

The AP first discussed whether or not implementing state-shares was the correct choice. They discussed the advantages and disadvantages of state-shares. The advantages included:

- Equitable allocation of the coastwide quota to prevent one state from dominating the harvest
- Increases accountability of each state
- Gives states flexibility to monitor their catch according to their specific needs

The only disadvantage discussed was the fact that state-shares would lock a state in to one percentage. However, further discussions clarified that under Adaptive Management, the Board could revisit state-shares at any time so this was not as large of an issue. The AP agreed that implementing state-shares was the best choice. Option C (historical landings 1998-2010) was the preferred option because it was the most equitable division of the coastwide quota.

Issue 2: Quota Transfer

The AP did not agree on one option under Issue 2. Some members indicated that allowing transfer would further the management plan's objectives by helping states stay under the coastwide quota. However, other members were against allowing quota transfer at this time because of the lack of stock assessment. These members felt that quota transfers could maximize harvest and in the absence of a scientifically-based quota this was not the best management option at present.

Issue 3: Quota Rollover

Most AP members agreed that Option B with no restrictions on rollovers was not the best management choice. They felt that Option C (5% maximum rollover) was the best option for Issue 3 while others reiterated the position that measures aimed at maximizing catch were not appropriate until after science-based catch limits are in place.

Issue 4: Possession Limits

The AP did not feel strongly about this issue, and did not agree on one option. Board-specific possession limits ensure consistency across the range of smoothhound sharks. However, state-specified possession limits allow states the flexibility to adapt to their market.

Issue 5: Re-Evaluation of State-Shares

The AP did not feel strongly about this issue. Under *Section 4.5.2 Adaptive Management* in the Coastal Sharks FMP, state-shares can be revisited at any time. Because of this, the AP felt this issue was somewhat redundant. They also questioned how state-shares would be re-evaluated. If a state had a certain percentage, then their historical landings would reflect that percentage and make establishing new allocations more difficult.

Issue 6: At-Sea Processing

There was general concern and disagreement over this issue. Most members agreed that the scientific basis for the proposed fin: carcass ratio is insufficient, although the reasons for this varied. Some members indicated that without scientific evidence Draft Addendum II will bring scrutiny and negative attention to this well-intentioned plan. Other members indicated that the 5:95 fin: carcass ratio is not accurate due to the fact that fishermen do not trim the fins neatly, and the ratio is closer to 10 percent. Some members of the AP also felt that changing the maximum fin: carcass ratio before NOAA Fisheries proposes a rule is premature.