

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
COASTAL SHARKS MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**The Westin Crystal City
Arlington, Virginia
Hybrid Meeting**

August 1, 2023

Approved October 17, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chair Erika Burgess.....1

Approval of Agenda1

Approval of Proceedings from May 2, 2023.....1

Public Comment1

Presentation on Scoping for Draft Amendment 16 to the Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan1

Consider Approval of Fishery Management Plan Review and State Compliance for 2021 Fishing Year6

Adjournment7

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of agenda** by consent (Page 1).
2. **Approval of Proceedings of May 2, 2023** by consent (Page 1).
3. **Move to approve de minimis request from Massachusetts, state compliance reports, and the Coastal Sharks FMP Review for the 2021 fishing year** (Page 7). Motion by Justin Davis; second by Roy Miller. Motion approved by Board consent (Page 7).
4. **Move to adjourn** by consent (Page 7).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Dan McKiernan, MA (AA)	Michael Luisi, MD, proxy for L. Fegley (AA)
Raymond Kane, MA (GA)	Russell Dize, MD (GA)
Sarah Ferrara, MA, proxy for Rep. Peake (LA)	David Sikorski, MD, proxy for Del. Stein (LA)
Jason McNamee (AA)	Lewis Gillingham, VA, proxy for J. Green (AA)
Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)	Chris Batsavage, NC, proxy for K. Rawls (AA)
Justin Davis, CT (AA)	Jerry Mannen, NC (GA)
Bill Hyatt, CT (GA)	Chad Thomas, NC, proxy for Rep. Wray (LA)
Craig Miner, CT proxy for Rep. Gresko, CT (LA)	Mel Bell, SC (AA)
John Maniscalclo, NY, proxy for B. Seggos (AA)	Malcolm Rhodes, SC (GA)
Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)	Ben Dyar, SC, proxy for Sen. Cromer (LA)
Heather Corbett, NJ, proxy for J. Cimino (AA)	Doug Haymans, GA (AA)
Jeff Kaelin, NJ (GA)	Spud Woodward, GA (GA)
Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Sen. Gopal (LA)	Erika Burgess, FL, proxy for J. McCawley (AA)
John Clark, DE (AA)	Gary Jennings, FL (GA)
Roy Miller, DE (GA)	Karyl Brewster-Geisz, NMFS

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

Ex-Officio Members

Angel Willey, Technical Committee Chair

Staff

Bob Beal	Caitlin Starks	Alex Dijohnson
Toni Kerns	Jeff Kipp	Katie Drew
Madeline Musante	Tracy Bauer	Jainita Patel
Tina Berger	James Boyle	Chelsea Tuohy

Guests

Debra Abercrombie, US FWS	Lisa Crawford, NOAA	Greg Hinks, NJ DEP
Pat Augustine	Scott Curatolo-Wagemann,	Jesse Hornstein, NYS DEC
Rob Beal, ME Marine Patrol	Cornell	Jillian Houle, Save the Sound
Alan Bianchi, NC DMF	Becky Curtis, NOAA	James Jewkes
Jeffrey Brust, NJ DFW	Russell Dize	Yan Jiao, Virginia Tech
Scot Calitri, NH F&G	Thomas Fote, Jersey Coast	Blaik Keppler, SC DNR
Nicole Caudell, MD DNR	Anglers Association	William Lucey, Save the Sound
Michael Celestino, NJ DFW	Tony Friedrich, ASGA	Jerry Mannen Jr.
Benson Chiles, Chiles Consulting	John Gans, Theodore Roosevelt	Chris McDonough, SC DNR
Joe Cimino, NJ (AA)	Conservation Partnership	Joshua McGilly, VMRC
Haley Clinton, NC DEQ	Angela Giuliano, MD DNR	Robert McGinness
Richard Cody, NOAA	Joseph Grist, VMRC	Steve Meyers
Margaret Conroy, DE DNREC	Brendan Harrison, NJ DEP	Kyle Miller, FL FWC
Caitlin Craig, NYS DEC	Hannah Hart, MAFMC	Brian Neilan, NJ DEP

Proceedings of the Coastal Sharks Management Board – August 2023

Kenneth Ostrand, US FWS
Marina Owens, FL FWC
Ian Park, DE DFW
Nicole Pitts, NOAA
Bill Post, SC DNR
Will Poston, ASGA
Jill Ramsey, VMRC
Kathy Rawls, NC (AA)
Jeff Renchen, FL FWC

Kirby Rootes-Murdy, USGS
Linnea Saby, Senate
Environment and Public Works
Christopher Scott, NYS DEC
McLean Seward, NC DMF
Carrie Soltanoff, NOAA
Renee St. Amand, CT DEEP
Elizabeth Streifeneder NYS DEC

Chad Thomas, NC Marine &
Estuary Foundation
Beth Versak, MD DNR
Ann Williamson, NOAA
Charles Witek
Emerald Wright, NH F&G
Erik Zlokovitz, MD DNR

The Coastal Sharks Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Jefferson Ballroom of the Westin Crystal City Hotel, Arlington, Virginia, a hybrid meeting, in-person and via webinar; Tuesday, August 1, 2023, and was called to order at 12:30 p.m. by Chair Erika Burgess.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR ERIKA BURGESS: Good afternoon, everyone, I'm calling to order the Coastal Sharks Management Board.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIR ERIKA BURGESS: The first item on the agenda is Approval of the Agenda. Is there any opposition to the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved by consent.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR BURGESS: Next is approval of the proceedings from May, 2023. Any opposition to approving the proceedings? Seeing none; the proceedings are approved by consent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIR BURGESS: At this time, we'll take public comment. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to give public comment before the Coastal Sharks Board? There are no hands online, so we'll move forward to Item 4.

PRESENTATION ON SCOPING FOR DRAFT AMENDMENT 16 TO THE HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN

CHAIR ERIKA BURGESS: Item 4 is a Presentation on Scoping for Draft Amendment 16 to the HMS Fishery Management Plan. We'll have a presentation from Guy, and I clarified this right beforehand. Guy DuBeck from HMS. We'll get that presentation loaded and you're welcome to get started.

MR. GUY DuBECK: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Guy DuBeck here from the Atlantic HMS

Division. I'm here to talk about scoping of Amendment 16. First, I want to wade through some background of two large documents, Amendment 14 and then the Shark Fishery Review Document that kind of sets the stage for Amendment 16, and then move on into the scoping document, and all the options that we're kind of considering.

The first one here is Amendment 14, which we put out earlier this year. At the beginning it was a framework action that kind of sets the stage, and implements the ABCs and ACLs for the Atlantic shark fisheries. In there we had a variety of preferred options. The first one was to create a tiered ABC control rule.

Next one was to create a phase-in of ABC control rule under certain modifications. Then for the ACL development we're looking to actively manage the recreational/commercial sector ACLs along with establishing ACLs for different shark management groups without quota linkages.

The next one was we could, for any carryover of underharvest of the commercial quota under certain conditions, and the last one is we're going to look at a three-year kind of rolling average of mortality to determine the overfishing stock status. The other big document we released earlier this year was our shark fishery review or SHARE Document. This was kind of our complete review of the shark fishery, looking at the commercial and recreational conservation and management measures, along with depredation. Another part in the document we looked at was the external factors that are affecting the shark fishery. Mostly CITES listings, and then also the state and now the national shark fin bans.

From that we kind of determined that management measures are working well, there were some concerns with the different management measures, but then overall from there we looked at how we move forward, and provided some suggestions of what management measures would we moved forward with.

From those we kind of formulated the scoping for Amendment 16. In May, we released Amendment 16. From here the objective of this stayed kind of consistent with the Amendment 14 and scientific advice to establish ABCs and ACLs for the non-prohibited shark species. We want to try and optimize the commercial and recreational quotas for fishermen to harvest, and also increase management flexibility for us to kind of react to the changes that are occurring real time.

Here is kind of a slide based on Amendment 14, we did the tiered ABC control rule. From there we were establishing it based on the data from the assessments to determine which species were in place in each tier. We have four tiers. Tier 1 is data rich stock assessments. Tier 2 is data moderate. Tier 3 is the data limited, and then Tier 4 are the ones that have not been assessed.

You also see we have two tiers outside the ABC control rule, and those are stocks under a rebuilding plan, and then the ones that are ICCAT or pelagic shark species. I just want to point out that you will see the green highlighted ones. In our scoping document we did an example of what the ABC and ACLs could be for those species, with commercial and recreational ACLs in the document, so the ones highlighted we have more detail than what it may look like in the document.

But also, to point out that you see the red asterisk with the hammer head shark assessment. We're currently working on that right now, and we're hoping to have that done sometime in the coming year. But once that's completed, we'll be moving the hammerhead species around within or outside this Tier process, depending what the results are.

But I also will point out that is true for all of our shark stocks. Once we get more scientific data and have assessments, we'll be moving them around. It's going to be kind of fluid in what it looks like here. Here I just want to orient you

with, in Amendment 14 we set up the ACL framework for non-prohibited shark species.

It just kind of orients you to this kind of tree process we set up, and how we are going to be going through it in future slides about looking at what an example may look like. Again, we have the OFL. We'll have an OFL or an OFL proxy, ABC or ABC proxy, and then the ACLs for our shark stocks. Then we'll have the different sector ACLs too.

I want to show you at least one example of what it may look like. This group here it shows the Tier 1, so data rich assessment, and we did the black tipped sharks in the Atlantic region. Also, I just want to highlight that for this chart here we made some assumptions. We're using all the catch history, and in our document, we are looking at, give options of what kind of catch history do we use? Do we use all of our catch history to kind of split the ACL between the commercial and recreational, or do we want to look at more recent years, in the last five or ten years?

In this one we're using all of it. Also, with the HMS risk policy. Historically we've used 70 percent for a majority of our shark stocks, as the risk policy to ensure that they are healthy stocks, and we're not going to cause overfishing or overfishing will continue. We've had to use 70 percent, but since we have this example here with Atlantic blacktip and Tier 1, the scientific uncertainty for that stock is much lower than other ones.

Maybe we could consider other risk policy percentages, and the document would kind of look at whether you're looking at 60 or 50 percent, or sticking with 70 percent. For this example, here we looked at 70 percent, and just kind of run through what the OFL and the ABC would be for the Atlantic blacktip sharks. Then we kind of did an estimate what the management buffer would be, and then calculated what the ACL would be. Using all the catch history for this one, the recreational sector ACL for Atlantic blacktips would get 58 percent of that ACL.

Their recreational sector quota would be 50,000 sharks, and currently the past couple years are averaging, harvesting about 89 percent of that. For the commercial sector they are going to get 42 percent of the ACL. Looking at the commercial quota of 136 metric tons, recently in the past couple years they've only harvested about 40 percent of that.

Since we're talking about changing the ABCs and the ACLs and all the quotas, and kind of everything for our shark fishery. We're looking at you know, what other things can we change for our fishery, and move forward. It's kind of all connected. The first thing is looking at the shark managed groups.

Historically we've had those for the longest time where we have large coastal, small coastal or pelagics. Then as we do in stock assessments, we've been pulling species out, but kind of keeping the other ones grouped together as aggregated large coastal or non-blacknose small coastals. Maybe it's time for us to reevaluate that.

You know, maybe we should look at creating different management groups based on the assessed and unassessed, whether regional or nonregional. But then also look at what species are being caught together. We've been hearing a lot about, you know if I'm going out shark fishing, I'm catching blacktip, bulls, and spinners together, so maybe we create a blacktip, spinner, bull quota for the fishermen that are kind of going out and catching those things.

Again, the possibilities, it might simplify some regulations, but then also could complicate some of our management measures moving forward with doing that. Just some options in the document. We're moving on to the regionals and sub-regional quotas. Historically we've kind of split the Atlantic and Gulf region for management purposes, and for some stocks.

Maybe it's time for us to relook at that split. You know maybe look at more recent catch

history, and change those quotas based on recent catch history. Then we have the Atlantic blacknose management boundary line. Where we've put that in place about ten years ago, then again now that sharks are kind of migrating more north and north, maybe it's inappropriate. Maybe we should look at that line again. Then the other thing was in the Gulf of Mexico we have sub-regional quotas for management purposes. Maybe it's time for us to reevaluate that, especially if we're looking at the quotas. In the document we talk about the Gulf of Mexico blacktip quota to be 16 million pounds.

Maybe we don't need a regional split for that one. Just some options about that. Then the last one here about the Caribbean region. You know historically all the landings from the Caribbean region of sharks come off the Gulf quota. But we know that the Caribbean just operates very differently between how they, the gears they use, what species they can retain. Maybe it's time for us to create a regional quota for the Caribbean.

As we're changing the quotas, maybe it's time for us also to look at our exempted fishing permit quotas, and also the shark research fishery. Those have been kind of established for many years, and the usage of those quotas are very low. For the EFPs, you know we are already going to be taking the research mortality off the top with the framework, and based on the framework under the management buffer.

Maybe we just rework the quotas around to look at more prohibited species, and create a prohibited species quota. For their shark research fishery, we've had that in play since 2008. Unfortunately, I hate to say this, we've had record low participation this year in effort levels, and it has declined the past couple years. We feel the research fishery is very vital for our stock assessments now and in the future.

We're trying to come up with ways for how do we keep that? Maybe changing the goals, objectives, just trying to keep that going to collect that data that we need for those stock assessments. As we are changing quotas, one of the things we have

identified in our shark fishery review document is, maybe we should be changing commercial retention limits that we have not looked at in a long time.

You know we're looking at potentially revising and increasing it or removing it for some species, you know like I mentioned, if we have such a large quota for some of our healthy stocks, maybe we don't need a commercial retention limit for those species, because we know that the driver of the fishery are the markets.

Just some options that we have in the document on how to revise that. The last set of options we have on our document is the recreational fishery. Right now, we have a 54-inch minimum size limit for a majority of our shark stocks, so for hammerheads and makos, and some small coastals. After we look at our SHARE document, maybe it is more appropriate to set the minimum size for size at maturity for some of those shark species.

Some of them are much smaller than 54 inches, some are much larger. Maybe it's kind of bringing up what it says for size, based on size at maturity, and also for bag limits. I mean we have healthy stocks, maybe we can increase bag limits or remove some of them for some of those species. Some of the options we have in our scoping document. This last slide here kind of highlights some of the overall kind of comments we've been receiving to date for Amendment 16.

Generally, there is a lot of support for us to do something for the shark fishery. However, we're finding that there are a lot of things, a lot of options in Amendment 16, and it's hard for a lot of people to get their heads wrapped around, because if you're changing one thing it ripples to the next thing, so they feel like it's a little too much.

The other ones are, you know a lot of our constituents feel like we need to make the

change now, not in the future. The fishery needs help, make those changes now. Then the other thing is, the big thing is to help, they would like us to help them create markets to improve the fishery. However, that is kind of beyond the purview of NOAA Fisheries. But they would like our help somehow.

Then the biggest one we've been hearing a lot in all of our actions is, shark depredation is increasing and continues to increase, and is causing an issue. Then the last thing, last time we've been hearing is the sharks need more protection, and we should not be looking to remove these regulations or reducing those, we need to be putting more and more for some of these shark species.

That's kind of Amendment 16 really quickly. I have the website up here for folks that want to go back and look at the document. We have our last webinar this coming Monday, and then the comment period for this action closes on August 18. The last part of this is kind of beyond Amendment 16, and then this kind of just came out today, so some of you probably saw the e-mail, is our Shark Season Proposed Rule came out.

I just want to highlight that we're going to change things, moving forward for our Shark Season Rule. For this one is that we're going to be, we're proposing to automatically open the fishery January 1, under base quotas, and the default retention limit. Historically we've always closed the fishery on December 31, and would not open until we do our next season rule, announcing the quotas and the opening dates and the retention limits.

Under this we're proposing that it just kind of rolls over, automatically opens up with the default and revised retention limit. The other thing is we're revising the default retention limit, so currently right now in our regulations we have a default limit of 45 large coastals per trip. We're proposing to increase it to 55, the max number we have.

That is based on catch efforts historically have kind of lowered for the shark fishery, so we're putting the higher limit as the default limits. Then also

we're proposing a revised quota based on the current regulations to carryover underused quota. The end of it here is just we have a comment period for the shark season rule, ends on September 1st. If you want to place a comment, we've put the regulation.gov, and then the keyword there. Then hopefully have a proposed rule for the shark season rule by November or December. That's all I have.

MS. BURGESS: Thank you very much, Guy. At this time, are there any questions on the presentation? Gary.

MR. GARY JENNINGS: Thank you, Guy. What is the process or the trigger for reevaluating a shark position on the ABC Rule here, and is there like a set reevaluation schedule, based on SEDAR assessments, or how does that work?

MR. DuBECK: Yes, so right now there is no set schedule, it's mostly based on the data from that stock assessment, how we place them in the tiers. Right now, we're taking comment on the placement of our shark species within each of the gear structure. But we've kind of put it out there that a few of them are in the data rich, some of them are in data moderate. Unfortunately, a majority of our shark stocks are in the no accepted assessments. It would have to wait for an assessment, whether done through SEDAR or externally that has been reviewed for moving forward.

MR. JENNINGS: I've got kind of a follow up if that is okay. Is there an option to use alternative data years that align with significant management or policy changes, to determine ABC, other than the 5-10?

MR. DuBECK: Yes, it is something that can be done, because I know we've changed quite a few of our shark regulations in the past 10, 15 years. How the fishery is going to operate in the near future with some of the external factors that are affecting them. We can look at more recent years, or go back to a certain point when the fishery changed to forward.

I think it could be overall for all of our shark stocks, or it could be based on individual management groups. If we've changed the large coastal fishery in the past five years, maybe just go to the past five years. But small coastals, say it was like 10, 15 years ago, maybe for that point a more recent. But we can be flexible and take comment on what years of data we should be using.

CHAIR BURGESS: Yes, John.

MR. JOHN CLARK: Thank you for the presentation, Guy. Could you give a little more detail on what is going on with sandbar sharks, why there seems to be such a decrease in the number of permits?

MR. DuBECK: The big thing is the market, because for the Shark Research Fishery when our money for the research fishery, whatever they make is what they can sell the product for. We're not paying those fishermen, certainly to go out shark fishing, and the markets just haven't quite been there.

Unfortunately, with some of the fishermen, and now with some of the different regulations from CITES, and then national fin ban, the value is not there anymore. This year we only had, I think three applicants, and we took three. But historically we've been taking 5 to 10 in the past. Unfortunately, the interest has not been there.

CHAIR BURGESS: The next hand I saw was Roy.

MR. ROY W. MILLER: Guy, in your scoping document, this is more of a comment than a question. I would be interested to see how you address topics that seem to be coming from the opposite ends of the spectrum. In other words, I'm thinking about the depredation. How do you decrease depredation while the very next item in your list was additional protection? How do you see that working out, where there seem to be opposing approaches to address these problems?

MR. DuBECK: That's a tough one. We're stuck in the middle. But you know based on the science that we have for each one of the assessments, we can set quotas that are perfect for that stock, and

then we would have management measures appropriate for them, each one. Under depredation, we're getting such a range of shark species that are potential culprits for those. We're hearing a lot of sandbars and dusky's.

Dusky is prohibited, sandbars are really on the shark research fishery. But some of the options we have in our document is like, okay if no one is participating in our shark research fishery, maybe we can allow sandbar quota or retention outside the research fishery on a limited basis too. It really comes down to the science and what the ABCs and ACLs could be for each one of the stocks, and then we would set management measures appropriately.

CHAIR BURGESS: Yes, Gary.

MR. JENNINGS: It looks like the recreational and the commercial OFL and ABC, ACL are taking into consideration discards. Do you have a concern, because there is a large amount of uncertainty around the discard data, that using it could result in more conservative quotas, which would restrict the fishery more than is necessary?

MR. DuBECK: I think that would depend on the shark stock. An example is, you know with the blacktip shark in the Atlantic. The uncertainty for that species is much lower than other species, so we're pretty confident some of those data, compared to some of the other truck species. But I think it really comes down to individual species, individually to get a better sense of that one.

CHAIR BURGESS: I saw Lewis with his hand up.

MR. LEWIS GILLINGHAM: I'm just wondering if you could comment regarding blacktip in the Gulf. I know they're having difficulty with reaching their quota everywhere else, but it seems like that blacktip quota, which is fairly substantial, goes quickly every year. What is the difference on marketability?

MR. DuBECK: Chatting with some of the fishermen dealers in the area, they have a window of when they go shark fishing, usually beginning of the year, and then during the religious holiday of lent. They export those products to Mexico. There is a big market for them in that area, so that is why they kind of go through their quota really fast at the beginning of the year, and kind of target them.

But then they move on to other things, and that is what we're hearing from a lot of our fishermen, they have a diverse portfolio, and they kind of look what is available, and what is more profitable for them to be jumping into. Yes, and blacktips are kind of the quota is going to be pretty large in the Gulf potentially for that species. That is just based on their reproductive cycles and biology.

CHAIR BURGESS: I'm not seeing other hands for questions, thank you for answering them, Guy. The decision before the Board now is to determine whether we would like to send a letter during scoping for this Amendment. Is there any interest in sending a letter? All right, I'm not going to twist anyone's arm. I will note, Florida FWC will be submitting a letter with a comment on it.

CONSIDER APPROVAL OF FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW AND STATE COMPLIANCE FOR 2021 FISHING YEAR

CHAIR ERIKA BURGESS: The next item of business is a Review of the Fishery Management Plan.

MS. CAITLIN STARKS: I'm going to go through this pretty quickly. These are the sections in the FMP Review Report that you received in materials. But in the interest of time, I'll just touch briefly on each of these. The coastal sharks FMP was implemented in 2009, there have been five addenda that modified the FMP.

The FMP and addenda do not include any coastal shark monitoring or research requirements, and the Commission typically follows the lead of NOAA Fisheries Highly Migratory Species, HMS, when setting the quotas and closures for shark. Since last year there haven't been any changes to the stock

status of any of the managed shark species, and the most recent stock assessment was for Atlantic blacktip, and it found Atlantic blacktip not overfished and not subject to overfishing.

As was mentioned, there is an ongoing management track assessment for the HMS hammerhead sharks through SEDAR 77. Commercial landings of aggregated large coastal shark species in 2021 were less than 181,000 pounds dressed weight, and roughly a 20 percent decrease from 2020 landings.

Commercial landings of small coastal shark species in 2021 were 246,932 pounds, which is about a 5 percent increase from the 2020 landings, and commercial landings of Atlantic pelagic sharks in 2021 were greater than 84,850 pounds, which represents an approximate 14 percent decrease from 2020.

This graphic is showing the recreational harvest of sharks where large coastal sharks and small coastal sharks are shown in numbers, and those are represented by the red and blue bars, and pelagic shark data are reported in metric tons, whole weight, and that is shown by the gray line. In 2021, recreational harvest for large coastal sharks and small coastal sharks both increased relative to 2020, and for pelagic sharks the recreational harvest decreased in 2021 relative to 2020.

In 2021, recreational harvest of prohibited Atlantic shark species was 58 sharks, and that is the lowest value that it's been over the last five years. Then this FMP again doesn't establish specific de minimis guidelines that would exempt a state from regulatory requirements contained in the plan, but de minimis can be determined on a case-by-case basis.

This year Massachusetts has requested continued de minimis status for aggregated large coastal and hammerhead species groups, with regard to the possession limit and the closure requirements. The PRT reviewed the de minimis request and the recent data, and they

recommend de minimis status be granted to Massachusetts for the aggregated large coastal and hammerhead species groups. As an update from last year, the PRT noted that New Jersey has now implemented the non-offset circle hook requirement for the recreational fishery as of February, 2023.

Then lastly the PRT noted that in 2021, Georgia's recreational regulations allowed for the landing of 1 hammerhead, 1 shortfin mako, and 1 other shark, which is in excess of what is allowed under the FMP. Our FMP allows one shark per person per vessel, plus one Atlantic Sharpnose and one bonnethead.

This issue has been raised with Georgia DNR staff, and they've indicated that the regulations will be updated accordingly, but as of right now I don't believe those changes have been implemented. Then to wrap up, the Board action here is just to consider approval of the de minimis request for Massachusetts, the state compliance reports, and approval of the FMP review for the 2021 fishing year. I can take any questions.

CHAIR BURGESS: Any questions on the FMP review? All right, seeing none, I will open the floor for a motion. Justin.

DR. JUSTIN DAVIS: I move to approve de minimis request from Massachusetts, state compliance reports, and the Coastal Sharks FMP Review for the 2021 fishing year.

CHAIR BURGESS: Thank you, is there a second? Second from Roy. All right, **is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none; that is approved by consent.**

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR BURGESS: Thank you, Caitlin. Is there any other business to come before the Board? Seeing none; I consider this meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m. on Tuesday, August 1, 2023)