

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

**The Westin Alexandria
Alexandria, Virginia
February 3, 2016**

Approved May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chairman Adam Nowalsky.....	1
Approval of Agenda.....	1
Approval of Proceedings, November 2015	1
Public Comment	1
Discussion of the Differences Between State and Federal Smoothhound Catch Composition and Regulations for Processing at Sea	1
Review and Set the 2016 Smoothhound Quota.....	3
Adjournment	10

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of agenda by consent** (Page 1).
2. **Approval of proceedings of November 2015 by consent** (Page 1).
3. **Move to initiate an addendum to the coastal sharks FMP to address a disconnect of the processing at sea. Commercial fisherman can fully dress (remove head and fin and gut at sea) smooth dogfish if at least 25% of retained catch is smooth dogfish** (Page 3). Motion by Louis Daniel; second by Brandon Muffley. Motion carried (Page 6).
4. **Move to adopt the 2016 smoothhound (smooth dogfish) quota of 1201.7 metric tons (2.6 million lbs dw)** (Page 8). Motion by Pat Augustine; second by Louis Daniel. Roll Call Vote: In Favor - MA, RI, CT, NY, NJ, DE, MD, VA, NC, SC, GA, FL, NMFS, USFWS). Motion carried unanimously (Page 10).
5. **Motion to adjourn** by consent (Page 10).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Jocelyn Cary, MA, proxy for Rep. Peake (LA)
Dan McKiernan, MA, proxy for D. Pierce (AA)
Bill Adler, MA (GA)
Jason McNamee, RI, proxy for J. Coit (AA)
David Borden, RI (GA)
Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)
Dave Simpson, CT (AA)
Steve Heins, NY, proxy for J. Gilmore (AA)
Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)
Pat Augustine, NY, proxy for Sen. Boyle (LA)
Brandon Muffley, NJ, proxy for D. Chanda (AA)
Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Andrzejczak (LA)
Tom Fote, NJ (GA)

Craig Pugh, DE, proxy for Rep. Carson (LA)
Stewart Michels, DE, proxy for D. Saveikis (AA)
Roy Miller, DE (GA)
Bill Goldsborough, MD (GA)
Mike Luisi, MD, proxy for D. Blazer (AA)
Rob O'Reilly, VA, proxy for J. Bull (AA)
Louis Daniel, NC (AA)
Douglas Brady, NC (GA)
Robert Boyles, Jr., SC (AA)
Malcolm Rhodes, SC (GA)
Pat Geer, GA, proxy for Rep. Nimmer (LA)
James Estes, FL, proxy for J. McCawley (AA)
Wilson Laney, USFWS
Margo Schultz-Haugen, NMFS

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

Ex-Officio Members

Staff

Robert Beal
Toni Kerns

Jeff Kipp
Ashton Harp

Guests

Dave Goshorn, MD DNR
Steve Doctor, MD Fisheries Svc
Mike Millard, USFWS

Greg DiDomenico, GSSA
Arnold Leo, E. Hampton, NY

The Coastal Sharks Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Edison Ballroom of the Westin Hotel, Alexandria, Virginia, February 3, 2016, and was called to order at 1:40 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Adam Nowalsky.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN ADAM NOWALSKY: I would like to welcome everybody to the Coastal Sharks Management Board. We'll go ahead and get the meeting started. My name is Adam Nowalsky, and I am joined by staff Ashton Harp to my right.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Our first order of business here today is to approve the agenda.

Is there any objection to the agenda as provided? Seeing none; we'll accept that.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Our second order of business is to approve the proceedings and minutes from the 2015 meeting. Is there any objection to accepting those as provided? Seeing none; they will be approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Our next order of business is any public comment for issues not on the agenda. We don't have anybody presently signed up, pretty thin.

Does anybody need to speak on an issue not on the agenda? Seeing none; we'll move right along.

DISCUSSION OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL SMOOTHHOUND CATCH COMPOSITION AND REGULATIONS FOR PROCESSING AT SEA

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Our next two items, one of which will require an action, is to discuss the differences in the state and federal

smoothhound catch composition and regulations for processing at sea. Then that will lead into the 2016 quota. With that I will turn the floor over to Ashton for a presentation.

MS. ASHTON HARP: This presentation is actually going to go over a little bit more than the processing at sea changes. It is going to kind of outline the memo that was sent in December. That kind of explains the differences in federal and state management measures for smoothhound as a result of the Amendment 9 Final Rule that was released at the end of November.

As you can see on the board, now smoothhound is a federally managed species, which means it has a federal quota, which is 1,201.7 metric tons for the 2016 fishing year. I've gone ahead and allocated the coast wide quota for states, because in Addendum 2 of the coastal shark's fisheries management plan smoothhound had state shares.

We were just waiting to implement the state shares until we had a federal quota. You can see how the percentages and the breakdowns will be by state. Just as a background, the percentages are based on historical catch from 1998 through 2010, if you are kind of trying to think of how did we get to these percentages?

The federal and state quotas, so the final rule from Amendment 9 will become effective on March 15, 2016. Therefore, the state shares will then become effective at that time as well. One point to note in the differences, in federal waters when the landings are projected to reach or have reached 80 percent of the coast wide quota, HMS will close down the Atlantic shark fishery, which would include the smoothhound fishery. However, the state allocations that I showed on the previous slide allocate the full coast wide quota up to 100 percent. Fishermen with a state permit can continue to fish even after the federal fishery is closed.

I am just noting here in the blue that the board will take action to set the 2016 smoothhound quota at this meeting, because it was not part of the 2016 specifications for Atlantic sharks that was set in December. For recreational permits, I just want to note that Amendment 9 requires recreational anglers fishing in federal waters to have an HMS angling or HMS charter headboat recreational permit for retention of recreationally caught smoothhound sharks.

There are not changes between this and the coastal sharks FMP that we have. There are no specific management measures for recreationally caught smoothhound sharks in state waters. There is no minimum recreational size limits or possession limits at this time for smoothhound sharks. Commercial permits, this is just simply to note that in federal waters it is required to have a federal commercial smoothhound permit.

These will be required as of March 15 of 2016. This does not affect anyone who just has a state permit and would like to remain having a state only permit. The commercial possession limits, Amendment 9 did not set a commercial retention limit for smoothhounds. As you know with large coastal sharks we have possession limits that we set. For smoothhounds that is not the case.

As stated in Addendum 2 to the coastal sharks FMP, the board will not set possession limits for smoothhound sharks once the federal coast wide quota has been implemented, which it has. States can establish a specific management program to achieve but not exceed their state quota. Now moving on to processing at sea, so Amendment 9 allows commercial federal fishermen to remove the fins of smooth dogfish if it meets the following four criteria.

All four are required for federal fishermen and for state fishermen. The fishermen must have a federal commercial smoothhound permit and possess a state commercial fishing license. If you are only in state waters you only need the

state license. Number two is highlighted in blue, because it is a change.

Twenty-five percent of the retained catch on the vessel must be smooth dogfish to process at sea. This is now in the federal FMP. It is not in the coastal sharks FMP, so it is something for the board to consider. The vessel must be located between the shore and 50 nautical miles. We have this in our FMP now, and the fin to carcass ratio does not exceed 12 percent. We also have this in the coastal sharks FMP.

For dealer permits, Amendment 9 requires dealers to possess an Atlantic Shark dealer permit to purchase smoothhound sharks. Permits are available and dealers must report smoothhound shark purchases on a weekly basis. As stated in the coast sharks FMP a federal commercial shark dealer permit is required to buy and sell any sharks caught in state waters. We already have this in the FMP; no changes need to be made.

For gillnet gear, Amendment 9 requires smoothhound fishermen to limit soak time to 24 hours when using sink gillnet gear, and conduct a net check at least every two hours when using drift gillnet gear. This does present a change between the federal and state FMPs. The coastal sharks FMP does not define sink or drift gillnet, rather identifies small mesh versus large mesh gillnets. Addendum 1 of the coastal sharks FMP removed the two hour net check requirement for commercial fishermen using large mesh gillnets. The board could consider adding this back into the coastal sharks FMP if they wanted to.

This kind of just highlights the issues for consideration. If the board would like state waters regulations to be consistent with federal measures it would require an addendum to the coastal sharks FMP, specifically for the following. The processing at sea, we would need to include 25 percent to retain catch on the vessel is smoothhound, in order for our fishermen to process at sea. The gillnet gear is

another consideration as well that should be considered; questions?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Thank you for that presentation, we'll turn to the board for questions of Ashton on the presentation, and again in order for the measures at the present time to be complementary between state and federal waters there are the two issues that were highlighted in the presentation.

Processing at sea with the catch composition and then the issue of the gillnet gear, just to reiterate those items; questions for Ashton?

REVIEW AND SET THE 2016 SMOOTHHOUND QUOTA

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: All right seeing none; we can go ahead and entertain potential action on that disconnect, have discussion about that disconnect, or if there are no concerns from board members about it we would move into the 2016 quota.

DR. LOUIS B. DANIEL: Certainly support and appreciate the service doing the 25 percent to allow processing at sea. I would just ask from an enforcement standpoint, 24 hours is not that difficult to enforce, but every two hours? I don't know how we at least in state waters, how we would patrol that. I'm not sure about that part. But to get the ball rolling I would recommend that the Coast Shark Board consider adopting the 25 percent retained catch on the vessel for smoothhounds for processing at sea.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: To go that route that would require a motion to initiate an addendum. Are you doing so?

DR. DANIEL: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Do you wish for that motion to be just on that issue or do you want to combine it with the gillnet issue at all?

DR. DANIEL: I would prefer to have further discussion, and if someone would like to amend my motion to include the soak times that would be fine. But I certainly support the processing at sea issue. I just don't know enough about the gillnet gear and 1, how NMFS is going to enforce that and Number 2, how we would. That seems to be a very difficult onerous task to commit to.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Your motion then is to initiate an addendum to address the disconnect for the processing at sea between state and federal waters.

DR. DANIEL: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Give us a moment to get that up on the board. I see Brandon Muffley's hand up as a second. We'll get that up. While we're getting that up can I see a show of hands for any discussion on that issue? Got one, okay let us get it up before we do. We'll give staff a moment to get that up. In the mean time I will turn to Eric for discussion on the motion.

MR. ERIC REID: I just have a couple of questions. Should it say at least 25 percent, and is that 25 percent round weight or dressed weight or what kind of weight are we talking about?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: We'll get that up on the board and then we can address perfecting it, and I will have to turn to staff for the clarification on dressed, round or other.

MS. KERNS: I would go to NOAA since it was their final rule, just to confirm on the dressed versus round.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Great, go ahead.

MS. MARGO SCHULZE-HAUGEN: I believe it was dressed weight.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: I see your hand, Mike. Let's get the motion up completely so if we need to perfect it we can get that done first.

MS. KERNS: Adam, may I ask Margo a question?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Yes, go ahead.

MS. KERNS: In the rule is it at least 25 percent or is it 25 percent?

MS. SHULZE-HAUGEN: I think at least would cover it. It's got to be greater than 25 percent, so at least.

MS. KERNS: At least, okay thank you.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: **Okay so the motion that we have up right now; Move to initiate an addendum to the coastal sharks FMP to address the disconnect of the processing at sea. Commercial fishermen can remove the fins of smooth dogfish if at least 25 percent of retained catch is smooth dogfish.** Is that satisfactory, Dr. Daniel? Getting a nod of the head, Brandon as well, okay so that is the motion we have before the board. I've got Mr. Luisi and then Mr. Augustine.

MR. MICHAEL LUISI: While I appreciate the need to have measures in federal and state waters that mirror one another in many cases. Maybe either staff or NOAA could just provide a little bit of the background as to why the 25 percent rather than having no percentage of the catch retained. What is the significance of having at least 25 percent of the retained catch be smooth dogfish?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Again that was through Amendment 9. I'll turn to NOAA for a clarification and for the reason in that in the final rule.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: This is to implement the shark conservation act of 2010, which included a number of provisions; which are what was outlined before about 50 nautical

miles from shore and the state permit. This particular provision was to implement the requirement that the individual be fishing for smooth dogfish. We had proposed in the draft several criteria, 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent.

We had preferred 75 percent to make sure that it was a real directed trip. During the public comment period we got a lot of input from folks that the fishery was much more mixed than what we had initially realized, and so upon further review of the data, looking at things a little bit differently; we ultimately concluded that 25 percent of the catch would meet that test of fishing for smooth dogfish. That was the reason.

MR. PATRICK AUGUSTINE: I would like to amend the motion to include the gillnet, and if you want to use the language that you had in your presentation I think it would be more clear than what I would write; if you want to put it up there. If I get a second on it I would like to speak to it, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Okay so the issue at hand there was with regards to the definition of the sink versus the drift gillnet.

MR. AUGUSTINE: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: You would move to add to the addendum a definition of sink and drift gillnet.

MR. AUGUSTINE: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Do I have a second to that amendment? Do I have a second to that amendment? Seeing none; the motion fails for lack of a second. We'll go back to comments on the original motion. I've got Dr. Daniel, Emerson, and then Rob O'Reilly.

DR. DANIEL: It was appropriately pointed out to me, and if Brandon will indulge me, when these guys come in they take the heads off as well. These fish when they come in they are cores.

They are headed, they are gutted and they're finned; and they have to retain all the fins. But I hope it would be just a perfection to remove the head and fins. I don't know if that raises a red flag for NMFS or not. But it doesn't seem like it does. If you're okay with that Brandon, I would like to friendly amend my motion to just say can remove the head and fins of smooth dogfish, please.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Having had discussion is there any objection from the board to that modification to the motion? I've got two hands went up, so we can't just go ahead and amend it. Let me turn to those comments. Let me go down the list that I had here of people who wanted to speak. I'll add those two and then we can come back to that. If we need to we can entertain a motion to amendment. Let me first go to Emerson Hasbrouck.

MR. EMERSON C. HASBROUCK: I've got a question here about terminology. The question was asked a couple minutes ago, 25 percent catch weight, and the NMFS response was that is dressed weight. It seems to me like we have to process dogfish here in order to get to the 25 percent to see if we can have processed dogfish onboard, unless there is a definition that gutting or heading and gutting is not processing these fish. I need some clarification on that, please.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: I'll turn to NOAA for that clarification again.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Right so by dressed we mean head, gutted, it's basically a log or a core that is coming back. The difference for sharks other than smooth dogfish is that they can still be dressed, but the fins have to remain attached. There are different ways of cutting so that you can still process but keep the fins attached.

The exception is for smooth dogfish. They can be fully dressed, headed, gutted and the fins removed at sea. For all the other sharks the fins can be removed dockside. Headed and finned

at sea that is consistent with what we're doing, so it is a full processing at sea is what this is allowing. Does that make sense?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Follow up to that?

MR. HASBROUCK: Can I address NMFS directly, is that okay? I understand what you're saying, but that doesn't make sense to me; unless the definition of processing is just removing the fins. Because if processing includes gutting and heading, you are not supposed to do that until you've got 25 percent onboard of dogfish, dressed weight. You have to start processing fish before you know if you've got 25 percent of fish to start processing, but you've already processed them.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: The regulation is phrased in a way that that 25 percent is determined at the point of landing. That enables fishermen to process as they are going; they just need to watch the percentages before they come back.

MR. ROB O'REILLY: My comment was about the headed that I thought was a friendly amendment to the motion.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: I'll turn to the two people who raised their hand when I asked if there was any opposition for clarification on that matter. First I had Pat Augustine.

MR. AUGUSTINE: Margo clarified it for me and I could support that.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Okay so you no longer oppose that original maker of the motion's amendment. Eric Reid.

MR. REID: If the language was fully dressed I would have no problems. The fishermen can fully dress smooth dogfish.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: I'll turn back to Dr. Daniel.

DR. DANIEL: I have no problem with that as long as it's clear that they can head them, fin them and gut them. If fully dressed accomplishes that without concern from enforcement or other members of the board, then I have no problem with that as a friendly amendment. It is up to Brandon.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: I'll turn to staff and the Service for whether fully dressed would be the correct phrase to use here with relation to the intent of head, gut and fin.

MS. HARP: NOAA, did you have any comments on that?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: I think it might be clearer to maybe have a parenthetical, fully dressed i.e. remove heads, fins, and guts at sea. That might kind of meet both purposes and be clear.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Eric, are you comfortable with that? Dr. Daniel, are you okay with that? Mr. Muffley, you're okay? **Okay so the original maker has amended the motion to now read; Move to initiate an addendum to the coastal sharks FMP to address the disconnect of the processing at sea.**

Commercial fishermen can fully dress (remove head and fin and guts at sea) smooth dogfish if at least 25 percent of the retained catch is smooth dogfish. Is there any objection by the board to that modification to the motion? Seeing none; that is the current motion before the board. Further discussion on the motion, I turn to Mr. Hasbrouck again.

MR. HASBROUCK: Does that mean that somebody who has less than 25 percent of dogfish onboard has to land them whole? You know if you've got 200 pounds of dogfish, for instance, in a trip of something else. Do you have to land those dogfish round, whole?

MS. HARP: Based on Amendment 9, yes. I'll turn to NOAA for confirmation.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: They would have to keep the fins on through the point of landing, but would be able to dress the fish in another way; so remove the heads and the guts, but the fins would have to stay on through landing.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Further questions or need for clarification? Seeing none; I will give the board a moment to caucus. All right we'll go ahead. I'll ask all those in favor of the motion to raise your right hand, please. **All those opposed like sign; abstentions, null votes, motion carries 14 to 0 to 0.** That brings us back to whether the board would like to consider the gillnet question. Seeing the Service, go ahead.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: I would just offer the background on this that this is a requirement of our biological opinion, where net checks are required for drift gillnet to enable the live release of protected species, particularly turtles and the sink gillnet check for 24 hours was a new provision added to address sturgeon bycatch, and so to enable the live release of sturgeon in that gear type; just informational.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: I'll ask what concerns if any would the service have if there was no action taken by the board here today on this?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: As I said, this is a requirement of our biological opinion for federal fisheries. The net checks requirement has been in place for a number of years and has not posed any particular difficulties for the fishermen or for enforcement. Obviously the gillnet provision is new, so I don't have background or experience in that. I think the concern, without complementary regulations would be potential increase mortality of protected species. But I think that would be the extent.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Okay well not seeing any hands raised on this issue, are you raising your hand? Okay I'll turn to Pat Augustine.

2016 SMOOTHHOUND QUOTA

MR. AUGUSTINE: In view of the fact I did not, Mr. Chairman get a second on the motion the first time, could I bring it back on to try to get a second; so we would be consistent with the feds?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Based on the fact that the discussion earlier was that the desire was have them discussed separately, I will go ahead and allow you to make that motion as a separate issue versus amending the previous motion.

MR. AUGUSTINE: May I do that, sir?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: You would like to initiate another addendum to treat it separately, or you want to add it to this addendum?

MR. AUGUSTINE: I would like to add it. It didn't pass when I tried to add it to that first motion, so if I could add it as another item within this addendum; Mr. Chairman, I think that would be appropriate. Treat it as a separate element by itself. If the board so desires not to approve it, it will drop dead of its own weight and if they do we can go forward with it as a single unit.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Okay I'm going to; even though it is very similar I will allow the motion based on the fact that we had the discussion about wanting to treat them separately. Your motion will be to include the gillnet provision from Amendment 9 in the addendum.

MR. AUGUSTINE: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Is there a second to that? Is there a second to that? Seeing none; the motion fails for lack of a second. We'll move on to the next agenda item, which is the 2016 smoothhound quota.

MS. HARP: The 2016 quota, I just wanted to put on the record that there was an electronic vote in December. At the annual meeting there were the 2016 coastal shark specifications that we tabled. I just wanted to note that we did move to adopt the 2016 coastal shark specifications, specifically a start date of January 1, 2016 and a variable possession limit which will start at 36 large coastal sharks per vessel per trip, i.e. aggregated large coastal sharks and hammerhead shark management groups.

States will follow NMFS for in-season changes in the possession limit. That was passed in December. What we did not pass was the smoothhound quota, because that had not been released yet. Before you is a slide that I showed earlier, these are just the allocations. But what we're looking for today is just to set the commercial quota for the Atlantic region of 1,201.7 metric tons.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Any questions for Ashton on that? Question, or did you have a motion, Emerson? Go ahead with your question.

MR. HASBROUCK: I don't want to digress too much here, and seeing that I'm relatively new to the board. How did we end up with state-by-state allocation with smooth dogfish; the short version?

MS. HARP: I only have the short version, because I have just read up a little bit on it. This was initiated, the amendment passed in 2013. From what I gathered people felt that there should be a smoothhound state shares, although there wasn't a stock assessment that had been done on smoothhound at that time. The commission decided to proceed with the state allocations, but wait until the feds released the commercial quota.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: We've had those in place, those shares, but they haven't actually

had poundage associated with them until this year.

MR. BRANDON MUFFLEY: Can you put in context what landings have been over the last couple years for smooth dogfish in relation to what the quota is for 2016?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Give us just a moment. We don't have that immediately available, but I'll see what we can do to pull that up for you. Turn to the board for additional discussion, questions, and motions. Margo?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: In our Amendment 9, landings in 2014 were 577.8, 2013 were 663, 2012 was 705, 2011 was 885, 2010 was 1,219 and 2009 was 861. In the last several years the quota that was implemented, which is based on the assessment of 1,201 would be considerably higher. The only year that really approached the quota was one year of 2010.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Thank you.

MS. TONI KERNS: If it is helpful to the board the shares I believe, if I'm remembering correctly, were based on both historical allocations as well as more current landings. I think we used a combination of the two pieces in order to allocate.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: If the board does not take action on setting a quota here today, what are the potential implications?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: We will count all landings against the federal quota. Vessels will be required to sell to dealers and the dealers are required to report, so we'll get landings. We don't have a state shares component, so we'll be managing the Atlantic as a whole. But in terms of our monitoring and landings, it includes both the federal and state permitted vessels.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Basically the fishery would just continue as it has been, and just subject to federal monitoring at that point.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: State permitted fishermen are not subject to federal rules. Federally permitted fishermen need to follow the federal rules regardless of where they're fishing; but again all the data will be coming into us and going into the quota monitoring.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Just to clarify with staff, there is nothing in the FMP that would require action. I'm giving staff a moment to delve into that. Did you have your hand up, Louis? Go ahead.

DR. DANIEL: I guess there is a specific quota, I haven't seen it yet; that would go up on the board, in terms of what we would be asked to approve. I would be concerned about not implementing that quota, because if we don't set this quota then we run the risk of jurisdictions being disadvantaged by geography if one group starts catching more fish than their allotted share. You could run the risk if states weren't managing their specific quota allocation that some states might be disadvantaged by having the fishery shut down before their fishery even begins.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: The number is 1,201.7 metric tons. Again we heard from the service what landings have looked like; 2010 was the only year in the last six that that number was exceeded. That is the number that would need to be put forth in a motion if the board so desires.

MR. AUGUSTINE: Thank you for that information, Mr. Chairman. **I move that the board accept a 2016 smoothhound commercial quota for Atlantic region at 1.201.7 metric ton or dry weight of 2.6 million pounds for smoothhound.**

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Do I have a second to that motion. Dr. Daniel. Move to adopt the 2016 smoothhound, smooth dogfish quota of 1,201.7 metric tons, 2.6 million pounds dry weight, motion by Mr. Augustine seconded by Dr. Daniel; discussion on the motion.

MR. WILLIAM A. ADLER: Now does that mean, I'm looking at the chart here on Page 2 of the handout and I see those numbers. Now is that without the percentages that are above there in that chart or including the percentages that are above that in that chart?

MS. HARP: Can you clarify that question? You're asking the chart that was previously shown. Can you just clarify the question again?

MR. ADLER: Well I see, yes there is the chart. I see the numbers that the motion made, the 1,201 and the 2, but does that include this chart that shows the percentages for each state? That is included in this motion?

MS. HARP: No, it is not included in the motion, because it is already specified in Addendum 2 that these percentages would apply whenever a coast wide quota became available.

MR. ADLER: Oh, okay so all we have to do is just approve those numbers, the totals.

MS. HARP: Yes just the total.

MR. LUISI: I want to make sure I understand the difference. If we approve this motion the quota will then be divided up by individual states and we'll be expected to manage those individual quotas as a state; with consequences that I would imagine would be some sort of payback provision to any harvest overage by state. However, if we choose not to approve this motion we would then all be at the mercy of one another, and a total quota would be monitored and as Dr. Daniel stated, some of us could be disadvantaged, depending on migratory patterns and when the fish are available to different states along the coast. Is that a correct interpretation of where we stand at this point?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: I'll turn to staff for the provisions of Amendment 2, with regards to the state specific allocations.

MS. HARP: It is true that any amount, if a state goes over then the next year that state will then

have their quota reduced by that same amount. An unused quota may not be rolled over from one fishing year to the next.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: In short, yes states would then be constrained to their percentage.

MS. HARP: One other thing is that two or more states under mutual agreement may transfer or combine their smoothhound shark quota after commission approval.

MR. LUISI: Just a quick follow up. It would be the state's responsibility then to manage their own quota and have a mechanism in place; as far as their regulations are concerned to open and close the fishery, rather than the federal government opening and closing the entire fishery altogether, correct?

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: I'll turn to Toni for a response.

MS. KERNS: That is correct, Mike, but do note that NOAA did indicate that they will close the fishery when 80 percent of the harvest has been reached. At 80 percent they close because due to history that is approximately when it is good in order to not exceed the quota. It may be that NOAA will close the quota earlier than your state has harvested your full state share, and then only your state permitted fishermen could fish on that; anybody with a federal permit would not be able to continue to fish, similar to the sea bass problem we have.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Okay before you follow up with that I have to deal with a minor procedural issue here; that being that the setting of the quota will be a final action, while the motion itself is valid. We have the issue that for this particular meeting the maker of the motion is a meeting specific proxy, who cannot make motions for final actions; is what staff is advising me.

MS. KERNS: I believe he can actually make motions, he just cannot vote on those motions. He can make them, talk about them, participate in the discussion; but he may not vote.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Okay. All right, great so glad we got that cleared up. Moving on, Rob O'Reilly was next.

MR. ROB O'REILLY: Bill Adler's comment makes me wonder about this motion. It was almost indicated that the share percentages are a part of the motion, but it doesn't say that. It just says that it will be a 2016 quota.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: Again those percentages were put in place in Amendment 2, which said they would go into effect when a quota was put in place. By virtue of the motion whereby we are instituting a quota, those percentages would then go into effect. Okay any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none; as it is a final action this will require a roll call vote, and I will also again add the reminder that meeting specific proxies cannot vote on the final action.

We'll give states a moment to caucus. All right I'll turn to staff to go ahead. **Again the motion is move to adopt the 2016 smoothhound or smooth dogfish quota of 1,201.7 metric tons, 2.6 million pounds dry weight.** Motion by Mr. Augustine, seconded by Dr. Daniel, I'll turn to staff to call the roll.

MS. HARP: Maine, not present. Massachusetts.

MR. ADLER: Yes.

MS. HARP: Rhode Island.

MR. REID: Yes.

MS. HARP: Connecticut.

MR. DAVID G. SIMPSON: Yes.

MS. HARP: New York.

MR. HASBROUCK: Yes.

MS. HARP: New Jersey.

MR. MUFFLEY: Yes.

MS. HARP: Delaware.

MR. ROY MILLER: Yes.

MS. HARP: Maryland.

MR. LUISI: Yes.

MS. HARP: Virginia.

MR. O'REILLY: Yes.

MS. HARP: North Carolina.

DR. DANIEL: Yes.

MS. HARP: South Carolina.

DR. MALCOLM RHODES: Yes.

MS. HARP: Georgia.

MR. PAT GEER: Yes.

MS. HARP: Florida.

MR. JAMES ESTES: Yes.

MS. HARP: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

DR. WILSON LANEY: Yes.

MS. HARP: HMS.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Yes.

MS. HARP: And NMFS.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: That's me.

MS. HARP: Oops, sorry, already on the list; done.

CHAIRMAN NOWALSKY: **Okay motion carries.** Is there any other business to come before the board?

ADJOURNMENT

Seeing none; I'll entertain a motion to adjourn; made by Mr. Adler, seconded by Mr. Augustine. Without objection the board is adjourned. Thank you everyone.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 2:28 o'clock p.m., February 3, 2016.)