

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
SPINY DOGFISH MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**Wentworth by the Sea
New Castle, New Hampshire
October 29, 2019**

Approved October 21, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chairman Chris Batsavage 1

Approval of Agenda 1

Approval of Proceedings from August 2019..... 1

Public Comment..... 1

Consider Addendum VI for Final Approval..... 1
Review Options and Public Comment Summary..... 1

Review and Revise the 2020/2021 Spiny Dogfish Specifications 8

Consider Approval of the 2019 FMP Review and State Compliance 8

Election of Vice-Chair 9

Adjournment 9

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of agenda** by consent (Page 1).
2. **Approval of Proceedings from August 2019** by consent (Page 1).
3. **Move to adopt Draft Addendum VI to the Spiny Dogfish Management Plan with Option 2: Allow Quota Transfers between all states and regions effective immediately** (Page 3). Motion by David Pierce; second by Ritchie White. Motion carried (Page 4).
4. **Move to accept the FMP Review and State Compliance Reports for Spiny Dogfish and *de minimis* requests from New York and Delaware** (Page 9). Motion by Sen. Miramant; second by Emerson Hasbrouck. Motion carried (Page 9).
5. **Motion to adjourn** by consent (Page 9).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Megan Ware, ME, proxy for P. Keliher (AA)	Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)
Steve Train, ME (GA)	Joe Cimino, NJ (AA)
Sen. David Miramant, ME (LA)	Tom Fote, NJ (GA)
Kevin Sullivan, NH, proxy for D. Grout (AA)	Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Sen. Andrzejczak (LA)
G. Ritchie White, NH (GA)	Stewart Michels, DE, proxy for D. Saveikis (AA)
Dennis Abbott, NH, proxy for Sen. Watters (LA)	Roy Miller, DE (GA)
David Pierce, MA (AA)	Mike Luisi, MD, proxy for B. Anderson (AA)
Raymond Kane, MA (GA)	Russell Dize, MD (GA)
Rep. Sarah Peake, MA (LA)	Phil Langley, MD, proxy for Del. Stein (LA)
Jason McNamee, RI (AA)	Pat Geer, proxy for S. Bowman (AA)
David Borden, RI (GA)	Chris Batsavage, NC, proxy for S. Murphey (AA)
Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)	Jerry Mannen, NC (GA)
Justin Davis, CT (AA)	Michael Blanton, NC, proxy for Rep. Steinburg (LA)
Bill Hyatt, CT (GA)	Peter Burns, NMFS
Maureen Davidson, NY, proxy for J. Gilmore (AA)	

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

ExOfficio Members

Staff

Robert Beal	Caitlin Starks
Toni Kerns	Maya Drzewicki
Kirby Rootes-Murdy	

Guests (Sign-In not distributed)

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

The Spiny Dogfish Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Wentworth Ballroom of the Wentworth by the Sea Hotel, New Castle, New Hampshire; Tuesday, October 29, 2019, and was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Chris Batsavage.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN CHRIS BATSAVAGE: I would like to welcome everyone to the Spiny Dogfish Management Board. My name is Chris Batsavage; I have the honor of serving as Chair. I'm from North Carolina.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Start off by approval of the agenda, are there any changes to the agenda or can we approve that by consent? Seeing no changes it's approved.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: The next item is approval of proceedings from our August, 2019 meeting. Are there any changes or modifications to those minutes? Seeing none, those are approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Next up is public comment. Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak on issues that are not on the agenda today? No one signed up, so seeing no interest I'm moving right along.

**CONSIDER ADDENDUM VI FOR
FINAL APPROVAL**

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Next is Consider Addendum VI for Final Approval. With that I'll hand it over to Kirby Rootes-Murdy.

MR. KIRBY ROOTES-MURDY: I have a presentation I'll go through now, just an outline. I'll give you guys a little bit of an overview of this document development; the

statement of the problems, some background information. We'll go through the management options, and then the public comment summary, followed by the Board action for you all to consider today.

As you probably are all aware, at the ISFMP Policy Board in May there was a motion to initiate a Draft Addendum, to try to address transfers between the northern regions to the states south of that. New York through North Carolina currently can have state-by-state transfers; the northern region does not have the ability to take part in that. This addendum was initiated to address that.

**REVIEW OPTIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT
SUMMARY**

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: The Board considered a draft version of the Addendum in August for public comment. It was approved and went out for public comment between August and September, and today you all will be taking final action on this document. As mentioned, in terms of the statement of the problem. Currently the FMP only allows quota transfers between states with an individual state quota. The regions cannot currently transfer quota.

Full utilization of the coastwide quota may not be possible this year, in 2019, due to quota transfer limitations without Board action. The quota for this year has been reduced by approximately 46 percent in response to the 2018 stock assessment update. Some states may end up having to close their fishery early, while other states have quota that could be transferred, but due to this provision would not be able to do so. In terms of background, for the spiny dogfish fishery this operates on a fishing year of May 1 through April 30. The Commission has a complementary FMP to the federal joint FMP, between the Mid-Atlantic Council and the New England Council. In Addendum III to the Commission's FMP established a northern region of Maine through Connecticut, and state-specific allocations of

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

the coastwide quota. Those are up on the screen for you to look at.

In terms of how this fishery has played out over the last 20 years or so, total commercial landings have tracked the coastwide quota for most of the first 12 years of quota management, after which landings plateaued while the quota continued to increase. Landings during fishing year 2012 through 2018 averaged about 20.93 million pounds, while the coastwide quota averaged about 42 million pounds.

For fishing year 2019, which is what we're currently in, the coastwide quota has been reduced to 20.5 million pounds, to avoid overfishing the stock amidst declining biomass based on the stock assessment update last year. Over the last three years less than half of the cumulative coastwide quota has been landed, though similar landings in 2019 would achieve nearly 100 percent of the newly reduced quota level.

Next I'm going to go through the management options, it's a little easy on this Addendum, because there are only two, and there is a scoping question that was also included regarding the federal trip limit. The first, as you all are aware, is status quo. This would keep the FMP as is, so there would be no ability for the northern region to participate in the transfer of quota. Option 2 would allow all states and regions to participate in quota transferring.

Basically how it would work is there would have to be mutual agreement for those states in the northern region, and any future region, to sign off on a transfer. What would happen is the Administrative Commissioner from each of those states would have to send a written agreement to the Commission stating their approval of the transfer, and the same transfer rules would apply that we have for our current transfer policy for the spiny dogfish fishery.

Transfers don't permanently affect allocation, and quota management and accountability based on transfer adjusted quota would still be in place. You are held to that year's quota as it's been adjusted, any overages you still have to account for the following year. The other thing that this Addendum Option 2 offers is that all transfers could occur up to 45 days after the fishing year ends.

That is to allow for the accounting of landings data, maybe that came in after the fact that indicated that a state or region might have gone over the quota. Those were the two management options. There was also a scoping question as part of this Addendum, and that was should the Commission recommend the federal commercial trip limit be eliminated and replaced by the state-by-state trip limits where they exist, New York through North Carolina, and a regional trip limit for the northern region.

As you all are aware, NOAA Fisheries annually establishes the federal commercial trip limit as a requirement for vessels with federal spiny dogfish permits. As part of the annual federal specification process the Councils make recommendations to NOAA Fisheries on what the federal commercial trip limit should be. As part of the Commission's process, the states of New York through North Carolina annually establish commercial trip limits for state permit holders, and the Commission's Spiny Dogfish Board establishes a regional trip limit as we've discussed at previous meetings. For vessels fishing with both, state and federal permits the more restrictive trip limit must be followed regardless of where they are fishing. As part of the FMP, states set commercial trip limits to achieve their annual state and regional quota.

The Commission does not establish the federal trip limit, but can make a recommendation to the Councils on how that is set annually. Now I'll go through public comment. We didn't receive a lot of comments on this Addendum, just to put it clearly. There were three public hearings held, one in New Hampshire, one in

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

Rhode Island, and a virtual one. A total of seven written comments were received.

A few of the comments that were offered were specific to the options included in the Addendum, and the scoping question. In total three were in favor of Option 2, allowing quota transfer between the states and regions. One was in favor of maintaining the status quo. In terms of the scoping question, we had one person who indicated their preference for it to be eliminated, another in favor of it remaining in place, and then the third comment that actually started the question why this process was playing out.

The New England Council expressed a number of concerns regarding the Commission's public comment scoping process. They listed concerns regarding the number of public hearings that were held, the fact that there was not in the document a stated issue that was to be addressed through this scoping question, and felt that this was something best handled by the Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Council.

In terms of other comments that were offered, it was noted that there is high abundance around Block Island, and that there should be an effort to try to maximize harvest of this biomass. There were also comments that said that there shouldn't be full utilization of the quota, instead that quota should be reduced by about 50 percent in all regions. There was one individual who took issue with the Northeast Fisheries Science Center's Trawl Survey.

They indicated that it's missing much of the biomass, based on the type of gear and how it's set, additionally that there should be import data regarding how much spiny dogfish is imported into the U.S., and expressed the need for spiny dogfish to be renamed to help with marketing to help increase market demand for spiny dogfish domestically.

Last, it was noted by one individual that the Commission is not currently complying with Article 1, Section 1 of the Commission's Compact to prevent physical waste of the resource. That is a summary of the public comments we received. In terms of Board action today on this document, the Board needs to select the management option, confirm the implementation date.

I just want to note that the document does state that if approved the measures would be effective immediately. That is just something to keep in mind, unless this Board wants to change that. Consider approval of the document and then separate as part of the scoping question, this Board can consider whether or not to send a letter to the Councils and NOAA Fisheries regarding the federal trip limit. With that I will take any questions, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Any questions for Kirby on the Addendum and his presentation? Basically we're at a decision point on the options that were presented. Let's look for a motion. Dr. Pierce.

DR. DAVID PIERCE: First of all I would like to thank Kirby, as well as Nichola Meserve of my staff who worked quite hard on this document to get it where it is right now. I think it's very well done. It does address the motion that was made by the Policy Board back in May. Thank you very much for all of that work, especially you Kirby, who got us to this particular point.

I am going to make a motion that we, I haven't provided it so it's going to have to be, it's a simple motion so don't worry. **I would move that we approve Draft Addendum VI to the spiny dogfish interstate fishery management plan with state transfer quota Option Number 2, allowing quota transfers between all states and regions. With Option 2 allowing quota transfers between all states and regions.**

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Is the motion up on the board the way you want it? Okay. Second,

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

Ritchie White, discussion on the motion, yes Ritchie.

MR. G. RITCHIE WHITE: I just wanted to have the honor of seconding Dr. Pierce's probably last motion in Spiny Dogfish, so thank you, David.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Is there any other discussion on the motion? I guess just a question with the motion the way it's written. It looks like it's adopting Option 2 and the Plan, do we still need to do a separate motion to adopt the Plan or is this all in one? All in one okay, I guess the next question is, since the final action is wrapped in here, would this be a roll call vote at the same time? Toni.

MS. TONI KERNS: The only other thing that we would need in there is the implementation date. I believe it's effective immediately if I recall correctly, but it would be good to throw it in there, and yes Chris, it would be roll call. You can see if anyone objects if you want.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Is there any objection for including the implementation date becoming immediately in the motion? Is there any objection or abstentions for this motion? Jay McNamee.

MR. JASON McNAMEE: No objection, a question. This one I thought had, so it may be there and it's implicit in the motion. But there was a piece about per the agreement of the states involved. I'm not sure if I'm being clear, but there needed to be, so in the northern region it's multiple states. I recall that there needed to be agreement between the states before the transfer could occur, and so is that implicit in this motion?

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Kirby.

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: Yes, it is outlined in Option 2 that all the states have to agree on a transfer who are in that region. The Administrative Commissioners have to sign off

on that indicate that to staff, and then we would process it based off of that.

MR. McNAMEE: Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Okay so if there are no objections, abstentions or null votes, I think we can approve this motion by consent. Okay actually what I'll do now is in Kirby's presentation he mentioned the federal waters trip limit question that was a part of the Addendum. I want to tee that up right now. As you saw in Kirby's presentation there wasn't much comment received in general, and it was mixed on this question.

Some of the things we heard about it is the marketing challenges appear to be the bigger issue at the moment, when it comes to the fishery. I also represent my agency on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and this time of year the Mid-Atlantic Council goes through their priorities for 2020.

Those will be finalized in December, but with discussion at the Executive Committee it doesn't appear that the federal waters trip limit issue is among their list of priorities. It probably won't rise to the top. I just wanted to at least make this Board aware of that at the Mid-Atlantic Council level. With that I'll ask any Board members on how they want to proceed regarding this topic. David Borden.

MR. DAVID V. BORDEN: You know since we had mixed reviews, we did have some I thought useful written comments submitted, but at least in the case of Rhode Island we had poor attendance at the meeting, at the Public Hearing, namely because it's a wind meeting about every five minutes in our area, and people are just getting burned out going to regulatory hearings.

These are just personal comments. The impediment to making (microphone stopped working) progress on this I think is us, the Commission process. We have an advisory role

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

in this. All we can do is to advise both the Service and the New England Council and Mid-Atlantic Council of our preferences on it. But we haven't had like a caucus among the states.

I mean we have states represented around the Council that have spoken in favor of this. Rhode Island has spoken in favor of the concept. I think Maryland has done the same thing. There have been some positive comments, even from some of the fishermen out of Chatham on the concept, in addition to some North Carolina fishermen.

What I would suggest is like a two-step process. I don't think we need to start an addendum or do anything like that. I think what we need is a dialogue. To me the first step would be, between now and the next meeting arrange a conference call of the New England states, and basically try to get the dialogue going among the New England states of is this a desirable thing to do and how. How would you do it?

More importantly, what will the Commission do to take action to put something in place that would replace the federal trip limit? I can't envision either one of the Councils or the federal government removing the federal trip limit, unless they had some assurance that the Commission was going to take some action to support a controlled harvest in federal waters. I think the onus is on us, and I think the first step is basically to have a dialogue of the New England states for a report at the next meeting, and then based on that report we could decide on whether or not there is a next step and what the next step is. That is my suggestion on how to move this issue forward.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Just a question on that. Are you thinking of the Commissioners from the New England states, or would you also include folks in the industry such as the Advisors for spiny dogfish in those states too for this conference call? Just trying to get an understanding of who will be involved, as far as trying to get to what you're hoping.

MR. BORDEN: I was just thinking of the state agencies themselves first, and then if they could flesh out at least a range of options. Then I think they can broaden the discussion with the industry advisors. But right now we're kind of starting at ground zero on this. There isn't a proposal for a substitute set of regulations.

I think it would just benefit the states to get together and discuss it. Then if they can reach some kind of consensus, by all means I think they should seek the input of the industry. I have no objections to an industry listening and participating in the conference call. It's simpler if you have five people talking instead of 20.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Thanks for the clarification. I would like to hear from other folks, particularly some of the New England states regarding David Borden's idea for a continuing dialogue on the federal waters trip limit issue. Ritchie White.

MR. WHITE: I agree with David. I think we've got to proceed with this, and I think that's a good starting point.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Is there any objection, oh, David Pierce.

DR. PIERCE: No, I have no objection to that approach, I won't be around anyways, so the next Director will embrace it I'm sure.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Okay fair enough. Kirby, I guess this would be something that the Commission would facilitate a conference call, and based on. Oh, Eric Reid.

MR. ERIC REID: You can continue that conversation if you want. My question is just about what is the timing of this going to look like? You know there is a letter in our packet from Tom Nies of the New England Council. He had several reasons why he didn't want to deal with it. You can all read those, I won't repeat them here.

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

But, I would assume that whatever this discussion may be, we're going to have to have it before our combined meeting in December in Annapolis with the Mid, and then bring it up in front of everybody. Maybe by then we'll know what the priorities are in the Mid-Atlantic. It might die an instant death right there, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to go through a lot of effort and end up with zero in December, and I don't want to drag it out past December either.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: I'll let Kirby speak to the timing of that because yes, there are some challenges with this, so Kirby.

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: As Chris mentioned before, it's been communicated to us that the Mid-Atlantic Council is not taking up an action on spiny dogfish federal trip limit in 2020. The plan right now is that in their draft priorities they don't have that. We have staff from the Mid-Atlantic Council here today.

They can speak to how likely it would be that if you had a conference call between now and that joint meeting, whether that would change anything. I have a sense of how that might go, but they could probably speak to it better. You can sit at the table now. Yes, Jason Didden would like to provide some comments as Council staff.

MR. JASON T. DIDDEN: Thank you. This was in our potential additions in the 2019 Implementation Plan, and the way the Council handled it is we tried to talk the issue up a bit for our AP meeting, kind of highlighted that that issue would come up during the AP meeting. Again, didn't get a lot of participation. What we did get was mixed.

The same thing the Council reviewed the comments you guys solicited on this issue as kind of that scoping question. Given the minimal comments that were received and their mixed nature, the Council at this point has decided not to include it in the 2020 Implementation Plan. Now it is draft, it can

change in December, but based on the Council's evaluation of both the input coming in from our AP, and your scoping process, it's not on the list of priorities for 2020 at this time.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Thanks Jason, actually next I had Mike Luisi, oh Mike you're good, anyone else? Okay so Kirby, I guess we can work to try to schedule a conference call. I'm just trying to figure out where it would go next, because I think at some point it would have to come back to the Board, and I'm not sure when the Board will meet again. Kirby if you could just give some thoughts on that. Then I'll go to David.

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: Maybe as additional background, there have been calls organized earlier this year for the Mid-Atlantic States Commissioners to talk about this issue, and get their feedback on how the federal trip limit either should be adjusted or eliminated. We have that call summary that we could pull together, and then we can do another call for the New England states, and report out both of those calls to this body.

But I think it might be helpful just to be clear that that would be basically you all getting on calls to summarize how you feel about it, and then me summarizing that for you at a meeting here. I'm not entirely sure kind of what the timetable is that you would want to deal with this in, if it's not for action in 2020.

We could schedule these calls in 2020 for a 2021 action if that's of interest. But I think it's important to keep in mind kind of where the Councils have indicated their priorities are, at least for the upcoming year, and consider that with when these calls need to happen and what the goal of them should be.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: David.

MR. BORDEN: I don't see this as an action item. (Microphone glitch) It's something to do with my voice. I don't see it as an action item for

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

2020. I think if the assembly here basically agrees to a conference call, we do the conference call and we report back to this group, the full group at the winter meeting, which will be the next meeting.

Then we decide at that point on the next step. To me the logical next step would be to expand the dialogue with the Mid-Atlantic States. If the New England States come to some kind of agreement on it, then the next step would be to discuss it with a broader group here, and see if the broader group is in agreement. Then we decide when and how to submit a written recommendation to the Councils on the issue. That would put it on a 2021 timeframe.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Mike Luisi.

MR. MICHEAL LUISI: David, I'm glad you made your last point about bringing it back to the broader group and including the Mid-Atlantic States. You know some would see that in Maryland we have a state waters trip limit of 10,000 pounds, which is larger than the federal waters limit.

Some would say well then all of your fishermen would prefer perhaps having that higher trip limit in federal waters, and that is not necessarily always the case. We often get a split decision on this issue when we bring it before our permit holders in Maryland. As long as the discussion from New England is going to fold back to the southern states, I think that will be a good thing.

In the meantime I think I'll certainly work with my staff to try to get any additional feedback that we can draw out of our permit holders, to be able to inform that discussion, and if you would like just for consideration, Kirby and David. As the Council Chair I wouldn't mind participating as a silent partner in the conference call, just to keep my head wrapped around the discussion, because again if this comes before the Council. You know the more

information that I can have at those meetings is helpful for me.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: I'll go to Jason Didden then David Pierce, Jason.

MR. DIDDEN: Just one other thing to consider, in terms of timing. Right now multiyear specs are set through April of 2022. There is a benchmark assessment scheduled, I think for review in early 2022. The Council, based on the results of that action will be probably looking to do some kind of interim measure that is effective May 1, 2022.

Then spinning up a specifications action to take in the results of that 2022 benchmark, and then adjust specs for the remainder of 2022, and then going forward probably for several years, so 2022 is likely to have some kind of spiny dogfish action going on to set specifications. Just in terms of timing of when things might be happening, I just thought I would relay that.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Thanks Jason, I appreciate that. David Pierce.

DR. PIERCE: This Board has discussed the trip limit aspect to the spiny dogfish in New England at previous meetings. Rhode Island has had a perspective that they shared with us, and it did not prevail at the time if I recall correctly. In preparation for whatever conference call is held, it would be useful to know what Rhode Island's end game is, in other words what does Rhode Island attempt to achieve by doing away with the federal commercial trip limit? That will be helpful, because it will give all Board members advanced notice as to what eventually will come before this Board.

It's not clear to me yet what Rhode Island is trying to achieve by getting rid of the federal trip limit. Perhaps Rhode Island will want a 10,000 pound trip limit as opposed to a lower Massachusetts trip limit, so it puts the states at a disadvantage in terms of competition for the quota. We've discussed this issue already, and

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

it will come up again I'm sure. Anyways, it will be important to know what eventually will come before this Board as a motion from Rhode Island to deal with trip limits, if we get rid of the federal trip limit.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Are there any other comments on this? Kirby, so we've got I guess a plan as far as having a conference call of the New England states, where Mike Luisi would like to listen in as Mid-Atlantic Council Chair. I will probably join the call too, to listen in and to report back in February. But I guess a question for Kirby or Toni, were we planning on having a Spiny Dogfish Board meeting at the winter meeting?

MS. KERNS: We haven't planned out the winter board meeting yet, so we could. We'll have a pretty full winter meeting; I'm pretty sure with menhaden assessments being released.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Okay so I guess it's possible we could shoehorn that in from a timing standpoint. I guess other considerations. I guess based on that Toni, it's possible we could shoehorn in a board meeting at the February meeting and it will work out.

MS. KERNS: Oh yes.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Anything else on the federal waters trip limit issue? I think we have a plan to keep this moving forward for now. I guess we'll just be in touch as far as when to schedule a conference call.

**REVIEW AND REVISE THE 2020/2021
SPINY DOGFISH SPECIFICATIONS**

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: If nothing else, we'll move on to the next item, which is Review and Revise if necessary the 2020/2021 Spiny Dogfish specifications. I'll pass it over to Kirby again.

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: This is a very quick presentation. Basically the Mid-Atlantic Council met earlier this month to consider whether to

modify any of the specifications for the 2020 fishing year. They decided not to take any action, so they're leaving the three-year specifications that they approved last year in place.

Today if this Board wants, you all could choose to modify the northern region trip limit for 2020. Keep in mind that you did specify it for three years last year, but it's at your prerogative if you wish to change that. That would really be the one item, if you all wish to take action today on. I'll take any questions if you have any, thanks.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Any questions for Kirby? Okay any interest in changing the northern regions state waters trip limit? Since there is no interest we'll, I guess specifications will stand from our end. Thanks that was easy.

**CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE
2019 FMP REVIEW AND STATE COMPLIANCE**

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Next is Consider Approval of the 2019 FMP Review and State Compliance, Kirby again on that one.

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: I'll quickly go through the spiny dogfish FMP Review and State Compliance. Just an overview, I'll remind you all what the status of the stock is based on the 2018 stock assessment update, what the commercial quota and landings were, and then state compliance and *de minimis* requests.

Based on that assessment update last year, female spawning stock biomass was estimated at 106,000 metric tons approximately in 2018. Again that's a projected biomass. In 2017 the F rate on female biomass was estimated to be at 0.2 and has remained below the target level since 2005. In terms of the commercial quota and landings, as I talked about in the Addendum VI presentation, the fishing year ran from May 1, 2018 to April 30 of this year.

Proceedings of the Spiny Dogfish Management Board
October 2019

The quota was 38 million pounds, the trip limit was 6,000 pounds for the northern region states, and commercial landings in total were approximately 16.74 million pounds. That's about a 14 percent increase from fishing year 2017, and dead discards decreased by about 16 percent down to 8.5 million pounds.

Recreational landings and dead discards decreased, and landings were approximately 77,162 pounds, which is about a 73 percent decrease. The dead discards were estimated to be about 1.6 million pounds, which is a 4 percent increase. In terms of state compliance and *de minimis*, the Plan Review Team reviewed all state compliance reports.

All regions and states harvested within their quota, and all states implemented the regulations consistent with the requirements of the FMP. New York and Delaware have both requested *de minimis* status. They harvested less than 1 percent of the total landings, and therefore they meet the requirements of *de minimis* for 2018. With that I'll take any questions.

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Any questions for Kirby? **We'll see if we can get a motion to approve the FMP review and state compliance and *de minimis* requests. Motion by Senator Miramant; get a second, Emerson Hasbrouck.** Is there any discussion on the motion, any opposition to the motion or abstentions? We'll get it up on screen first.

I'll read it into the record too. **Move to accept the FMP Review and state Compliance Reports for Spiny Dogfish and *de minimis* requests from New York and Delaware. Are there any objections or abstentions to the motion? Okay it's approved by consent.** The next item we could cover now or when we meet in February is to elect a Vice-Chair.

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: The next item we could cover now or when we meet in February is to elect a Vice-Chair

I didn't know if anyone was interested in serving as Vice-Chair. If not we can cover that in February, I guess. But I'll open it up for now. Maybe too early in the morning to volunteer themselves, we'll take care of it in February, easy enough.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN BATSAVAGE: Is there any other business to come before the Spiny Dogfish Management Board? Seeing none, we're adjourned. Thanks everyone.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 8:45 o'clock a.m. on October 29, 2019)