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The Shad and River Herring Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Jefferson Ballroom of the Westin Crystal City Hotel, Arlington, Virginia, via hybrid meeting, in-person and webinar; Thursday, February 2, 2023, and was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chair Lynn Fegley.

CALL TO ORDER
CHAIR LYNN FEGLEY: Good morning, everybody. We’re going to get ready to get started on the Shad and River Herring Board meeting. I want to say for the record that I’m terrified to chair this meeting after yesterday’s parliamentary training. We’ll see how it goes. We’re going to go ahead and get started. Welcome everyone, we’ve got a pretty quick agenda.

We do have four action items, so please be ready for that. My name, if you don’t know who I am, my name is Lynn Fegley, I represent the state of Maryland, and I’m happy to serve as your Chair today. I’ve got James Boyle and Katie Drew up here with me, and we’re also going to hear from Brian Neilan, who I want to flag. This is his last meeting as our TC Chair, so I want to thank Brian for all the great work that he’s done for these two important species.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
CHAIR FEGLEY: With that, the first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any modifications, additions or changes to the agenda? Seeing none; we’ll consider that approved by consent.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS
CHAIR FEGLEY: Next, we’re moving to the proceedings from November, 2022. Does anybody have any changes, additions, modifications to the proceedings?

Okay, seeing none, we will consider those approved by consent.

PUBLIC COMMENT
CHAIR FEGLEY: Next, we move to Public Comment. I do have, is Mr. Mike Nardolilli in the audience, and I apologize if I massacred your name, but welcome.

MR. MIKE NARDOLILLI: Thank you, Madam Chair. I’m Mike Nardolilli; I’m the Executive Director of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, ICPRB. In 1940, Congress approved the compact between all of the basin states of the Potomac watershed; Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia.

I am here to just introduce myself and my Commission. Some of you may remember that we were very involved with the return of the shad to the Potomac River. This was an operation done by our aquatic biologist in the 1990s. Jim Cummings may be a name familiar to some of you. I’m just here to learn about how the shad are doing, and look forward to any further interactions with your Commission. Thank you very much.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you very much for being here.

CONSIDER THE NORTH CAROLINA AMERICAN SHAD SUSTAINABLE FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN
CHAIR FEGLEY: Okay, so next we will move on to consideration of the North Carolina American Shad Sustainable Fishery Management Plan, this is an update. This will require a final action, so I’m looking for a motion at the end of the presentation by Brian Neilan. Brian, if you’re online, take it away, please.

MR. BRIAN NEILAN: Thank you for those kind words, Madam Chair, and good morning to the Board. My name is Brian Neilan and I’m the current TC Chair, not for long, as Madam Chair just told you guys, and I’m also the TC Rep from New Jersey. Today I have a quick overview of an updated sustainable fishery management plan from North Carolina for your consideration, so we’ll fall right into it.
I would like to include some quick background info, so Board members have some frame of reference for reviewing the plan presentations. Amendment 2 and 3 of the Shad and River Herring FMP requires states requesting a fishery to submit a sustainable fishery management plan. A fishery management plan defines sustainable as demonstrating a stock could support a commercial and/or recreational fishery that will not diminish the future of the stock reproduction and recruitment.

These plans are updated every five years to reassess stock status and sustainability. Last month the TC reviewed an update for shad from North Carolina that concludes this plan would be in place from 2023 through 2027. After reviewing the updates and changes to the plan, the TC recommended the approval of the SFMP as presented. North Carolina does not qualify for *de minimis* status, so it made a request for both commercial and recreational fisheries.

They do quite a bit of work in view of their river systems throughout the state, and they use the data, both fishery dependent and independent from those rivers to support their fishery management plan. The most recent stock assessment of American shad in North Carolina determined that the population in Albemarle Sound are sustainable and not overfished, whereas the determination of status could not definitely be assigned for the Tar-Pamlico, the Neuse and Cape Fear Rivers, due to limited information from the 2020 benchmark stock assessment.

While stock status for the Neuse and Cape Fear River Systems could not be determined, the SAS noted that adult mortality for the Neuse was considered sustainable, and there is an increasing trend in adult abundance in the Cape Fear River since 2005. This plan was an update, so the general framework of the plan remains relatively the same, with some changes to a few of the sustainability parameters, to better reflect the data currently being collected, and how that data is analyzed and applied to develop the various parameters.

This slide here just kind of summarizes some of the changes, and this plan updates North Carolina’s sustainability parameters. Albemarle Sound index of juvenile abundance was added after it was developed through the 2020 benchmark stock assessment, and it’s been incorporated to the plan as a new sustainability parameter, catch per unit effort.

Additionally, sink nets were removed from their independent gillnet survey. These nets were removed to reduce interactions with sturgeon. The removal of the sink gillnets from the data did not significantly impact the relative abundance estimates of shad, since most of their shad gillnet surveys are getting caught in their floating nets. Finally, for the Albemarle Sound, relative F is now calculated using the female CPUE index as a sustainability parameter and commercial harvest of those is now coming from all gear types, so that is how they are generating their relative F.

These modifications are necessary to capture changes in the commercial fishery due to management restrictions, as well as changes in sampling methodology. In their independent gillnet survey, the modifications to the relative F calculation are now more representative of American shad abundance than fishery independent and fishery dependent data.

For the Tar-Pamlico and Neuse, the relative F now incorporates recreational harvest into the calculation. This was due to a significant decrease in commercial harvest over the past 10 year of the previous plan. The Rec data will help round out the declining data typically available from the commercial fishery in the past.

For the Cape Fear River, the plan now incorporates recreational harvest data as well, for the same reason declining commercial harvest, as well as the electrofishing CPUE that they also use, as was adjusted due to some fish passage issues at one of
the survey sites that didn’t artificially inflate abundance estimates.

Here is a slide of the Summary of Changes for the commercial and the recreational harvest restriction. For all the waterways highlighted here, commercial season dates have been changed from fixed-season dates to potential timeframes in which the fishery can occur. The dates listed on this slide should be considered the maximum potential duration of the fishery in a given year.

The actual dates of each year’s fishery will be determined by North Carolina’s Shad Working Group taking into account the previous seasons fishery harvest, independent data, whether or not sustainability parameters have been exceeded, and put some stakeholders and other applicable parameters.

For the Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River, the potential timeframe for the commercial fishery was extended from the previous plan. It is now January 1st, potentially January 1st through April 14th. The expansion of the potential season for this part of the state only was due to the Albemarle/Roanoke complex being assessed as not overfished and overfishing not occurring.

The rest of the rivers and inland waters retained the previous plan set dates. As I mentioned before, these are no longer set dates, they are now potential timeframes for the fishery to be executed. For the commercial fishery, the statewide bag limit was changed from a 10-fish aggregate to a 10-fish shad aggregate with only 1 of those fish are permitted to be an American shad.

That is a potential reduction in American shad harvest there. That was the general summary of North Carolina’s updated plan, just changes to how the sustainability parameters are calculated, as well as changes to commercial and recreational regulations coming up. I could take any questions if anybody has any.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you, Brian. Are there any questions for Brian on this? Anybody online, Toni? Okay, Malcom Rhodes.

DR. MALCOLM RHODES: If you’re ready for a motion, Madam Chairman. I would move to approve the updated American Shad Sustainable Fishery Plan for North Carolina as presented today.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Is there a second? Russel Dize, okay. We have a motion on the board, and that is: Move to approve the updated Shad Sustainable Fishery Management Plan from North Carolina as presented today. Motion by Dr. Rhodes, second by Russell Dize, and I now give the motion to the body to discuss.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Okay, well is there any objection to the motion? Okay, we’ll consider this one approved by consent. Thank you very much.

UPDATE ON THE 2023 RIVER HERRING BENCHMARK STOCK ASSESSMENT

CHAIR FEGLEY: Moving on, the next item is an Update on the 2023 River Herring Benchmark Stock Assessment. Dr. Drew, take it away.

DR. KATIE DREW: Work continues on the 2023 stock assessment for river herring. The Index and Life History Work Groups of the SAS have been hard at work standardizing and evaluating the indices, as well as developing life history parameters, including growth, maturity, natural mortality and total mortality.

We’ll be having our Methods Workshop the week after next, to finalize those data decisions and move on to developing methods for reference points and potential stock status options, as well as dealing with the bycatch question, and maybe some potential modeling population approaches for that. The goal is to have a final assessment workshop sometime in early summer, and to do the peer review in late summer, so that we can present to you at the annual meeting this year.
However, depending on how work progresses over this time, we may end up bumping back to the February Board meeting to give ourselves a little more time this year. Complete it this year, but do the Peer Review at the end of the year. I think after the methods workshop, we’ll have a better sense of whether this year is a completable timeline. That’s where things are, and I’m happy to take any questions.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Questions? Any online, Toni? All right, well we’ll look forward to the results of those analyses. Okay, moving on.

MS. TONI KERNS: There was one question if there was a date for the Methods Workshop, Katie.

DR. DREW: Yes, so the Methods Workshop will be held via webinar. The date and the link are on the ASMFC Calendar, but it’s going to be February 13th and 14th, and then 16th and 17th, so there will be sort of a break in the webinar on that Wednesday, to give the SAS some work time. But it will be the 13th and the 14th, and the 16th and the 17th, and like I said, the dates and the link for that webinar are on the ASMFC calendar if you’re interested.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Great, thank you very much.

MS. KERNS: There is one question from Jeff Kaelin. He put his hand down, I think we covered it. Perfect, thank you.

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

CHAIR FEGLEY: Okay, moving on. We’re going to go to, Consider the Fishery Management Plan Review and State Compliance for the 2021 Fishing Year. James Boyle, take it away.

MR. JAMES BOYLE: We’ll jump right in. Here is an outline for the presentation. I’m going to start with a short reminder of historical landings over time, and then move on to cover the 2021 fishing year specifically. Then I’ll move on to some of the monitoring and the compliance reports, including fish passage, stocking efforts and certain bycatch interactions.

Finishing off with the de minimis requests and the recommendations from the Plan Review Team. We’ve got a quick reminder of the historical context, so this figure shows the trajectories of commercial landings for river herring and American shad since 1950. Starting in the 1970s, river herring landings fell drastically, and then steadily decreased over time.

For shad there has also been a steady decrease in landings over time, which of course is in part due to the moratoria implemented through Amendments 2 and 3. To zoom in on the end of that time series, make it a little bit easier to see. Since 1990 there is more variation for river herring, which ended up with landings increasing from 2016 to 2019, but for shad you generally see a downward trend in landings since the ’90s.

For 2021 specifically, this table shows state landings and coastwide totals for commercial shad and river herring, excluding confidential data. The river herring coastwide commercial landings including bycatch, totaled just over 2.1 million pounds, which is a 12 percent increase from 2020. Bycatch values continue to plummet by 99.7 percent from 2020, which is as a reminder, after a 77 percent drop from 2019 to 2020.

Almost all of this is the result of lower bycatch reported from Massachusetts. Another quick reminder that I reported at the last FMP Review last year. Massachusetts eliminated their state portside sampling program, and so they report NOAA NEFOP data. In that compliance report, the NEFOP data they reported was 90,259 pounds, but I did not include that in this table, because it’s a combined estimate of both shad and river herring, so it didn’t really fit in the table.

That is also across several fisheries and regions. For reference, that same reporting counted 142,639 pounds in 2020. For American shad the total 2021
commercial landings, directed and bycatch included, reported in compliance reports were 195,642 pounds, which is a 39 percent decrease from 2020 landings.

However, bycatch landings of shad increased 96 percent and represent 17 percent of total landings. Hickory shad commercial landings amounted to 99,419 pounds, which is an 8 percent increase from 2020, although bycatch landings decreased by 89 percent, and are 2 percent of the total landings.

As part of the requirements in Amendments 2 and 3 for river herring and shad respectively. Passage counts are required on select rivers in the states on the slide, 4.44 million river herring were counted, which represents a 29 percent decrease compared to 2020, and 377,472 shad is a 47 percent decrease compared to 2020. There are a few caveats to note from the compliance reports. I’ll give a couple examples. For instance, the American shad survey at the Stephen Dam in South Carolina was cut short, due to a gate mechanical failure, and two locations on the Susquehanna River were not in operation to prevent invasive species, although they did perform trap and transport operations, which transported 6,413 American shad upstream.

During 2021 half the American shad fry were stocked in the Pawcatuck, Nanticoke, Potomac and the Santee Rivers, totaling 16.24 million American shad, as a 10 percent increase from 2020. Maine also continues to participate in track and transfer stocking of adult pre-spawning alewife of wild origin on the Androscoggin River, although that is not included in the table in the document.

For sturgeon interactions in 2021, there were 40 reported with one fatality. However, as always, New Jersey gillnetters report the weight and not the number of individuals, so they reported 1,666 pounds. Of those 40 interactions, 33 were identified as Atlantic sturgeon, 5 were shortnose and 2 were unclassified.

Again, as always, Rhode Island reports NOAA NEFOP and At-Sea monitoring data, which lags by a year, because it comes out after the compliance report deadline. They reported 4 interactions from 2020, and we will see the 2021 interactions in this year’s compliance report in July. For the upcoming fishing year, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Florida have requested continued de minimis status for their American shad fisheries, and New Hampshire, Georgia and Florida also requested continued de minimis status for river herring.

They all meet the requirements and qualify based on their commercial landings, which is less than 1 percent of the coastwide total. Moving on to the PRTs recommendations. In evaluating the state compliance reports, the PRT noted a few inconsistencies with the requirements in Amendments 2 and 3. Similarly to 2020, some monitoring could not be completed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which is detailed in Table 6 of the document.

Just so you know, there are a few longstanding issues that are related to funding or staffing shortages, where a state either cannot complete a survey or take samples, cannot process them for example. In previous years we included those only Table 6, but the PRT just wanted to note them in the body of the document as a reminder, but they’ve been longstanding for many years and does not represent, the PRT doesn’t feel they need to take any action on them.

Another issue of note. It’s in the document the Edisto River was below CPUE sustainability benchmark for three consecutive years, but management action was not listed as triggered in the compliance report. However, since the drafting of the document, a management measure has been implemented for the 2023 fishing year, and that measure will be evaluated by the TC in a future meeting.

There are other small inconsistencies looking at compliance report template, such as not including a
copy of the state fishing regulations, or a section in hickory shad, which the PRT requests, even if that section just said not applicable for the ease of our review. With those minor issues and given the circumstances regarding the monitoring, the PRT recommended approval for the compliance reports for 2021 for all states. There is one further recommendation the PRT is making. The group noticed some inconsistencies in bycatch reporting with some states utilizing NEFOP reporting, some states using their own catch reporting, and some not specifying the sources for their data.

Therefore, in the compliance report template for this year, staff will add a section for states to detail the sources of their bycatch data, and the PRT is going to use that to better identify gaps in reporting and use them for future reviews. With that information, the action for the Board is to consider approval of the 2021 shad and river herring FMP review, the State Compliance Reports and de minimis status for Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Georgia, and Florida. With that I am happy to take any questions.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Great, thank you, James. Are there any questions on the presentation? John Clark.

MR. JOHN CLARK: Thanks for the presentation, James. Just curious. I noticed that the shad landings continue to drop, and the stocking though is going up. I know that the states all use marking on the fry they’re stocking. Is there any effort to get all the results from the states that are stocking, if they can generate any type of estimate of the impact that the stocking is having, you know to look at in the catch? I know a lot of states are sampling the catch to look for the marking on their stocked shad.

MR. BOYLE: I am not aware of any current effort, at least not in the FMP Review Process, if there is something I can look into and get back to you, maybe it’s something we can include.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Interesting question, Ross Self.

MR. ROSS SELF: I just wanted to speak briefly to the missed CPUE targets for the Edisto in South Carolina. Those, you know we’re seeing a marked decline in the number of shad fishermen across the state, and particularly in the Edisto. You know we feel like that loss in effort from the fishermen contributed to that, as well as the impact of the social restrictions in ’20 and ’21 from the pandemic. But measures like was mentioned in the report. We do have some measures being implemented for ’23 that should address that, even though we think that that is kind of an artifact of a lack of participation.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you for that clarification, Russell Dize.

MR. RUSSELL DIZE: I was wondering. A few years back Connecticut was, we were at a meeting and they reported they had removed X amount of dams on the rivers. I was wondering if that was showing any progress in the amount of shad or river herring. Justin Davis.

DR. JUSTIN DAVIS: Thanks for the question, Russell. I’m going to have to say that I don’t really know. I mean we have certainly got ongoing efforts within our state to do dam removals, fishway installations. That being said, I don’t know right now off the top of my head, sort of how many miles of river we’ve restored in recent years. I don’t really have a good answer for you. But I can certainly get some information for you and send it back to you.

MR. DIZE: Thank you. The reason I asked the question was, I don’t see any chance for our shad and river herring in Maryland. This is when I was a young man that we had just boatload after boatload of herring caught and processed on Tilghman. But now we’ve got so many invasive species, with snakehead and the blue cat up around the Conowingo Dam, that I see no hope for them. But I was just wondering, you know I would like to see success somewhere.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Go ahead, Justin.
DR. DAVIS: Yes, thanks, and thanks for the follow up. I guess one thing I should mention is that we were seeing some marginal success with alewives. You know some of our runs seemed to be recovering a little bit. Blueback herring had been in tough shape all along and then not been doing any better. Then this last year in 2022, we had pretty much the worst year of river herring returns that we’ve had, I mean really probably since we’ve really started counting them.

That wasn’t just a Connecticut thing, it was also Rhode Island and Southern Massachusetts as well. I would love to say that we’ve got some really good signs of success with river herring restoration. We felt like we were kind of getting somewhere, maybe a little bit with alewives, and then this last year was really bad. We’re hoping it’s sort of a one-year speed bump, and we’ll get back to normal next year. But we’ll have to wait and see.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Yes, I appreciate the conversation. It’s a daunting problem, and between climate change and invasive species, and then the money that we’re investing, it would be nice to see some progress. Are there any other questions on the presentation? Anything online, Toni? Okay, so our next step would be to consider approval. John Maniscalco.

MR. JOHN MANISCALCO: I would be happy to make a motion. Move to approve the Fishery Management Plan Review, State Compliance Reports and de Minimis requests for Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Florida for American shad, and New Hampshire, Georgia and Florida for River Herring for the 2021 fishing year.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Second by Erika Burgess. Okay, we have a motion on the board. Move to approve the Fishery Management Plan, review State Compliance Reports and de Minimis requests for Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Florida for American shad, and New Hampshire, Georgia and Florida for River Herring for the 2021 fishing year.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Okay, seeing no discussion, is there any objection to this motion? Okay, good job, motion passes by consent.

REVIEW AND POPULATE THE ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERSHIP

CHAIR FEGLEY: Moving on, we are going to go to our next agenda item, which is to review and populate the Advisory Panel membership. Tina Burger. Is Tina in the room?

MS. TINA L. BURGER: I’m here, give me one second, sorry about that.

CHAIR FEGLEY: It’s all right, Hi, Tina.

MS. BURGER: Sorry, guys. I offer for your consideration and approval, two nominations to the Shad and River Herring Advisory Panel, Stephen Gephard, a recreational angler and retired Connecticut DEEP biologist, with over four decades of experience with diadromous species, and William Lucey, who focuses on dam removal and fish passage issues with Save the Sound, also from Connecticut. Your nominations were provided in the supplemental materials.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Thank you, Tina, are there any questions or discussion on these nominations? Okay, it looks like there is a motion on the board, Dr. Davis, would you care to state your motion for the record?

DR. DAVIS: I move to approve Stephen Gephard and William Lucey of Connecticut to the Shad and River Herring Advisory Panel.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Okay, we have a second by Roy Miller, and the motion on the board is to approve Stephen Gephard and William Lucey of Connecticut to the Shad and River Herring Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Okay, seeing none; the motion passes by consent. Thank you, very much.
ELECT VICE-CHAIR

CHAIR FEGLEY: next is also going to be an action. We are going to move to, we are going to elect a Vice-Chair, so I will be looking for a motion to nominate some lucky person. Pat Keliher.

MR. PATRICK C. KELIHER: I would like to nominate Phil Edwards from Rhode Island. Sorry, Phil.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Second by Eric Reid. The motion on the board was to nominate Phil Edwards as Vice-Chair of the Shad and River Management Board. Is there any discussion on this motion? Eric Reid.

MR. ERIC REID: Yes, I missed the parliamentary procedure yesterday, but I was really considering making a motion to amend the language to expound on Mr. Edward’s qualifications or it’s a substitute with a couple of blanks in it, or something like that. I don’t really know what happened yesterday.

CHAIR FEGLEY: You can fill in the blanks.

MR. REID: I could amend how you spelled Mr. Keliher’s name, but that’s fine, and my name as well. Congratulations and condolences, Mr. Edwards, but he’s an excellent choice, so thank you.

CHAIR FEGLEY: Any other discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? All right that carries by consent, congratulations, Phil. Thank you for stepping up to do that.

OTHER BUSINESS

GENETIC WORK INVOLVING SHAD AND RIVER HERRING SPECIES

CHAIR FEGLEY: All right, this takes us to our last agenda item. This is Other Business. We do have an item here. I’m going to turn this one over to John Maniscalco to outline his Other Business.

MR. MANISCALCO: I’ll make this quick. There is some really important genetic work being done on shad and river herring species, that we hope will inform stock ID efforts and sources of bycatch mortality. USGS among others is heavily involved, and I would ask that USGS update the TC on the status of current genetic sample collections, identifying data gaps and future needs. The idea is to work together to achieve comprehensive sampling, and identify where additional resources may be needed to accomplish that. Following that TC update, I would ask that the Board be updated next time we meet, on collections this far, and on any recommendation the TC may have, and if necessary, I’m happy to make a motion.

CHAIR FEGLEY: I don’t think we need a motion for this, if the Board can sense that we can send this to the TC. Is there any discussion or thought about having the TC updated and getting more information on genetic sampling, and bringing that update forward to the Board. I think this is an excellent idea. Any comments, questions? Okay, with that thank you, John. We’ll move that forward for the record.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR FEGLEY: The final item is, is there any objection to a motion to adjourn, made by the Chair. Okay, seeing none; we stand adjourned, thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 9:03 a.m. on Thursday, February 2, 2023)