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Current Issues Facing the Atlantic Shark Fisheries

- Commercial landings that exceed the quotas
- Declining numbers of fishing permits since limited access was implemented
- Increasing complexity of regulations
- Derby fishing conditions due to small quotas and short seasons
- Increasing numbers of regulatory discards
- Declining market prices
Objectives

- Continuing to rebuild overfished shark stocks
- Preventing overfishing of shark stocks
- Increasing the efficiency in the Large Coastal Shark (LCS) and Small Coastal Shark (SCS) fisheries
- Maintaining or increasing equity across all shark fishermen and regions
- Promoting economic viability for the shark fishery participants
- Obtaining optimum yield from the LCS and SCS fisheries
- Maintaining or increasing management flexibility for the shark fisheries
- Decreasing dead discards of sharks
SEDAR 34 Stock Assessment: Small Coastal Sharks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnethead Shark</td>
<td>Not overfished and no overfishing occurring</td>
<td>Atlantic: Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico: Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Sharpnose Shark</td>
<td>Not overfished and no overfishing occurring</td>
<td>Atlantic: Not overfished and no overfishing occurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico: Not overfished and no overfishing occurring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of SEDAR 34, NMFS is proposing SCS TACs and modifying the commercial non-blacknose SCS quotas
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

  Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

  Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative A1: No Action – Do not implement permit stacking – Preferred Alternative

Alternative A2: Implement permit stacking for directed limited access permit holders where 2 permits would allow the permit holder to harvest a maximum of 2 retention limits per trip

- 2 directed permits per 72

Alternative A3: Implement permit stacking for directed limited access permit holders where 3 permits would allow the permit holder to harvest a maximum of 3 retention limits per trip

- 3 directed permits per 108
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

**Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits**

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

  Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

  Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
The Large Coastal Shark retention limit is increased by utilizing an unused portion of the sandbar shark research fishery quota.
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

**Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas**

Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Objective and Rationale

Commenters have requested different shark season opening dates based on sub-regional differences in the shark fisheries.

Comments raised on Predraft:

- Sub-regional quotas could account for regional differences by allowing for different season opening dates.
- There is a potential for unequal distribution of sub-regional quotas if historical landings are used.
- The location of the split between the sub-regions would impact potential quotas.
- There needs to be flexibility to move quotas between sub-regions.

Based on these comments, we considered a number of options in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico regions.
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Alternative C - Atlantic Sub-regional Quotas and Quota Linkages

- Establishing sub-regional quotas in the Atlantic region
  - NMFS considered breaks for sub-regional quotas at the 33° and 34° lines (only showing proposed line)
  - Landing history used:
    - Aggregated LCS and Hammerhead – 2008-2013
    - Non-blacknose SCS and blacknose – 2011-2012

- Modifying the quota linkages in the Atlantic sub-regions

- Prohibiting the harvest of blacknose sharks in the Atlantic region or one of the Atlantic sub-regions
Proposed Atlantic Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Northern Atlantic Sub-Region
New Sub-Regional Quotas
- Aggregated LCS: 73,393 lb dw (33.3 mt dw) - 19.7% of quota
- Hammerhead Shark: 20,370 lb dw (9.2 mt dw) - 34.1% of quota
- Non-blacknose SCS: 117,631 lb dw (53.4 mt dw) - 30.3% of quota
- Blacknose Shark: 0 lb dw (0 mt dw) - 0% of quota

Southern Atlantic Sub-Region
New Sub-Regional Quotas
- Aggregated LCS: 299,159 lb dw (135.6 mt dw) - 80.3% of quota
- Hammerhead Shark: 39,366 lb dw (17.9 mt dw) - 65.9% of quota
- Non-blacknose SCS: 270,591 lb dw (122.7 mt dw) - 69.7% of quota
- Blacknose Shark: 36,899 lb dw (16.7 mt dw) - 95.5% of quota
Atlantic SCS TAC and non-blacknose SCS Quotas

- Current Atlantic non-blacknose SCS base quota = 176.1 mt dw (388,22 lb dw)

- We are proposing the following TAC and commercial quota options, based on the 2013 assessment results:

  Alternative C5: TAC = 353.2 mt dw \(\rightarrow\) Decrease current commercial base quota to 128 mt dw (282,238 lb dw)

  **Alternative C6: TAC = 401.3 mt dw** \(\leftrightarrow\) Maintain the current commercial base quota of 176.1 mt dw (388,222 lb dw)

  Preferred Alternative

  Alternative C7: TAC = 489.3 mt dw \(\leftarrow\) Increase the current commercial base quota to 264.1 mt dw (582,333 lb dw)
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking
Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits
Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas
  Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages
  Alternative D – Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages
Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Alternative D - GOM Regional and Sub-regional Quotas and Linkages

- Implementing sub-regional quotas in the GOM region
  - NMFS considered breaks for sub-regional quotas at the 88° and 89° lines (only showing proposed line)
  - Landing history used:
    - Blacktip, Aggregated LCS, and Hammerhead – 2008-2013

- Adjusting the quota linkages in the GOM region
- Prohibiting the harvest of hammerhead sharks in the Gulf of Mexico region or one of the Gulf of Mexico sub-regions
Proposed Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Western Gulf of Mexico Sub-Region

New Sub-Regional Quotas

- Blacktip Shark: 397,239 lb dw (180.2 mt dw) - 65.7% of quota
- Aggregated LCS: 141,877 lb dw (64.2 mt dw) - 42.5% of quota
- Hammerhead Shark: 0 lbs dw (0.0 mt dw) - 0% of quota

Eastern Gulf of Mexico Sub-Region

New Sub-Regional Quotas

- Blacktip Shark: 207,387 lb dw (94.1 mt dw) - 34.3% of quota
- Aggregated LCS: 191,951 lb dw (87.0 mt dw) - 57.5% of quota
- Hammerhead Shark: 55,388 lb dw (25.2 mt dw) - 99.4% of quota
Current GOM non-blacknose SCS base quota = 45.5 mt dw (100,317 lb dw)

We are proposing the following TAC and commercial quota options, based on the 2013 assessment results:

Alternative D5: TAC = 931.9 mt dw → Maintain the current commercial base quota of 45.5 mt dw (100,317 lb dw)

Alternative D6: TAC = 954.7 mt dw → Increase the current commercial base quota to the 2014 adjusted annual quota of 68.3 mt dw (150,476 lb dw)

Preferred Alternative

Alternative D7: TAC = 1,064.9 mt dw → Increase the current commercial base quota to 178.5 mt dw (393,566 lb dw)

This TAC/Quota would be for the entire GOM, not split by sub-regions
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Handling Sub-Regional Annual Quota Adjustments

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Alternative E - Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions

- The current upgrading restrictions for shark limited access permits (LAP) are:
  - Increases cannot exceed 20 percent of the horsepower of the permit’s baseline vessel
  - Increases cannot exceed 10 percent of the size (length overall, gross tonnage, or net tonnage) of the permit’s baseline vessel
- We are proposing to remove the current upgrading restrictions for shark LAP holders:
  - Alternative E1: No Action - Do not remove current upgrading restrictions for shark limited access permit holders
  - Alternative E2: Remove current upgrading restrictions for shark limited access permit holders - Preferred Alternative
Timeline

1) Proposed rule published on Jan 20, 2015
2) Proposed rule public hearings in Feb and March 2015
3) Comment Period Ends – April 3, 2015
4) Target effective date summer 2015
## Amendment 6 Public Hearing Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Feb. 17 – 5pm to 8 pm</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Feb. 18 – 5pm to 8 pm</td>
<td>Melbourne, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Feb. 23 – 5pm to 8 pm</td>
<td>Belle Chasse, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Mar. 18 – 5pm to 8 pm</td>
<td>Manteo, NC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conference call / Webinar | Mar. 25 – 2 pm to 4 pm | To participate in conference call, call: (877) 918-1344  
Passcode: 7371832  
To participate in webinar, RSVP at: [https://noaaevents2.webex.com/noaaevents2/onsstage/g.php?d=998580989&t=a](https://noaaevents2.webex.com/noaaevents2/onsstage/g.php?d=998580989&t=a), A confirmation email with webinar log-in information will be sent after RSVP is registered. |
Request for Public Comments

Comment period closes on:

April 3, 2015

Please submit comments to:
http://www.regulations.gov
Keyword - “NOAA-NMFS-2010-0188”

Comments can also be submitted via fax: 301-713-1917, Attn: Guy DuBeck / LeAnn Hogan

Or Mail: NMFS SF1, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Please identify comments with NOAA-NMFS-2010-0188

For more information go to: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/hms/

Additional Questions?

guy.dubeck@noaa.gov / leann.southward-hogan@noaa.gov or 301-427-8503
Additional Questions or Comments?

Please share them with us!

Karyl Brewster-Geisz, LeAnn Hogan, Guý DuBeck, Delisse Ortiz or Alexis Jackson

Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division
301-427-8503
The following slides are for the Amendment 6 Public Hearing Presentation
Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management

- Draft Amendment 6 to the 2006 Consolidated Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan

February 2015
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Current Issues Facing the Atlantic Shark Fisheries

- Commercial landings that exceed the quotas
- Declining numbers of fishing permits since limited access was implemented
- Increasing complexity of regulations
- Derby fishing conditions due to small quotas and short seasons
- Increasing numbers of regulatory discards
- Declining market prices
Objectives

- Continuing to rebuild overfished shark stocks
- Preventing overfishing of shark stocks
- Increasing the efficiency in the Large Coastal Shark (LCS) and Small Coastal Shark (SCS) fisheries
- Maintaining or increasing equity across all shark fishermen and regions
- Promoting economic viability for the shark fishery participants
- Obtaining optimum yield from the LCS and SCS fisheries
- Maintaining or increasing management flexibility for the shark fisheries
- Decreasing dead discards of sharks
SEDAR 34 Stock Assessment: Small Coastal Sharks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnethead Shark</td>
<td>Not overfished and no overfishing occurring</td>
<td>Atlantic: Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico: Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Sharpnose Shark</td>
<td>Not overfished and no overfishing occurring</td>
<td>Atlantic: Not overfished and no overfishing occurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico: Not overfished and no overfishing occurring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of SEDAR 34, NMFS is proposing SCS TACs and modifying the commercial non-blacknose SCS quotas.
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas
  Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages
  Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages
  Handling Sub-Regional Annual Quota Adjustments

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Objective and Rationale

- NMFS has received comments stating that increased trip limits would provide more efficiency and improve market conditions.

- If NMFS were to implement permit stacking, fishermen with multiple limited access permits could use them concurrently on one vessel, which would result in aggregated, and thus higher, trip limits.

- Permit stacking could provide additional opportunities and more efficient use of resources for fishermen with access to more than one permit.

- However, permit stacking could also result in quotas being harvested more quickly due to higher trip limits.
Alternative A - Permit Stacking

- **Alternative A1:** No Action – Do not implement permit stacking – Preferred Alternative

- **Alternative A2:** Implement permit stacking for directed limited access permit holders where 2 permits would allow the permit holder to harvest a maximum of 2 retention limits per trip
  - 2 directed permits per trip = 72

- **Alternative A3:** Implement permit stacking for directed limited access permit holders where 3 permits would allow the permit holder to harvest a maximum of 3 retention limits per trip
  - 3 directed permits per trip = 108
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

**Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits**

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Handling Sub-Regional Annual Quota Adjustments

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Objective and Rationale

- Over the past few years, the shark research fishery has not been catching the full sandbar quota (on average only 64%, or 76,332 lb dw, of quota caught)

- In the predraft for Amendment 6, NMFS considered creating a commercial sandbar fishery

- NMFS received negative comments from HMS AP members on re-establishing a commercial sandbar shark quota due to the risk of re-opening a commercial fishery for sandbar sharks, targeting an overfished stock, and the potential linkage with dusky sharks

- NMFS also received comments requesting an increase in the commercial LCS retention limit as an alternative to permit stacking

- In Amendment 2, the current retention limit (36 LCS other than sandbar sharks per trip) was based in part on how many sandbar sharks would be discarded dead from the number of shark trips that were expected to interact with sandbar sharks
Atlantic Shark Research Fishery Landings

Numbers reflect the number of research vessels per year

- **Sandbar Quota**
- **Sandbar Landings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quota</th>
<th>Landings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

The Large Coastal Shark retention limit would be increased by utilizing an unused portion of the sandbar shark research fishery quota.
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

**Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas**

Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Handling Sub-Regional Annual Quota Adjustments

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-regional Quotas

Objective and Rationale

- Commenters have requested different shark season opening dates based on sub-regional differences in the shark fisheries.

- Comments raised on Predraft:
  - Sub-regional quotas could account for regional differences by allowing for different season opening dates.
  - There is a potential for unequal distribution of sub-regional quotas if historical landings are used.
  - The location of the split between the sub-regions would impact potential quotas.
  - There needs to be flexibility to move quotas between sub-regions.

- Based on these comments, we considered a number of options in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico regions.
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Handling Sub-Regional Annual Quota Adjustments

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Alternative C - Atlantic Sub-regional Quotas and Quota Linkages

- Establishing sub-regional quotas in the Atlantic region

- Modifying the quota linkages in the Atlantic sub-regions

- Prohibiting the harvest of blacknose sharks in the Atlantic region or one of the Atlantic sub-regions
Alternative C - Atlantic Sub-Regions

- Apportion the Atlantic commercial quotas for LCS and SCS along 33° 00’ N. Lat. or 34 ° 00’N. Lat. into northern and southern sub-regional quotas.
Alternative C – Atlantic Sub-regions

Alternative C1: No Action –

- Do not implement sub-regional quotas in the Atlantic region
- Do not adjust the non-blacknose SCS quota to reflect the results of the 2013 assessments for Atlantic sharpnose and bonnethead sharks
- Do not adjust the quota linkages in the Atlantic region
- Do not prohibit the harvest of blacknose sharks in the Atlantic region or any portion of the Atlantic region.
Sub-regional Quotas for Atlantic LCS

Alternative C2: Apportion the Atlantic regional commercial quotas for certain LCS* and SCS management groups along 33° 00’ N. Lat. (approximately at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina) into northern and southern sub-regional quotas.

- Landings history: Agg LCS and Hammerhead – 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Landings</th>
<th>2014 Quota (lb dw)</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lb dw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated LCS</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>500,647</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>372,552</td>
<td>91,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>1,539,943</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>281,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerhead Shark</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>64,661</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>59,736</td>
<td>20,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>124,786</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Certain LCS refers to the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups
## Sub-regional Quotas for Atlantic LCS

### Alternative C3: Apportion the Atlantic regional commercial quotas for certain LCS* and SCS along 34° 00’ N. Lat. (approximately at Wilmington, North Carolina) into northern and southern sub-regional quotas.

- Landings history: Agg LCS and Hammerhead – 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Landings</th>
<th>2014 Quota (lb dw)</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated LCS</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>402,858</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>372,552</td>
<td>73,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>1,637,724</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>299,159</td>
<td>299,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerhead Shark</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>64,661</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>59,736</td>
<td>20,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>124,786</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>39,366</td>
<td>39,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Certain LCS refers to the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups
**Alternative C4:** Apportion the Atlantic regional commercial quotas for certain LCS* and SCS management groups along 34° 00’ N. Lat. (approximately at Wilmington, North Carolina) into northern and southern sub-regional quotas and maintain SCS quota linkages in the southern sub-region of the Atlantic region; remove the SCS quota linkages in the northern sub-region of the Atlantic region and prohibit the harvest and landings of blacknose sharks in the North Atlantic region – Preferred Alternative

- Landings history: Agg LCS and Hammerhead – 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Quota</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
<th>Quota Linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated LCS</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>402,858</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>73,393</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>1,637,724</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>299,159</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerhead Shark</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>64,661</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>20,370</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>124,786</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>39,366</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Certain LCS refers to the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups
Sub-regional Quotas for Atlantic SCS

Alternative C2: Apportion the Atlantic regional commercial quotas for certain LCS and SCS* management groups along 33° 00’ N. Lat. (approximately at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina) into northern and southern sub-regional quotas.

- Landings history: Non-Blacknose and Blacknose – 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Landings</th>
<th>2014 Quota (lb dw)</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Blacknose SCS</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>211,777</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>1,539,943</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacknose SCS</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>38,638</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>60,189</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Certain SCS refers to the non-blacknose SCS and blacknose shark management groups
## Sub-regional Quotas for Atlantic SCS

### Alternative C3: Apportion the Atlantic regional commercial quotas for certain LCS and SCS* along 34° 00’ N. Lat. (approximately at Wilmington, North Carolina) into northern and southern sub-regional quotas.

- Landings history: Non-Blacknose and Blacknose – 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Landings</th>
<th>2014 Quota (lb dw)</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Blacknose SCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td>199,058</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td>458,236</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacknose Shark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>38,638</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,189</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Certain SCS refers to the non-blacknose SCS and blacknose shark management groups

- Depends on Alternatives C5, C6 and C7
Alternative C4: Apportion the Atlantic regional commercial quotas for certain LCS and SCS* management groups along 34° 00’ N. Lat. (approximately at Wilmington, North Carolina) into northern and southern sub-regional quotas and maintain SCS quota linkages in the southern sub-region of the Atlantic region; remove the SCS quota linkages in the northern sub-region of the Atlantic region and prohibit the harvest and landings of blacknose sharks in the North Atlantic region – Preferred Alternative

Landings history: Non-Blacknose and Blacknose – 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Landings</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
<th>Quota Linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Blacknose SCS</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>199,058</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>Depends on Alternatives C5, C6 and C7</td>
<td>Remove*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>458,236</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacknose Shark</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>60,189</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>36,638</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Certain SCS refers to the non-blacknose SCS and blacknose shark management groups
+ We are proposing to remove quota linkages, and prohibit harvest and landings of blacknose sharks in northern region due to small blacknose quota
Atlantic SCS TAC and non-blacknose SCS Quotas

- Current Atlantic non-blacknose SCS base quota = 176.1 mt dw (388,22 lb dw)

- We are proposing the following TAC and commercial quota options, based on the 2013 assessment results:
  
  Alternative C5: TAC = 353.2 mt dw → Decrease current commercial base quota to 128 mt dw (282,238 lb dw)

  **Alternative C6: TAC = 401.3 mt dw** ← Maintain the current commercial base quota of 176.1 mt dw (388,222 lb dw) **Preferred Alternative**

  Alternative C7: TAC = 489.3 mt dw ← Increase the current commercial base quota to 264.1 mt dw (582,333 lb dw)
Atlantic Non-Blacknose SCS Quotas

Alternative C5 –
TAC = 353.2 mt dw, decrease commercial quota to 128 mt dw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Quota</th>
<th>Potential Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
<th>Potential Quota Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34° 00’ N. Lat.</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>199,058</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>85,518</td>
<td>Remove⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>458,236</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>196,720</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁺ We are proposing to remove quota linkages, and prohibit harvest and landings of blacknose sharks in northern region due to small blacknose quota.
**Atlantic Non-Blacknose SCS Quotas**

**Alternative C6 (Preferred Alternative) –**

*TAC = 401.3 mt dw and maintain commercial base quota of 176.1 mt dw*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Quota</th>
<th>Potential Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
<th>Potential Quota Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34° 00' N. Lat.</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>199,058</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>117,631</td>
<td>Remove +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>458,236</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>270,591</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ We are proposing to remove quota linkages, and prohibit harvest and landings of blacknose sharks in northern region due to small blacknose quota.
Atlantic Non-Blacknose SCS Quotas

Alternative C7 –

TAC = 489.3 mt dw and increase commercial quota to 264.1 mt dw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Quota</th>
<th>Potential Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
<th>Potential Quota Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34° 00' N. Lat.</td>
<td>Northern Atlantic</td>
<td>199,058</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>176,447</td>
<td>Remove*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Atlantic</td>
<td>458,236</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>405,886</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We are proposing to remove quota linkages, and prohibit harvest and landings of blacknose sharks in northern region due to small blacknose quota
Proposed Atlantic Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Northern Atlantic Sub-Region

New Sub-Regional Quotas

- Aggregated LCS: 73,393 lb dw (33.3 mt dw) - 19.7% of quota
- Hammerhead Shark: 20,370 lb dw (9.2 mt dw) - 34.1% of quota
- Non-blacknose SCS: 117,831 lb dw (53.4 mt dw) - 30.3% of quota
- Blacknose Shark: 0 lb dw (0 mt dw) - 0% of quota

Southern Atlantic Sub-Region

New Sub-Regional Quotas

- Aggregated LCS: 299,159 lb dw (135.6 mt dw) - 80.3% of quota
- Hammerhead Shark: 39,366 lb dw (17.9 mt dw) - 65.9% of quota
- Non-blacknose SCS: 270,591 lb dw (122.7 mt dw) - 89.7% of quota
- Blacknose Shark: 36,899 lb dw (16.7 mt dw) - 95.5% of quota

NOAA Fisheries
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

**Alternative D – Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages**

Handling Sub-Regional Annual Quota Adjustments

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Alternative D - GOM Regional and Sub-regional Quotas and Linkages

- Implementing sub-regional quotas in the GOM region
- Adjusting the quota linkages in the GOM region
- Prohibiting the harvest of hammerhead sharks in the Gulf of Mexico region or one of the Gulf of Mexico sub-regions
Alternative D - GOM Sub-Regions

- Apportion the Gulf of Mexico commercial quotas for aggregated LCS, blacktip, and hammerhead sharks along $88^\circ\ 00'\ W$ Long. or $89^\circ\ 00'\ W$ Long. into western and eastern sub-regional quotas; not looking at sub-regions for SCS fisheries.

![Diagram showing Apportionment of Gulf of Mexico]
Alternative D – Gulf of Mexico Sub-regions

Alternative D1: No Action –

- Do not implement sub-regional quotas in the Gulf of Mexico region
- Do not adjust the non-blacknose SCS quota to reflect the results of the 2013 assessments for Atlantic sharpnose and bonnethead sharks
- Do not adjust the quota linkages in the Gulf of Mexico region
- Do not prohibit the harvest of hammerhead sharks in the Gulf of Mexico region or any portion of the Gulf of Mexico region.
Sub-regional Quotas for Gulf of Mexico LCS

Alternative D2: Apportion the Gulf of Mexico regional quotas for aggregated LCS, blacktip, and hammerhead sharks along 89° 00' W Longitude into western and eastern sub-regional quotas

- Landings history: Blacktip, Agg LCS and Hammerhead – 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage Landings</th>
<th>2014 Quota (lb dw)</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacktip Shark</td>
<td>Eastern Gulf</td>
<td>1,257,104</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>604,626</td>
<td>207,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Gulf</td>
<td>2,409,960</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>397,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated LCS</td>
<td>Eastern Gulf</td>
<td>1,537,298</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>333,828</td>
<td>191,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Gulf</td>
<td>1,133,965</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>141,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerhead Shark</td>
<td>Eastern Gulf</td>
<td>286,634</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>55,722</td>
<td>55,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Gulf</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sub-regional Quotas for Gulf of Mexico LCS

**Alternative D3:** Apportion the Gulf of Mexico regional commercial quotas for aggregated LCS, blacktip, and hammerhead sharks into western and eastern sub-regional quotas along 88° 00’ W Longitude

- Landings history: Blacktip, Agg LCS and Hammerhead – 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage Landings</th>
<th>2014 Quota (lb dw)</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lb dw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mt dw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blacktip Shark</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eastern Gulf</strong></td>
<td>1,144,115</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>604,626</td>
<td>188,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Western Gulf</strong></td>
<td>2,522,949</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>415,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregated LCS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eastern Gulf</strong></td>
<td>1,419,926</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>333,828</td>
<td>177,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Western Gulf</strong></td>
<td>1,251,336</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>156,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hammerhead Shark</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eastern Gulf</strong></td>
<td>286,634</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>55,722</td>
<td>55,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Western Gulf</strong></td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Alternative D4:** Apportion the Gulf of Mexico regional commercial quotas for aggregated LCS, blacktip, and hammerhead sharks along 89° 00’ W Longitude into western and eastern sub-regional quotas and maintain the LCS quota linkages for aggregated LCS and hammerhead sharks in the eastern sub-region of the Gulf of Mexico region; remove the linkage in the western sub-region of the Gulf of Mexico region and prohibit the harvest and landing of hammerhead sharks in that sub-region – Preferred Alternative

- Landings history: Blacktip, Agg LCS and Hammerhead – 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Group</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Landings (lb dw)</th>
<th>Percentage of Quota</th>
<th>New Sub-Regional Quotas</th>
<th>Quota Linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lb dw</td>
<td>mt dw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktip Shark</td>
<td>Eastern Gulf</td>
<td>1,257,104</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>207,387</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Gulf</td>
<td>2,409,960</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>397,239</td>
<td>180.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated LCS</td>
<td>Eastern Gulf</td>
<td>1,537,298</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>191,951</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Gulf</td>
<td>1,133,965</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>141,877</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerhead Shark</td>
<td>Eastern Gulf</td>
<td>286,634</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>55,388</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Gulf</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prohibit harvest and landings of hammerhead sharks within sub-region due to the small hammerhead shark quota
Proposed Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Western Gulf of Mexico
Sub-Region

New Sub-Regional Quotas
Blacktip Shark- 397,239 lb dw (180.2 mt dw) - 65.7% of quota
Aggregated LCS- 141,877 lb dw (64.2 mt dw) - 42.5% of quota
Hammerhead Shark- 0 lbs dw (0.0 mt dw) - 0% of quota

Eastern Gulf of Mexico
Sub-Region

New Sub-Regional Quotas
Blacktip Shark- 207,387 lb dw (94.1 mt dw) - 34.3% of quota
Aggregated LCS- 191,951 kb dw (87.0 mt dw) - 57.5% of quota
Hammerhead Shark- 55,388 lb dw (25.2 mt dw) - 99.4% of quota
GOM SCS TAC and Non-Blacknose SCS Quotas

- Current GOM non-blacknose SCS base quota = 45.5 mt dw 
  (100,317 lb dw)

- We are proposing the following TAC and commercial quota options, based on the 2013 assessment results:

  Alternative D5: TAC = 931.9 mt dw  ➙ Maintain the current commercial base quota of 45.5 mt dw 
  (100,317 lb dw)

  **Alternative D6: TAC = 954.7 mt dw**  ➙ Increase the current preferred alternative commercial base quota to the 2014 adjusted annual quota of 68.3 mt dw (150,476 lb dw)

  Preferred Alternative

  Alternative D7: TAC = 1,064.9 mt dw  ➙ Increase the current commercial base quota to 178.5 mt dw 
  (393,566 lb dw)

- This TAC/Quota would be for the entire GOM, not split by sub-regions
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Handling Sub-Regional Annual Quota Adjustments

Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions
Example of Regional and Sub-Regional Quota Adjustment Scenarios

Baseline Quota = 100 mt dw
-Sub-Region A quota (50% of baseline) = 50 mt dw
-Sub-Region B quota (50% of baseline) = 50 mt dw

Scenario 1: Overall underharvest
-Sub-Region A Landings = 30 mt dw
-Sub-Region B Landings = 40 mt dw
-Overall Landings = 70 mt dw
-Underharvest = 30 mt dw (split per baseline split)

Overfished, overfishing, unknown stocks
Following year adjusted quota = 100 mt dw
-Sub-Region A quota (50%) = 50 mt dw
-Sub-Region B quota (50%) = 50 mt dw

Scenario 2A: Overharvest by BOTH sub-regions
-Sub-Region A Landings = 60 mt dw
-Sub-Region B Landings = 60 mt dw
-Overall Landings = 120 mt dw
-Overharvest = 20 mt dw (split per baseline split)

Following year adjusted quota = 80 mt dw
-Sub-Region A quota (50%) = 40 mt dw
-Sub-Region B quota (50%) = 40 mt dw

Scenario 2B: Overharvest by ONE sub-region
-Sub-Region A Landings = 45 mt dw
-Sub-Region B Landings = 75 mt dw
-Overall Landings = 120 mt dw
-Overharvest = 20 mt dw (counted against sub-region that overharvested)

Following year adjusted quota = 80 mt dw
-Sub-Region A quota = 50 mt dw
-Sub-Region B quota = 30 mt dw
Range of Alternatives

Alternative A - Permit Stacking

Alternative B - Commercial Shark Retention Limits

Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Regional and Sub-Regional Quotas

  Alternative C - Atlantic Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

  Alternative D - Gulf Regions, Quotas, and Linkages

Handling Sub-Regional Annual Quota Adjustments

**Alternative E - Modifying Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions**
Alternative E - Commercial Vessel Upgrading Restrictions

- The current upgrading restrictions for shark limited access permits (LAP) are:
  - Increases cannot exceed 20 percent of the horsepower of the permit’s baseline vessel
  - Increases cannot exceed 10 percent of the size (length overall, gross tonnage, and net tonnage) of the permit’s baseline vessel

- We are proposing to remove the current upgrading restrictions for shark LAP holders:
  - Alternative E1: No Action - Do not remove current upgrading restrictions for shark limited access permit holders
  - Alternative E2: Remove current upgrading restrictions for shark limited access permit holders - Preferred Alternative

Alternative E2: Remove current upgrading restrictions for shark limited access permit holders - Preferred Alternative
Timeline

1) Proposed rule published on Jan 20, 2015
2) Proposed rule public hearings in Feb and March 2015
3) Comment Period Ends – April 3, 2015
4) Target effective date summer 2015
# Amendment 6 Public Hearing Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Feb. 17 – 5pm to 8 pm</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Feb. 18 – 5pm to 8 pm</td>
<td>Melbourne, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Feb. 23 – 5pm to 8 pm</td>
<td>Belle Chasse, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Mar. 18 – 5pm to 8 pm</td>
<td>Manteo, NC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conference call / Webinar    | Mar. 25 – 2 pm to 4 pm | To participate in conference call, call: (877) 918-1344  
Passcode: 7371832  
To participate in webinar, RSVP at: https://noaaevents2.webex.com/noaaevents2/onsstage/g.php?d=998580989&t=a, A confirmation email with webinar log-in information will be sent after RSVP is registered. |
Request for Public Comments

Comment period closes on:

April 3, 2015

Please submit comments to:
http://www.regulations.gov
Keyword - “NOAA-NMFS-2010-0188”

Comments can also be submitted via fax: 301-713-1917, Attn: Guy’ DuBeck / LeAnn Hogan

Or Mail: NMFS SF1, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Please identify comments with NOAA-NMFS-2010-0188

For more information go to: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/hms/

Additional Questions?
guy.dubeck@noaa.gov / leann.southward-hogan@noaa.gov or 301-427-8503
Additional Questions or Comments?

Please share them with us!

Karyl Brewster-Geisz, LeAnn Hogan, Guý DuBeck, Delisse Ortiz or Alexis Jackson

Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division
301-427-8503