

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**Crowne Plaza - Old Town
Alexandria, Virginia
August 5, 2014**

Approved October 29, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chairman Douglas E. Grout..... 1

Approval of Agenda..... 1

Approval of Proceedings, May 2014 1

Public Comment..... 1

Technical Committee Report on the North Carolina Stock Assessment 1

Draft Addendum IV for Public Comment:

 Review of Draft Addendum IV..... 3

 Law Enforcement Report..... 14

 Discussion of LEC Report 15

 Advisory Panel Report..... 15

 Discussion of AP Report..... 16

Consideration of Draft Addendum IV for Public Comment..... 16

 Remarks of Mr. Desmond Kahn 17

 Remarks of Mr. Jeff Deem..... 17

 Board Discussion and Action On Draft Addendum IV 18

Other Business 43

Adjournment..... 43

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of agenda by consent** (Page 1).
2. **Approval of proceedings of May 2014 by consent** (Page 1).
3. **Move to approve North Carolina's 2013 Benchmark Albemarle/Roanoke Stock Assessment for management use** (Page 3). Motion by Michelle Duval; second by Jim Gilmore. Motion carried (Page 3).
4. **Move to approve all of the recommendations of the Striped Bass Board Subcommittee to remove the options B-14, B-15, C-9, C-10 and D-6 from Draft Addendum IV to the Striped Bass Fishery Management Plan.** (Page 18). Motion by Paul Diodati; second by Emerson Hasbrouck. Motion carried (Page 19).
5. **Move to include an option under Option B that would reduce the Amendment 6 state coastal commercial quotas by 30 percent** (Page 19). Motion by G. Ritchie White; second by Michelle Duval. Motion defeated for lack of a majority (Page 21).
6. **Move to add Option C to Section 2.5.2, Chesapeake Bay Stock Reference Points, where the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions would manage the Chesapeake Bay Striped Bass Fisheries so as not to exceed a target fishing mortality rate of F equal 0.058** (Page 21). Motion by Tom O'Connell; second by Rob O'Reilly. Motion defeated (Page 29).
7. **Move to include a sunset provision in 3 years after implementation for Section 3.0** (Page 30). Motion by Tom Fote; second by Steve Meyers. Motion defeated (Page 34).
8. **Motion to add an option to take necessary harvest reductions (25%, 17%, 7+7+7%) from the 2012 harvest for the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions instead of the 2013 harvest** (Page 37). Motion by Rob O'Reilly; second by Martin Gary. Motion carried (Page 40).
9. **Move to include in Draft Addendum IV for Public Comment the reductions that would be obtained in the coastal recreational fishery with options of one fish at 30 inches or one fish at 32 inches** (Page 40). Motion by Emerson Hasbrouck; second by Michelle Duval. Motion carried (Page 43).
10. **Move to adopt Draft Addendum IV to Amendment 6 to the Atlantic Striped Bass FMP for Public Comment as modified today** (Page 43). Motion by Dennis Abbott; second by Bill Adler. Motion carried (Page 43).
11. **Motion to adjourn by consent** (Page 43).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Terry Stockwell, ME proxy for P. Keliher (AA)	Tom Fote, NJ (GA)
Rep. Walter Kumiega, ME (LA)	Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Andrzejczak (LA)
Steve Train, ME (GA)	Leroy Young, PA, proxy for J. Arway (AA)
G. Ritchie White, NH (GA)	Bernie Pankowski, DE, proxy for Sen. Venables (LA)
Doug Grout, NH (AA)	Roy Miller, DE (GA)
Dennis Abbott, NH, proxy for Sen. Watters (LA)	John Clark, DE, proxy for D. Saveikis (AA)
Rep. Sarah Peake, MA (LA)	Tom O'Connell, MD (AA)
Paul Diodati, MA (AA)	Russell Dize, MD, proxy for Sen. Colburn (LA)
Bill Adler, MA (GA)	Bill Goldsborough, MD (GA)
Mark Gibson, RI, proxy for B. Ballou (AA)	John Bull, VA (AA)
David Borden, RI (GA)	Rob O'Reilly, VA, Administrative proxy
Rick Bellavance, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)	Kyle Schick, VA proxy for Sen. Stuart (LA)
David Simpson, CT (AA)	Catherine Davenport, VA (GA)
Lance Stewart, CT (GA)	Michelle Duval, NC proxy for L. Daniel (AA)
Rep. Craig Miner, CT (LA)	Martin Gary, PRFC
James Gilmore, NY (AA)	Dan Ryan for Bryan King, DC
Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)	Steve Meyers, NMFS
Sen. Phil Boyle, NY (LA)	Sherry White, USFWS
Russ Allen, NJ, proxy for D. Chanda (AA)	

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

Ex-Officio Members

Charlton Godwin, Technical Committee Chair

Staff

Robert Beal
Toni Kerns

Mike Waine
Mark Robson

Guests

Joe Fessenden, MD DNR
Elizabeth Silleck, PEW Trusts
Joseph Gordon, PEW Trusts
Donald Lajavic USCG
Mike Sorbrau, USCG
Mike Leonard, American Sportfishing Assn.
Melanie Sturn, American Sportfishing Assn.
Phil Langley, PRFC
Alexei Sharov, MD DNR
Angela Giuliano, MD DNR

Arnold Leo, E. Hampton Baymens Assn.
Ed Liccione, CCA
Tony Friedrich, CCA
Raymond Kane, CHOIR
Brandon Muffley, NJ DFW
Desmond Kahn, Newark, DE
Ed O'Brien, MCBA
Dave Smith, MD Saltwater Sportfishing Assn.
Patrick Paquette, MA Striped Bass Assn.

The Atlantic Striped Bass Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Presidential Ballroom of the Crown Plaza Hotel Old Town, Alexandria, Virginia, August 5, 2014, and was called to order at 1:05 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Douglas E. Grout.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS E. GROUT: Welcome to a meeting of the Atlantic Striped Bass Management Board. My name is Doug Grout; I'm chair of the board right now. We have a lot of work to do today. We're going to be receiving a technical committee report on the North Carolina stock assessment and then, of course, we will be considering Draft Addendum IV for public comment today, along with reports from the Law Enforcement Advisory Committee and our subcommittee that we tasked with making revisions to Addendum IV.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN GROUT: To start off with, we have an agenda here. Are there any changes to the agenda? Wilson.

DR. WILSON LANEY: Mr. Chairman, could we please add under other business a very brief update on the cooperative winter tagging cruise.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: It sounds good; I think we should make that a standing other business item. Any other changes? Seeing none, we will consider the agenda approved as modified.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GROUT: We also have the proceedings from our May 2014 meeting. Does anybody have any changes to that? Michelle.

DR. MICHELLE DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I apologize, I was at that meeting, but in just reviewing the motions it appears that there might be just a copy-and-paste error in Motion Number 8, which was a motion as amended. The text of that does not actually reflect that the amendment passed. I'd be happy to get with staff with that afterwards.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, we'll look at that and make the correction as needed. Any other changes? Seeing none, is there any objection to approving the minutes of the May 2014 meeting? Seeing no objections, they approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN GROUT: We now have a point on the agenda where public comment can be made.

These are public comments for items that are not on the agenda; so, for example, if your comments refer to anything in Addendum IV, we will be taking comments at that time and not now. But if there is something else that is not on the agenda; I have two people that have signed up. I know I talked to one Des Kahn; that it sounds like his comment is related to the addendum; is that correct, Des?

MR. DES KAHN: I think so.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: And then I believe there is another, Jeff Deem; is that related to the addendum? Okay, we'll take public comment on that at that particular time. Are there any other comments from the public on something that's not on the agenda? Seeing none, we will move forward to Item Number 4, which is the technical committee report on the North Carolina Stock Assessment.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE NORTH CAROLINA STOCK ASSESSMENT

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Our technical committee chairman, Charlton Godwin, will be providing a report for us.

MR. CHARLTON GODWIN: As background, at the 2013 winter meeting the board tasked the technical committee with developing stock-specific reference points for the Albemarle/Roanoke River Stock. In July the technical committee reviewed the results from the 2014 North Carolina Benchmark Stock Assessment. This is the Albemarle/Roanoke stock. This presentation just informs the board

on the results of the assessment and the technical committee discussion.

The tagging data continued to suggest minimal mixing between the Albemarle/Roanoke stock and Chesapeake Bay stocks, Delaware and Hudson River stocks. As far as total abundance, the Albemarle/Roanoke stock is smaller and is migratory older ages compared to the other stocks. The female maturation schedule is different for the Albemarle stock than it is for the Chesapeake Bay stock or for the maturation schedule using the coastal assessment.

Due to these facts, age-structured stock assessments of the Albemarle/Roanoke stock have provided stock-specific reference points of F and spawning stock biomass and fishing mortality since 1992. The current assessment of the Albemarle/Roanoke stock also is an age-structured assessment program; and it uses similar methodology as the coastal stock assessment to estimate reference points.

Due to the differences in the life history of the Albemarle/Roanoke stock and the ability to develop stock-specific reference points for the A/R stock, the ASMFC Striped Bass Technical Committee recommendation to the board is to use the reference points developed through the North Carolina Albemarle/Roanoke stock assessments for management use.

The technical committee will continue to review Albemarle/Roanoke benchmark stock assessments and make recommendations to the board as to the appropriateness of each assessment's results for management use. We will just go through a couple of slides showing the results of our most recent stock assessment.

The proposed new reference points for fishing mortality and spawning stock biomass are listed; 0.33 for a target and 0.41 for a threshold for fishing mortality. This level of fishing is associated with the target and threshold spawning stock biomass much like the coast-wide model. Also, our recreational and commercial fisheries in our Albemarle Sound and Roanoke River are managed on a quota-based system; so we have a quota each year which we may managed to not exceed.

The total allowable landings associated with those fishing mortalities are 305,000 pounds and 325,000 pounds, respectively. From our last stock assessment, the current quota that were using for our Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River is 550,000 pounds; so this is a reduction from that due in part to just changing in stock size abundance.

This next graph shows the – these are results from our assessment. It shows recruitment and it shows SSB. Currently our stock exhibits a lot of the same similar trends in recruitment that some of the coastal stocks, specifically the Chesapeake Bay stocks exhibit; and we are in a period of decline in abundance. Right now our SSB is in between the target and threshold.

The next slide is going to show total abundance as well as where our F rate is; so currently we are just above our F target, below the F threshold. The most recent years in the assessment for this model tend had a lot of uncertainty with them, especially with the total abundance. You can see in those couple of years that abundance is probably going to come back down with a couple more years of data.

The last slide is just upcoming management of the Albemarle/Roanoke fisheries. Within our North Carolina state fisheries management plan, we have a trigger that if the F is over the F target, mortality will be reduced to bring the F estimate below the target. The 2012 point estimate as stated in the terminal year is above the new effort's reference point.

At our next Marine Fisheries Commission meeting, which happens later on this month, we will be presenting this information to our Marine Fisheries Commission and we will developing options to reduce harvest to necessary levels based on projections to take out to the public with management implementation tentatively scheduled for January of 2015. I will take any questions if anyone has any.

MR. JOHN CLARK: Thank you, Charlton; that was very interesting. You said there was minimal mixing between the Albemarle/Roanoke stock and the coastal stock. Is there a size component to the mixing; do you

see more mixing as the females get bigger. What percentage of the stock would you say as the fish do get to the larger size, eight-plus years old, does mix with the coastal stock?

MR. GODWIN: You're absolutely correct. The fish in the Albemarle/Roanoke, as you know, as you get down further latitudinally, striped bass become less and less migratory. North Carolina stocks with striped bass in the Pamlico Sound, for instance, are not migratory at all. Our Albemarle/Roanoke striped bass, it is the larger females, 30, 35, 36, 38 inches and greater, that we do see.

We certainly get tag returns from states on the east coast, New York, New Jersey; but our fish just are not migratory nearly at an earlier age. We do not have an actual estimate of – we've never quantified the actual estimate of the portion of the Albemarle/Roanoke stock that migrates up and down the coast.

That has been one of the things we have tried to do in recent years is to account for that mortality. Dr. Jody Callahan recently published a paper that looked at the 25 or 30 tagging dataset that we have in the Albemarle Sound on our spawning grounds; and he came up with migration probabilities.

We were able to incorporate that information in our state-specific stock assessment to try to get a little better handle on the mortality to some of our nine-plus group. Our assessment uses a nine-plus group. We do not at this time have a specific number of fish that are migrating. Our nine-plus group fish, though, to put it in perspective, is estimated to be in the tens of thousands of fish, not hundreds of thousands of fish.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Any other questions for Charlton? Seeing none, we need a motion here to approve the assessment of the North Carolina Stock Assessment for management use. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the motion that we approve North Carolina's 2013 Benchmark

Albemarle/Roanoke Stock Assessment for management use.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there a second-James Gilmore. Discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to this motion? **Seeing none, it is approved.**

DRAFT ADDENDUM IV FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

REVIEW

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Now we're moving on to consideration of Draft Addendum IV for public comment. We're first going to have a report from the PDT Chair on the addendum, which will also include the report of the subcommittee.

Then we'll have a report from law enforcement, followed by the advisory panel. I'll stop at the end of each of those reports and give you a chance to ask questions of the various presenters. What I do hope is you've heard me in the past we try and avoid getting into the deliberative phase of this as we'll have that opportunity after the reports. Again, try and limit your questions of the presenter. I'll start off with our illustrious PDT Chair Mike Waine.

MR. MICHAEL WAINE: Just to catch everybody up with how we arrived at this point, the board accepted the 2013 benchmark stock assessment at their October meeting. That assessment recommended new fishing mortality reference points that match with the SSB reference points already implemented.

We started an addendum to change the F reference points. At that same time the board charged the technical committee with considering stock-specific reference points for the Chesapeake Bay and Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River stocks, which you've heard about over the last several meetings. We were working on options as the plan development team to reduce F to its target level over two different timeframes. One was within one year and the other was within three years.

This draft addendum currently contains those options and timeframes for management. In terms of the addendum timeline, the board at this meeting is considering the document for public comment. If approved, we would send this document out for the public comment period, which would occur over the next couple of months.

We'd hold public hearings, summarize all that comment and bring it back for board review at its annual meeting in October and which final options would be selected. It is intended – at least the board's stated intention was to implement management measures for the 2015 fishing season. This is a slide that just contains all the different topics that are discussed in the addendum.

I will be working through each one of these starting with the statement of the problem. As I mentioned, there is new proposed F reference points. Under those new reference points, F is currently above the target and SSB has been below the target since 2006. A similar downtrend has been observed in total harvest.

To address all these concerns, this addendum contains management options to reduce F to a level that is at or below target within one or three years. In terms of reference points, the 1995 SSB level, which has not changed through the assessment – it stayed the same – was a management reference point that has been useful for striped bass.

The issue is that under the current reference points that we have, which are Fmsy reference points, we're not able to achieve that SSB level. The benchmark assessment went through and recalculated F reference points that would match up with the SSB reference points; and those were the ones that were accepted by the board for management use at their 2013 meeting. This is just a pictorial representation of what I just described.

The current reference points are in gray and the new reference points proposed are in black; and then you can see the fishing mortality estimates through time. What I wanted to point out is you can see that the fishing mortality has been

maintained below the solid gray line, which is our current F target; except if you go to the next figure, this figure shows spawning stock biomass as the trend line.

You can see even though we've maintained F below the target, our SSB has declined below its target since 2006 and is currently very close to the dashed line, which is our SSB threshold. The vertical bars are just recruitment and that pattern in the SSB is driven by poor recruitment over the last several years. As we've talked about before, there is an emergence of this strong 2011 year class.

Regarding the stock-specific reference points, the Chesapeake Bay uses a quota management system in which they adjust their quota based on biomass changes similar to what I just described. The idea here is that they established a lower fishing mortality reference point in Amendment 5; and that was because they were harvesting on a smaller fish, so they essentially took a penalty and resulted in a lower F that they were fishing at.

The Chesapeake Bay stock, though, is not assessed independently as it is part of the coastal migratory stock and it assessed with the benchmark stock assessment we completed in October or the board reviewed in October. We just heard from our technical committee chair, Charlton Godwin, about the Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River stock, how it contributes minimally.

It has enough data for an independent assessment; and they have quota management that is matching up with F and SSB targets that are specific to the Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River stock. Also included in the addendum – this slide is titled wrong. This is ecosystem considerations in which we described the food web relationship should be considered when pursuing management changes. The idea here is as striped bass populations increase, demand on prey species may impact other species under rebuilding.

As we know, striped bass is a predator for some of our finfishes that we manage; specifically shad and river herring and weakfish. The

description of the fishery is pretty straightforward. It just reviews what the landings' history was; and to conserve some time I'm going to skip through those and go to the reference points.

In terms of reference points, the document considers reference points for coast-wide population, which includes the Chesapeake Bay, Hudson, and Delaware areas and the Chesapeake Bay stock and Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River stock. For the options of the reference points, Option A is status quo; so these would be Fmsy reference points that are based off the last updated assessment that was in 2011.

Option B is the reference points from the 2013 benchmark, which as I mentioned earlier match up with the SSB reference points. In terms of the Chesapeake Bay stock, as reported to you at our May meeting from the technical committee, Option A is status quo; the lower target that was established for harvest of the smaller fish.

Option B is the use of the coast-wide population reference points as described in the section we just left; and that was because the technical committee could not reach consensus on the reference points for the Chesapeake Bay Management Area at this time and that the coast-wide reference points incorporated the mortality of those smaller fish and represent the best scientific advice for management at this point.

The technical committee did note that they wish to continue development of stock-specific reference points for the future for the Chesapeake Bay. Charlton just went through the A/R stock reference points. Option A would be the reference points that were established in Amendment 5; and then Option B would be essentially the reference points that the board just approved for management use a few minutes ago.

In terms of how we're evaluating the stock status, there is a bunch of management triggers that are included in Amendment 6 that aimed to prevent overfishing and ensure the objectives of that amendment are met. There is one on the juvenile abundance indices. There is one that

deals with overfishing and overfished. There is also a couple that deal with sort of the in-between, which I'll discuss right now.

This is a little bit hard to read, but it is text taken right from Amendment 6. This is actually Management Trigger 3. This deals with the timeline to reduce F to the F target. That was a stated goal of this addendum. In Amendment 6 one of the management triggers is if the board determines the fishing mortality is exceeded in two consecutive years and the female SSB falls below the target within either of those years, the management board must adjust the striped bass program to reduce the fishing mortality rate to the level that is at or below the target within one year.

That is essentially Option A; that is a one-year timeframe to reduce F to the target. At its May meeting the board approved a potential change to this management trigger to have it read within three years as opposed to within one year. The intent there was to provide some management flexibility that would hopefully minimize the social and economic impacts by splitting out the harvest reduction through time.

Let's talk about those harvest projections. What we've essentially got is three management scenarios, that each have a probability of around 50 percent of achieving F target. To reduce F to the target within one year, that would take a 25 percent reduction from the 2013 harvest. To reduce it within three years, that would take a 17 percent reduction from the 2013 harvest.

The way that scenario would work is the reduction would be taken all in that first year and then you would hold the management constant; and over that three-year timeframe you would end up reaching your F target. The third scenario is reduce F to the target within three years, but take it in a stepwise approach with equal reductions occurring in each of the three years. That was calculated to be a 7 percent reduction that is needed for three consecutive years to reduce F to the target.

Just for contrast, status quo is less than a 1 percent probability of achieving F target over any of these timeframes if the fishery remains

status quo. Just to give you a picture representation of what I just described, in the figure you can see the three different shades of gray indicate the different years. The vertical line on top is where we are at currently with our F rate. The vertical line on the bottom is where we're trying to get to, or our F target.

These lines that are associated with the reductions represent the various timeframes I just went through. If you take a 25 percent reduction in harvest, you reach F target all within the first year, which is 2015. If you take a 17 percent reduction in harvest, you don't quite get there in 2015; but through time, as you protected a lot of fish up front, you end up reaching F target over the three-year time span. Then you can see the step-wise reduction gets there in three different management steps.

That showed you what the fishing mortality would be doing over that timeframe. Now let's look at what spawning stock biomass will do in response to those management actions. This figure shows the different projections of spawning stock biomass under those different management scenarios.

I'll start with the bottom-most line, which is this dashed dot line that is essentially status quo. You can see that SSB is projected to continue to decline and will not likely increase very much under status quo conditions. The next line above that, the dotted line, is the 7/7/7 reduction; so taking 7 percent in three consecutive years. The line above that is the 17 percent reduction.

The line that gets us closest back to the SSB threshold is that 25 percent reduction. The take-home message here is the more conservative you are in terms of reduction, the quicker SSB will begin to increase back towards the SSB threshold and eventually to the target. The projections become more uncertain the farther time you go.

What are the options that are associated with these three timeframes? There is just a note in here about conservation equivalency programs that are currently in place. If the management was to change, conservation equivalency programs would need to be updated to account

for that new change. They would be, of course, reviewed and approved by both the technical committee and the board.

As always, states can voluntarily implement more conservative management programs than any that are contained within the document. The way the document is split out from here is by option; and the option is associated with those timeframes that I was just talking about. Option A is the status quo, which essentially holds the fishery with the current regulations that are being used right now; so I'll jump right into Option B.

Option B is that 25 percent reduction from the 2013 harvest to reduce F to the target in one year. The document is broken up into recreational fishery and the commercial fisheries, splitting it between both the coastal component and the Chesapeake Bay and Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River.

These options represent the coastal recreational fishery; and you can see that the percent reduction from 2013 harvest is the column on the right. That is the estimated reduction that each one of these options would achieve; so these are just various options that could be used to reduce the coastal recreational fishery to the level that is needed. I'll mention that some of these options are limited by datasets.

As you start to incorporate both size restrictions and bag restrictions, you have to start looking at the MRIP-measured fish; so it starts to basically minimize the dataset that you're allowed to use to really estimate what these harvest reductions end up being.

These are the options in the document that achieve the necessary reduction from the Chesapeake Bay recreational fishery. At the last meeting the board have included an option to allow the bay to continue to operate under their quota management system; so there are options that are contained through the document that provide the bay the flexibility to do that based on that 2013 quota level.

Then regarding the Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River recreational fishery, you've heard from

Charlton and just approved management of that resource by the state of North Carolina; so this represents basically a placeholder for all the options for them to manage their fishery with the quota that they established through their assessment.

One thing I actually forgot to mention is in my report I'll also comment on the subcommittee did meet between the last meeting, which was May and our current meeting now to give guidance on the addendum. The intent of those calls were to help the PDT and the technical committee address all the concerns that came up at the last meeting.

I've incorporated a lot of their input into the background portion of the document; so I won't highlight those changes, but I will talk about specifically options that they recommended removing from the document. With that, we're on to the coastal commercial fishery for this 25 percent reduction. There are two different options.

One takes that reduction from the Amendment 6 quota, noting that wouldn't achieve the reduction that we need to achieve if all the states harvested up against their quotas. Then there is an option that takes a 25 percent reduction from the 2013 harvest and then allocates the remainder of that to all the states using the same allocation percentages used in Amendment 6.

The board's subcommittee actually recommended removing this option because it unfairly distributes the reduction that is needed to be taken because it is taking away quota from states that harvested all the way to their quota and giving it to states that didn't harvest their quota at all. That's essentially what these tables show in terms of the quota breakdown for the specific options that I just walked you through.

In terms of the Chesapeake Bay commercial fishery, Option B-15 is that the quota would remain at its 2013 level. The board subcommittee recommended removing this option because it does not achieve a reduction from either quota or harvest. In terms of Option B-16, that does take the reduction from the 2013 commercial quota. I'll note that for all the

Chesapeake Bay commercial quotas there isn't an option that currently takes the reduction from harvest, which is what the projections say is needed. This is just the placeholder for the Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River.

Option C is now we're transitioning into this second timeline, which is the three-year timeline to reduce F to the target. This option looks at taking the reduction all up front and then holding that constant to reduce F to the target over that three-year timeframe. Because you're not having to reduce F to the target all in one year, you don't need as significant of a reduction to do so.

These are the coastal recreational fishery options that achieve roughly that percent reduction; and these are all in the document. These are size and bag limit combinations, including trophy fish options, that achieve the reduction for the Chesapeake Bay recreational fishery, including a quota as well. Once again the placeholder for the Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River fishery.

Then on to the coastal fishery; we have very similar options as we had for that one-year timeframe. It is take it from the quota or take it from the harvest and reallocate it to all of the states. Once again, the subcommittee recommends removal of this option that takes the reduction right off the top of the 2013 harvest and then ends up allocating the remainder of that to the states.

The intent there is that it's not taking equal reductions from all the states to achieve the overall reduction that is needed. This table just shows what the actual quota allocations would be under these options. For the Chesapeake Bay we have once again an option that is keeping the bay quota at its 2013 level. The subcommittee recommended removal of that because it doesn't achieve the reduction from harvest or from the quota.

Then there is an option to take the 17 percent reduction from their 2013 commercial quota. Another placeholder for the Albemarle/Roanoke stock in their commercial fishery. Then we're into the last option of the document, which is the

step-wise approach to reducing F; and it ends up being a 20 percent from the 2013 harvest.

That reduction is achieved with a consecutive three-year reduction and that is taking 7 percent in each year. That is what this figure represents. You'd take a 7 percent reduction implemented in 2015, another 7 percent implemented in 2016 and the last 7 percent implemented in 2017. What do the options look like to achieve this?

For the coastal recreational fishery, assuming you stayed with a size limit change; so because the management measures would need to change every year for three consecutive years, the PDT focused on options that would be relatively easy to implement given that management scheme. The way this would work is a one-inch size limit increase starting with 30 inches in the first year and ending with 32 in the last.

The Chesapeake Bay recreational fishery has similar options. There is an option for a slot limit for the bay to be managing with a changing slot limit through time. All of these options are matching up with the percent reduction that is needed in each year. Some of them are in a perfect match, which is why you see some variations in the numbers that don't match perfectly, but they achieve the percent reduction that is needed. The bay could also do it with a quota, which is Option D-4. The placeholder for the A/R recreational fishery.

The coastal commercial fishery, Option D-5 is taking this 7 percent reduction sequentially from the Amendment 6 quota. The way these quota reductions would work sequentially is the first year would be taking from Amendment 6 and then the following year would be taking from the 2015 quota and then the last year would be taken from the 2016 quota; so it is a sequential reduction through time.

Option D-6 is that same option that you saw in the timeframes that takes the reduction off the top from 2013 harvest and then reallocates the remainder to the states. Once again the board subcommittee recommended removal of this option because it unequally takes the reduction from all the states.

For the Chesapeake Bay commercial fishery, there is an option in here for the sequential reduction to be taken from the commercial quota starting with the 2013 quota and then taking a sequential reduction through time in each year. Then once again the placeholder for the Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River commercial fishery that will be managed with the reference points we just approved. That was a very quick run-through of some complicated timeframes and all the options that go along with that.

There are a couple of other options in the document that deal sort of overall with a specific management timeframe. They weren't exclusive to one timeframe or another. It was just an option that the board could consider regardless of the timeframe they chose or option they ended up going with. That was a commercial quota transfer provision that currently is not allowed in the fishery, but would provide some flexibility if it were allowed. This is a very similar quota transfer program as we've seen our other ASMFC-managed species.

Then commercial size limits was something that the plan development team considered as well considering that we were looking at options that changed the recreation size limit. The status quo in the document is if the recreational size limit changed, the commercial size limit would also change to match that.

The PDT sort of talked this through and thought that it would be worthwhile to have another option in the document that maintained the commercial size limits where there are at now even if the recreational size limits changed. That is Option B, essentially allowing for the size limits to remain status quo, noting you would be reducing the quota with maintaining the same size limits.

The compliance schedule, as was previously stated, for the board was to implement in 2015; and we would have to work back from there to get implementation plans together for implementation on January 1, 2015. Then there is just an option in the document that provides the board an opportunity to recommend to NOAA Fisheries implementation of any options that considered in this draft addendum for the

exclusive economic zone. With that, I'll take any questions.

MR. ROB O'REILLY: I have four short ones; and I think it would be easier if I just went through them. They're not substantive; they're just some clarification mostly. That would save others a chance to speak as well. The first one is relating to the consensus that the technical committee failed to achieve on the Chesapeake Bay Biological Reference Points.

I know that there was a reason the technical committee pursued that course to determine a biological reference point. I guess I'm uncertain when it is stated that the best scientific advice for management is the coast-wide basis that is there now for biological reference points. Is that mainly because at this time there is not a Chesapeake Bay Biological Reference Point or a coastal biological reference point? That's one.

The second relates to the 25 percent reduction having the best probability of the SSB being back to the threshold; and I guess my question is that because that measure would be in place for three years? We know Amendment 6 says management measures have to be in place for at least three years. With that being considered, it does make sense that if you're staying at that reduction of 25 percent for three years that you would have the best chance; so maybe if you could comment on that.

The third is relating to the lack of examples where the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions achieve a 25 percent reduction in harvest. I think the basis for that was the last meeting at the board a motion was made to consider reducing from the quota specifically because of ITQs, and a pretty long explanation of all that last meeting; but besides that, the other part is when you look at the 50 percent probability, I think we realize that when you take tags from a commercial fishery or quota, then that's gone until the next time it is allowed to be there.

In fact, if you take a 25 percent reduction in harvest, then you're essentially taking 25 percent right off the top of the commercial quota. It is a little different than the recreational fishery; and it is pretty clear that combine the effect gives

that 50 percent probability. The commercial fishery is different; and I can talk about that a little later on.

That was just a statement that we did talk a lot about ITQs last time; and that was the reason for the motion not to reduce from the harvest. The other thing is the coastal commercial options; there was an indication that the subcommittee said to remove – I think it's more than just the reductions weren't taken equally. Those quotas for the last 20 years have been individual state quotas.

The allocation was set up in Amendment 5; and it was 20 percent of the 1972 to 1979 landings. That has never changed. Amendment 6 brought that up to 100 percent. The problem really was there is reallocation involved in those options that you pointed out, Mike. Those are just my points and I thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: I heard two questions and two comments. Do you want to handle the two questions?

MR. WAINE: I'll start with the second one because I'm going to try and kick the first one to Charlton. If you go back in the presentation to the figures that show the timeframe reductions with the SSB, I want to make a little bit of a clarifying point here. It is Slide 19 and 20. On this slide, the one that shows projections, the reductions we're trying to achieve are to reduce fishing mortality to the target level.

That 50 percent probability of achieving F target is associated with each one of these reduction scenarios. Let me explain what that means. With the one-year timeframe and the 25 percent reduction in harvest, we have a 50 percent probability of it reducing F to its target level within 2015. Then the same thing applies to the 17 percent reduction except the 50 percent probability of achieving F target is within three years instead of one year. That applies to the 7 percent reduction as well.

That's different than this next slide which shows how spawning stock biomass is going to respond to each one of those harvest reduction scenarios, which is different from F. The idea is the more

aggressive you are at reducing F to the target, the quicker SSB responds to that management action in terms of increasing back towards the threshold or the target.

MR. THOMAS O'CONNELL: Does this projection assume that the 25 percent reduction is kept in place for just 2015 or for three years?

MR. WAINE: That's the point I forgot to clarify. All of these management actions and timelines are trying to get us back to sort of what is a stable position. It would be in place for – well, I guess it really depends on how long the board wants them to be in place, but there is no sunset provision written into the document. The idea would be to be maintaining F at its target level; and by maintaining F at its target through these harvest reductions through time, you would end up increasing SSB back to its target. By fishing and maintaining the F rate at its target level, you'll achieve the SSB target.

It is not going to happen in the next several years, but through time it would. The idea here is to get that level of harvest at the level that's equivalent to an F target. Of course, there will need to be – you know, there will be another stock assessment in the future in which we would assess sort of how the SSB has responded, et cetera, how F has changed and be able to sort of redo these. This is just to give you an idea of how things would go in the near future or over the next three years.

MR. G. RITCHIE WHITE: Following Rob's lead, I'll ask a couple of questions. The first is can the document refer to the time to reach the reductions? The one that says one year, that reflects Amendment 6; and the one that is three years is a change in Amendment 6. If those could be added to clarify the document for the public so that they know if you're going to go to a three-year timeframe, that is a change from Amendment 6. Can that take place? The second is I believe in the document it says even with proposed measures, probability of stock being overfished in 2015 and 2016 is high. If that happens, are additional steps necessary?

MR. WAINE: Regarding your first point, Ritchie, let's chat offline because I think if I

showed in the document where it kind of ties that together, I think it might answer your concern. If it doesn't, we can clarify it further. Regarding your second question, technically if SSB fell below the threshold, that would trigger Management Trigger 2. This is in Amendment 6.

Management Trigger 2 in Amendment 6 says that you need to rebuild the SSB back to its target over a specified timeframe that should not exceed ten years. I think there is sort of a combination of things happening. The board is acting to reduce F. Through that action we see the projections showing that SSB will start increasing towards its target, but we're uncomfortable with projecting out far enough to tell you when it will reach its target because the further on the projections we go the more uncertainty that is involved. Therefore, I think the trend is to get back towards the target, but we can't tell you exactly how quickly that will happen.

MR. MARK GIBSON: I'd like to know what the mechanism is for maintaining – well, this F gets maintained at the reduced level; and first off the 25 percent, given that we have fixed commercial quotas and input controls for the recreational fishery, how is F maintained at the 25 percent reduced level. In the second option, what is the mechanism by after we make the first reduction in F; how does it continue to fall with fixed commercial quotas and recreational input controls?

We're not specifying catch limits every year based on the stock assessment to deliver an F target. I'm just now seeing the precision in the system that's going to ensure that either F stays at its 25 percent reduced level across the remainder of the time series or what is the mechanism that gets us from 17 to 25 after the initial bite is made. What is the mechanism that takes away the next bite of mortality?

DR. KATIE DREW: That's an excellent point for the system that we have now. We do have a commercial quota in place. The way the projections are working is we put in a fixed catch every year over the short amount of time. In 2015 we take the 25 percent reduction; and

that is essentially within the model treated as a quota throughout the rest of the projections, which is how you get that reduction in F. Similarly, when you take either the 17 percent reduction over that time is put in as three separate fixed amounts or the 7 percent reduction every year is put in as fixed amounts over that time period but you're right that there is some error or uncertainty in the fact that we're controlling the recreational fishery through effort controls and not a fixed quota.

We present you with these options that will in theory reduce catch, but we hope that we have conveyed the fact that they're definitely based on assumptions about how fishing behavior or angler behavior is going to change in relation to these regulations that may not be 100 percent correct.

We can provide you with estimates of how much you will reduce catch by implementing size limits or bag limits, but there is no guarantee that those will in fact bring you to the recreational harvest that you need. There is no way for us to predict how effort will change; and there is no way for us to implement that within the projection model.

MR. GIBSON: Given that, I now have questions about the 50 percent probability of the achievement level. I guess maybe that's preserved maybe for the next part of the discussion and not so much a question. It is a question about the adequacy of it given what was just said.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Yes, I think that would be good to save until we get into the policy debate.

MR. DAVID SIMPSON: I think Mark's question is covered and mine adequately.

MR. THOMAS FOTE: Why didn't we go out in these tables – that table there out to 2018 and 2019, because that's when the 2011 year class would come into play there; and that's going to change the whole dynamic with the numbers of fish that was in the 2011? Wouldn't it make more sense if you go out to two periods?

I know it is less certainty, but we also went to less certainty about the regression analysis when we looked at the years previous and we all of a sudden find that the mortality is not as great as it is. We're making assumptions on this end and why don't we make the same assumptions on the other end?

DR. DREW: The technical committee was tasked with finding the management options that would reduce F to the target within a set amount of timeframes. We had no instructions regarding additional information that you would like to see on SSB. The SSB is presented for information, but it doesn't relate to any of the management options or the tasks that we were instructed. The 2011 year class is beginning to move through the system.

There is selectivity on those younger fish on starting in three, four and five; so they are moving into the system and being picked up by the projection model. That in fact is why you see the SSB start to tick up even in the absence of reductions. That is that status quo line. If the board wanted us to extend the projections further, it would increase the uncertainty, but we could do that. It was not part of the tasks or the management options that we were asked to consider.

MR. FOTE: I just think before we go out we should basically do that out to 2019 because we know that year class is there. It should be part of the document so people can make more informed decisions.

MR. EMERSON C. HASBROUCK, JR.: Thank you, Mike, for that excellent presentation and trying to pull all those different options together so that they make sense to us. Thank you, also, Mike, for helping me out over the phone a couple of times over the last couple of weeks on some issues. I have three questions.

One is I know that this is a model projection that you have up on the screen now. Do we know where we were in 2013 in terms of spawning stock biomass and F? Other than just the model projections; do we know where we were with that?

MR. WAINE: The terminal year of the 2013 benchmark assessment was 2012; and so that's the last year of those estimates that we have. The projections is where it picks up from there. We have projected SSB and F for those years from 2012, but not coming from that benchmark assessment.

MR. HASBROUCK: And we won't know what that is until you just do an update I guess next year?

MR. WAINE: We talked about when would be the best time to update this assessment, pending sort of management action, evaluation of how the stock responds to that management action. I think that's a discussion that has come up, but we haven't formerly addressed because we have been focused on the management change.

MR. HASBROUCK: My second question is are the commercial percent reductions that you included under those various scenarios; are they based on continuing a 28-inch minimum size?

MR. WAINE: Yes, they're based on continuing the same size limits that all the states currently have. That was originally based on the 28-inch size limit, but they're noting there is conservation equivalency proposals already in place based off of that.

MR. HASBROUCK: And my last question is kind of in response to your response to Tom's question about how long these measures will be in place; and the response was, well, kind of as long as the board wanted them to be. Being relatively new to the commission; is that going to require a new addendum? I know this is a little premature, but I'm just wondering if we are successful as we hope we are; then does that require an addendum or how does that work in the future?

MR. WAINE: Unless these provisions contain a sunset clause that would revert back to some other management that was already in place; the way the board would make management changes moving forward would be through the addendum process very similar to what we're doing now.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Rob, do you want your second question answered first?

MR. O'REILLY: How did you know? We have the best scientific advice for management based on the coast-wide reference points. There was a lot of effort on the part of the technical committee; and in fact there were two what we're calling interim reference points; one by staff and one by Alexei Sharov. I'm wondering would the advice to management be better with a Chesapeake Bay Biological Reference Point which has existed for the past 20 years.

MR. GODWIN: The technical committee, as we talked about the last time, could not come to a consensus on the best, at this time, appropriate reference point for the bay; could not come to a consensus that one different from the coast-wide reference would be adequate due to the reasons that we explained.

The different in the selectivities – the difference in the F reference point for the bay as currently estimated from the statistical catch-at-age model for that bay fleet is relative to the entire coastal stock as well as not just a bay stock fleet. I mean, it is not a bay stock F mortality that comes out of the model. It is relative to the entire coastal stock complex.

Without more information about the mixing between the stocks and the sex ratios, at this time the selectivities in the model – the different selectivities for the bay and the coast account for the different sizes in the fleet; and the technical committee just considers this at this time still the best reference point to be using for management.

MR. FOTE: With Rob talking, I'm just remember, there was at one point that the Chesapeake Bay didn't count I think the winter fishery when the coastal – because they were allowed so much of the coastal fishery; and so this is only on a certain part of their fishery. If I remember in Amendment 6 somewhere that they got credit for the coastal fishery, and they were allowed to harvest on the coastal fishery. Am I right or wrong in my estimation on that?

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Well, if you're talking about the coastal commercial quota, they have a

separate quota for their coast that they're fishing under larger sizes; and then they have a different one in the Chesapeake Bay that applies both to the recreational harvest and the commercial harvest. Go ahead, Rob.

MR. O'REILLY: This might help. Going into Amendment 5 there was a situation where the Chesapeake Bay would have 25 percent of the coastal migrants; and instead of that what was designed was 25,000 as a cap on the coastal migrants. That later was raised a little bit; and then eventually it was based on the entire spawning stock of the coast, a portion thereof that went to that what is called trophy fisheries for the coastal migrants.

MR. O'CONNELL: Just to follow up for Charlton, in regards to the bay-specific reference points, what I've been told is that when the interim reference points were first brought to the technical committee; that the technical committee objected to them because they were overly conservative.

Recognizing the comments that you just made and as to the reasons why there wasn't consensus; is it correct that if those reference points were utilized on a temporary basis with the bay, that they would be more conservative?

MR. GODWIN: I don't know that the entire technical committee thought that the reference points would be too conservative. It was my understanding that the bay states thought that those reference points would be too conservative compared to what they currently were, but that's not the main issue as to why the technical committee couldn't come to a consensus on a separate specific reference point for the bay.

The main issue continues to be need more information about the mixing of the three stocks, the sex ratios and the other information that we've gone over as to why a bay-specific reference point – we could not come to a consensus on developing one at this time. It wasn't necessarily due to the idea of it being more conservative or too conservative from the technical committee.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I sort of refrained from asking any questions about the whole bay-specific reference points, but I think I am now – and this might be a question for Katie; but in terms of the original reference point of F of 0.27, it might be informative to explain to the board how that was calculated or how it came about previously. It was applied to the Albemarle/Roanoke stock as well before we had the additional information that we do. I just don't know if you might be able to provide a little bit of background for how that F of 0.27 came about previously.

DR. DREW: My understanding is that the previous assessment came up with a single coast-wide reference point that was based on Fmsy; and that was the 0.3/0.04 estimate. Because concerns were raised that the bay was harvesting on smaller fish that they wanted a reference point that would take that into account.

The technical committee went through and basically calculated sort of the SPR that would result from that MSY; so how much of the virgin spawning stock would you leave in the water if you were fishing at the Fmsy estimated by the model with the selectivity pattern estimated by the model and then use a different selectivity pattern that had that sort of dome-shaped selectivity focusing on younger ages that the bay exhibits and apply an F rate that would get you to that same SPR.

Because you're harvesting on those younger fishes, you have to fish at a lower level to keep the same amount of spawning stock biomass in the water. That is where that reference point came from. The technical committee did consider a similar approach for these new reference points with the bay, but we were concerned that approach doesn't adequately take into the fact that there are in fact essentially two fleets operating on this stock; that it's the bay fleet alone and it's not the coastal fleet alone.

It is this single composite fleet that covers the entire stock that's operating on that fishery so that you can't really adjust one fishery's F separately from all of the other fisheries that are still operating on it because that requires the

assumption that one fleet is the only fleet operating on that stock.

You would have to fix the coastal fleet F in some way at a certain level in order to get an appropriate amount of F that would be allowed on the Chesapeake Bay; and that's when you start getting into I think management concerns and that's where you also start getting into concerns about the sex ratio and what proportion of the stock you're actually harvesting on with those reference points. That's why we were uncomfortable using that SPR or conservation equivalency approach for the new reference points.

LAW ENFORCEMENT REPORT

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Are there any other questions for the PDT? Seeing none; we're going to move on to the Law Enforcement Report. Kurt Blanchard couldn't make it so Mark Robson is going to make the report for them.

MR. MARK ROBSON: The LEC was asked to try to convene a teleconference call, which we did on July 29, to take a look at the draft addendum and just provide some very general law enforcement perspective, understanding that obviously we would flesh out more details and have more specific written comments at a later time during the public hearing process.

We did take a look at just focusing mainly on the management options in the document and provided some general comments. I have a few of them here that I can summarize. Again, this was mostly looking at changes in the recreational management options. That's I think what the focus of the discussion was during the conference call.

In regards to that and particularly with recreational changes, there were a number of comments that if you're going to look at making these kinds of changes, obviously they would prefer to see regulations that change not every year if possible, so a three-year series of changes would obviously present the greatest enforcement challenge.

There were a number of reasons why they were concerned about that approach. One would be, of course, every time there is a change there is an element of education and outreach effort that the enforcement personnel undergo. They're out there trying to inform and educate about regulation changes just as we do in our management documents and publications.

Of course, it has been their experience that frequent regulatory changes tend to lower compliance somewhat. It varies depending on the type of change and how good the education and outreach effort is. Of course, we all know it's not cast in stone anywhere; but typically when there is a significant change in a regulation officers tend to use a little more discretion.

There may be more informational stops and more warnings given as an approach to new or changed regulations when they're encountering fishermen out there on the water. Having said all that, I think there were also a couple of comments which I wanted to convey. The Law Enforcement Committee members recognize that if you take a graduated three-year approach to, let's say, a size limit change; that there may be a value in that and that we understand a graduated approach might actually enhance public acceptance and compliance; but overall they believe and continue to reiterate that applying a change in one year would maximize compliance and minimize confusion.

There was some discussion about the recreational fishery options and particularly for the Chesapeake Bay; and at least one comment from an LEC member that for the recreational fishery a bag and size limit restriction would probably be preferable to attempted recreational quota management just because of the enforcement challenges that they encounter and cited the Chesapeake Bay experience.

Again, that would depend on the type of quota system you put in place, if it is tagged-based or however that's done. We were asked to take a look, too, at the option of possibly changing the commercial size limits to match recreational limits. If that was put in place so that they were all consistent, that could possibly minimize confusion and aid in compliance; but overall

because of the nature of the commercial fishery being more in touch with even small changes in regulations that the commercial fishermen are used to, the LEC did not really envision a major problem in commercial compliance if in fact size limits remain different – if there was a change in the recreational limits.

There was also an example given in the specific case of New Jersey where if you're going to consider a combination of slots or a minimum size limit or a slot limit to trophy size allowance, that could potentially complicate law enforcement. In the case of New Jersey where on charter or party boats, if they're allowed to fillet those fish on board, then if you do have these multiple kinds of combinations of slots and maybe a trophy-sized fish allowance, that it makes it much harder if the charter boats or party boats are required to keep those racks; and so if they are checked or they come back to the dock, it makes it a lot harder to match up fish racks or carcasses with the number of fillets on board if you have these multiple kinds of size limit or trophy limit operations. That was the general comments that we had with regard to some of those options, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Any questions for Mark? Tom.

DISCUSSION OF LEC REPORT

MR. FOTE: Yes, just to point out that when you fillet in New Jersey, you've got to keep the racks on board unless the fillet is larger than the size of the fish you need to keep; so they really have to keep racks for all the fish they filleted on board so the size would be there to measure. That's only on charterboats fifteen and above. That is not a real problem. It's the same thing we've been doing for years.

MR. O'REILLY: The top item is one that really I think is just not applicable. The bay jurisdictions do have size and bag limits. It's just that at the end of the year the recreational harvest is part of the total bay-wide quota; so it's really for enforcement. It's still the bag and the size.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Any other questions for Mark? Okay, seeing none, unfortunately Kelly Place is still in transit here from Florida; so I'm going to have Mike Waine give the report of the AP.

ADVISORY PANEL REPORT

MR. WAINE: The board had requested the advisory panel to take a look at this draft addendum for public comment before it was presented to the board to get a perspective of the range of options that this document has contained within it, other things that we left out, forgot about; does it contain enough perspective from the AP's standpoint for the public to be able to comment on all the various objectives that the board is trying to achieve through this document.

We held a conference call to do this. I reminded the AP that we will have a sit-down formal meeting if the board approves this document for public comment where they'll be able to specify a preference for specific options at that point. They just focused their comments on sort of the scope of this document.

Just running through their comments; they had varying opinions on the description of the fishery over the recent years; but they felt overall it was appropriate. There is a little bit of confusion about what the reference points were when the SSB had increased in the mid-2000's to the level that was above its target; so there was a suggestion to include that information in there.

Some AP members were concerned about this move away from using stock-specific reference points for the Chesapeake Bay as that has been a management option that they've been used for quite some time now. There was a member that suggested that 50 percent probability of achieving the F target is low and a larger range should be considered to give a higher probability of reducing F to that target over those timeframes.

As far as the management options are concerned, there were some AP members that suggested more conservative management options should be pursued; so essentially larger

reductions on harvest than those currently contained in the document. Then there were some AP members that suggested less conservative; so less reductions in harvest than is included in the document.

There was a suggestion for a yearly review of the three-year timeframe to ensure that timeframe is being met; so getting that sort of checking period to make sure we're on track if the three-year option is considered. There were some AP members that didn't like the quota options that were based on that reduction from harvest and then allocation to all the states based on the remainder; citing the same issues that the subcommittee had, which was that the reductions are not equal across the states.

The AP felt that the states shouldn't be punishing for managing within their quota; so essentially if a state was to maintain its quota within what it was allowed, why should they be more severely than another state that just didn't harvest all of their quota. Then there a suggestion to include an option that achieves optimum sustainable yield in three years. That concludes the AP report.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Any questions from the board regarding the AP Report? Emerson.

DISCUSSION OF AP REPORT

MR. HASBROUCK: Do we have any idea what OY is or what OY might be? The suggestion there is to include an option to use OY and three years. Do we even know what that might be?

DR. DREW: No; the optimum yield is sort of predicated on a certain MSY framework that we did not pursue for this assessment because of our concerns about the stock-recruit relationship and other factors. This is kind of an empirical and historical-based reference point; and the technical committee has not tried to calculate optimum yield in that framework.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT ADDENDUM IV FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Any other questions? Okay, as we move on into the part where we will

be discussing adding and potential removing some measures, I kind of want to give an overview of some of my meeting management training and how I plan to try and handle this. One of the things I wanted to make both the public and the board members reinforce the fact that we're just considering a document for public hearing. We're not making final decisions here.

What we're looking to do is provide a range of options for the public to comment on. General public, keep in mind that I will assure that there will probably be a public hearing in every state for you to provide comments on specific measures that are in the document. The way I'd like to handle this is, first of all, before we get into debate, I have a couple of people that wanted to make some general comments from the public on Addendum IV.

I'm going to ask those people to limit their comments to about three minutes because we're already an hour and a half into this, and we do have a number of items that we may making changes here. Keep in mind, also, if a motion is made and seconded, I will take public comment pro and against that motion before we start having debate among the commissioners.

If your comments are going to relate to individual management measures that may be in or out, you may want to wait to make your comments then. From the board standpoint, what I'm going to tackle first here is recommendations from the subcommittee. There were a number of subcommittee recommendations here; and I hope my subcommittee members will make motions to implement those recommendations.

After we do that, I'll take any other suggestions for adding or removal or modifications to the document. When we get motions, from our meetings' management training, I'm going to get a list of for and against, and I will do one for, one against, one for and one against. After everybody has had a chance to speak once, depending on quickly we're moving through the document, I may give a chance for a second bite at the apple on that motion. As I time gets short, I may restrict it to one comment per board

member. So with that being said, I'm going to go to Des Kahn first. Again, if you can keep your comments on Addendum IV to three minutes, we'd appreciate it.

REMARKS OF MR. DESMOND KAHN

MR. KAHN: Ladies and gentlemen of the board; I'm grateful for just a few minutes of your time. For people who don't know me, I served on the tagging subcommittee, stock assessment subcommittee and the technical committee for quite a few years representing the state of Delaware. I'm speaking to you about an issue with this draft addendum that gives me a lot of concern; and that is the presentation in here of the stock assessment results, primarily in Figures 2 and 3.

Figure 2 portrays the female SSB trend and the recruitment in Figure 3 presents the fishing mortality. Now, I know the commission tries to be guided by scientific findings, which is commendable. Last year a peer-reviewed scientific paper was published in the Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. Dr. Liao and Jones from Old Dominion and technical committee members Alexei Sharov and Gary Nelson were the co-authors.

The title is "Quantifying the Effects of Aging Bias in Atlantic Striped Bass Stock Assessment". They verified what we had found on the committee when I was a member, which is that our method of aging bass using scales produces biased estimates of the age distribution. What they found was that when this biased data is input into the statistical catch-at-age model used in the assessment; that the estimates of fishing mortality and female SSB and other parameters come out biased.

The fishing mortality estimates they found were 20 percent too high and the SSB estimates were likewise 20 percent too low. Now, to their credit, the stock assessment committee in the recent assessment evaluated this effect; and they found pretty much the same pattern, although they used the last two years, 2011 and 2012.

It's quite clear that the input put using scales that we have used is biased and that the outputs from

the assessment are biased; and yet in this draft addendum these estimates that come out of the model are presented with no indication of even any uncertainty, much less this bias. We're going out to the public, if this is sent out, with misleading estimates that makes things appear much worse than they are. This is a well-documented scientific finding at this point.

The other minor point here is that the tagging estimates of F are not even included here in any way. I've read the statements in the assessment and the previous draft addendum, which the technical committee seems to discount the tagging results, and I would point out that very few, if any, members had been trained in the tagging methodology as I and others were in the 1990's by the commission.

They don't understand the tagging methods and a lot of their comments reflect that lack of understanding. When this bias is corrected, the estimates from the SCA Model, the unbiased input data of the age distribution is used, the estimates that come out of that model are much closer to the tag estimates. They're ignored completely so I would suggest that if this goes out, it will be misleading to the public. I don't think it could said that it's in accord with the recent scientific findings. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Thank you, Des. Jeff Deem.

REMARKS OF MR. JEFF DEEM

MR. JEFF DEEM: I would like to ask that you include another option. I'm here to represent the Chesapeake Bay fishermen. Although I represent Virginia on the Mid-Atlantic Council and a couple of state committees; I'm here personally as a recreational fisherman in the bay. The bay has been under a quota since 1997 and took a 14 percent reduction in 2013 when no other jurisdiction had to reduce.

Now that it has been determine that sacrifice alone was not enough to solve this problem, I think the fair thing to do would be either that every other state takes a 14 percent reduction in the first year and then we add whatever is

necessary in the second or third year or that we simply go back to the 2012 quotas as our base.

We've already made a serious sacrifice. It has hurt our businesses; it has hurt our fishermen; it has denied us a lot of access. My point is that I don't believe the MRIP data in anybody's opinion has the wherewithal at this point to be used as a single-year estimate of landings. I would think with something this serious that we should at least use a three-year average of the MRIP data.

In a two-year period in the bay, Virginia and Maryland has completely flipped on which is the highest, which is the lowest, and there were severe changes. It's just not strong enough for that kind of decision. Then my final point is that I can understand why this appears to be necessary to reduce the landings; but if you look at the stock like you would at any other population, it went from a very low period to a very peak and has now begun to level off.

I'm not a scientist, but everything since I was 12 years old that I learned about populations of anything from deer to rabbits to fish, that is a pretty normal pattern. The question is do we really know what our spawning stock biomass can be? We've reached a peak; we're back down to what the ecosystem – maybe what the ecosystem can sustain.

I don't know how we determine where that is and to make any sudden changes to try to reach that or to try to find out where that balance point is, I don't think is justified. I think we should go – if you do anything, go and have an option for the three-year period where we reduce a little bit each time and try to learn as we go along. Those are my comments. Thank you very much.

BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON DRAFT ADDENDUM IV

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Thank you, Jeff. Okay, I'm going to bring it back to the board now. I'm going to rely on my subcommittee members to bring forward some of the recommendations from the subcommittee for the board's full consideration. Paul, you're not one of my subcommittee members but –

MR. PAUL DIODATI: No; I was going to make that comment myself that I wasn't on the subcommittee, but I appreciate the work that the board subcommittee members put into this. To cut to the chase and to give us something to talk about as a starting point, **I'd like to make a motion to approve all of the recommendations of the board subcommittee, to eliminate the Options B-14, B-15, C-9, C-10 and D-6.**

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there a second to that motion; Emerson. Okay, discussion on this motion? Paul.

MR. DIODATI: I just want to respond to the two previous commenters and some of the board members as well have made comments that I think just emphasize that we have essentially a grossly imprecise system that we continue to try to make elegant in our management process. I'm not going to apologize for that; that's fisheries management. I think the most obvious information shows us that this stock in particular; yes, it has been down and it went up and it has come down again; and we can see that.

I don't think there is any argument about that; so it is just a matter of acting in the most fashion and adjusting to those ups and downs. As unfortunate as it is, I feel pretty strongly that it has come to the point where it's time to take a small reduction. How we do that and how much that reduction is and how we implement it is really the question. I sense there is frustration in trying to make this extremely elegant; and I don't think we can succeed there. I think we have to be very simplistic, somewhat gross and simply take a reduction. It's as simple as that, but I'll start with this motion.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there further discussion on this motion? Seeing none; I have to tell you there is one other item that I forgot to mention, and that is that the commission received a request from one of our board members to have a roll call on every vote that we take here. We're going to be proceeding with that request because it is a request that has been made.

Do you need time to caucus? While you do that, I will read it into the record: Move to approve all of the recommendations of the Striped Bass Board Subcommittee to remove the options B-14, B-15, C-9, C-10 and D-6 from Draft Addendum IV to the Striped Bass Fishery Management Plan. Motion made by Mr. Diodati; seconded by Mr. Hasbrouck.

We're seeing if we can do something a little bit faster. Okay, we're going to have a slight modification. Anytime we have a motion, I will ask if there is any objection. If there is an objection, at that point we will have a roll call on it. That will handle the request of the board member and at the same time see if we can move along.

Is there any objection to this motion? **Seeing none; I see it approved unanimously.** Were there any abstentions? No. Okay, are there any other modifications to the document that people would like to make? Ritchie White.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chair, I would like to make a motion to include an option under Option B that would reduce the Amendment 6 state commercial quotas by 30 percent. If I get a second, I'll talk to that a little bit.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there a second to that motion; seconded by Michelle Duval. Ritchie, do you want to speak to that?

MR. WHITE: The thinking in this motion is that unlike some of the motions that were just taken out of the document, there was a concern for reallocation. This eliminates any reallocation because we're staying with Amendment 6 quotas. I arrived at the 30 percent by making an assumption that North Carolina, New Jersey, Maine and New Hampshire will not harvest the majority of their quota.

That's an assumption and it's a risk. If that happens, that would equate to a 25 percent reduction in mortality. It doesn't obligate those states in any way, so all states would get their Amendment 6 allocation minus 30 percent. I think that this is something that we could reach our 25 percent reduction without any reallocation.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Can I just ask a clarifying question, Ritchie. Is this applying to the coastal commercial quotas only; so maybe we should modify to say state coastal commercial quotas?

MR. WHITE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, further discussion? I've got a whole bunch of hands and I'm going to go down this side and come back up the other way. What I'd like to find out and going by my own rules who is speaking in favor of this motion? Who is speaking against? Steve.

MR. STEPHEN R. TRAIN: Mr. Chairman, I've been biting my tongue on a lot of these things because I notice the commercial harvest has been stagnant for years as the increase in harvest was going on in this fishery. They're expected to take a cut; so to further go after the commercial sector with an increased percentage doesn't seem right to me at all. I'm against this.

MR. O'REILLY: Mr. Chairman, my understanding the last time was that there would be a reduction from the quota, but I think 25 percent was what we left with. I'm not sure that this motion would provide that 25 percent reduction of the harvest. On the other hand, that's not part of what we're looking at right now. There was a motion made by Louis Daniel last meeting.

In Virginia we're not stagnant. We harvested 97.5 percent of the 2013 quota. We have 33 fishermen. They all have ITQs. It certainly would hit home to add on a little bit here; and they certainly would be wondering about the recreational situation with the 25 percent reduction. I couldn't support this motion.

MR. FOTE: It is based on the assumption that New Jersey would underfish its quota. Depending on what you do with the recreational measures, there will be more pressure to basically take the tags, so the opposite is going to happen. Actually, it's going to be closer to the maximum of this and we might wind up finding way of monitoring. That's my concern here.

It is based on a poor assumption that we would actually have a lower catch than we had or the same catch, which implement recreational measures in that trophy tag program will probably increase. A couple of years we went to the slot limit and the commission wouldn't give us credit for basically being conservative and then they decided to just go out and catch the trophy tag program, so we had this really almost catch that was almost up to the quota one year just to prove the point. This will prove the point when you switch the quota and you switch the management measures; so I can't agree to the assumption.

MR. GIBSON: I oppose the motion. The commercial monitoring system is probably as good as it has ever been with the evolution of the SAFIS dealer reporting system, the enforcement actions that have taken place; so we have ability to cap what I call the commercial partial F pretty well. It's the other side of this system based on input controls, the recreational measures where we don't have much confidence that the measures are connected rigorously to a partial recreational F. I don't support going after the piece that we have the most control over. I think we have to think about the other side of the ledger, the probability of achieving the Fs and the lack of connection between input controls and realized Fs. Thank you.

MR. SIMPSON: I'm just trying to make sure I'm clear on where this is in the document. This would add an option to Option B-13; that instead of each coastal state taking a 25 percent reduction, there is another alternative to take a 30. I suppose if you look at the range of alternatives on the recreational side at 28 and one fish is the 31 percent reduction. Was that part of the logic of the maker?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there any other discussion on this motion? Louis.

DR. LOUIS B. DANIEL, III: Speaking as the chairman, I think the intent, I believe – I haven't spoken to Ritchie about this so I don't know, but I believe the intent is to try to provide some more precautionary options. I don't know about

all of you, but I've gotten a lot of calls and a lot of e-mails from up and down the beach.

People are very frustrated and very concerned about the status of striped bass. I think it might behoove you to consider some more precautionary measures simply to go out to public comment on. I think there will probably be some more restrictive recreational measures proposed or suggested as well; and that may be a reasonable approach.

I'm hearing around the table a lot of concerns about any reductions when I'm hearing also a lot of concern from our citizenry. I'm hearing a lot about trophy tag systems when should we really be harvesting these trophy fish at all. In the South Atlantic we don't harvest red drum and we don't have any more trophy red drum. We don't have any world record red drum being caught. That seems to have served us pretty daggoned well with the red drum fishery.

This is our flagship stock; and as the chairman of the commission I want to make sure that whatever we do has the greatest possibility of restoring the stock back to the level that our constituents are hoping it will. Please just keep those ideas in mind. They may be valid; they may not; but it is just my sense and my feeling at this point on the issue.

MR. DENNIS ABBOTT: I feel compelled to support my fellow commissioner here at the table. I think we should keep in mind that we're not making final decisions here. This is something that would go out for public comment; and I think the public deserves a wide range, which we already have in the document, but I don't see any harm in this being in the document and going out and hearing what the public will say.

I appreciate everybody's comments that they don't support this, but we really need to know what the public is thinking. Like Dr. Daniel said what he is hearing up and down the beach, it may be a little different than the views expressed at this table; so I would ask everybody to remember on this motion and other motions that we are preparing for public comment a document. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there any comment from the public on this particular option? Okay, I am sensing that there isn't a unanimous opinion this; so I am going to give you a chance to caucus and we will have a roll call vote. I will be reading the motion: Move to include an option under **Option B that would reduce the Amendment 6 state** coastal commercial quotas by 30 percent. Motion made by Mr. White and seconded by Dr. Duval. All right, is everybody ready to vote? Mr. Waine, can you call the roll call.

MR. WAINE: Maine.

MAINE: No.

MR. WAINE: New Hampshire.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

MASSACHUSETTS: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Rhode Island.

RHODE ISLAND: No.

MR. WAINE: Connecticut.

CONNECTICUT: Yes.

MR. WAINE: New York.

NEW YORK: No.

MR. WAINE: New Jersey.

NEW JERSEY: No.

MR. WAINE: Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Delaware.

DELAWARE: No.

MR. WAINE: Maryland.

MARYLAND: Yes.

MR. WAINE: District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: No.

MR. WAINE: Potomac River Fisheries Commission.

POTOMAC RIVER FISHERIES COMMISSION: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Commonwealth of Virginia.

VIRGINIA: No.

MR. WAINE: North Carolina.

NORTH CAROLINA: No.

MR. WAINE: National Marine Fisheries Service.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE: Yes.

MR. WAINE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: **The vote is eight to eight; no nulls; no abstentions; so the motion fails for lack of a majority.** Tom O'Connell.

MR. O'CONNELL: I would like to make a motion related to the Chesapeake Bay Reference Points. It was an action that the board directed the technical committee to work on last October. It has been something that we've had in place for almost 20 years; and I think it provides a lot of benefit to protecting the Chesapeake Bay stock.

I know there is work to be done, but there is an option that the technical committee has developed. **I would like to move to add Option C to Section 2.5.2, Chesapeake Bay Stock Reference Points, where the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions would manage the Chesapeake Bay Striped Bass Fisheries so as not to exceed a target fishing mortality rate of F equal 0.058.**

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there a second; Rob O'Reilly. Would you like a chance to speak to the motion, Tom?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, just briefly. I just would like to recall that the current Chesapeake Bay Reference Point is 0.27. This 0.58 reference point is consistent with the SCA approach. It does not account for the predominance of males in the Chesapeake Bay and is why we believe it's viewed conservatively; and it will allow the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions to continue managing annually to account the strengths and weaknesses of year classes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: All right, can I get a list of people who are in favor of the motion. Question on the motion; go ahead, Ritchie.

MR. WHITE: The question is has the technical committee reviewed this; and if so, what is their opinion?

MR. GODWIN: This was one of the options presented. When we reviewed, there were five options that we looked at and this was one of the options. We just could not come to a consensus as to which one of those options to pick.

MR. WHITE: So, does that mean that the technical committee did not support this; was that the outcome of the –

DR. DREW: Certain people on the technical committee did support it and certain people did not support it. This was something we came back to; and it was kind of a last-minute request by the Chesapeake Bay to revisit this question. The technical committee could not come to consensus on whether this was better or as good as the coast-wide reference point that already exists. I can't speak for the technical committee; we didn't come up with a recommendation as to whether this is good or bad as a consensus at all.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: All right, who wants to speak in favor? Another question, okay; then I'm going to go to people who have questions on this. We'll start with John.

MR. CLARK: I was just wondering if Tom could elaborate if he has any idea what that would translate to in terms of the Chesapeake Bay quota for 2015.

MR. O'CONNELL: I'm not sure of what that answer is. In talking to staff, I think we'd still be looking at a reduction of 12 to 15 percent. I don't know if the technical committee or Rob may have more information to share.

MR. GODWIN: No; we were not presented with what that actual quota would have been for the 2015 year using that harvest control model.

MR. FOTE: I have the same question. I don't know what this means and without knowing what it means, I can't vote for it. I'm not a statistician and I'm not on the technical committee; so I need an answer to how much of a reduction is this actually, how much is not, and what is the difference between now and that in the existing one. I have a real concern here because I'm buying a pig in a poke.

MR. GIBSON: So this means that there will be an exploitation rate applied to whatever stock is in the bay and the catch target or catch limit will vary in accordance with year class strength; so it will go up with the 2000 year class; and as that year class goes out of the fishery – so my question is what is the monitoring system that will estimate the bay-specific exploitation rate consistent with this and where will the computations be done of available biomass. Are you reverting back to the harvest control model and direct enumeration of F tagging studies and all of that?

CHAIRMAN GROUT: I think Rob wants to answer that question.

MR. GIBSON: Just as a point, I think we ought to know what this level of exploitation means on the recruiting 2011 year class. I think that's an important thing for the board to understand. I don't know what it is on the fly here and it doesn't sound like they do either, but it's a good question.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Rob, go ahead and answer the question.

MR. O'REILLY: I think Mark has most of the pieces; and, of course, the Chesapeake Bay is an area where age three to eight fish principally are part of the exploitable stock. That exploitable stock varies by year depending on weak, strong or average year classes that have move in to make that composite age group.

I know that we sent around a white paper and I hope you had a chance to look at it. It was staff who suggested the idea of sending that to you. One of the elements of that is just that fact; that certainly if there were a 2015 harvest control model run, it would result in a very high quota compared to 2013 because of the 2011 year class. I don't think anyone has that expectation in the bay. It would go up by about 4.5 million pounds.

On the other hand, I think what has been put forth as a motion here does have a lot of situations involved in it. One is, Mark, that I guess that we are obligated under Amendment 6 to have a tagging program to be able to report back on what the exploitable fraction is or the fishing mortality rate; and that is the direct enumeration of F that has been in place since 1993.

A dilemma right now without a bay reference point is twofold; one, how are we supposed to do that or are we supposed to continue to do that; and, secondly, there is an economic component here that it is quite an event to spend Wallop-Breaux money each year to have that tagging program. We have a lot wrapped up in here.

Everyone can figure out that if there is going to be a Chesapeake Bay Biological Reference Point; that means there has to be a coastal biological reference point. Under the coast-wide approach right now, it would have to be separated. I think at a minimum we would hope that this can be done. If this can't be approved today, we would certainly come back and like to know that within a year that we would be able to have reference points for both the coastal and the Chesapeake Bay stock. It is a pretty weighty issue.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, Roy Miller, you had a question, too?

MR. ROY MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think Tom Fote and Mark Gibson addressed my concerns. Basically all the other options are relative to a percent reduction from the 2013 harvest; and this one is relative to an F rate. I just don't know how to compare this to the others. It's a difference currency to me. If I'm confused, I think the public would be equally confused.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think Roy concluded his remarks by stating what I was going to state; that if this went out for public comment, is anyone going to be able to explain this to the public?

MR. HASBROUCK: As I understand it, during the benchmark assessment the Chesapeake was running the model as a separate fleet. What fishing mortality rate was used as that fleet? Was it similar to this fishing mortality rate or was it what the coastal fishing mortality rate is projected to be?

DR. DREW: The Chesapeake Bay Fleet was modeled as a separate fleet; and part of what comes out of the model is an estimate of the F that comes from the Chesapeake Bay Fleet. Keep in mind that because we are not using stock-specific models at this point, it is a measure of the impact of the Chesapeake Bay Fleet on the total coast-wide population.

This reference point comes from basically saying, okay, over a certain period of the most recent certain periods of years how much did the Chesapeake Bay Fleet contribute to the total mortality that the stock experienced and keep it at a level that is consistent with – this is sort of a fraction of the total allowable F that is in the document for the entire coastal F; so the current coastal F is something like 0.17 as a target – 0.18 as a target, so this is a certain fraction of that 0.18 that has come from based on what the bay has contributed in the past.

MR. HASBROUCK: So then this 0.058 F; that's relative to what the fishing mortality in the Chesapeake is going to be – not relative to but

what the mortality rate that the Chesapeake Bay Fishery is going to impart on the coastal fishery. This isn't relative to just the fishing mortality rate within the Chesapeake Bay; am I following this correctly?

DR. DREW: Right; obviously, the whole coastal population is made – as we have discussed many times is made up of a bunch of different stocks; so you're getting contribution to that coastal-mixed fishery from several different systems; and the Chesapeake Bay is one of those system. We're not measuring it only on fish that are coming from the bay. It's a measure of how much it's affecting the entire coast-wide population.

MR. RUSS ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to reiterate what Roy had to say. I can understand it a little bit trying to come up with some reference points for the bay to throw out there for options; but when you put an F up there that I don't know how it equates to what percentages that are all throughout this document, it makes it real tough to stick with this motion. I'm sure I'll be against this motion unless it is clarified a little better for me.

MR. ADAM NOWALSKY: Would the inclusion of this in the document require additional options be added to Section 3 under the proposed management measures that would equate to this should this be the preferred option?

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Do you want to answer it?

MR. WAINE: Yes; we did talk about this a little bit because essentially what is happening is your breaking the total fishing mortality into its components. Those components are the Chesapeake Bay Fleet and the coastal fleet. Then if you're going to separate the Chesapeake Bay Fleet Reference Point and to also have a coastal fleet reference point, and then you're reducing sort of your F to a target level for both of those independently and there would be a set reduction that goes along with that, I don't see any other way to do it. When you start breaking it out, you can't just do it for one piece and not for the other.

MR. NOWALSKY: So then is the answer, yes, we would need additional options added under Section 3.0, proposed management measures?

MR. WAINE: I would say the answer is, yes, you would need additional measures and you would need to revise the measures that are currently already in there that are based off the coast-wide reference points into those two separate components that I just told you about.

MR. NOWALSKY: And then how would we go about including those today for our review if our intent is to potentially vote on up or down for releasing this today, if we add that; and now you're saying if we add this we need to make a number of changes; how do we proceed with that procedurally?

MR. WAINE: What Charlton and I are sidebarring about is that the technical made a recommendation that if we start breaking this fishing mortality that we've lumped together as a coast-wide population mortality rate into its fleet components; that we would need to have separate reference points for those components and then options that reduce those F rates through their relative targets that go along with that.

MR. DIODATI: I think I'm experiencing the same problem that most people are; and that is getting a good feeling for what the rate of 0.058 means and where it comes from. I guess my question is, is 0.058 the current portion of the coast-wide F that is attributed to the bay fisheries; is that how you came up with that; that is what you think the current F rate is? Is that what that is? I guess I'm looking at both Rob and Tom.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Rob and Tom; do you want – Rob.

MR. O'REILLY: I can answer that. It was actually staff that came up with the 0.058; and as I mentioned earlier, Alexei Sharov came up with 0.62; so there were actually two estimates that were debated at the technical committee.

MR. DIODATI: But I guess my question is, is that the estimate of the current level of F?

MR. O'REILLY: I'll answer again – but I can be corrected – my understanding is that's for the age five component and staff can chime in.

DR. DREW: This is part of the other problem is there were two proposals that are sort of on the same idea of how to partition your total coast-wide F reference point into a coastal fleet and into a bay fleet, but we never resolved some of the issues which have to do with selectivity and the age at which you're fully recruited, et cetera. But, in this case if we are – and I don't have my numbers off the top of my head; but this target fishing mortality rate would be this is the target; and I believe the bay is currently slightly above the target, the same way that the coast is slightly above the – the total F is above the target.

MR. DIODATI: Okay, so I'm going to assume that this is in some way related to the current level of their contribution so –

DR. DREW: It's on the same scale, yes.

MR. DIODATI: And I can understand why you'd want this option because it sounds like it's similar to the way you're currently administering your fisheries there. You estimate an F and you put a quota out there that assimilates it; and that is how the fishery has been operating. But, if we're looking for a 25 percent reduction, wouldn't this rate then be something like 0.04? That's what I don't understand it; why would you be fishing at the current rate if we're looking for a reduction? If the reduction is 25 percent, why wouldn't you reduce that to 0.04?

DR. DREW: This target is the target the same way that the coastal 0.18 is a target in that that is not what they are fishing at currently. They are above that and they would need to reduce in some way to this target, the same way that the coast needs to reduce – or the same way that the entire complex of fisheries on the Atlantic Coast needs to reduce to this 0.18 target. They would need some kind of reduction. We have not done those projections to able to tell you what percentage that would be in terms of landings.

MR LEROY YOUNG: So, I understand there is interest in developing this Chesapeake Bay

specific reference points; but their sex ratio, unknowns and things like this; how long would it take to do that? What kind of a timeframe are you talking about?

DR. DREW: I think the technical committee is talking about more of having this completed and ready for the benchmark and not in terms of having this ready for the October meeting.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, I'm starting to get people that want to have second bites of the apple; and I just want to make sure everybody who hasn't had a – is there anybody else who hasn't spoken that wants to speak at this point? Okay, I'll go to Bill.

MR. WILLIAM A. ADLER: I just want to reiterate that whatever this – and there will probably be other parts of this – that we're taking this out to public hearing; and the public wants to know, okay, this is where we are, you're proposing some reduction, whatever those numbers are, whether they're in reference points, F points or whatever they are, and this is what my quota will be or this is what my allowance will be. That's what they'll understand. You get too complicated here and I can just picture the public hearings just going around in circle. I'll hold this not only for this one but for any other one that happens to get wound up in its own morass. Thank you.

MR. JAMES J. GILMORE, JR.: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to get a clarification because Bill actually made my point. If we adopt this, it sounded like before, this is not going out for public comment and we're not going to be able to get it out until the October meeting. If that's the case, that's a big problem.

We heard it very clearly from all our guys that we've got to get this thing out. I have no problem adding options to it, but we've got to get something out on the street so we can start getting some input on it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, now I'm going to start going through the second time. Tom O'Connell.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think just first for clarification, I don't think this motion delays the process. This is to add an option to the addendum. We set forth a charge back in October to develop both Chesapeake Bay and coastal reference points; and unfortunately we were unable to get a technical committee recommendation. To clarify, my motion is to serve as an interim reference point until the technical committee can come forward with a recommendation. Thanks.

MR. FOTE: I just want to make sure I'm clear on understanding this. This reference point includes the Delaware spawning area and Hudson spawning area and they take credit for those two spawning areas in the Chesapeake Bay because they took away – in Amendment 6 they took away the spawning status of the Hudson River and the Delaware Bay because I walked out of the room at the wrong time. I just want to make sure that is included in that big figure.

Because what I'm seeing here is if you basically do the coastal stock and base it on the coastal stock, what you're doing is you're taking credit for the production in Delaware River and the Hudson River and this allows you to be more – without explaining the contributions of those two systems.

I have asked for this for the last 25 years since I have been sitting here around this table or actually before I was sitting here. So, until we get a point – how can you draw the reference points without knowing what the contribution exactly is or even close of the Delaware River and the Hudson River?

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think everybody has had a bite of this apple; and I think from where I sit I see a sense of the board. If necessary, I would like to make a motion that debate be limited if we can't get ourselves to a vote. We are under some time constraints. I think we have had enough discussion; so if necessary, I will make a motion that debate be limited and not pull a Pat Augustine and say let's move the question.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: The only thing I'd like to do is give the public an opportunity to comment on this motion.

MR. ABBOTT: I would agree.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there anybody from the public that would like to comment on this motion? Alexei.

DR. ALEXEI SHAROV: This is mostly a comment on the discussion where this number came from for a clarification point. The technical committee developed a new coast-wide reference point. We estimated what fishing mortality is required to maintain the spawning stock biomass at the target. That fishing mortality rate coastwide was estimated to be at 0.18.

This is based on the so-called bay fleets that were used in the model. The Chesapeake Bay Fleet is one component of it. The same model estimated that if you maintain the fishing mortality of 0.058 as a target for the bay; that would then be equivalent to the 0.18 coast-wide target. That is where it came from.

I also am under the impression that when you initiated Addendum IV there were two goals. One was to bring the fishing mortality to the target. The other one was specifically to develop reference points for the Chesapeake Bay and Albemarle Sound. My view of this was the opportunity to introduce the interim Chesapeake Bay Reference Point that could be used; and it is not necessarily related to the specific percent reduction that you're currently considering. These are mutual goals and not conflicting ones. Thank you.

DR. DREW: I guess sort of similar to what Alexei was saying; I just wanted to clarify the intent of this motion. Is this to put this reference point on paper the same way that the 0.18 becomes on paper; but do you intend for any of the management options that we considering today – the reductions, size limits, bag limits, all of the reductions that we're going to take; do you intend for those to be based on this reference point or do you intend for future

management of the stock once this has been put into place, to take that into consideration?

MR. O'CONNELL: If this option was approved by the board in October and for the draft addendum; I'm viewing that there would be management options; that the bay jurisdictions would develop management strategies to keep their fishery at or below this target level, similar to how the Albemarle Sound stock is being managed within this draft addendum.

If this motion is approved, there would need to be additional management strategies; that the bay jurisdictions would submit a plan to demonstrate how it's going to constrain its fishery to this new target.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, Roy, you get another bite, too.

MR. MILLER: I still don't understand. If the technical committee was unable to recommend at this time Chesapeake Bay Reference Points; why are we poised to take a motion that ignores the advice of the technical committee? I just don't understand why we think we know better than the technical committee did in regard to this issue. Thank you.

MR. HASBROUCK: I'm hearing conflicting information; and in order to help me make a decision on voting on this motion, I'm going to ask a direct question and I hope I can get a direct answer. If we vote in favor of this motion and include it in the public hearing document, will we still be able to at the end of the day today approve the public hearing document or will this delay approval of the public hearing document to our fall meeting?

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Michelle, would you like to give your opinion on that?

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I guess that was a similar question I had. I support this in concept because I understand that the bay jurisdictions would like to be able to use similar management measures that they have been using. My question was really more about any delay in getting this out for public comment.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: I'll ask, Tom, what is your opinion and then I'll ask some other people's opinion on this. My opinion is it would, but, Tom, maybe you can explain to me why it wouldn't.

MR. O'CONNELL: It wasn't my intent nor do I believe it would. It would add an option for a Chesapeake Bay interim reference point; and then in the management section, I had motions prepared to have an option for the bay jurisdictions to develop management strategies to constrain their fishery to at or below this reference point.

That goes out for public comment along with the other options that utilize the coast-wide reference point. The public would have an opportunity to look at options that relate to a coast-wide reference point as they apply to the bay as well as an interim Chesapeake Bay reference point, which we committed to doing last October, and give the public an opportunity to comment on both of those options.

MR. WHITE: I'm going to oppose this. The technical committee said they are going to work on this for the next assessment; and I think that's the correct way of coming up with this. It's not to quickly late in the date assign this. It needs to go through the technical committee. It needs to be figured out properly and we all need to understand it. I think there is a lot of misunderstanding around the table of think; so I'm not going to support it.

MR. WAINE: Doug was just asking me as PDT Chair if I think the document could go as Tom is suggesting. Tom, I understand your intent, I think, which is to get this out as an option very similar to how the Albemarle Sound/Roanoke River. You would develop options among the bay states to restrain your F to that level.

It doesn't sound like that necessarily needs to be specific in the document but maybe you have some motions to do that. I think the question that I have I think is for the technical committee. Let's just play the hypothetical that in October the board does choose to use that bay-specific reference point; does that mean that the coast-wide reference point needs to be adjusted

because now we're separating out the components of mortality that originally contained the bay mortality in the coast-wide reference point into its own separate mortality component; so does the coastwide need to be adjusted as well? That's the question I have.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think Paul described it best. We're in a very imprecise situation. In the best of worlds, we would have had that. That was the charge back in October. I'm not suggesting that there is time to go back and recalculate the coastal points. It's a policy decision at this point. Recognizing all the issues that we have been talking about the last year and the differences that the peer reviews of the stock assessment recognize for the Chesapeake Bay; is this an acceptable policy decision for the board until the technical committee can go back and develop the Chesapeake Bay and revise the coastal reference points. It sounds like that is going to take three years.

MR. O'REILLY: What I heard was when the next benchmark is done; and that leaves a lot up in the air until then not even to have a reference point. Again, Amendment 6 at least indicates that we should be looking at the stock and determining the fishing mortality rate, which has been a tagging program for 20 years. I'm not sure a benchmark means three years even, Tom.

I understand the situation that right now no one has the exact amount of reduction. I think Tom had indicated 12 to 15 percent. That has been the understanding. I think this is a situation where my understanding of what happened was that these dueling, I call them, sort of reference points of 0.58 and 0.62 were stymied by the fact that these are sort of an interim basis until there can be a biological reference point. To do that, obviously, you need the coastal and you need the Chesapeake Bay. I think everyone is pretty much up on that now. But, really, to wait a long time, several years, is going to pose a real problem.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: All right, John, since you haven't had a chance to speak, I am going to give you a first bite at the apple; and then I think I would like to try and move this to a vote.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chair, I definitely sympathize with what Tom and Rob are trying to here, but I can understand the confusion. I just think one of the problems we have is that in the reference point options we have, if we go with Option B for the coastal, which is to accept the new benchmark reference points and we have to go with Option B for the Chesapeake, which is the same coast-wide reference point, and they don't have any certainty that new reference points will be developed for the bay under this Option B, I was just wondering if we could maybe clarify the language in there to give the Chesapeake some certainty that new reference points would be developed in a certain amount of time.

Right now it is just left that the technical committee agrees that stock-specific reference points are the ultimate goal for management of the species. It doesn't give them any certainty there will be new reference points before the next benchmark assessment. I'm just wondering if maybe a clarification in the wording might ease some of the concerns about how long the Chesapeake will be stuck under the coastal reference points. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, let's caucus on this; and I'm perceiving that there is not a unanimous vote on this, so we will have a roll call on this. The motion is move to add Option C to Section 2.5.2, Chesapeake Bay Stock Reference Points, where the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions would manage the striped bass fisheries so as not to exceed target fishing mortality rate of F equals 0.058. The motion was made by Mr. O'Connell and seconded by Mr. O'Reilly. Are you all ready to vote? Okay, go ahead, Mike.

MR. WAINE: Maine.

MAINE: No.

MR. WAINE: New Hampshire.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: No.

MR. WAINE: Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Proceedings of the Atlantic Striped Bass Management Board Meeting August 2014

MASSACHUSETTS: No.

MR. WAINE: Rhode Island.

RHODE ISLAND: No.

MR. WAINE: Connecticut.

CONNECTICUT: No.

MR. WAINE: New York.

NEW YORK: Yes.

MR. WAINE: New Jersey.

NEW JERSEY: No.

MR. WAINE: Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA: No.

MR. WAINE: Delaware.

DELAWARE: No.

MR. WAINE: Maryland.

MARYLAND: Yes.

MR. WAINE: District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Potomac River Fisheries Commission

POTOMAC RIVER FISHERIES COMMISSION: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Commonwealth of Virginia.

VIRGINIA: Yes.

MR. WAINE: North Carolina.

NORTH CAROLINA: Yes.

MR. WAINE: National Marine Fisheries Service.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE: Yes.

MR. WAINE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE: No.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: **The motion fails; seven in favor, nine opposed, zero abstentions; and zero nulls.** Tom Fote.

MR. FOTE: Because I deal with legislation a lot and also deal with fisheries management plans, I always figure it's easy to pass an addendum than to basically retract an addendum. What I mean by that, it's always easy to take the fish away; but when it comes to giving them back or increasing the quota, it is very difficult.

I found that out with summer flounder; I found that out with black sea bass; and I found that out with a number of species. It is the same way trying to pass a bill. It's always easier once you get the bill but trying to change it afterwards gets to be real difficult. I would like to see included in this addendum is that there is a sunset period.

If we don't do another amendment in three years – now I'm not saying we can't do another amendment. What I'm saying is if we don't do an amendment in three years and we have all these year classes and we take a look at the document, there is no necessity to go out to another amendment to revert to what Amendment 6 does.

The history of us is once you come and take away fish, we never give them back. I don't want to do that because people have hidden agendas and we know that people have been calling for a reduction in the striped bass fishery even when the stocks were at an all-time high and now they have found the vehicle for doing that. **I wish to basically put a sunset.**

It could be two years; it could be three years. By that time we will have the year classes coming in and we should know better the status of the stocks. At that point if we decide we have to do more in an amendment, then we pass it.

Anyway, that is why I would like to make a motion if I can get a second.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Tom, what would probably help here rather than just saying a sunset provision; do you want to provide a year or a range of years to consider?

MR. FOTE: Well, I'm looking at the 2011 year class and I'm looking at the regression analysis; so in two years' time we should really start knowing what is going on with the stock again; so I'd put it in for two years; that unless we have an addendum in two years, it reverts back to – but it could be three. I'm willing to listen to people, but I will make it for two years as a starting point.

MR. WAINE: It just popped into my head that there are options in the document that look at implementing measures over a three-year timeframe; so maybe it would make more sense to correspond with those options for the sunset provision.

MR. FOTE: I think that's what I'll make it three years.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: **Okay, let's have a motion up there; move to include a sunset provision within three years.** Is there a second to this motion; Steve Meyers. Discussion on this motion?

MR. SIMPSON: Okay, when would the next stock assessment occur; what is the planned interval?

MR. GODWIN: I believe the last recommendation from the technical committee to the management board, which was approved, was a benchmark every five years and an update every two years.

DR. DREW: So that would correspond to a benchmark to be completed in 2018.

MR. SIMPSON: If I could, that would be the timeframe and with the update every couple of years, we get a sense of where we are relative to our target and we'd need to be revisiting adjustments to meet our management objectives.

My thought process is this is going to happen without a sunset provision because we're managing to certain targets that presumably we'll accept in this addendum.

MR. WAINE: Except that it's automatic; so without the sunset clause, you need an addendum or an amendment to change the management. With it, you don't.

MR. TERRY STOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman, just a quick question for Tom. Is this sunset provision for all the measures in the draft addendum?

MR. FOTE: Yes, I would assume that. What I'm saying is it doesn't stop from doing addendums in between; but if no addendum is done in three years and we look at it and we've above all those levels, then it automatically reverts back to Amendment 6. That means the stock is in good health and we can do this and we don't have to go through the amendment process, which can be long and timely as we found out with this addendum that has been dragging out for two years.

MR. ABBOTT: I'd speak against the motion because I think, Tom, this could create a false expectation in behalf of the public of what might happen. I think the board has the ability to react to whatever the conditions of the fisheries are in any year, and we will be responding to any assessments that are done and do our due diligence and do at that time what is the correct thing. I don't think putting in a sunset provision does anything other than provide a false expectation on the part of the public thinking that we're going to go back to where we were in the future because we don't know what we'll be doing going in either direction.

MR. WHITE: Tom, would you consider changing the language such that it would sunset after the next assessment was delivered to the board? My concern here is that the sunset might kick in like months before we have the stock assessment and then we have to turn around and possibly go back. Could the sunset happen after we get the stock assessment and know where we are?

nMR. FOTE: We do a stock assessment update

MR. FOTE: We do a stock assessment update every year – every two years – yes, two years, but we’re talking about waiting for a benchmark stock assessment.

MR. WHITE: I think they said it was 2018, so it would be the same exact time. My concern is that they’re six months apart or something. It’s the same year; but if you could just put the wording in that it sunsets after delivery of the next benchmark stock assessment unless there is information in there that would force us to –

MR. FOTE: Yes, but priorities have changed stock assessment due dates; so we could wind up in 2019. That’s my concern here; we wind up in 2019 or 2020 waiting for a stock assessment to come out. Then we get into the same argument which held up this amendment for two or three years; so I don’t want to be in ’20 or ’21 where we could basically be increasing it.

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER A. KUMIEGA, III: Tom, are you talking about a sunset or some kind of a trigger, because you just said a minute ago that if everything is okay, then we revert back to Amendment 6. I think that might be more acceptable is some kind of a trigger when that stock assessment comes in 2018, everything is good, then we sunset. If things are not good, then we continue on with the conservation measures.

MR. FOTE: Walter, what I’m saying is if things are not good and we keep going downhill, we’re going to put another addendum in another year or two to basically correct that. The only way this is going to get implemented is if we think we’re at the point – and I won’t be sitting at this table probably three years from now, I don’t know – but for that new management regime to look at.

The past history of trying to change something once it is in place, as we just found out with this addendum, takes a long time, even sometimes longer than the council, which is two years. I don’t want to have to wait until that process goes through, because we’re going to greatly impact the recreational fishing industry and the commercial fishing industry.

Some of us think that maybe we don’t have to impact them the way they are; but this will take care of three years out and looking at it and saying you guys have got to change it or you can put a new amendment. It doesn’t stop you from doing an amendment in 2017 to say that year class wasn’t what we thought and we have two more bad year classes to be more restrictive. That’s all I’m saying.

MR. WAINE: Before I forgot about it, I just wanted to make we’re all on the same page with what this motion means. A sunset three years from implementation would mean management measures implemented in 2015 and held constant ’15, ’16 and ’17 and then it would sunset for implementation in 2018; so ’18 would be when it reverts back.

MR. FOTE: It also means we could another addendum in ’16 or ’17. It doesn’t stop us when we see that we’ve got good spawning, we have good young-of-the-year indexes or when we do the regression analysis. That’s up to us to do a new amendment; but I’m saying if we do nothing by three years from now, we need to do something. That’s all I’m saying.

MR. DIODATI: I guess if that’s the intent and that was what I was assuming the intent was, what Mike Waine described; then I think you’d have to put that in the motion that what you really mean is you’re reverting back to Addendum III measures that manage the fishery. That is what you’d have to put in there because we may do Addendum VI before 2018.

There may be other addendums in place. Conditions in this fishery might be considerably better than they are now, and we might want to be more liberal than we are in Addendum III. I guess I see all kinds of issues being raised for no particular good reason, no benefit, by having this motion. I’m probably not going to vote for it; but if you’re going to continue with it, I think it needs to be clarified.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Bob, you wanted to make a comment?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: Mr. Chairman, just to Ritchie’s point about the

timing of the potential sunseting of this Addendum IV and the assessment, in the charter any board has the ability to extend a management plan provision for six months; and then if there is an addendum being worked on, they can extend it for another six months.

If this plan is about to sunset and we're about to get the stock assessment, there are some provisions where you can sort of extend the sunset period a little while and buy the board some time to see what the stock assessment says and then initiate your next addendum. There are some tools that we can use to make sure we don't end up in a spot where you're trying to get an addendum done and wait for assessment results at the same time.

MR. TRAIN: Mr. Chair, I understand the concept behind this, but I think I'd rather be here in three years voting to increase the harvest than having this sunset in three years and having to vote all over again the way we're sitting here today. I can't support this as it is. We're here to manage fish and I'd rather sit here in three years and vote to increase the harvest a little bit because it worked than to be sitting here like we are now.

MR. NOWALSKY: Will this motion refer only to Section 3.0, the proposed management measures, or is it the intent of this that it would revert back the reference points, any transfers, any federal recommendations we make or does this specifically refer only to Section 3.0, the management measures. If so, I think that should be very clear.

MR. FOTE: I consider that a friendly amendment to put it in there, because that's basically talking about. I'm not talking about changing reference points and reverting the reference points back to Amendment 6. What I'm changing are the measures because I know how difficult it is to get a new addendum passed or an amendment.

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if it might give some folks a little bit more comfort if it was a motion to reconsider the management measures or reevaluate the impact of the management measures in three years. Tom, that

sounds like what you want to do is evaluate the management measures that we put in place through this addendum and see if they're actually still necessary. It seems like the word "sunset" is giving people some heartburn.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Tom, do you want to respond to that?

MR. FOTE: I would do that if we could basically just say, yes, we evaluate it and we automatically go back to Amendment 6 or we put an addendum to go further. What I found out in this process after doing it for 24 years sitting around the table, that is a lot easier said to do. Even though we're looking at it, there are some that people said, well, you go out to an addendum and three years from now that's what I can have.

What I'm putting here is a little caveat that says, yes, if we're evaluating it and everything is fine, it will sunset without us having to go through the amendment process. If we think it needs more going to be done, we're going to do an amendment to the plan, anyway, to basically implement that. I could put something in besides "sunset" if you think it's a better idea.

All I want to do is make sure that in three years when we reevaluate and it goes back to Amendment 6 if we don't find – if it's accomplishing what we thought it was accomplishing or we had two good producing area years come in a row and we're looking at plenty of females out there because the 2011 year class moves forward.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, I'm getting hands for second bites of the apple on this particular motion. Anybody with their first comment on this? Seeing none, Terry, you get the first try at number two.

MR. STOCKWELL: The first one was a question, Mr. Chair. That being said, Michelle's suggestion had some comfort to me; but that all being said, I have to agree with my colleague, Steve. When we come back here in three years, we're going to be carefully and closely tracking this population over the next three years. I'm not convinced when we get back, any of us are

going to want to support any of the existing measures that are in there. I'd as soon wipe the slate clean and apply what measures are needed at the time, if any at all. I'm going to be opposed to this motion.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, is there anybody in the public that would like to make a comment on this motion? Go ahead, Pat.

MR. PATRICK PAQUETTE: Patrick Paquette, recreational fishing advocate from Massachusetts. I just wanted suggest that you have a really good understanding. I don't like the motion at all. We have a stock in decline, in a pattern of decline; and so we're trying to catch one reference point in one year; to then sunset it at the end of this.

I don't believe that if we achieve one point of data, that that is enough to automatically to have a sunset kick in automatically. I hope I'm saying that correctly, but I don't believe that – so you now are making sort of an assumption with this motion. Say you stemmed it one year and you caught it; you haven't established that it worked right there.

To me a one-year achievement is not enough to automatically sunset the action taken by this addendum. In other words, you don't know whether you're going to have that SSB or – I still didn't think that we got a clear answer on what exact point is going to be used to determine if things are better. But if they are, did we turn around for two years above that point; was it we just in the third year achieved that point. I think you need some sort of a stability. I'm sort of in favor of sunsets in different ways, but it seems like we're, okay, the minute we can wipe our brow, we're going to say that it's better.

To me this is way too important especially when you consider the national outcry of the recreational community right now for stability of both our industry and our fishermen looking for stability in regulations. To sort of set something up to drop right back out the minute we've achieved a little bit of success, it seems like it's dangerous and will encourage the roller coaster to continue and not stabilize.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, any other comments from the board? Seeing none, let's caucus on this because I also perceive that we have a consensus on this. **The motion is move to include a sunset provision in three years after implementation for Section 3.0.** The motion was made by Mr. Fote and seconded by Mr. Meyers. Okay, go ahead, Mike.

MR. WAINE: Maine.

MAINE: No.

MR. WAINE: New Hampshire.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: No.

MR. WAINE: Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

MASSACHUSETTS: No.

MR. WAINE: Rhode Island.

RHODE ISLAND: Null.

MR. WAINE: Connecticut.

CONNECTICUT: No.

MR. WAINE: New York.

NEW YORK: Yes.

MR. WAINE: New Jersey.

NEW JERSEY: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA: No.

MR. WAINE: Delaware.

DELAWARE: No.

MR. WAINE: Maryland.

MARYLAND: No.

MR. WAINE: District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: No.

MR. WAINE: PRFC.

POTOMAC RIVER FISHERIES
COMMISSION: No.

MR. WAINE: Commonwealth of Virginia.

VIRGINIA: No.

MR. WAINE: North Carolina.

NORTH CAROLINA: No.

MR. WAINE: National Marine Fisheries
Service.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE:
Yes.

MR. WAINE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: **The motion fails four to eleven with one null and no abstentions.** Any other items? Go ahead, John.

MR. CLARK: I can understand the Chesapeake's concern about the reference point options that are in here as I mentioned a little while ago; so I was wondering if it would be possible under 2.5.2 to add an Option C that would essentially just be Option B with a timeframe in there for developing the new options. For example, we could add a sentence that the technical committee will develop stock-specific reference points for the Chesapeake Bay by 2015.

It sounds like they're very close right now to having some stock-specific or some Chesapeake-specific reference points that could be used. Right now Option B is open ended. There is no timeframe for the developing of these Chesapeake reference points. As I mentioned if we go with the new reference points for the coastal, we have to accept the coastal reference points for the Chesapeake. It is just an idea to give a little more certainty to

when the Chesapeake reference points would be developed.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Can you make that in the form of a motion?

MR. CLARK: Yes; I'd say move to add Option C, which would be Option B, but with instructions in there to the technical committee to develop Chesapeake reference points within one year of passage of the addendum.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Let me ask a question of staff on this. Is this something that should be a task to the technical committee and giving a time period as opposed to putting something in a management document? I understand where you're coming from; that you want to have some certainty, but does that mean that the technical committee is out of compliance if they can't come to an agreement by one year.

MR. CLARK: Well, yes, that wording obviously I just off the top of my head; but if we could word it in a way, as I said, to give some certainty that new reference points would be developed. It doesn't have to be instructions to the technical committee; but if we could just say the board will allow the Chesapeake to develop new reference points within a year of approval of the addendum, something to that effect.

It seems as though they already have some reference points that I think there was a lot of interest around the table about the reference points that Tom just mentioned. Even if the Chesapeake came back with these points; that we would give that more consideration – you know, just to give some timeframe to this.

Because, as I said, as of right now by accepting the coastal reference points we have to accept the coastal reference points for the Chesapeake and there is no timeframe as to when the new reference points for the Chesapeake would be developed. We could still keep that option in there, but this new option would just add a little more certainty to when these new reference points for the Chesapeake would be able to be implemented.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, I'm going to ask for a second. Is that you, Rob?

MR. O'REILLY: Yes; and may I add that the terminology gets missed a little bit and mixed up, but obviously from all the discussion we've had today, if there is a Chesapeake Bay Reference Point, there needs to be a coastal reference point; because right now we have a coast-wide reference point.

It would be something and maybe a friendly amendment for John that he include "coastal" in there as well. I think this is a very timely motion by John, because, again, we spent about 20 years making sure that we could manage on a stock basis; and we'd hate to see that delayed even for more than about a year.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, I hate to be the contrarian again; but I don't think this is something that belongs in Addendum IV. I think this is something the board should decide separately whether they want to do this. I further think it's unfair to put a time limit on the technical committee on something that to this point they haven't been able to agree upon their ability to accomplish the task at all and not surely putting a time of a year on it. I think, like you say, are they going to be out of compliance. I appreciate what Mr. Clark is trying to get it; and I think we should do it in a different manner. I don't think this motion is in order as regards Addendum IV. Could I ask for your opinion on that, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN GROUT: My opinion on this is that this is more of a task to a technical committee; but if the board so sees fit to put this in, it is up to them on this. Now, I've got several hands. I'd like to get some comment from people that have not spoken yet; and I'll go back and let you –

MR. CLARK: I want to clarify the wording.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, why don't you clarify since you're the maker of the motion?

MR. CLARK: Yes, I'm sorry because that wording is confusing there. Could we change it to add a line that the board will consider

Chesapeake Reference Points within one year? That way it is not a task to the technical committee because as we've already heard the Chesapeake has reference points that they have developed; that if the technical committee is still unable to agree to – come to consensus on reference points, the Chesapeake states could then propose their own reference points to the board as they did earlier today for further consideration.

I would just take out the instructions to the technical committee part because I can understand that is – I don't want to put a deadline on the technical committee because clearly there are some debates within there; but I think that there are reference points that the Chesapeake has that could be considered by the board. I would like to give them a chance to a time certain that they could bring that back to the board for consideration. Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: This goes back to the question I asked earlier; and that is why agreement isn't being reached. Is there additional data that has to be collected? Is it just a matter of the type of modeling that you're doing? I mean what do you have to actually do and how long would it actually take to get a Chesapeake Bay Reference Point that the technical committee you think could be agreeable to?

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Charlton, do you want to reiterate the reasons that they couldn't come to a consensus at that point in time?

MR. GODWIN: So kind of getting back to the origination of the Chesapeake Bay Referent Point, it was done as a conservation equivalency from that particular model; and through Addendum IV – I wasn't involved with the technical committee at that time, so I'm just going off the historical. From a 28-inch fish on the coast to a 20-inch fish in the producer areas, the selectivity pattern that was used in the model was different.

With the current model, the way it is set up, that conservation equivalency exercise is not quite as comparable with the different selectivities in the three fleets; the way we have a Chesapeake Bay Fleet, a coastal fleet and a commercial discard

fleet. Those are the three fleets that go into the model currently.

They each have a different selectivity pattern so they account for the total F for all of the fisheries, so that is the sticking point and one of the reasons we can't come up with a bay-specific or a Chesapeake Bay stock specific reference point. We need some more information about the – if we want a sex-specific model, that's a different thing.

But just to get a reference point, some members of the technical committee – and as Katie said earlier, we could not come to a consensus on it. Some members of the technical committee felt that it would be okay to use the reference point. I think the majority did not. We didn't do a roll call. It is those same issues that we've looked at; and I don't know that we can guarantee a reference point one year from implementation. We can certainly continue to work on it and come back to the board with recommendations from the technical committee and our advice and then the board can make a decision on that.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, just a clarification from John. Is it the board will consider these reference points within one year with or without technical committee approval? Is technical committee approval needed to have that happen?

MR. CLARK: Russ, I was just talking to Rob about this; and he agrees that because there is so much uncertainty in this that it would probably be best just to withdraw the motion and just task the technical committee with it as Dennis Abbott suggested. As I said, the only problem that I see is in the option as it is written there is no certainty to the Chesapeake Bay that these reference points will be developed in any time period. I mean if there is so much confusion about them, this could go on for a long while. Given the confusion that this has caused, I will gladly remove the motion and Rob has also indicated he would see it removed.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: All right, I'm going to ask is there any objection from the board to withdrawing the motion? Okay, seeing none, the motion is withdrawn and it will be a task of the technical committee. Rob.

MR. O'REILLY: Yes; I think the really important aspect of all this is just that some progress can go forward. It was alarming to hear that this might wait until 2018. Obviously, there just was a benchmark assessment. It had the fleets in it. I know the technical committee has really worked hard over the last year and a half; and so I hope, though, that this can be a priority. That's all that we would ask.

MR. WAINE: I was just thinking we could clarify in the document that the board has tasked the technical committee to continue developing these just to clarify the sentence you were talking about.

MR. DAVID V.D. BORDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back and revisit an issue that the AP raised. It is the issue of the 50 percent probability. The document is basically crafted around a 50 percent probability that F will be at or below the target within a specified period of time. My problem with it is that I think what we're going to get is a reaction from a number of our constituents that this is not conservative enough.

I don't have a motion, but I think the document would be improved greatly if we instructed the technical team to craft a couple of paragraphs that talk about how sensitive that probability is. In other words, it could be nothing more than – I'm sure they've already done these probability runs so they can go back and look at the analysis.

They could calculate, for instance, if you reduced catch by 30 percent in the first year, you'd have a 75 percent probability of reaching the target or some like that. In other words, I think we'd want to have some language in here that gives the public the ability to say I want a higher degree of success or at least understand how sensitive the probability analysis is. I'm not going to make a motion because if nobody else agrees, I don't want to waste the time of the board on it; but if three are other people, I think we could work on language or at least a directive for the technical committee to develop that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: For this document; the technical committee or the PDT?

MR. BORDEN: Whichever, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, any comments on that? Dave.

MR. SIMPSON: Yes, I think if it is possible to do, it would be helpful. For example, 50 percent probability of achieving a 25 percent reduction in the first year as one of the alternatives and the other being three 7 percent reductions at the end of three years has a 50 percent probability, as I remember it. Well, it might be good for the public to read that if we take that first-year step; that at the end of three years, as we look at it now, we have something much higher than a 50 percent probability of having achieved the target. Does that make sense, Katie?

DR. DREW: Yes, I think that would be – you know, we’re just sidebarring up here about how much of that information we actually retained or would we need to go back and request that we redo these projections with different reductions. It is kind of a solver routine to get to where – so you say I want to get here; how do I do that?

I don’t know how of that data we retained along the way of, okay, we’re at 29 percent, here is what our percentage is; we’re at 30 percent and here is what our percentage is. That would require additional work on the technical committee’s part; but I know we would have information on if you take that reduction up front what is your probability after three years of being at the F target versus the other two prolonged options.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Would that get at it, Dave, something like that?

MR. BORDEN: Yes; understand I’m not trying to delay this. I do not want to delay the document. I’m more comfortable sending it out the way it is without that; but if this doable the way David just characterized, I think it would improve the document.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, I assume that we’re going to move ahead with David’s suggestion and add some words to the document. At this point would a motion to adopt Draft Addendum IV to Amendment 6 to the Atlantic Striped Bass Interstate Fisheries Management Plan for public comment be in order to send it out for public comment?

CHAIRMAN GROUT: I just want to make sure that nobody else had potential changes. It looks like Rob has one and then Emerson.

MR. O’REILLY: Mr. Chairman, I’d like to make a motion to add an option to reduce harvest for the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions for a one-year or a three-year timeframe, with the reductions by 25 percent or 17 percent or 7 percent for the three-year timeframe based on 2012 state-specific harvest amounts. I’ll explain that if I get a second.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there a second; Martin Gary seconded that. Why don’t you provide your justification.

MR. O’REILLY: This ties in with the way management has been since 1997. There has been a Chesapeake Baywide quota. We distributed a white paper to you so you could see some of the information in case you aren’t aware of that system. It covers both commercial and recreational harvest.

The reason for asking for a 2012 basis for the Chesapeake Bay is that we have sort of lived and died by the results of the harvest control model. Although fishing mortality rates except for one year have been below target – and the year it wasn’t was 2003 – fishing mortality rates have been very modest; so that we have the exploitable stock biomass and changes to the exploitable biomass year to year.

In 2013, because of the exploitable stock biomass output, we elected to reduce the harvest by 14 percent for recreational and commercial fisheries. This wasn’t the first time that we reduced harvest. We have reduced it in other years.

Clearly, it is a situation that is voluntary. We were under quota. We've always been under quota in the baywide quota, but nonetheless it was very important for the jurisdictions to reduce that harvest. For that reason, we're asking that for the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions 2012 be the basis or the reference for any reductions.

This eliminates the situation that was created last board meeting where a reduction from the 2013 harvest for the Chesapeake Bay was removed from the document and it was left at 2013 quotas. There was also an option in a motion last time we met which said that the recreational harvest could also reduce from the quota instead of the harvest.

Obviously, some of the information that I've provided you shows you that the situation in the Chesapeake Bay recreational fisheries has been managed very well on a baywide basis. We're the only jurisdictions that have tempered our harvest if we had a feeling that the exploitable stock biomass called for such a reduction. I think that's most of it. There may be some questions.

MR. NOWALSKY: Would this change be only for the commercial options or would this be for the recreational options as well that would require some analysis be done to provide some different size, season and bag limits that would reflect the reduction from the 2012 harvest instead of 2013, what is currently in the document?

MR. O'REILLY: It's for both commercial and recreational. As far as the size, season and bag, they still are not all in this document. If you've heard Mike earlier, for the Chesapeake Bay options, those haven't been filled out completely. That would be something that it would still be the 25 percent reduction. That would be something that the public would certainly understand. There might need to be a couple of sentences as to why it was 2012 as opposed to 2013.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, Rob, you made a statement there; and Mike and I were sidebarring when you said that not all the Chesapeake Bay

recreational options have been included in the document. The PDT I believe is not aware of that. Maybe you could explain the options that were supposed to be in there that aren't.

MR. O'REILLY: I may have misspoken, but are there strictly baywide options? Is there going to be any opportunity for state-specific options? That is what I meant.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: If you're talking about a conservation equivalency option, yes, any state can put in a conservation equivalency option. If we were going to choose a bag/side limit combination, that would be the basis for the bay – just like when Amendment 5 went in, it was 20 inches and one fish except Virginia got two fish, something like that. Then conservation equivalency was applied to change that.

MR. O'REILLY: Then that's fine and I retract that statement about the recreational options; but the main item here is really 2012 as the basis for the reductions. I'm happy to answer any questions on that.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: But, clearly, do you think that if we went off of 2012, we'd have to change the options that are in the – for recreational fisheries that are in the document right now?

MR. WAINE: We've done so many projections I'm trying to think about whether we have this done based off of 2012.

DR. DREW: Rob, to clarify, when you're talking about taking necessary harvest reductions, are you talking about taking that 25 percent or that 17 percent or the 7, 7, 7 from the 2012 to establish sort of a quota for the baywide states; or, are you talking about – because the issue that we had initially was that obviously 2013 harvest is higher than 2012; so if you look at the allowable harvest that the projection model says is necessary, it is 25 percent of the 2013 harvest.

So that allowable harvest; that number that comes out of the projections is a lower percentage of the 2012 landings; is that the

percentage that you want or do you want these percentages from the 2012 landings?

MR. O'REILLY: From the 2012 harvest or landings; landings for recreational, harvest for commercial. This is something that was talked about quite a bit last board meeting. It is just that it didn't get resolved; and I think probably it could be resolved pretty quickly. I'm not even sure that the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions have a higher 2013 harvest from 2012.

I know on the commercial end of it, because there was a 14 percent reduction, the commercial fishery certainly had lower harvest in 2013 by 14 percent. The recreational quota was lower, but I'm not sure on a jurisdictional basis whether the complete combined jurisdictional harvest for recreational was any higher or lower in 2012. We could certainly let you know that pretty quickly.

DR. DREW: We certainly have those numbers and we could go back and look at that. I'm just saying that the projections were done for the coast and the bay combined; so this reduction – it is still unclear to me whether you are comfortable with these percentage numbers or you want the percentages revised based on the 2012 numbers.

MR. O'REILLY: We are comfortable with those percentage reductions because of the fact that we took the 14 percent reduction in 2013. Whether it impacted the recreational harvest as much, I'm not sure, but nonetheless we would choose the same reduction scenarios that are up there right now, and it would be applied to 2013 for other jurisdictions outside the bay.

MR. YOUNG: I just have a question. In this white paper that you guys provided, Table 2 – there are two tables there; I guess A-1 and A-2 – and it shows that both Virginia and Maryland recreational harvest, if I'm interpreting this correctly, in 2013 was much higher than 2012. Am I interpreting that correctly? It seems counterintuitive if you want the same reduction from a higher harvest, you're going to end up with a – or from a lower harvest you're going to end up with an even lower harvest quota.

MR. O'REILLY: I think you are seeing that, but then again that's just the recreational; so as I mentioned before, the commercial fishery, when the 14 percent reduction was taken, that was right away a reduction for them because the bay fisheries generally come pretty close to their quota. Even throughout the process of the addendum, when the commercial fishery takes a reduction, that's it. I mean those tags are lost so that quota is lost; so I think that's what you're seeing there.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Further discussion on this motion? **Okay, seeing none, I'm going to let the states caucus and I will read the motion: move to add an option to take necessary harvest reductions (25 percent, 17 percent, 7+7+7 percent) from the 2012 harvest for the Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions instead of the 2013 harvest.** Motion made by Mr. O'Reilly and seconded by Mr. Gary. Okay, are you ready, Mike?

MR. WAINE: Maine.

MAINE: Yes.

MR. WAINE: New Hampshire.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: No.

MR. WAINE: Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

MASSACHUSETTS: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Rhode Island.

RHODE ISLAND: No.

MR. WAINE: Connecticut.

CONNECTICUT: Yes.

MR. WAINE: New York.

NEW YORK: No.

MR. WAINE: New Jersey.

NEW JERSEY: No.

MR. WAINE: Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Delaware.

DELAWARE: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Maryland.

MARYLAND: Yes.

MR. WAINE: District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Potomac River Fisheries Commission.

POTOMAC RIVER FISHERIES COMMISSION: Yes.

MR. WAINE: Commonwealth of Virginia.

VIRGINIA: Yes.

MR. WAINE: North Carolina.

NORTH CAROLINA: Yes.

MR. WAINE: National Marine Fisheries Service.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE: Yes.

MR. WAINE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE: No.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: **The motion carries eleven to five to zero to zero.** Emerson, you had something?

MR. HASBROUCK: Mr. Chairman, with your permission I'd like to ask Mike some questions that I had asked him on the phone a week or so ago. Mike, we had some discussion about looking at recreational measures of one fish at 30 inches and one fish at 32 inches and to see what percent reduction in fishing effort those would attain. You said if you had some

opportunity, you'd take a look at that. Were you able to look at that at all and doing an analysis on that?

MR. WAINE: The problem with those options – so you're asking about what the percent reduction would end up being and how does that relate relative to the options in the addendum. We calculated that for I think it was B-2, I believe, which was the trophy fish option.

What happens is when you end up decreasing both the bag limit and increasing the size limit, the dataset that you use to estimate the percent reduction in harvest gets a lot smaller because you need to be using the MRIP-measured fish to calculate that percent reduction in harvest. Basically what I'm saying is that the analysis is constrained by the dataset; so we couldn't estimate exactly what the percent reduction in harvest would be. That was exactly the case for Option B-2 as well. As you see, there is a footnote in there that this option is obviously more conservative than Option B-1 and yet that percent harvest reduction is less; and that's a function of the dataset.

As we talked on the phone, all that we really tell you at this point is those options would be more conservative than size limit options that are similar to the ones already in the document; so it would achieve more than a 30 percent reduction in harvest or something along those lines.

MR. HASBROUCK: So the error around that analysis is the same as it is for B-2, more or less, is that what you're saying?

MR. WAINE: Yes.

MR. HASBROUCK: **Then I would like to offer a motion that we include in the public hearing document with the same caveats that you have for B-2; the reduction that would be obtained in the recreational fishery with one fish at 30 inches and one fish at 32.**

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Is there a second to that motion. Dr. Duval seconds it. Discussion on this motion?

MR. HASBROUCK: Our interest in it is that there is a lot interest in the recreational fishery in New York to have some information on these options. I would like to provide those in the public hearing document so that fishermen from New York can at least comment on those options.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, any other comments from the board? Bill.

MR. ADLER: I briefly would just like to say this thing is something that the public can understand. Okay, I got the point and I like this or that rather than 025 reference points, whatever.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Anybody from the public wish to comment on this motion? I'll come back to the board. Jim.

MR. GILMORE: We actually got some of these things from a council meeting, which actually was an update on striped bass and not at a public meeting, but it almost turned out to be a public meeting. A lot of the correspondence that we've been getting is actually the issue about the 50 percent probability.

I think that is what these were coming from is that we went out to a higher size limit with a one-fish bag, would that get us a higher probability. Is there any way to actually calculate what the probability would be if there is an improvement on that?

MR. GODWIN: That's what the issue is; the kind of error estimate associated around that because your sample size gets small and it is not going to show much of a difference in the percentage calculation, right? Intuitively, yes, if you increase your minimum size limit and decrease your bag as well, you're going to get more of a saving than if you just decrease your bag at 28. The problem is a lot of the sample size, the error associated with that. We can do those calculations and show them to you, but –

DR. DREW: We can't give you a percentage of what is your likelihood of getting to that F target on the basis of that, but we could tell you it would reduce your harvest by 30-ish percent.

MR. SIMPSON: So I get the limitation of last year's length frequency sampling; you just don't have enough fish that are over 30-some inches to really characterize what that component of the catch looks like. That seems to turn up in some of the evaluations.

For example, I'm looking at Page 13; you know, the one-fish bag and 28 inches would produce a 31 percent reduction in harvest, but a slot limit where you'd only harvest 28 to 40 wouldn't achieve as much conservation. I mean, that's counterintuitive. I wonder if you have an ability – does it get any better if you look at what you constructed as the entire population in the last assessment for the last year, 2012, and just sort of hypothetically try to answer the question more precisely?

DR. DREW: The issue is once you start combining size and bag limits, you have to know what individual fishermen are catching, because the question now becomes – so we can look at the size structure and say, okay, we're not allowing any fish below 30 inches and cut all of that off; so it doesn't matter if they caught two fish at 28 inches on one trip or if one person caught one fish at 28 inches and one person caught one fish at 30 inches on that same trip.

Once you start moving into – you know, do you get that savings because they had two fish and you dropped one or you'd lose both of those fish in that case of the size limit, but you would keep one of them in the other scenario. The problem it is not so much about the population structure as it is about what is actually being intercepted; and so we need to know what each individual angler is catching, what their bag was and what the size of the fish in their bag was in order to be able to calculate the reductions for these.

Once you start specifying that you need to know who the fisherman was and what that fish was for them personally as opposed to just four fish spread out over three anglers and you need to know the measurements of those individual fish, that is what really reduces the sample size, and there is no way to reconstruct that data.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay, thanks, but does it still – you know, when the public goes and reads this

table, the one I'm looking at, the idea that throwing back every single fish over 40 inches has less conservation value than keeping them; I'm pretty sure I'm going to be inviting Mike to do our public hearing, and this is one of the reasons why.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Mike, do you want to respond to that?

MR. WAINE: Would the board feel more comfortable with us using similar options; so, for example, the options we keep talking about are one fish at 28; and so obviously this is a more conservative option than one fish at 28, which is why this would be hard to explain to the public. Do we want to just qualitatively just say that Option B-2, reduction in harvest, is greater than 31 percent?

We can't calculate exactly that percentage. When we did calculate that percentage, because of the limitations of the database, it's 26 percent. There is nothing further that we can do to clarify that. I tried to put in a footnote, but I think it probably will end up getting overlooked, and I'll just be talking about footnotes the whole time.

MR. SIMPSON: If I could, I think that would be preferable because logically it has to be higher; and if we have a hard time calculating it, people can appreciate that; but reporting less conservation I think is going to tangle us for fifteen minutes right there in the public hearing and it won't help.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: So I would suggest that without objection from the board that they change that to greater than 31 percent but still keep in the footnote to explain why you're putting greater than 31 percent or something to that effect so that they realize there is data limitations and that's why we're putting greater than. Terry.

MR. STOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I was out of the room for part of the rationale; so my question is, is this a motion for a two-fish bag limit, one at 30 inches and 32 or two separate one fish – I'm just confused.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Two one-fish bag limit options, correct, Emerson?

MR. HASBROUCK: Yes, two different options, each of which has one fish.

MR. STOCKWELL: I think then we need to wordsmith that a little bit because if this comes out in the public, Mike, you're going to be explaining it, too.

MR. WAINE: We can change it if you want, I understand as long as the board understands.

MR. WHITE: That was my question, thank you.

MR. HASBROUCK: Relative to what Dave was talking about before, we can only ask the staff to provide an explanation based on what the data is. If there is a lot of variance and a lot of error around that data; then that needs to somehow communicated in the document.

REPRESENTATIVE CRAIG A. MINER: I think if you insert the word "options" after "with" would make it clearer that it's an option of one fish at 30 or one fish at 32 so maybe add "option" and change "and" to "or".

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Are you all set with that?

MR. HASBROUCK: Yes; I'm fine with that.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Dr. Duval, are you okay with that change?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, sir.

MR. WILLIAM J. GOLDSBOROUGH: I would say in addition to that you could just make the word "reduction" plural, "the reductions that would be obtained". That might help, too.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Are you okay with that, Emerson?

MR. HASBROUCK: I'm sorry; Jim and I are having a sidebar here; I missed that.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Bill, do you want to repeat that?

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Just to help with clarifying the intent; I thought if you make the change that just done, to make the word "reduction" plural; that would help as well.

MR. HASBROUCK: Yes; that's fine, thank you.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Dr. Duval?

DR. DUVAL: Yes again,

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Any other comments on this motion? Okay, let's caucus on this. **Move to include in Draft Addendum IV for Public Comment the reductions that would be obtained in the coastal recreational fishery with options of one fish at 30 inches or one fish at 32 inches. Motion by Dr. Hasbrouck and seconded by Dr. Duval.**

Okay, I'm going to try this first. Are there any objections to this motion? Okay, any abstentions? **The motion carries unanimously.** Anything else? Seeing none, Dennis, are you ready to make your motion?

MR. ABBOTT: I am, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a motion to adopt Draft Addendum IV to Amendment 6 to the Atlantic Striped Bass Interstate Fisheries Management Plan to be sent out for public comment.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Seconded by Bill Adler. Any discussion on this? Jim.

MR. GILMORE: Just a quick clarification; do we put in "as modified today" or is that implied?

MR. ABBOTT: As modified today.

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Bill, you're okay with that, too? Okay, is there any objection to this motion? **Seeing none, the motion passes unanimously.** Any abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much.

We actually are on a timeline to get through earlier today. We have one other agenda item, and that is do you something else, first?

MR. WAINE: I just wanted to give everybody a heads-up that I'll be in contact with everybody regarding scheduling public hearings so we can start working on that over the next couple of days.

OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Okay, Wilson Laney, you've got an item under other business.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to let everybody know that we did get a match Saltonstall/Kenney Grant to the Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant that North Carolina that already given us; so we will definitely be doing a cooperative winter tagging cruise in 2015. That means we will be doing the trawling-based tagging of striped bass, which we didn't do this year because we didn't have the match.

We will also be doing the hook-and-line-based tagging as well. That will give us a second data point in addition to the one we generated in 2013 to be able to compare hook-and-line-tagged fish with trawl-based fish. We're hoping to do another one in 2016. We had to put in a new grant proposal to North Carolina because of the mismatch between our S/K grant and our CRFL grant. We will await the outcome of that grant proposal to see if we will be able to do one in 2016. I just wanted to give you that update.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN GROUT: Thank you, Wilson, and thank you, board members, for putting together a draft document for public hearing with a wide range of options and doing it in a good amount of time. I'll take a motion to adjourn now. So moved; and I think it's unanimous.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 o'clock p.m., August 5, 2014.)

— — —

