



# Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

1050 N. Highland Street • Suite 200A-N • Arlington, VA 22201  
703.842.0740 • 703.842.0741 (fax) • www.asmf.org

## MEMORANDUM

July 28, 2014

**To:** Atlantic Striped Bass Management Board  
**From:** Atlantic Striped Bass Advisory Panel  
**RE:** Comments on Draft Addendum IV for Public Comment

The Advisory Panel (AP) met on July 28, 2014 via conference call. The main agenda item discussed was to review the context of Draft Addendum IV for public comment and provide feedback to the Board regarding the range of options that are being considered. Below is a summary of their conference call.

### *Attendees*

Arnold Leo (NY) commercial  
Kelly Place (VA) commercial  
John McMurray (NY) charter boat  
Chuck Casella (MA) charter boat  
Ed O'Brien (MD) charter boat  
Louis Bassano (NJ) recreational  
John Pedrick (PA) recreational  
Ed Cook (RI) recreational  
Peter Whelan (NH) recreational

David Sikorski (MD) recreational  
Bill Hall (VA) recreational  
Charlton Godwin (TC Chair)

### *Public*

Louis MacKeil (MA)

### *Staff*

Mike Waine, FMP Coordinator

### **Comments on Document Background**

-Several members shared various perspectives about the performance of the fishery in recent years. There were varying opinions depending on the geographical region represented by AP members. Overall, most individuals felt the description of the fishery was appropriate for the document.

-An AP member suggested including information on what the reference points were back when the coastwide stock was rebuilt. Estimates of F during the rebuilt timeframe are displayed in Figure 2 in the addendum.

-Some AP members were concerned about the shift in the management approach for the Chesapeake Bay and were confused about why the Bay will not be managing with stock specific reference points.

-An AP member suggested that a 50% probability of achieving F seems low and a larger range of options that achieve a higher probability of reducing F to the target should be considered for the public document.

## **Comments on Management Options**

-Some AP members suggested exploring both recreational and commercial options that exceed the necessary percent reduction for a given timeframe, while other members thought less conservative options should be considered as well.

-Some AP members suggested yearly review for the three year timeframe that spreads out the harvest reduction through time. As data become available the management program should be adjusted to ensure the timeframe is being met.

-Some AP members commented about the lack of equivalency between the recreational and commercial options for the coastal fishery. For example, options B14, C9 and D6 significantly reduce commercial quotas for some states by more than 50%. Generally states should not be punished for managing within their quotas. There was also a discussion about the fact that if the fishery remains similar to previous years, taking the reduction from Amendment 6 quotas will actually reduce the fishery.

-One AP member suggested including an option that achieves optimum sustainable yield in three years, noting the benefits of the industry that come from restoring larger table fare and trophy fish.