PROCEEDINGS OF THE

ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS MANAGEMENT

The Westin Alexandria
Alexandria, Virginia
August 3, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of agenda** by consent (Page 1).

2. **Approval of proceedings of February 2016** by consent (Page 1).

3. **Move to approve the 2016 Atlantic Striped Bass FMP Review and state compliance reports** (Page 8). Motion by Doug Grout; second by Tom Fote. Motion carried (Page 8).

4. **Move to approve Patrick Paquette membership to the Atlantic Striped Bass Advisory Panel** (Page 8). Motion made by Michelle Duval; second by Adam Nowalsky. Motion carried (Page 8).

5. **Move to adjourn** by consent (Page 8).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Pat Keliher, ME (AA)
Rep. Jeffrey Pierce, ME, proxy for Sen. Langley (LA)
Terry Stockwell, ME, Administrative proxy
Steve Train, ME (GA)
G. Ritchie White, NH (GA)
Doug Grout, NH (AA)
Dennis Abbott, NH, proxy for Sen. Watters (LA)
Bill Adler, MA (GA)
David Borden, RI (GA)
Jason McNamee, RI, proxy for J. Coit (AA)
Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)
David Simpson, CT (AA)
Rep. Craig Miner, CT (LA)
James Gilmore, NY (AA)
Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)
John McMurray, NY, proxy for Sen. Boyle (LA)
Russ Allen, NJ, proxy for D. Chanda (AA)
Tom Fote, NJ (GA)
Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Andrzejczak (LA)
Andrew Shiels, PA, proxy for J. Arway (AA)
Loren Lustig, PA (GA)
Tom Moore, PA, proxy for Rep. Vereb (LA)
Roy Miller, DE (GA)
Craig Pugh, DE, proxy for Rep. Carson (LA)
Ed O'Brien, MD, proxy for Del. Stein (LA)
Mike Luisi, MD, proxy for D. Blazer (AA)
Rachel Dean, MD (GA)
Kyle Schick, VA, proxy for Sen. Stuart (LA)
Rob O'Reilly, VA, proxy for John Bull (AA)
Michelle Duval, NC, proxy for B. Davis (AA)
Martin Gary, PRFC
Derek Orner, NMFS
Sherry White, USFWS
Dan Ryan, DC

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

Ex-Officio Members

Staff

Robert Beal
Toni Kerns
Katie Drew
Max Appelman

Guests

Robert Boyles, Jr., SC DNR
Malcolm Rhodes, SC
Jim Estes, FL F&W
Spud Woodward, GA DNR
Wilson Laney, USFWS
Mike Millard, USFWS
Charles Lynch, NOAA
Topher Holmes, NOAA
Debra Lambert, NOAA
Roy Crabtree, NMFS
Jessica Coakley, MAFMC
Jeff Deem, VMRC
Justin Davis, CT DEEP
Peter Aarrestad, CT DEEP
Patrick Geer, GA DNR
Jack Travelstead, CCA
Dan McKiernan, MA DMF
Mike Luisi, MD DNR
Steve Heins, NYS DEC
Doug Christel, MA F & G
Aaron Kornbluth, PEW Trusts
Joseph Gordon, PEW Trusts
Raymond Kane, CHOIR
Louis Daniel, Morehead City, NC
Arnold Leo, Town of E. Hampton, NY

The Atlantic Striped Bass Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Edison Ballroom of the Westin Hotel, Alexandria, Virginia, August 3, 2016, and was called to order at 1:36 o'clock p.m. by Chairman James J. Gilmore.

CALL TO ORDER

MR. JAMES J. GILMORE: Welcome everyone; I would like to call the Striped Bass Board to order. I am Jim Gilmore; I am the Administrative Commissioner from New York, and I will be chairing the meeting today. Welcome back, LGA folks. You've got to keep on time, guys, you know. We're running a tight ship here. I did want to just acknowledge my colleague from the state of Rhode Island for the phenomenal job he did this morning on menhaden, so a round of applause for Bob Ballou. (Applause)

I was so inspired I offered Bob the opportunity to run this meeting; but he repeated how much fun he had this morning. Let's get into it.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: First off, we have approval of the agenda. It should be in your meeting package; any changes to the agenda? We are going to have one addition at the end. We do have an AP nomination, so we are going to add that to Other Business.

We'll put that change in and seeing none other; we'll consider that approved.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: We also have the proceedings from the February, 2016 meeting. Are there any changes to those proceedings? Seeing none; we'll take those as adopted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Before each meeting we offer the public an opportunity to comment on items not on the agenda.

There was no one signed up to make any comments, but by show of hands is there anyone in the audience that would like to make a public comment on items not on the agenda? Seeing none; we'll move right along.

REVIEW OF THE STRIPED BASS ADVISORY PANEL MEETING SUMMARY

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Our first order of business is the review of the Striped Bass Advisory Panel meeting summary; and Max Appelman is going to do that for us.

MR. MAX APPELMAN: Typically, advisory panels meet at the direction of the board to provide feedback throughout the adaptive management process. However, there were several requests from advisory panel members for staff to conduct an informational meeting, and give the AP an opportunity to discuss a few striped bass fishery topics that are not currently being discussed at the board level. The AP met via conference call on April 29th, to receive an update from staff on those topics.

The first topic on the agenda was the EEZ Transit Zone Clarification and Access Act; so this is in relation to the Block Island Sound Transit Zone within the EEZ. For those who are unfamiliar with the Bill, the current language essentially reaffirms that the Secretary of Commerce in consultation with the commission may issue regulations to permit and regulate recreational fishing for striped bass within the transit zone. Summarizing the APs discussion about this, basically regardless of the outcome of the Bill, the AP does not support the use of legislative procedures to override the current fishery management framework. Back to what the AP was getting at is that they are and have always been in support of fishery management processes that are science driven; that are based on technical expertise, and provide ample opportunity for public comment.

The next item that was on the agenda was discussion of the western North Atlantic squid resource in Nantucket Sound and the surrounding area. Just a little bit of background there. Perhaps, to some of you this might be common knowledge, but squid are

considered a significant food source for striped bass; and Nantucket Sound typically supports large concentrations of both predator and prey during the summer months.

In recent years, some AP members and other fishermen have reported a decline in the availability of striped bass during the summer in that area, and also in recent years, there has been above average harvest of squid in and around that area, leading some AP members to the belief that this increased harvest may be a contributing factor to the decreased availability of striped bass in the Sound during that time.

Many of you are likely aware that the Mid-Atlantic Council is currently pursuing a Squid Capacity Amendment; which both directly and indirectly addresses a lot of the concerns of the AP regarding this issue. In short, that amendment considers options for a harvest buffer zone beyond state waters, south of Nantucket Sound, as well as other measures that address the potential for increased effort in the fishery.

The current timeline includes a public comment period on the draft amendment in early 2017. Moving forward, staff is going to continue to track the progress of that amendment and provide updates to the advisory panel as necessary. Moving forward, you know, again this was somewhat of a unique situation, as it was not board directed.

Basically, just making sure the board is aware that this meeting occurred, is aware of the outcomes that came from that meeting, and the discussions that took place; but in the future, if a similar request is made to hold an informational meeting, the board chair will be consulted first. This should help maintain transparency between the board and the AP and the rest of the commission stakeholders; and is also more in line with some of those new policy changes that went into the ISFMP Charter and some of the commissions guiding documents. I'll take any questions.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Any questions for Max?

MR. JOHN McMURRAY: Max, I recall a discussion about the Mid's Squid Capacity Amendment, and the AP agreeing to write a letter providing public comment in support of a full analysis of those buffer zone alternatives included in the draft amendment. Well, I guess it is not yet a draft amendment, it is just a PID. Is that recollection correct, and if so, was a letter written and sent? Because I don't think the council has seen it yet if it was.

MR. APPELMAN: That discussion did take place. What we decided to go with is for AP members to submit comment during the public comment period individually, as stakeholders interested in the fishery.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Other questions. Ritchie White.

MR. G. RITCHIE WHITE: Just to that point. I think the process would be the AP would bring that issue to the Striped Bass Board and then the Striped Bass Board, if deciding that letter should go, then it would go to the Policy Board. That would be the process for a formal letter to go to another entity on an issue.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Other questions?

MR. McMURRAY: Sorry, Jim, I don't mean to jam this up. If that's the case, and I kind of thought that would be the case during our AP meeting. That may be something the board would like to put on the agenda as a future item for discussion.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Yes, John, we'll do that. That is correct. Any other questions for Max before we move on?

2016 ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS FMP REVIEW AND STATE COMPLIANCE

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Okay, seeing none; the next agenda item is to consider approval for the 2016 Atlantic Striped Bass FMP Review and State Compliance. Max is going to do an overview of this, and just let me say it for the first time; because hopefully, you hear it many times.

There is some surprises in this for some states. These

are preliminary MRIP numbers that haven't been gone through by the TC or anybody yet. I know I've gotten some comments from different states about going into this, but we're really going to reserve most of this for the annual meeting after the TC and the other folks have gotten it. We'll gladly discuss it, but the only motion we're going to be doing today is actually to accept the review. We're not going to get into beating up things, so Max.

MR. APPELMAN: Just a quick overview of the presentation today. We will cover the most recent stock status, status of the fishery, highlighting again that 2015 fishing year, status of management measures; including a preliminary review of the performance of Addendum IV. Then we'll wrap up with compliance and recommendations.

Based on the 2015 stock assessment update, the Atlantic Striped Bass stock is not overfished and overfishing is not occurring. Again, the 2016 stock assessment update will be available for review in October. In 2014, SSB was estimated at 63,918 metric tons; which is below the target and above the threshold, and F was estimated at 0.2, which is similarly below the threshold and above the target.

This is Figure 1 from the report, basically showing SSB estimates through time. The take home here is that SSB has steadily declined below the target towards the threshold level since about 2004. Also, on this figure are recruitment estimates, which are more or less variable across the time series but you can see that spike in 2012, which is likely that 2011 year class.

This figure is Figure 2 from the report; fishing mortality estimates over time. The take home here is basically over the last ten years or so. Fishing mortality has fluctuated back and forth across that threshold level; and in the terminal year has been estimated between the target and the threshold.

Just a quick look at some harvest numbers in 2015 compared to the previous year. These are total harvest, these are commercial landings plus recreational harvest; and this is according to MRIP. In 2015, total harvest was estimated at 1.96 million fish weighing 23 million pounds. This represents a 23 percent decrease by weight and by number; compared to last year, or 2014. Harvest was again dominated by the recreational sector, and accounted for 79 percent of the total harvest by weight. The commercial landings were estimated at 620,034 fish weighing 4.8 million pounds. That is a 19 percent decrease. Then recreational harvest was estimated at 1.3 million fish weighing 18 million pounds; a 24 percent decrease by weight and 25 percent by number.

Just a quick look at the Albemarle Sound and Roanoke River stock; this is Section 4 of the report. This latest stock status information comes from the 2013 North Carolina specific benchmark assessment, which similarly indicates that the stock is not overfished and overfishing is not occurring; and also stock status trends are very similar to the coastal stock.

In 2012 SSB was estimated at 835,462 pounds and fishing mortality estimated at 0.34. There will also be an updated assessment for the AR stock using catch and index data through 2015 as well, and that should be available for board review in October. Harvest from the Albemarle Sound and Roanoke River in 2015 was estimated at 240,445 pounds; 76 percent of that came from the Albemarle Sound Management Area and the rest from the Roanoke River.

REVIEW OF THE PERFORMANCE OF ADDENDUM IV

MR. APPELMAN: Moving on to status of management measures, this is Table 9 from the report showing coastal commercial quotas and harvest. A reminder that 2015 quota does reflect Addendum IV. In 2015, the total coastal quota was not exceeded; harvest was estimated at 1.9 million pounds. Rhode Island exceeded its quota by 6,903 pounds, and that has been subtracted from the 2016 quota, so Rhode Island's commercial fishery is currently operating under a reduced quota.

Same statistics for the Chesapeake Bay commercial quotas in the harvest, again reflecting Addendum IV. In 2015 the bay-wide quota was not exceeded.

Harvest was estimated at 2.9 million pounds; and each jurisdiction harvested below its quota; therefore, no deductions were applied to 2016 quotas in the Bay.

This is a review of juvenile abundance indices or JAIs. Addendum II defines recruitment failure as a value that is lower than 75 percent or the first quartile of all values in a fixed time series appropriate to each JAI. The PRT annually reviews JAIs from six different surveys, and if any surveys JAI falls below the respective Q1 for three consecutive years, then appropriate action should be recommended to the board.

For the 2016 JAI review the PRT evaluated the 2013, 2014 and 2015 JAI values, which triggered no management action. You can look into Section 5 of the report and Figure 8 for a more detailed discussion on those specific JAI reviews. Addendum 3 of the FMP requires all states with commercial fisheries to implement a commercial tagging program; and monitoring reports are due no less than 60 days prior to the start of their first commercial season.

These monitoring reports typically include a summary of the previous year's tagging program, tag descriptions for the upcoming season, as well as highlighting any issues that may have been encountered in the program thus far. In 2015 all states implemented commercial tagging programs consistent with the requirements of Addendum III.

No major issues stood out in those reports, and again, you can refer to Table 12 in the FMP review for a more detailed summary of each states program requirements. A couple slides here on Addendum IV, just as a little refresher. The Addendum established new fishing mortality reference points as recommended by the 2013 benchmark assessment. The results of that assessment also indicated that F was above the target for several consecutive years, and SSB below target for several years; which triggered management action. Accordingly, the addendum aims at reducing fishing mortality to a level at or below that new target.

To achieve this, prior to the 2015 fishing season all jurisdictions implemented regulations projected to reduce harvest by 25 percent from 2013 levels along the coast, and by 20.5 percent from 2012 levels in the Chesapeake Bay. More specifically, coastal commercial quotas were reduced by 25 percent from the Amendment VI allocations; coastal recreational fisheries implemented a one-fish bag limit, and a 28 inch minimum size limit or alternate measures approved by the board through the conservation equivalency process. Chesapeake Bay commercial quotas were reduced by 20.5 percent from that level harvested in 2012, and there was no standard measure laid out in the addendum for Chesapeake Bay recreational fisheries, so instead the Bay jurisdictions implemented measures that were subject to TC review and projected to reach the 20.5 percent reduction from those 2012 levels.

This is Table 7 from the report. It is simply comparing the 2015 harvest estimate again, these are based on MRIP compared to that number that was predicted by the TC this time last year. Looking at the totals in the bottom row there, the predicted harvest reduction was 25.8 percent and the realized reduction was 22.4 percent, which to me indicates really impressive work conducted by the Technical Committee.

The Chesapeake Bay recreational sector certainly sticks out with a 53 percent increase; but I'm very hesitant to make any interpretations from these numbers at this time for several reasons, but primarily because this is a very rudimentary evaluation. It does not provide any insight to the mechanisms effecting harvest in each of these regions or by sector.

The TC will dive into this a little bit more, a much more in-depth evaluation of the performance of Addendum IV. They will look at things like changes in effort between regions and sectors, and again, those impacts from different fishing sectors. Potential impacts from the emergence of that 2011 year class in the harvest data, and any other things of that nature. Again, that will be a TC evaluation which will be available for board review in October.

Another point to keep in mind is that the ultimate goal of this addendum is to reduce F to the target level. This evaluation doesn't provide any insight to what that F estimate is; again, that information available in October. To wrap up the presentation, no states requested de minimis status at this time, and all states were found to have implemented regulations consistent with the striped bass FMP. I'll take any questions.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Thanks, Max, great report. Do I have questions? I've got a few of them coming up. Okay I've got Mike Luisi, then Rob O'Reilly and Tom Fote.

MR. MICHAEL LUISI: I'll take your opening remarks as keep it short, and this doesn't mean a whole lot here. I think Max reiterated that too. I don't necessarily have a question. I don't know if this is the appropriate time. I would like to clarify a few things based on one of the statements that were made in the executive summary. If you want to take questions first, you can certainly do that. If you would like, I can give you my thoughts at this time about one of those statements that was made.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Why don't we just go to questions on the summary; if people just have questions on the summary, and then we'll go back to the implications of it? Okay, Rob O'Reilly.

MR. ROB O'REILLY: Max, a couple times you mentioned harvest reductions, and then towards the end, you mentioned the important reduction in fishing mortality rate. I would ask you whether it is the plan of the Technical Committee to make any estimation on the B2s that will be on the coast, a little bit now, more in 2016, more in 2017.

The reason I bring that up is there was a 680 percent increase in B2s just in Virginia in 2015 compared to 2012. The 22.5 percent is impressive, but I think we need some indication of the expectations of how many of the 2011 year class that were present in 2015, how many are expected in 2016/2017?

There are three different migration rates coming from the Bay. I guess the Rugolo-Jones one is still the one of choice, but I think everyone needs to know that; because it may not be a quick situation with the fact that those sub-legal's are going to be more prevalent on the coast, as they have been in the Bay.

MR. APPELMAN: Not sure if that was a question per se, but definitely will be something that the TC looks into. I've written down your comment and am happy to relay that.

MR. THOMAS P. FOTE: I'm thinking about what happened last year and a question I have. When you bring this information for the annual meeting, could you bring back the wave information to go along with this and the wave data on striped bass? The reason I'm asking that question is because we make calculations on what we see in the last previous four years.

I want to see if all this increase in New Jersey was in the last wave, because we had a fishery with Atlantic herring showing up for 25 miles and things. It is like Massachusetts this year projected what they would catch during this time of year. From what people are telling us, they're not going to catch that; so they're going to catch a huge figure in that two month wave. We call this an episodic event, but I would like to know what the reasons; and that is part of the reason we went over.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: All right, Tom, I think when the TC does their review the wave data is going to be included in that; so you should have that for the materials in October.

MR. WHITE: Question on process, for the report in October the TC will be looking at the effects of conservation equivalency by state and making recommendations on any states that don't meet the conservation equivalency amount. Am I correct in that?

MR. APPELMAN: My understanding is that the TC will make the appropriate recommendations to the board on the effectiveness of those management measures.

MR. McMURRAY: My question is very similar to

Ritchie's. However, I am not clear on what the responsibility of the TC is, as far as interpreting and reacting to the overages, and whether or not the requirement in Addendum IV was to achieve that 25 percent reduction overall, or if it was to achieve the reduction in the Bay; and then also have the reduction on the coastal side. That is my question, was I clear as mud?

MR. APPELMAN: I highlighted this in the presentation. But the goal of the addendum was to reduce fishing mortality to a level at or below the target. We don't have that information yet, and my interpretation is that as a mechanism to get there, that is what the regulations set out to do, is achieve those reductions per sector per region. But the ultimate goal, the bottom line is where is F? We'll have that information in October.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Just to add, John. There are no compliance requirements. We had to hit the coastwide overall target. If a state went over theirs, there wasn't a compliance issue with it, so at this point it is just to hit that 25 percent target.

MR. McMURRAY: That's understood, but if the conservation equivalency is not working, I am assuming we would need to revisit it; correct?

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Yes well, we would definitely talk about that in October; other questions on this? Okay, Mike, do you want to go ahead?

MR. LUISI: Yes thanks, absolutely. I think it ties nicely into John's questions regarding conservation equivalency. When the information was made available for this meeting I got some pretty heavy feedback, or some reaction I guess is what I should say, from stakeholders in our state and also board members here at the commission; regarding the statement in the executive summary that reads that, "Addendum IV regulatory measures achieved a 22.4 percent reduction in harvest compared to the reference harvest level. All sectors achieved their harvest reduction goal, except for the Chesapeake Bay recreational sector, which increased its harvest by 53.4 percent compared to the 2012 harvest levels". If I could, I would like to make a few comments regarding Maryland's perspective on the harvest that occurred in 2015, and just give everybody here, both members of the audience and commissioners, the perspective on our take; as to why those numbers were the way they were.

I went back into Addendum IV and looked at what the management measures were expected to achieve. Addendum IV states in its overview section that the measures were aimed at reducing fishing mortality to the target, beginning in 2015. I think it has been stated, it is pretty clear that reducing fishing mortality was the overarching goal of the management measures, and it wasn't just reducing harvest in numbers.

Fishing mortality is going to be the way that we figure out whether or not we're making progress to that goal. There were also two objectives stated in the overview section of the addendum. One was that the measures were intended to conserve the large 2011 year class that was in the Bay, focusing on the Chesapeake Bay.

The second objective was to conserve the female spawning stock biomass. I would argue that while our harvest increased from that 2012 baseline, we did achieve those objectives; conserving the 2011 year class and protecting the female spawning stock. The reason I can say that is because right now the Chesapeake Bay is in a very unique situation. We've mentioned many times before, and I am not going to belabor the points about how the Bay fishery is different from the coastal fishery.

But what I am going to focus on is one of the conditions that are occurring in the Bay right now that completely separates it from the coast. That has to do with the exploitable stock biomass that we have in the Chesapeake Bay.

Anyone who is paying attention to striped bass kind of has in their dreams the spawning stock biomass graph.

Most people focus on the last 10, 12 years. Their focus is on this steady decline of spawning stock biomass over the last decade. Well, given the

enormous fourth largest in history of the survey that is conducted the year class strength for that 2011 year class. We are seeing just the exact opposite in the Chesapeake Bay.

We are seeing an enormous group of fish growing into what is exploitable to fishermen. By having that condition in the Bay, the measures that we put in place and the measures that are being reported here, and the fact that our harvest increased from 2012, is not an indication I believe that Maryland or even Virginia in that case, Potomac River fisheries, didn't achieve the goal of what we were intending to do; which was to preserve that year class and to control the harvest of the spawning stock.

If you refer to Table 4 in the meeting materials, you'll see that harvest, and I'll speak specifically about Maryland, harvest in 2012 was 262,000 fish. It went up the next year to 477,000 fish. It increased the next year to 583,000 fish. In 2015 when the reductions were put into place, Maryland harvested 406,000 fish.

My perspective on that is had we not put the management measures in place that we did that we could have drastically overshot. There was a 30 percent reduction in our state, just based on MRIP information from 2014 to 2015. Had we not done anything, the potential for what we could have caught in 2015 would have indicated a 50 percent or greater increase in what the potential was.

Because like I said, we're at this point where the 2011 year class is just now, it is recruiting to the fishery. There was a reduction there, although compared to the baseline it is being reported that there wasn't. The trophy fishery, I won't get into details about that. You know we have access to the spawning stock for a few weeks, six to eight weeks a year.

Our records and our reports and our surveys indicate that we reduced as much as 30 percent from the previous year to 2015; regarding our take of that spawning stock, the female spawning stock, or just let's say spawning stock in this case. I wanted to lay that out there, Mr. Chairman. There was a pretty strong reaction, due to the numbers that were presented.

But I wanted everybody around the table to understand that we are experiencing something quite different from what is being experienced on the coast, and we're doing everything we can to control that harvest and mitigate the consequences of that harvest. I appreciate the time, thank you.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Other questions or comments? Rob, I'm looking at you, because I know you wanted to talk; so go ahead.

MR. O'REILLY: All right, my apologies for the second time around. Just to confirm what was said by Mike. I think the only thing we wait for is the Baranov catch equation. We wait to see if the catch was constrained enough. The abundance overall throughout the entire states increased enough that fishing mortality rate dropped. That is what we're really waiting for, and we'll wait for the October meeting.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Any other questions? John McMurray.

MR. McMURRAY: Just a quick question for Max. Those 2011s, when do we expect them to become part of the coastal stock, because it seems, and this is totally anecdotal, that we're seeing them now. I mean there is a ton of 20 to 24 inch fish around.

DR. KATIE DREW: I think now definitely is sort of like the beginning of that trickle out into the coast. I think we can go back and look at some of our emigration rates, but admittedly I think that is one of the areas that we definitely could use some more data on; in terms of the sex-specific and age-specific rates of emigration out of the Bay into the coast. I also think we don't have a good handle on whether the size of that year class would affect how soon they migrate. But I think starting now and moving into the future, you would expect to see those guys move out into the coastal fishery.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Any other questions? Okay seeing none; we're going to need a motion to accept these. Doug Grout.

MR. DOUGLAS E. GROUT: **Yes, I would like to move that we approve the Striped Bass FMP Review and State Compliance Reports.**

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Second, Tom Fote. Is there any discussion on the motion? **Is there any objection to the motion; okay, seeing none, we'll consider those accepted and the motion is approved.**

ADVISORY PANEL NOMINATION

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: That moves us to our last item. We have an AP nomination and Tina is going to come up and give us an overview of that.

MS. TINA L. BERGER: Just to be quick, we have a new nomination from Massachusetts for Patrick Paquette to be added to the advisory panel. He would replace Chuck Casella who served on that panel for a very long time, but is no longer on it. Captain Paquette has experience in recreational for-hire and commercial industries. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Okay, we're going to need a motion for that. Michelle.

DR. MICHELLE DUVAL: **I move that we appoint Patrick Paquette to the Striped Bass Advisory Panel.**

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Thanks, Michelle and that is seconded by Adam Nowalsky**. Is there any discussion on the motion, any objection to the motion? Seeing** none; we will add Patrick to the advisory panel. Congratulations, Patrick if you're in the room. I thought I saw you before.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Any other business to come before the Striped Bass Board? Seeing none; I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: So moved. We are adjourned, thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 2:12 o'clock p.m., August 3, 2016.)