PROCEEDINGS OF THE

ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

SOUTH ATLANTIC STATE/FEDERAL FISHERIES MANAGEMENT BOARD

World Golf Village Renaissance
St. Augustine, Florida
November 5, 2015

Approved February 3, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chairman Patrick Geer 1

Approval of Agenda 1

Approval of Proceedings, August 2015 1

Public Comment 1

Update of the 2015 Red Drum Benchmark Stock Assessment Peer Review 1

Discussion of Compliance Report for Black Drum 3

2015 Spanish Mackerel FMP Review and State Compliance Reports 4

Spotted Sea Trout FMP Review 5

Discussion on the Future of the Management of Spotted Sea Trout 6

Other Business 9

Adjournment 9

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of Agenda** by Consent (Page 1).

2. **Move to approve the 2015 Spanish Mackerel FMP Review, state compliance reports, and *de minimis* status for Delaware, New Jersey, and Georgia** (Page 5). Motion by Robert Boyles; second by Spud Woodward. Motion carries (Page 5).

3. **Move to approve the 2015 Spotted Seatrout FMP Review, state compliance reports, and *de minimis* status for Delaware and New Jersey** (Page 6). Motion by Dr. Louis Daniel; second by Robert Boyles. Motion carried (Page 6).

4. **Move to recommend to the ISFMP Policy Board that the spotted seatrout FMP be withdrawn** (Page 8). Motion made by Dr. Daniel and seconded by James Estes. Motion carries (Page 8).

5. **Adjourn** by Consent (Page 9).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Andrzejczak (LA)
Russ Allen, NJ, proxy for D. Chanda (AA)
Tom Fote, NJ (GA)
John Clark, DE, proxy for D. Saveikis (AA)
Roy Miller, DE (GA)
Craig Pugh, DE, proxy for Rep. Carson (LA)
Bill Goldsborough, MD (GA)
Lynn Fegley, MD, proxy for D. Blazer (AA)
Joe Cimino, VA, proxy for J. Bull (AA)
Louis Daniel, NC (AA)
Robert Boyles, SC (AA)
Malcolm Rhodes, SC (GA)
Patrick Geer, GA, proxy for Rep. Burns (LA)
Spud Woodward, GA (AA)
Nancy Addison, GA (GA)
Jim Estes, FL, proxy for J. McCawley (AA)
Martin Gary, PRFC
Wilson Laney, USFWS
John Carmichael, SAFMC

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

Ex-Officio Members

Staff

Toni Kerns
Robert Beal
Megan Ware
Jeff Kipp

Guests

Virginia Fay, NMFS

The South Atlantic State/Federal Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the St. Augustine Ballroom of the World Golf Village Renaissance, St. Augustine, Florida, November 5, 2015, and was called to order at 11:15 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Patrick Geer.

CALL TO ORDER

MR. PATRICK GEER: Let's get settled in and get started. My name is Pat Geer; I'm Chairman of the South Atlantic Board. We're going to try to get through this as quickly as possible. With the commissioners' consent, instead of braking for lunch as of right now, maybe just go out a couple at a time and get lunch and bring it back in. Is that okay with everybody?

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN GEER: The first item is board consent. I want to change some things around on the agenda a little bit. I want to move the discussion for future management in spot sea trout after the approval of the spotted sea trout FMP review and state compliance, and then do the Spanish mackerel before that. A little bit of flip-flopping so we can kind of talk about all the Spanish mackerel things at the same time.

Are there any other additions or any other changes to the agenda? Hearing none; approved by consent.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GEER: Now on to the proceedings, so the August, 2015 meeting, any objections? Hearing none; the proceedings are approved by consent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

I have not received any public comment. No? Is there anybody who would like to speak in front of the board? Hearing none; we're going to move on.

UPDATE OF THE 2015 RED DRUM BENCHMARK STOCK ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW

CHAIRMAN GEER: Our first major item of discussion today is the update of the 2015 red drum benchmark stock assessment peer review. Jeff Kipp is going to lead us through that.

MR. JEFF J. KIPP: I just have a few slides here to go over the red drum benchmark stock assessment and where we are right now; just a little background on the assessment. Prior to the assessment starting, it was discussed amongst this board that a primary objective of management is to have an abundance or biomass stock status estimate, as well as reference points; in addition to an overfishing status and reference points from the stock assessment.

Prior to this assessment there was not that information available from the last benchmark stock assessment, which was SEDAR 18. There were several limitations noted with the statistical catch at age model developed for that assessment. The plus group in that model was a 7 plus, so all ages 7 and older were lumped into that plus group; which includes approximately 90 percent of the ages in the northern stock and approximately 83 percent of the ages in the southern stock.

This contributed to, as I mentioned, the inability to develop reliable abundance in our biomass estimates with that stock assessment model. Just another note that that model heavily relied in the northern region on tag-based F estimates developed from a publication, and those F estimates were only available through 2005. Some of the recommendations coming from that last benchmark stock assessment were to complete a statistical analysis of the tag recapture data, preferably within the assessment model in this benchmark stock assessment; to inform the fishing mortality estimates, also to fit the survey and fishery length data directly due to sparse coverage of age sampling, especially for some of the older age classes in the population.

Also, another recommendation to develop catch-compositions with survey or fleet specific age samples, age samples were combined over all data sources to develop the age compositions in SEDAR 18. The Stock Assessment Subcommittee, based on these recommendations and the limitations with the last assessment, identified Stock Synthesis 3, a modeling framework, as an ideal modeling framework to transition to for the red drum benchmark stock assessment.

This modeling framework does include a tag recapture model within the model that informs the fishing mortality estimates. Another major advantage of this modeling framework is the integrated design. It has been noted that this is a superior framework for handling missing data over the time series for different data sources.

It also has the ability to fit survey and fishery-specific age data, and also survey and fishery-specific length composition data. This did address some of those recommendations from SEDAR 18. However, while developing these stock synthesis models, the SAS, the Stock Assessment Subcommittee encountered several issues throughout model development that contributed to unstable models.

The SAS did seek external guidance for improving model stability, but this modeling framework has been used pretty extensively around the country and even around the world, but its use along the Atlantic Coast is just now beginning to pick up, especially down in the southeast. This model instability that had been experience throughout model development persisted through a workshop that we had back in June.

At that time the Stock Assessment Subcommittee had the discussion on moving forward. There was work on the old statistical catch at age model as a continuity model. We did discuss moving forward with these stock synthesis models that we were experiencing issues with or potentially scrapping those models and just continuing with the old catch-at-age model.

However, based on those limitations and the recommendations from the last peer review, the Stock Assessment Subcommittee agreed that continuing work on the stock synthesis models was the most beneficial path forward for the assessment and the ability to provide advice on abundance and biomass to management.

We did go to a review workshop, it was SEDAR 44; it was in Charleston over August 25 through 27. Based on where the models were, the objectives of the workshop were modified given these challenges experienced by the SAS. Typically, a review workshop is for the Peer Review Panel to evaluate the models being presented for providing management advice.

However, we knew that going into this workshop the models were not at that point, so we did have some preliminary calls with SEDAR staff and the Peer Review Panel, and modified these objectives to essentially draw from the Peer Review Panel's experience and get some guidance and recommendations from the Peer Review Panel to improve these models to the point where they could be evaluated for management advice. We knew that this wasn't possible within the week we would be there, so we felt this was the best objective of that workshop. As I mentioned, we went to the workshop and the Peer Review Panel did provide guidance and recommendations.

We specifically sought experts with backgrounds in stock synthesis and also in tagging data, which was a major component of this stock assessment. As I mentioned they did provide some great guidance and recommendations. The Peer Review Panel did endorse this Stock Assessment Subcommittee's decision to continue development of the stock synthesis models in place of reverting back to the catch-at-age model that was developed in SEDAR 18.

Moving forward, we're currently working on implementing the recommendations made at the Peer Review Workshop, and Stock Assessment Subcommittee expects to complete this work to be reviewed by the end of 2015, and then to present the results of that benchmark assessment and that review at the February, 2016 meeting.

Just a note here, the assessment report that went to the Peer Review Panel was provided in meeting materials, but just recently I think about a week or a week and a half ago, the individual CIE review reports were released on the SEDAR website; and those can be found on the SEDAR website under the SEDAR 44 web page. That concludes my presentation, so if there are any questions on the assessment, I can take those now.

CHAIRMAN GEER: Are there any questions for Jeff? Hearing none; okay, I just want to commend Jeff and the rest of the stock assessment team. I was at that workshop with them. They were working very hard, diligently at the meeting. Late at night when the rest of us were out to dinner, they were still locked away in the room.

In fact just the other night going up in the elevator, Jeff had his computer running, and it was running one of the simulations. He has been working very hard on this and I want to commend him and the rest of the group for the job they've been doing on that. I look forward to seeing it completed in February, so thank you, Jeff. Moving on to the next item would be the update of the 2016 spot and croaker benchmark stock assessment.

MR. KIPP: Since we've last updated this group we did have the data workshop for spot and croaker down in Raleigh; that was September 21 through 24. That workshop went well and we will be having a webinar between now and our first assessment workshop, which will be in early 2016, probably late January or early February. As I mentioned we'll be having a webinar between now and then to follow up on some of the tasks identified at that data workshop. If there are any questions about spot and croaker assessment I can take those now.

DISCUSSION OF COMPLIANCE REPORT FOR BLACK DRUM

CHAIRMAN GEER: Any questions for Jeff? We're going to finish before 11:45. Okay, the next item on the agenda is discussion of Black Drum Compliance Report, when it may be due. There has been some discussion about – it is presently due on March 1, and unfortunately not all the commercial landings data and definitely not the MRIP data are available at that date.

There was some consideration for moving it back. We have asked some of you to talk to your TC members to see what would be a better date that we could possibly move it back to. Looking at some of the other species, it seems like this spring was rather light; only one or two species are due those months, but when you get into June and July there are four species; so we may be overburdening some of our TC members that may have multiple compliance reports, also, the staff that have to compile all those. I just want to open the floor to see if there are any other recommendations for months we may be able to do that. Robert.

ROBERT H. BOYLES: Conferring with my staff, my folks were suggesting August/fall, so it is a little inconsistent with what you've said in springtime, but by then data is collected; so sometime in the fall, August/September/October is one option.

MR. JOE GRIST: We kind of came to the same conclusion, and I think although the spring may be light you're still in a situation where some states may be waiting to finalize data around May, so that would put June one is the closest. I think August is probably a better choice for us.

MR. RUSS ALLEN: Yes, I would concur with that Mr. Chairman, so thank you. I talked to our

technical folks and although they get busy in the July to September timeframe, it seemed as if we're gathering this data for all these different species at the same time. We would be willing to go with August 1 as a good date.
MR. JIM ESTES: Ditto.

CHAIRMAN GEER: That was easy. Toni, I guess all it is, is a recommendation we move the compliance deadline to August 1.

MS. TONI KERNS: I think if there is consensus by the board then you don't need to have a motion, and we'll just reflect that change in the commission documents, and then get that information out and tell all the states.

CHAIRMAN GEER: There are two other species that are due in August, I don't know which ones they are; but that seems okay then. All right, so we'll move forward with a new deadline of August 1 on that one, great!

2015 SPANISH MACKEREL FMP REVIEW AND STATE COMPLIANCE REPORTS

The next item on the agenda is the 2015 Spanish mackerel FMP Review and the State Compliance Reports and that is Megan.

MS. MEGAN WARE: We have two FMP reviews today. First I'll do Spanish mackerel and then I'll pause for a motion and then I'll go into spotted sea trout. This graph here shows commercial harvest in orange and recreational harvest in green. Total landings of Spanish mackerel in 2014 are estimated at 4.4 million pounds, which is a slight increase from 2013; and commercial fishery harvest approximately 70 percent of this total.

The specific commercial landings were 3.27 million pounds, and the majority of this was landed by Florida; about 79 percent. This here is the recreational sector, so it shows recreational harvest in blue and those that were released in red. The recreational anglers harvested approximately 8,800,000 Spanish mackerel or 1.15 million pounds in 2014 and this is just a slight decrease from 2013.

Florida and North Carolina continue to account for the majority of these recreational landing in both number and weight. The number of recreational releases of Spanish mackerel has generally increased over time and reached a peak of 930,000 fish in 2008. Recreational releases in 2014 were estimated at 490,000. In terms of status of the stock, the most recent stock assessment was in 2012; it was a SEDAR review. It said the stock is not overfished and not experiencing overfishing. In terms of ASMFC management, we are currently under the Omnibus Amendment, which sets a recreational and a commercial 12 inch fork length or 14 inch total length.

For recreational there is a 15 fish bag limit and commercial there is a 3,500 pound trip limit; and then we have Addendum 1 which reduced the minimum size in the commercial pound net fishery to 11.5 inches. At the last board meeting we extended this addendum to the 2015 and 2016 fishing seasons.

There have also been some changes in the federal side. I just wanted to go over the three that I think are the most important that have happened, just so everyone is on the same page. We have CMP Framework Amendment 1, which was a response to the stock assessment. It increased the ACL to a little over 6 million pounds, and this was divided between the commercial and the recreational sector.

We also had Amendment 20B, which was effective March, 2015. This amendment separates commercial quotas of Spanish mackerel between the northern zone and the southern zone, and the dividing line is the Carolinas. Then we have CMP Framework Amendment 2. This was also in your meeting materials at the last board meeting, and it established a trip limit of 3,500 pounds for Spanish mackerel in federal waters offshore of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; and then it

progressively decreased that trip limit as more of the quota was caught.

In terms of state compliance, all states were found in compliance. For de minimis we have a state can qualify for de minimis if its three year average of combined commercial and recreational catch is less than 1 percent of the coastal average. We got requests from New Jersey, Delaware, and Georgia and all states meet those requirements.

The PRT recommends the board approve the 2015 Spanish mackerel FMP review of state compliance reports and de minimis status for New Jersey, Delaware, and Georgia. Then they just had two research recommendations. These were their top two; mostly, it is to get better data for future stock assessment. With that I'll take any questions.

CHAIRMAN GEER: Any questions for Megan? Robert. You have a motion, I'm assuming?

MR. BOYLES: I do, thank you, Mr. Chairman. **I would move that the board accept the 2015 FMP review and grant the de minimis for Delaware, New Jersey, and Georgia**.

CHAIRMAN GEER: It's already up there, do I have a second? Mr. Woodward. Okay let me read the motion. Any discussion on that? We're working faster than we can type at this point; that's great. Move to approve the 2015 Spanish mackerel FMP review, State Compliance Reports and de minimis status for Delaware, New Jersey, and Georgia; motion by Mr. Boyles, and seconded by Mr. Woodward. Any opposition to that motion? **Hearing none; the motion carries,** moving on to spotted sea trout FMP review, Megan.

SPOTTED SEA TROUT FMP REVIEW

MS. WARE: Just hold on one second for the presentation. All right, spotted sea trout, this year this is the graph that shows commercial harvest in blue and recreational harvest in orange. In 2014 total landings were 1.8 million pounds and this is a decrease from the 2.4 million pounds that were caught in 2013. Commercial landings represented 19 percent of total catch and estimated at 346,000 pounds. This represents roughly a 100,000 pound decrease in commercial landings from 2013. North Carolina accounted for approximately 70 percent of this total commercial catch.

Looking at the recreational sector, so we have harvest in red, releases in green, and total catch in black. Over the last 33 years we can see that recreational catch of spotted sea trout has actually had an upward trend, increasing from 1.1 million fish in 1981 to a peak of 8.8 million fish in 2012. In both 2013 and 2014 there has been a noticeable decrease in recreational total catch, with 5.9 million fish caught in 2014.

The recreational harvest of spotted sea trout has remained relatively stable throughout this time series at an average of 1.3 million fish. Recreational harvest in 2014 was 1.12 million fish with most of this coming from North Carolina and Florida. In terms of stock status there has not been a coast wide stock assessment and the PRT does not recommend that one be completed, due to the largely non-migratory nature of the species and the lack of data on migration where it does occur.

There are some state assessments, so the most recent one was conducted in the waters of Virginia and North Carolina in 2014. The results of the assessment suggest that the age structure of spotted sea trout has expanded over the last decade. However, there was a sharp decline in recruitment after 2010, and spawning stock biomass peaked in 2007.

Terms of management were also under the Omnibus Amendment for spotted sea trout, which states a 12 inch total length minimum size for the recreational and commercial fishery, and all states were found to be in compliance with this. Then for de minimis it's the same qualification as Spanish mackerel; if a state's three years average of combined commercial

and recreational catch is less than 1 percent of the coast wide average.

We got requests from New Jersey and Delaware and both of these states qualify. The PRT recommends the board approve the 2015 spotted sea trout FMP review, State Compliance Reports and de minimis status for New Jersey and Delaware. With that, I'll take any questions.

CHAIRMAN GEER: Any questions?

MR. GRIST: I just had one correction if I could to the document. It is minor, but in Table 1 on the 2014 summaries. We manage our commercial hook and line fishery under the same exact management measures as the recreational fishery. All that happened was there were dates thrown in for the five fish possession limit, but it is in fact year round just like our recreational fishery.

MS. WARE: Remove that April 1 through November 30 date, okay no problem.

MR. GRIST: As long as that is removed, yes.

DR. LOUIS B. DANIEL, III: **I move we approve the 2015 Spotted Sea Trout Report and accept the de minimis request for New Jersey and Delaware.**

CHAIRMAN GEER: Second from Rob Boyles. Let's get it up there. Any discussion on this motion at all? Hearing none; move to approve the 2015 Spotted Sea Trout FMP Review, State Compliance Reports and de minimis status for Delaware and New Jersey. Motion by Dr. Daniel, and seconded by Mr. Boyles. Any opposition to this motion? **Hearing none; the motion carries**.

DISCUSSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE MANAGEMENT OF SPOTTED SEA TROUT

CHAIRMAN GEER: The final item on the agenda is a discussion on the future of the management of spotted sea trout. Dr. Daniel brought it up at the last Policy Board about the possibility of having it removed from the South Atlantic Board's purview, and to not have a fisheries management plan. At that time when he mentioned it, a lot of us around the table kind of shrugged our shoulders and said, you know, why not? At this time Louis, if there are any comments you want to make about that before we get into a discussion.

DR. DANIEL: My intent here is purely conservation oriented. My concern is that the federal plan, as it's deemed by some states, is far less restrictive than I think all the management actions that have been taken in any of the states. I think every one of us has more restrictive regulations than the 12 inch size limit.

My fear is that we could get into a situation where, if we were deemed more restrictive than the federal government, we could be forced to go to what is in the ASMFC plan, which would be a 12 inch size limit; no trip limits, no bag limits, and that would be devastating to the speckled trout fishery.

That is my concern. That is the reason I suggest removing the plan, because we like our tailor-made-state regulations, so we don't want to be disrupted in our tailor-made state regulations by the plan. Doing something coast wide is not going to work for everybody. That is my pitch. It is certainly not with any intent to be less restrictive, it is the fact that we're all more restrictive and we could find ourselves in a spot.

I am particularly concerned about North Carolina, obviously and the impacts that would have on Virginia would be extraordinary; probably not impact South Carolina so much, based on the tag data there is not a lot of exchange. But we certainly have exchange with Virginia, and that could have a huge impact on Virginia.

CHAIRMAN GEER: Discussion or comments from other board members?

MR. BOYLES: Just a question, Mr. Chairman; maybe for Megan or for Toni. Toni, what is the mechanism for rescinding or putting in irons the interstate plan? Is this something this board makes a recommendation to the Policy Board?

MS. KERNS: That is correct, Robert. We would make a recommendation to the Policy Board and then the Policy Board, I think, would make a recommendation to the full commission, since we do not have a Policy Board meeting following this meeting that would be action that would need to be taken up at the February meeting; if that is the will of this board.

MR. ROY W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of a state that has very little stake in this particular stock issue. I still am somewhat puzzled, and perhaps a little concerned about basically the South Atlantic Board abandoning management of this species, if I understood Louis correctly. What if something went amiss with this species? Where would we be in terms of taking collective action? If we drop it from our list of managed species, I don't understand what the default position would be other than state-by-state management. We all made the decision many years ago that state-specific management was not the best way to go with species that at least have a potential for migration.

Maybe migration is insignificant for these species, I don't know. We see a few of them up our way. They got there somehow. They don't stay there all year, so there is some migration. Do you see my concern, Mr. Chairman with this suggestion?

CHAIRMAN GEER: I see your concern, but generally, the states are being more restrictive, and the species are pretty much staying within state waters.

DR. DANIEL: I don't know for certain, Roy, but I'm pretty sure that the fish that are going all the way to Delaware are coming out of North Carolina and perhaps Virginia. There is some spawning that occurs in Virginia; juveniles fairly uncommon, trying to find the little guys is tough.

But I think your primary producer areas for the entire Mid-Atlantic is probably North Carolina and to some degree Virginia. If this plan stays in place it is status quo, 12 inches; and we go to 12 inches and no limit, you definitely won't see any more speckled trout in Delaware, and Virginia is likely not to see a huge reduction in their catch. We can certainly; we just created a black drum plan.

If we were to have a problem we could reconstruct a speckled trout plan. I don't anticipate that being a problem. Right now I think we're at 14 inches and six fish with a 75 fish limit on the commercial fishery; very restrictive now compared to what we were. I know the other states, at least the Virginia, South Carolina south are far more restrictive than just a 12 inch size limit. I don't share the concerns. I think the potential fallout from going to 12 inches is far more risky than something possibly happening down the road.

CHAIRMAN GEER: Roy, follow up?

MR. MILLER: Just as a follow up point, I appreciate what Louis says about his concerns about folks dropping down to 12 inches. But clearly, we all have the ability to be more restrictive than the plan calls for. That is clearly what has taken place with this particular fishery; just point that out.

DR. WILSON LANEY: Well, just a suggestion. I know there have been quite a few tagging studies in the South Atlantic states especially, and I think maybe the board would have a higher level of comfort in going along with Dr. Daniel's suggestion if by the -- I guess the way things are set up with no Policy Board meeting it will have to be dealt with at the February meeting.

Maybe Louis, between now and February, we could just have some sort of a table put together that shows what the actual

percentages have been of fish that did migrate from one jurisdiction into another. I think it is very small, based on my recollection of the studies I've looked at, at least. I don't have any objection.

I think that state-by-state management in this case, and even estuary by estuary management like we're already effectively doing for American shad and the other clupeid species is the best way to go. Now clearly those other species do migrate out to the ocean, so there is a big advantage to having a coast wide plan. But for spotted sea trout, I don't see the downside of it personally, and I think Louis raised a very good point about states being deemed more restrictive than a quasi federal plan, and that potentially being problematic from a political perspective.

MS. LYNN FEGLEY: I think Dr. Laney just really echoed what I was going to say. We don't have a coast wide assessment because it is non migratory, so I think if something were to go amiss, it would be on the state level and we wouldn't be able to determine the problem on a coast wide level anyway. I just wanted to point that out that the science isn't really leading us into a coast wide direction.

MR. ALLEN: Not having a pony in this one really, it is more to the purview of what the southern states want to do. We kind of manage spotted sea trout along with weakfish, so we're always going to go with what weakfish regulations are. Obviously, they're not going to change for a little while. I think we're okay with what the discussion is and how it is going around the table.

MR. GRIST: Yes, especially for Virginia. We've been actively managing this fishery for some time, and in at least one case reactively managing this fishery. With the most recent North Carolina/Virginia stock assessment, I think this one place where we do know there is migration and overlap, we have biological reference points that both states are able to manage to; especially with that and the great work that Louis' staff did there. I think I am pretty comfortable with going forward with that.

DR. DANIEL: I'll make a motion that the South Atlantic Board recommend to the Policy Board to withdraw the spotted sea trout FMP. Is that the right word, Toni?

CHAIRMAN GEER: Is it withdraw or transfer management to states?

MR. ROBERT BEAL: Well, I think all we have the authority to do is withdraw. In other words, essentially get rid of the ASMFC plan. What the states want to do with it after that is up to them. We can't obligate the states to take on any management once the plan is gone.

CHAIRMAN GEER: Okay, Louis, can you say that again then, I'm sorry?

DR. DANIEL: **Move to recommend to the ISFMP Policy Board that we withdraw the spotted sea trout FMP.**

CHAIRMAN GEER: Do I have a second? Second from Mr. Estes. Discussion on that?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman I just point out, it may be of no consequence whatsoever, but I would just point out that the state of Delaware, if we withdraw the fishery management plan for spotted sea trout, then the state of Delaware has no ability to manage that species by regulatory action. It would require legislation in the future.

CHAIRMAN GEER: Any other discussion or comments? Pretty quiet. I would assume we should do a show of hands on this one. Need it read, okay? Move to recommend to the Policy Board that the spotted sea trout FMP be withdrawn; motion by Dr. Daniel, second by Mr. Estes. All those in favor, raise your hand. I count 10. All those opposed. **The vote carries unanimously; oh I'm sorry, and one abstention. Any null votes, no**.

OTHER BUSINESS

That was quick. Is there any other business? One last thing I would like to do on a personal note. Joe, this is your last board meeting for your last ASMFC meeting. You have served us all very well and kept us all on track all these years. I would like to give you the honor of adjourning the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. JOSEPH L. GRAHAM: Meeting adjourned.

CHAIRMAN GEER: There we go.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 o'clock a.m., November 5, 2015.)