PROCEEDINGS OF THE

ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

SCIAENIDS MANAGEMENT BOARD

The Westin Crystal City
Arlington, Virginia
Hybrid Meeting

February 4, 2025

Approved May 6, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF MOTIONS

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Joe Cimino, NJ (AA)
Jeff Kaelin, NJ (GA)
Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Sen. Gopal (LA)
John Clark, DE (AA)
Roy Miller, DE (GA)
Craig Pugh, DE, proxy for Rep. Carson (LA)
Carrie Kennedy, MD, proxy for Lynn Fegley (AA)
Russ Dize, MD (GA)
Pat Geer, VA, proxy for Jamie Green (AA)
Chris Batsavage, NC, proxy for Kathy Rawls (AA)
Ben Dyar, SC, proxy for Blaik Keppler (AA)
Malcolm Rhodes, SC (GA)
Mel Bell, SC, proxy for Sen. Cromer (LA)
Doug Haymans, GA (AA)
Spud Woodward, GA (GA)
Marina Owens, FL, proxy for J. McCawley (AA)
Gary Jennings, FL (GA)
Ron Owens, PRFC
Frank Helies, NMFS

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

Ex-Officio Members

Ethan Simpson, Red Drum TC Chair
Joey Ballenger, Red Drum SAS Chair
Col. Matthew Rogers, LEC Representative

Staff

Bob Beal
Tina Berger
Tracey Bauer
Toni Kerns
Madeline Musante
Jeff Kipp

The Sciaenids Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Jefferson Ballroom of the Westin Crystal City Hotel, Arlington, Virginia, via hybrid meeting, in-person and webinar; Tuesday, February 4, 2025, and was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chair Doug Haymans.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR DOUG HAYMANS: I will call to order the February meeting of the Sciaenids Management Board.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIR HAYMANS: First of all, we need to take a look at the agenda. Hopefully, you have had a chance to review the agenda. Are there any additions? Seeing none; we'll approve the agenda by consent.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR HAYMANS: Secondly, we have two sets of proceedings. We had a webinar on October 3, followed by the annual meeting of October 24. Hopefully you've had a chance to read those word for word, and are there any changes to the proceedings? Seeing none; we'll consider those approved by consent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIR HAYMANS: It is now time for public comment on items not included on the agenda. Is there anyone in that beautiful audience back there that wants to comment? Seeing none.

UPDATE ON BOARD TASKS TO RED DRUM TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

CHAIR HAYMANS: We will continue to move forward, and that gets us to Jeff. Jeff is going to update us on the Technical Committee's reports and actions, and that is as of this past Friday. Let's sit up, pay attention, and listen to Jeff.

MR. JEFF J. KIPP: Just as a refresher, this is the Board Task up on the screen, and some additional guidance sought during the Commission's Annual Meeting back in October of last year. That original task included in the Board motion was, produce the static spawning potential ratio for a range of slot limits between 14 and 27 inches, associated with bag limits ranging from 0 to 5 fish per person, for the southern region and/or South Carolina, Georgia or Florida individually.

There was also some additional guidance requested verbally on the northern stock that included interpretation of the yellow traffic light results, and to determine if there are methods for providing estimates of bag and slot limit regulation change impacts on the northern stock, despite not having a Stock Synthesis model to provide projections.

On the TC's first call to address these tasks, the TC determined that the southern stock task could not be addressed in a reasonable timeframe without a narrower set of management options to consider. If you think back to that task that you showed, a combination of potential size limit changes across 13 inches of spread between minimum and maximum sizes, and six different bag limits resulted in potentially thousands of regulation combinations. The way the task read is that we would go through and determine what catch reductions each of those combinations would produce, and then we would have to run those projected catches through the stock assessment model, to estimate what those catches resulted in spawning potential ratio.

We did talk at the TC about identifying a small set of management options that each state was interested in considering. But the TC indicated that that set of management options could not be brought forth, particularly not knowing how they would impact SPR first. It was a little bit circular in this discussion.

It was also not clear from the motion if the management target identified in the FMP, which is SPR 40% was the goal or alternate SPR levels were acceptable to the Board or the target of the Board. In consultation with the TC, the Board revised the tasking. This came from the Administrative Commissioners from the southern stock states via e-mail.

The task was revised to determine the stock wide catch reduction necessary to achieve the management target of $SPR_{40\%}$, and regulation changes that will achieve the necessary catch reduction. It is sort of the reverse of how the task read initially from the Board. Here we're doing projections of the assessment model, determining the catch reductions needed to achieve the target SPR, and then going to catch reduction analyses with the potential management changes, to determine which of those meets that catch reduction needed.

The TC has met several times since the Board meeting in October. The TC met on November 7 of last year for their initial meeting to address the Board tasks. That is where they developed their request for Board guidance on the tasking, and it was also determined that from that point, despite not having guidance from the Board at that point, we could start working on catch reduction analyses and how those would be developed in the tools to support those.

We did form a working group to develop those methods and tools. That working group met twice, shortly after in November of last year, and then again, this past January to flesh out those methods and review the tools that were developed to apply those methods. Then the TC as a whole met again just this past Friday.

As part of that call, they reviewed catch reduction methods and tools proposed by the working group. They reviewed southern stock projections and discussed guidance on the northern stock items.

Just the details of these catch reduction analyses. The idea here is that the status quo catch that was observed at the end of the assessment time series will be adjusted according to a set of proposed bag, vessel and/or size limit changes.

You'll see that vessel limit is added there, although it was not captured in the original Board motion. But in discussions with the Technical Committee, we became aware that Florida had already implemented vessel limit changes since the assessment, and also some of the other states expressed some interest in considering vessel limits. That was added to these analyses as a potential management tool that might be changed.

Those catch adjustments that are made to the status quo catch will account for dead discards, due to shifting of harvest under a new, for example, a new bag limit to those fish now being released, and then an 8 percent discard mortality is applied to those new releases, which is consistent with the discard mortality used in the stock assessment.

Then at the end of the analysis the adjusted catch is compared to the status quo catch, to determine reduction in dead catch. That is going to be total removals including harvest and dead discards that result from the proposed regulations being put forth. The catch reduction analyses will use the MRIP data from 2018 through the 2021 fishing years as the status quo catch.

The Technical Committee decided on this because there were consistent management measures across states during those years, and so there are no impacts on changing regulations to the catch within those four years at the end of the assessment time period. The analyses are set up to account for additional documented mortality.

What I mean by additional documented mortality is both some observed noncompliance, where it appears in the MRIP data that anglers intercepted fish outside of the regulations on the books, but that could also include things like reported dead discards. When anglers go out, they get interviewed on their catch, and if they threw back a fish due to regulations and saw that it was dead, they could report that as a dead fish, and that technically gets counted as a harvest in the MRIP data. We're using this term "additional documented mortality" to capture both of those types of situations.

The TC reviewed and approved the methods and tools put forth by the working group, and will now

apply these to their data under the proposed regulation changes they are not interested in considering for their state.

One part that came up in these catch reduction analyses the TC debated for a while was the assumption of constant effort. That is a typical assumption in these catch reduction analyses, but the Technical Committee was concerned that there is pretty strong information that effort has been changing.

They did recommend putting forward some sensitivity analyses at the end of this process in the report that the TC puts together, and the intention of those would be to inform the Board of risk due to increasing efforts, and these three figures here just show the observed directed trips, that is trips that anglers indicated red drum are either the primary or the secondary target of that trip by states.

Sort of open circles projected through that observed timeseries in the solid line with circles, is just a linear extrapolation of that effort. The table below shows the change in effort projected into the future years relative to the effort observed in the 2018 to 2021 fishing years, and the percent increase for each of those states.

This is sort of the idea of the data that we would be using for the sensitivities, to give the Board some information on how these catch reduction analyses could shake out, if in fact effort continues to change. But I think the Technical Committee also provides the caveat here that although there are some pretty clean relationships looking into the past, effort is notoriously difficult to predict into the future, because of various factor that could impact that.

Then moving on from the catch reduction analyses to the projections. We'll use the stock synthesis assessment model that we used in the benchmark stock assessment, and we'll project the stock forward from the terminal year. The stock is projected until equilibrium catches are reached, and I'll show what that looks like on upcoming slides. Then we would compare the catch at the end of the projection period under the status quo F or the F at the end of the assessment time series, to the projected catch under an $F_{40\%}$ F level to determine the stock wide catch reduction needed to achieve that $F_{40\%}$ fishing mortality level.

That $F_{40\%}$, it's just the fishing mortality reference point that is associated with the $SPR_{40\%}$, the management target identified in the FMP. There ae a couple specifications for these projections needed. The first is recruitment, how are we going to specify recruitment into the future projection years?

The way this is done in the model is you take an average over a specified year range. The Technical Committee decided to use the full model time series that is used for management advice, which would be 1981 to 2021. The 2022 model estimates, they were made by the model. There were some partial 2022 data, but those 2022 model estimates were not recommended for status estimates.

On the right you can see the model estimated recruitment across the assessment time series in the open circles, and the black dash line shows the time series average from 1981 to 2021, which ultimately is very similar to the average recruitment from the terminal status years of 2019 through 2021, which is that short red dash line at the end of the time series.

The other specification needed is a fishing mortality level. There are two projections that are done here to get us the estimated catch reduction needed. The first projection is we're going to project the stock forward under the status quo F levels. Those status quo F levels are the average F estimated at the end of the assessment during the years we used for stock status, which is 2019 through 2021, and is a value of 0.526.

Then we do a second projection where we project the stock forward under a $F_{40\%}$ fishing mortality level, so that target fishing mortality level, and that

F level is the model estimated $F_{40\%}$ reference point of 0.301. The first figure at the top on the right shows those F levels that are used in the projection years to project the stock forward.

The orange is that status quo F, and then the black is the projection using the $F_{40\%}$ F level. That F has been partitioned amongst fleets in the model. The model includes three fleets, one for each of the three southern stock states. The F is partitioned amongst those fleets according to the relative F amongst those fleets in the terminal years of the assessment from 2019 to 2021.

That is what is shown in the lower right figure with the dashed line at the end of the time series for each state showing that relative F level that is used to project the Fs forward. Of note here, there were Florida regulation changes that occurred in September of 2022. These are not accounted for in the time series used for stock status determination. They kicked in immediately after the assessment time series used for management advice, which ends in August of 2022. The idea here is that Florida would get credit for those regulation changes that occurred after the assessment model time series by applying these catch reduction analyses to show what catch reduction they've already put in place with their regulation changes that occurred after the assessment.

This next slide shows some of the projected quantities. This is a 15-year projection, and up on the top right is the projected total removals from the stock across all three fleets. Again, this uses a constant F level in all of these years, and projects the stock forward under the two different fishing mortality levels.

You can see that there is an initial bump due to a large recruitment estimated in the model at the very end of the time series. As soon as that large year class works its way through the vulnerable part of the population, you can see that catch starting to settle in on an equilibrium. Ultimately, what we're using for the estimated catch reduction needed to get the stock back to an $F_{40\%}$ target fishing mortality level are the two data points at the end of the time series.

We're just comparing that higher catch under the status quo F to a catch produced under the lower F, according to the $F_{40\%}$ reference point. That is what gives us our catch reduction percentage down in that last bullet of 28.7%. That is the reduction you see from those two points to get from the status quo F to the $F_{40\%}$ level.

Below the catch plot is the full time series of spawning stock biomass estimates relative to the spawning stock biomass at 40%. The dashed line would show any time that spawning stock biomass is at its target level. You can see the response in the different projection scenarios, with the black being that lower reduced $F_{40\%}$ target level, where the spawning stock biomass begins to increase into the projection period, whereas, under the status quo F, that F continues to decline.

Those are the projections and then the catch reduction analyses that we've put together so far. For next steps here, the southern stock Technical Committee members will use the catch reduction analyses to determine proposed regulations that meet that specified percent reduction. The TC will meet again to review those proposed regulations from the Southern Stock TC members, and to finalize guidance on those northern stock items being sought from the Board.

Then a final report will be provided in meeting materials for the May Board meeting coming up in May. Maybe for discussion purposes here today, as the Technical Committee has been working through this, there have been a couple of points that have come up and have been debated a bit at the Technical Committee.

The first, and this would be helpful to have guidance on these items, so that the Technical Committee can complete their analyses and know what to package together into a final report for you all to see in May. The TC does recommend that that

additional documented mortality be accounted for in the catch reduction analyses. Again, this is going to be truly noncompliant fish that have been observed, and then also could potentially be observed dead discards to come through in the MRIP data. We're just curious if the Board does agree with that, or if they feel that this additional documented mortality should not be included in these catch reduction analyses, and we should do them as though compliance will be perfect into the future.

The TC recommends sensitivity analysis on changing effort on catch reductions, going back to the slide I showed earlier. Just to give the Board some information on risk, and how these catch reduction analyses could shake out if effort does in fact increase. Whereas for these sorts of baseline catch reduction analyses, the underlying assumption is that effort is constant. The Technical Committee is curious if this is something the Board would like to see in that final report.

Then sort of how to break up the percent reductions needed for the southern stock states. The TC would like to know if all states should aim for even catch reductions equal to that stock wide reduction estimated, or if they should collaborate to reach that stock wide reduction, so more of a collaborative process among the three states where that percentage could vary across the three states, but ultimately, at the end of the day, all three states collectively get to that reduction needed. That is what I have for an update, I can take any questions.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Mr. Batsavage.

MR. CHRIS BATSAVAGE: Thank you for the presentation, Jeff. A couple questions for the Board feedback questions you posted. I listened to the TC meeting for a little bit last week, I had to jump off. But I was wondering for kind of the size limit change analysis to get reductions, did the TC talk at all about just a very fast growth rate of red drum at that size, especially the lower end of the slot. At least in the northern zone they could grow up to an inch a month during times of year, and how that could offset any expected reductions that would be calculated, and after that I have an unrelated question, thanks.

MR. KIPP: The Technical Committee did not specifically talk about growth rates. I think the underlying assumption of those size limit change analyses that we put together are that essentially angler behavior doesn't change. They are going out, they are targeting the same sizes.

They are fishing at the same time of year, and so that those growth rates that are being experienced by the population that was caught in the 2020, 2021 years would be comparable to what they would catch into the future. That seasonality type of aspect would be the same or consistent, so those are the assumptions under that size limit change analyses.

MR. BATSAVAGE: In your presentation where you showed the projections for F of 40%, and recovering the stock, it looked like under the $F_{40\%}$ that the projections kind of just fall short of hitting the target biomass. Is it safe to assume that if the goal of the Board was to rebuild the spawning stock, we would need to come up with like an estimate of F rebuild, which would be a lower fishing mortality to meet that spawning stock biomass target, and therefore probably be a higher reduction, if I understand that correctly.

MR. KIPP: There would be the different level, potentially. If you wanted to use the same timeframe as what we have up here, 15 years, or it could be a longer timeframe at this current F level that is showing here, and it would just be a longer period for that SSB to hit that SSB target.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Ben.

MR. BEN DYAR: Can we go back one slide, just so I can ask a question. Documented mortality and talking about the noncompliance fish. You mentioned in a previous slide that we are going to

kind of look at maybe looking at a different way to phrase that or a different name. In this request, are we specifically talking about noncompliance fish or are we talking about both, the observed and the noncompliance as well?

MR. KIPP: We're talking about both here and it's a little tricky to partition those out. You could dive into the MRIP data further, and basically what MRIP reports are two types of harvest. There is A, which is available for the interviewer to actually see and confirm that it was harvested, and then there is B1, which are reported by the angler as dead. That could be anything from filleted at sea to observed dead, thrown back, they know it's dead, so they are not going to say that it was released alive.

You could partition the data out into what was actually brought back and landed and reported harvested, versus those B1s that are just reported dead. But it is kind of hard to further differentiate those, because there is not necessarily disposition reported with those. It could be all of them were filleted at sea, it could be some of them were and some of them were reported dead discards, or all were dead discards, and we don't know exactly how that would shake out.

It's a little tricky to partition all of that out. But what we're talking about here would be inclusive of both those B1 fish that were reported as dead, and then also true noncompliance, where there is information that suggests that maybe a number of fish well below the size limit were landed, and that is like a true noncompliance issue. It would be inclusive of both of those issues.

MR. DYAR: Thank you, I appreciate that. Follow up. I mean not to go down a rabbit hole. I don't know about, I'm not quite clear on Georgia or Florida, but I know in South Carolina they can't be filleted at sea. I don't know if that helps or not, or makes things more difficult. But I appreciate that. That was my secondary question is how difficult would it be, understanding it is how they are reported is the issue with how difficult it would be to separate those two.

CHAIR HAYMANS: I think we have Marina online. Marina, you are unmuted.

MS. MARINA OWENS: I wanted to say thank you to Jeff for putting this together. This was great, thank you so much. I wanted to ask, has noncompliance ever been used for other species when assessing catch reductions?

MR. KIPP: Yes, so I can offer one example and that is striped bass. For striped bass, you know going back into time different catch reduction analyses applied for striped bass have accounted for this sort of noncompliance issue. There are some nuances for striped bass where they have like bonus programs that some states or areas are allowed to retain fish that are sort of outside of the size limits that are more widely applied to the coast. In their noncompliance analyses it captures that, but also truly noncompliant fish, which there is some indication in other areas where there is true noncompliance. That is one example where another species accounts for noncompliance on the technical side of thing in these catch reduction analyses that then go to the Board.

MS. OWENS: Okay, thank you, that makes sense. Just wanting to make the comment about Florida's concerns with including noncompliance. You know we feel we should address noncompliance through enforcement and education, as opposed to potentially penalizing those anglers that do follow the rules. But I appreciate you answering my question, thank you.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Kipp, I also had concerns over the perceived recorded increase in effort. I mean that 33 percent increase, and that is the most recent three years that you used compared to the long term, right? That was how you achieved the increase.

MR. KIPP: That was the 2018 through 2021 years that we're using for the catch reduction analyses.

The average effort over that period compared to the extrapolated effort following that trend out into future years. That was compared to what we would get from expanding that relationship out to 2025 through 2028, taking the average over those years and comparing those.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Yes, and though I have no doubt that effort is increasing in the state of Georgia, I do know that two of those years were COVID years where effort went through the roof in Georgia, because hey, we stayed open and people were buying boats and going fishing, right. I'm a little hesitant to use increased effort based on those three years, because it does look pretty high. Ben.

MR. DYAR: In that same vein on effort that Doug is mentioning, is there any account for, because the timeframe for the projection's occurrence was 2018 to '22, is that correct, '21. With the MRIP noting some concerns with the FES projections, which started in 2018, if we were to extend that timeline of effort, I don't know if we were to see that increase during that same timeframe. Given those concerns, not to say that it's not important to utilize for use if trying to show some concerning trends or being cautious, but just wanted to throw it out there. I didn't know if that was something that was brought up within the TC and those discussions, and that would be a point of some concern.

MR. KIPP: Yes, so particularly the FES issue with MRIP was not really brought up amongst the TC and discussed. I think there was some comments from the Technical Committee that the relationship that we saw going back into earlier years, holding and looking relatively clean, gave them confidence that those effort data were capturing real changes that were happening.

I would just add that I think the Technical Committee's perspective here is that they would just put forward the impacts of the catch reduction analyses as sort of like a sensitivity and upper bound on what impact that could have to catch reductions, but that the catch reductions under a constant F or assumption would be sort of the baseline that they would recommend. I just wanted to add that comment.

MR. DYAR: Thank you very much, that has helped me.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Marina, your hand is still up. Do you have continued input, questions?

MS. OWENS: No, sorry, just a lingering hand.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Just trying to understand the next step. My TC member has already provided me with a use of the tool, right, 28.7 percent reduction, here is the possible creel, vessel, size. Are we expecting each of the three states TC members, if what I heard you say, the TC members will provide those reductions, those needs to you, and that will be a recommendation from the TC?

MR. KIPP: Yes, so they will report back to the Technical Committee, and ultimately the Technical Committee would include in their report a recommendation of, we believe these sets of management options from this state meet the necessary percent reduction or they do not, and this is what we think they need.

I think that would be the product provided from the TC, and we have not talked about specific stuff like what number of combinations we would be looking for from each TC member, whether it's one, a set of four. We have not gone into those details. But ultimately would be a report back of, these are the proposed regulation changes, these are the percent reduction in catch that they would achieve, and this compares to what is needed from the projections.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Forgive me for my lack of understanding of it. If that then comes back as a recommendation from the TC, then I as the state manager who has that TC representative working for him, has to go back, if I so choose, go back and refute or argue against whatever that

recommendation may be, if it's set for conservation equivalency purposes, if it refutes in any way the tool that was provided for them. Does that make sense?

The TC has developed a tool that our TC member can go back and develop these options. Well, here are a few options that he's got. I as the manager, may not want to use those, so that I've got to come back at this group with an equivalency request, as opposed to being able to do it on the front end. Am I missing it?

MS. TRACEY BAUER: Jeff, you can correct me if I'm wrong here, but I believe you can work with your TC member to propose options that Georgia is comfortable with, so the TC member does not have to operate in a vacuum.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Spud and then Chris.

MR. SPUD WOODWARD: If the TC generates the analyses that tell us what state-specific reductions need to be made to reach the target, 28%, how would we take those and combine them back together to address this third bullet here, if we wanted to collaborate to reach the reduction on a stock wide basis? They won't be additive. I mean it's not like, well, if Florida accounted for 50% of the 28%, then that means that South Carolina and Georgia have to come up with the remaining 50% or the 28%. How would we use those numbers to do what I think we will be doing is that third bullet? I think that is what we'll agree on, so how will the information they provide us allow us to do that?

MR. KIPP: I think we could look at magnitude of these catches. We could add those together across states, and determine if it hits that 28.7 percent, even though each state might have something that is different than 28.7 percent. We can take those catches that generated their percentage at their state level, and add those catches up on both the status quo level and then on the adjusted level, and calculate a coastwide reduction percentage, to see if it matches that.

For example, you know if the states got together, the three states got together, and they were all comfortable with the set of regulations within their own state that achieve different percentages than that 28.7 percent. But when you add up those catches across states and look at them compared to those status quo catches before those regulation changes. If it hits that 28.7% that would be on target collectively across the stock.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Spud, continue?

MR. WOODWARD: Basically, it's kind of like a weighting process, to make sure that they are weighted appropriately, that the reductions are weighted equally to the contribution to the fishing mortality. Right? Okay.

MR. KIPP: Yes, exactly.

MR. BATSAVAGE: I'm going to provide some Board feedback, Doug, just thinking about the next steps you were discussing. This is probably to Tracey, I think I know the answer, but when we come back here in May with this information. In order to move forward through the FMP, then the Board is going to need to take action to initiate either an addendum or an amendment to actually get this into the plan, am I correct on that?

MS. BAUER: I believe so, yes.

MR. BATSAVAGE: All right, thanks, definitely more steps on the way. Yes, since the Board feedback is keyed up here, I think trying to estimate future effort is problematic. I think for the TC to assume that effort could increase, either through more people fishing or just the existing gear and technology getting even better than it is right now, which is way better than it was 20 years ago, should be probably considered when we ultimately decide what management to make.

But trying to have a linear relationship is really hard, especially for a fish like red drum, where effort is driven by availability, and you get these pulses of

good year classes coming through. Then everyone is a red drum fisherman, and then you go back to normal our below average year classes, and it's really just the diehard drum fishermen fishing.

To the top bullet, regarding a documenting undersized, oversized fish, and the reductions are accounted for. Yes, I fully support that, Jeff, you mentioned that has been done for striped bass. I know it's been done for summer flounder. It's, regardless of how much enforcement and education and outreach you may have, you are always going to have undersized or oversized fish, and some people are nice enough to let the MRIP folks measure them, so we can document it. We make a lot of enforcement cases on oversized and undersize and over the bag limit fish. I think it's the cleanest way to do this, and make sure we meet the management goals through these reductions is to account for it at this level.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Before you, Spud, I do know that there was concern, at least from my APAIS person, right. We're measuring fish in fork length, and there may be some estimation there or some calculation errors there, as well as and they also measure in millimeters, when we get to the upper end.

In other words, when I look at 13-inch fish in Georgia, I'm like 7% of our harvest was from illegal fish in a 13-inch bin. But there is concern from our APAIS member that that may not be necessarily the case. It may be that rounding error. I'm a little cautious to necessarily use all. To that point, Chris.

MR. BATSAVAGE: Yes, to that point. That is a good point, Doug. I listened to that part. But thinking about, since there is a slot, we have a lot of fish that are measured in fork length through our APAIS sampling, right at 27 inches, which total length is going to put it at 28 plus, which is oversized, so you kind of get that uncertainty with fork length total length on both ends, which basically shows you are getting fish that are harvested outside of the slot limit.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, just to follow up on that theme. We've been grappling with this. I mean we measure in millimeters and manage in inches, you know, and it just creates this ongoing predicament of how to deal with the uncertainty that that creates. Then the thing about this that also troubles me is the self-reported dead discards, and the fact that they are not validated, they are self-reported.

You're counting on a fisherman to give you an accurate determination of the status of that fish, when it may have gone in the water and been temporarily stunned, but it was perfectly fine later on. But you're just kind of categorically counting those as dead fish. You also are not getting length measurements on them.

How do you assign them to a size and age category? It layers another level of uncertainty for a species where we've always struggled with a high degree of uncertainty. Unlike striped bass, where at least you're getting some harvest of larger fish. You know we're crossing these fish off at juvenile ages.

I don't know that I just totally oppose that, but it gives me great concern when you see those estimates generated by a very low number of intercepts. All it takes is the typical thing we see with MRIP, with one intercept, boom, it blows up and you have a disproportionate impact on mortality.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Marina, I've got you coming up, just hold one second. Kipp, looking at reported dead discards versus calculated dead discards, versus the mortality rate, you use the mortality rate against everything that was just released. Did you look at which was greater?

MR. KIPP: Well, we don't have like a fraction of those reported discards that die and don't die, so it's either an angler will report and say, I threw a

fish back, it was dead, so it should be counted as harvest. Those are those B1s, and then we have those B2s, which we have the total number that anglers said, these were all released alive. Then we used some rate from published literature or other sources to say, we think after this fish swims away from the boat, this number of them are going to die.

We don't have sort of that comparison to make from those B1 fish. We don't know what the starting number of fish that they would be releasing, and then what proportion of those that die to compare to that assumed rate.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Because to Spud's point, not necessarily knowing whether the fish lived or died, it just floated away. It would seem to me that if you applied the 8% accepted mortality rate across the board to releases, you would get a lower total number of dead discards. But backwards way of thinking, maybe.

MR. KIPP: I could add to it. You know there is something that the TC could do. The TC could further dive into these data, and determine what proportion of the harvested fish were reported as B1s as opposed to Type A fish, that were seen at the dock as confirmed harvest. I don't have those numbers off the top of my head.

That is something that we could dig into, just to provide the Board more information as to how many of these fish may be accounted for through this B1 sector, this reported dead for some reason. I heard the comment that, you know you can't fillet them at sea. I don't know the full list of dispositions that might make up.

But I don't know if that is the only other disposition is, if it's a B1 and it's a red drum, does that mean that it was discarded dead, or is there some other reason that accounts for that B1. I would have to look into those details further. But that is something we can provide, is that how many of those B1 fish are in these datasets, to have some better confidence about what of those were reported harvest and what of those were actually seen as harvested fish.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Marina.

MS. OWENS: Yes, I just again wanted to reiterate the concerns with the uncertainty with MRIP estimates. As Jeff mentioned, Florida has recently made management changes to address stock concerns, so we have had the benefit of ground truthing these catch reductions. The model, as you mentioned, estimates a 16.8% reduction or 14% with noncompliance.

With our regulation changes that went into effect, the data two years post regulation changes Florida has actually realized a 21.6% catch reduction. This kind of makes it seem like the model is already conservative enough, without adding the noncompliance, and we feel that the noncompliance is overly conservative compared to what reality is actually showing, and what we've actually seen in our trends.

MR. KIPP: Yes, thanks for that. I would just add the comment that yes, Florida is in a unique situation, as opposed to the other states, because they do have these observed catches post assessment model. There is two years of data. I would just note that there are other factors going into those realized catches.

There are things like variability and year class strength that are going to lead to different catches, whereas these catch reduction analyses basically are assuming sort of a constant recruitment, to generate what those catch reductions would be. That is one distinction to keep in mind with the sort of realized data, and with these catch reduction sort of simulations that are done.

CHAIR HAYMANS: I know that 28.7% number caused a lot of consternation in the southeast corner this past Friday through the weekend. There had been some discussion about additional request for the TC. Is anybody interested in discussing that? Marina or Ben? If not, Marina, you have your hand up still?

MS. OWENS: Yes, I would like to make a motion if now is the time for that. Again, I want to thank ASMFC staff for putting this together, and Jeff, everything was very well done, thank you so much.

But I would like to make a **motion to direct the TC to calculate the catch reduction needed for the southern stock to fish at an F of 30%, 35%, and 40%, just to see what those differences would be, and as well as the projected timeline to reach the threshold and target SPRs associated with each of those F scenarios. We would also like to not incorporate effort trends or incorporate noncompliance.** As I've reiterated a couple times with that as well.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Okay, so I think we captured that, Marina. Do you see it there on your screen? Can you verify that that is what you're asking for?

MS. OWENS: Yes, I can see it. Yes, that looks good, thank you.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Before I ask for a second, Kipp, you wanted to get some clarification.

MR. KIPP: Yes, I just wanted to clarify some of the language here. It reads that we're looking for the timeline to reach the threshold and target SPRs. I just wanted to clarify that in these projections, when we set an F level and project the stock under a specified F level, we are setting the SPRs. When we set that F at that $F_{40\%}$ F level, we are setting the stock to be fished at a level that gives us SPRs of 40%, that target level.

I think what this shows, maybe what the intention here is, to identify the timeline to reach the threshold and target SSBs, like what I showed on that figure a little bit earlier. You see that response when you project the stock forward under a constant F, you see what the response in that SSB is, and how it either approaches or moves away from the target SSB level. I just wanted to clarify and make sure that that was the intent.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Marina.

MS. OWENS: Yes, that sounds good, you interpreted that good.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Okay, we have a motion, is there a second? Spud. Any additional discussion on the motion? Ben.

MR. DYAR: I actually would like to make an **amendment to this motion**.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Go ahead.

MR. DYAR: The motion can read as follows. For the first sentence, I don't know if I need to read the whole thing again, I think it's keyed up well. I'll read it. **Direct the TC to calculate the catch reduction needed for the southern stock to fish at $F_{30\%}$, $F_{35\%}$, and $F_{40\%}$, as well as the projected timeline to reach the threshold and target SSB under each F scenario. These analysis should not incorporate effort trends and should include the F calculations of noncompliance fish, as well as calculations excluding noncompliance fish.**

CHAIR HAYMANS: You basically, we're going to not include effort, but do look at it both with noncompliance and compliance.

MR. DYAR: That is correct.

CHAIR HAYMANS: We'll look at Kipp as he's reading it, to see if it makes sense to you.

MR. KIPP: Yes, the only thing I would look for clarification on here is where it says should include in the F calculations. I think that is intended to read something like, should include in, I think you could leave it as just should include in calculations noncompliance fish, because we're calculating catch reductions and not Fs.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Are you good with that, Ben, I see a shaking of the head, **so remove the F.**

MR. DYAR: Yes, that's fine, I apologize. When you have 30 or 35, yes thank you, I appreciate that.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Okay, does everybody understand the amended? Is there a second? Chris Batsavage, thank you. Any additional discussion on the amendment? Marina, does that cause you any concern as the maker of the main motion, before I ask for a vote on the amended?

MS. OWENS: No, we're good with that amendment. That sounds good, thank you.

CHAIR HAYMANS: Okay, Ben, go ahead.

MR. DYAR: I did have a question, and Jeff, you brought it up, about potentially diving into looking at the differences between A and B1s. Would that need to be included in some way, or is that kind of verbally? Again, I don't know what that amounts to or the task there.

MR. KIPP: Yes, I think verbally, since it's on the record, we can take that back to the TC, and that would be enough.

CHAIR HAYMANS: All right, any other discussion on the amendment to the motion: Seeing none**; all those in favor, is there any opposition? Seeing none; we will consider the amended motion the main motion,** and I'm going to piece it together now.

It should read, **Direct the TC to calculate the catch reduction needed for the southern stock to fish at $F_{30\%}$, $F_{35\%}$, and $F_{40\%}$, as well as the projected timeline to reach the threshold and target SSBs under each F scenario. These analyses should include in calculations noncompliance fish, as well as calculations excluding noncompliance fish.**

Is there any additional discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none; the motion carries. Kipp, is there anything else that we should expect, or will we hear from the TC before we get to May?

MR. KIPP: Nothing else from the TC to the Board, I don't think at this point. I think we're good on guidance. I think there will probably be at least two full Technical Committee calls between now and May, so just an FYI on that. But I think we're good right now.

CHAIR HAYMANS: I'll ask sort of a procedural question. That back corner, we pretty much chat on a regular basis, right. We talk between the states a good bit. I assume that there is not a formal Commission process that we need to go through, in order for us to talk about what are those options, we work amongst ourselves to come up with the solution.

It's not a full process, right? Bob is shaking his head no, so I take that as good. Anything else on the TC report? Jeff, I can't appreciate enough what you've all done at this point. I was hoping we'd have it full by February, then we heard May. But now you've come back with an awful lot by February, so I appreciate that very much.

ELECT VICE-CHAIR

CHAIR HAYMANS: All right, Item Number 5, we need a Vice-Chair. Do I see a motion from Mr. Woodward?

MR. WOODWARD: Yes sir, Mr. Chairman, **it is my honor to nominate Ben Dyar from the Palmetto State as Vice-Chair.**

CHAIR HAYMANS: Excellent, is there a second? Oh, Mr. Cimino, thank you very much, sir, appreciate that. Is there any opposition? Well, is there any discussion on this? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none; congratulations, Mr. Dyar**.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Executive Director, thank you very much for getting us moved up. I think we used the hour and giving back 15 minutes extra, so I appreciate it. Is

there any other business? We are adjourned, thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 2:24 p.m. on Tuesday, February 4, 2025)