

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION  
TAUTOG MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**The Westin Crystal City  
Arlington, Virginia  
Hybrid Meeting**

**May 7, 2025**

**Approved October 27, 2025**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Call to Order, Chair Robert E. Beal .....1

Approval of Agenda .....1

Approval of Proceedings from October 16, 2023.....1

Public Comment .....1

Review Technical Committee Report on New York Study of Alternative Commercial Tags .....1

Progress Update on the 2025 Tautog Stock Assessment Update .....7

Adjournment .....8

**INDEX OF MOTIONS**

1. **Approval of agenda** by consent (Page 1).
2. **Approval of Proceedings of October 16, 2023** by consent (Page 1).
3. **Move to elect Matt Gates as Chair of the Tautog Management Board** (Page 8). Motion Jason McNamee; second by Mike Luisi. Motion approved by unanimous consent (Page 8).
4. **Move to adjourn** by consent (Page 8).

**ATTENDANCE**

**Board Members**

Dan McKiernan, MA (AA)	Joe Cimino, NJ (AA)
Sarah Ferrara, MA, proxy for Rep. Armini (LA)	Jeff Kaelin, NJ (GA)
Jason McNamee, NJ (AA)	Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Sen. Gopal (LA)
Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)	Rich Wong, DE, proxy for J. Clark (AA)
Matthew Gates, CT, proxy for J. Davis (AA)	Roy Miller, DE (GA)
William Hyatt, CT (GA)	Michael Luisi, MD, proxy for L. Fegley (AA)
Robert LaFrance, CT, proxy for J. Gresko (LA)	Pat Geer, VA, proxy for J. Green (AA)
Jesse Hornstein, NY, proxy for M. Gary (AA)	Chris Wright, NMFS
Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)	

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

**Ex-Officio Members**

Craig Weedon, Technical Committee Chair	Brian Scott, Law Enforcement Committee Rep.
---	---

**Staff**

Bob Beal	Caitlin Starks	Chelsea Tuohy
Toni Kerns	Emilie Franke	Katie Drew
Tina Berger	Tracy Bauer	Jeff Kipp
Madeline Musante	James Boyle	Samara Nehemiah

The Tautog 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; Wednesday, May 7, 2025, and was called to order at 3:55 p.m. by Chair Robert E. Beal.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR ROBERT E. BEAL: Good afternoon, everyone. I want to call to order the meeting of the Tautog Management Board. My name is Bob Beal; and I am the stand-in chair for this meeting. The chair was Justin Davis from Connecticut, but he has taken a new job and no longer able to chair this meeting. I am the stand-in chair until we get to Agenda Item Number 6 and elect a new chair. I'll be looking forward to that.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

CHAIR BEAL: For Agenda Item Number 2, Board Consent to see if there are any changes or additions to the agenda that was published in the briefing materials. Seeing none; that stands approved.

### **APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS**

CHAIR BEAL: Next is Approval of Proceedings from October 2023, so it's been a while since this Board has got together. Are there any adjustments or changes to the proceedings from October of '23? Seeing no hands on that we will consider those proceedings approved.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

CHAIR BEAL: Now it brings us to public comment. Is there any public comment on items not on the agenda today? When we get to Item Number 4 and 5, we'll give a brief opportunity for public comment if needed. I don't see any hands in the back of the room, because I don't see any people in the back of the room. Is there anyone online? No, no one on line, so that speeds this up.

With that, I should have introduced the folks that are up in the front here. To my left is Craig Weedon, a Chair of the Technical Committee from Maryland. To his left is Brian Scott, Law Enforcement Committee representative from New Jersey. To my right is James Boyle, to James's right is Dr. Katie Drew, helping out with any difficult assessment questions. That is who we've got up front here.

### **REVIEW TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON NEW YORK STUDY OF ALTERNATIVE COMMERCIAL TAGS**

CHAIR BEAL: With that, and Craig if you're ready, we will jump right into the presentation of the Technical Committee Review on New York's Study for Alternative Commercial Tags for Tautog. Take it away, Craig. Thank you for being here.

MR. CRAIG WEEDON: I'm going to run through New York DEC's Feasibility Study, in response to the reported issues with the Commercial Tagging Program. The New York State Department and Environmental Conservation conducted a feasibility study last summer, to find a better tag for the live market. I put down some facts for those here. The Tagging Program was implemented in 2020. Years of work went into this, and New York was given an exception, and they implemented in 2021, due to the pandemic of COVID 19. The tag is considered successful by Law Enforcement and management, and we've seen that reporting has gone up, the price has gone up. Another fact, the tags selected at the time had to be used by the entire commercial fishery. There was no declaring if you were going to be a live fishery fisherman or the traditional fishery at the time, so everyone uses the same tag.

This assumption that it wouldn't change went into this study. Another fact, members of the live market industry are not satisfied with the tag performance. We've done surveys, and there has been a lot of written and verbal complaints about the tag. The live fishery really expects to have a high-quality fish without any marks on it when they sell it.

The free tags that were tested by New York was the Floy T-Bar Tag, the National Band and Tag Strap Tag, we call it the small tag, compared to the other tag that is currently being used now, and a Petersen Disk Tag. The Floy T-Bar Tag, we had high hopes for this, and during the test they used the Mark 3 applicator, it's like a pistol grip, and it can hold 25 tags in the magazine, and they're about \$50.00.

The Small Strap Tag uses an applicator that is a little bit different than the current applicator. It costs a little less, and it helps the self-piercing of the tag, but it doesn't have a magazine in it to help secure the tag into the applicator, so the tags can fall out easier than the current method. The Petersen Disc Tag, I'll talk about that on the next slide.

New York tested that on a carcass, and they found it was difficult to apply to the operculum without two people or a special tool or assistance, so they removed that from the consideration of the test. In late June last year, 20 fish were delivered untagged in a live container, and they were about 15 to 22 inches, and they were dropped off at Kings Park, where DEC personnel picked it up and moved them east about 60 miles to a holding cage, they built.

This is a picture of the holding cage, it is 64-cubic feet, 8 x 4 x 2 feet in a PVC frame with a 1-inch mesh. Each fish had about 3.2 square feet. That was the density of the study for each fish. The water temperature was measured on Day 0 in the transport tank, and it was 59 degrees. They moved it 60 miles, took about an hour.

When they got to Mattituck Creek, they tested the water there and it was 70 degrees, and so they had a 20-minute acclimation, and they tagged the fish and put them in the cage. They came back on Day 2 and the water temperature was the same. Day 13 it bumped up to 73, and on Day 20 it was 78, and I couldn't find in the report on the last day, Day 30, what the temperature was.

They were put under stress, and that was one of their criticisms of the previous study that it was too pristine for the fish in the controlled environment. The fish survived with no food and increasing water temperatures. I'm going to talk about the T-Bar Tag first. There were 10 fish that had this applied, and it was in the posterior portion of the dorsal fin, using the Mark 3 insertion, which has a maximum depth of 3/8 inches.

Then the needle pushes it through, and it should go through the interstitial rays, and then the barbs should anchor behind the bony structure of the fish. This is a picture of it. These are the results, I'm going to read them to you. I took them from the report and just sorted them a little bit different so it was easier to explain. The tag type, these are all T-Bar, total length of the fish. They are all around 16, 17, 18 inches. The tagger comment on Day 0 was taken on Day 0. When they returned on Day 2, two of the fish died.

They necropsied the fish and found that those two fish, the tag was placed correctly and they were both retained. On Day 12 another fish died, and the tag was not deep enough, but it was still there in the fish. Four other fish at the end of the study were determined to have lost tags. This was kind of saddening for us, to read that.

But I went back and listened to a previous Board meeting, where Mr. Roy Miller suggested, he said you should be concerned maybe about using the T-Bar tag, the Tog might want to eat it. Maybe they did. You know their feeding behavior. Unfortunately, all those tags were lost, which is just, you know we can't have that.

Then the other three fish, they weren't so bad, and it was a minor petechia, a minor hole, a very minor hole. We didn't see necrotic lesions or anything like that. The advantages of the T-Bar are it holds 25 tags. It is a lot easier to tag the fish with the T-Bar tag. Unfortunately, you know, the disadvantage was, even though the tags passed the tug test, inserting you pull on it and they didn't come out.

They were either not deep enough or they were potentially preyed upon. The T-Bar tag cost a lot more than the current Strap Tag. Next slide, I'll talk about the smaller Strap Tag that has been tested before with success. This is to show on the operculum where the tag was inserted. That's how we do it now on the East Coast.

These are the results from the Strap Tag, so three tag misfires. That means that the tagger, when he used the tool to put it in, they knew it wasn't inserted properly, but they left it in. They felt like they didn't want to take it out and reinsert. Two of those fish lost their tags, and there were signs of healing, because they didn't see the hole in the fish.

But losing those tags was probably preventable if they reapplied the tag. The third misfire, the tag stayed in and there was minor gill damage and a tag hole. Then the remaining seven tags, no comment from the tagger, and they showed minor gill damage and a tag hole. Typical gill damage and a tag hole. I have a picture of typical gill damage after this.

Some gill damage, redness, gill damage, a wound, tag hole. No lesions necrotic skins and this was after 30 days. Inside the yellow circle you can see a little piece of the gill that has come off, right where the tag rests. That was one of the worst pictures from the study. The pros and cons. The advantage was that you could tell that the tag misfired or didn't lock in when it was applied.

Maybe best practices would be to reapply the tag. These smaller tags were less expensive; they are about 40% less than the current tag and there is a smaller tag hole. The disadvantage is everyone has got to buy a new applicator, there is no locking mechanism for the tag to seat in, and it still does create a hole that is susceptible to bacteria. You know all tags do that. These are the recommendations from New York DEC. Given the problems they encountered with the smaller Strap Tag and the

T-Bar Tag, this study did not find a viable alternative to the current tag. They also discussed with the industry members that the cost will go up using the T-Bar Tag, and they weren't willing to absorb the cost. New York DEC is going to pause efforts right now to conduct another study until a better tag comes out or better technology. Then that concludes by brief.

CHAIR BEAL: Great, thank you, Craig. Any questions for Craig on the New York DEC Alternate Tag Study? Jason.

DR. JASON McNAMEE: Thanks, Craig, good report, appreciate it. Maybe this isn't a question for you. I'll direct it at you, but maybe it is a question for New York. You know the point of all of this was to see if we could find, you know people weren't happy about the tag we were using in the other states and New York, so we said if you can find a viable alternative, you know we're all interested in finding something that works better.

You know we could think about that. We did the study, it sounds like there wasn't a viable alternative, so does that like kind of end it until something new comes along for the state of New York, or is there like something else that is going to come along. Just curious as to whether we're moving forward or if there is some other process that is going to happen at this point.

MR. WEEDEN: Well, looking at the website for National Band and Tag, I noticed they have aluminum tags now, which could work, or maybe a lip tag. Even the small tag had problems at the very beginning, because the requirement for the number of tags New York requested was 200,000, so we had to have a space on the tag to fit all those, right?

James and I worked through with a smaller tag they could shift from numeric designators in the front to alphabetic, so that would give you 26 possible numbers instead of 10 and 9. I know there was talk about possibly creating a budget and looking at other alternatives, maybe. I've been thinking through it. It would be really hard to have a separate tag just for the live market, because I think

fishermen provide to both markets, the live and the traditional. We should try to figure something out.

CHAIR BEAL: Jason, you have a follow up? It's all right, we'll go to Jesse then come back to you.

MR. JESSE HORNSTEIN: Just to respond to Jay. From New York's perspective, you know as of now the current tag is what we're going to move forward with. We don't have staff time to continue to test different tags. However, if there is something that comes about that is some new tag that's developed or something that is new that wasn't discovered before, you know we're still willing to test tags that meet the goals of the fishery management plan. But they also have to be cost effective to the masses. That is another factor you need to consider as well.

CHAIR BEAL: Great, thanks, Jesse. I'll go to Jason and then Dan.

DR. McNAMEE: No, that sounds good. Just thank you both, Craig and Jesse. From my perspective, yes, I thought this approach was good. You know I would be supportive of, if something new comes up and we want to do something systematic like this again, I'm supportive of that, just to sort of offer that for the record.

MR. WEEDEN: There was discussion in previous meetings to have fish tagged at the holding facility for where they all are, and then monitor them every two weeks. But I think the fish that look really bad are the ones that are held for a long time. I think it's encouraging to see that when a tag is not in the fish it does heal quickly.

CHAIR BEAL: Dan.

MR. DANIEL McKIERNAN: Thank you, Craig, good report. Do you have a sense of what the expectation is on the part of the dealers, how long they want to hold the fish and what kind of

density and what temperatures? Because it seems to me those are the three factors that are probably contributing to the injury and the mortality or the reduced marketability. What are the needs?

MR. WEEDEN: My impression is, the ones that are complaining the most really don't want the fish to have any marks on them at all for the live market. It's a premium fish with high standards.

MR. McKIERNAN: Sorry, I'll repeat the question, what are the needs? What do they want?

MR. WEEDEN: I know we talked about a white paper to be developed. It took us a while to get a handle on how many live fish people in business there are, and it is not required on a compliance report or anything like that. It's difficult to get your arms around it. I think we were all a little bit surprised about the depth of the live fishery market that has come to surface over time.

MR. McKIERNAN: If I could follow up. You know I'll confess that I was probably the main person pushing for this. In Massachusetts we have a 60,000-pound quota, which is comparable to Rhode Islands with a 16-inch minimum size it's about a 3, 3.5, 4-pound fish. We are selling about 20,000 tautog, and so we feel we've got a pretty good handle on that. We're seeing stock growth.

We don't feel at this time that the commercial fishery and/or any poaching or unreported catch is subverting the recovery of this stock or the growth of the stock. Bottom line, I'm rather pleased with how we're managing tautog now. Our fishery doesn't open until September, and so we've got cooler temperatures there that maybe with the New York fishery being operated during the summer.

Maybe that might be adding to the stress that the fish are under. But I was interested to hear, I'm thinking back to five years ago. A program like this does just what you said, it actually creates a level of accountability and opens our eyes to how many fish are actually being caught, and where they are going. We had huge poaching problems; we would find

trucks with like 1,000 live fish heading to New York. There were a whole lot of good reasons why we went down this road. I personally think that the overall stock status, I know there are many stock-lets within this fishery. I think they've really benefited, and I'm really pleased that we're going to continue with tagging with this level of accountability.

CHAIR BEAL: I think one of the "needs" that varies is how long they keep the fish and how long they want to keep the fish. But I don't know the answer to it. Are there hands over on this side? Yes, Roy.

MR. ROY W. MILLER: Craig, appreciate you taking the time to share these results with us. Could I ask a question concerning the original Strap Tag, which is a larger tag? In this particular experiment, no fish were set out with the tag that you previously deployed that was legal to use, is that correct? In other words, they weren't serving as a control.

MR. WEEDEN: Right, there was no current tag applied. It's been mentioned before at other meetings that the control could just be the other side of the fish that wasn't tagged, and showed no lesions. But there weren't 10 or 20 fish in there without tags in them. I mean, of course, that would be ideal. Did that answer your question?

MR. MILLER: I'm groping for the conclusion. The conclusion of this study is that it was not worth changing the tag. In other words, the lower rate of necrosis that we hoped for with a smaller tag, your results showed that the gill damage wasn't appreciably different than it was with the larger Strap Tag, or am I not correct in assuming that?

MR. WEEDEN: Right, that's what New York came up with. But I think there may be other concerns too, with the applicator and putting the numbers on, the state, the year, the number on the tag as well, and then having everyone buy a new applicator. That might

have gone into their conclusion. But I don't think personally, I didn't think the results are that bad from the smaller tag study.

MR. MILLER: But apparently the results weren't effective enough for you to change what you are going to require in the way of tagging, am I right?

MR. WEEDEN: Right, it would be status quo. Personally, I wouldn't see an issue if someone would rather use a smaller tag, but it gets complicated with the administration of the program.

MR. MILLER: Do you feel like you sufficiently addressed at this point the handlers concern over the amount of necrosis they were seeing in their holding tanks, caused by the original Strap Tag? Do you feel like you addressed their concerns or not? I'm just curious.

MR. WEEDEN: No, because we lost tags, the fish died. I think having a side-by-side with industry with different tags would be more beneficial. Like it's really hard to keep a fish alive for 90 days, but the industry could do that and provide access in monitoring them. I mean I think that would be a way ahead. We really want to help them.

MR. MILLER: I know you do. Thank you.

CHAIR BEAL: Yes, Mike Luisi and then I think Jesse may have had his hand up.

MR. MICHAEL LUISI: This is a simple question, it's kind of getting away from the science part of it, just for a better understanding from my perspective. These fish are going to be served as a meal, right? That is the intent, right, they are kept alive. The scratches on the gill plate and the holes, how does that cause a problem with the sale of the fish for food?

Is it because of the appearance? Is it presented to the person purchasing it? Do they buy it and then eat it right away? Do they buy it and put it in a cooler of water and take it home? There is just a lot

I don't understand about the live market and how, is it in a restaurant, where the fish are in tanks?

Just not quite sure why it's so important that it doesn't fester a little bit, it's a hole in something, and if it festers a bit it is going to die relatively soon and be served as a meal. Maybe you can offer, or somebody that has the fishery that knows how they work can help me understand that.

MR. WEEDEN: I think the traditional practice came from countries that didn't have a lot of refrigeration, so you keep fish alive to show that they're healthy, and you don't have to refrigerate them. Yes, it's like buying a lobster out of the tank. Do you want to buy the one that has shell disease? Probably not.

If you're the middleman, you're probably not going to want to take on fish that have blemishes and put them in your tank, because they are expensive. I think they're up to like \$4.50 a pound, and they were used to occasions. I think it's a valid concern, it's just how far can we go to find a tag that is going to work in captivity over 30 days?

CHAIR BEAL: I think Eric had a comment on the marketability of these fish.

MR. ERIC REID: You touched on it. It's an ornamental like big occasion fish, and they're served whole. It's an Asian kind of thing, Chinese, I think. But you know you walk by the restaurant and they are all swimming in the tank. You are exactly right; nobody wants the one that's laying on its side in the bottom of the tank. Nobody is buying that.

But it is not like they are filleted, they are served whole, so that is a big thing. Honestly, the real problem here is not the tag, it is how long these guys keep tautog in a swimming pool in their basement, because the price peaks at certain times of the year, because of holidays or

whatever it may be. The fishery closes, I think 30 days is amateur hour.

They hold those fish a long time, because when the season ends, they have to hold them until a month, two months, who knows how long? Literally, in your basement with a little swimming pool in it. The shape of the tank, this means a lot. Usually it's a round tank, because a rectangle tank like that the fish get stuck in a corner.

They actually swim to the corner and they get stuck in the corner, then they hurt themselves from being in a corner. Because a round tank they swim around and then they don't get hurt. There is a lot to it, but I think the real problem is the time between the end of the season and the market peak. That is the real problem, it's not the tag, it's just the time. You are not going to solve that; you're not going to make anybody happy. I'm good with the way things are now, but the seller has got to be able to take care of his fish, so he supplies the market with what he wants.

CHAIR BEAL: Good, thanks, Eric. I had Jesse, and then I think Rich, you had your hand up as well.

MR. HORNSTEIN: I was just going to respond quick to Roy about the smaller tags. Yes, some of the issues with the misfiring is why it wasn't looked at further. But before we would consider changing tag or moving along that path, you know we want to make sure a tag was tested, you know in a facility, in a holding tank that a fisherman has, to make sure that the lesions don't show up there. You know not just in our experimental kind of set up, so we would want to see it actually in the market, to make sure that they are not seeing the same issues that they see now.

CHAIR BEAL: Rich, go ahead, please.

MR. RICHARD WONG: Thank you, Jesse, that actually helps with my question. What I was curious about, what are the industry holding practices, because this study is informative, but I feel like if they are in high densities in a closed recirculating system with not much water volume, it doesn't'

matter what tag you have in there, you are going to have lesions and infections. But these animals were held in situ at the dock. I agree with Eric and Jesse, it would have to be tested in conditions similar to how the industry actually is holding these fish.

CHAIR BEAL: I think that is all the hands I saw. I guess the question for the Board is, is everyone comfortable with status quo with the understanding that if a new tag type comes along and there is time and/or resources, financial resources to do some more studies on this, then we'll go down that road and study the alternate tags, should there be an opportunity to do that.

Is everybody comfortable with that, or is that kind of where we are? I see no objections and a lot of heads nodding yes, so we'll accept that as the plan moving forward. We'll keep an eye on this and see where it goes. With that we'll get to Agenda Item Number 5, which is, Dr. Drew will give an update on the Tautog Stock Assessment, please, Katie.

**PROGRESS UPDATE ON THE 2025 TAUTOG STOCK ASSESSMENT UPDATE**

DR. KATIE DREW: This will be a much shorter update than the previous stock assessment update I gave at the last meeting. Yes, we have formed the Stock Assessment Subcommittee. I think you guys approved that over e-mail, and we have good representation in all regions. There are several people who are sort of new to the ASMFC process, like new hires and newly involved in the SAS.

We're really excited to get them onboard and into the process, and learning and bringing new fresh blood to this SAS and hopefully to future SASs, so we are meeting regularly to discuss data processing as we move forward with the assessment. We have data through 2023 submitted, and the deadline for the 2024 data is May 16.

Hopefully we should have all of our data soon, and can move into the data processing and modeling components, so that we can present this to everyone at the October meeting of this year. Obviously, I think maybe the one thing we talked about as a TC that you guys maybe have thought through already, maybe not, is the fact that we will not have the newly calibrated MRIP data as part of this, because this assessment will be completed this year, and the new estimates are not scheduled to come out until basically, this time next year.

The TC did talk about this briefly, and we feel that given the potential for delays in that MRIP calibration, and kind of how long its been since this species has had an assessment update, that it's really not worth it to try to wait out that process, especially given that we don't really know that things are going to be available next year at this time anyway, to keep us on tack, for even a one year delay.

But maybe that is just something you guys would want to think about is, we will not be having that calibrated data included in this assessment. I think that is something we would look for though for the next benchmark assessment. But yes.

CHAIR BEAL: Are there any magnets involved?

DR. DREW: Not to my knowledge.

CHAIR BEAL: Better that way. Questions, I've got Joe and then Dan.

MR. JOE CIMINO: Katie, it's been a while since I was part of this, but are all the regional assessments doing something similar, or are they still kind of based on the data available you have maybe different models. One of the things I'm just curious about when you mention this is, how much can we kind of interpret? Some of these are pretty simplistic. If we see the changes in catch to say, maybe this particular assessment should be rerun, based on the fact there was a change in catch, or we could just make some assumptions.

DR. DREW: All the regional assessments use AFAC, so we are using the same model in all of the regions. All of the regions except the DelMarVa Region have fishery independent and fishery dependent indices in them. The DelMarVa Region only has a fishery dependent CPUE at this point, the MRIP index.

I think we can definitely maybe do a sensitivity run around something like; everybody is throwing this 30% reduction out across the board. We can look at maybe what is the potential impact of, if catch is lower or if effort is lower, what is the impact of that on the assessment and on stock status.

Generally, in the past we've just seen with the MRIP changes you sort of scale everything, but it doesn't really affect status, and so we would likely expect something similar in this case, but we can look into that any maybe provide guidance to the Board about, we're right on the edge with this region, but this region we're pretty confident about where we are, at part of the results.

CHAIR BEAL: All set, Joe. Dan.

MR. McKIERNAN: Katie, a few minutes ago Craig had mentioned that the tagging program actually creates a new level of accountability, or it reveals the scale of the commercial fishery, which is great. Are you seeing that in the early assessments that because of the better enumeration of commercial landings, and I'm not suggesting there is a growth in that sector, it is just more accounted for. Is that part of the story that will be coming out in the assessment?

DR. DREW: I think we'll definitely be looking at or reporting on those trends in commercial landings, which we have seen an increase, especially in New York, which does have a very, probably the most robust commercial fishery out of all of these regions. Obviously, it's hard to tease out how much of that is better reporting versus increased effort or increased catch rate.

It's also hard to sort of hindcast how much we might have been missing in the past. But I will say, obviously, the dominant fishery for all of these regions is the recreational fishery. A small increase in the commercial due to better reporting, is not going to have a huge impact on the final assessment results.

CHAIR BEAL: Other questions for Katie. All right, seeing none, for those of you tracking along this week, there is going to be a number of stock assessment presentations at the annual meeting for at least lobster, menhaden and tautog. I don't know if there are any others. That is probably enough and then some.

Be prepared, the annual meeting is going to be pretty tech heavy, and a lot of important results come out at that meeting. Seeing no other hands that brings us to Agenda Item Number 6, which is the election of a Vice Chair. Sorry, I'm sorry, a Chair, an actual Chair. Jason McNamee.

DR. McNAMEE: Yes, I have a motion, Mr. Chair. I **move to elect Matt Gates from the great state of Connecticut as the next Board Chair for the Tautog Management Board.**

CHAIR BEAL: Thank you, Jason, is there a second to that motion? Mike Luisi, thank you. **Are there any objections to electing Matt Gates as the Chair of the Tautog Management Board?** You are not getting off that easy, Joe. **I see no objections, congratulations, Matt,** appreciate it. That brings us to Other Business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR BEAL: Is there anything else to come before the Menhaden Management Board. Oh my gosh, I'm brainless, Tautog Management Board. Seeing none; any hands online. Seeing no one in the room or online, we are going to **close the Tautog Management Board and thank you all.**

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m. on Wednesday, May 7, 2025)