



Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

1050 N. Highland Street • Suite 200A-N • Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0740 • asmfc.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sciaenids Management Board

FROM: Sciaenids Plan Review Teams

DATE: April 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Discussion and recommendations on the definition of *de minimis* for Sciaenids Board species

Background

The Commission includes *de minimis* provisions in interstate fishery management plans (FMP), which are meant to reduce the regulatory burden for states whose measures would have a negligible effect on the conservation of a species. The Commission's [De Minimis Policy](#) document provides guidance on standards for *de minimis*, but a species board may deviate from these standards to address unique characteristics of a fishery, as long as rationale is provided.

Generally, a state can request to be *de minimis* if the average landings for the last three years is less than 1% of the coastwide landings. *De minimis* states are also exempt from any sampling requirements established in the species' FMP. Other requirements, or lack thereof, for *de minimis* states vary by species FMP. For example, some FMPs do not require *de minimis* states to implement all the regulations required for non-*de minimis* states. The *De Minimis* Policy also encourages regulatory stability for *de minimis* states by recommending FMPs establish a set of measures for *de minimis* states that provide a minimum level of species conservation, prevent regulatory loopholes, and do not need to change annually.

The *De Minimis* Policy did not automatically change the provisions of current FMPs. To change a species' *de minimis* standards, an addendum or amendment process must be completed, unless the FMP specifies a different process.

Statement of the Problem

In the last 5-10 years, several states have experienced reoccurring issues related to the current definitions of *de minimis* for multiple Sciaenids Management Board (Board) species. *De minimis* provisions and requirements vary by species, but all Sciaenids Board species currently define *de minimis* using a three-year threshold of landings and a 1% threshold (Table 1). Notable differences between species include consideration of *de minimis* separately by sector for Atlantic croaker, and separately by stock for red drum.

Several states have expressed concern that the 1% threshold for these species may no longer be appropriate. States on the edge of a species range, like New Jersey and Delaware, have hovered around the 1% threshold, or have repeatedly been barely above the threshold in recent years. For example, from 2021-2024, Delaware's three-year average recreational Atlantic croaker harvest was 1.01%, 0.97%, 1.69%, and 1.92% respectively of the coastwide recreational harvest. In addition, in 2024, Delaware's three-year average Atlantic croaker commercial harvest was 1.26% of the coastwide commercial harvest. However, even if these states have no longer been meeting the definition of *de minimis* for a

M26-43

species, the state’s landings have continued to be relatively very low compared to the rest of the coast. In several cases, a single year of disproportionately high landings, averaged with two years of lower landings, caused a state to be just above the *de minimis* threshold. These experiences have led states to question how meaningful any regulations they implement would be for the stock, compared to that state’s relatively low proportion of the coastwide landings and the time and effort it would take to implement those regulations.

Several states have also expressed concern about high uncertainty in some of their state’s MRIP harvest estimates being used to calculate *de minimis*, which has been used as justification for allowing a state to remain *de minimis*. However, it should be noted that high uncertainty (i.e., a high percent standard error) in MRIP estimates indicates that a given harvest estimate could potentially be much lower or much higher.

Lastly, due to environmental factors that contribute to the cyclical nature of recruitment and adult abundance in some of these species and ongoing stock expansion, it is likely managers will continue to see increased variability and uncertainty in landings and changes in which states qualify for *de minimis*. As a result, the Board requested the Plan Review Teams (PRTs) review the current definition(s) of *de minimis* for the Sciaenids Board species.

Specifically, the Board tasked the PRTs to provide recommendations on:

- Whether the current 1% threshold for a state to be considered *de minimis* is appropriate
- Whether there may be alternate ways to evaluate whether a state is *de minimis*

Table 1. For all Sciaenids Board species, their respective stock(s), current *de minimis* threshold (the percent of coastwide total landings that a state’s average landings must be less than to be considered *de minimis*), the current number of years of landings averaged to calculate *de minimis*, states which were granted *de minimis* based on requests from the FY2024 Compliance Reports, and whether the species’ FMP has regulatory requirements for non-*de minimis* states. Sciaenids Board species do not have any monitoring requirements.

| Species | Stock | Threshold | Number of years averaged | <i>De minimis</i> States (FY2024) | Regulatory requirements? |
|------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Atlantic croaker | NJ-FL | 1% | 3 | Comm: NJ, DE, SC, and GA Rec: NJ | If TLA is triggered at 30% red threshold: Y If TLA isn’t triggered: N |
| Black drum | NJ-FL | 1% | 3 | none | Y |
| Red drum | Northern: NC-NJ Southern: SC-FL | 1% | 3 | NJ, DE | Y |
| Spot | NJ-FL | 1% | 3 | NJ, GA | If TLA is triggered: Y If TLA isn’t triggered: N |
| Spotted Seatrout | NJ-FL | 1% | 3 | NJ, DE | Y |

PRT Discussion and Recommendations

The PRTs met four times between November 2025 and April 2026 to address the Board’s tasking. The PRTs agree the current 1% threshold may not be appropriate for all the Sciaenids Board species, at least without changes to the *de minimis* process.

The PRTs propose several possible solutions for the Board's consideration to alleviate some of the current issues states are having. The options described below suggest either:

1. Modifications to the current definition of *de minimis* or
2. Modifications to the *de minimis* process.

The Board can choose to further explore any one option below, or multiple, on a species-by-species basis. However, the PRTs do not necessarily recommend simultaneously implementing multiple options suggested below for a single species. None of the options below would be suitable as a one-size-fits-all approach for all Sciaenids Board species. For example, the PRTs would not recommend the multiple threshold approach (1B) for spotted seatrout. The options below should be considered on a species-by-species basis, due to these species' varying life history, assessments, and other differences in the fisheries.

Overall, the PRTs caution the Board about the amount of leeway that may be allowed to states who wish to remain *de minimis* despite not qualifying for it, particularly if there are concerning trends with the stock or a negative stock status. If a state has no regulations for a particular species, there is potential risk of a stock being harmed if a state is allowed to remain *de minimis*, when in hindsight it shouldn't have been. For example, New Jersey has fairly strict regulations for red drum (1 fish at 18"–27"), so New Jersey remaining *de minimis* poses a low risk to the stock, even if all red drum moved to New Jersey waters. Conversely, since Atlantic croaker are unregulated recreationally in New Jersey, the state remaining *de minimis* carries a much greater risk to the stock because there is very little protection from potential overfishing.

Lastly, the PRTs recommend any changes to the definition of *de minimis* or the *de minimis* process should undergo review by the species' respective technical committee (TC) prior to or during the development of an addendum/amendment. The TC can provide a recommendation to the Board on the appropriateness of the changes to *de minimis* for that specific species, with the goal of ensuring the proposed change will have a negligible effect on the conservation of a species.

1. Potential modifications to the definition of *de minimis*

A. Number of years of harvest averaged

Averaging 5 years of harvest instead of the current standard of 3 years may be appropriate for longer-lived species, if landings data are highly variable, and/or where it's suspected the stock may be undergoing expansion. If the Board wishes to go this route, this option should be considered on a species-by-species basis.

B. Multiple Thresholds

Under this option, there would be multiple threshold levels, each with differing requirements. A state would need to average a greater amount of harvest (i.e., 3% as opposed to 1%) to be required to fulfill all requirements for non-*de minimis* states. The multiple thresholds would include:

- If the average landings for the most recent (3 or 5) years are less than 1%, a state would qualify for *full de minimis*. States that fall into *full de minimis* are not required to implement regulations and do not have any monitoring requirements (if applicable).
- If the average landings for the most recent (3 or 5) years are between 1 and 3%, the state would qualify for *provisional de minimis*. States that qualify for *provisional de minimis* would

not be allowed to liberalize any current regulations in place. However, they would not need to implement any FMP-required regulations for non-*de minimis* states.

- If the average landings for the most recent (3 or 5) years are greater than or equal to 3%, then the state would officially be *non-de minimis*. If a state meets or exceeds this upper threshold, it cannot request continuance of *de minimis* or provisional *de minimis*.

The PRTs recommend this approach only be used when there are no major concerns about the status of the stock, e.g., allowing more leeway in defining which states are *de minimis* when the stock is doing well. Each year, each species' FMP review summarizes information on the stock either from a recent assessment or the most recently completed TLA/indicator analysis. If the species PRT has concerns about the stock after reviewing the most up-to-date information on stock status, the PRT can recommend the use of a strict 1% threshold for *de minimis* in the following year, which would need to be approved by the Board. This recommendation won't be applied retroactively to the current year's *de minimis* requests. The PRTs discussed the importance of the states knowing the *de minimis* criteria ahead of the submission of compliance reports for that year.

The PRTs recognize this approach may not be appropriate for all species. For example, although spotted seatrout is assessed on a much more localized scale than the other Sciaenids Board species, *de minimis* for this species is calculated for the entire coast. The different spotted seatrout stocks may all have different statuses, making a general recommendation on the level of risk to take with defining *de minimis* difficult. Likewise, this approach may not be appropriate if a species' stock status can frequently change, which could lead to frequent recommended changes in whether to use the 1% or multiple threshold approach.

2. Potential Modifications to the De minimis Process

A. Codify the number of years before a state can no longer request de minimis status

States have been requesting to remain *de minimis* despite no longer qualifying for it, particularly if the state has been *de minimis* for many years and would need to go through the process of implementing FMP requirements if no longer *de minimis*. The species PRT has typically allowed the state to remain *de minimis* to see if this is a consistent trend in higher landings for the state. However, the PRT also usually recommends a specific cut-off where they will no longer recommend *de minimis*, i.e., if the state continues to not qualify for *de minimis* for a consecutive number of years (usually two or three years). However, this process, including the number of years to use, is not officially established anywhere.

It may be appropriate to codify the number of years a state has before the state can no longer continue to make the request for *de minimis* and must begin implementing FMP requirements to be in compliance with that species' FMP. This would make the process more official, no longer just a recommendation, with the benefit that states would know expectations ahead of time. The PRTs recommend if a state does not qualify for *de minimis* for a number of times (non-consecutive) within a specific time frame (e.g., if a state's landings are above the threshold for *de minimis* in 3 out of the last 4 years), the state would no longer be able to request *de minimis* unless there are extenuating circumstances. Any extenuating circumstances would need to be detailed by the state in their annual compliance report for the PRT and Board to review. The PRTs recommend that the specific number of years be established by a species' PRT and TC, based on what is determined to be most appropriate for that species.

If a species' FMP is already modified to increase the landings threshold for *de minimis* above 1%, such as in 1B above, it may be appropriate to not allow states to request *de minimis* if this higher threshold is exceeded unless there are extenuating circumstances.

B. States remain non-de minimis or de minimis for X number of years

The PRTs also brainstormed ideas to improve stability in the implementation of FMP-required regulations and/or monitoring requirements if a state has a history of moving in and out of qualifying for *de minimis*. Once a state is officially no longer *de minimis*, there could be a set number of years before the state can qualify for *de minimis* again, regardless of their landings. The reverse could be true as well, where once a state moves from non-*de minimis* to approved as *de minimis*, they could automatically be able to remain *de minimis* for a set number of years. For example, if the Board no longer approves a state's *de minimis* or that state decides to no longer request *de minimis* after multiple years of higher landings, the state must begin the process of implementing FMP-required regulations and/or begin collecting samples required for non-*de minimis* states (if applicable) for a set number of years before they can be eligible for *de minimis* status again.

3. Additional Considerations

This section contains additional considerations related to *de minimis* discussed by the PRTs. If interested in exploring further, the Board can request the individual species PRT to investigate on a species-by-species basis. These considerations will not be appropriate for all Sciaenids Board species.

A. Splitting De minimis by Sector

The PRTs recommend further consideration of splitting *de minimis* by sector, wherein the species PRT (with consultation of the TC) explore if this change would be appropriate on a species-by-species basis. As previously mentioned, *de minimis* status is already determined separately by sector for Atlantic croaker. It has been a longstanding recommendation by the Spot PRT to be implemented for that species as well. For species like spot, sector separation may alleviate the need of states with a small commercial fishery to make regulatory adjustments (primarily reductions) to commercial landings for a fishery that has relatively insignificant landings while retaining recreational management measures required by the FMP.

B. Splitting De minimis by Stock

The PRTs discussed red drum's recently implemented definition of *de minimis*, which splits *de minimis* by stock. The PRTs recommend splitting *de minimis* by stock continue to be considered on a species-by-species basis. If a species has more than one stock, which are managed separately, *de minimis* should similarly be evaluated at the stock level. The PRTs note that although currently the only Sciaenids Board species with more than one stock is red drum, two separate stocks are currently under consideration for Atlantic croaker through its ongoing benchmark stock assessment.

C. Consideration of Total Removals when Determining De minimis

The PRTs also discussed the possibility of redefining *de minimis* to use total removals instead of total harvest, highlighting concerns with increasing discards for several Sciaenids species. Consideration of total removals could allow for a more complete picture of each state's contribution to fishing mortality.

Currently, consideration of total removals would likely only be possible in combination with separating *de minimis* by sector, as state-specific commercial discard estimates are not available on

an annual basis. The impact of including recreational dead discards on which states would qualify for *de minimis* would need to be examined in more detail on a species-by-species basis, if the Board is interested in pursuing this idea further.

Although commercial discards cannot be incorporated into the calculation of *de minimis*, the PRTs briefly discussed how the lack of this information could impact our understanding of *de minimis*, particularly for species such as spot and Atlantic croaker that have much higher commercial discards compared to commercial harvest. Using only harvest to calculate the threshold and determine *de minimis* for these species may overestimate the impact on the population from states with lower commercial harvest and little to no discards, and underestimate the impact from states with higher commercial harvest and discards. In addition, the pounds of landings at the 1% *de minimis* threshold or 3% *de minimis* threshold for a species with very high commercial discards will both likely be relatively minor compared to the total removals.

APPENDIX I

The figures in this appendix illustrate whether a state’s 3-year average harvest was less than 1% (i.e., qualified for *de minimis*; blue), greater than or equal to 1% but less than 3% (yellow), or greater than or equal to 3% (green) of the total coastwide (NJ-FL) harvest for the years 2015-2024. This information is shown for the combined recreational and commercial harvest (excluding Atlantic croaker since *de minimis* is already split by sector for this species), solely recreational harvest, and solely commercial harvest. Actual values are not given due to some confidential data. These tables depict what states qualified for *de minimis* in any given year but may differ from states that were granted *de minimis* status. For example, some states may have qualified for *de minimis* but did not request it, or were granted *de minimis* when they did not technically qualify for it.

Atlantic Croaker

Recreational

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | | | ≥3% |
| 2016 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | | | ≥3% |
| 2017 | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |

Commercial

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | | <1% | ≥3% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | <1% |
| 2016 | | <1% | ≥3% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | <1% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | <1% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | ≥3% | | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |

Black Drum

Combined

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | | ≥3% |
| 2016 | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | | ≥3% |
| 2018 | ≥3% | | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | ≥3% | | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | ≥3% | | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | ≥3% | <1% | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | ≥3% | <1% | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |

Recreational

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | | ≥3% |
| 2018 | ≥3% | | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | ≥3% | | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | ≥3% | | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | ≥3% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | ≥3% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |

Commercial

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | ≥3% | ≥3% | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | | ≥3% | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | | | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | <1% | | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |

Red Drum

Combined Northern Stock

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|
| 2015 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | <1% | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | <1% | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | <1% | <1% | | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |

Recreational Northern Stock

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | VA | NC |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| | | | | | |

Commercial Northern Stock

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|
| 2015 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% |

Southern Stock (Recreational)

| Year | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |

Spot

Combined

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | | | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | <1% | | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% |
| 2023 | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% |
| 2024 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% |

Recreational

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | |
| 2023 | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | |
| 2024 | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | |

Commercial

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | <1% | | ≥3% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | <1% |
| 2016 | <1% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | | ≥3% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | | | ≥3% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | | | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2022 | | | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2023 | | | | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2024 | | | ≥3% | | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |

Spotted Seatrout

Combined

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |

Recreational

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2022 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2023 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |
| 2024 | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% | ≥3% |

Commercial

| Year | NJ | DE | MD | PRFC | VA | NC | SC | GA | FL |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2015 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2016 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2017 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2018 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2019 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2020 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% |
| 2021 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2022 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2023 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |
| 2024 | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | ≥3% | ≥3% | <1% | <1% | |