Maryland DNR Spring Meeting of the Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission(SFAC)

Tuesday, April 25, 2017

Held at theTawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland

Maryland DNR Spring Meeting of the Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission

April 25, 2017

SFAC Members Present:

Phil Langley, Vice Chair

Micah Dammeyer
Rachel Dean
Mark DeHoff
Jim Gracie
Dr. Ray P. Morgan II
John Neely
Ed O'Brien
David Sutherland
Roger Trageser
James Wommack

Maryland DNR Fisheries Service

David Blazer Paul Genovese

Maryland DNR Spring Meeting of the Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission

April 25, 2017

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

	Page
Welcome and Announcements by Phil Langley, Vice Chair, SFAC	
and Dave Blazer, Director	
MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services	5
NRP Activity Report and Priorities	
by Lt. Tim Grove	1.0
MD DNR NRP	10
Questions and Answers	16
Marine Recreation Information Program (MRIP) Update by Dr. Linda Barker	
MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services	27
Questions and Answers	31
Policy Program	
by Sarah Widman	4.0
MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services	4 9
Black Bass Advisory Subcommittee Report	
by Commissioner Roger Trageser	57
Questions and Answers	65
Muskellunge and Northern Pike	
by John Mullican	67
MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services	6 /
Questions and Answers	83
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Classification Update	
by Commissioner Jim Gracie	84
Monitoring and Assessment Topics by Mike Luisi	
MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services	87
ASMFC/ MAFMC Updates and Announcements	88
Ouestions and Answers	95

$\underline{I} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{D} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{X} \ (continued)$

	Page
Finalize Yellow Perch FMP	102
Questions and Answers	104
MOTION	114
MOTION	116
MOTION	126
Catch and Release Tournament Request	129
Questions and Answers	131
MOTION	132
Coastal Forum Update	133
Public Comment	135

1	<u>AFTERNOON SESSION</u>
2	(2:00 p.m.)
3	Welcome and Announcements
4	by Phil Langley, Vice Chair, SFAC
5	and Dave Blazer, Director, MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services
6	MR. LANGLEY: All right, if I can have everybody's
7	attention, we would like to bring the Sport Fish Advisory
8	meeting to order. I am filling in for Dave Sikorski, who was
9	our chair. And you can go into more details, I guess. Dave
10	resigned his position due to a conflict of interest, I guess.
11	He had to register as a lobbyist with his new position with
12	the CCA. And I can tell you I miss him already.
13	(Laughter)
14	MR. LANGLEY: So, you know, Dave is a terrific guy
15	and did a terrific job, and there may be a possibility of him
16	coming back to the commission, which would be great. Until
17	that, I will act as chair for Dave until probably the June
18	meeting.
19	MR. BLAZER: And I will just take it from there,
20	because there are a couple things going along. Phil has
21	articulated Dave Sikorski's situation but several of you, your
22	terms are expiring June 30 of this year. So if you are
23	interested in continuing on, you are going to need to reapply
24	to the Appointments Office.

It is a new process now for applications through the

1.3

2.0

2.4

Appointments Office. Paul is going to send everybody here in the next couple days the link where you have to go on and fill out the application. There is a scroll-down screen where you are going to have to go on put Sport Fish Advisory Committee and check that box or click on it and fill out all the information.

We are also going to promote and advertise if other people want to join so we have get pool of applicants. The Appointments Office will get that list of people together. We will see it and provide some recommendations and comments, like if you have been on SFAC or TFAC in years past. So you have to go through that process before June 30.

And really quick, the people whose seats expire are Dave Sikorski, Ed O'Brien, Mark DeHoff, Roger Trageser, Micah, Val Lynch, the new David Sutherland, Jim Gracie and Tim Smith, who also resigned earlier.

We have had a couple resignations. Not only Dave Sikorski but also Tim Smith resigned and Rob Hardy resigned a couple weeks ago. So we have some replacements. But since term for about half of you is coming up, we will try to do all this over the next couple weeks, months. And then our July meeting or the meetings after July, we will get reorganized with the new chair and new vice chair, et cetera.

I have talked to Phil. Hopefully he will fill -- we have only got one more meeting in June before that time. And

we will go from there at that point as far as our structure if that is agreeable with everybody. 3 MR. LANGLEY: And thanks to Dave, if you have a comment you would like to make on any subject today, please 4 5 just put your card up on edge. That way, we can recognize you 6 and won't miss any hands. Thank you. 7 MR. BLAZER: Continuing on --8 MR. GRACIE: Do we have a card somewhere for Ray Morgan? 9 10 MR. GENOVESE: Yes, I have got them. 11 MR. BLAZER: I also want to welcome Dave Sutherland. 12 It may sound like a repeat. I have to tell you we made a 1.3 mistake here. There are two Dave Sutherlands that live in 14 Queenstown that both applied. They both applied for a seat on 15 sport fish. 16 The Appointments Office designated this David 17 Sutherland, and we welcome and thank you for being here and 18 sorry for the confusion. And we had contacted the other Dave Sutherland. Again, my apologies to you. 19 2.0 MR. SUTHERLAND: No apology necessary. 21 MR. BLAZER: But also welcome you to the Sport Fish 22 Advisory Commission, and glad you are here with us. 23 MR. SUTHERLAND: Thank you. I look forward to 2.4 working with everybody. 25 MR. BLAZER: I have a couple other announcements if

1.3

2.0

I can. I have talked about the applications for the Sport

Fish Advisory Committee. Three other things I wanted to talk

about or just follow up on.

At the last SFAC meeting, we had a question about electronic copies of recreational fishing licenses. They are now being acknowledged by NRP as a proof of license so if you have it on your phone or whatever, that is good to go.

We don't need the paper copy any longer. We have got that cleared up. No signature is required. There was some question about that and we confirmed that so I wanted to follow up on that.

Also crabs, 'tis the season for crabs. It is going to be a busy time over the next couple weeks. Hopefully you all saw the results of the winter dredge survey. The press release was released last week from the winter dredge survey.

Over the next several weeks, we will have meetings with the industry workgroup in May. I believe tentatively right now it is May 11. But then that is why we also inserted those June sport fish and tidal fish meetings. We will be coming back, and those will be focused on crabs.

So we will talk more in depth at the June meeting.

Not too much here but basically there are a couple themes, if
you will, out of the winter dredge survey. We have a lot of
mature female crabs at this point that over-wintered, and that
population seems to be doing well. So that is kind of the

1.3

2.0

2.4

good news.

On the other side, male crabs have dropped a little bit from previous years. And also the other concern is the amount of juveniles that are out there is below average. So we will take a lot of this winter dredge survey information, talk to the industry workgroups, come back and talk to you all and TFAC to talk about any tweaks or modifications we need to make on the crab fishery for the upcoming year or years as we go through.

Oysters: Just a really quick update on oysters. We canceled the last oyster advisory committee meeting back in April. We will have another one. The next scheduled one is May 15. The legislature concluded May 12, I believe. I believe Sarah will probably talk a little bit more about some of that.

The bill, House Bill 924, was passed that basically said the department may not alter the sanctuaries until the stock assessment is done. So the strawman the department had worked with OAC on and put out and were seeking comments on, a lot of those proposals that were in that have kind of been scrapped at this point.

So we will meet in May to talk about steps forward with the oyster fishery and what is going on there. I will comment that the stock assessment is moving forward.

That will be one of the agenda items probably at the

1	next Oyster Advisory Committee to talk about terms of
2	reference and trying to really establish the process and the
3	information that will go into that stock assessment and
4	biological reference point, which the legislation linked to.
5	So that process is still moving along pretty well.
6	So I think from there those are my announcements at
7	this point. Are there any questions on crabs, oysters or
8	anything else that is not on the agenda?
9	(No response)
10	MR. BLAZER: Great, thank you.
11	MR. LANGLEY: Thanks, Dave. Moving along, we have
12	the NRP Activity Report. Is Lieutenant Timothy Grove here?
13	LT. GROVE: Yes.
14	NRP Activity Report and Priorities
15	by Lt. Timothy Grove, MD DNR NRP
15 16	by Lt. Timothy Grove, MD DNR NRP LT. GROVE: Good afternoon. I did add a little bit
16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
16	LT. GROVE: Good afternoon. I did add a little bit
16 17	LT. GROVE: Good afternoon. I did add a little bit of a supplement to what you had in your binders with some more
16 17 18	LT. GROVE: Good afternoon. I did add a little bit of a supplement to what you had in your binders with some more of the updated warning information.
16 17 18 19	LT. GROVE: Good afternoon. I did add a little bit of a supplement to what you had in your binders with some more of the updated warning information. The citations are probably the same, which is the
16 17 18 19 20	LT. GROVE: Good afternoon. I did add a little bit of a supplement to what you had in your binders with some more of the updated warning information. The citations are probably the same, which is the sheet that you are used to seeing after all these years. This
16 17 18 19 20 21	LT. GROVE: Good afternoon. I did add a little bit of a supplement to what you had in your binders with some more of the updated warning information. The citations are probably the same, which is the sheet that you are used to seeing after all these years. This one is going to be going away just so you know what is
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	LT. GROVE: Good afternoon. I did add a little bit of a supplement to what you had in your binders with some more of the updated warning information. The citations are probably the same, which is the sheet that you are used to seeing after all these years. This one is going to be going away just so you know what is happening with us. This format is kind of going away because

2.0

electronic tickets, along with all the traffic and State police and all the other law enforcement agencies are using. E-tickets, which get generated and sent straight to the courts.

So we are phasing out of our paper ticket phase.

And in such, the old database that we were using is being phased out.

We stopped using that database for warnings as of January 1st of this year so all the paper warnings that came in -- but we weren't spun up to actually start using e-tickets so all the paper warnings that were written had to be hand entered by some of our dedicated cadets into the new database. They just finished up with those on Friday or almost finished with those on Friday.

So that generated this -- this is what things are going to look like now. It generates this new format, which actually gives you the violation and breaks it down kind of much further as to what is actually being written out there.

And that will be something that is able to be pulled up pretty much at any time once we are fully functional with that. As of May 1st, officers are not allowed to generate paper warnings anymore or if they do, they have to hand-enter them into this new system, this new e-ticket system.

Once officers go through their probation -- we have to write 50. The people who mandate and oversee the e-ticket

1.3

2.0

system say that each officer has to write 50 warnings before they can start writing citations into the new e-ticket situation.

So as we phase into that, probably by late May and June, officers will be generating all their citations through this same e-ticket format so we will be able -- we will be able, within the next six months, be able to pull up all of our stats in this format as to tickets and warnings and what the actual breakdown is.

Whether or not that is important to you -- you can kind of give us feedback. If that is too much information, let us know and we will kind of pare it back to what we used to get in generalities a little more.

The other sheet, and you can see that things probably, I will say, were a little lighter this year on some of the citations and warnings issued in this first quarter.

One just because our officers are being tagged with a lot of stuff that get spun up into this new e-ticket situation.

You are going to hear -- you may hear of officers or see officers doing traffic stops and that kind of stuff. That is kind of where we have to go to get the e-tickets program spun up because we have to write those warnings, and the easiest thing to do is just crank out 50 traffic warnings or something. So a lot of officers are trying to knock that out so they can get back to their real jobs. It is problematic.

1.3

2.0

2.4

But we have had some good cases out on Church Creek,
Randy Bowman and his officers have written quite a few
citations for striped bass violations up in that area during
the closure season.

On the Susquehanna Flats, I don't know if any of you heard anything with regard to that. We had some issues up there that kind of came to light and generated some discussion between fisheries and ourselves with the catch-and-release areas.

We wrote three citations up there for essentially not immediately returning the fish to water. Well, what is immediate? That kind of thing.

So we had a discussion with fisheries and kind of came to a consensus that if they are pulling them out of the water by their gills, passing them around, taking pictures, measuring them, that kind of stuff, and then putting them back into the water, that is not immediate and does affect or can affect mortality of the cows that are spawning at that time.

So we kind of tried to do a combination of education and enforcement, depending on how egregious the situation was up there. We did issue, I know, at least two or three citations for the upper reach there above the line there at Lapidum up to the dam.

We had a couple guys in Deer Creek, at the mouth of Deer Creek, attempting to catch in the middle of the night.

1.3

2.0

And some of those were addressed as well.

So the striped bass has been addressed to some degree. I did throw an extra sheet in here. It is these CADs. CAD is a computer-aided dispatch. This is what we get pushed out to us by the Communications Center. If we get a call, they create a CAD.

If we come upon an incident ourselves, we generate a CAD. Essentially it is a unique identifier for that particular situation. So you can see, within the three months, officers responded to like 79, at least 79, different closed season incidents.

That is -- there could have no citations or no warnings issued out of that. It may have been unfounded or there could have been five or six enforcement actions taken with regard to that one CAD but there were 79 of those.

You can look down through -- the fishing miscellaneous at 354, those can be just checks of a section of a stream. An officer goes into a section of a trout stream and just does a foot patrol. That is when I open a CAD for that section, just as he does his patrol, that type of thing.

All of your commercial fisheries inspections, that is why they are -- every one of those gets generated a CAD.

That is why that was so high. And the same with the oysters.

If you have any questions about those, give me a holler.

Priority wise, you know, we are going to be focusing

1.3

2.0

on the striped bass season, the various aspects of that. With regard to -- we are just going to, the spring season that we are already in, of course.

Then there are going to be the closure on the flats during the beginning of May there. That sometimes can generate some stuff for us because people don't like to be told they can't fish that area. So I am sure we will have some pretty egregious enforcement in that area during that two-week period.

And then opens again on the 16th. That usually doesn't cause us any problems until everything opens up on June 1. So we will do that.

The end of the clamming season down, you know, the Eastern Shore sections, we will have officers focused on that as well. Like I said, things are in the mix, and I apologize. We have had a total of 55 promotions within the past few months, promotions and reassignments within NRP. So one is doing their job.

I am not even the commander of the area that I was the last time we met so I have been shipped over to Area Six so people are being pushed around. A lot of learning is taking place so I am going to ask for a little bit of patience with some of this because a lot of people are being thrown into a lot of new positions, and it is a major, it is kind of a major reformation of the agency.

1	Questions and Answers
2	MR. GRACIE: I have two questions. First of all,
3	maybe I misunderstood you but you said nobody could write
4	citations until they had done 50 warnings in the e-system?
5	LT. GROVE: In the e-system but they can still write
6	the paper.
7	MR. GRACIE: Let me ask my question. Does that mean
8	that a violator could get up to 50 passes on a violation
9	because a person who stopped him can't do an e-citation yet,
10	can only do a warning?
11	LT. GROVE: No, sir. He can still write the paper.
12	MR. GRACIE: Oh, oh, they are still using I
13	thought you said
14	LT. GROVE: No, warnings have stopped. The warnings
15	have stopped being able to be issued paper-wise. The
16	citations are going to follow, like I said, probably within
17	the next few months.
18	MR. GRACIE: I was hoping I misunderstood that.
19	LT. GROVE: And we can always write paper. We just
20	can't essentially send it to the courts. It has to go
21	electronically to the courts.
22	MR. : I think benefited from the State
23	police then two weeks ago because I got a warning.
24	MR. GRACIE: My other question is I am not sure I
25	understand about the flats. A lot of people fish for bass up

there. We can't fish for bass up there? 1 2 LT. GROVE: Sure you can. It is just that we ask if you do catch the stripers, that they are returned to the 4 water. Yes, you talked about the period it was 5 MR. GRACIE: closed. You said when the flats are closed. 6 7 LT. GROVE: For striped bass. 8 MR. O'BRIEN: I certainly appreciate your We have had a lot of different people from 9 presentation. Marine Police come in to address this meeting. And I can see 10 that you have really got it together. So I am going to take 11 12 the opportunity to bring up one of the biggest problems that charter boats have. 13 I am vice chairman of the National Charter Boat 14 15 Association again. And from Alaska around to Maine right now, 16 one of the biggest problems we have is people running parties 17 for hire for consideration who don't have Coast Guard licenses. 18 19 And they are typically smaller boats because they 2.0 can be of any size, and here in Maryland we have had 21 complaints. We have had some come up around this table about 22 some practices that are going on. Sometimes people run more 23 than six people. Yet they have a six-person license. 2.4 So Uber has really brought it to a head. Really

brought it to a head. Certain districts, states, have really

1.3

2.0

got into it, particularly Florida, Texas, and Maryland we have talked about it. Different inputs as to what is going on out there but I know you all, when you stop boats, and I know you all know that when a boat has certain decals on it, they are certified boats.

It is usually not a problem but it usually is a problem on smaller boats. And I know you all check for licenses. If you have any intuition, any suspicion that it is a boat for hire. So that is major right now, and Maryland hasn't taken off into any deep discussions about it.

We have got a couple instances that have happened recently with loss of life relative to these kinds of operations. And representing our people and the Coast Guard, it is, I would say, their number one problem right now, even more than marijuana on the boats, and that is a problem also because of the different state laws on the subject.

So I just thought I would bring these things up. I hope you are going to be continuity, which we used to have here. I mean, we used to have officers who were permanent or semi-permanent coming to our meetings but we have had this discussion with previous people, and I can see that you have listened to what I have said and to what other people might add to this.

LT. GROVE: I appreciate that. I will not guarantee the continuity. Unfortunately, like I said, usually this

1.3

2.0

2.4

position goes to the area -- our Area Five lieutenant usually handles this position, and I have recently been transferred out into another area but we will see what we can do with that.

With regard to the unlicensed charter boats, I know last year, we actually did work undercover with one up in the Susquehanna area. We found out about it kind of indirectly that he was offering trip. We surveilled him for several instances and then we did run an undercover operation where we actually had two officers who were taken out on the trip and paid the money to go and everything.

And he was cited for that. Unfortunately we did not -- it not go as well as we would have liked. We didn't catch what we were hoping to, to see if he would encourage going over the limit or any of that type of thing. But he was cited for operating the charter boat without the license.

And we know that does happen quite a bit. The problem, a lot of times, is getting the initial information. So by all means, if you can supply just that initial inference that somebody might be doing that, make sure that information gets pushed up to the district officers or the area lieutenant, and then they will assign it to initially probably to the local officers to do some background checks and stuff on --

And then if we have to, we have had a couple new

Τ	people put into our covert unit, and if we need to we will see
2	if that is applicable for them to get involved in it as well.
3	MR. O'BRIEN: This is encouraging that you are doing
4	that.
5	LT. GROVE: And also I did have a conversation with
6	one of the western Maryland sergeants who is kind of the
7	fishing guides even up in the upper Potomac, you know, need to
8	have those Coast Guard certifications, and a lot of them are
9	not aware of that so we are actually addressing that as well
10	with those local guides.
11	MR. O'BRIEN: Well, that is good. I appreciate
12	that. Now is there any publicity on these cases that you have
13	dealt with because that is what really helps. A lot of people
14	just don't know, particularly people who are looking for a
15	charter.
16	LT. GROVE: I cannot answer specifically about that
17	particular case, whether it was pushed out or whether they
18	were trying to keep it low key because we thought that he
19	would go right back to doing it again, and we wanted to see if
20	we could snag him.
21	MR. O'BRIEN: is pretty good if you want to get
22	some publicity. That is for sure.
23	LT. GROVE: Oh, yes. We try to push quite a bit out
24	to them.
25	MR. WOMMACK: What is going on in Somerset County?

It looks like they have thrown the book out the window. 1 2 everything is going on down there looking at this report. You 3 know, my fear is every one you catch, seven you didn't catch. 4 LT. GROVE: I am sorry. Could you say that again? I said my fear is that every one that 5 MR. WOMMACK: you caught, seven of them you didn't catch. 6 7 LT. GROVE: Oh, most definitely. 8 MR. WOMMACK: Do you have enough police presence in Somerset County? To be a small county, they sure are on here 9 10 an awful lot for possession of crabs and rockfish. 11 MR. BLAZER: He is looking on tab three, the 12 noteworthy cases. 1.3 LT. GROVE: Oh, I don't have that. 14 MR. WOMMACK: What is going on down the bay here? 15 LT. GROVE: That I can't speak to overly. I am not 16 as familiar with that area but I know those guys have been, 17 they have been trying to hammer things out. We have got a lot of new officers. We had officers out on the -- the 27 18 19 officers that came out of the academy were in field training 2.0 during this quarter. 21 So there was a lot of extra activity going on and 22 extra people -- they were all assigned with an officer but 23 they were trying to dig and get into everything they could to 24 get these officers experienced in that training period.

25

will --

MR. WOMMACK: Well, maybe reach out and try to find 1 out what is going on down there. 3 LT. GROVE: I can address that or have that officer --4 MR. WOMMACK: Have him call me. 5 LT. GROVE: Have that lieutenant give you a call. 6 7 Okay, that would be fine. MR. WOMMACK: 8 Any other questions for Officer Grove? MR. LANGLEY: You had mentioned a reorganization 9 MR. SUTHERLAND: 10 What is the goal of that reorganization and 11 how -- whatever that is, is there a way that we can understand 12 that better? Maybe it is a presentation so we --1.3 LT. GROVE: I won't say, and I apologize at the word 14 reorganization. We are not really reorganizing but we have, 15 in the scope of our departmental size, if you have 55 16 promotions in that very short span of time -- we have officers 17 who are being promoted to sergeant who have five years on the 18 job. 19 They are good officers but it is still just, it is 2.0 kind of the demographics or the way our department is 21 currently laid out. We have a huge amount of retirements in 22 2017 and 2018. There will be a fair number and again in 2019, 23 which were big hire years for both NRP and in the Park 2.4 Service, which merged in 2005. 25 So because of that we kind of hit a cliff and a lot

of the more seasoned officers and the upper echelon are 1 2 dropping off so you are having officers being promoted very 3 quickly. You know, five years is what we kind of used to say takes an officer to get familiar with the job as a whole. 4 now we have officers who are being promoted to corporals and 5 sergeants at five years. 6 7 So it is going to be a little bit of a learning curve on some of this. Those people are well-qualified for 8 the positions. It is just a new era for NRP and the fact that 9 10 our intrinsic knowledge, to some degree, is dropping off with the retirement of some of these officers who have been here 11 12 for 30 years. And now their direct replacement is coming in 1.3 with maybe 2 years of service or 2 months of service. So you can't -- even though they may be both officer 14 15 first class or officers, the two aren't synonymously 16 interchangeable. 17 MR. SUTHERLAND: So it is not really like a 18 mission-driven change. 19 LT. GROVE: No, sir. 2.0 MR. BLAZER: And if I can, just really quick, there 21 is an announcement this week for a new recruiting class so NRP 22 is recruiting for another group of people to go to the 23 academy. 2.4 LT. GROVE: The 21st it opened up for new applicants

25

to apply to become officers.

1	MR. SUTHERLAND: Is the attrition actually
2	benefiting the overall budget? You had some people who
3	obviously were being paid at certain levels who are now
4	retiring, and then you have, as you described, some people who
5	are corporals, sergeants.
6	LT. GROVE: That is kind of outside my bailiwick but
7	yes, I would say in some respects you are getting a little
8	more bang for your buck with these younger officers coming in.
9	MR. LANGLEY: I have got Rachel.
10	MS. DEAN: I was just going to ask, to address some
11	of the more egregious things, especially with the striped bass
12	violations this time of year and at those public sites up and
13	down the bay, we have kind of done some outreach here and
14	tried to put more signs up, different things that we could to
15	get the word out.
16	If that is not working, I guess nothing says don't
17	do that quite like a fine so I guess my question is, as these
18	cases are going to court, are you finding that you are getting
19	more support from the courts or are we still running up
20	against it is a slap on the wrist and the word is not getting
21	out?
22	LT. GROVE: I wish I could give you a definitive
23	answer on that. It seems to be, from what I get back, it is
24	court to court. The more urban areas, more metropolitan

areas, you definitely don't seem to get the judicial support

maybe that you do in some of these Eastern Shore counties and 1 2 southern Maryland counties just because it is not as much of a 3 way of life and they don't understand it the magnitude of what is involved, I think. That is kind of my personal opinion. 4 5 The metropolitan areas, we are not quite getting the support that we would like to see. 6 7 MR. LANGLEY: All right, any other questions for Officer Grove? 8 9 (No response) 10 MR. LANGLEY: Thank you so much. 11 MR. BLAZER: One thing I forgot in my announcements 12 section. I need to go back. We talked about the appointments 1.3 and reapplying and so forth. With Dave Sikorski resigning, one of the positions we need to fill is a liaison with the 14 15 Tidal Fish Advisory Committee. And they meet on Thursday 16 afternoon. 17 Kind of the way it has worked in the past is, you 18 know, Bill and Dave had agreed to do that as chair of SFAC. Phil if you are willing to fulfill that or do you want to take 19 2.0 nomination or is somebody willing to -- how do you want to 2.1 handle that? 22 MR. LANGLEY: Well, I would fill that but I would 23 like to have a proxy because this came up all of a sudden, and 24 I know I am very busy fishing right now and it would be tough

for me to make Thursday's meeting.

25

So certainly if we could have a volunteer or a 1 2 proxy, it would be very appreciated. 3 MR. GRACIE: I would like to suggest David Sutherland. 4 MR. SUTHERLAND: I will raise my hand. How about 5 6 that? 7 MR. LANGLEY: Okay. David, if you are willing to do it that would be great. 8 9 I would be more than happy to. MR. SUTHERLAND: 10 MR. LANGLEY: Thank you. 11 MR. SUTHERLAND: Thank you, Jim. 12 MR. BLAZER: We will get you all the information 13 about Thursday's meeting. Thank you. 14 MR. LANGLEY: We have got an MRIP update from 15 Dr. Linda Baker. 16 MR. BLAZER: If I can really quickly, while Linda is 17 getting set up, one of the things that I want to try to do is 18 bring issues before you that are kind of primers for things 19 that are going to happen in the future. 2.0 MRIP used to be MRFSS, the Marine Recreational 21 Fishing Survey. They changed the name. They changed a little 22 bit of the process but there is still controversy around it. 23 And it is undergoing a significant change at this point, and 2.4 that has been done by NOAA as we go through. 25 So there is a lot of controversy right now related

2.2

to black sea bass and flounder and a couple species at the
Mid-Atlantic Council and ASMFC. So you are going to be
hearing more and more about MRIP and some of the issues
associated with that

So our staff specialist who is involved with MRIP and some of her staff or folks are here as well. She will introduce them. We just thought it would be good to give you kind of a primer on what is MRIP, what does it do, what are some of the issues. So we asked the very intelligent Dr. Linda Barker to come and give you an update about that. So, Linda, you want to take it from there?

Marine Recreation Information Program (MRIP) Update by Dr. Linda Barker, MD DNR

DR. BARKER: Well, good afternoon. It has been too long since I have been here because I don't know most of you.

And I used to come pretty often, once or twice year, and do little statistics things, make you all do some math. We had a good time.

So maybe we need to go back to that. One of the reasons you haven't seen me so much the last few years is that the vast majority of my time has grown over from doing a lot of the statistical support for the department to becoming our de facto mom of our interaction with the federal survey that is done to gather recreational fishing information.

And so I will talk a little bit about that. We have

25

is by species of fish.

now come to fruition with that effort but we are still 1 2 remaining involved both as a State and as a participant in 3 MRIP. So I would really like to come back maybe every and do an update as you all are bringing new folks onto the 4 commission because this shouldn't happen again that I don't 5 6 know anybody. 7 (Slide) Well, I am going to do a primer working with the 8 idea that some of you really don't know much about MRIP at 9 What is it? It is stands for the Marine Recreation 10 11 Information Program. 12 It is a project conducted by NOAA. It is a federal 13 The purpose is to produce estimates of recreational project. saltwater fishing. So not any freshwater at all and no 14 15 commercial. 16 Most important for you all to understand is that 17 MRIP is made up of many, many surveys as well as a whole cadre 18 of people and effort to produce the estimates from the raw 19 data. 2.0 (Slide) So how does that work? Well, in theory, it is a 21 22 very simple idea. There are a couple of surveys designed to 23 get at the number of angler trips taken. And you multiply

that by the number of fish caught on any angler trip and that

And then you should be able to come up with estimates -- estimates of the total number of fish caught, the number of fish harvested, some biological information about those fish. So it is a simple idea, right? The devil is always in the details.

(Slide)

1.3

2.0

So I thought you all might be interested in some statistics because I love statistics so I know you do too.

What does MRIP tell us about Maryland's saltwater recreational fishery? Well, duh, most of our saltwater fishing is done in Chesapeake Bay, right? Comparison between the Atlantic area and Chesapeake Bay.

There are approximately 2 1/2 million saltwater trips estimated to be taken in Maryland each year. And out of that 2 1/2 million trips, there are about 3,500 actual interviews with anglers taking those trips.

So that should give you an idea that the process of scaling up what is observed, to the estimates that are coming out, is a big deal.

(Slide)

So looking through those data, these one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight species are our top caught fish. And if we look at -- I looked at the 10-year average harvest, annual harvest, on each of these species and put them in order. And I want to talk very briefly about

1.3

2.0

precision.

MRIP produces these estimates of harvest and estimates of how good those estimates are. The technical term they use percent standard error but without going into a mini-statistics lesson, generally speaking a number lower is better in this and generally speaking a number less than 25 has deemed by our Technical Committees through ASMFC that are doing stock assessments, to be pretty good for their purposes. So that is where that decision is coming from.

And you will see that in general, on an annual basis, across all fishing modes -- for hire, shore, private boats -- across all of Maryland, our precision values are pretty good.

Now I want to point out to you that precision is not the same as correct. Precision is an estimate of how much uncertainty there is around that not. And it is a statistical value, so again -- you know, you can come take my classes -- but other than that it is measuring observed variability.

It is not an absolute measurement of how correct that number is but it is the best that anybody has got to go on about the quality of the number. So in three words, what I will tell you is you can possibly have a pretty good precision, look at black sea bass, but your number not be very good.

It is a statistical value that comes out of the data

that are observed. So in general then, given the information
that we have to go on, we are doing pretty well. We think we
are doing pretty well on annual estimates. But even so we
continue to have some suspicion about our coastal fishery
estimates.
Questions and Answers
MR. GRACIE: Can I ask a question before I get lost?
DR. BARKER: Sure.
MR. GRACIE: Is the standard that is a standard
error in the right-hand column. Is that a percent or a
number?
DR. BARKER: It is a percent standard error.
MS. DEAN: Can I also ask a question before we go
on?
DR. BARKER: Sure.
MS. DEAN: You said that it was 2.5 million trips
estimates, and it was 3,500 anglers. How many of those
anglers are on the same trip? Is that a possibility?
DR. BARKER: But it is 3,500 anglers are estimated
on an angler trip so it is apples to apples. I gave you
numbers that are apples to apples. So it is angler trips and
anglers being interviewed on an angler trip.
So you can consider that angler trip to angler trip.
MS. DEAN: So let me ask it in a different way. If
there is a boat that goes out and it has 25 people on it, and

1	10 people on that boat are interviewed, do they count as
2	separate intercepts?
3	DR. BARKER: Yes.
4	MS. DEAN: It is how I am wording it. I know what I
5	am trying to get at. Of the total number of trips, which is
6	estimated at 2.5 million, it was said that there were 3,500
7	angler intercepts. How many of those anglers were on the same
8	boat? Is it a possibility?
9	DR. BARKER: Are you asking if the 3,500 is
10	relatable to the 2.5 million?
11	MS. DEAN: It should be. No, I assume it is.
12	DR. BARKER: Is that the question you are asking?
13	MS. DEAN: Somebody help me?
14	MR. GRACIE: She is asking are these independent
15	trips, and I don't think in MRIP there is any way of knowing
16	whether two different interviewees were on the same trip or
17	different trips.
18	DR. BARKER: The answer is yes. Some of them are on
19	the same boat.
20	MS. DEAN: And are charter boats included. So if a
21	charter boat comes in with 30 people on board, they are
22	included in it? Charters are separate or together?
23	DR. BARKER: Probably not. There is going to be
24	more than one interview off of that charter boat.
25	MS. DEAN: A head boat. Thank you.

1.3

2.0

(Slide)

DR. BARKER: So how is the MRIP information used? Well it is used in two ways. Now remember it is saltwater fishing that we are talking about so the vast majority of these fish are migratory. It is used as input for stock assessments, which you hear a lot about.

And the vast majority if not all of these stock assessments are multi-state groups, where our information is going in with other states' information, where these fish are passing across state boundaries and the vast majority of these species will go in and out of federal and state waters. So we have got multiple states, we have got states and feds.

Secondly, then once those stock assessments are done, those numbers are used again to adjust the regional and state harvest quotas.

(Slide)

So who is doing that? Who runs MRIP? And I have heard, a lot of folks have heard, over the last four or five years about a lot of changes. The National Marine Fisheries Service runs MRIP. Why? Because of what we just talked about, these fish that are saltwater fish are often migratory and running across state boundaries.

So the idea, when the federal legislators made up this law, was that they wanted the data to be collected in a consistent way from state to state and to have consistent

1.3

2.0

communication about sharing that information.

So in 1981, as Dave mentioned, they began with the MRFSS, the Marine Recreational Fishing Statistics Survey. In 2006, the National Research Council produced a review that looks about that thick if anyone wants one of my copies. And they had studied it for about four years, and they recommended very substantial changes in every area of the survey.

So MRIP is the new MRFSS. So we have had MRIP as a name around now for about four years, three or four years.

(Slide)

So what changes have already been made? First, in 2008-11, they started with those estimation procedures, how do you scale up from those interviews to the estimates of what is happening on these 2.5 million trips, right?

So they started with that, and redid the statistical design of those, and in 2012 they published a revised time series. So they went back and they ran their raw data through new equation so to speak, and recreated 1981, 1982, 1983 all the way up through 2011's numbers.

(Slide)

I am going to talk about this later but I am going to talk about how things have affected Maryland. When those were published we were not heavily affected like a lot of the other states were. Our numbers did not go crazy. Our numbers stayed fairly stable.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

Second big change is that the access point angler intercept survey, which is never called that. It is either called APIS or APAIS. Some people will call it that. It is the survey that interviews fishermen when they are coming in from their recreational trips. And it is the one that is used -- remember that original image? Effort times catch rate equals the estimates? This is the one that gets catch rate. How many fish were caught on each angler trip and what types? In 2013 the design changes started, and those came into effect starting in '14/'15, and in our big news is that last year in 2016, we took over the field management of APAIS. And I would like to introduce our DNR employees who are now managing the folks who go out in the field and interview anglers in Maryland. Angela Dender* is our program manager handling our administrative side. And Nestina Jackson is our program biologist. So we chose to take over this portion of MRIP. is not the whole thing. We are not doing MRIP but this management of the field staff who are actually interviewing anglers in the field, we are now in charge of so we know the quality of those data, we know the behavior of those interviewers. (Slide)

The third big change is in 2002, the National

1.3

2.0

2.4

Saltwater Angler Registry was implemented. This was part of changes for the effort survey.

(Slide)

And the last change that is happening with the effort survey, and this is the one that you may have heard some buzz about right now, especially in the last year, is that this has traditionally been a telephone survey, a random digit dial survey.

It was very inefficient. It started having more and more problems as folks went over to cell phones and could block the calls and whatnot. We also started seeing more and more bias. That household telephone, if you have a landline, that was no longer representing the general population. So this has now been piloted for a year and they are transitioning over to a mail survey.

(Slide)

What changes are still coming? Well, as I said, so now they have changed the catch rate survey, right? They have changed the methodology on that. They have made massive changes to how they are going to be doing the efforts survey, and they are now running the -- so they are starting to develop, as they are running the new and the old effort survey side by side, they are gathering two sets of data.

And they are looking at developing what they call a calibration model. So how big are the changes going to be?

1.3

2.0

2.4

How do we put these new methods in and combine that with old data to come up with something consistent over time. That should be completed this year.

Second upcoming change: Once they have approved that, they are going to publish a new set of these catch statistics. So just like they did in 2012, they are going to publish a new time series of these catch statistics of the harvest estimates. And they will discontinue use of the telephone survey.

Right now they are running them side by side. So they will have done that for two years.

(Slide)

estimates, starting next year, they think they will begin next year for the primary species, so think striped bass, for us definitely. They will take that new revised time series and start reworking as the updated stock assessments come up in their schedule, reworking those into the stock assessments.

What the pilot work has shown is that very likely, the effort estimates are going to be higher. Remember that calculation: If the effort estimates go higher, then the catch is going to probably be estimated to higher through this time series but if you are putting a higher catch, and remember these estimates are used two ways, if that rolls back through the stock assessment that there were more fish caught,

2.0

then what does that mean? There were more fish available.

So the stock sizes are probably going to be restimated as larger. So we, quite frankly, do not know what the end result is going to be of all of this. We do know that it is not just a 1 to 1. That if the estimates of catch go up, then we are going to be dinged that proportion and amount down.

We don't know that it will have -- it may wash out. We just don't know. It is an extremely complex process.

(Slide)

We do, however, have some particular interest in our coastal fisheries: Summer flounder, black sea bass and tautaug, and particularly now that we have more of a direct in with the folks who are designing the sampling through us managing the field sampling with APAIS, we actually have the ability in our new role to get them to adjust sampling to what we feel is a more representative way of looking at our coastal fisheries.

So we do not anticipate working with them to make those changes until '18 or '19, 2018 or '19. We are still, you know, getting our feet under us. We want to be very confident about our knowledge of our fisheries. And Nestina and Angela are coming up to speed really fast on that.

But I would say within three years I will be coming back to you and talking about that.

1	MR. GRACIE: When you say adjust sampling, does that
2	mean change the number of letters they send out or do you mean
3	to adjust it with different areas?
4	DR. BARKER: We are talking specifically about the
5	catch rate survey because the effort survey is a blanket
6	survey asking statewide. So the only one we will have control
7	over is the sampling of where we go interview anglers.
8	I did an analysis about two years ago and my
9	preliminary analysis, it looked like we could, without paying
10	more money because we have no more money without paying
11	more money, we could shift some sampling from Chesapeake Bay
12	over to the coastal bays without affecting our estimates of
13	fish, especially striped bass in Chesapeake Bay.
14	But we could improve our estimates over in coastal
15	bays.
16	MR. GRACIE: In other words, you still think you
17	would have a large enough sample size in Chesapeake Bay that
18	you would have reasonable standard errors and get some
19	information on the coast up. So you actually do mean shifting
20	the loci of the sampling.
21	DR. BARKER: Yes. So that was that initial analysis
22	I did. It really didn't move those percent standard errors at
23	all, especially for striped bass because it is caught
24	(Slide)
25	MRIP generally provides really good annual estimates

1.3

2.0

for species that are caught often across a wide area by a lot of anglers. It will never produce good estimates for rare event species -- tautaug, cobia -- for short time periods. If you have a burst fishery. Or for specific fishing modes. If you are talking just shore or just party boat.

So this is why we are hoping for our coastal

So this is why we are hoping for our coastal fisheries -- the analysis that I did was looking at what if we take some of our summer sampling in Chesapeake Bay and put it specifically to these modes in the coastal bay in this short time period to try to catch that burst, localized fishery.

MR. GRACIE: As we understood it in the past -maybe I am going back 10 years -- one of the problems with
MRFSS was that it is an annual estimate, and you start looking
at our trophy season for striped bass, they have no
relationship because it is a short time period and MRFSS can't
an MRIP isn't set up to accurately predict something that is
compressed like that. That is still a problem, correct?

DR. BARKER: Yes, that is still an issue. Again, what Florida has done is for some of their burst fisheries, they have negotiated to shift sampling away from where they have really good sampling and they can afford to lose some sampling over to a burst fishery.

But since we moved away -- and I don't remember how long ago that was. That was a while, maybe seven years ago, we moved away from having a quota for our recreational

fishery --1 2 MR. GRACIE: And that was one of the arguments we used. It was when Howard King was head of fisheries. DR. BARKER: So we have not been as worried about it 4 5 since then because we haven't been under a quota. 6 (Slide) 7 So toolbox: Are MRIP results reliable? Well, problems happen when odd MRIP estimates -- you know, these 8 short timeframes, these estimates within a specific fishing 9 mode, these estimates for not encountered often fish --10 11 because you will get completely crazy, impossible, shouldn't 12 be believed estimates when you break that annual estimate away 13 down into its component parts, when odd MRIP estimates are applied by management without accounting for the limitations 14 15 we just talked about. 16 There are two solutions. One is to spend millions 17 of dollars to sample a lot more anglers, and nobody has got 18 that money. And the other one is to modify management to account for MRIP's limitations. I thought that was a pretty 19 2.0 nice way of saying that. 21 MR. GRACIE: That battle has been going on for 12 22 years. 23 That battle has been going on a long DR. BARKER: 2.4 time. Mike is still fighting that good fight. Alexi is still 25 fighting that good fight. There may be some change coming on

1.3

2.0

the horizon. But I do want you all to understand that this process is not just something -- why can't you, Maryland management, fix that?

What I hope you are coming away from this lesson with is understanding that it is a cooperative process, that we have limited influence but we have stepped up to the plate to get to take over the influence that we were offered.

So we have done that. We have stepped up, and now we have got this tiny little piece that we are responsible for and we are hoping to leverage that to start managing a shift in our sampling that will be a benefit to us.

But the big picture is going to be long and complex and involve people. So if anyone has any questions, if we didn't answer them as we went through, I will be happy to answer them.

MS. DEAN: I was kind of interested in how you said we are moving away from the telephone to the mail. And in some ways my initial thought is we are going backward here. And I understand that not everybody has the access to electronics but I feel like we could reach more people by interfacing with the idea that when you buy a fishing license in Maryland, you provide an e-mail.

Do you think that the benefits of snail mail outweigh what you would have lost electronically lost because I feel in some ways people would be -- it is quicker to

respond electronically. It costs less to send out a survey 1 that way than through mail so what were some of the reasons 3 for that? 4 DR. BARKER: I can't answer why they said, why they are saying mail, and I don't know -- I would be surprised if 5 there is not the option to reply to that mail survey 6 7 electronically. I don't know. But remember that the effort survey is still a 8 statistical sampling. So it is not a voluntary thing. It is 9 10 not if you want to report your catch you do. If you bought a 11 fishing license then you report when you want. 12 This is still a statistical, random sampling survey, 1.3 and that ties into what I said earlier about that National 14 Saltwater Registry. So that is exactly what happens. 15 you buy a license in Maryland, your contact information goes 16 into essentially a phonebook of people who should be sampled. 17 And then in this methodology then on these certain 18 timeframes, they will pull a random sample from those people 19 who have licenses. 2.0 MS. DEAN: You are talking about the paper one too 21 or is it too soon? We haven't implemented the paper. 22 DR. BARKER: The mail survey? 23 MS. DEAN: Yes. 24 DR. BARKER: Well, one reason they went to the mail

survey is because in the pilot work that they did -- they ran

a pilot for two years in four states, and they found that the 2 response rate was more than double. Well more than double 3 what they were getting with the telephone survey. MS. DEAN: But it might not be more than double what 4 5 they would get if they did an electronic survey. Okay. 6 DR. MORGAN: Quick question on the table. You have 7 typical precision listed for eight species. What do those estimates of precision look like for some of the other states 8 for those same species? Are they generally higher, lower, 9 10 about the same? 11 DR. BARKER: Again, if it is a species that is 12 caught often in that state, so if it is one of their dominant 13 species -- so striped bass up and down the board, the Atlantic 14 seaboard, those values are going to be down in the teens any 15 state. 16 So you can look at --17 DR. MORGAN: You are building a model, a coastwide 18 model for a number of species so the more precision that you 19 have, the better the model is going to be, correct? 2.0 DR. BARKER: For the species that are caught often 21 the answer is yes. If you are talking about a rare-event 22 species --23 No, I am not talking about rare event. DR. MORGAN: 2.4 DR. BARKER: Then generally the answer is yes. 25 DR. MORGAN: Because one of the concerns with this

1.3

2.0

group is obviously the striped bass fishery up and down the coast for a number of reasons. And obviously the more precision you build in by state then the better your prediction should be for the entire coastwide population as a whole.

DR. BARKER: You are absolutely correct, yes.

MR. LANGLEY: Dr. Barker, I do have one kind of follow-up question, kind of what Ray touched on there. The Chesapeake Bay is a very large estuary compared to a lot of states, a lot of rivers, a lot of fingers. And with your sampling. Is there any way to predict or geographically, there seems to be a migration pattern of fish over the last few years, several years, as far as northern bay, middle bay, southern bay.

As far as the sampling process and whether, you know, you could identify any patterns there with the sampling process as far as the fish being caught. And there are so many little tributaries and whatnot within the Chesapeake Bay and so many ports. Unlike the coast, the number of ports are limited.

And in the Bay you have got the eastern shore, you have got the western shore, you have got the rivers, the fingers and so many areas that when we are talking about possibly focusing, taking some people and transferring some of that effort to the coast, do we feel that we have got the bay

pretty much covered?

1.3

2.0

2.4

DR. BARKER: Well, the sampling sites are actually set. Is it 234? Yes, so in Maryland, and Chesapeake Bay is probably 170 of those, 185? Yes. So we know the big number. There are 234 set sites for Maryland. And we are talking about the catch rate survey, the APIS, where we interview anglers, not the effort survey.

And I used to know but I don't anymore the exact number of those that are Chesapeake Bay but it is dominated by Chesapeake Bay so I am guessing maybe 185 or more, 185 to 200 of those, are in Chesapeake Bay.

So the National Marine Fisheries Service has a program that they will do what we call a sample draw, and they will say, okay, in this next two months, you are going to go here on this date at this time. And you are going to go here on this date at this time.

And so it is this -- as you can imagine, sort of light coming down and pinging all over with the idea that has been randomly sampled Maryland in that timeframe.

So what we are talking about doing is not so much shifting people or shifting sites but saying take some of those pings that you were aiming in Chesapeake Bay and ping more over on the coastal bays. Does that answer the question you asked?

MR. LANGLEY: Yes, I think so. It is just I didn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

know, as far as how random those sites were and geographic areas, whether it was a consistency at the geographic sites in the middle, upper and lower bay, or is there a possibility that one area get hit harder than the other area, which may give a false --DR. BARKER: Absolutely. And the answer is yes and no because the sites are very well distributed to be, you know, pretty even coverage all over Maryland. And some of you -- Jim, you have been on forever. Ed, you have been on forever. You remember back in 2012 when we were doing that project. So we are very pleased with the sites themselves but just because of the nature of random chance, that is exactly right. In any given timeframe, you could pull, by chance, more from one areas than another but there is some stratification in the design to try to work against that. So in Maryland -- we are one of the few states where the National Marine Fisheries Service does this -- they actually have us split up into three areas. So it can't happen that all of our samples are drawn just up here. So we are what is called a stratified draw to make sure that they can't go too far off and clump everything together. MR. GRACIE: I think you answered my question because I think one of things that is behind Phil's question

Τ	is that there is reason to believe that the location and
2	concentration of the fishing in the bay have been changing
3	recently.
4	So you didn't say you had a stratified random sample
5	until just now so it would have be stratified otherwise you
6	would see changes in precision if that was really happening.
7	If the patterns were you had a much higher density in one
8	section and you didn't have a stratified random sample.
9	You wouldn't know what was going on. You would see
10	changes in precision, I would think. If your numbers went
11	down if you had too many samples concentrated in the areas
12	where the fish weren't. Is that part of your concern, the
13	changing location of fish?
14	MR. LANGLEY: Absolutely. Thank you, Jim.
15	DR. BARKER: We have no way through this survey to
16	actually track movement of fish in Chesapeake Bay though.
17	MS. DEAN: Those sites and Jim, you probably know
18	better because you were here when it was happening are they
19	marinas, boat ramps and public fishing sites? No private?
20	DR. BARKER: Yes, it is all public access. Good
21	question.
22	MR. BLAZER: I just want to say thank you, Linda.
23	Great job, great summary. This is something you are going to
24	hear more about with black sea bass, flounder, tog this is
25	the best available science, the system that we have got. It

is not perfect but it does pretty well, and we hope we can
make some improvements but you are going to be hearing more
and more about it in the upcoming years. But thank you,
Linda. Great job.
DR. BARKER: I have got a couple handouts from you.
I sent you an expanded version of this presentation ahead of
time in your notes, and we have got a couple handouts that we
give anglers when we interview them that has some basic
information about MRIP and some contact information, and then
I have my contact information in the notes I sent you earlier
if anybody has any other follow-up questions.
And it was good to be back. And I guess I will see
you in another year or so. I got something else to talk
about.
Policy Program
Sarah Widman, MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services
MS. WIDMAN: So you all should have received I think
a couple weeks ago our normal Regulatory and Penalty Update
Poport Possuso of the histus that the state takes from

MS. WIDMAN: So you all should have received I think a couple weeks ago our normal Regulatory and Penalty Update Report. Because of the hiatus that the state takes from issuing regulations over the winter as we go into session, there is not a lot of new stuff on here.

In the effort of trying to save you guys a little time, unless someone has questions, there is not a lot to say about this at this meeting today.

Moving ahead then, scoping: Just because we are

Audio Associates 301/577-5882

1.3

2.0

2.4

awesome, we are going to make scoping super short too. There are only two items. One of them is something we do every year.

By law we have to adjust the commercial license targets so we are working on that, and the reasons we do that are for instance, right now we have 10 individuals who downgraded an unlimited tidal fish license that let you do everything into its component parts. So we have to adjust the numbers for each of the different license types when that happens, and we do that once a year. So we are doing our annual corrections to those numbers that happens every year.

That will be, as noted on the handout, on our Website and all the normal social media stuff for feedback as a scoping item.

And then a second one is more specific to commercial. Some of the commercial pound netters wanted the ability to essentially share their pound nets to make better, more efficient use of their gear and so we are scoping that ability to permit folks to have pound net authority to be able to essentially co-use a pound net together as long as it is registered that way that we know, for enforcement purposes, there are two people registered to that.

Again on our Website, social media for scoping.

Questions on scoping?

DR. MORGAN: How many pound nets do we have left in

the Maryland portion of the Chesapeake Bay? 2 MS. WIDMAN: I would have to look up that number. Ι 3 do not know. 4 DR. MORGAN: You should have it off the top of your head. 5 6 I know, I should have, and I don't have MS. WIDMAN: 7 the current number but it is actually on our Website. Let's move on to legislation. So we didn't have a 8 9 really busy session in comparison to some other years so that 10 was good, I guess. 11 Some things to be aware of that passed -- I will go 12 through the stuff, the failed ones related to fishing or 13 fisheries I have on here too -- but the stuff that passed that you will see, we have a couple of veterans'/Purple Heart 14 15 recipients' licenses that will have some sort of discount for 16 those folks coming up here that you will see. After the 30th 17 of June, we will start working on that. 18 Some of the require reports. Some of them have us 19 looking at what other states are doing, and if they do 2.0 something similar, we would reciprocate. 21 Crab harvest times: Something I guess more for 22 commercial but so that you are aware that on the summer 23 holidays, I am trying to remember which ones. Memorial Day, 24 Fourth of July, and Labor Day, the day of the holiday and the 25 day before, you might see commercial crabbers having different

1.3

2.0

ability to go outside the normal time period that we give them
on those specific days.

So it is normally a set time and a catch time for them, and it is going to be expanded on those holidays to help them, a, get out in the summer months when it hotter, to get their catch in earlier so it doesn't spoil. And also around the holidays when there is more need for folks who want to go have their crab, that there will be more available for them. So be aware of that.

I think Dave brought up House Bill 924 under the oysters so essentially it was amended a little bit but it is going to have us looking at the oyster stock assessment in terms of our fishery management plan before we are able to either reduce or alter the actual boundaries to our sanctuaries.

So some of that work that was ongoing is sort of put on hold for a while, while that happens.

Cownose Rays: So we did have a bill pass on cownose rays. It is asking us to essentially come up with a fishery management plan kind of denoting -- the general assembly recognized that some of that is commiserate with the funding we have to study cownose rays.

And we have until the end of 2018 to try to start working on that and put something in place. In the meantime though, until July 1, 2019, there is a moratorium on cownose

1 ray fishing tournaments. So anything that is deemed as a tournament, under that statute, would not be allowable until 3 after that timeframe. 4 Our seafood marketing program has moved over to the Department of Agriculture. There is some stuff on leases and 5 6 submerged aquatic vegetation when we are looking in terms of 7 shellfish leases, setting up a program to better analyze that, 8 and the impacts it might have. 9 That was supported by -- the Aquaculture 10 Coordinating Council was actually looking at putting it in 11 place anyways, and this bill just kind of solidifies the 12 There were two bills that weren't cross-filed process for us. 1.3 but they were the same thing on that, and essentially those were all the bills that passed. 14 15 Questions on any bills, passed or failed? 16 Sarah, maybe we could mention to this MR. BLAZER: 17 group about the FMP workgroup for cownose rays. 18 MS. WIDMAN: Oh, yes. Thank you for reminding me. 19 So it is starting to look at creating a cow nose ray FMP. 2.0 would want essentially kind of groups of various 21 stakeholders -- every time we create an FMP, we have a whole 22 workgroup that meets, that would meet a couple times and kind 23 of look at things and discuss things. 2.4 So generally speaking we are looking for people, we 25 would want people in place kind of around the time you guys

1.3

2.0

2.4

1 meet at your July meeting so that those meetings could start
2 occurring.

And we are kind of looking for a group of 10 to 12 people with various representations, so some from charter boat and commercial, environmental groups, recreational components, aquaculture as well.

So if you all have, you don't have to decide tonight, but if you have recommendations of folks in those general categories you would like to see on the workgroup, that would be super helpful. You could either send them to me or Nancy Butowski, who does our fishery management planning.

Or Dave. And just let us know whom you would want to recommend to sit on that.

But especially the sport fish and tidal fish, we would like some representation from you guys or people you think would be good to represent the groups that know a lot about cownose rays or have an interest in it. Any other questions on legislation?

(No response)

MS. WIDMAN: So I think at your request, and we have had, let me see, the reorg, so I am kind of becoming the person who handles a lot of intercept with licensing. So I drew the short straw so I am here to present this to you.

This is just a quick rundown of license sales from the recreational, and it goes all the way back to I think '04.

2 an annual cycle -- so you purchased your license in January, 3 February or March and it would expire in December. And it is a 365-day license. So if I purchase it right now, it expires 4 5 a year from today. 6 So that kind of -- keep that in mind when you look 7 at the numbers but essentially our numbers looked fairly consistent from last year when that was implemented. A couple 8 ups and downs, but generally speaking somewhat close to last 9 10 year's numbers. 11 So if anyone has specific things they want to ask or 12 address, I may not have answers but I can certainly find them 13 out. Any idea what proportion of the license 14 MR. DeHOFF: 15 sales are coming through Compass and what is coming through 16 dealers? 17 MS. WIDMAN: I don't but I can find that out. 18 MR. DeHOFF: Because that says -- like somebody said 19 earlier, that is a great place for us to gather contact 2.0 information. If they can do that online through Compass, we 21 get so many more ways to reach out to them. 22 MS. WIDMAN: That is a good point, and we are really 23 trying to be more interactive electronically, so I know --2.4 even with commercial license renewals this year, we reminded them, give us your e-mail because we can remind you of stuff 25

It denotes that in 2015, if you all remember, we all went from

2.0

if we can get a hold of you electronically.

MR. BLAZER: One of the things that we have kind of been looking at and working with our BFF, Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation, is better ways to retain license holders so like, for example, going to a year-round was one of the thoughts they had. Are there other marketing ideas and other ways to do promotions?

If you remember last year, we had -- your 16th birthday you could get a free license for your first year out to try to recruit new anglers so we have been working with some of the national groups to try to figure out strategies to retain the licensees that we have but also hopefully increase because as I am looking back at some things, some of the numbers you look back at 2004, 5, and 6, where you have got the resident nontidal. You have got about 135 to 140,000 people. Now it is about 115 to 120.

You know, is there a reason for that in 10 to 15 years? What is the trend and -- so I don't think we are the only state in that category so our BFF, this group, has been trying to figure out ways to do better outreach, better marketing to help with the license sales in a lot of the states.

MS. WIDMAN: And then also just quickly on the penalty, I now a couple meetings ago we kind of let you know with e-tix, which you heard more about tonight. And the

1	Interstate Wildlife Violators' Compacts. If you get suspended
2	or revoked in one state there are 46, soon to be 49 you
3	could be suspended or revoked in all the other states.
4	So we are working on implementing that. We are
5	really close to having it fully implemented. So if you hear
6	of constituents or people who get suspended here, we do reach
7	out. If they are licensing with us, and they will be getting
8	letters if they are a Maryland resident.
9	But essentially that I am hoping in the next few
10	months that is fully implemented and those people would see a
11	restriction show up in their account with us if they have one.
12	MR. LANGLEY: Any questions for Sarah before she
13	goes?
14	(No response)
15	MR. LANGLEY: Sarah, thank you. Okay, we have
16	freshwater fisheries.
17	MR. BLAZER: Roger, do you want to talk about the
18	Black Bass Advisory Subcommittee?
19	Black Bass Advisory Subcommittee Report
20	by Commissioner Roger Trageser
21	MR. TRAGESER: We had a meeting on March 30. Took
22	care of a little housekeeping first off. We approved what our
23	procedures will be moving forward with minority reports.
24	We went back to the haul seining issue again. We
25	had a video presentation. Our natural resources planner

2.0

2.1

2.4

Bob --- gave us a video from a study that was done back in 1996. It was an upper bay study, summertime, and deeper water haul seining on well-established grass beds.

The purpose of the study was to see what the effects were on the grass beds. Apparently their results gave little to no impact on these grass beds.

The thing is, it is kind of apples and oranges to what our concerns are. Our concerns are shallow water haul seining, springtime with emerging grass and with spawning beds, bass spawning beds, already in place, and what the results could be for that.

So Dr. Love suggested that perhaps the department could perform a stud to maybe evaluate what these haul seining effects in springtime nesting habits might be because right now these are just observations that a lot of our fisherman have seen.

There is no real science, there is no real study or any science, and if we are trying to move forward with any type of regulatory action on this, there has to be some science that would back up what are claims are to the problems with the shallow water haul seining in the springtime.

Joe said he is going to consult with Virginia's

Marine Resource Commission, Virginia's Department of Game and

Inland Fisheries and/or the Potomac Fisheries Commission for

data or reports on the effects of commercial haul seining on

2.0

submerged grasses during the spring.

Another item on our agenda was habitat. Tom Parham, who I believe as actually given a presentation down here before, gave us a Powerpoint presentation on water quality monitoring across the state and emphasized that water quality has been improving; however, land development, agricultural practices, are still very much an issue, posing threats to a healthier bay system.

Information obtained within the presentation provided reviewers information needed to access water-quality data, report habitat problems to the state and become involved in management decisions. The presentation was going to be delivered electronically to all the subcommittee members.

Out of that, we have also decided to form a habitat workgroup within the subcommittee. Myself and Steve Jaconis* will be on that along with the department heads Dave. I think Joe is going to sit on that as well.

The workgroup will work with department staff to examine legislative or regulatory actions that may be of interest to black bass fishery management. The workgroup will report to the subcommittee, and the subcommittee may act as a unit for providing input regarding such actions.

Our subcommittee decided that we did indeed want to get our number back up to 13. We had a resignation that brought it down to 12. So the department has sent out,

2.0

2.4

already sent out applications, and they have had four responses on that. Pretty much close, those four responses.

We were going to close off -- today was supposed to be our close-off day for the subcommittee members to respond to those applications. But we didn't have a significant number. Actually the number right now of the 12 who have responded is 7 because we had some last-minute ones today. So we have got 7 out of the 12.

And I think Dennis, our chairman, wanted to extend this at least one more day. I think we needed to, through an e-mail between him and I, we needed to put a little fire under some people's backside to even remind them, oh, yes, we are supposed to review those applications and get back.

I think we will get a few more of our subcommittee guys to give us some feedback. Are all the applications then going to go to sport fish or are we going to look at the overwhelming -- right now between the seven, we have two who are recommending one individual, and five who are recommending another individual.

MR. BLAZER: Right. We are going to bring those recommendations back to this committee. If you remember with the Black Bass Advisory Subcommittee, this group approved those original 13 members way back when we first started this almost a year ago.

So the subcommittee wanted to look at the

1.3

2.0

applications. They will provide a recommendation. We will bring that to you all for you all to make a recommendation to the department.

We want to kind of go through this process because, if you recall, with some of the issues we have had with the Black Bass Advisory Subcommittee, there was a lot of concern about the original makeup that we had. There were a lot of tournament anglers. There were a lot of fishing guides.

Originally the department tried to balance out with our original recommendation so we want to make sure we are going through a pretty thorough process here to make sure we have a good diversity of people who go through. So we are going to bring that back to you all --

MR. GRACIE: You all, meaning the commission as a whole?

MR. BLAZER: The commission, yes. I am sorry. The subcommittee is dealing with it now. We will bring it all back to you all probably in June because we will have everything all wrapped up by that time. And then let you all deliberate over that and make a recommendation to us.

But again, knowing the issues that we had, as we kind of evolve through this process -- and again, we want to make sure that we have got a diversity of stakeholders, not too many of one particular component, if you will, on that committee. So we will bring that back to you all in June.

1.3

2.0

MR. TRAGESER: Just a couple items or closing remarks coming out of our meeting. Dennis Fleming, who is a member of the PRFC, spoke about the multijurisdictional meeting that was held on February 8 at the District of Columbia's Aquatic Resource Education Center.

So you had Maryland there, Virginia there and District of Columbia giving presentations. They are, meaning the PRFC, is going to work on a program that would incorporate multiple, yearly interagency meetings. Right now we just have that meeting once a year, and there is a lot of information that comes out on that.

It is not just information that a random spectator gets. It is information that Virginia gets from Maryland and Maryland gets from Virginia and DC and back and forth.

So in my opinion the more times within reason that those groups could meet, the more information they can share and maybe compare notes a little bit better and maybe even tweak the way they conduct some of their surveys and do some of their monitoring to fit it a little bit better. So looking into that.

One of our members requested that the DNR look into the possibility of lifting the springtime no possession rule on the nontidal fisheries. Between March 15 and June 15, no possession whatsoever. Noting that perhaps making some of these fisheries available to potential tournament sites might

take some of the pressure off of the river system. 1 2 It is an issue that we will visit at a later 3 meeting, maybe even 2018 because we have got a pretty busy parking lot list that we are going to go over. That we still 4 have things to address on. 5 I think our next meeting we have NRP enforcement and 6 7 was it education or did we bump education for something else. I can't remember now. No, education ideas and outreach and 8 National Resources Police enforcement, that is on the next 9 meeting. And the next meeting is scheduled for October 3. 10 11 The other item I want to bring up is early on there 12 was a potential proposed regulation that dealt with one 15-13 inch fish in possession within the creel 5 between June 15 and I think that was February 3. 14 15 This wasn't just for tournament anglers. 16 going to be for anybody fishing in that timeframe but 17 nothing -- only one over 15 inches. 18 While this commission gave the department the 19 authority or the okay to scope that, the department did scope 2.0 it in house but actually decided not to pursue that regulation 21 any further than that. I think we are making some strides 22 through education, through getting the message out with our 23 anglers about fish care. 2.4 Now what was in place last year is pretty much still

in place. There is still the need for tournaments that are

Τ	larger than 10 boats to register. We encourage every
2	tournament to register, whether they are 2 boats or 10 boats
3	because that provides the department with information that
4	they use.
5	But any tournaments over 10 boats are required to
6	register as long as they meet the waiver requirements for fish
7	care. Then they can bring in more than 1 15-inch, a 15 or
8	larger inch fish within their creel limit.
9	And the waiver information is available on the Black
10	Bass Subcommittee Website. You can see that information there
11	if you haven't already looked it up. So that is about it.
12	Any questions?
13	MR. BLAZER: I just have one quick update on the
14	haul seine discussion. Joe has reached out to some of our SAV
15	biologists and also some of the haul seiners down on the
16	Potomac. He has been in touch with Billy Rice and Rocky and
17	the grinders. And they had a meeting I think was it last week
18	just to talk about some things and some issues and some way to
19	try to get some of the information that we talked about at
20	that subcommittee meeting.
21	They have had some of those discussions. They are
22	formulating work plan to move on from there so we will have
23	more information. Those discussions have kind of taken place.
24	MR. TRAGESER: Thank you.
25	MR. LANGLEY: Any questions for Roger?

1	Questions and Answers
2	MR. DeHOFF: Roger, those waiver requirements, those
3	are the requirements to have tanks and things like that? That
4	is what that is?
5	MR. TRAGESER: It is tanks. It is also providing
6	information, making sure your angler, while they are out on
7	the water, are doing the right thing, keeping the live wells
8	running, changing water frequently, icing down later in the
9	summer when the water gets hot.
10	MR. DeHOFF: That is what I thought it was. The
11	reason I asked is some of the people I have talked to kind of
12	feel that those are a bit restrictive to the local
13	tournaments, the small clubs and things like that sometimes.
14	MR. TRAGESER: Well, small clubs like I said,
15	this is going to impact tournaments that are over 10 boats.
16	Most small clubs, and I am a small club, if we have five or
17	six boats, that is about it.
18	However, take a page out of what we are doing. We
19	are practicing, we are doing what is called major-league
20	fishing. We get a fish, every boat had a scale, we weigh it
21	right then and there, we record it and on the score
22	tracker and the fish go right back in the water.
23	That is easy to do for club tournaments. That is a
24	little more difficult if you are talking about tournaments

25 where there are money and prizes and whatnot involved in it.

That gets into the bigger scale and then those requirements 1 have to be met. 3 MR. DeHOFF: I just wanted to let you know. I am sure you heard that feedback. The guys that I talk to are 4 generally smaller guys and they were concerned about that. 5 6 MR. TRAGESER: It doesn't take that much, even for a 7 small outfit, to set something up that is a little bit better carewise than what they have been doing. For instance, we 8 have seen this in bad, bad tournament practices where even if 9 it is just five or six boats, they come in, and two guys in a 10 11 boat, they each have their bag of fish, and they all come in 12 at one time. 1.3 They don't have a tank sitting there, and they are waiting there to weigh their fish. Why do that? You are 14 15 right there. You leave your fish in, we will call you when we 16 need you. You bring your fish in, you come right up, you 17 weigh them, they go right back in. 18 It is really little things like that, that just need 19 to be addressed to clean it up. 2.0 MR. DeHOFF: I agree with what you said about 21 education. That is a major part of it. 22 MR. LANGLEY: Thank you, Roger. Appreciate your 23 presentation. All right, we have got John? 24 MR. PROCHASKA: I am going to say a few words if 25 that is okay. So I have decided to mix things up a little bit

1	today. Instead of sitting up here talking about our
2	initiatives and projects and deliverables, I asked John
3	Mullican to come in and give a presentation on some of the
4	work that we are doing with other fishes other than
5	largemouth, smallmouth and, of course, all the trout species
6	that we work with.
7	I think most folks probably know John Mullican. I
8	thought this would be a good opportunity for folks here to get
9	to know him a little bit better.
10	He has been in freshwater fisheries pushing 30
11	years. Started as a conservation associate, was a regional
12	manager for West II, Washington and Frederick counties, for
13	almost a decade. And recently was promoted to serve the
14	old Charlie Gudjen*, he oversees all our regional managers.
15	So it is an opportunity to meet John and also learn
16	about some of the other work we are doing. He is going to
17	talk about Northern pike and Muskie, two large top predators
18	that get, as you will learn here, many of you probably already
19	know, they get very large in our freshwater system. So with
20	that, I will turn it over to John.
21	Muskellunge and Northern Pike
22	by John Mullican, MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services
23	MR. MULLICAN: It is little question that black bass
24	are the most sought-after freshwater sport fish in Maryland.
25	Nationally they are a great gamefish. And they are readily

1.3

2.0

available pretty much no matter where you live.

Although not as widely distributed, we are fortunate in Maryland that we do have some exciting other freshwater fisheries, and I am going to talk about two of those today. And these have attracted a pretty dedicated following. The two I want to talk about are the Potomac River Muskie fishery and the Deep Creek Lake Northern pike fishery.

When it comes to Muskie, we really only one fishery, and that is in the Potomac, the nontidal Potomac River. And we have some limited populations of Northern pike in some of the Baltimore and WSSC reservoirs but primarily our most known and highest-quality pike fishery is in Deep Creek Lake. I am going to talk about Deep Creek Lake first.

(Slide)

Maryland and Deep Creek Lake are at the extreme southern end of the Northern pike's range. They are native more to the northern regions of Canada and the Midwest.

Generally, in the southern portions of their range, trophy size pike are very rare.

Deep Creek Lake, as you probably know, is our largest impoundment fully within Maryland. It is just under 4,000 acres and it is far to the west in Garrett County.

(Slide)

Both of these species are what Linda -- a prime example of what Linda referred to as rare event species, which

2.0

makes them very difficult to sample in a statistically valid way. They generally -- we had little information on this species previously because they were generally just bycatch during more standardized surveys for black bass.

So what do we know? What we found is that trophy specimens are present. We see it on the anglers' log, in some of the tackle stores in the area, and there is anecdotal evidence that a pike greater than 40 inches are perhaps a little more abundant than they used to be.

And again a Pike over 40 inches is a pretty rare fish in even some of the Canadian areas for pike so we have a pretty special though limited fishery. And I would imagine we also know that Northern pike are going to be difficult to sample. They are a rare event species. It is very difficult to collect enough of them to get both life history data as well as data on relative abundance.

We know that some harvest occurs. We see pictures of it. Primarily a lot of this will occur during the ice fishing season. And we know that anglers like big fish.

So we are trying to get more background information on this fishery so that we can continue to provide those big fish and protect this resource for the future and maintain its trophy quality.

So to do that, we have to gain more life history information, age, growth. How fast do they grow, how old are

1.3

2.0

they at maturity, what is the size distribution? And can we in an efficient manner determine relative abundance or changes in abundance?

So we have to try to determine the most efficient, accurate sampling methods, and we also have to get information on the anglers themselves. Are they targeting this species? How much effort do they invest in it? What is the harvest and related mortality?

(Slide)

We have tried different things. We found that the highest precision for survey is a spring electrofishing survey early in the spring prior to the fish spawning, and targeting the spawning covers.

Generally, as Linda mentioned, a relative standard error. We tried sampling in the fall, targeting SAV habitat and the standard error was very large, and based on those samples we would not be able to detect any kind of change in the relative abundance.

But we found by using fixed sites early in the spring, and based on the number of samples, our relative standard error is around 25, which is actually pretty good for this type of fishery.

Again the fish was targeted in spawning coves, particularly ones that have active, incoming streams. These fish move into, right after ice out when the main lake is

1.3

2.0

still in the 30s, and these bays start to warm up early. They are in the 40s. These pike will move into the very headwaters of these coves in very shallow water, eventually spawning in the incoming streams or over detritus and vegetation in the upper part of the cove.

(Slide)

We also this spring deployed some hoop nets to try to capture fish in areas that were very difficult to get into electrofishing. The picture on the upper right, you can see some of the headwater areas that these fish, even large fish, will move into. These areas are typically less than three feet deep and can be hard to get the electrofishing boat into some of these areas.

Anybody who has fished in Deep Creek in March knows a boat ride in Deep Creek is very cold in March. Pretty icy mornings. One of the benefits of using passive gear like the hoop nets, we were able to capture a pretty valuable fish to, as far as studying the life history.

This is a male pike that was one of the original fish tagged in 2014. It was tagged at 29 inches, which is one inch shy of the current minimum size. And based on scale analysis was aged at age 7.

This fish was recaptured in a hoop net this spring at 29 and less than 3/4 inch at age 10. So in 913 days at large, this fish only grew a quarter of an inch. And this

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

also shows that based on its age, it is unlikely that many of the male Northern pike will reach a size that they can be harvested under the current limit.

MR. SUTHERLAND: What is the state record?

MR. MULLICAN: The state record is 43.7 inches and around 25 pounds.

(Slide)

MR. MULLICAN: So another project that we have been doing to arrive at more of this data and to get the preference, the effort that is put toward this fishery, freshwater conducted a statewide angler preference survey.

We know that fish like black bass and trout are going to be more sought after but we are hoping to get some feedback on how important these other fisheries are to anglers and we have also established a tagging study, and there are some signs around the lake and at the boat ramp indicating to anglers that if they catch a tagged fish, to report the length and the tag number.

And those tagged fish will help us verify the ages that we determine from scales. Particularly for larger, older individuals, scales are very difficult to read. As the fish growth slows, growth rings become closer and closer together so the tagging should help us verify the ages that we are getting through the scale analysis.

There was a female that was recaptured this spring,

1.3

2.0

2.4

and she is also at the upper limit of sizes that we might expect, and we see the growth is pretty slow.

(Slide)

So what have we learned so far? We have learned that the spring electrofishing at the fixed sites is the most precise for determining relative abundance. You can see in the upper right we had what our catch per unit effort is, that is basically many fish we caught per hour of electrofishing.

In 2016 and then in 2017 we caught a few more. But based on the power of our sampling and the sample size that we have, it would have to decrease to 2.2 or increase to 9 before we could statistically say that we have seen a change in the population.

The size distribution suggests that recruitment is fairly low. We could see that larger, older individuals make up a larger percentage of the population. Generally when you have the predators, the percentage of mature fish over fish that are recruited to the population is over 70 percent. It suggests that recruitment is fairly low.

Another possibility is that spring sampling, our sampling is biased toward larger fish. We did find this spring a very interesting fish. It was a 16-inch female that was mature. That was quite a surprise that they would be mature at that small size.

And the largest male collected to date measured only

1.3

2.0

31.3, and that was to 18 male to reach 30 inches so it is pretty clear the current minimum size, we are protecting nearly all males.

Other things we have learned is looking at the growth of this population, it is a bit faster than the national average but a bit less than --- Region 9, which is basically some of the Midwestern states within the native range. On average, this is males and females. It takes 6.2 years to reach the minimum size of 30 inches, and we can also then predict that the theoretical maximum age is about 10.8.

So some of those fish that we had recaptured earlier were most likely toward the end of their life span.

We are attempting now, and another reason to do the spring samples, is both Northern pike and muskies have sexual dimorphism where the males and females will grow and mature at different rates.

And so that is an important consideration when we look at growth rates and looking at regulations that may protect that fishery.

Based on catch curves, the total annual mortality we estimate at about 44 percent with a harvest rate of around 20 percent. We haven't had a lot of returns from the tagging.

Two of the eight tagged fish that were reported to us were kept, and both of those were during the ice fishing season.

And the fact that we didn't have ice last year probably

1	protected a few pike.
2	(Slide)
3	So what is next for the pike fishery? We are going
4	to continue to monitor the relative abundance. We are going
5	to continue to gather life history for both males and female
6	in the population.
7	And we are going to continue to encourage anglers to
8	participate with the tagging program, and use that information
9	to model the population under various length limits and
10	mortality rates to determine if that is a viable option for
11	maintaining or improving the trophy quality.
12	It looks like at the current time that might be
13	fairly limited based on current growth rates and ages of the
14	fish.
15	Next I want to talk about Maryland's muskie fishery
16	that occurs in the nontidal Potomac River. Muskie's occur
17	from Cumberland, and they have been captured all the way down
18	by the DC fisheries group. Yes?
19	MR. NEELY: Can we go back to the pike really quick?
20	Just curious. How much of an effect are these fish having on
21	the walleye in Deep Creek Lake?
22	MR. MULLICAN: Well, there is no indication we
23	have no information that would indicate that they are
24	impacting the other species.
25	Walleye are extremely in Deep Creek Lake and produce

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

large year classes so there has been no decline. These fish have been in this system for many, many years. It is kind of a background fishery. Whether people had targeted them now with larger lures and they are discovering larger fish than are typically caught, or whether these are a little more abundant than they used to be, we just don't know. MR. GRACIE: I have got to tell you, most of the tiger muskie I have seen have been up at Black Oak Flats. So they are way above Cumberland. I flyfish up there. I never hooked one of them but I had a lot of them follow big flies. They come up to the boat, turn around and go away. They are pretty plentiful -- maybe they are just easier to see up there because it is smaller water but they are definitely plentiful at Black Oak Flats, which is 20-something miles above Cumberland. MR. MULLICAN: There are two muskies that we have had in Maryland. There is the hybrid muskie --MR. GRACIE: I am talking about the tiger muskie. MR. MULLICAN: What I am talking about here, this is going to be true muskies. This is a pure strain true muskie. This is not the hybrid. And they are found throughout the river with the strongest populations generally occurring from the eastern portions of Alleghany County down through Washington County and to a lesser extent below that. (Slide)

Τ	we nad a tiger muskie stocking program. As i
2	mentioned, this is a sterile hybrid between a muskie and a
3	northern
4	MR. GRACIE: That is what I am talking about.
5	MR. MULLICAN: And they were stocked from 1989
6	through 2006. We have pure strain muskie. The origin of that
7	is kind of a mystery but even back in the '80s when I first
8	started working, we occasionally would collect an adult muskie
9	in the system, and reproduction seemed to whether there was
10	kind of enough of them over time that the population took off,
11	we documented reproduction in the mid-90s, and the population
12	has expanded from that.
13	With VHS, viral hemorrhagic septicemia it is a
14	highly contagious fish pathogen in the Great Lakes and with
15	this fishery taking off, that is one of the reasons that we
16	discontinued stocking the tiger muskie in the Potomac.
17	We still do stock Black Hills Lake and a few other
18	impoundments in Maryland with the tiger muskies but we no
19	longer stock the main river.
20	This population is entirely supported by natural
21	reproduction, which in the southern portion of the range,
22	which this is, is fairly rare. And currently the minimum size
23	is 36 inches, one fish per day.
24	(Slide)
25	Our management objectives for this fishery is to

2.0

maintain a high-quality fishery with a desirable size distribution. And we -- again, this is a rare-event species so typically the number that we would collect during our standardized FAS surveys in the fall, we would only get a handful of these fish.

So to increase our sample size, we developed an angler creel diary program using muskie fishermen to record the length of the muskies they catch, whether the fish are tagged or not, whether they are harvested or released.

And this enables us to have a larger data set of muskie lengths, and then using a length age key, we can determine catch curves, and from that we can estimate mortality.

(Slide)

And this is some of the historic data where we are with the fishery. The table on the upper right in highlighted is the total catch per hour. As you can see, not surprisingly, these are fairly low by other standards, whether if you are looking at bass.

However, these are comparable to the catch rates for muskies in Ontario. So, I mean, we have a pretty high-quality fishery. The predicted maximum length is, from or aging data, came up to 50.4 inches, and last fall or the fall before that we actually found a dead muskie that was 50 1/2 inches. That was the largest fish we have ever encountered.

1.3

2.0

2.4

And we removed the --- bone from that fish to age it and also provided that to Dr. Casselman in Ontario, who is the leading expert on aging muskies with that structure. And aged that fish at -- best guess was 14 but it could be anywhere from 13 to 18. So that is our largest fish.

Harvest is generally low. That is very common.

Catch and release is very common throughout the muskie fishing fraternity no matter where they are found. And our harvest was estimated to be only 2.7 percent. And based on the tagging study, it was even less than that.

But the tagging study generally the returns are from avid muskie fishermen.

(Slide)

As you can see, the growth rate, once they mature at about age four, the females grow faster and obtain a much

As you can see, the growth rate, once they mature at about age four, the females grow faster and obtain a much larger size than the males. The chart at the bottom we also get from the angler creel diary program as angler effort,

18 | number of trips per month and their catch rate.

(Slide)

And what we have noticed in more recent years is typically with muskies they become a little bit stressed in the warm summertime temperatures, and catch rates are generally highest from October, November, through the winter but we notice the peaks in July.

And the reason for that is these fish, when water

1.3

2.0

2.4

temperatures become warm, they seek cooler waters. So they are seeking these thermal refuge areas, and anglers have picked up on that, and now specifically target these fish in those areas.

So this a concern. We are working with the southern division of the American Fisheries Society. And this a concern for a lot of southern states that have muskies is this summertime stress and targeting of those fish and the related mortality.

(Slide)

So to kind of get some answers on how big a factor that is or how important some of these thermal refuges are to the survival of muskie, particularly as we get into global warming, we established a telemetry study that kicked off this year. And the purpose was to identify seasonal habitat use, specifically two important features: Where these fish are spawning and some of these thermal refuges.

And also to determine the angling mortality of fish that were targeted that are taking refuge in these sites. The study area is one of the more popular areas along the Potomac for muskie fishing. It is near Williamsport. That is out hear Hagerstown.

The study site is about 12 kilometers long and extends from Dam Number 5 downstream to the Alleghany Energy Dam. There is a low head dam from a power plant that used to

2.0

2.1

2.4

operate t	here.
-----------	-------

And there are a number of known thermal refuge sites that are noted here.

(Slide)

So what we did this spring is prior to the fish spawning we went out electrofishing. A lot of these fish move upstream toward the dam and we were able to collect 7 female and 7 male for 14 total.

About midpoint we established a surgery station on a small island, gaining access through some private ground.

Each of the fish were brought in. They were measured, weighed, double-tagged to be able to identify those as radio-tagged fish. And then they were placed in an electronarcosis tank in preparation for surgery.

That electronarcosis tank was pretty slick. We borrowed that from the anadromous group, and it is essentially a large cooler with a plate on each side and a cradle in the middle. And it sets up a mild electrical current that you can adjust and it acts as anesthesia. The fish just rolls right over, complete docile. Enabled the surgery to take place.

Surgery generally was only several minutes. That shows the size of the transmitter that is used. And that is just a small incision of about two centimeters, and the transmitter is pushed into there and sewn up.

And then the fish were placed in a recovery cage and

2.0

2.4

then went through the whole series to make sure everything was
working properly before they were released, and the release
site was about centrally located in the study area.

The plan is to sample weekly through the spawning season. And then bi-weekly after that until the fish start to occupy some of these thermal refugia. Each time the fish is located, the GPS coordinates are recorded as well as water quality, depth, flow. And this will enable us to use some principle component analysis to cluster habitat use and how these fish are using the river.

(Slide)

This is a GIS map from some of the sampling that has occurred so far this spring. The white area on the upper left is Dam Number 5. There are several island complexes there, and you can see the concentration of muskies around that island. That was found to be a spawning site. And then we found another spawning site further downstream.

(Slide)

So this is what we hope for the outcome of this project. We want to identify important habitat, primarily spawning, and the thermal refugia. This will help us protect some of these habitats through the environmental review process, and also, as it turns out, through the stewardship review process.

That particular chain of island below Dam Number 5

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

1 | recently came up for sale. So that is working out already.

And then to determine direct and indirect angling mortality related to fish targeted at these thermal sites.

And primarily, based out the outcome of that, it will involve angler outreach to improve fish handling, survival, make people aware of the stress in the summertime.

Regulating that activity is pretty impractical for a number of reasons.

(Slide)

And these are, if you want more information on Northern pike in Deep Creek Lake, Alan Klotz* is the West I manager and Michael --- is the West II regional manager, and the West II is doing the muskie study and West I is doing the Northern pike study. Any questions?

Questions and Answers

MR. GRACIE: We had a presentation two years ago, a proposal actually about a special area in Deep Creek Lake for Northern pike. And I remember it being a little critical that we didn't have any science to back it.

I am really thrilled that we have collected this data, and it certainly puts things in a different light.

MR. MULLICAN: Well, the whole purpose of that project was to get that data that we need. And there were some earlier surveys that were done of anglers that generally showed that anglers would be favorable toward --

1.3

2.2

MR. GRACIE: There was an opinion survey but no data on the fish.

MR. MULLICAN: Right. So I think we are on our way and we are getting a lot of that data that we need to make those decisions, and then we can then model the populations and see if we would be able to gain in the size distribution and protect that trophy aspect of the fishery.

MR. LANGLEY: Thank you. We have Jim Gracie with the MDE Classification Update.

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Classification Update by Commissioner Jim Gracie

MR. GRACIE: Thank you. Yes, I am happy to report that I and a representative from Trout Unlimited had a very good meeting with the Department of the Environment, hosted by Ben Grumbles and five of his staff.

This all goes back, you may recall, our subcommittee got involved and got interested in this issue of reclassification and redesignation of trout streams, and it came to a head in an effort to solve a problem at the Harestad Sewage Treatment Plant by putting half of the treated sewage over in another stream that was designated Use 1 but had a trout population.

The Department of Natural Resources had recommended that it be redesignated as Use 3 I think two years ago, and there has been no action on that. And they are getting ready

2.0

to issue a permit under the Use 1 standards with no temperature in it.

And we were concerned that is not going to protect the existing use of the natural trout population. But the issue is a little more complex than just a simple permit 1.

And I know, because I have been around forever as somebody said, that we have had this issue come up at least 3 times in the past 40 years, where the Use 3 designation is 68 degrees maximum, and everybody knows that brown trout can survive water up to 82 degrees for short periods of time.

So the 68 degree maximum seems like an onerous standard to some people who want permits. And actually it was DNR back in those days, and then the Environmental Programs Division in the Health Department, and the MDE have tried to come up with a higher temperature standard for trout streams.

And we think that is a pretty dangerous thing to do without having things well vetted. In the meeting, what -- I think I am pretty sure we convinced Secretary Grumbles that we needed to have pretty broad stakeholder input and talk about a possible separate standard for a different kind of trout water as long as we are not eliminating the potential of it becoming brook trout water.

And we asked for wide stakeholder input. Toward the end of the meeting, Grumbles indicated that he wanted his staff to work with us. I indicated we wanted broad

2.0

2.1

2.4

stakeholder input, including DNR fisheries and several units because there is some expertise there.

I also asked to have our Wild Trout Subcommittee included because we have some people who are very interested in that, and we happen to have an international expert on brook trout sitting at the end of the table in Ray Morgan, and I wanted him involved in that, and he has agreed to participate.

The most encouraging thing was toward the end of the meeting, Grumbles turned to his staff, and particularly Ed Stone, and said, you make sure you tell Carroll County that this permit is not a done deal so I think we are going to have an honest, well-thought-out discussion before anybody jumps to something.

I get a little nervous when our policy is ready, fire, aim. Or fire, ready, aim. So I am very encouraged. That was the first time I have really had a meeting with Grumbles. I was pretty favorably impressed. I like the way they are going to approach this. So we are moving ahead I think on a good track. We don't have the answer yet but we are headed there.

MR. BLAZER: And I will just comment, Jim. I know Tony has been working with you, you know, on this, giving whatever information we have got. Again, anything that we have got as far as information, make the request.

MR. GRACIE: I forgot to mention probably 10 days
before that, out Trout Unlimited counsel met with Secretary
Belton and Bill Anderson, who is in the room now, and felt
very encouraged, got a good reception there, and we told them
we were going to be working with MDE.
So I actually called Belton after that meeting and
told him that, and he said he was delighted. He said that he
and Grumbles get along well and they work together well. So
think we are going at it with a good approach without having a
public fight because that is what we were trying to avoid.
DR. MORGAN: May I point out that I have retired as
an expert?
(Laughter)
MR. GRACIE: I hope you haven't forgotten
everything.
MR. LANGLEY: Jim, thank you. Thank you, Ray, for
your participation. All right, we have got Mike Luisi.
Monitoring and Assessment Topics
by Michael Luisi, MD DNR Fishing and Boating Services
MR. LUISI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is
Mike Luisi. Our team is the Monitoring and Assessment
Division. I am the manager and I have a report for you guys
today.
We are going to start with Mid-Atlantic Council and
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission meeting updates.

2.1

2.2

ASMFC/MAFMC Updates and Announcements

MR. LUISI: The Mid-Atlantic Council met for its April meeting on April 11-13 in Avalon, New Jersey.

A few things that may be of interest to you all is that the council, while they are not managing river herring and shad at this time, it has been an issue that has continually come up over time about whether or not the federal government should engage in federal management of river herring and shad.

At this time that is not going to be the case; however, the council is very committed to continuing efforts to understand the population, understand impacts of fishing practices on the river herring and shad populations in federal waters. So there is just a continued effort for ongoing work that will continue.

Now there are some lawsuits that NOAA is facing right now regarding the decisions that the council has made in previous years about taking on river herring and shad management, but I can't speak to those details of the lawsuits but the council would be giving guidance as to the judge's decision if we need to reconsider those issues.

Something is of importance to our highly migratory species marlin and tuna fishermen on our coast is that the council is now considering taking action on a fish called chub mackerel. Chub mackerel are very, very incredibly important

1.3

2.0

2.1

2.4

during a particular period of time in the summer where they
localize around the canyons.

And there has been a growing directed fishery commercially on chub mackerel, and as that information became available, the Mid-Atlantic Council stepped in and is now considering taking on management of chub mackerel through addition of that species in an FMP.

It would likely look at harvest limitations, whether they would be time and area specific due to the nature of that fish being in those canyons while white blue marlin, blue marlin, tuna are occupying those same areas.

It is of great importance to those fishermen recreationally on our coast who -- the white marlin open and all the interest on HMS species off-shore. So you guys will likely hear about that as it develops over the next year.

Another thing that you may have read about or that you might read about is that the council took a position not to support the designation of the Hudson Canyon for sanctuary status. This was out of a concern regarding the sanctuary programs' overall authority to manage fisheries within the federal waters.

The council has fisheries management authority over now through the Magnuson Stevens Act. It was a long discussion. The council understands the importance of where those individuals who put this proposal forth were going as

1.3

2.0

2.4

far as protecting the Hudson Canyon from off-shore oil drilling and other bottom-affected practices.

However, the council at the end of the day felt that the fisheries issues in the canyon were something that they didn't want to have given up or taken from them. So you may read a press release or see interest on that.

That is some council news. Moving to ASMFC, the Atlantics States Marine Fisheries Commission will be meeting in two weeks beginning on May 8. Items of interest here -- I will do striped bass last since I know that is of great interest to all of you.

The council will be deciding whether or not to take forward an FMP that looks at regionalization of our tautaug fishery. So we would be lumped into a group with Virginia and Delaware in the hopes that we might find some commonality in our recreational regulations in our region.

We are not looking at taking any reductions. Put it that way. We have a fishery that is pretty strong right now. It is slightly overfished but we are not overfishing anymore. So we have been working with our state partners in Delaware and Virginia to try to figure out where we are going to move forward with this as it goes out to the public. So you may some of that cross your e-mail bins.

We are still in a state of flux regarding summer flounder and black sea bass management along the coast. This

has been an ongoing debate that is -- it has been something 1 2 special this year. I won't get into the details of it. 3 just happen to be right now the chairman of the board for both the Atlantic states commissions' summer flounder/ black sea 4 bass board and the council chairman. 5 6 So it is all just coming together because it is 7 jointly managed with ASMFC and the Mid-Atlantic Council. There has just been a lot of moving parts and --8 9 MR. GRACIE: Do you feel like you have a bullseye on 10 your back? 11 (Laughter) 12 MR. LUISI: It has been tough. We are moving 1.3 We are making progress but it is slow and there are forward. consequences to actions and decision that are made by both of 14 15 those bodies. 16 Now summer flounder has moved forward further than 17 black sea bass, and we look like we are in range of being able 18 to just have what I have referred to before to you as our 19 regulations for next at 17 inches and 4 fish for the whole 2.0 year. 21 New Jersey has appealed the decision that the board 22 and the council made back late last year. And that appeal, 23 after being reviewed by the ASMFC leadership, they have 24 decided to grant New Jersey one of a number of different 25 criteria or elements that they appealed on.

1.3

2.0

They have granted them one of those issues to bring to the policy board for the policy board to determine if this appeal should hold up and we should revisit all of the decisions that were made back last year, which would then delay anything that we are doing now, and would likely trigger the federal government into taking action because it is April and it will May, and they need to put federal waters measures in place.

So a lot of moving parts. I feel the appeal is mostly a technicality on process that we following given all the moving parts -- there were a couple gears grinding along the way. We will see how it goes but we will need to talk about it internally and with our other commissioners on ASMFC to determine how we go forward with that.

I know that you are all interested in the outcome of the spot and croaker benchmark assessments. Those assessments have been completed and will be -- the information will be delivered to the board on Thursday, May 11 during the South Atlantic Federal Fisheries Management Board.

I don't have the details right now in front of me to give you any indication about what those benchmark assessments are going to tell you but what has been of interest to this group has been the issue between gill netting and charter fishing, head boat fishing, and the user conflict associated with the spot and croaker fisheries.

1.3

2.0

And we have kind of put off any further discussion on that until we had the information, this benchmark information.

So I guess it is our point moving forward from here would be that if the board decides that this benchmark stock assessment on these two species would be applied for management use and is approved for management use, it will likely, depending on the results, trigger into some form of management action, which we could then sit down as -- maybe get a group from tidal fish and a group from sport fish and sit down and talk about what we might do as a state in managing these species.

I am sorry I don't have all the details but I think for this point we just need to wait and let's see what ASMFC thinks of the assessments and we can go from there.

Lastly at the ASMFC meeting, the Striped Bass

Management Board is going to be considering the Draft Addendum

V and whether or not the Draft Addendum V would go out for public comment.

Draft Addendum V was something -- it is something that we in Maryland and our other bay jurisdictional partners along with other partners on the coast have been supportive of for the last year and a half, two years. And what it is, Addendum V is very simple: We either are allowed in increase our coastwide landings of striped bass by 10 percent, given

2.0

2.4

the latest stock assessment information or we are not.

So that is what this document contains. It is very simple. It is only a few pages long. It doesn't have a lot of meat to it. The board is going to need to ultimately decide at the end of the day if commercial -- if all entities, all groups, all states, all sectors are going to be given the opportunity to increase striped bass harvest by 10 percent.

We have been very supportive of this effort. We have argued and discussed and debated that Addendum IV restrictions that we took on as a state have been overly burdensome based on what we have in the Chesapeake Bay versus what is available along the coast.

And that the increase in size limit that we undertook through Addendum IV to go to 20 inches has really been economically hurtful to our charter fleet. The commercial fleet lost 10 percent of their quota. I am sorry, 20 percent of their quota, and we have been working very tirelessly at the ASMFC level to get to the point where we are right now.

In May, we will not be deciding whether or not a 10 percent increase in harvest will be allowed or not. In May we are going to decide if the addendum is complete enough to take to the public, to allow for the public to weigh in on that addendum.

Now we have had a lot of support from both the

2.0

charter boat industry, recreational anglers, the commercial industry here in Maryland for our continued efforts to get to where we are today but I understand, and our agency understands, that there will be some groups, some people who don't want to see an increase in 10 percent on striped bass harvest.

They don't believe that is the direction that we are going to go, and I just want to give everybody the heads up that if this document is approved and supported by the board to go to the public, that there will likely be, there will be a lot of interest in providing comment not only to our agency, to the state house, to our administration and to ASMFC commissioners.

There is going to be a lot of interest, not only for support but in opposition as well. So we are going to have to deal with that as we move forward. Just everybody know it is not a unified approach here on this because we will have Marylanders who feel that what we are asking for isn't something that we should do.

I will leave it at that. Before we go into yellow perch and move on through the agenda items, maybe I will take a few questions if you have any on either the council or commission issues.

Questions and Answers

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, several things you covered, Mike,

1.3

2.0

and I am going to take a little while here.

First of all, you have done a tremendous job at ASMFC just to get that amendment. Now initially we thought that amendment would relate to the bay, to us, relative to that 20 inch fish. But something happened right at the end of that, to where somebody must have gotten together and made it more universal for everybody.

I can understand that, and I can understand where that gets us a few votes like Delaware, but I am worried it is going to lose us some votes too from New Jersey northward.

The key thing we are up against here, and we can't forget it, is ever since I have been involved with this, and that goes probably back to the Roosevelt administration --

MR. : Which one?

(Laughter)

MR. O'BRIEN: Anyway, we thought we had won a war but we won a battle because of you and your consistency in pushing this over the last four meetings that we have had with ASMFC.

But we are, as we all know, we are up against a group of states that is always against us when it comes to striped bass, and that is that northern combine. And some of the, not all, but some of the organizations that promote saving the fish, we call them, and it is not good to say it, but the environmental organizations, they seem to be pretty

1.3

2.0

2.4

much in unison with that group of states up north.

And right now they are very active and writing letters. They blamed our governor for this. They say this all started with our governor, which we know is not the case. He wrote a great letter for us and I think we should try to get some more letters.

When this is hopefully going to at least stretch until the October meeting before a final decision is made. But we are up against a coalition at ASMFC that is very difficult to compete with. And anybody who disagrees with that, fine, but that is the way that I have seen it. I have seen it for a long time.

Even when we came out of the moratorium where we shut down for five years, and a lot of people kept fishing along the coast. So again thanks for what you have done. I know it has been a heck of a mountain for you to climb, and you have climbed it but we keep getting pushed down.

But you didn't get pushed down. You have stayed on this, the department has stayed on this. I think the commercial, the recreational and the charter boat industry has been pretty much together on this. Every ASMFC meeting since we started on this, commercial people have been there along with recreational and charter boats.

The problem is at ASMFC. Now Phil has asked me to mention, you know, at our last charter boat meeting, the

1.3

2.0

2.4

charter boat, particularly the people from Chesapeake Beach on down, are very alarmed as they see our customer base falling off. That is a lot of votes too.

But they are falling off because of this 20-inch fish. They keep throwing back fish that they know are going to die. And there is a factor figured in for that. So we have tried to come up with a couple of ideas that might help in this.

First of all, tournaments. Maybe we have too many tournaments. They seem to be proliferating. Every stakeholder group has got tournaments now. That is a lot of mortality and that is a lot of catch and release.

That leads to our catch-and-release season in the spring. Recreational, charter boats, there is nothing else for them to do. They go out there and catch and release and throw them back and catch and release and throw them back. And that is one hell of a lot of mortality.

And people who witness this are aware of this. It is hard to knock another stakeholder's group. Another idea that came up again, looking for things that we can do to try to avert what we are up against on this 20-fish decision. And again, that 20-inch fish can go on and on and on for years. That is the way it is set up. It can keep going on and on.

Was 18, went to 20, we tried to come up with a compromise at 19. So anyways that was about what I wanted to

1.3

2.0

2.4

say. One other thing the charter boat captains came up with. You know, they are desperate right now. We used to have a program where we raised striped bass and then released them. Striped bass in a hatchery. And there are different opinions as to how that worked out.

Certainly if we did that, that would make some people feel better. There would be some more fish to catch, particularly in rivers. And then the other side of it that we have fought with over this is that, hey, there are more fish produced by survival of these big catfish than is raised in the catch-and-release fishery.

But it is not that easy just to dismiss something because of that, because we have got a lot of people who are really affected by this. From Chesapeake Beach south we have every business that relates to fisheries, every single one, is down. Charter boat fishing is way off. We are down to 125, I think, in the association where it used to be 250. It is a real problem.

And the only other thing that you alluded to, and we have talked about a lot, is this commercial hook and line in the summertime. Now this is the third year that this is being discussed. We have had meetings. The Secretary has come to the meetings. The watermen have come to the meetings.

And there has been, for those in the meetings, I think a real understanding. A head boat out at Chesapeake

1.3

2.0

2.4

Beach, he talks to the gill netters. They come out of Deale or wherever.

And it just seems to come out that there are things the department can do that can make it better on everybody. We have got these lines of part of the bay can do it, in the middle can't do it, down south can do it. It is just a convoluted situation.

So anything that can be done there. It has slipped now as to where we face it because of other priorities like striped bass, oysters, crabs. So I understand that but sooner or later it would be good if we sort of sit down and talk about this one.

To me it has got the potential certainly to bring people together. We have had good discussions again with local watermen and senior people in the watermen community so that is about it. Thanks for letting me take the time.

MR. LANGLEY: Thank you, Captain Ed. The only thing that I would like to add to that, it was brought up as far as I think it was the hatchery program that was in existence until 1992 I believe if I am not mistaken. And it was phased out I believe primarily because there was no way a hatchery could keep up with the natural reproduction of striped bass.

And we had some pretty good year classes coming up and the natural reproduction was doing very, very well. So the program was kind of phased out because it was felt like

that it wasn't necessary.

1.3

2.0

In the last four or five years we have had a couple good year classes but we have had a couple of the poorest year classes that we have seen.

And we are wondering if the department could look into back when that program, if you have records on it, when it was established, how successful it was. The fish that were released, how many of them actually made it to, back into the migration, into the coastal migration.

And if nothing else, if there has been a decline in the spawning stock biomass, it certainly would look better for our state that we were the only state that was actually promoting it and putting the effort into bringing back the striped bass in year classes that are down.

MR. BLAZER: You have mentioned this before. I think what we will do is we will take a look at the hatchery operation, prepare some report just giving you some of the basis of the history.

You know, one of the reasons that it was discontinued back in the '90s was because the population was doing so well. You know, mother nature can outdo anything we can do in a fish tank. So when the population rebounded and the fishery reopened, we didn't seem to need to supplement the population at that point.

So we will put together some background information,

you know, what we did back in the '80s and '90s, why we 1 discontinued it and some of the arguments, you know, for or 3 back and forth. We will have a discussion about that. 4 will give you some of that information. MR. LANGLEY: Any other questions regarding striped 5 6 bass? 7 (No response) 8 MR. LANGLEY: All right. Thanks, Mike. 9 appreciate it. 10 MR. LUISI: Moving on through the agenda, the next 11 item is the yellow perch FMP. 12 Finalize Yellow Perch FMP 13 MR. LUISI: You all received the document via 14 e-mail by Paul. We are not going to go through the full 15 document but I think the plan here that we have discussed is 16 for the commission at this time to consider taking action to 17 finalize the amendment as it is written right now. 18 This amendment revises the management plan 19 objectives. It also incorporates the current status of the 20 stock and formally adopts the management approach that began 2.1 in 2009. So we changed our management approach in 2009. And 22 this FMP hasn't been amended for quite some time. So this is 23 kind of -- this document gets us to where we are as of 4:45 24 p.m. today. 25 This is how we are managing the fishery. There has

1.3

2.0

been discussion leading up to now about dealing with quota overages in the commercial fishery. And while we had the best of intentions to get a small working group that came together -- a couple members of this commission, a couple members of the tidal fish commission, some of my staff got together. We talked about how to handle the 2016 overage as a one-time shot.

We would like to engage that group again. There was an interest there to talk about how we look to the future and how we deal with quota overages for the future. However, I feel at this point, the best course of action, since this amendment has been open now for a number of years, and what we find ourselves doing is just updating it and updating it with new data each time we have new information.

I would recommend that if you are happy with the way this stands right now, that we finalize this amendment, and then we will commit to re-engaging that smaller group of individuals to have this more broad discussion over the future of how we manage quota overages.

There were a lot of ideas that were thrown around. We would head that up, maybe get that group together sometime over the summer and then look to a future meeting of the commission as to getting a recommendation from that committee as to whether or not you would want to formally initiate a new amendment to address quota overages in the yellow perch

fishery. 1 2 So we close this one but then start a new one after 3 we get advice from the committee as to whether or not we start just an amendment that addresses this one particular issue 4 rather than a full update of the suite of issues in this one 5 that we are looking at today. 6 7 Questions and Answers 8 MR. NEELY: Could you state the amendment again, restate the amendment? 9 10 MR. LUISI: The new amendment? The new amendment 11 would focus its attention on just commercial quota overages 12 and how to deal with those overages. 13 MR. NEELY: Because right now there is a 50/50 14 harvest, right, between recreational and commercial? 15 MR. LUISI: There is a 50/50 quota allocation. The 16 harvest is thought not to be 50/50 but the allocation is 17 separated evenly to the two sides. 18 And just to give you just a touch bit history on 19 this, so if you remember about a year ago we got a formal 20 request from the watermen -- not Maryland Watermen's 2.1 Association but two northern bay associations looking for 22 whether or not we would support an allocation shift from 23 recreational to the commercial fishery. 24 There was a 15,000 pound overage in 2016 in the 25 commercial fleet. I think the impetus for that allocation

1.3

2.0

conversation was that overage, and let's take some of that recreational allocation that we know isn't being caught and let's shift it over to the commercial side.

Well, we debated it here, we debated it at tidal fish. We talked about it internally. Our internal group decided to recommend to the commissions that we do not pursue the allocation debate but that we figure a mechanism for the future on how to deal with quota overages.

And so that is when we got this committee together. The quota overage was high. It was 15,000 pounds but we are in a position right now where the stock is very healthy. The yellow perch stock is very healthy.

So weighing those two, weighing those two things -you had the high quota overage, relative to the quota, and
this stock that is healthy and appearing to, it is going to
continue to be in a very healthy condition -- the committee
was happy with just halving that overage. Taking the 7,000
pounds or 7,500 pounds as a payback rather than 15,000.

Now it was decided at that time that was a one-time shot. We don't want this to be the thing that we are going to -- you are just going to automatically default to each time we go through a quota management process.

So with all of that said, we have some work to do to determine how we are going to work with quota overages for the future and so with the understanding that -- and I was going

1.3

2.0

2.1

to give you the update on the 2017 harvest.

The 2017 harvest came in under its Chesapeake Bay quota, as did the upper bay quota. So we won't have to even deal with this issue next year. There is no quota overage to even have a discussion about, which gives us time to get a committee together to potentially initiate a new amendment to address this particular issue in the event that it happens in the future.

And so the idea is we would always keep the stock biomass condition in mind when making these payback decisions. And just so -- I want you to be aware if you turn to page 10 of the document, because this has been brought to my attention. I figure I might as well make sure everybody is aware of it.

Page 10 of the amendment, about ¾ of the way down, the second paragraph, if you go all the way to the right-hand side, there is a sentence that starts with if.

If commercial harvest exceed the TAC, all or a portion of the overage is subtracted from the TAC of the next fixing year. And we added a portion into that language because that is what we did last year.

We did a portion of what the overage was. We didn't take all. And so if that is -- I felt this was more accurate to reflect how we are managing right now. Now it doesn't go into detail about the portion that we did but it was something

that was brought to my attention as potentially causing some concern.

1.3

2.0

That we now have language in here that allows the department to follow -- that is only going to give back a portion of any overage in any particular year. What I am telling this group is we have every intention to convene a group to address that sentence more completely in another amendment.

And I also am saying that this time -- we won't even have to deal with this for at least another two years because we don't have an overage from last year so we will look to you now, I guess, we will look to you to decide if moving forward with language as modified to this point today, if this course of action is what you want to do or would you rather delay this amendment and do all the work with the quota overages before we finalize it?

We will throw it back out to you, Mr. Chairman, to see what you would like to do on this.

MR. LANGLEY: I see some cards going up here. I might have missed the order but I will make sure I get to everybody. Jim?

MR. GRACIE: I have three concerns with the fisheries management plan. One of them is I am not sure that I am willing to -- and I was a member of that subcommittee by the way. I am not sure that I am willing to only consider and

1.3

2.0

amendment on how we pay for overages because one of the things
that came up in the subcommittee discussion was how we do
stock assessments and how we set quotas.

And in fact, if you think about it, what happens is we think that we have had a growing population of yellow perch for several years so that is one of the reasons that there is an overage because there are more fish out there and they are more easily caught.

The other side of the coin is how fast you can notify people and stop the fishery. But if you think about the progression of three successive increases in population, then what you get, as the population gets longer, then the penalty gets larger.

As the population increases, we are going to penalize people more and they are going to get less and less in a growing population. So we had a concern about how the stock assessment relates to the quota. And I think that needs to be part of the discussion, not just how you pay for the overages.

So that is one concern. That we just can't simplify it to that. I guess that is two in one. I am sorry. Because the overage is one part of that but the stock assessment and how it relates -- I see you making some changes in your stock assessment. I am not sure I fully understand all of these elements yet so I will need to think about that a little bit.

1.3

2.0

2.4

I am glad you are taking a harder look at stock assessment.

The other concern I have is it is just incredible to me that we have got a bunch of statements in here about how we can protect this fishery and at different levels of impervious we have made some assumptions, which are only based on correlation, not anything else.

And the problem I have with it is that central Maryland on the western shore, which at one time was the heart of the yellow perch fishery, is going to spend almost \$1 billion a year on restoration in the next probably 2 years from now. This is all the MS4 and the width requirements for restoration work.

And we are not prioritizing. We are missing the boat. We should be telling these counties that it is important to do restoration in these historic yellow perch streams, which we know the habitat has been degraded. The water may be causing problems for the Young of the Year and egg survival. And we are not doing anything about it.

So I think there needs to be some effort to prioritize this effort; in fact, there needs to be some set at the 15 to 25 percent impervious area so we can collect some data and see if it is really true that we can't save anything there. So that really concerns me.

All this money is going to be spent by counties without input from fisheries on a declining yellow perch

1.3

2.0

2.1

2.4

population, which was huge in this state when I was growing up.

And I have had this conversation with people in fisheries, and I don't know why we are not focusing on that. So we need to have somebody looking at the priorities of restoration and how that might help yellow perch, and even if it doesn't, we can at least validate some of our assumptions in here by finding out what we can do with restoration work.

That is my biggest concern. A lot of money being spent that we are not going to take advantage of.

MS. DEAN: Jim, I appreciate your comments both on the environment but also on the stock assessment. But I wanted to also kind of say that the overage adjustments that were brought by the workgroup, and I appreciate all of that because the commercial guys were very appreciative of the work they were able to accomplish in that workgroup.

It wasn't a way to circumvent the allocation. It was more of a management issue because of the timing of being able to shut the fishery down. I just wanted to make sure that I made that clear, and it is great that the 2017 catches show that wasn't the intention of it.

I just wanted to say that overage, it happened within that very short window. But I guess I want to come back to Jim. Jim, would you not support finalizing this FMP because you are afraid those conversations won't happen in

future meetings?

1.3

2.0

2.1

MR. GRACIE: No, I am not going to object to this FMP. I think there are three things that have to be addressed, not just how we pay for the overage. And that is what I said, three things. And I think the restoration one is most important. And I don't think we should hold off the FMP for that.

I think Dave Blazer should get some people to sit down with stakeholders and talk about restoration potential and how we can grab some of that money for yellow perch that is being spent on restoration, which may or may not be doing any good because it is all driven by sediment, nitrogen and phosphorous, not fisheries concerns.

A lot of money being spent on sediment, nitrogen and phosphorus. Most of it modeled, not even measured.

MR. SUTHERLAND: Most of my questions were raised on both sides here but I am the new guy on the block so this has been a learning experience for me. And reading through this, I mean the first thing that came to my mind was this was a great example of recreational people working together with commercial industry.

And I wasn't here but I applaud this group for doing that. I think that is a really -- that attitude of collaboration is very close to my heart as some of you know. I think it is a great example of this.

1.3

2.0

2.4

The second part is in looking at the intent -- I was listening to what you were saying and you pulled out the language about "or a portion of." In reading through this, I look at it and say, is that a relevant point? Does it have to be in here?

And the second point that you raised was the workgroup. We are going to work with the workgroup. Does this amendment actually address all the things that you said the workgroup came up with, the intentions out of that with regard to, again, the workgroup coming back together and addressing long term how do we deal with the overages.

The second is again the question of "the portion of." I don't know what the relevance of that is. Is that a management issue?

MR. LUISI: In order to be accurate in this amendment, in order to have accuracy as to what our management practices have been and how they have been reflected in this, we need to say something about the fact that last year we only had a payback of a portion of the total overage.

We could be much more descriptive about what that portion is. We could state that the portion -- we could say something as to what that portion means in more descriptions. Like for future years, it can't be more than 50 percent and needs to include stock condition as part of the --

You know, we could elaborate on what the portion is.

1.3

2.0

2.4

That is up to the commission if you want to make modifications like that. I just felt that -- this gives you the flexibility in future years if another amendment isn't initiated for us to manage that overage. And we have shown, I think, a commitment, to working with both sides to come to some common agreement on how we manage an overage.

If we just leave the word all in there, in future years if we decide the stock is very healthy, the overage was small, we don't really need to pay the whole thing back, we are kind of going against our own guidance here in the FMP. That is the reason why we added it. I think it does reflect what we have done.

MR. GRACIE: If I could say something, Mike. I think the important point is that what we agreed to this year violated the fisheries management plan. It violated the language in the fisheries management plan because we were supposed to pay back the overage, and we paid back a portion of it.

So that was really in conflict with the fisheries management plan. So I think your language is good. If give us the flexibility to do that if we need to do it again. It doesn't require that we do that and it doesn't eliminate the ability to pay back the whole overage if there are reasons for that.

The rest of it, I am happy with the fisheries

management plan as it is as long as we understand we are 1 2 addressing more than just how to pay back the overage. 3 MR. LUISI: And if the workgroup were to come to a conclusion that there are other issues that they want to 4 address in an amendment, it is up -- you can make a list of 5 things you want to include in an amendment. It doesn't have 6 7 to be just one. 8 MR. SUTHERLAND: My concern was are we on a slippery 9 What happens -- we have all these different people. slope. 10 And then we have to resurrect the past, who is there to 11 resurrect the past? I mean again, I quess we have got notes. 12 Being a new guy on the block, I guess I am asking a 1.3 dumb question but I have seen this happen in the past where 14 you agree to -- so I am just asking the guestion and I think 15 he has answered it, which is, is this consistent with what you 16 intended or is it opening up another door that when you go 17 back, you can't close? And being consistent, as Jim said, 18 with the fishing plan? 19 MR. LANGLEY: At this point --2.0 MR. GRACIE: Are you ready for a motion? 21 MR. LANGLEY -- we are ready for a motion to 22 accept the --23 MOTION 24 MR. GRACIE: I would move that we accept the yellow 25 perch fisheries management plan.

MR. LANGLEY: Jim has made a motion. Do we have a 1 second? 3 MR. DeHOFF: Second. MR. LANGLEY: Second, Mark. All in favor? 4 Whoa. We need discussion and from the 5 MR. GRACIE: public before we vote. 6 7 MR. LANGLEY: Thank you, Jim. Okay, any discussion? Any public comment? 8 9 MR. LEWIS: Ken Lewis, and I think that what 10 happened this year is an exception to the fishery management 11 It is not a change. And so what we doing here is we 12 are actually making a change from the previous document that 1.3 was shown here in July of 2016. A change without real discussion of the implications 14 15 had everybody concerned. So this a new policy that is 16 reflecting what actually happened as an unusual circumstance 17 last year. 18 MR. JENNINGS: Where is the department noting that 19 their participation was part of the problem in going over? 2.0 That it was tough to call and you missed by a day, at the same 21 time, the stock going up? 22 Next time, if this is in there, and the stock is 23 going down, oh, well, we only got to give back a portion. 2.4 That should not follow. And that is why it puts it into 25 language now that there would be a case to be made that, no,

1	we have only got to give 10 percent back. And how would it
2	affect other FMPs?
3	MR. LEWIS: Look how long it took this amendment to
4	work its way through here. Doing and amendment is not a
5	simple process. As you all well know, it has been at least
6	two or three years that we have been working with this.
7	This could all be corrected by removing the phrase,
8	"or partial" or whatever it is and leaving the statement
9	exactly as it was in the draft amendment that came to this
10	body in December or
11	Then we can go back and resolve this whole issue of
12	how we are going to do it but it stays the same as it has
13	traditionally been.
14	MR. GRACIE: Can I move to make an amendment?
15	MR. LANGLEY: Yes, please.
16	MOTION
17	MR. GRACIE: I move that we follow that suggestion
18	and remove that phrase. If we have to make an exception we
19	make it again.
20	Now you want some help with Robert's Rules? You get
21	a second for the amendment. You have to vote on the amendment
22	before the motion.
23	MR. LANGLEY: Do we have a second on the motion? We
24	had a second from Mark for the original.
25	MR. GRACIE: Yes, this is the amendment.

MR. NEELY: Second. 1 2 MR. LANGLEY: All right, we have a second. 3 MR. GRACIE: Discussion. MR. LANGLEY: Discussion on the motion. 4 5 MS. DEAN: I don't think the language as written says with absolute certainty that it has to be a portion. 6 7 think it makes sure that we are not going against the FMP. 8 It only allows for it. It does not say for certainty that would be the procedure but it allows our 9 10 subgroup and our workgroup to have that discussion without 11 being in fear of violating the FMP. I think that leaving that 12 language in allows for the flexibility that we were looking 1.3 for and what the workgroup was working toward and felt 14 comfortable with. 15 There were members of this sport fish commission 16 that felt comfortable with that so I don't think that we need 17 to take that language out. It is not saying that is the way 18 it will be done. It is saying our workgroups have the option 19 to discuss that further. Not that, that is the way it is 2.0 going to have to be. 2.1 First of all, there is no reference or MR. GRACIE: 22 requirement for a workgroup in the fisheries management plan. 23 So there is no quarantee that we would have, as David 2.4 Sutherland characterizes a dumb question, which is a really 25 smart question about whether this was necessary.

There is no requirement that we would have the same mindset or the same people or the same organizations represented in the workgroup. For your information, it was Billy Rice, chairman of the tidal fish commission, and I -- for some reason I have trouble remembering the guy's name from the northern bay.

MR. : Steve Lay.

1.3

2.0

2.4

MR. GRACIE: Steve Lay. And Dave Sikorski and myself. We all agreed that we needed a better way to cut off the fishery and we needed a better way to do stock assessments before we start penalizing people on an arbitrary route. And we also agreed that we weren't ready to figure that out yet.

And you may recall that at the last commission meeting, Dave Sikorski and I made a commitment to get this workgroup together before this meeting so we could discuss this. We failed to do that so we haven't had any further discussions.

I am comfortable with removing that language. I knew that we have some people who have been involved for a long time. That is why I made sure the public got some input on this. So based on my thoughtful response afterward to David Sutherland's question and listening to them, I am comfortable removing that.

If we made an exception with a workgroup this time, we could do it again if there was a reason to.

1.3

2.0

2.4

MR. DeHOFF: I think last time we all discussed this, I thought we had a pretty good consensus that we all felt like it was probably pretty important to pay back the whole thing.

We actually kind of thought of maybe even spreading that out over multiple years. That was one of the ideas that we have had but it seemed that everybody wanted to have that 100 percent payback.

I would not mind having it removed but I do, because of the process and the time it takes to change things and what has to go on, I feel that maybe it might be a good idea to leave in if we could somehow sharpen the pencil on when those occasions would occur when less than 100 percent would be required.

Now that, you get into let's approve this now and go back and make an amendment or an addendum where we can come back and say, let's finalize this verbiage on this. How do we say this? But I can see really strongly on both ways.

I think you need to -- they need to be responsible with that 100 percent or else somewhere down the road somebody is going to say, well, you know, it looks like a good year that we go over. We might not have to pay this back or we only have to pay a little bit back.

Whereas if we say it is 100 percent and it is in the books 100 percent, they know what that it, but then you can

1.3

2.0

2.4

make adjustments. And then that verbiage, if you can sharpen the pencil and word it right, can allow you that time.

So I am kind of playing both sides of the fence here but I see the importance of both ways.

MR. LUISI: And I just wonder -- I am not an attorney. So here is the situation. And I am not taking any sides.

We had it written as all but we made an exception to that for this one case. And we did that in working with one another and the different commissions to come to that conclusion so really did we break our own rules? Is that something that we want to continue to do or we would rather have language in the document that gives us a wider range of options to allow for those discussions?

So I don't know really what that means, doing an exception to what is stated in the FMP. I don't believe that it is written in our regulation that it is a one-for-one payback. I would have to find that and look that up but I just wonder if this is a precedent that we are going to continue to have to have the same -- I don't know.

I am just laying it out there to see -- that is in mind. I am thinking about more flexibility but if that is not the wish and intent of the commission, then we will work with what we end up with.

MR. LANGLEY: Right now we do have the motion on the

table. We have a second. 1 2 MS. DEAN: Can I ask a Robert's Rules question? Ιf the amendment is accepted, does that then become the main motion and we vote again? 4 5 MR. GRACIE: Yes. 6 MS. DEAN: Thank you. 7 MR. LANGLEY: Right now we have the main motion on the table. 8 9 MR. GRACIE: No, we have the amendment on the table 10 to remove the language. 11 MR. LANGLEY: To remove the language. We have a 12 second. 13 MR. LUISI: And that language would be to remove "or a portion of." 14 15 MR. LANGLEY: To remove "or a portion of" and leave 16 it at currently it is a 1-to-1. 17 MR. DeHOFF: 100 percent payback. 18 MR. LUISI: Hey Paul, would you mind highlighting 19 the words "or a portion"? Not the sentence, just the phrase "or a portion" 2.0 21 MR. BLAZER: That is the amended version, to accept 22 the yellow perch FMP minus those three words. 23 MR. GRACIE: So call the question. 24 MR. LANGLEY: Before the question, I had one comment 25 on that. As far as the word portion, I had a little concern

with that too because a portion could be 3 percent. A portion could be 2 percent. A portion could be 5 percent depending on who looks at that.

Is there a protective floor that we could come up

Is there a protective floor that we could come up with as a far as that portion to set it at a level that it would not fall below, whether it is 50 percent, 70 percent or whatever the payback would be, and still allow the workgroup to analyze and work on the process?

MR. GRACIE: I would like to respond to that.

MR. LANGLEY: Yes, Jim.

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

MR. GRACIE: First of all, I don't think any of us would have a clue as to where to set that number on any scientific basis or any good reason. That would be another case of ready, fire, aim, which I don't like doing.

So I don't know that, that is necessary.

Furthermore, the workgroup was able to do something that isn't called for in the fisheries management plan, and both commissions and the fisheries service. So we would have that flexibility to do that again even if we don't change it.

And I guess I share the concerns of -- I don't want to characterize it but I think they are CCA representatives, and CCA has been involved in the yellow perch issue for 20-something years and they have a lot of history with it, and Ken especially and Larry both have been in the middle of this.

And David Sutherland's question is pertinent. We

25

don't know if the workgroup is going to be the same, whether it is going to come up with the same ideas or not. I would 3 just leave it the way it is and let's put the workgroup to work, and I would like to see them address three issues on 4 5 yellow perch. 6 I would be happy with removing that language. 7 don't think that we really have any basis for setting some 8 number, attaching some number to that. 9 MR. SUTHERLAND: So the portion was decided by a 10 workgroup. 11 MR. GRACIE: It was recommended by the workgroup. 12 MR. LUISI: It was recommended to the sport 1.3 fish/tidal fish commission by a smaller group that recommended 14 that to the agency to do a portion, a proportional payback 15 this year in 2017 from the 2016 overage. 16 So we had stepped aside from what the FMP currently 17 says, which is all, and did a portion, as a result of advice 18 from this group and tidal fish, which is why I added it into 19 the document, to reflect what it is we did. 2.0 That is the only reason we added it. It wasn't to 21 forecast the future. It was to clear up what we have done to 22 this point so that this amendment is reflective of the most 23 current and recent management actions that we took. 24 Because it is an open amendment, I felt -- and that

is the reason I pointed it out -- that is the only language

that was added other that data updates to the document since the last time you saw it. 3 MR. LANGLEY: All right, any further discussion? MR. GRACIE: Call the question on the amendment. 4 5 MR. LANGLEY. All right, we are going to call the question on the amendment, to remove "a portion" and leave the 6 7 fishery management plan as it is. All in favor raise your 8 right hand. 9 (Show of hands) 10 MR. LANGLEY: I counted nine. 11 MR. LUISI: I counted nine. 12 MR. LANGLEY: Okay, opposed? 1.3 (Show of hand) MR. LANGLEY: Abstentions? 14 15 (Show of hand) 16 MR. LANGLEY: Okay, the motion passes nine to one. 17 MR. GRACIE: The amendment. 18 MR. LANGLEY: The amendment passes nine to one. 19 Okay, now the original question to approve the original FMP. 2.0 MR. GRACIE: No, FMP as amended. 21 MR. LANGLEY: As amended. Okay, you will get me 22 straight. Thank you, Jim. 23 MR. BLAZER: So it is literally the same vote. 2.4 call the question again. 25 MR. LANGLEY: All in favor?

MS. DEAN: Don't we get to discuss? 1 2 MR. BLAZER: Discussion. 3 MR. LANGLEY: Oh, I am sorry. MS. DEAN: I just wanted to point out a couple 4 5 things. Because we waited so long to this point, I don't think it is imperative that we pass this, and I want to point 6 7 out a couple of things around the table that were mentioned 8 around the table, that maybe we can hold off on this. The first being that Phil had some reservations of 9 10 his own about was there a number that could be reached, and I think there is a number that can be reached. 11 12 Jim recognized that the workgroup didn't meet, and 1.3 we had kind of suggested that they might meet and they might 14 be able to work through some of these things, so maybe a delay 15 is warranted here. 16 Mike also said that, you know, there are some 17 questions and maybe we need a lawyer for whether or not we 18 acted correctly the first time. So I think putting this word 19 in there is probably something we need to do. So maybe we 2.0 kind of need to hold off it. 2.1 And this is all brought about by a management issue, 22 and the timing of being able to shut it down. This is not 23 based on the industry saying, hey, you know, I think we can 2.4 get away with this.

So for those four reasons, I think at this point I

25

would ask that we hold off on making a final decision on this 1 2 FMP because of this wording and because we are changing what 3 we see in front of us now. 4 MR. GRACIE: Are you making a motion to table? 5 MS. DEAN: Jim, is that what I just did? MOTION 6 7 MS. DEAN: Yes, I am making a motion to table. 8 MR. GRACIE: You need to call for a second. 9 MR. LANGLEY: Okay, do we have a second? 10 MR. NEELY: Sure, I will second it. 11 MR. LUISI: Just a point of order on this, just to 12 be clear. So a motion, just so you are clear, a motion to 13 table can't be debated, and if the motion to table is 14 approved, if it doesn't come up at the next meeting, the 15 motion is gone. And then anything goes. 16 A motion to postpone, if you change it to a motion to postpone, can be debated about a certain time, that you 17 18 would postpone it until something. That time of certainty in 19 that postponed motion can be discussed. 20 MS. DEAN: I have just been Robert ruled schooled. 21 May I make a motion to postpone there because I certainly want 2.2 further discussion. Thank you. 2.3 MR. BLAZER: To postpone? 24 MR. LANGLEY: We have a motion to postpone. Do we 25 have a second on that motion?

MR. SUTHERLAND: So what does postpone mean again? 1 2 MR. LUISI: A postponed motion, if there is no 3 particular time certain, like let's postpone until our third meeting from now or let's postpone until the workgroup has an 4 5 opportunity to reconvene and come back to us with a 6 recommendation. 7 If there is nothing like that in it, and it is just a motion to postpone, it is essentially -- it will never come 8 9 back before this group. This amendment will -- we will have 10 to take it upon ourselves --11 MS. DEAN: So it would have to be postponed until 12 next meeting? 1.3 MR. BLAZER: Until we decide to bring it back. 14 There is not a set time. There is not a prescribed time. 15 MR. GRACIE: The important element is a motion to 16 table requires that it be brought up at the next meeting. A 17 motion to postpone does not have a fixed time to it. 18 MS. DEAN: And tabling wouldn't help us here because 19 it is not going to happen before the next meeting, these 2.0 things that we need to work out. So I would like to motion to 21 postpone until the workgroup meets. 22 MR. LUISI: Until after the next meeting after a 23 workgroup meeting. 2.4 MS. DEAN: Yes. 25 MR. LUISI: Something like that would work.

MR. LANGLEY: We have a motion to postpone until 1 2 after the next workgroup meeting. Do we have a second. 3 (No response) MR. GRACIE: There is no motion. 4 MR. LANGLEY: Now we are back to the motion to 5 accept the amended FMP. As amended. All in favor? Raise 6 7 your right hand please? (Show of hands) 8 9 MR. BLAZER: Nine. 10 MR. LANGLEY: Opposed? 11 (Show of hand) 12 MR. LANGLEY: Abstention? 1.3 (Show of hand) 14 MR. LANGLEY: The motion passes nine to one. 15 MR. LUISI: That concludes any business I think 16 related to yellow perch on this issue. So just so you all 17 know, we will have the same conversation on Thursday with the tidal fish commission. 18 19 MS. DEAN: If they approve it without the change, 2.0 how does that --21 MR. LUISI: We will modify that language to show 22 that this group took certain action. Well, Dave and I will 23 talk. 24 MR. GRACIE: My answer to that answer would have 25 been you guys have to decide because we are both advisory

commissions.

2.1

2.2

MR. LUISI: We will get the same or a different reaction from tidal fish and then we will have to figure out where to go.

So with all of that, that concludes everything with yellow perch. Real quickly, the next item on the agenda is a catch and release tournament request prior to opening day.

Catch and Release Tournament Request

MR. LUISI: So we discussed at our last meeting a tournament request that would be before May 1, and we have told you that our policy here is not to permit tournaments, harvest tournaments, prior to May 1. That is just something we have stood by.

We have once deviated from that when May 1 split a weekend but there is a new request now that we received for catch and release tournaments, and what the department, how they would view those prior to even opening day. So this is preseason catch and release tournaments. And whether or not you would advise the department to allow for those tournaments to be conducted.

And we are just looking for some feedback on your recommendation as to whether or not we approve those catch and release tournaments prior to season starting.

MR. DeHOFF: At this time, does this particular request involve a split of the date?

1.3

2.0

2.4

MR. LUISI: We are already past the date. This would be for something for the future, for next year.

MR. BLAZER: We declined them because we weren't sure, didn't know. So we anticipate that they will come back next year and we wanted to bring this up with all, get your feedback.

MR. LANGLEY: I am going to make one comment on that and then I will take questions. Right now at ASMFC, we are under a, in our spring trophy season, we are under a 25 percent reduction from ASMFC on the spawning stock biomass.

This is preseason catch and release. These fish are getting hammered just about 12 months a year. There are not many species that survive that get hammered 12 months a year.

If wildlife did, if rabbits, deer, squirrels were hunted 12 months a year, the populations would probably diminish. And I am not saying in the cold water temperatures. If you are going to catch and release, that is a good time of year to do it but the problem is, using ASFMC's statistics that there is a 9 percent mortality on catch and release.

And on preseason, you know, if you catch 100 fish, you are going to kill 9 prespawned fish based on those statistics at that time of year. So that is where I have high reservations of allowing any preseason catch and release tournaments.

And I will take questions from there.

Questions and Answers

2.1

DR. MORGAN: I would also oppose any kind of tournament prior to opening day, prior to May 1. Not so much dealing with the male population of striped bass but with the female population, if you catch a female, you immediately induce a stress.

And from some of the work that a few of my colleagues have done up and down the East Coast, when you stimulate those cortisol hormones into the system, there is a probability that fish may or may not spawn. So you may not kill the fish but you may definitely damage any potential spawning from that fish.

And that is why we have this period of May 1 enacted. The majority of the spawning -- and of course temperatures have all changed since when I was working with striped bass -- with most of the spawning taking place in April and some spilling over into May perhaps, I would be very much against any tournament prior to May 1 for physiological effects on the female population.

MR. LANGLEY: Thank you, Ray. Any other --

MR. DeHOFF: Well, just as a clarification, on the sheet here it says prior to opening day. We have our date as May 1. Are we talking prior to the third week in April opening day is what they are requesting?

MR. LUISI: Prior to the season even being opened

1	for harvestable fish.
2	MR. DeHOFF: Not just open season for us to allow
3	tournaments. Okay.
4	MR. SUTHERLAND: You have already made the right
5	decision turning it down. It really is that simple. It makes
6	no sense to me why anyone would even consider it.
7	MR. GRACIE: I don't think I want to say too much.
8	I was chair of this commission when we had one of the most
9	heated diverse stakeholder debates ever about preseason catch
10	and release. Not tournaments, just catching in the bay.
11	And it is a tough issue but certainly I would agree
12	with this, no tournaments.
13	MR. BLAZER: If I can ask, is that pretty much the
14	consensus of the group? Do I see anybody opposed to that?
15	MR. GRACIE: Should we make it a motion, make it a
16	matter of record?
17	MR. BLAZER: I would appreciate that.
18	MOTION
19	MR. GRACIE: I move that we prohibit any preseason
20	catch and release tournaments.
21	MR. SUTHERLAND: I will second it.
22	MR. LANGLEY: All right, any public discussion?
23	MR. NEELY: Please restate it. Just restate it,
24	exactly what it is you are asking us to vote on.
25	MR. BLAZER: The motion is to prohibit catch and

release tournaments for striped bass prior to opening -- the 1 2 season opening. I have got the motion by Mr. Gracie and the 3 second by Mr. Sutherland. MR. NEELY: Call for discussion. 4 5 MR. LANGLEY: Okay, any discussion? MR. NEELY: Typically when would those dates be? 6 7 MR. LUISI: Third Saturday in April. Is the opening date. 8 MR. BLAZER: 9 Did you ask for public comment? MR. GRACIE: 10 MR. LANGLEY: I did ask for that, Jim. All right, 11 we have a motion on the table. We have a second. All in 12 favor, please raise your right hand. 1.3 (Show of hands) 14 MR. BLAZER: Thank you. Unanimous. 15 MR. LANGLEY: Unanimous. 16 MR. LUISI: Thank you for that, and Mr. Chairman, in 17 the interest of time, the last item on the agenda has to do with our coastal fisheries forums that we have. 18 19 Coastal Forum Update 20 MR. LUISI: We go down to Ocean City two to three 2.1 times a year. Dave and I go. Dave, Lynn and I along with our 22 coastal fisheries program staff have open forum discussions 23 with coastal and recreational fishermen about any issue that 24 we have to bring to them and whatever they have to bring to 25 us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

We held those meetings on March 27 of this year. There are write-ups in your packet about what we discussed. Ι don't need to necessarily go through it all but if you have any questions about anything discussed down on the coast, you know how to find me. And if you are okay with that, we will leave it there. DR. MORGAN: Mike, are there any hot topics coming down, you know, in the next year or two, like marlin or anything like that? Nothing serious? MR. LUISI: Oh, there are plenty of hot topics. of the big things that will be discussed is a comprehensive summer flounder amendment. It will deal with commercial allocations not just in Maryland but along the coast, a potential shift in those allocations. It will also look at the recreational fishery and potentially shifting allocations from states to other states given the climate variability and the shift and the movement of summer flounder on the East Coast. It is going to be a huge undertaking. It is already two years in the works but it is probably two or three years coming but it will be a big deal. BLAZER: The other thing I might add to that, I mean, not a big issue for us but that is Mike, is cobia. kind of brewing in the south Atlantic states, and we are kind

of on the fringe of that but cobia is something that has got a

1 lot of interest.

2.1

2 MR. LANGLEY: Thank you, Mike. I will make a quick 3 call for any new business. Any public comment?

Public Comment

MR. LEWIS: Just two comments on the yellow perch fishery management plan. I would like to give my appreciation to the department for working on that. It has been a long time coming and it has updated a lot of data.

Secondly, there is a statement in there that all of the yellow perch monitoring for the commercial industry is done electronically. That is not the case. There are six people who harvested this year and are still tagging individual fish, and I couldn't understand why so I checked it out.

Apparently there is a small group of people who don't want to get involved in electronic monitoring. So they are willing to hand-tag all their fish but it is not all being done electronically.

There is also a statement in there that both the commercial and recreational sectors have requested a change in the TAC. And I have been involved in this for 10 or 15 years, and I can never recall any recreational group requesting a change in the TAC.

We know that the commercial did because we have seen the request from the groups. But unless somebody has

```
information to the contrary, I would like to see that removed.
 2
              MR. LANGLEY: Thank you. Any other new business?
 3
              (No response)
 4
              MR. LANGLEY: All right, motion to adjourn.
 5
              MR. SUTHERLAND: Motion.
 6
                            : Second.
              MR.
 7
              MR. LANGLEY: Meeting is adjourned.
              (Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 5:32 p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```