Maryland DNR Fall Meeting of the Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission

Tuesday, October 14, 2014

Held at theTawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland

Maryland DNR Summer Meeting of the Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission

October 14, 2014

SFAC Members Present:

Bill Goldsborough, Chair

Micah Dammeyer
Rachel Dean
Mark De Hoff
Jim Gracie
Shawn Kimbro (proxy for Dave Sikorski)
Phil Langley
Val Lynch
Dr. Ray P. Morgan II
Ed O'Brien
Vince Ringgold
Roger Trageser
John Welch (proxy for Beverly Fleming)
James Wommack

SFAC Members Absent:

Kate Chaney
Beverly Fleming
Dave Sikorski
Tim Smith

Maryland DNR Fisheries Service

Tom O'Connell Noreen Eberly

Maryland DNR Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission Meeting

October 14, 2014

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

	Page
Welcome and Announcements by Chair Bill Goldsborough, SFAC and Tom O'Connell, Director MD DNR Fisheries Service	5
NRP Activity Report by Lt. Beth Mauk MD DNR NRP	6
Questions and Answers	8
Regulatory Updates and Regulatory Scoping Items by Jacob Holtz MD DNR Fisheries Service	11
Questions and Answers	23
Estuarine and Marine Fisheries Management Planning	53
American Eel Fishery Management Plan Review	
by Nancy Butowski MD DNR Fisheries Service	53
Questions and Answers	58
Atlantic Croaker/ Spot Fisheries Management Plan Review by Nancy Butowski	
MD DNR Fisheries Service	65
Questions and Answers	74
Coastal Fisheries Forum Update by Lynn Fegley	
MD DNR Fisheries Service	83
Overview of ASMFC Annual Meeting of October 27-31 by Tom O'Connell, Director	
MD DNR Fisheries Service	86
Questions and Answers	92

$\underline{I} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{D} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{X}$ (continued) Page Public Comment 103 Inland Fisheries Management Plan by Don Cosden MD DNR Fisheries Service 110 Questions and Answers 114 Fisheries Habitat Workgroup Update by Commissioner Jim Gracie 123 Invasive Species Bill by Bevin Buchheister Chesapeake Bay Commission 126 Questions and Answers 128 Fishing App by Greg Schildwachter Watershed Results 132 Questions and Answers 135 Fisheries Annual Budget Report and Closing Remarks by Tom O'Connell, Director MD DNR Fisheries Service 137

1	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
2	(2:10 p.m.)					
3	Welcome and Announcements					
4	by Bill Goldsborough, Chair, SFAC					
5	and Tom O'Connell, Director, MD DNR Fisheries Service					
6	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Welcome to the Sport Fish					
7	Advisory Commission quarterly meeting. You all have your					
8	agendas, so you know what is before us. We might be adding					
9	one or two things.					
10	First let me note we have got a couple of					
11	commissioners not here. Tim Smith's wife just had a baby so					
12	he is not able to be here for personal reasons. Kate Chaney					
13	has business conflicts and couldn't be here. And I don't					
14	think either of their proxies is able to make it. I know					
15	Kate's is not.					
16	And Beverly Fleming is not here but sent John Welch.					
17	Welcome, John.					
18	MR. WELSH: Thank you.					
19	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: And Shawn Kimbro is here for Dave					
20	Sikorski. Anything else? Anybody else I am missing?					
21	MR. : Mr. Wommack?					
22	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Oh, yes, Mack. Where is Mack? I					
23	haven't heard anything. He didn't say he wasn't coming. We					
24	will see. So if there are no other announcements up front and					
25	neither Tom nor I have any at this point, we will have some					

1	things later on, I am going to open it up for public comment
2	right now.
3	Does anybody have anything they want to bring before
4	the commission that is not on the agenda? Otherwise an agenda
5	item, particularly any that involves motions or decisions of
6	some sort, we will allow for public comment then.
7	MR. SCHILDWACHTER: Do you want me to go now?
8	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Well, just introduce your topic.
9	MR. SCHILDWACHTER: I am Greg Schildwachter. I am
10	here on behalf of a project that has developed a smart phone
11	app for anglers to self-report their data. So when the time
12	is right, Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain where it is at
13	and encourage everybody to get behind the effort.
14	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Yes, I think that is right up our
15	alley. Unless anybody objects, we will try to fit in a few
16	minutes to let Greg brief us on that initiative. I
17	participate in it and so does Ed Liccione and a few others,
18	and I think it is very worthwhile. So I think you all will
19	find it that way. Anything else for public comment?
20	(No response)
21	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay, let's move on to the NRP
22	Activity Report. Lt. Mauk?
23	NRP Activity Report
24	by Lt. Beth Mauk, MD DNR NRP
25	LT. MAUK: Good afternoon. I hope that everybody

2.1

2.5

got a copy of our narrative. There are two reports in there.

One is derived from our new computer automated dispatch and it is a lot of figures. Probably hard for you to digest. You don't need to.

It is nice for us. We meet on a monthly basis with all of our commanders to sort of see how many calls for service and what these data trends look like in terms of areas of the state and types of violations.

A little easier to understand is probably the one you are used to seeing, which is just sort of a bullet-point list of what we noticed. If you look over that, we had a fair amount of crabbing violations this year, at least I thought so.

I was a little surprised at how many citations were written for recreational possession of female crabs. And to toot our own horn a little bit, I think you guys may have seen the Don't Get Pinched Initiative that we did. I think that is part to do with why our numbers are a little higher in terms of crab, recreational crabbing violations.

I don't think our commercial violations were substantial. If anything, I think they were lower. I think most commercial crabbers would agree there weren't that many crabs out there this year. Most crabs they harvested --- .

Striped bass violations, really the only one to note is the 66 fish that some gentleman decided to harvest up at

Port Smallwood I think or Armistead.

A lot of our tickets now are must appear. It wasn't always the case so we are glad about that. We are getting really good results in our court system. And I guess another case to note would be the -- we got a lot of complaints in the northern part of Anne Arundel County in reference to thefts from crab pots. And we did complete some surveillance and we did apprehend a couple guys. And we did charge them with theft along with the natural resources violation.

And that stuff I think goes to court in November.

Any questions about the list of violations?

Question and Answers

MR. LYNCH: On your list, you have entries to homeland security. How does that play in?

LT. MAUK: Homeland Security checks are done while we are doing our job, so if I go out to check commercial crabbers under the Bay Bridge, I am looking at that infrastructure. I am going to call that a Homeland Security check when I do that, and then our communication center is going to log that.

MR. LYNCH: I don't know what that means. You call it a Homeland Security check.

LT. MAUK: I would get on the police radio and I would say my unit number and say that I am doing a Homeland Security check of the Bay Bridge, for example. We have

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

2.5

identified several targets around the state, the Naval Academy being one, the Bay Bridge being another, probably the Patuxent Air Base is probably one. I don't know them everywhere, but I do know Anne Arundel. So the officers are instructed -- it used to be they did it with pen and paper. It used to be that they would have to log those and hand those in every week. But now that we are computer automated, they just say it over the police radio, and a dispatcher records that in the computer. MR. LYNCH: So you are reporting anomalies? LT. MAUK: We are reporting that we are checking that Bay Bridge for any type of problem. So if we go out there and Greenpeace is doing some type of operation, which is not uncommon, coming out of Sandy Point, and we stop and check those folks that would be a Homeland Security check. Or if we just go out and inspect the Bay Bridge, particularly if we are getting ready for a 10K across the bay. Those officers will be doing Homeland Security checks like 24 hours a day before that bridge walk happens. That would be a Homeland Security check. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Jim? MR. GRACIE: Do you have any details on this 64 fish over this limit, this 66 undersized?

LT. MAUK: I do. It was just some folks who were

1	fishing does it say Port Armistead? Port Smallwood. Yes,	
2	it was just a regular routine patrol check, and officers check	
3	in there all the time. Those anglers tend to be weekend	
4	anglers and not necessarily always the most educated anglers	
5	that we encounter.	
6	And so that guy was just collecting up huge cooler	
7	full of striped bass.	
8	MR. GRACIE: Did he claim he didn't know?	
9	LT. MAUK: No, I don't think so?	
10	MR. : Were they licensed?	
11	LT. MAUK: I believe the were licensed, and I know	
12	that those tickets are must-appear tickets. And so it had to	
13	be only the one guy because he is 64 fish over, so two of	
14	those fish	
15	MR. O'CONNELL: Were his.	
16	LT. MAUK: Could have been his if had they been 18	
17	inches or over but they were not. He couldn't even keep the	
18	two that were legal. And he must have just got into a school	
19	of them and I don't know if he knew or didn't know. But I	
20	will certainly ask that officer.	
21	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Any other questions for Lt. Mauk?	
22	(No response)	
23	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Easy one.	
24	LT. MAUK: It was easy.	
25	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Let's move on to the regulatory	

2.3

update and scoping items. Jacob?

Regulatory Updates and Regulatory Scoping Items

by Jacob Holtz, MD DNR Fisheries Service

MR. HOLTZ: All right, how are you all doing today? So for our regulatory update, as far as things that you all would be interested in that became effective, there is a summer flounder study going on out in the Atlantic right now.

It is a commercial study but just so you all are aware of it going on. We talked to you about this before. For the area one to three miles off the coast, commercial hook and liners are going to be allowed to keep summer flounder of the size limit --- gears, so they would be keeping 14-inch fish when previously they were only keeping 16-inch fish.

They will still be keeping 16-inch fish within a mile of the coast and the coastal bays tiers study, and after the tiers we are going to see how it performed.

Also recreational gear rules went into effect on September 29. We got rid of the use of finfish trotlines and are eliminating the use of jugs to 10 jugs in the tidal tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay. And that is from July to the end of February so that way it doesn't interact with striped bass spawning as much.

As far as regulations that have been proposed, none of the regulations that were proposed in the last quarter affect the recreational fisheries. You can see the ones that

2.1

2.5

we did propose that would affect the commercial fishery is on that page.

And that is it as far as what we have proposed or what became effective. Switching gears, going over to the scoping for this quarter -- and just a reminder, for scoping we are giving you an idea of what we are going to be working on and how we intend to get this information out to the public.

What would be really useful from you guys is if you can tell us if you think we need to do any more to get this information out to the public. So for American eels, there was a consideration of Draft Addendum IV to the FMP at ASMFC.

The board postponed final action, and although they are going to discuss it again at ASMFC's annual meeting at the end of this month, ASMFC had an informational meeting in June.

Whatever ASMFC decides, we will make sure that you all are aware of that, and we are going to post that on the Website, and we will take action based on that.

For black bass, that is large mouth and small-mouth bass, we have received a lot of reports of extended periods of poor fishing the last couple years on the tidal Potomac.

Possible solutions that we are considering are size or creel limit changes. We don't have an idea or we are certain what we are going to do right now.

There is a meeting scheduled with PRFC and I believe

2.1

2.5

Virginia as well and DC, and that will be -- I guess either

November or December we will --- . Based on the results of
that meeting, we are going to have a better idea of what we
are going to do and if we are going to make changes and if so
what those changes would be.

After that meeting we will let you all know the results of that meeting and what we are looking at. If we didn't make changes, we would post those on the Website for the scoping. We have sent out an angler survey before to get an idea of whether the public would be receptive to these changes or what changes they would like to see made.

So we didn't think a public meeting or anything like that would be necessary.

For crabs, for the --

MR. O'CONNELL: Hey, Jacob, can I interrupt you for one second?

MR. HOLTZ: Sure.

MR. O'CONNELL: Just a couple points on the black bass that I think are worth noting for some people who may not be as familiar with that fishery. One is that there is a lot of concern about the status of black bass in the Potomac River. And Maryland has taken the lead on doing a lot of surveys but the jurisdictional regulatory responsibility is within the Potomac River Fisheries Commission.

Maryland has the rules for the Maryland tribs.

lcj 14

2.1

2.5

Virginia has the rules for the Virginia tribs of the Potomac, and the Potomac River Fisheries Commission manages the river.

So it is very important if we are going to pursue possible changes to work closely with the Potomac River commission and Virginia. Ideally we would like to agree upon a common set up rules.

If we can't, it doesn't mean we won't do something different, but ideally we want to see consensus on that approach. So that was the one point. And we are having this meeting with the Potomac River Fisheries Commission in December. The second point is the online poll that we did -- it is kind of a new tool we are using to get public input. The public can provide us with their input at their own leisure. They don't have to come to a meeting. They can take the time to fill out the poll and send it to us.

As we talked about before, we have been having a limited amount of people turn out at our public meetings or open houses. We had about 700 people complete the survey online. So that is the second time we have done it, I think. One for trout and one for black bass, and we are finding it is a really good tool to get public input and help us understand the perspectives on these fisheries.

So I just wanted to provide you those two items. Thanks.

MS. DEAN: How do you access the poll?

1	MR. O'CONNELL: Well, it is available online, and	
2	what we also did was we utilized e-mails that sport fish	
3	license holders gave us and blasted it out to them. So we	
4	used e-mails, we did our social media, we put it on the Web,	
5	just trying to get the word out. It is no longer available	
6	online. It has been shut down but that is how we distributed	
7	that. Jim, did you have	
8	MR. GRACIE: I think that was my question. How did	
9	you publicize the fact that it was online?	
. 0	MR. O'CONNELL: Through e-mail blasts with the sport	
.1	fishermen, Facebook posts, tweets, I think Constant Contact	
2	when people give us their e-mails outside of the license	
.3	process. And just on our Website.	
4	MR. GRACIE: If this were a regulatory process,	
.5	would that satisfy the public notice requirements?	
- 6	MR. O'CONNELL: The public scoping requirements?	
7	MR. GRACIE: No, public notice requirements on final	
. 8	regs.	
9	MR. O'CONNELL: No, this is all just kind of	
20	preliminary scoping.	
21	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: So it is an intermittent tool.	
22	That would seem like a good way for commission members to be	
23	able to get their contacts to weigh in so when you are using	
24	that tool on something of relevance here, if you could just	
5	lot us know	

1 MR. O'CONNELL: Hopefully we did that but I can't 2 say for certain. 3 MS. HUNT: If you bought a fishing license you got it. Just kidding. 4 MR. O'CONNELL: But did we notify sport fish of the 5 survey? Jacob, could you just make a note? If we don't by 6 standard operating procedures notify the commissions when we 8 do a survey like that and we should send them an e-mail. 9 MR. TRAGESER: I know I got it but I could have gotten it for a lot of different reasons. 10 MS. HUNT: Did you sign up for the Constant Contact 11 12 list maybe? 13 MR. TRAGERSER: I think I did get it. 14 MR. LANGLEY: As far as the reduction that we are 15 seeing a number of fish taking, how does that compare to what 16 we are seeing with invasive species in the Potomac, in the 17 tributaries, as they are increasing? Is there a pattern that 18 we are seeing? 19 MR. O'CONNELL: In the short term we could try to 20 put two and two together and -- blue catfish are increasing. 2.1 Tidal bass are decreasing. There have been some --- studies 22 that do consume black bass. I don't think that is the primary 23 factor right now. 24 A lot of it seems to be dealing with the amount of 2.5 habitat. Submerged grass has really dropped off. That could

2.1

be a factor in survival of recruitment. There doesn't seem to be any maybe one thing. It is probably a combination of things.

One last point: We are going to be analyzing our survey that we did this year to see what the population looks like. One point of the year, like spring, I don't know if it is spring or fall, one season it is like fishermen are saying there is nothing out there, and another season they show back up again.

It is almost seems like the fish behavior has changed and the fishermen are probably just figuring that out. But there is enough concern, and given the popularity and importance of this fishery, the majority of the stakeholders are willing to impose some further restrictions as a conservative approach to protect the resource and the fisheries that rely upon them.

MR. HOLTZ: Moving on to blue crabs, for 2015, we are going to raise the peeler size limit from April 1 to July 14. Right now it is three and a quarter inches in that first leg and then three and a half inches the rest of the year.

And it is going to be three and a half inches for the whole year next year. The reason for that is we are trying to maximize protection for spawning females, and the peeler fishery has a really high female percentage. So hopefully this size limit change will allow more females to

2.5

1 enter the population. That would only be for 2015. Right now we are 2 3 planning on just scoping that on the Website, and depending what you all think and obviously what the Tidal Fisheries 4 Advisory Commission thinks would be -- I think this was 5 actually the recommendation of one of the blue crab 6 workgroups. 8 So if you all had any concerns about just doing that 9 on the Web for the time being --10 MR. GRACIE: You said that was a recommendation of the Blue Crab Workgroup. Which -- the raising the peeler size 11 12 or scoping on the Website? 13 MR. HOLTZ: No, raising the peeler size. 14 MR. GRACIE: That is what I thought. Okay. 15 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: You mean as a way to accomplish 16 the 10 percent cutback. 17 MR. HOLTZ: Correct, as part of it, yes. Fishery management areas: The fishery service owns a little over 18 19 1,100 acres, and there are certain activities that are allowed 20 on certain areas and other activities that aren't allowed on 2.1 other areas. So just to make things clear, rather than just 22 23 having signs on each of the individual properties, we are 24 going to be doing regs to make it clear where the fishery

management areas are and what you are allowed to do on those

2.1

2.5

properties.

The plan for that right now is also just to scope it on the Website, and you also have an attachment in your packets for additional information on the fishery management areas.

We are looking at re-doing the elections for the oyster committees on the commercial fishery. That is more of a concern for the tidal fish commission but right now we are planning on scoping this on the Website and then reaching out to the current county committee chairs and oyster surcharge holders.

The regulations for the sport fish advisory commission and tidal fish advisory commission haven't been updated in about 20 years. So we are planning on going in there in the next month or -- I am sorry, the next quarter. Because this affects you guys, we just wanted to give you a heads up that we were planning on working on this.

We are going to have a draft regulation before the next meeting that we are going to send out to the commissions so we are going to come back to you next meeting and ask for your opinions on what we have put together because it really just affects the commission members.

And so after the next meeting we will scope it on our Website but I just wanted to give you all a heads up that we are going to be working on that.

2.1

2.5

For snapper/grouper, a number of our partner management agencies have increased the landing limits for some species and are also specific as to whether commercial landing limits are whole or gutted weights.

Our plan is to increase our landing limits and specify whether limits are whole or gutted weights to be consistent with the partners that we manage those species with. The plan for that is also to scope on the Website.

And the last item is striped bass. We don't have a final decision by ASMFC that I believe, Tom, is coming in the meeting in October. At which point, we will have a better idea of what we need to do. Informational meetings were held in September.

Based on what ASMFC decides, we will -- because we have had these meetings already, we are planning on scoping whatever changes are necessary on the Website unless you all would rather us scope those changes in a different way.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Comments on that?

MR. O'CONNELL: The first point that Jacob is looking for is whether or not we should have public meetings for striped bass. It is one of our major fisheries, and whether or not we should do that or you think that we have had sufficient public outreach during the ASMFC public hearing process to just post the proposed actions on the Website.

So what we are going to be looking at, just as a

2.1

2.5

brief reminder, is pending ASMFC action, we are going to be looking at quota reductions for the commercial fishery. We are going to be looking at minimum size increases for the spring trophy fishery and we are going to be looking at minimum size increases for the summer/fall fishery.

Some management change on the coastal side, whether that is reduced creel limit or some type of increased minimum size or slot. And there is a chance that we may be required to have the commercial and recreational size, minimum sizes, the same.

There are a lot of issues that affect a lot of people, so we may want to consider having a meeting on that. Two other items that are outside the ASMFC process, or ASMFC plan requirements that have come up during our public discussion that I would ask for some input and see what you guys have today.

One is our preseason catch-and-release fishery March first to the third Saturday in April. We have put forth some guardrails on the fishery several years ago, which many of you commission members have been involved in. No stinger hooks, certain hook requirements for trawling and using live bait, limitations of up to only six rods per charter boat.

We have heard some suggestions that this is the one time a year that we can actually do something in protecting the females. While it probably doesn't result in a

2.1

2.5

large -- it probably doesn't result in a measurable level of reduction that we can use as a conservational equivalency action, it may be a good strategy that we can go to ASMFC and tell them that we are doing everything we can to protect these females spawners when they are in the bay.

So one, you know, do you think that the department should scope an idea on prohibiting catch-and-release fishing for striped bass from March 1st to the third Saturday in April?

Another item that has come up is in regard to the requirement of using circle hooks. And we just got this inquiry about this. The staff are trying to put together the information we have on using circle hooks.

But the individual who brought this forward thought that, recognizing that we are going to have a lot of interaction with the 2011 year class for the next couple of years, and if ASMFC does increase the minimum size, we are going to have a lot of discard losses, and whether or not the use of circle hooks as a requirement would help conserve some of those striped bass.

So another idea is whether or not we should go out and scope the required use of circle hooks. Again, scoping is a way to get public input on ideas. So I just wanted to throw that out because our next meeting I think is in February. And after the ASMFC meeting, we are going to have to very quickly

go out to the public and scope the regulations and then propose them by mid-December.

So now is the time to have these discussions about other things that we may want to consider doing. Outside of having this in place by mid-December, we could always consider it again, you know, in the spring but by the time those regulations would be adopted it would be too late at least for the preseason catch-and-release fishery.

So with that, if anybody wants to comment on those two ideas. And then we need to come back and answer Jacob's question, if you think scoping these items on the Website is sufficient or if you think we should have a public meeting.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: All right, so let's see if we can give Tom some feedback on those two issues, the preseason catch-and-release fishery and use of circle hooks. I saw Mark first, and I will get you, Jim, and Mack.

Questions and Answers

MR. DEHOFF: I know that based on the conversations

I have had with people in the past, especially some of the
things being announced for public comment and things like that
over the last year or so, that people are really looking
forward to more opportunities to be able to voice their
comments.

And also to make sure that they feel the department could do a better job in announcing where these things are

2.1

2.5

going to be,	how they are going to be,	because some of the
feedback was	that some of the meetings	that were for the gear,
they were ve	ery minimally attended.	

And they were -- some comments that I heard were, well, that is just the department trying to put these up.

Nobody is going to them. Nobody goes to them, so why have them?

So I think it would be a very good idea to open up the ways and opportunities for people to be able to voice their comments on that. I think that is going to be a very good idea, especially on something as impactful as this Addendum IV and the changes we may be making from it.

As opposed to -- and regarding the preseason catch and release and the circle hooks, the people I know that I talked to feel that the rod limits and hook limits and things like that, especially considering the water temperatures, has minimal impact on the fishery.

And I heard fewer that disagree with that but most seem to lean in that direction, and I think we should move forward with something on bait fishing with circle hooks.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Jim? Oh, Jacob, did you have a response to that?

MR. HOLTZ: I just had one question. So right now when we have public meetings, what we do is we post it on our Website, we put it on our Facebook, on the Twitter, we send it

2.1

2.5

out to our e-mail listserv as far as everybody who signed up for it.

Are there any other ways that you can think of that would get the word out to get people to actually come to these meetings because from my perspective I am a loss to figure out how to get people to actually show up.

MR. DEHOFF: And I am too, and that has been my comment to them. You know, they give you every opportunity but you have to take some interest in this and you -- they are not going to come knocking on your door saying, please give me your comment. You are going to have to go to the Website and look for the question or look for the opportunity to do this if you want to give your input.

I just think based on past history and what is coming up, that we need to make an effort to at least take an extra step on something as impactful as Addendum IV.

MR. O'CONNELL: Given that we have had some really good responses on this online survey, do you think people are more apt to -- more likely to participate in an online survey that they could do at their home or sitting somewhere while they are waiting for their kids?

MR. DEHOFF: Sending it to their e-mail address and asking them to please complete this, it doesn't get any easier than that. I mean, you would almost think that, you would hate to think you have to go that far. If someone is

1 interested enough in the process and in what is going on to complain about it, that they would at least have the 2 initiative to find out what they need to do to make a change. 3 If we could do that, I certainly think that would be 4 valuable feedback. 5 MR. O'CONNELL: I think based upon the preliminary 6 results of some of these online surveys, that is something for 8 us to consider using more of, recognizing that it is not a 9 vote but you can get -- you can get some perspective from a 10 much larger group of people. When we had our striped bass informational meeting, 11 12 we had maybe 20 people show up. We do an online survey and we are getting 700 people. So I think we will definitely look 13 14 for more opportunities to utilize that tool. 15 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Jim? 16 MR. GRACIE: Actually I want to first go back to 17 something else, the peeler crab scoping question. primarily of interest to commercial fishing? 18 19 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. 20 MR. GRACIE: Then I don't have any problem with 2.1 doing it on the Website. 22 The other issue is that it is my impression that our 23 interest in public hearings dropped off in the central part of the state when we lost our outdoor writer because they used to 24 2.5 be listed in Candy's column regularly.

So that there is no general public notice anymore.		
You are getting high numbers of responses to an online survey		
but you are getting it from a select group, not a broad		
spectrum. So I am not sure what the answer is but I think it		
is something you need to think about, especially now if we are		
talking about striped bass. That is something you could		
probably get some publicity on.		
I would think that public hearings are a better way		
to get a broad spectrum of input, even if the numbers aren't		
as great. When you work with people who have signed up to be		
on an e-mail list or Twitter or something else like that, you		
have got a selective group there. It is not necessarily		
random.		
MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: And to that point, an earlier		
comment, so when you get a fishing license, are you put on		
the you have to offer your e-mail address there, right?		
MR. HOLTZ: You have to choose to give the		
department your e-mail address and you also have to choose to		
receive e-mails.		
MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: So that could be a mechanism you		
encourage, and explain why.		
MS. DEAN: I want to go back to Jim real quick. He		
asked about peeler size change and you said it wouldn't affect		
recreational?		
MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Minimally but it does.		

MS. DEAN: Okay, but it does, for bait fishing. 1 2 Okay. MR. HOLTZ: It would be universal for the whole 3 It is just --4 state. 5 MS. DEAN: So it would affect --MR. HOLTZ: Yes. 6 MR. DEHOFF: I just have one quick thing, Jim, about 8 Candy not being around any longer. I do have a contact with 9 Andy Noble down there at Sun Paper. He does the outdoors 10 calendar. And he posts all of our MSSA meetings, things like 11 that. 12 I know that if we contacted him with this 13 information, saying there was going to be a public hearing or something like that, he could post that in the outdoor 14 15 calendar both online and in the back page of the Sunday sport 16 section. He would do that for us. 17 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay, I am down to you, Mack, and then I got Phil and then I will put you on, Vince. 18 19 MR. WOMMACK: First, let me apologize to the board. 20 I have been out with some health issues so I missed a couple 2.1 I just want to apologize to the board for that. meetings. 22 What I want to talk about: I was down Chincoteague 23 yesterday and I was talking to some of the older guys, and we 24 were talking about this rock situation and this crab 2.5 situation. I know when I was coming up, there was a guy who

used to come on the TV show all the time called Scotchie's Corner that dealt with the lower Eastern Shore.

lcj

2.1

2.5

There is a new guy now, and I am getting in touch with him on Channel 16, who does most of the lower Eastern Shore and some of the issues going on.

I want to try, if you open it up to the public, I want to try to get him here but if I can get a date I can get him to put it on the news on the lower Eastern Shore to get a lot of people out.

There is a major concern with rockfish and right now they are flooded with 17 and below rockfish. You know, everywhere you throw out, that is what you are getting.

But one of the major issues that came across from the older watermen and different things is they are opening up rockfish in the 30-inch range with some of them close to 60, 70 crabs in their bellies.

So you know, you kind of got a conflict going on because you are trying to get the crab population straight and you got the rockfish eating up the crabs.

So I am wondering, maybe we can all kind of sit down and maybe get a good picture of what would be the best strategy because I believe one of the problems we are seeing with these rockfish is there isn't enough food around, and it is putting so much pressure on other things in the bay and we are kind of fighting each other, one hand fighting the other

2.5

1 hand dealing with issues. But I think if we could -- I don't know if the 2 3 Menhaden is so bad, with the small peanuts, that it is not food enough for them to feed on anymore and they are just 4 turning to all other species and eating them, which is causing 5 the problem with us dealing with crabs and everything. 6 7 So I think it would be really nice if we could open 8 it back up to the public and let me see if I can work on 9 getting this guy here to come to the meeting and talk and give 10 his input, especially since he deals with the lower ocean 11 shore and Chincoteague and all of that in the lower bay with 12 the rockfish. Get some input. 13 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Do you remember his name, Mack? 14 MR. WOMMACK: I have to call the old-timer because 15 he shot it to me today but he told me just give Channel 16--16 : Andrew Tulls*? MR. 17 MR. WOMMACK: I think that might be it. (Simultaneous conversation) 18 19 MR. WOMMACK: He is really good and knowledgeable 20 about what is going on, especially in the lower bay with the 2.1 movement of rockfish and everything. 22 So maybe we can all get some input because if we 23 don't deal with the amount of crabs they are eating -- you know, 60 to 70 crabs in one rockfish, that is ridiculous so 24

can you imagine the amount of crabs that is being eaten, the

soft crabs out there and little crabs? It is taking its toll. I bet we have got a major food chain issue going on 2 3 here as well. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Mack. That is a good 4 reminder of some of the other issues we are dealing with. 5 I have two comments on that: One is there is a 6 commitment in the new bay agreement to evaluate the forage 8 base available in the bay. 9 That is already being followed up on with a technical workshop coming up next month, so they are going to 10 be trying to go down the road of figuring out what constitutes 11 enough of a forage base of all the different species and what 12 actions we might be able to take to ensure it continues to be 13 14 enough or that we restore it so it is enough. 15 The other comment is about habitat and grass beds, 16 especially down where you are. I think that is another key 17 factor when you talk about predation impacts on crabs because the grasses in the bay now are about 20 percent of their 18 19 historic coverage. They have got to have a place to hide to 20 be able to minimize predation impacts. 2.1 It is another factor that our Habitat Subcommittee 22 is focused on as well. Did you have a follow-up?

23

24

2.5

SO

MR. WOMMACK: Well, I just wanted to -- one other

thing he reminded me of was not only the rockfish but you got

301/577-5882

1 really bad -- small redfish that are like the garbage can of the bay. It eats up a lot of the small crabs too. 2 3 So we are dealing definitely with an issue with the food chain that is going to be really traumatic on the crab 4 5 population. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Bad or good depending on how you 6 look at it. MR. WOMMACK: Well, bad because if they eat up all 8 9 those little crabs you aren't going to have any. 10 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: I have got Phil, Vince and Ed on the list now. Okay, Phil? 11 12 MR. LANGLEY: I just want to go back to the catch and release and I will just kind of express my feelings 13 14 here. As far as the catch-and-release season, I think there 15 at least needs to be one month where these fish aren't 16 harassed. They are not touched. 17 Most of the major species, whether it is hunting season --deer or whatever, rabbits -- there is an off-season 18 19 for it, and there is a commercial fishery in March in 20 Virginia. The Potomac River extends part of it into March. 2.1 And even, I am not taking anything away from anybody, but 22 catch and release in March. 23 But it would be nice I think to have one month when these fish were harass-free. 24

MR. RINGGOLD: In regards to scoping, public, I have

2.5

2.1

2.5

been very disappointed in the ones that I have been to because there is nobody there. So I have no clue how to get them there, which is really concerning.

Circle hooks: As a charter captain, a new charter captain, I should say, and being a mate, I am not seeing the damage that people are saying that the small treble hooks do.

Utilizing a small treble hook, you are more in tune with the rod and the reel, and most of the people I know, when they are using these circle hooks, unless they are really experienced, are just setting it in the rod holder and letting it go.

On the trips I have taken as captain and as mate, I am not seeing the discards so I don't honestly see where there is a need for it.

The preseason catch and release, as you know, I brought this up at the sport fish meeting last time, and I have been polling quite a few people and my board of directors and our members. And what you said here that I wrote down, Tom, is doing everything possible.

Now when you deal with conservation equivalency I think it would behoove us to go into sport fish, or at the Atlantic States, to take from March 1 to opening day, and have that to where it is not being targeted, just like Phil said. That shows us that our fishery is -- really the majority is our summer fishery, which is the males.

2.1

And Addendum IV we talk about is protecting the spawning biomass, which is our spring season and the coast season. So by doing everything, even if it is just a little bit. And, you know, I have talked before: The catch and release has always been designed, and I never know how it got out of it, but was from a point A to a point B in the Susguehanna.

And we have guides that are on the water that still do make a living or make part of a living by guiding in these areas, and I don't think they should be affected.

But in the main heart of the bay we need to allow these fish, even for that little bit of time just like Phil was saying, to have that opportunity to get there. We have talked more and more in regard to Virginia and Potomac River on the size of their caps and all with their commercial so we need to push that.

But MSSA would definitely support a preseason catch and release closed season, say from March 1st, a nontarget. It works all over the place. I mean there are nontargets in the ocean left and right, that you cannot go target these -- from March 1st through opening day, we shouldn't be targeting those fish. And you know I brought this up. Thank you.

MR. O'BRIEN: It is as if I have talked to these previous four speakers before we came in here and I haven't.

2.1

2.5

I haven't talked to Mr. Wommack in months. But I have talked to him in the past a lot and he is a wealth of information, what goes on down around that Maryland-Virginia line on the eastern shore as well as the western shore.

He and I have talked about this Virginia commercial fishery -- no upper limit. Those big fish go to New York legally. And I had thought that maybe if Virginia could do something about that, this year it could have a potentially dramatic effect on ASMFC.

Now I know we don't like it, talking about the charter boat captains know what is going on. If recreational fishermen knew more about it, they wouldn't like it. And I know our watermen don't like it because they can't operate the same way. We have an upper limit on the size of fish that can be caught.

So I appreciate you maybe bringing this guy in here.

I would like to see that kind of dialogue getting going

because we are starting to see a lot of rockfish with crabs in

them, particularly soft crabs.

Now on the catch and release, I feel that is important also. God knows with what is going on in ASMFC, we may see catch and release this summer like we have never seen it before. And that has many negative connotations to it when it comes to charter boats.

Now if we inhibit anybody catch and release, that

2.1

2.5

should apply to everybody: charter boat captains, guides, recreational fishermen, everybody. On the hooks: In my experience, just one person, but the captains around me it seems to be what has been evolving -- that small treble hook, and again it is a small one, that we have been using when we are live-lining or when we are fishing with clams, chumming, that lip hooks a lot of fish.

And it can be easy to get out compared certainly to a large treble hook and certainly to a circle hook. I mean, circle hooks are like religion, and they certainly have their place, but when a circle hook goes down a fish's stomach, there is nothing harder to get out.

Now certain people have technique to where that doesn't happen as much, professional fishermen, particularly professional recreational fishermen let's call it that way.

Competent recreational fishing.

So that will be an interesting conversation when that opens up for discussion, and I support that. Something else, but I will think of it later.

MR. KIMBRO: I just wanted to visit the circle hooks issue as well. Maryland and the mid-Atlantic area here that we live in is one of the only places, probably the only place, that I know of in the United States that you can get an argument on circle hooks.

You can go to our states to the south -- Florida

2.1

2.5

requires them. The other states, they all either suggest circle hooks or they require circle hooks. If you go out with a guide anywhere else in the country, they are going to have circle hooks on their outfits because it eliminates that hook set malfunction that so many anglers have, especially inexperienced anglers.

So I certainly think that we should require circle hooks and not only in the spring but year round for every type of bait, and I would even go to suggest for every other kind of species besides striped bass.

Now when you talk about circle hooks, there is a lot of misunderstanding about circle hooks. And I always hear circle hooks deep-hook fish. And it is true. Some circle hooks do deep-hook fish. But the main reason circle hooks deep-hook fish is because people really don't understand what a circle hook is.

If you go down to any bait shop and buy a circle hook off the rack, it may not even be a circle hook. Even though it may say circle hook right there on the top, it might not be. What we have to specify when we are scoping this is that this is a non-offset circle hook.

And that -- you know we can't get into a situation where we are specifying a brand, but we are going to have to educate anglers on what a real circle hook is and what the difference is between an --- hook and a circle hook. Frankly

2.1

2.5

it will be a challenge but I certainly think it is a noble effort and worth it.

Now catch and release: Did I understand you to say,

Tom, that you didn't think there would be any measurable

impact to conservational equivalency to --

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, I mean, it is very difficult to assess -- if you recall when we tried to look at the issue several years ago, we are looking at a brief period within a one-, two-month wave of the National Marine Fisheries Service recreational survey MRIP.

So it is difficult to assess, but I think what we learned is that the level of interactions were pretty low and that the conservation benefits of that are probably low to not measurable just because the interactions are low.

But, you know, the reason we took action is because we have seen an increasing trend in the level of effort and we wanted to put some guardrails on that. You know, that said, I think people who have put forth the argument that is one time that we interact with these fish, you know, it is something that is worth consideration and, you know, is that one time of the year that we interact with these large females.

MR. KIMBRO: So the reason I ask that is that we are -- the way I understand what Maryland's position is likely to be at ASMFC is that we are not going to call for maximum conservation. We are going to ask for 17 percent or 7,7,7 or

2.1

whatever it is going to be.

So it seems disingenuous to me to go to ASMFC and say, here is what we are doing for conservation in Maryland:
We are going to close fishing during March to catch and release but we are not even asking for those maximum cuts.

Does that not seem like a conflict? To me it seems like a conflict. Well, to me it does, Vince. So if we are looking at something that doesn't even have anything to do with conservation equivalency or frankly conservation, for that matter, why are we doing it?

Is it because MSSA doesn't like it or the charter boat association doesn't like it? Is it because you feel like you need to punish somebody because you guys are getting cut? Or is it because we really have a need to do that? That is just my question.

MR. O'CONNELL: Just a point of clarification. You know, Maryland hasn't formalized its position yet. We have stated the preference for a three-year plan but in regard to the spring trophy fishery which is considered part of that coastal recreational fishery, we have -- our preference right now is to support the maximum conservation of 25 percent.

I mean, that is the one area that we can protect, and so I just wanted to clarify -- we are preferring a slower approach in the summer/fall fishery because it us predominantly males. That time of year that we do interact

Τ	with remales, we are opting for the maximum.
2	MR. KIMBRO: I apologize. I misspoke. I meant 25
3	percent in the first year.
4	MR. O'CONNELL: That would be for the spring trophy
5	fishery just not for the summer/fall.
6	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Jim and then I will get you,
7	Vince.
8	MR. GRACIE: A couple comments. I was chairman of
9	this commission when we went through the controversy of
10	catch-and-release fishing. It seems to me that many people
11	supported more severe restrictions on the catch-and-release
12	fishery.
13	And at the time I think MSSA objected to such severe
14	restrictions on it. That would be the last organization that
15	objected to restrictions on it as far as I know. At least
16	based on the landscape at that time.
17	I would submit that you could calculate a
18	conservation equivalency based catch-and-release mortalities
19	data that we have. Maybe it is not strictly applicable
20	because of the colder temperatures. But it is certainly in my
21	mind it might give us a perceptual advantage in our
22	negotiations with ASMFC, and I think that is what Ed is
23	talking about.
24	And I think that makes a lot of sense. I don't see
25	any inconsistency with that and what we are doing here. The

2.1

2.5

other point I would want to make is that in terms of the summer fishing, I don't know how else to say it. We keep talking about the forage space. Well, the consequence of the forage space we have now is that we have an overpopulated fishery of males.

You have got data on that, that shows slower growth rates, more susceptibility to disease, poorer conditions, and that has to do with a loss of the forage space, which is another way of saying there are too many fish for they amount of food they have to eat.

So I am not sure that the measures for the summer fishery are that significant in terms of the health of these small fisheries. I think it is a point that has kind of been ignored and not mentioned.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Jim. Vince?

MR. RINGGOLD: Just a few comments too. In regard to -- Shawn, to answer you, it is not that MSSA doesn't like it. We have quite a few members, and myself including, that practice catch and release every day. And we practice it the proper ways and even the ways that you have shown on your Website and in some of your books.

The problem when we talk catch and release is that come summertime, it is the hardest catch and release that there is. Mortality is just so strong, it is unbelievable. But the summertime, our summer and fall fishery, is the

2.5

majority of males. And what the addendum has set out to talk about is the protection of the spawning stock, which are the females.

For Maryland, we get them for a month and a half.

Okay? And, you know, that is our only time, like you said,

that we actually have physical control of that. We don't have

control at any other time.

And we can argue that all you want but it is just the fact at this point, and I have made it very clear in my position as a sportsman and the MSSA position, that we have to have a plan that is a total plan, which is full circle.

And part of that is catch and release. And part of that is size limits, and part of that is the biomass, and part of that is the ecology. So it is not just one answer. But it is not that MSSA doesn't like it because most of our members support it.

But we realize --what can we do? If we are going to take a look that we have a very minute time to fish for big fish, and the majority of our time is spent on the water fishing for smaller fish, to maintain our smaller fish and to allow it to even grow more, we need to protect the big girls.

So why not give them that one opportunity? It wouldn't hurt anybody, and to be honest with you -- and even you and I have spoke with regard to it, you would agree that if that were the case, you would do that yourself. Okay?

2.1

2.5

So in this case, why wouldn't somebody take the one extra step, and step up and say, you know what, for one month, three weeks, whatever the case may be, you know, I am going to make my lures, I am going to put my fishing on hold. I am going to go out, as Micah has me doing now, practicing my flycasting.

MR. DAMMEYER: I knew you were going there.

MR. RINGGOLD: So I can scream again when I catch that blue gill. On the second part of that, I think everything that we do as this organization and as the fishery, when they go into Atlantic States and sit down and say -- and Atlantic States knows this straight up front -- that our majority of our fishery is the summer/fall, which is the males.

But this is what we are going to try to do to help in the spawning, to protect the girls. We are going to cut it down for a month and a half, a month and two weeks.

We are going to let the big ones get up there and spawn. We are going to try to protect -- we are doing everything we can in our four walls of the Chesapeake Bay, and if we do everything we can on our four walls of the Chesapeake Bay then we have done it all. Wouldn't you agree?

MR. KIMBRO: I do agree but whenever you are talking about doing everything we can, then why aren't we asking for 25 percent in the first year? I mean -- to me that, I see a

2.1

2.5

conflict there. You can disagree with that. Now that was very well-stated, everything you said. And I think Maryland fishermen, myself, and a lot of other fishermen would you agree with you 100 percent if you can show us that there is a damage, that there is a consequence.

Then of course we would line up and say, yes, we won't catch and release during those times. We would happily do it. But where is the proof? Where is it? In fact, I saw something on Secor Labs, where they netted the fish, caught it, caught it again, and it still migrated up above the Bay Bridge.

So we don't have any science. That is not science. That is just what happened this year. So show us. Show us and we will do it. But we don't see it right now.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Mark?

MR. DEHOFF: All right, just a quick comment on the circle hooks. I was fortunate enough to spend quite a few days on the boat with Rudy --- . And did quite a few of those studies back in -- that was going back some years ago. Matter of fact, Gina just got up and left, but she was on those trips as well.

And there were substantial differences in the amount of gut-hooking that the J hook provided than the circle hooks during the studies. I mean, it was substantial. I mean, we measured everything from every time you got a tickle on the

line to how many you hooked up to how many you brought on board, where they were hooked and everything else. 2 3 And the -- it was dramatic the amount gut hooks of that were not set up, that were not done the circle hooks. 4 5 And again, like Shawn said, it has got to be non-offset circle hook. 6 An off-set circle hook, a standard off-set circle 8 hook, is no different than a J hook and it will not do what a 9 circle hook is supposed to do. 10 And so it is quite substantial. And then just one last quick comment on the catch and release. 11 12 You know, I wasn't on the commission at the time, but it did seem as though several years ago when we said, hey, 13 14 it is okay to do the catch and release, what has changed that 15 now -- because obviously the commission had to say, hey, we 16 can see that it is okay to do this because there are not going 17 to be substantial impacts to the fishery. What substantial impacts do we see now where people 18 want to rescind that decision that we made? 19 20 MR. GRACIE: Just a point of fact: Actually the 2.1 commission recommendation was not what was implemented. 22 MR. DEHOFF: Okay. 23 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Would you care to elaborate a 24 little bit, Jim? 2.5 MR. GRACIE: The commission recommended more

1 restrictions on catch-and-release fishing than were 2 implemented. MR. DEHOFF: But they said it was okay to do but 3 they just wanted to see tighter reins. 4 5 MR. GRACIE: We wanted to limit the amount of it, in fact. What we recommended was cutting the number of days. 6 And what the department did was limit the number of hooks, of 8 lines. 9 MS. DEAN: Mark, was that with artificial lures or 10 with clams? What were you fishing with? 11 MR. DEHOFF: It was all live bait. 12 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Mack? 13 MR. WOMMACK: I hear you talking about the catch and 14 release in the upper bay. But let me ask you something: What 15 is the quota on, or has it gone down, on the netting in 16 Virginia's waters because when you talk about catch and 17 release up here that seems like such a small issue to me when I see in the spring, like last year, those fish sat off shore 18 19 and didn't come down during the whole season of Maryland and 20 Virginia. 2.1 And then when they came down here, those guys 22 slaughtered these cows in the early spring in that lower 23 Virginia bay, and I mean in two days' time they had their 24 quotas.

So what I am trying to figure out is, you know, are

2.5

1 we together on this Chesapeake Bay or are we still at this dividing line because it is never going to work with this 2 3 diving line. This whole bay is going to have to be together when 4 it comes down to doing something about the rockfish, the net 5 and everything else. It is not going to work to say, I am 6 going to penalize all of Maryland, the fishermen and the 8 watermen, and we are going to allow this stuff to go on in 9 Virginia and just act like it is not happening. 10 I know they are not a direct part of Maryland when it comes to that but somehow we have got to get on the same 11 12 page with how we are going to deal with this bay and these fish spawning because they are not coming from the north, 13 14 coming down. 15 They are coming from the south and they are coming 16 off that ocean and they are coming up here, and those guys are 17 slaughtering those fish in the early spring. And I mean cows after cows. 18 19 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: So Mack, are you echoing the 20 desire for a maximum size limit in the Virginia commercial 2.1 that was discussed earlier? 22 MR. WOMMACK: We are going to have to get something. 23 Sooner or later we are going to have to get there --24 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Similar to Maryland's? Yes. 2.5 MR. WOMMACK: Because this isn't going to work

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

2.5

saying, I am going to restrict everybody in Maryland and it is open season down there because they are getting to them first. So then you create all the problems up here because you don't have quite the amount of fish that you used to have because they have been netted up before they get here. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Point taken, and I think Tom may have a comment on this because he has been working with Virginia on this issue. MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, you know, this is a topic that Ed and Mack have brought up in the past, and I have had an opportunity to kind of look into it and talk to Virginia again. They have some changed leadership there. I think this is a really good discussion because a lot of issues of coming up. I think everyone has a chance to learn something. So on the maximum size for commercial: Maryland's commercial fishery is January, February, June through December. We have a size limit of 18 to 36 inches. That is all during those time periods. Season is closed March, April and May. Virginia, they are open year round outside of the first two weeks in January. So the only time they are closed commercially is the first two weeks in January. From January 16 through March 17, I believe, they have an 18-inch minimum with no maximum size. Now they may

have a minimum mesh size that, you know, mitigates the

1 interaction with large fish, but I am still waiting for that information. 2 3 But the point is that they have no maximum size during mid-January through mid-March, and we know that is a 4 time period when these large females start coming up the bay. 5 From March 18 through the end of the calendar year, they have 6 a 28-inch maximum size. So unlike Maryland at 36 inches, 8 Virginia, when they do have a maximum size, they have 28 9 inches. So they are more conservative. 10 The Potomac River Fisheries Commission is kind of in between Maryland and Virginia. There is a period in late 11 12 winter -- in March, I believe -- they have no maximum size. The rest of the year they have 18 to 36 inches, I believe. 13 14 So both Virginia and the Potomac River has a period 15 in time, during the late winter/spring, that has no maximum 16 size, and that is an issue that we are discussing with the 17 Potomac River and Virginia as an area, again, where there is interaction with these large fish for which we should consider 18 19 taking some action, and where there is opportunity to be 20 consistent, we should strive for that. 2.1 MR. WOMMACK: Tom, are you talking about 22 commercial-wise or --23 MR. O'CONNELL: Commercial, all that is commercial. 24 MR. WOMMACK: Okay.

MR. O'CONNELL: So we are trying to get data on the

2.5

1 level of interaction during these periods that there is no maximum size just to see, you know, how much they actually 2 interact with these big fish and whether it is substantial or not substantial, you know, it is something worth considering 4 because that is a time of year that we interact with these 5 6 larger fish. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Rachel? 8 MS. DEAN: And I know you already know this too, 9 Mack, but I just wanted to reiterate that our commercial 10 fishery does have a maximum size limit and I think that was why we were all kind of taken aback when we realized that it 11 12 was the commercial quota too that this was coming after. it was the --- . 13 14 So we thought we were ahead of the game, doing 15 better than the other jurisdictions but still it kind of 16 slapped us on the face. 17 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Any other comments? MR. GRACIE: Wasn't the question on the table about 18 19 scoping? Did we ever resolve that? 20 (Simultaneous conversation) 2.1 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: If there are no further comments, 22 this has been really great. You know, we haven't had this 23 quality of discussion in a good while, and I think that is 24 what we are here for, so I appreciate everybody thinking about 2.5 it and coming up with some thoughts for the department.

2.1

Having said that, the point was whether or not the department should scope these additional issues -- the circle hooks and the preseason catch and release.

MR. GRACIE: We only do that for controversial subjects, right?

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: But understand that scoping doesn't mean that we have given them a position on those issues, and that they are putting forth a position. All that they would do, if they scoped it, would be to put together information about those issues and put them out to the public to get some comment and consider whether or not they think it makes sense to move forward with a regulatory proposal.

So it sounds to me, and somebody correct me if I am wrong, it sounds to me like the view around the table is that these issues are both worth that kind of further deliberation and analysis. Does anybody disagree with that?

MR. GRACIE: Can you explain to the commission and maybe others the whole basis for scoping? We didn't used to do that.

MR. O'CONNELL: Up until probably five or so years ago, the department's public participation process didn't begin until we proposed a regulation. And when we went out and had public input, we may hear something, a piece of new information that would have resulted in us wanting to change the regulation. And when we decided we needed to change the

regulatory proposal, we had to go back and start the process
all over again.

lcj

2.1

2.5

MR. GRACIE: The advice from the attorney general's office was that you can only make nonsubstantive changes once you have proposed a regulation.

MR. O'CONNELL: Exactly. So that is when scoping was suggested, that it is an opportunity to discuss options with the public to help determine how to proceed or not proceed with a regulatory proposal. And that should hopefully mitigate the number of substantive changes that would come out of a public hearing process after the regulation is proposed.

And I think it has been very successful. We haven't had many regulations that we have had to withdraw because of a piece of new information that resulted in a substantive change.

MR. GOLDSBOROGH: So any further comment on that? I see no objections to supporting the department if they choose to move forward with scoping on these two issues?

(No response)

MR. O'CONNELL: I think it is a good idea. I mean, to Shawn's point, we could pull together some of the science on what a preseason catch-and-release prohibition would mean. We can look at some of the circle hook information and present that for more discussion and come back and talk about that.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: All right. Jacob, did you have

1 | anything else?

2	MR. HOLTZ: That was it.
3	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: All right, thank you. Okay, we
4	are a little bit behind schedule and I didn't think we would
5	be. I will take that as a good thing because that was a great
6	discussion. But we will catch up. So let's move on to the
7	estuarine and marine fisheries management planning, and I
8	guess we will start off with Nancy?
9	MS. BUTOWSKI: Yes.
10	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: On the Eel FMP review and then
11	spot and croaker.
12	Estuarine and Marine Fisheries Management Planning
13	American Eel FMP Review
14	by Nancy Butowski, MD DNR Fisheries Service
15	MS. BUTOWSKI: So this is your opportunity, as part
16	of the review process, to provide comments on what we reviewed
17	for the FMPs. Like I said, we are going to start with eels,
18	and this is just to remind you of what we have done this year,
19	the review schedule. We have already completed four reviews,
20	and these are the last two for this year.
21	We will put together a 2015 review schedule probably
22	
23	by the end of the year and get the off to your probably after
2 0	the first of the year.
24	

2.1

2.5

in 1991 and has been reviewed several times since then, and we have annually updated since 2007. The major framework has to do with conserving the stock, getting more information from catch and effort, especially on the --- fishery.

When this plan was developed we didn't really have a lot of information on what the crabbers were using as bait so we wanted additional information on catch and effort from that fishery. And we also wanted to promote research and understanding of the biology and to improve water quality and protect habitat.

(Slide)

So part of the actions in the FMP have to do with minimum size and mesh size requirements. We wanted to protect --- as part of protection of the stock. We put into effect some additional requests for gathering catch and effort statistics. And we have been doing several fishery dependent and independent surveys to get additional information on eels.

So we -- fisheries service conducts a Young of the Year abundance survey in the coastal bays. There is also a yellow eel pot survey and a silver eel trap survey at the end of the season.

And then our fisheries staff also goes out with the commercial fishery and gathers additional biological information. For improving water quality and habitat, we work with the Chesapeake Bay program, and there are a number of

2.1

22

23

24

2.5

1 efforts to reduce nutrients, toxins, pollution, and to protect SAVs and wetlands. 2 And also an effort to open additional spawning 3 habitat for the eels. So we have a pretty active fish passage 4 5 program. 6 (Slide) From a coastal perspective, an ASMFC FMP wasn't 8 developed until 1991 and began being implemented in the year 2000. Since then there have been several addendums to that 9 FMP. And again, recognizing the need for additional 10 information on catch and effort statistics to provide upstream 11 12 and downstream passage, especially at hydroelectric dams, and 13 active dam removal projects. 14 And additionally to, and most recently, to increase the minimum size for both the eels themselves and gear 15 16 restrictions. Most recently ASMFC put together Addendum IV, 17 and I think Tom is going to be giving an update later in the agenda. And that is to reduce fishing mortality. 18 19 So eels have a unique life history strategy, and

fishing mortality is really a concern, especially since all fishing mortality occurs on prespawned individuals. And also there is a concern about an --- fishery.

(Slide)

So the current status of eels along the coast -- the last stock assessment was done in 2012. Based on that, there

2.1

2.5

are varying abundance indices that have different trends but the overall trend is that there has been some decline in abundance. So like in places like in the Hudson, in the south, there have been decreasing indices.

Around the mid-Atlantic region there has been stable -- and in the Chesapeake Bay there is actually some information to suggest that there has been some increasing abundance trends.

The general conclusion from the stock assessment is that the stock is depleted, and that is based on a combination of harvest pressure, reduced habitat -- and again, mainly due to fish blockages -- decreased water quality and possibly climate change since the eel stock relies on coastal current patterns to disperse larvae along the entire coast.

So that is where the depleted status comes from.

Overfishing could not be determined. We don't have enough good information to really say what the actual biomass is.

Again that has not been determined. Additional information is needed before reference points can be put forth.

(Slide)

The status of the fishery, you can see that for the commercial fishery, early on in the 1970s and '80s, there was a range between 2.5 and 3.6 million pounds of fish landed.

Since the mid-1980s, it has dropped a little bit, and currently the coastal harvest is between 700,000 pounds

lcj

2.5

like a 22-year average.

and 1.5 million pounds. There is a glass eel fishery only in 1 Maine and I think it is -- South Carolina or North Carolina, 2 3 Tom? MR. O'CONNELL: South Carolina. 4 5 MS. BUTOWSKI: South Carolina. That has been limited to some extent but it is about 20,000 pounds each 6 year. But you can see that the price of the --- fishery is 8 dramatic. 9 There is very little information on coastal recreational eel landings. It is very limited in scope and 10 currently is -- we really don't have a good handle on what the 11 12 recreational fishery takes of the eels. So back when the Marine Recreational Fisheries' 13 14 statistics program was in effect, they did some estimates. So 15 around the 1980s they counted like maybe 160,000 eels were 16 caught by the recreational fishery. And then they really 17 re-examined how they collect the data, and there is really not enough information to say what the recreational fishery is. 18 19 So beginning in 2009, they no longer even try to 20 calculate recreational landings. 2.1 (Slide) 22 The Maryland commercial eel harvest has been 23 variable, as this graph indicates. And the average landings 24 have been about 400,000 pounds over the long term. That is

Most recently in the last three years it has jumped up to about 600,000 pounds per year.

(Slide)

So the conclusions of the Fisheries Service Plan
Review Team was that the American eel FMP framework is
appropriate but it lacks an objective that addresses the ASMFC
coastal management process. If you notice, our eel plan was
put into effect like eight years before the ASMFC plan was
developed. So we are missing that piece where we say that we
follow the ASMFC guidelines.

There was no public request for a change in allocation due to any biological or social factors but as you can see, by default, it is about 100 percent for commercial fishery. And the plan team recommended an amendment be developed to adopt ASMFC guidelines and any other strategies and actions that might come out of adopting Addendum IV to the ASMFC plan. Any questions?

Questions and Answers

MR. WOMMACK: You said the population has come back up in the bay? Because I know as a recreational fisherman, last year was probably the most I have caught in the back rivers, seeing some eels in a long time because I noticed two years before that, at the docks, they had some kind of floating tank, that it would come up, and a truck would back down with a vacuum system, and it was sucking all these eels

1 | out of these floats.

2.1

2.5

And it is some kind of delicacy over in China or something. They would directly take them to the airport. And I wondering has that taken any effect on the population of eels because like I said, last year was the most I have seen eels actually get hung up on lines in a long time in the back creeks because they had just went out of sight.

But the reason I ask that is because all that has something to do with the food chain, getting back to the rockfish as well so I am just curious. What is the percentage of commercial eels being taken out for market that is going overseas and different places?

MS. BUTOWSKI: You know, I don't know what the actual export of eels are. What size were they taking?

MR. WOMMACK: They had a float I guess about the square of these tables in here that they pulled right into the dock. And they had a truck come down with a vacuum system.

MS. BUTOWSKI: Could you tell the size of the eels?

MR. WOMMACK: Oh, there were all different types in there. You know, there were just bundles of eels in there. I don't know exactly what the size limit, you know, stretched out because they were twisted up. But I was just amazed at how many eels they were taking out, and I don't know how many times a week this was going on.

And that was just in this one particular river off

24

2.5

1 the lower Chesapeake Bay. And, you know, I talked to the guy and he was telling me they take it straight to the airport 2 3 because it is a delicacy over there and they like to try to keep them alive until they get them over there. 4 And like I said, the last 7 to 10 years, I haven't 5 really seen a lot of eel population for hook-and-line guys 6 getting hung up eels anymore like it used to be at one time. 8 So I am just curious. 9 MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, beginning this year, we have had a 9-inch minimum size limit so that was increased. So if 10 they are taking eels that are smaller than 9 inches --11 12 MR. WOMMACK: No, this was before this year. 13 a couple years ago. I was just wondering what is the effect 14 of the commercial people or businesses taking these eels out 15 the bay and shipping them over -- on the population growth in 16 the bay? 17 MR. BUTOWSKI: Well again, all of our commercial fisheries take eels before they are even -- before they have 18 19 even spawned once. So no matter what stage you are at, you 20 are having some impact. 2.1 Obviously smaller eels, which provide food for other 22 organisms, that would be an issue. There is a big market for

the Asian community for --- of smaller eels, for their market, their live market.

MR. WOMMACK: I remember at one time there was talk

1	about sectioning certain sections off in the bay just for
2	that, keep the eels in until they were ready to get them. I
3	don't know where it got to on that. I think that was
4	somewhere down off of Island where they wanted to do that.
5	MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, that is another issue of
6	concern, especially when they are congregating and moving
7	upstream. They are extremely vulnerable to being caught in
8	large quantities because they are concentrated as they are
9	moving upstream. So you probably want to be mindful
10	MR. WOMMACK: I would be curious to know what the
11	commercial percentage of that is.
12	MS. BUTOWSKI: I don't know if we even have that
13	information, to tell you the truth, as far as what goes for
14	bait and what goes for food market or aquaculture.
15	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Mack. Jim, you had a
16	comment?
17	MR. GRACIE: Yes, maybe I am the only who doesn't
18	understand. I thought you said you can't determine whether
19	they are being overfished.
20	MS. BUTOWSKI: Right.
21	MR. GRACIE: What measures are you using? Since our
22	population data is based on harvest, what measures are you
23	using to say the population is in decline?
24	MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, the different indices.
25	Different states have different indices. We actually can

calculate a catch per unit (CPU) effort based on the surveys

1

2.5

is warranted.

62

that we do. So although we can't say exactly what the size of 2 3 the stock is, there is too much uncertainty --MR. GRACIE: I didn't see anything on CPU here. I 4 saw harvest numbers, which you are up and down all over the 5 It doesn't seem to really indicate any trends. 6 place. didn't see a catch per unit effort presented. Did I miss 8 that? 9 MR. O'CONNELL: What me to comment, Nancy? 10 MS. BUTOWSKI: Go ahead. MR. O'CONNELL: So as Nancy mentioned, the 11 assessment of data that the technical committee reviewed 12 13 wasn't a quantitative assessment. It was more juvenile 14 indices along the Atlantic coast. They also developed a model 15 that is based upon harvest that they can kind of use that as a 16 proxy for population. 17 And when they compare that to historical levels, in looking at the juvenile indices, they determine that the 18 19 population was depleted. They can't say that overfishing is 20 occurring but just based upon their model, their model using 2.1 the harvest and these indices, they believe that the 22 population is depleted compared to historic levels. 23 And the difficulty for the management board is that the technical committee cannot offer what level of reduction 24

2.1

2.5

MR. GRACIE: When they listed the factors, they listed everything you could think of, with no weighting.

MR. O'CONNELL: To Mack's point -- you guys remember the tsunami that hit Japan in 2011? That wiped out the aquaculture farms for eels over there. So that is what drove the glass eel fishery in Maine and the fishery in the Chesapeake Bay region is that those companies were seeking young eels to repopulate their aquaculture farms.

Fast forward a few years, they are back up and running and they are starting to put yellow eels back on the market, and that has decreased the prices. And some of the decreased harvest you see is probably more related to lost market opportunity than reduced population size because the catch per unit effort is still about the same.

MS. DEAN: I was just going to say that we do have the harvest data. Every eel that comes over the side of a boat, whatever I do with it, I record it. We do have that. But of course that leads back to what you were saying, Jim, about you know, if we are using that harvest data, how accurate is it?

Harvest goes up and down for numerous factors, including shifts in trend. So to say that, you know, the population based on the harvest, we can quantify that, would probably be difficult to do.

But, yes, overseas is where they were going, keeping

them alive. And my understanding was they would come back. 1 So it is kind of interesting. 2 MS. BUTOWSKI: Do you have an idea of what 3 percentage is going? 4 5 MR. O'CONNELL: I think it is a high percentage. 6 am not positive of that. 7 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: All right, any other comments or 8 questions for Nancy on eels before she moves on to spot and croaker? 9 10 MR. O'CONNELL: Just one last comment. The Fish and Wildlife Service was petitioned to list American eel as a 11 12 threatened or endangered species. They are going to be making an announcement of their final determination here in the next 13 14 couple weeks. 15 You know, from some of the information they sent out 16 to the Technical Committee, it sounds like they will not list 17 them but they haven't made that determination yet. So if they list it, it is probably going to present some pretty 18 19 significant challenges so we are hopeful that they won't and 20 we can continue managing --2.1 MR. GRACIE: Based on the data, I would think it 22 would be pretty controversial if they did. 23 MR. O'CONNELL: In 2007 they were petitioned and it was determined there wasn't sufficient information to list 24 2.5 them, and their report to the Technical Committee was

1	basically that there hasn't been much change in the
2	information. That is where the people are starting to suggest
3	that it is probably not going to be listed.
4	MS. BUTOWSKI: That is what I thought I had heard,
5	that it wasn't going to be listed.
6	MR. O'CONNELL: They won't say formally but that is
7	what
8	Atlantic Croaker/Spot Fisheries Management Plan Review
9	by Nancy Butowski, MD DNR Fisheries Service
1,0	(Slide)
11	MS. BUTOWSKI: So going on to the spot and croaker
12	FMP, our Chesapeake Bay program plan deals with both of these
13	species in one plan. Again over the years it has been
14	reviewed several times and updated regularly since 2007.
15	The management framework for spot and croaker mainly
16	have to do with monitoring stock status and working
17	cooperatively with ASMFC in the coastal process to reduce the
18	harvest of small spot and croaker, to promote research and
19	data collection and again to improve water quality and
20	habitat.
21	(Slide)
22	Several actions that we are taking within the plan
23	again had to do with minimum size limits for croaker and a
24	recreational creel limit. And a commercial season open from
25	March through September. There are currently no recreational

2.1

2.5

or commercial regulations for spot.

Reducing the catch of small fish in the Chesapeake Bay, at least from a Maryland perspective, is not that big of an issue. The Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions supported the use of by-catch reduction devices, especially in the southern shrimp fishery. And that has proven successful in reducing some of the by-catch.

And the bay jurisdictions would continue their mesh size restrictions for both trawl and gill nets. And again that was to reduce mortality for small fish.

(Slide)

We currently do not have any directed fishery dependent or independent surveys for spot and croaker. However, we do collect biological information on our finfish surveys. So there is a coastal bay and a Chesapeake Bay --- and a same survey that collects information on Young of the Year spot and croaker.

And we just started a pilot study in 2013 for gill net and that is in the Choptank River, looking at adult fish. The information on that has not been thoroughly processed but as years go by we should get some additional information on those stocks.

Improving water quality and habitat, again we continue to work with the Chesapeake Bay program to reduce nutrients, toxics, pollutions and protect wetlands and SAVs or

2.1

submerged aquatic vegetation.

(Slide)

From a coastal perspective, ASMFC developed a separate management plan for spot and a separate one for croaker back in 1987. The croaker plan since then has been replaced by Amendment I, which defined fishing mortality and spawning stock biomass reference points.

Since then there have been several addendums. One to expand the management unit or area. Before it was just like, kind of based on the middle plan of the region and now it is from New Jersey down to Florida. And they also revised the biological reference points.

Most recently, just in August of this year, they have established a precautionary management approach called the traffic light approach, which I will talk about in a little bit. And that again is both for spot and croaker.

For spot, again, just to reiterate, a plan was developed in 1987. There was recently an amendment in 2011, and that was for a couple of other species as well as spot because under the framework they did not -- well, this plan did not meet the standards that ASMFC had since adopted.

So they developed some triggers for management actions. But for both of these species, there are no required management actions by any of the coastal states. And again I will talk about the traffic light approach in just a few

2.5

1 slides. 2 (Slide) 3 So the status of the stock: Croaker had a stock The most recent one was in 2010. They determined 4 that overfishing was not occurring. But again estimates of 5 stock abundance were highly uncertain, and so they cannot come 6 to a conclusion about whether the stock is overfished or not. However there are some indications that the stock is 8 9 in okay shape in that there has been increasing biomass and 10 the age structure within the stock has been expanding. So 11 there is still concern about the discards, and again I 12 mentioned that the by-catch reduction devices have been successful at reducing the catch of small seine. 13 14 especially croaker and spot. 15 But however the discards haven't been quantified and 16 that is one of the reasons why it is uncertain as far as what 17 the stock biomass is at this point in time. For spot there has been no coastal stock assessment either in Maryland or 18 19 along the coast so the status of the stock really is unknown. 20 There is some concern in regard to decreasing trends 2.1 in abundance along the coast. Again it is highly variable. 22 Spot is a short-lived species and reaches maturity early. So 23 we are expecting that there would be variability in population

but it has been variable.

Maryland juvenile indices have been again variable

2.1

2.5

over time without any trends so again we don't have a really clear picture as far as what the status of spot is.

(Slide)

As far as the commercial fishery goes, the coastal catch has been between 2 and 30 million pounds. Again that has been highly variable. Since about 2000 there has been a noticeable downward cycle but that is not unusual either if you look at the whole total picture. There seems to be a cyclic nature in harvest.

Maryland's long-term annual harvest has been around 1 million pounds, and landings have been below or around 1 million pounds for the last few years.

For spot, again the coastal commercial catch has been variable and between 3 and 14 million pounds. There has been a decrease since the 1990s and it has to do with -- the range has been closer than it had been before so there is less variability in the stock or commercial catch.

Most recently the coastal harvest has been 1.2 million pounds. For Maryland, the commercial catch has been around 172,000 pounds and we have been around that for about 6 of the last 10 years.

(Slide)

Regarding the recreational fishery, the coastal harvest estimates for croaker have been again variable, 3 to 11 million pounds. The 2013 estimate is around 4 million

1.3

2.1

2.5

pounds.

That includes -- I was going to say that includes the discards or releases but I am not sure that is part of the estimate. I will have to go back and check on that. Maryland harvest estimates have been around almost a little less than 800,000 pounds, and that has been about average for the last few years. Again, highly variable from year to year.

For the spot commercial harvest estimates, for recreational fishery, it has been between 1.3 and 6.9 million pounds. The most recent estimate for 2013 was around 3 million pounds. Maryland harvest has been variable and most currently it has been around 280,000 pounds. That is for 2013.

But again both these fisheries are highly variable from year to year.

(Slide)

I told you I would talk a little bit more about the new costal management approach, and it is called the traffic light approach or TLA for short. It is based on assigning different colors to categorize relative levels of indicators. And the condition of both the population abundance and harvest.

It is a precautionary approach for data-poor species, and it is considered just an interim approach until the next stock assessments can be completed. So both spot and

2.1

2.5

croaker both scheduled for coastal stock assessments in 2016. But until then this approach provides some statistical way and objective way to determine whether or not management measures are necessary. So I will show you a figure in just a moment.

But these levels -- red, yellow and green -- are assigned colors. And then as harvest increases or abundance increases, you would see more green on your figure. As the proportion of harvest decreases from the mean, then you would get more red.

(Slide)

So I just copied an example from the ASMFC croaker addendum. And this again illustrates what the traffic light approach is all about.

So generally the line between the yellow and the green, that is usually what your mean, long-term average should be for that particular characteristic. So this is the fishery independent traffic light approach, which is the abundance, the adult abundance characteristics.

There is another graph that they put together for the traffic light approach for recreational and commercial harvests. So you have two graphs to look at about those parameters.

The red and yellow line is usually about 60 percent of what the long-term average has been. So you can think of that as about a 40 percent reduction in either abundance,

2.1

2.5

depending on what you are looking at, or harvest.

So the ASMFC has determined two levels that they want to use as triggers. The first is a 30 percent level, which is the lower line. And then a 60 percent level, which is the top line.

So under the new management regime, what they would do is like if we -- based on what we are looking at right here. Back in the 90s, the middle ones, you noticed all the red is above and there are three consecutive years where it is above the 30 percent line.

So at that point, it would be determined that some moderate management measures would be necessary to be put into place. If the race went above the 60 percent line three consecutive years, and this is for croaker, then you would look at significant or more drastic management measures to consider and to put into effect.

For spot it would be a two-year -- it has about the same general framework as for croaker, with a 30 percent level and a 60 percent level. Except that instead of looking at three years spot would be after two years.

So if two years went by where the red light went above 30 percent, you would think about establishing some management levels. Those management levels have not been determined at this point. And again this is a precautionary management framework and just an interim approach until the

stock assessments can be completed.

(Slide)

2.1

So based on the information in the review, the fisheries service Plan Review Team noted that there were no requests for any changes in allocation, and right now we don't have any defined allocation between the commercial and recreational fisheries.

But based on the last 10 years of like harvest data, croaker, about 60 percent of the harvest has been for recreational and 40 percent for the commercial fishery. For spot, it has been about 70 percent of the total harvest for recreational and 30 percent for the commercial.

But there were no public input or requests to change any of the allocation framework. Currently we have -- our harvest limits on croaker are more conservative than the coastal -- what ASMFC requires. And again, like I mentioned, there were no restrictions on spot whatsoever.

Both species are under this new traffic light approach management scenario, which may result in some management measures over the next few years but to date the team recommended that the FMP is still an appropriate framework for managing the spot and croaker stocks in the Chesapeake Bay, the Maryland portion, and recommend that the plan be reviewed again after the stock assessments are completed in 2016.

there.

_	2.00.000.000
2	MR. WOMMACK: I know you said the stock assessment
3	is going to be in 2016, but I truly feel you will be behind
4	the eight ball because there are issues going on with the
5	croakers and the spot and the schools. In my personal fishing
6	and charter boat captains that depend on them and headboat
7	cantains depend on that type of fishing the fish aren't

Questions and Answers

The schools are smaller, they are spread out. Now I know a couple years ago we had something unusual happen where the water cooled down.

MS. BUTOWSKI: What, winter kill?

MR. WOMMACK: We lost a lot of juvenile. But even this year, the demand was on for small spots just for live-lining. And they weren't there. Usually you would see a lot of juvenile croakers and spot just taking -- what I call bait thieves. But they weren't even there this year.

So it really worries me because without that next generation around, where are we going to be at because in my personal -- I see the schools starting to get smaller and smaller for both species. I think they need to get on that assessment as soon as possible.

MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, hopefully the traffic light approach will help us a little bit too in the interim until we get those completed.

1	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Nancy, are you done?
2	MS. BUTOWSKI: Yes.
3	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay. I did have a hand already,
4	and that was Vince. And then I will get you, Shawn.
5	MR. RINGGOLD: In regard to spot, I apologize. I
6	don't know the gentleman's name, but is my understanding that
7	fisheries is doing a study with spot to where they are
8	actually trying to design a better spot trap because spot
9	traps always have been the issues.
10	Where do we have any information on where that is
11	and what is going on with it at this time?
12	MS. BUTOWSKI: I don't know. I don't have the
13	answer to that but I can find out for you.
14	MR. O'CONNELL: Based upon our previous spot pot
15	trap discussions, staff have reached out to some commercial
16	fishermen to conduct some field studies this year, trying to
17	get a better understanding of by-catch issues and, you know,
18	the current trap designs that are utilized.
19	I know that study was initiated earlier this year.
20	I don't know the status of if right now. We could find out
21	and get back to you.
22	MS. BUTOWSKI: I don't think we we must not have
23	the information because Harry didn't provide it, and he would
24	have been the one that was doing the sampling. So hopefully
25	early next year, beginning in January, we should have some

1 information on that. We could get back to you. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Vince. Shawn? 2 3 MR. KIMBRO: Just two quick questions. First of all, on the commercial spot landings chart, does that data 4 include spot that are caught and used for bait in the 5 hook-and-line fishery? 6 MS. BUTOWSKI: No. 8 MS. DEAN: Yes. 9 MS. BUTOWSKI: For the commercial? 10 MS. DEAN: Yes. I have to report that. I report 11 that on my log. 12 MR. KIMBRO: How do they report that? MS. DEAN: Every day we have to write in the gear 13 14 code that we use and the type of fish that we caught, and you 15 have to record either in pounds or numbers. 16 MS. BUTOWSKI: So that was commercial hook-and-line. 17 MS. DEAN: Yes, because it is under a TFL. MR. KIMBRO: And the next question is on the 18 19 recreational harvest. So correct me if I am wrong, some of 20 you guys who have been doing this a long time: The boom in 2.1 live-lining using spot has just come along recently here. 22 Does that sound right? Have we been doing that, Ed, for a 23 long time? 24 MR. O'BRIEN: I would say it really has picked up 2.5 the last five or six years.

MR. KIMBRO: So when I am looking at the chart, I
see, you know, 2007, 2009, the harvest was really up. But
otherwise it is not up. So this kind of doesn't jibe with
what we are seeing out there on the bay.
MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay, I have got Phil next and
then Jim and then you, Ed.
MR. LANGLEY: I just want to touch base with what
you were saying, Ed, as far as what I saw this year as far
as, in my travels, it was an abundance of mature spot this
year. Probably a two, three year class.
The juvenile spot were very scarce except for they
did show up about August. So there was on spot. From
what I understand with the spot being a, with the short life
cycle, I am hoping with the numbers of mature spot that we
had, that we have a year with high salinity conditions.
From what I understand, croaker and spot spawn
better, reproduce better in high salinity years than they do
in wet years or low salinity conditions. So with the number
of mature spot we saw in the bay this year, I am hoping the
numbers of juvenile spot next year
MS. BUTOWSKI: As long as we don't have a cold
winter.
MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Phil. Jim?
MR. GRACIE: You have got a slide, Nancy, that
showed some ranges and said the variability has decreased.

Was that based on just the range or was there a standard 1 deviation from mean or what? 2 3 MS. BUTOWSKI: That was based on range. MR. GRACIE: It really looked to me like the 4 variability was four-fold in each case, just the numbers went 5 down. 6 MS. BUTOWSKI: That was for the --8 MR. GRACIE: I couldn't write fast enough to catch 9 which one it was. MS. BUTOWSKI: Was that the spot? That was for 10 spot? 11 MR. GRACIE: I think it was. It had 4.6 to 14 12 million at the initial one --- . It is still roughly four-13 14 fold in each case, just the numbers went down. But you didn't 15 have a mean and standard deviation to base that on. Just the 16 range? 17 MS. BUTOWSKI: That was based on ASMFC coastal 18 information. 19 MR. GRACIE: Okay. And the other thing is I really 20 don't understand this --2.1 MS. BUTOWSKI: Traffic light approach? 22 MR. GRACIE: Traffic light thing. Can you go 23 through that really slow or is there something I can read on 24 it? 2.5 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Red means stop.

1 MR. GRACIE: The higher numbers mean less or something. It is just really confusing. 2 3 MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, again, the level where the yellow and the green coloring would be, that would be like 4 5 what the long-term average would be. MR. GRACIE: The juncture between yellow and green. 6 MS. BUTOWSKI: Yes. 8 MR. GRACIE: Okay. 9 MS. BUTOWSKI: And so then they take a 60 percent -- 60 percent would be where the yellow and the red 10 come together, all right? 11 12 MR. GRACIE: And what does the red mean? 13 MS. BUTOWSKI: The red means a decrease. So if you 14 get a --15 MR. GRACIE: So a .68 red is a greater decrease than 16 a .66 red. 17 MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, you want to look at it the other way around. So you are looking at like up. You are 18 19 looking at it up. So this is in relationship to one another, 20 so it is proportion and percentage of the whole. So when you 2.1 get your red above your threshold lines or your trigger lines 22 actually, that is when you would want to think about doing 23 some management measures. 24 MR. GRACIE: What are the trigger lines? 2.5 MS. BUTOWSKI: 30 percent of --

1 MR. GRACIE: Of what? 2 MS. BUTOWSKI: Of the total. And again, it is based 3 on statistics. MR. GRACIE: Is there something I can read, because 4 I need to think about this. I am just totally confused. 5 is counterintuitive to me. 6 7 MS. BUTOWSKI: Again this has to do with like 8 proportions and -- so when the red line is increasing --MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: There was a discussion on it I 9 believe at the summer meeting of ASMFC. And the South 10 Atlantic Board, the Technical Committee presentation -- you 11 12 can go online and see that presentation. That might help you. Thank you. I will do that. 13 MR. GRACIE: 14 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: I have got Ed and Rachel, and 15 then we will wrap this up because we have got to move on. 16 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, on the spot I think Phil said it well. But what did you say the life cycle for the spot is? 17 How long do they live typically? 18 19 MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, they reach maturity really 20 early. I think that it is only --2.1 MR. LANGLEY: Two or three years, I believe. 22 MS. BUTOWSKI: Yes, it is only like two or three 23 years, four years. 24 MR. O'BRIEN: I have heard four years. To me, it is 2.5 a breed of fish that remarkably recycles itself. This year,

1 anybody, any charter boat captain will tell you -- who is live-lining -- will tell you that we have seen the biggest 2 3 spot overall that we have seen in a long time. I mean, they are huge. They are huge. They are great in a frying pan. 4 5 Last year, we had all these little ones. You know, big difference between what showed up this year early and last 6 year. And of course they were the best bait to use, the small 8 spot. 9 Just like Phil says, about August, the small ones were starting to show up again. Now we had some people who 10 were really worried about the spot. And different motives for 11 that. Some people don't like the commercial hook-and-line 12 13 season. So they were very worried about spot, spot pots and 14 that kind of thing. 15 But my experience is they recycle themselves very, 16 very regularly and dramatically. And I don't think we have to 17 worry about them as much as we do croaker. We haven't had good croaker in so long -- and I read all the stories about 18 19 the hauls made at the mouth of the bay. They just haven't 20 come back. 2.1 MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, some species are particularly 22 susceptible to environmental conditions as well, so --23 MR. O'BRIEN: On that issue, what environmental 24 issue do you think is negative toward spot?

MS. BUTOWSKI: Well, especially like -- cold kills

2.5

1 happen in the wintertime --2 MR. O'BRIEN: Okay, I remember. 3 MS. BUTOWSKI: -- especially for smaller fish. They get caught in the bay and they are in shallow waters. I think 4 we had significant fish kills. 5 6 MR. O'BRIEN: When they spawn, it is a very short cycle before that gets to that, and it can come in one season, 8 the first season. 9 MS. BUTOWSKI: They have a --- spawning too depending again on environmental conditions. 10 MS. DEAN: Ed said it well. It is up and it is 11 12 down. And I do -- I personally target them using pots. And I 13 just say I couldn't believe what I was seeing in May, the 14 small ones. I thought it was early for them. And then, you 15 know, all of a sudden we got all of these big fish. Of 16 course, I quess they are a different year class. But just the 17 ups and the downs -- I mean, I wish we could put our finger on 18 them. 19 The other thing is -- and I know it is anecdotal, 20 but sometimes that is what we talk about, there kind of was a 2.1 question about maybe the shift, we should see an increase in 22 the commercial harvest. But I can say that I have been out 23 there fishing and had another commercial fisherman say to me, 24 well, the rockfish aren't here right now. I think I am going

to head back to netting the spot for market.

25

agenda and we ask for input.

So, you know, he might have left his netting of spot
to spot pot to target the rockfish, get that trend. Then he
returned to netting. So it is kind of, you know, one half
dozen in the other that might be where we are not seeing
the change in the increase that you might see.
It might be again the trends of where people are and
what they are doing.
MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Nancy. I think we are
going to move on now. Let's go the Coastal Fisheries Forum.
And Lynn, you are subbing for Mike, I think?
MS. FEGLEY: Yes, I am.
Coastal Fisheries Forum Update
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service MS. FEGLEY: Okay, I think I can catch us up quickly
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service MS. FEGLEY: Okay, I think I can catch us up quickly here. Just so that you are all, to remind
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service MS. FEGLEY: Okay, I think I can catch us up quickly here. Just so that you are all, to remind everyone hopefully you got an e-mail from us. As you all
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service MS. FEGLEY: Okay, I think I can catch us up quickly here. Just so that you are all, to remind everyone hopefully you got an e-mail from us. As you all know, we had a coastal fisheries advisory meeting, and we have
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service MS. FEGLEY: Okay, I think I can catch us up quickly here. Just so that you are all, to remind everyone — hopefully you got an e-mail from us. As you all know, we had a coastal fisheries advisory meeting, and we have replaced that process with a new one called our Coastal
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service MS. FEGLEY: Okay, I think I can catch us up quickly here. Just so that you are all, to remind everyone hopefully you got an e-mail from us. As you all know, we had a coastal fisheries advisory meeting, and we have replaced that process with a new one called our Coastal Fisheries Forum.
by Lynn Fegley, Maryland DNR Fisheries Service MS. FEGLEY: Okay, I think I can catch us up quickly here. Just so that you are all, to remind everyone hopefully you got an e-mail from us. As you all know, we had a coastal fisheries advisory meeting, and we have replaced that process with a new one called our Coastal Fisheries Forum. And in order to try to grab a more diverse and

We had our first one. Mike and Carrie Kennedy and ${\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}}$

1.3

2.1

2.5

went down there on September 23rd. It was great. We met a lot of people both on the recreational and commercial side, and that day the two hot topics that we covered were striped bass and also summer flounder.

Striped bass, we walked through the upcoming addendum, got some feedback from our stakeholders. And I am thinking that people showed up consequently at the subsequent hearing for ASMFC.

The other big one is summer flounder. We had

a -- there is a public comment document out right now. It is

a joint document from the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries

Commission and from the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management

Council.

You can access this document on the ASMFC Website if you go to summer flounder, and I would highly, highly recommend that every person go take a look at what this document is. This is an interesting process. In 2001, round about, summer flounder was allocated -- for the recreational sector it was allocated to states along the East Coast based on harvest in those states in 1998. That is one year.

The commercial sector got a little different allocation scheme. That allocation scheme started causing some problems among the states. There was an addendum passed in 2014 that moved us, for recreational flounder fishing, into a regional management.

lcj 85

2.1

2.5

And so now there is this thought that there is this changing distribution in summer flounder up and down the coast, that there is more -- the fish are moving north. And so both the commission and the council are interested in surveying constituents to discuss a whole -- shaking up the summer flounder management.

And it is an interesting process because what they are asking you to do now is to really comment broadly on your thoughts on summer flounder management up and down the coast. There are five management issues. Public comment is open until October 31st. You have got another two weeks.

We had a meeting, the Atlantic States and the council, there was a meeting down in, an Atlantic States meeting in Ocean City earlier this month but if anyone wants to get to an Atlantic States meeting and hear what this is about personally, I will just let you know there is another meeting in Washington, DC, on October 21st.

All of this information is on the commission

Website. And I would just definitely encourage people to go

out there, look at the document. And if anyone has any

questions about it, Carrie Kennedy is a great resource, Mike

Luisi or I are available to answer questions.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Lynn. We can send out to everybody the link to that document?

MS. FEGLEY: Sure.

_	MR. GOLDSDOROUGH. Any quescions for Lynn:
2	(No response)
3	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Good.
4	MS. BUTOWSKI: I forgot to mention something at the
5	end. If everybody, if they have any comments or reviews for
6	either the eel or the croaker/spot FMPs, just to get those to
7	me by October 31st as well.
8	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay. Tom, you want to take us
9	through ASMFC?
10	Overview of ASMFC Annual Meeting of October 27-31
11	by Tom O'Connell, Director, MD DNR Fisheries Service
12	MR. O'CONNELL: So the Atlantic States Marine
13	Fisheries Commission is having their annual meeting in
14	Connecticut the week of October 26. A couple of big topics
15	that are on the commission's agenda: One is American eel. We
16	touched on that a little bit earlier.
17	Measures that impact recreational fishermen with
18	eels have already been addressed in the previous action.
19	Increasing the minimum size limit from six to nine inches,
20	that is already done. This addendum focuses on the commercial
21	yellow eel and glass eel fisheries so I don't think I need to
22	go into a lot of detail of that at this meeting.
23	We obviously will be talking more about it at the
24	Tidal Fisheries Advisory Commission. But if you have
25	questions on that, let me know. And then I want to talk

2.1

2.5

about	striped	bass.	But	first,	any	questions	on	eels?
	(No	respon	se)					

MR. O'CONNELL: All right. So striped bass is the other major action item on the commission's agenda. The meeting is on the 29th. And the board has been given I think seven or eight hours to have the meeting, which is a marathon meeting for the commission.

We have spent a lot of time over the past year talking about striped bass. Many of you came to the ASMFC public hearing. Maryland had a great turnout. There was a little over 100 people there. And the diverse perspectives on the issue was well-voiced to the commission staff person conducting the hearing.

You know, I don't think I should go into a lot of detail. I think a lot of you already know the issues that are before the commission. I will probably open it up to see if you guys have some questions. But just in a nutshell, you know, the board is going to be looking at adopting the new reference points.

And those reference point implications are that we no longer have a Chesapeake Bay reference point but there is a commitment to make it a priority for the Technical Committee to come back to the board with recommend bay reference points. But we will not have them for at least 2015.

The second issue is what is the timeframe for the

2.1

2.5

board to reduce fishing mortality to the target level. And Amendment VI calls for one year right now. And this addendum provides the flexibility to pursue that for three years. It could also mean two years.

And then lastly once the board makes those decisions, what are the management options that are going to be used to achieve that reduction over that timeframe?

And a one-year reduction is going to require -- a one-year timeframe to reduce fishing mortality to the target is going to require a 25 percent reduction the first year. And there has been some misunderstanding that while it is called a one-year plan, it is likely to be in place for at least three years because there is not another assessment until that time.

If the bay reference points are developed, perhaps that is another period that they will be reassessed but likely to be in place for three years. A three-year plan, there are two options: One is to reduce the harvest 17 percent the first year and keep those measures in place for three years. And over the three-year period you achieve the necessary reduction.

And the other three-year plan is where you do a tiered reduction of about 7 percent each year for three consecutive years. So unlike the three-year option with the 17 percent reduction where you implement the measures and you

2.1

2.5

just hold them in place for three years, those same measures.

The other three-year option is you take a 7 percent reduction the first year, you take another 7 percent the second year, another 7 percent the third year. And you are basically reducing the quota scale or you are increasing the size limit each year.

So those are the three options that are available. I mean, those are the options that are available. ASMFC had incredible turnout of the public for these public hearings, from Maine to North Carolina.

I think you have heard me say before that while we will not make our final position until after the board's deliberation, that going into the meeting, we feel like our area to protect the female spawning stock is in the spring. That is part of the coastal recreational fishery.

We should take the 25 percent reduction. That would require us to go to a 36 inch size limit in that spring trophy fishery. In regard to the summer/fall, you know, our current perspective is that we should go with the three-year plan because our fishery is predominantly males. And that will allow time for the Technical Committee to come forward with a reference point.

I think it is a little misleading for the public to think that a 25 percent reduction in the bay is going to result in protection to the female spawning stock. People

2.1

have asked questions regarding the sex ratio issue. And I got some further clarification of that this morning that I want to pass along to you.

So those of you who have been coming to meetings have heard me say that, you know, we strongly believe that our fishery in the summer/fall/winter is male fish. The Technical Committee is saying that they don't have sufficient sex ratio data to come up with the bay reference points.

That in turn has led people to believe that our data is flawed. That is not the case. We have four separate surveys for about 10 years that looks at the sex ratio of fish from mid-May through February, and those surveys year in, year out, show 70 to 90 percent of those fish are males.

The issue with the Technical Committee is one, is that to utilize the statistical catch at age model that they use in the stock assessment, they need sex ratio by size. And there is some variability with the sex ratio by size that they are having some trouble working through the model.

They do not argue that Maryland's summer/fall fishery is predominantly male. That is not -- that is a fact. The issue is that there is some variability in the sex ratio data by size that is making it challenging for them to recalculate the Chesapeake Bay reference point.

A bigger issue is they have less data on sex ratio by size for the coastal population. And when they recalculate

2.1

2.5

the bay reference point, they need to go back and recalculate the coastal reference point.

So I just want to make it very clear that it is not a matter of question as to whether or not our summer/fall fishery is a male predominantly fishery. It is. The issue that the Technical Issue is having goes beyond that fact in the way they have to incorporate the data and the model that is making it challenging for them to come up with the bay reference points.

So, you know, we feel that, you know, our ability to take action is on the fisheries that interact with the spawners, and that is the spring fishery. It is going to come as an impact, but that is one area that we can play our part to help protect this resource.

In regard to the summer/fall fishery, you know, it is largely going to be a reduction of male fish. And that is not going to offer the protection that the commission is seeking at this time.

We should take some action. Some of the interim bay reference points do suggest that we take some corrective action in the bay. And taking a three-year plan allows us to initiate that reduction, but also allows time for the Technical Committee to come back to the board with some new reference points.

So that is where we at. I know a lot of the

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

organizations have submitted their associations' positions, and it varies across the board, across the spectrum of options that the board will consider. But if there is any additional feedback that you guys want to provide to me today -- Bill is also sitting on the board and Russell Dize from Senator Coburn's office. We will share input from the two commissions with him. Or any questions, I will be happy to try to address them. Questions and Answers MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Rachel? MS. DEAN: I just wanted a clarification. Did I hear you say that if we implement these reference points, ASMFC will then have to go back and adjust the coastal reference? So for example, they would have to then possibly admit that there is more mortality outside --MR. O'CONNELL: That is exactly -- right now, they have kind of averaged things between the coast and the bay, and they say a 25 percent reduction, right? MS. DEAN: I couldn't figure out the resistance.

get it.

MR. O'CONNELL: If you go into the stock assessment, there is one very important graph. And the last stock assessment looked at fishing mortality across the bay fishery and the coastal fishery.

And if you look at the bay fishing mortality, that

2.5

1 fishing mortality trend has been stable to decreasing because we have been adjusting the quotas downward as the population 2 shrunk. 3 The coastal didn't have that management tool, and 4 the coastal fishing mortality went up from 2004 to like to 5 2008 and then it has come back down because population size 6 decreased. 8 If you then look at the updated stock assessment 9 fishing mortality graph, that shows that we have been 10 overfishing in several of the last 10 years, it corresponds identically to the years that the coastal fishing mortality 11 12 was up. So if you look at why have we been overfishing for 13 14 the last 10 years, it seems very clear to me that it is not 15 the bay fishery. It is the coastal fishery. 16 And you are exactly right, Rachel, that if they recalculate the bay reference point and that fishing reduction 17 is decreased from 25 percent to a lower percent, that means 18 19 that the coastal fishing harvest reduction has to be higher. 20 MS. DEAN: And that is why the Technical Committee 2.1 dragged their feet. 22 MR. O'CONNELL: Hope not, let's hope not. 23 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Mark?

have a meeting after this meeting of our MSSA group, and just

MR. DEHOFF: Just for clarification, we actually

2.1

2.5

for clarification on the one, two, three year, even though they are called one, two and three year, basically if nothing changes between now and the next assessment, whatever is brought into play for 2015 might very well stay on the books until the next assessment.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. DEHOFF: So it is possible that if we were to choose, or if 25 percent were to come down, it is going to be 25 percent for 3 years.

MR. O'CONNELL: The only way that it would change is that if the Technical Committee came up with reference points for the bay. Other than that, it is going to be in place until the next assessment, which is three years out.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Ed?

MR. O'BRIEN: On the reference points, I mean, I am not asking you to comment, but being involved with this since before the moratorium, there has always been this bias up north toward the bay. With certain other organizations chiming in. It has always been there.

And on the reference points, looking at the Technical Committee, it seems to me that they have been in no hurry to come up with bay reference points. We are starting to raise some hell now, and that is going to get some kind of apparent results. But they have not been in any hurry.

Now I know the charter boat captains up there, and I

2.1

2.5

hear their comments. We are up against it, and it is the same people with the same states, and a lot of this, you know, really settles up in Maine and comes down. Maine is very important.

Now going back to something I said before, I really feel that wherever we can have everybody do it the same way is important on any issue. But I don't want to cast in stone what I said relative to catch and release. But it is an important factor. It is important to me because it is one of the things I hear about all the time.

And if Bill will remember, and part of our delegation disagreed, but I came to the forefront when Jensen was not there for that one meeting in support of our fishery up the bay, Susquehanna Flats. And I still support that because that was something at ASMFC that drove them nuts.

And states rights, we took our states rights and had that recreational catch-and-release fishery, no live bait, and some of the things we did, you know, no live bait.

Taking this where there has to be commonality when it comes to decisions. I just abhor having to face charter boat captains and recreational fishermen once it gets around if the commercial fishery can keep an 18-inch fish, hook-and-line, and we have to go to 20 or 19. I abhor that and how that will react from a PNR standpoint.

And the other thing is, you know, I read some things

2.1

and it looks to me that they would want their commercial fishery on the coast to come out of all this whole or even getting some more pounds. And I abhor that. How that is going to settle down with the general population, the charter boat captains, et cetera.

MR. LANGLEY: I guess my question is to you Tom or Bill or whoever can possibly answer it. But based on the Chesapeake Bay reference points, that you have got a pretty good idea that the numbers are good. If they were implemented what cutback would have been necessary for the Chesapeake Bay, if any?

MR. O'CONNELL: It is not as black and white. So the interim reference point option that the Technical Committee came up with, one, it utilized the same model approach that was used for the coast. So that was consistent and that was a big plus to it. But it was not able to incorporate the predominance of males into that reference point.

But using that approach, which was very conservative because it basically assumes the same sex ratio rather than the predominance of males, it came up with a reference point that our technical person believes would have resulted in a 10 to 15 percent reduction in the bay versus 25 percent.

And again that does not take into account the predominance of males, so that level of reduction should be

1 considered a high value from where we would be if the model did account for males. 2 3 MR. LANGLEY: So 10 to 15 percent would have been conservative. 4 5 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. And if you look at the three-year options, you are kind of bracketing where we would 6 have been. So if we go with the three-year option and we get 8 the bay reference points, we may find ourselves in the 9 position where we could just maintain status quo after the 10 first year. So rather than going 19, 20, 20, we could stay at 11 12 19. Or if we started with 20, I guess we are stuck with 20 maybe. Maybe fall back to 19. But, you know, it is a lot of 13 14 heavy lifting to do between now and then. 15 MR. LANGLEY: It is going to be a tough sell? 16 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, I mean -- well, I will leave it 17 at that. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Any other questions? Rachel? 18 19 MS. DEAN: I was just going to address what Ed 20 O'Brien brought up. We have got a little bit of confusion in 2.1 the commercial industry too. I know that it is on the table 22 for the size differences and the discrepancy. And I have 23 heard a lot of things from, you know, we have it in other 24 species, the size differences and all. 2.5 But we have a shorter timeframe to work with,

2.5

1 knowing that this needs to be implemented by essentially January. So I would love to have that discussion. I had 2 hoped this would meeting would happen after ASMFC made that. And I don't really know -- I mean, where you guys 4 5 are going to come to a consensus. Is it the size change that 6 you are looking for, whatever. So it is kind of hard for me to take it back and be 8 like, look, this is an issue that they are having. You know, 9 and predominately it will probably be our pound net fishery 10 and the hook-and-line fishery that it would affect. But I just -- we don't know how it is going to play 11 12 out either, and of course then, you know, NRP and all those other issues. Although, like I said, other fisheries may have 13 14 it. So we are kind of on edge too. 15 MR. O'BRIEN: But you know the conversation is going 16 around. 17 MS. DEAN: Yes, definitely. And we are attuned to it and aware and we are just, you know, I guess we won't even 18 19 have an opportunity to meet with the department on that. And 20 your decisions probably won't be made --- January 1. 2.1 MR. O'CONNELL: Well, one is that, you know, we 22 don't have any scheduled commission meeting and we could 23 schedule one, but we also will have a public outreach to scope

the idea and then a hearing for the regulatory proposal so we

will have opportunity to hear.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

2.5

But I think you bring up a really good point that absent all that, we know that the recreational fishery is either going to be 19, 20 or 21 in the summertime. And the question I would like to hear from tidal fish Thursday night is, you know, could they live with an increased size at 19 or 20 or 21. You know, the one three-year option is 19 and then 20 and 20. And if we get new bay reference points, maybe we stay at 19. I don't know. But is there a size limit that would be, you know -- could the commercial guys live with some size limit increases? It is not a biological issue. It is a user conflict issue largely between the commercial hook and liners and the charter boats fishing on the same area. MS. DEAN: And I can't answer that question or speak to it but I will say that I think -- even myself, I get frustrated when I think, I know, I am taking the cut. I know it is coming right off the top. Now I need to increase my size too. And I understand this commission's concerns with that but I also feel like, okay, now what? What is next? have got an upper limit. I have got a lower limit. And it keeps kind of squeezing in so I would like to have that conversation and continue that conversation.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Mark?

2.1

MR. DEHOFF: One comment and piece of data we need to make sure we keep I mind when we talk about these minimum sizes and what we are going to do: We all know that right now the future of the stock is based on our 2011 year class.

And those sizes, those fish, are just now going to be 18, 19 inches long. And if we have any intent of protecting them -- because we still need to give some protection to these fish because it is the last big spawn that we have had, that we need to be careful that we don't like make the size too small so that we end up taking our next set of big spawning class females out of the population before they become spawning age.

MR. O'CONNELL: And just to give you a sense of what -- based upon our understanding of growth rates, if we go to a 20-inch size limit next year, 45 percent of the 2011 year class is expected to be less than 20 inches, all right? So almost one of every two 2011 year class you are going to have to release because they are less than 20.

In 2016, they are all above 20 inches. So the protection of the 20-inch size limit on the 2011 year class is really for next year. If you go to a 19-inch fish, it is probably about a quarter. If you go to a 21-inch fish, you are looking at like three-quarters.

So then it gets back to some of the issues of concern about discard mortality. You want to give protection

lcj 101

but you don't want to lose a lot with discard mortality so what is that right balance there?

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Vince.

2.1

MR. RINGGOLD: Looking on this, I mean, from different aspects, I know a lot of people would like to see status quo. And I know you are going to do your best to get the minimum instead of pushing it but can you explain to me what is going to inhibit us from getting a 19-inch fish or a 20-inch fish and making us push to a maximum of 21.

From a charter boat industry, with what I am learning, a 21, I might as well through my license away because I am the new kid on the back and it ain't happening.

Okay? So can you explain to me what is going to prevent us from going in and saying, we need 19 and we are planning on doing A, B, C, D and E to show you that we can maintain 19 and still do what we need to do.

As opposed to either going to 20 -- and like I said, God forbid 21 inches.

MR. O'CONNELL: I can't speak for Bill and Russell Dize but right now Virginia and Maryland want to, they are going to go in and push for that three-year plan. What is going to prevent us from leaving there with that flexibility, it is 15 other votes on the commission.

There are 16 votes. We need 9. You count outside the bay region -- I mean, with the bay region, you have 4.

Potomac River, DC, Maryland, Virginia. There are not many 1 other states that are interested in pursuing a plan outside of 2 the one-year plans. So, you know MR. RINGGOLD: Assumingly we have those four so we 4 5 are almost halfway there. 6 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. So it is big lift but we are doing what we can to make the arguments and to do what we need 8 to be partners on this conservation effort but also make it a 9 priority to bring better science to the table so we are being 10 treated fairly. MR. RINGGOLD: And that is why I think it is 11 12 important that we go in with more of a comprehensive plan to 13 try to help our cause. 14 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Vince. Anybody else? 15 MR. LICCIONE: Public comment? 16 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Yes, I think on this issue we 17 certainly should entertain public comment since it is pending decision making in a couple weeks. Ed, would you like to lead 18 19 off? 20 MR. LICCIONE: First of all, I had a question, Tom. 21 Did I hear you right, saying you are going in proposing 7,7,7? 22 MR. O'CONNELL: We are going in -- right now our 23 preference is to push for a three-year plan. 24 MR. LICCIONE: Okay. 2.5 MR. O'CONNELL: Not sure if it is the 7,7,7 or the

17 percent.

Public Comment

MR. LICCIONE: Okay. There is going to be change.

I don't know whether that change is going to be 25 percent, if
it is going to be 17 percent. I hope it is not three years at
7,7,7 because I don't want to see recreational anglers have to
change their size and their creel every year for three years
in a row.

I don't want NRP to be completely confused about what is a legal fish and what is not a legal fish. That is secondary. I can tell you this: If we don't spend time on the important stuff and we keep talking about catch-release fishing and circle hooks and size -- if we don't look at the big picture, we don't have a shot.

Now the big picture is having the right reference point for the bay. Right now the information that ASMFC has is that the reference point for the bay is fine the way it is.

Now we could have 90 percent of the people in this room disagree with that. It doesn't matter. If their information says, this is the reference point, this is going to be the reference point. The only thing that I would --- is to hear that comprehensive plan and all that kind of good stuff. What I propose is that I think it makes sense for the various groups in Maryland to get together.

Okay, when I say various groups -- on the

2.1

2.5

recreational side, I will talk about CCA, MSSA -- combined with various commercial fishing groups, okay, and ask for one thing. Don't ask for 7,7,7. Don't ask for this or that. You can all do that individually.

Ask for ASMFC to give us the information that we need to close the data gaps on what Tom is talking about with the sex by year. Until you got that, you ain't got zoo. And I don't care what kind of passion you have or don't have for this thing. If you don't have the right information, if you don't have the right data, chances are you are not going to go anywhere with this thing.

So what I would propose is the groups in Maryland that have a very difficult time agreeing on anything, if there is one thing that we could probably agree on, it is that what do we need from ASMFC to close the data gaps and the sex/size relationship? That way at least you put the Technical Committee at ASMFC on a bit of a hot seat because, you know, Tom, to his credit, for you people, has been pushing this thing ad nauseam in terms of the different reference points.

And I haven't always agreed with the way he is going on things, I have to tell you that. But, you know, I understand it. If we don't have the data, if we don't have the right information to close the data gaps from ASMFC, what kind of data do you need? Then you are not going to change this thing for three years.

2.1

2.5

You are not going to change it next year I don't think at all because I don't think they are going to be able to come up with a reference point in time for next year. They are certainly not going to go back, as people know, and change what the coast is for their reference points for next year.

So that is what I would suggest: We get together and put together just a simple letter from the groups, not on anybody's stationary or letterhead. And we read it into the minutes before the ASMFC meeting.

I think that will probably be the way to go. At least we get on record in terms of just the information we need. The Technical Committee has got to get on the stick and get off their ass and do this.

Because right now there is no initiative for them to do it. None, none, because they are tired of listening to Tom. If he could have changed it, he would have changed it by now. So that is what I suggest. I would be more than happy to try to put together a very brief document to send it around to folks to see what you agree on, but that is going to be the only issue that I am going to deal with.

I am not dealing with size. I am not dealing with spring trophy season. I am not dealing with catch and release to ASMFC because they could care less. Until you get what those top-line categories are, okay, until that happens, then you can't fill in all the gaps.

1	And what we need is what information do you need to
2	close the data gaps different reference point with that.
3	So that is it. Period, the end. Thank you for the
4	opportunity.
5	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Ed. That is very
6	helpful. And I would encourage you to come to tidal fish on
7	Thursday and make that
8	MS. DEAN: Can I ask a question? Are you saying
9	that we get together to request the reference points or first
10	admittedly accept the 25 percent reduction?
11	MR. LICCIONE: No, no, no. All I am saying is get
12	together to say, ASMFC, tell us what you need to close these
13	data gaps that are out there right now for the bay.
14	MR. DEAN: Okay, because I thought you started by
15	saying let's come up with an agreement
16	MR. LICCIONE: No, no, no. For me to get into
17	percentages and all that, forget it.
18	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: On that, Jim?
19	MR. GRACIE: Well, there are three other issues on
20	the table that we have to respond to so I am not sure what you
21	are suggesting about that, Ed. Do we ignore them?
22	MR. LICCIONE: The other three issues being?
23	MR. GRACIE: Size, how you phase the reductions.
24	MR. LICCIONE: Yes, until you get a reference if
25	you are going to have this reference point, then whatever you

lcj 107

are going to do go ahead and do. 2 MR. GRACIE: I am not understanding the answer to my 3 question. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: What I took it to mean -- correct 4 me if I am wrong, Ed, is that all of us here discussed this in 5 a couple meetings. All the groups involved have made their 6 views known to the Maryland delegation. So the Maryland 8 delegation is going in with that input already. 9 But that the message, the predominant message, as Ed looks at it, that ASMFC needs to hear from those stakeholders 10 is that overarching message of the need for bay reference 11 12 points. 13 MR. LICCIONE: What information do you need. 14 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: What information do you need? 15 MR. GRACIE: I certainly agree that is an important 16 question to ask and we need to put them on the spot for that. 17 But are you suggesting -- what are you suggesting about the rest of the process because it is going forward and 18 19 they are going to make a decision. 20 MR. LICCIONE: I am not suggesting anything with the 2.1 rest of it. 22 MR. GRACIE: Oh, okay. 23 MR. LICCIONE: I am just commenting on that one 24 point. 2.5 MR. GRACIE: Not that we abandon our --

1 MR. LICCIONE: No, do whatever you want. 2 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: The Maryland delegation already 3 has to sort out all the input it has gotten on that stuff and come up with something. 4 5 MS. DEAN: Really quick, then: So have we not done enough to voice that we need a reference point? Do you think 6 this is something we should do, Tom? MR. O'CONNELL: It won't hurt and it will show some 8 9 united voice among the diverse stakeholders of Maryland. 10 Right now, the Technical Committee, through board direction, 11 from my request, is charged with, one, identifying what the 12 data limitations are. Two, how best to achieve that data. And three, how long it will take to get there. 13 14 And they were supposed to discuss that at their 15 September meeting but they ran out of time because they were 16 focusing on the addendum. They are not meeting again until 17 December. Prior to this meeting, I voiced my concern to the board chair that I don't feel like the priority is being 18 19 placed on this, and he promised he would pay closer attention 20 and make sure that their December meeting would accomplish 2.1 that goal. 22 But reiterating that in a letter, consistent across 23 all Maryland stakeholders, would be a positive thing, I think. 24 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay, is there any other public 2.5 comment on striped bass?

1 (No response) MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Phil? 2 3 MR. LANGLEY: Well, it is not public comment but it is a question for Tom. If there is a possibility in that 4 5 December meeting, if something came out of that, is there a possibility that you could do something for compensation for 6 conservation equivalency? Is it too late at that point? 8 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, I think the best course of 9 action is that some -- it won't happen at the December 10 meeting -- but at some point in 2015, the Technical Committee 11 would be able to come forth with a consensus on a bay 12 reference point. And then that would require a management 1.3 change with another addendum. 14 And if the board was able to initiate that by their 15 August meeting, it could be put in place for 2016. 16 MR. GRACIE: For public comment in 2016. 17 MR. O'CONNELL: Implementation for 2016. So if the board were able to initiate an addendum in August, they could 18 19 go out for public comment and then in October make final 20 decisions for implementation in 2016. I mean, that is the 2.1 best course of action for us, whether the Technical Committee will be able to deliver that. 22 23 They might be able to recommend an interim bay 24 reference point until they have more time and more of this 2.5 data that is lacking.

lcj

	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH. Oray, Totas, we need to move on
2	unless there is another pressing did you have something,
3	Ed?
4	MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. I support the situation where
5	the key players, when it comes to stakeholders, come out with
6	that one-page letter. That is a good idea. I don't think
7	anybody disagreed with that. But I am a little confused
8	relative to the answer to Phil's question.
9	First of all, when do you think the state, once we
10	get back here, will make a final decision on what we are going
11	to do in 2015?
12	MR. O'CONNELL: Well, following the commission
13	meeting we will initiate our public scoping process and then
14	submit regulations prior to mid-December. So prior to
15	mid-December you will see our proposed actions for the 2015
16	fishing season.
17	MR. O'BRIEN: That is important because trophy
18	season, needless to say, charter boats have most of the same
19	people that we have taken out previous years signed up for
20	next year. And they are going to take a close look at that.
21	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay, let's move on and switch to
22	freshwater. Don, you still with us?
23	Inland Fisheries Management Plan
24	by Don Cosden, MD DNR Fisheries
25	MR. COSDEN: I am going to discuss a little bit

2.1

about the largemouth bass fishery and focus on the Potomac. We sent out results of an angler survey. Hopefully everybody got that a few weeks ago.

And I just briefly want to go over that, where we stand right now. So that survey actually went to -- I believe 685 anglers opened that survey up and responded at least to some degree, which is pretty amazing. It went out on a Survey Monkey poll.

(Slide)

62 percent of those people actually responded that they favored a regulation change on tidal bass. And what is interesting is that 59 percent of the anglers that did respond were tournament fishermen.

And what makes that kind of remarkable is that the proposed regs are not proposed but the regs that were discussed in that Survey Monkey poll basically would have affected tournament anglers. There is very little harvest going on, on largemouth bass. So it is typically the tournament anglers, the catch-and-release anglers. Those regulations would have mostly affected tournament anglers.

So it is interesting that there was a majority of anglers who said they would like to see a change. We think that is based on the fact that fishing on the Potomac has been pretty lousy for the last two years. And anglers would like to see it improved. So would we.

2.5

If you read the introduction to that information we sent out, the analysis that we have looked at, our sample data and the catch data, tournaments — it is not clear we are overfishing the population. And therefore it is not clear that a regulation, an increased size limit or reduced creel limit, would result in a better fishery.

Before we get into that, I would like to say that we did go out as we got word again this spring, fishing got started again, we did extra survey work above and beyond what we typically do. We typically do our annual survey in the fall. We did a spring survey this year that mimicked what was done 20 years ago by some of the previous tidal bass biologists.

And that work looked pretty promising. We actually saw a good number of fish in some of these creeks. This is mainly pre-spawn fish, and I was feeling a little better about the fishery at that point. However, as time went on this spring, the fishing reports came in, and they were showing it hadn't really improved from last year.

So we have recently completed our survey on the Potomac, our annual fall survey, and I was hoping for better results. We just have back-of-the envelope calculations right now but it doesn't appear that the adult abundance has dropped again. This would be five years in a row that it has gone down --- and it is the lowest of the time series.

2.1

2.5

We did see an improvement in Young of the Year, better than it has been for a couple of years. And I would consider that a plus. As I said, right now our feeling is that this has not been related to overfishing but is probably related to habitat, and mainly may be related to the loss of SAV in recent years in the Potomac River.

However, we can do little to manipulate SAV. Our FMP, fisheries management plan, for tidal bass does call for examination and possible action when our indices and abundance are at this level. So that is what we are looking at. That is why we are looking possibly making a --- change, one of the reasons.

And the quickest response would be to reduce fishing mortality by either reducing creel to three fish, increasing the size limit in the summer to 15 inches. I am not going to go into a big discussion. We looked at how much we probably might reduce the number of fish that are carried in the live wells away and how much that might reduce mortality.

We could have that discussion at a later date. I am not making a proposal at this point. I just wanted to let you guys know it is not looking better and potentially getting closer to choosing one of these regulations potentially to put into effect.

We do have a meeting scheduled for early November to talk to PRFC, Virginia and DC. And that is purely an agency

2.1

discussion. We have had some phone calls with some of those managers but have not sat down in a room and hashed out -- seen their data.

What they are telling us -- Virginia has continued to say their fishery looks good, their sampling looks good. I can tell you it is not as extensive as ours. And that is part of the problem. Our stream sampling that we did was more or less fixed stations, sort of cherry picking the best locations, which is what we had done years ago.

It makes me feel better that those good locations still have good numbers of fish for the spawning period but the more river-wide survey that we do in the fall has been showing a consistent trend down. That leaves me to believe the population has been on the decrease.

After the meeting in November we are going to have a public meeting at PRFC to hear comments from anglers from that side of the river, and anybody is welcome to come voice their opinion. We are not proposing anything at that meeting but it is sort of a continuation of this discussion and getting a little more input as to what might be the preferable course of action if we did choose a regulation.

Questions and Answers

MR. TRAGESER: Is there a date on the public meeting?

MR. COSDEN: The public meeting is December 5th. We

will get that information out.

2.1

2.5

MR. TRAGESER: And you were talking about loss of SAVs. I didn't hear you say anything, and we have had this discussion numerous times, about invasive species: snakeheads, blue cats.

Do you guys, have you been doing, ever since the snakeheads have become an issue, have you been doing an annual survey, to some degree, as much information as you can collect on where we are as far as the overall snakehead population or getting reports from those fishermen who have been targeting snakeheads and what their catch has been?

Trying to establish some relationships between the number of snakeheads and blue cats for that matter that are out there and the pressure they may be putting on that population, whether they are contributing to, you know, reducing the population or is it more a matter of relocating some of the population, especially with snakeheads since they tend to like to inhabit the same areas that largemouth like to live in --

MR. COSDEN: Well, we have been working with Virginia and the Fish and Wildlife Service to try and see if we could normalize the data, the sampling that goes on between the different agencies.

And they did an index of abundance using data from all three agencies. It looked like snakeheads were on the

2.1

increase until just the last year or so. It looks like numbers have probably decreased for snakehead.

That may very well be because of the popularity of bow fishing and anglers pulling into them, and maybe we have actually done a good job of telling people to go get them. Or maybe they would have done it on their own.

On the other hand, blue catfish I think -- I don't have data on blue cats but just the impression, and our guys are out sampling bass and other species, that blue cats continue to increase. They are in all habitats.

You think of big blue cats, they are big fish, they are going to be at the channel. Well, we find, they find blue cats all over the shallow water, deep water, mid water, in the grass, and even some larger ones sometimes are in those areas.

Potentially there is some impact from that species. My gut feeling --- . And the loss of SAV may make that worse because that is refuge for small bass. So there is less grass for the bass to hide, and increasing abundance of a predator that wasn't there 10 or 15 years ago, perhaps there is a relationship.

It is not something we can quickly fix or perhaps ever fix depending on --

MR. TRAGESER: If the department decides to impose any of the restrictions, my guys -- and we talk about this, not so much doing a size restriction or size change

2.1

restriction right now or making it all 15 inch -- probably would be more comfortable with going to a three-fish limit.

Even our tournament guys. Now how that is going to impact some of the bigger groups that may come down, and I am not just talking about Delaware or New Jersey, like our groups, ---, whatnot. But there are some other -- I don't know what Potomac has on the books.

I know what the upper bay has on the book in August in the way of a large, large tournament, and that is one of the BASS elite series tournaments that is booked in August on northeast.

But I don't know that your restriction plans are talking about all tidal water. I know your surveys had that information in there about would you want to see it just on the Potomac? Would you want to see it on all tidal waters? So I don't know where we are with that or how you would deal with some of these other groups coming in.

If you implement any restrictions, would this be something that would go into effect, these regulations go into effect next year in 2015?

MR. COSDEN: Well, the -- we would not have time. We would need to do the scoping here. I would consider this scoping at PRFC. We need to come back and do the scoping here. We would not have time to have something in place by January 1, possibly even March 1.

lcj 118

1 Now a 15-inch minimum size would really only affect 2 the June through fall season so that potentially could go into effect next year but --MR. TRAGESER: But you got a 15-inch restriction up 4 5 until June 15 anyway. MR. COSDEN: Right, right, so we wouldn't be worried 6 about getting any place --- . So that is the schedule. 8 will say that the -- I don't have any numbers for the upper 9 bay but the biology stuff, it looked pretty good this year. 10 Indices have been stable. Our fear is that we make a change on the Potomac that reduces its desirability for tournament 11 12 anglers --13 MR. TRAGESER: Throw everything up on the upper bay. 14 MR. COSDEN: It is going to push them more into the upper bay where we have a really good fishery. That is kind 15 16 of the thought behind do we make this baywide so we are not 17 just crowding more anglers into smaller areas. 18 MR. TRAGESER: Plus I think you will create some 19 confusion among tournament anglers if you say, well, your 20 creel limit can be this one down here. But it can be 2.1 something different up here. I know our group would prefer to

see, if it is going to be done, would prefer to see some uniformity across the entire watershed if you are going to do it.

22

23

24

2.5

Well, we will be in touch. Stay tuned. MR. COSDEN:

lcj 119

We will be coming back to Maryland to talk to anglers as well. 2 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: You have got a couple other 3 hands, Don. MR. GRACIE: Maybe I didn't hear you right but what 4 I thought I heard was that you have no evidence that harvest 5 is affecting the population, so you have no other basis for 6 considering regulations other than an uninformed public 8 opinion poll. Tell me I am wrong. 9 MR. COSDEN: No, I said our index on adult abundance was down for the 5th year, and it is at its lowest in the 10 15-year time series that we have. 11 12 MR. GRACIE: And you have no relationship to that 13 with harvest, right? That is what you said. You have no 14 evidence. 15 MR. COSDEN: According to our management plan, it 16 might call for three different actions. It might call for 17 stocking. It could call for habitat enhancement and protection. Or it call for reducing fishing mortality. 18 19 MR. GRACIE: And where were those questions in your 20 I only heard one of them. survey? 2.1 MR. COSDEN: The survey -- we are already stocking. 22 We don't need to ask anglers should we protect habitat or 23 improve habitat. We are doing our best to do that. But that 24 is a long-term process. 2.5 The only short-term solution that might turn it

around is to reduce fishing mortality. And that not fair to take away from anglers because of some other thing here that has perhaps increased overall mortality, but that is the reality of almost every fishery we are managing here.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Phil?

2.1

2.5

MR. LANGLEY: I just want to go back to Roger, what you started off with, the invasive species and the blue cats. I have spoken to recreational anglers as early as yesterday morning who were fishing for striped bass in the Potomac River off St. Clements Island and they were catching 15 to 20 blue cats trolling in the 20-plus pound range.

And that is not something that, you know, you heard of in the past. It seems like that population seems to be thriving. And part of it could be they are not as habitat dependent as a lot of the other species. You know, maybe they can adapt a little bit better, and the numbers are -- reproduction levels are pretty high up there.

But it kind of amazed me that they were actually catching them trolling before striped bass but that is not the normal technique for fishing for blue cats.

MR. COSDEN: They are not competing with largemouth at St. Clements. It is a big issue.

MS. DEAN: I got the chance to see it commercially done, and I was just -- I don't even know how anything else lives up there. It was that much. Snakeheads, no biggie.

Those things are big.

1.3

2.1

2.5

MR. O'CONNELL: So one, we have been trying to promote this fishery and we are having some success. Last week I was asked to go up to Philadelphia with Congressional Seafood to meet with Whole Foods, their global manager and two regional managers. And Tim Sugrue from Congressional Seafood is pitching to them to market a frozen blue catfish product.

And based upon their sales in one of the regions of the mid-Atlantic, they are very optimistic that it will be well-received. The profit margin on wild blue catfish is about double that. Actually more than that. It is about \$4 to \$5 for a wild blue catfish and it is \$1 for a farm-raised catfish.

So Whole Foods sees a great opportunity here to tell a story, which they do very well, to increase the demand nationally for this product. Congressional Seafood is also making a \$16 million expansion to their Jessup facility and looking to purchase a filet machine so they can process the smaller catfish in large numbers and freeze them, get them while they are available and then freeze them for the annual market.

So knock on wood that is going to come forward and maybe establish the market that the fishermen need to pursue these things.

MS. DEAN: Can I just ask, are there recreational

lcj 122

1 tournaments for them? Is that --MR. TRAGESER: For what, for the blue cats? 2 MS. DEAN: For the blue cats. 3 MR. TRAGESER: Yes, they have turned that into a 4 5 cottage industry actually once that species sort of established themselves. 6 Well, you can speak to it better than I can. But I 8 have actually, when I have been fishing bass tournaments, and 9 we are in the shallows, off the channels you have got the other boats that are fishing the blue catfish tournaments. Of 10 course, they are fishing the deeper waters off the edge of the 11 12 channels. And I don't know that it is necessarily a 13 14 catch-and-keep situation with them. I think it is sort of a 15 catch-and-release because they are trying to maintain that 16 sport. 17 MS. DEAN: So it is sort of like a Calcutta, like a side tournament? 18 19 MR. TRAGESER: Yes. I don't know how they set up 20 the payout structure or anything like that --2.1 MR. DEHOFF: They release them all because they want 22 to catch them when they get bigger. They don't keep any of 23 them. 24 MR. TRAGESER: No, they don't keep them. 2.5 MR. COSDEN: So I am done. I will brief -- well, we

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

will have more information on the --- on the North Branch. We are meeting with MDE in a few weeks, and I should know a little bit more. We are collecting data so we will come back and talk. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: That will be good, Don. Thank you. Okay, let's move on to the Habitat Workgroup Update. Jim, and I think you have Margaret here too. Fisheries Habitat Workgroup Update by Commissioner Jim Gracie MR. GRACIE: I think we have had four meetings now. We have had kind of variable attendance. We are not sure what that is all about at this point but we are working on that. We are thinking of broadening the invitation to allow people interested to join, not just have various commission representatives there. We found that some commission representatives are more interested than others and we had some people who are interested enough that they want to attend the meeting. So we are going to ask them to join the workgroup. Two meetings ago we had a facilitated session to develop a mission statement. And we revised that last week at our following meeting. So Margaret, if you could read that to the group. This is kind of what we are about.

protect and restore fisheries habitat using ecosystem-based

MS. MCGINTY: So the revised as of last Wednesday is

2.1

2.5

management and practical understanding of watershed ecology to educate and engage people and influence decisions and policies, respecting all voices. That is the short version.

MR. GRACIE: And that is fine. We are going to start developing some goals and they are going to be driven by the interests of the members of the group. But I can tell you we have representatives who are interested in oysters habitat, tidal fisheries habitat, SAVs, freshwater habitat, land-use issues — the whole spectrum of habitat impact issues.

So I wouldn't say we are off to a fast start. I think it has been kind of painful but that is not Margaret's fault. She pushes us pretty hard. We are making some progress and I think we will probably -- by our next commission meeting we will probably have some goals identified and some people working on some issues.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Good. With your membership issue, would you like commissioners to put out feelers for interested parties that might still be representative of the fisheries stakeholders?

MR. GRACIE: Yes. Don't make any commitment to anybody because we are going to try to limit the size of the group. So if we had 30 new people, I am not sure we would want that many. I guess we are looking for people who have strong interest, I would use the word passion, in various habitat issues that represent the spectrum of habitat issues.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Everybody got that? Good. Thank This is good. Let's move into legislative you, Jim. Okay. updates. Gina, and Bevin is here too, right? MS. HUNT: Well, quite honestly I will just save you a lot of time. I don't have an update from what we have talked about last time. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: But you are going to introduce Bevin. MS. HUNT: But I can -- sure, because Bevin has an update. The only thing I would mention is because this commission doesn't meet again until February and session will already be in, you know, when we have things that are coming up that are actually going to be departmental bills or when things start moving, we will just have to do it by e-mail. If you guys hear anything, please e-mail me and let me know if maybe if within your organization there is some interest and where the recreational community is on certain goals because otherwise by the time I see you again as a commission, we are going to be pretty far into the session to get any comments on anything. So Bevin is here from the Chesapeake Bay Commission to talk about an invasive species bill, the potential for an

2.3

Invasive Species Bill

by Bevin Buchheister, Chesapeake Bay Commission

MS. BUCHHEISTER: Right, so our members carried this legislation in 2013. It increased the fine for spreading an invasive species. I think the fine had been \$2,500. And we increased it to \$25,000, and made it clear that the fine was a violation per species. So it was \$2,500 per species violation up to \$25,000.

That was just to, you know, to address the seriousness of invasive species. As you all know, it ruins habitat. There are predators, and sometimes, like the blue catfish, they don't have other predators. And once they are introduced it is pretty hard to eradicate them, and close to impossible.

So a part of that legislation that we had sponsored in 2013 was to allow for anybody who gave information on somebody who spreads invasive species, and that information led to an arrest and conviction and a fine, then the informant could collect up to half of the fine. And that was at the discretion of the presiding judge in the trial.

That piece did not pass. There were some concerns with creating a bounty industry. We looked at Maine and Alaska, and that really didn't happen. I think in Maine, as of 2013 in Maine, they had had one incident where somebody gave information on somebody else who was spreading invasive

2.1

2.5

species. It led to a conviction and a fine. So it didn't really spawn a bounty industry.

There was some other concern about it changing DNR jurisprudence because right now there is no other provision in the natural resources code that allows for a bounty to be paid for collecting information.

There is in Maryland state law, I believe it is at the governor's discretion, he can award, he or she can award up to \$25,000 for information and conviction to somebody who gave information about somebody who killed a police officer or firefighter or fire marshal or ambulance crew.

So that --there is precedence for this in Maryland law, and we thought we would come back again -- and especially with the bay, the bay programs, fisheries goal team had come out with management strategies for blue catfish so it brought it back to the attention, the invasive species issue.

And so they thought they would pursue it this next session and we wanted to get your input early on this. I know your next meeting isn't until January so you are the first group we have talked to, and we just wanted to get your input.

And this is a first draft so if you have any -- if see anything in there that, you know, raises the hair on the back of your neck, please let us know. That is what I am here for.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Questions, comments for Bevin on

1 this bill? I think you already got the flavor of how this 2 group feels about invasive species. Yes, Ray? **Questions and Answers** 3 4 DR. MORGAN: Question for Tom: Do all these go up before a district judge? This would not be like circuit where 5 6 it could potentially go to a trial. This would all be 7 district, right? MR. O'CONNELL: I don't know off the top of my head. 8 9 Gina, would you know? 10 DR. MORGAN: Does it go up before a district judge 11 or a circuit judge? They can ask for a trial, right? 12 MR. HOLTZ: They can always ask for a trial. 13 MR. HUNT: Yes, but it is going to go to district. 14 MR. GRACIE: We can't hear the question and answer 15 here. 16 DR. MORGAN: The question was where does the hearing 17 start? Does it start at district? You know, they can ask 18 for -- because of the severity of the fine, they could ask for 19 a trial in circuit court. 20 MR. : You have to have a maximum 90 days 21 in jail before you can request a jury trial in circuit court. 22 MR. GRACIE: I didn't see any jail sentence in here. 23 MS. HUNT: Subject to imprisonment not exceeding 30 days. But each one is a separate offense so depending on how 24 25 many nuisance organisms, you could easily get over 90 days.

lcj 129

1	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: More comments on this,
2	including I mean, if you want to just underscore that you
3	think anybody who would do this should be drawn and quartered,
4	that is fine too. Jim?
5	MR. GRACIE: Is the law valuable without the bounty?
6	MS. BUCHHEISTER: The bounty provision is because
7	DNR really doesn't catch anybody doing this and they need
8	information from somebody to be able to catch somebody.
9	MR. GRACIE: Just like they do for any other
10	violations that get reported. They still get reported.
11	MS. BUCHHEISTER: I am not sure the violations get
12	reported. At this point I think it is an incentive for
13	people
14	MR. GRACIE: We report people for violating fish and
15	game laws all the time. There is no bounty on that.
16	MS. BUCHHEISTER: I am talking about the spread of
17	invasive species. I don't think they are getting reports on
18	that.
19	MR. GRACIE: I understand but you might still get
20	reporting without the bounty.
21	MS. BUCHHEISTER: I think that what they found in
22	Maine is that is the incentive for people to report.
23	Otherwise there is not really an incentive.
24	MR. GRACIE: So it is not valuable without the
25	hounty

1 MS. BUCHHEISTER: Right, that is what I believe. MR. GRACIE: The 1999 Rivers and Harbors Act had a 2 3 bounty provision for pollution violations until --- . 4 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: There you go. Micah? MR. DAMMEYER: I have just -- maybe it is a minor 5 6 question. Does each nuisance organism, so it could be like if somebody had like a bucket full of snakeheads, a dozen in 8 there, right? 9 MS. BUCHHEISTER: Right. 10 MR. DAMMEYER: It could be 12 kinds of counts separately, right? It doesn't have to be snakehead and a 11 12 crayfish and --13 MS. BUCHHEISTER: No, no, if it is 12 snakeheads 14 that is 12 counts. 15 MS. HUNT: Like to be clear, that is existing law. 16 That is what passed in 2013 was the separate offense part. 17 This part is about the reward, and actually getting to that point where you are going to write the ticket, you have got to 18 19 find out who is doing it. So it is that incentive to get 20 somebody to call in. 2.1 MR. KIMBRO: Back during the gill net poaching 22 thing, there were some rewards offered. How did we do it 23 then? Was it private? 24 MS. HUNT: No, that was just a reward from, a reward 2.5 offered for information that would lead to conviction. It was

lcj 131

1 not out of -- that was just department money that would have 2 awarded that. This is actually --3 MR. O'CONNELL: Private money. MS. HUNT: Right, private money that was offered to 4 5 the department --6 MR. KIMBRO: So that wasn't public funds. MS. HUNT: Right, it was private money offered to 8 the department. This is actually out of the fine that they 9 would pay, part of it would go to the person who turned them 10 in. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay, I think I am on pretty safe 11 12 ground by saying the commission is fully supportive. But just to formalize that, does anybody have any objection to what is 13 14 being proposed? 15 (No response) 16 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay, great. 17 MS. BUCHHEISTER: Thank you. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Bevin. We ended up 18 19 coming a lot closer to our timeframe but we are not done yet. 20 And I appreciate everybody's forbearance. This has been some 2.1 good discussion. And we have one more yet to go so I would 22 like to invite Greg Schildwachter up. 23 And Greg, I appreciate your patience because we 24 weren't sure when we would be able to fit you in.

2.5

2.2

2.3

Fishing App

Greg Schildwachter, Watershed Results

MR. SCHILDWACHTER: Well, I appreciate being included. I used to do a lot more of these kinds of meetings, and it is seriously good to be back because this is really where conservation begins and I appreciate all of you taking the time to do it. It is the least I can do to sit here and get educated about some of the issues.

I am still relatively new to the area. I have only been here 10 years. And only in the last few years have I had time enough to really, you know, start focusing on hunting and fishing in the bay area as much as I would like to.

So one of the things I am doing to make myself useful is working with a group of anglers, many of whom are in this room right now, and others who are nearby -- Dave Sikorski, he can't be here because he is hunting and fishing. Good for him. And Bill and Shawn and Ed, of course.

But what we have done is we have developed an electronic system for anglers to be able to report their own fishing experiences and their catch data and their release data.

And the way this is going to work is anybody who cares to participate would be able to use their smart phone to use an app to record their catch. Those data would come to a Website which, you know, we are building in cooperation with

some Florida anglers who have pioneered this system.

lcj

2.1

And then we as anglers would be able to talk amongst each other on how to make those data available to the agency in a way that is useful to them for just about everything you all have spent the last three hours talking about. You know, you all know like I do that, I mean, especially on fisheries management, we are often blind casting when it comes to making these decisions with the kind of data that are available or missing.

So our idea here is that having anglers be able to have their own system of collecting useful data on catches is going to improve management, is going to improve the ability of anglers to participate in those management discussions, and, you know, really take advantage of the fact that every line in the water is an opportunity to learn something about what we are trying to accomplish.

So that is what we want to do. Data is key both in terms of quantity and quality, so, you know, improving that is what we are trying to do.

And, you know, the other aspect of it, of course, electronics today is an important way for people to communicate with one another so on these questions of getting the word out about meetings that you want to have attendance to or surveys, wanting to get, you know, more people involved in other surveys, we think the system can also help with that.

So we have got this application up and running. It is in a form now where I can send it to anybody who wants to look at it and start giving us some feedback. You can -- I will just say my e-mail address in a minute and you can just send me a note and I can send you what you need to know.

Pretty soon it is going to go the app stores for review and then it is going to be available just like any other smart phone app. And what you would do is download it. You would create an account on the Website, which would serve as your personal logbook. You know, private to you, and you get to use that to, you know, spread your fishing stories around to other people who are signed up and do whatever you want.

Use it to learn and track where you have been successful, where not. And then of course your data will also be part of the overall collection that we as anglers can work together on deciding how to interact with Tom and his staff, and also with universities and researchers and, you know, and others.

So that is my story. I am happy to take any questions. And if you want the information on the app, just send me an e-mail at Greg@watershedresults.com. And I will be glad to be in touch with you anyway and send you this.

You can look at the Website and see Steve Linheart's picture he put up of himself and all the other people who are

involved in helping to make this happen. I am just kind of chief cook and bottle washer, helping to make it happen. 2 Bill, that is all I got. MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Greq. I am going to 4 5 ask commissioners if they want to ask you questions. First, I 6 am going to toss it to Tom for a second. 7 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, I just wanted to mention that 8 Greg and his team have worked closely with our staff person, 9 Linda Barker, whom many of you know. She surveyed our 10 managers and they believe that data collected through this app can be very beneficial to them. 11 It is not going to replace like MRIP for harvest 12 estimates but it can provide a lot of data on angling effort 13 14 and catches that can be used when looking at management 15 strategies and exploring new approaches. So we are really excited on the potential application of this app and would 16 17 encourage you all to take a look at it and provide some constructive feedback to Greq. 18 19 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Did everybody get Greg's e-mail 20 address? Do we need to repeat it? 2.1 MR. SCHILDWACHTER: Remember, just two G's: one at 22 the beginning, one at the end. 23 Questions and Answers 24 MR. RINGGOLD: I didn't hear, and I apologize if you

Is there a projected cost or is it a free app?

25

said it.

2.1

2.5

MR. SCHILDWACHTER: No, no, it is free. We got grant money behind it and we are partnered with the --- Gamefish Foundation and so we are poaching on some of their staff to help run it and all that but any money aspect that we anticipate in the future, we will be trying to raise that money.

But we want any avid angler or newbie angler,

But we want any avid angler or newbie angler, whoever you might know who, you know, might want to contribute to use it.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Don, do you have something?

MR. COSDEN: I would just like to comment. Linda

clued me in a couple weeks ago and I went online and checked

it out. And it is a pretty impressive application. I think

it would help any fisherman be a better fisherman themselves.

And from a manager's standpoint, this is the kind of information for like the tidal bass fishery on the Potomac, we are desperate to have. We get these reports from anglers: Fishing is lousy. What is going on? We have some --- from tournaments but that is based on the number of fish brought to weigh-in, you know, the creel limit is --- , the seasons change, the size limits.

So it is really limited what we know about angler catch, and it is expensive data. So this is -- I encourage you, Roger, to tell your guys to download this thing and have at it.

2.2

2.3

MR.	SCHILDWACHTER	: Liccione	even	bought	а	smart
phone just so	he could use	it.				

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Any other questions for Greg, or comments? I think we all, the many times that we have dealt with data and lack thereof, lack of quality, whatever, and recognize the need of it to have effective management that helps our fisheries, I think we all recognize that something like this has a great deal of value.

So I too would encourage everybody to give the app a try and provide feedback because it is still an opportunity to help perfect it. Okay, great. Thank you, Greg. In my excitement about Greg's topic, I skipped over one final thing that was on the agenda, and on that last item this will be Tom on the fisheries annual budget report.

Fisheries Annual Budget Report

by Tom O'Connell, Director, MD DNR Fisheries Service

MR. O'CONNELL: I will just provide a brief overview as you have had a chance hopefully to take a look at it.

First, I just want to acknowledge Gina, Karen Knotts and Carl Simon. Carl may be a new person to you. Raise your hand,

Carl. He is our new fiscal person who took over George

Hurl's* spot a little over a year ago.

And he has been a great asset given his experience with DBM to make a lot of strides for fisheries. He continues to look at all of our budget issues with a cost-recovery lens

2.1

2.5

on it. He has developed some budget management tools that our managers can look at their budgets and manage it like a checking account.

And we also have some new revenue tracking tools where we can look at the special fund revenues coming in on a monthly basis to make sure that our revenues are coming close to our appropriations.

And also be able to possibly use that information to look at marketing, sport fish marketing products that we hope to initiate next year to see if we can get some bump-ups when we do the marketing.

But just in regard to license sales on page four, some positive news to report. You know, if you just look at our major licenses -- resident nontidal and resident bay sport and in the trout stamp -- all of them we had an increase in 2013 and for the first time resident nontidal and resident bay, we had the highest number of license sales for going back to five or more years.

So that is very good news, to see some increased license sales there. Going on to revenues, you will see that our revenue went up by \$5.4 million in FY14. It doesn't mean we have a lot of extra money. If you look at that more closely, of that \$5.4 million, \$1.7 was from the commercial fee increase, and \$600,000 was from a general fund match to that commercial fee increase.

2.1

2.5

So that in itself was \$2.3 million, and if you go back to the cost recovery, we were looking at \$2.2 to \$2.4 million. So that increased revenue is just to cover our operations that we have been conducting.

In regard to the sport fish license sales increases I just mentioned, we got about a \$300,000 increase from that. And you will see shortly that is helping us stabilize our special fund reserve. And then the remaining funds that are listed on page five are dedicated funds. They are oyster surcharge money for oyster industry projects, MDOT money for, you know, fish hatchery projects for mitigation.

So really the new money is that \$300,000 from the sport fish license sales, and that is going to help us stabilize our special fund reserve.

In regard to expenditures, getting back to what I just mentioned, for the first time since 2010, our special fund balances were stable and actually increased by \$158,000. That is great news, and through a lot of effort to put us in a better position. You may recall a few years ago we were talking about running out of our special fund reserve and looking at major reductions in the services.

We have now stabilized that and we have actually increased that by \$150,000. That increase comes from the Fisheries Research and Development Fund. You will see about a \$470,000 increase there. We have some work to do with our

2.1

Fishery Management Program Fund. That is the nontidal license sales. We are running a deficit of a little over \$300,000 there.

We have already begun to make some realignments in looking at the job functions our staffs are providing to -- we found some opportunities to reprogram some of the salaries to FR&D, given changed responsibilities over the last few years.

So we think we are going to be able to address that. And then just in closing, you will see in appendix one and appendix two that we listed our priorities for the coming year. You will see that our main focus is to continue operations, but we continue to strive for achieving new priorities and we challenged our staff to come up with a list. They are listed on that appendix one.

And as opportunities become available, we strive to make progress on those priorities. And then the last appendix is just a summary of some of the more major accomplishments that we made during the past year. So with that, I will be happy to try to answer any questions or comments.

And one last comment is, you should have seen this in an e-mail, but our graphics person had a sudden loss of her husband and was not able to, you know, put the graphics on this report when the text became final. When we are able to do that, we are going to, probably in a couple weeks. And then we will make this report final and include some pictures

1	and put it on the Website.
2	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Questions, comments?
3	(No response)
4	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Thank you, Tom. You had one
5	final note I think for everybody.
6	MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, with mixed feelings I wanted to
7	let you guys know that Noreen Eberly she hates when I do
8	this is retiring at the end of this month. And she has had
9	a long state service
10	(Applause)
11	MR. O'CONNELL: Most of her tenure with state was
12	with the Department of Agriculture but we were very fortunate
13	to have her transferred over here when the Aquaculture and
14	Seafood Marketing Program was, and I can tell you that she has
15	been incredibly helpful as one of my assistants and I am going
16	to miss her greatly. So thanks a lot, Noreen.
17	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: And with that, we are adjourned.
18	(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	