



Atlantic Striped Bass Draft Amendment 7 for Board Review



Atlantic Striped Bass Management Board
January 26, 2022

Outline



- Overview and Timeline for Draft Amendment 7
- New options since October 2021
 - Management Triggers
 - Measures to Protect Strong Year Classes
 - Rebuilding Plan
- AP comments on the scope of new options
- Review remaining options
 - Recreational Release Mortality (LEC input)
 - Conservation Equivalency

Board action for consideration today: Consider approval of Draft Amendment 7 for public comment



PDT Members



- Max Appelman (NMFS)
- Simon Brown (MD DNR)
- Brendan Harrison (NJ DEP)
- Nicole Lengyel Costa (RI DEM)
- Nichola Meserve (MA DMF)
- Olivia Phillips (VMRC)
- Greg Wojcik (CT DEEP)
- Emilie Franke (ASMFC)



Background



- The status and understanding of the striped bass stock and fishery has changed considerably since Amendment 6 (2003)
- The 2018 benchmark stock assessment indicated the striped bass stock has been overfished since 2013 and is experiencing overfishing
- In August 2020, the Board initiated development of Amendment 7 to update the management program to better align with current fishery needs and priorities and build on the Addendum VI action to initiate rebuilding



Background



- May 2021: Following public comment on the Public Information Document (PID), the Board approved four issues for development in Draft Amendment 7:
 - Management Triggers
 - Measures to Protect the 2015 Year Class (Ocean Recreational Fishery)
 - Recreational Release Mortality
 - Conservation Equivalency



Background



- October 2021: Board discussed and modified options
- Board removed some options due to concerns about implementation viability
- Board tasked the PDT with developing additional options
 - Additional option for fishing mortality threshold trigger
 - Options to consider low recruitment in rebuilding calculations and rebuilding plan
 - Options for Chesapeake Bay recreational measures to protect strong year classes



Background



- Since October 2021, PDT met via webinar
 - Developed new options with analysis from TC
 - Modified some options (PDT memo)
 - Clarifying edits



Amendment 7 Timeline



August 2020	Board initiated Amendment 7
February 2021	Board reviewed Draft Public Information Document (PID) and approved PID for public comment
February - April 2021	Public comment on PID
May 2021	Board reviewed public comment; directed Plan Development Team to develop Draft Amendment
May - December 2021	Preparation of Draft Amendment (including initial Board review in October)
January 2022	Board reviews Draft Amendment and considers approving for public comment <i>Current Step</i>
February - April 2022	Public comment on Draft Amendment
May 2022	Board reviews public comment and selects final measures for the Amendment; Policy Board and Commission approve the Amendment
<i>October 2022</i>	<i>Expected stock assessment update</i>

Note: The timeline is subject to change per the direction of the Board.

Amendment 7 Timeline



- Implementation timeline is determined by the Board during final approval of the Draft Amendment (*Section 5.2 Compliance Schedule*)
 - Deadline to submit state implementation plans
 - Deadline for implementation
- Board could specify implementation timeline for different Amendment 7 provisions
 - New management measures requiring changes to state regulations (e.g., recreational measures): likely implementation 2023
 - Management triggers: typically implemented immediately upon approval of the Amendment, and would be evaluated during the 2022 assessment update
 - Board could specify a different implementation timeframe if needed



Draft Amendment Components



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- Statement of Problem
- Benefits of Implementation
- Description of Resource
- Description of Fishery
- Habitat Considerations
- Impacts of the Fishery Management Program

2.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- History of Management
- Purpose and Need for Action
- Goal and Objectives
- Management Unit
- Reference Points
- Stock Rebuilding Program

3.0 MONITORING PROGRAMS

- Catch and Landings Information (including Commercial Tagging)
- Social/Economic Information
- Biological Information
- Assessment of Stock Condition
- Bycatch Information



Draft Amendment Components



4.0 MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND PROPOSED OPTIONS

- Management Triggers
- Recreational Measures
- Commercial Measures
- Rebuilding Plan
- Habitat Conservation/Restoration Recommendations
- Alternative State Management Regimes (including CE)
- Adaptive Management
- Emergency Procedures
- Management Institutions
- Recommendations for Complementary Actions in Federal Waters
- Cooperation with Other Institutions

5.0 COMPLIANCE

- Mandatory Elements for States
- Compliance Schedule
- Compliance Reports
- Procedures for Determining Compliance
- Enforceability
- Recommended Mgmt Measures

6.0 MANAGEMENT AND RESEARCH NEEDS

- Stock Assessment, Habitat, Socioeconomic

7.0 PROTECTED SPECIES

- MMPA, ESA
- Potential Species Interactions



Board Discussion Today



- New options since October 2021
 - Section 4.1 Management Triggers
 - Section 4.2.1 Measures to Protect Strong Year Classes (Recreational Size/Bag Limits)
 - Section 4.4 Rebuilding Plan
- Remaining options
 - Section 4.2.2 Recreational Release Mortality
 - Section 4.6.2 Conservation Equivalency
- **Board could modify the proposed options**
- **Board consider approval of Draft Amendment 7 for public comment**



Input from AP and LEC



- Advisory Panel (AP) met via webinar in January 2022 to provide feedback on the scope of new options developed since October: fishing mortality management triggers, measures to protect year classes, rebuilding plan
- Law Enforcement Committee (LEC) met via webinar in December 2021 and discussed proposed options to address recreational release mortality





SECTION 4.1 MANAGEMENT TRIGGERS

Management Triggers



Statement of the Problem

- When SSB is below the target, variable fishing mortality can result in continued need for management action
- Shorter timetables for corrective action are in conflict with the desire for management stability; changes to management before stock can respond to previous management measures
- Use of point estimates does not account for uncertainty
- Long periods of below average recruitment raise question about recruitment trigger



Tiered Options for Triggers



- Tier 1: Fishing Mortality (F) triggers
- Tier 2: Female Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB) triggers
- Tier 3: Recruitment Trigger
- Tier 4: Deferred Management Action

Note: Language to be added noting that during stock assessment years, the recruitment trigger should be evaluated concurrently, when possible, with the F and SSB triggers when assessment results are presented.



Tier 1: F Triggers



Tier 1: F triggers

A. Timeline to Reduce F to Target

- **A1 (SQ).** Reduce F within one year
- **A2.** Reduce F within two years



Tier 1: F Triggers



Tier 1: F triggers

B. F threshold trigger

- **B1 (SQ).** If F exceeds threshold, reduce F
- **B2.** If two-year average F exceeds threshold, reduce F
- **B3.** If three-year average F exceeds threshold, reduce F

For B2 and B3, averages should not include data under different management actions; trigger should not be evaluated unless there are at least two or three years of data under the most recent action.

AP Input: Some support for considering B2 and B3 to address concerns about MRIP uncertainty and F variability; one member concerned about waiting 2-3 years for enough data to take action for B2 and B3.



Tier 1: F Triggers



Tier 1: F triggers

C. F target trigger

- **C1 (SQ).** If F exceeds target for two consecutive years and female SSB is below target in either year, reduce F
- **C2.** If F exceeds target for three consecutive years, reduce F
- **C3.** No trigger related to F target



Tier 2: SSB Triggers



Tier 2: SSB Triggers

A. Deadline to Implement a Rebuilding Plan

- **A1 (SQ).** No Deadline
- **A2.** Two-Year Deadline

B. SSB threshold trigger

- **B1 (SQ).** If SSB falls below the threshold, rebuild the stock
- **B2.** No trigger related to SSB threshold

C. SSB target trigger

- **C1 (SQ).** If SSB falls below target for two consecutive years and F exceeds target in either year, rebuild the stock
- **C2.** If SSB falls below the target for three consecutive years, rebuild the stock
- **C3.** No trigger related to SSB target

Note: There must be at least one SSB-based management trigger.



Tier 3: Recruitment Trigger Definition



Option A. Recruitment Trigger Definition

- **A1. Status Quo** – Any JAI (ME, NY, NJ, MD, VA, NC) is below 25th percentile of reference period (1950s/1980s-2009) for 3 consecutive years (recruitment failure)
- **A2. Moderate Sensitivity** – Any of the four core JAIs (NY, NJ, MD, VA) is below the 25th percentile of values from 1992-2006 for 3 consecutive years
- **A3. High Sensitivity** – Any of the four core JAIs (NY, NJ, MD, VA) is below the median of values from 1992-2006 for 3 consecutive years



Tier 3: Recruitment Trigger Response



Option B. Management Response to Recruitment Trigger

- **B1. (Status Quo).** If recruitment trigger is tripped, the Board reviews and determines appropriate action
- PDT removed a previous alternative that would have initiated stock rebuilding
- PDT clarified sub-options B2 and B3 → reduce fishing pressure as weak year classes enter the population
 - Both are based on interim F reference points calculated using a low recruitment assumption
 - Different approaches for determining when reducing F is required
 - **Is there one approach that best aligns with the Board's intent for an alternative recruitment trigger response?**



Tier 3: Recruitment Trigger Response



B2. If recruitment trigger is tripped,

- Implement an interim F target using low recruitment assumption
- Compare F terminal year to interim F target
- If F terminal year > interim F target, reduce F to interim F target within one year

B3. If recruitment trigger is tripped,

- Implement interim F target and interim F threshold using low recruitment assumption
- Reevaluate F-based management triggers using the interim reference points
- If an F-based trigger is tripped upon reevaluation, reduce F to the interim F target within timeline defined in *Section 4.1*

Note: B2 evaluates one point estimate of F against the F target, which is more conservative than the F-based triggers defined in Section 4.1 and used in B3.



Tier 4: Deferred Management Action



- **A (Status Quo).** No deferred management action
- Defer until the next assessment if:
 - **B.** Less than 3 years since last action in response to a trigger
 - **C.** F target trigger is tripped and SSB is above target
 - **D.** F target trigger is tripped and SSB projected to increase/remain stable over 5 years
 - **E.** F target tripped and at least **75%** probability SSB is above threshold over 5 years
 - **F.** Board has already initiated action in response to a different trigger



Management Triggers



Questions or modifications to the proposed options?

Tier 1: F triggers

Tier 2: SSB triggers

Tier 3: Recruitment Trigger

Tier 4: Deferred Management Action





SECTION 4.2.1 MEASURES TO PROTECT STRONG YEAR CLASSES (RECREATIONAL SIZE AND BAG LIMITS)

SECTION 4.4 REBUILDING PLAN

Measures to Protect Strong Year Classes



Statement of the Problem

- Issue raised by stakeholders and the Board that protecting strong year classes is important for stock rebuilding
- Concern the strong 2015 year class is entering the current ocean recreational slot limit (28" to <35")
- 2015 year class may be subject to high recreational harvest in the ocean, reducing its potential to help rebuild the stock; also subject to release mortality
- TC noted the 2017 and 2018 year classes were above average
- 2017s and 2018s have recently become available to Chesapeake Bay fisheries



Measures to Protect Strong Year Classes



- Options consider changes to recreational size/bag limits to enhance protection of these strong year classes
- Intent is to reduce harvest on the 2015, 2017, and/or 2018 year classes by shifting harvest to other year classes
- Provide protection from harvest in the short-term, but year classes are still subject to release mortality
- Uncertainty around how angler behavior and fishing effort would change in response to a different size limit and changes in fish availability



Options: Ocean Recreational Fishery



- **Option A** (status quo): 28" to <35" slot and one fish bag limit
 - Maintain current (approved in 2020) state implementation plans and CE programs from Addendum VI
- **Option B**: 35" minimum size and one fish bag limit
- **Option C**: 32" to <40" slot and a one fish bag limit
- **Option D**: 28" to <32" slot and a one fish bag limit

Note: Options B, C, and D would also apply to the Chesapeake Bay spring trophy fishery, which is considered part of the ocean fishery for management purposes under Amendment 7.



Options: Chesapeake Bay Recreational Fishery



- **Option A** (status quo): 18” minimum size and one fish bag limit
 - Maintain current (approved in 2020) state implementation plans and CE programs from Addendum VI
- **Option B:** 18” to <23” and a two fish bag limit
- **Option C:** 18” to <28” slot and a one fish bag limit
 - C1.** All Chesapeake Bay CE programs would be maintained with modification to the recreational size limits to include an upper bound of <28”
 - C2.** New CE proposals would be required



CE for Year Class Options



- **Tier 1: Conservation Equivalency Consideration for Alternative Size Limits**
 - **A (SQ).** CE would be permitted (considering other CE restrictions/requirements)
 - **B.** CE would be permitted with limitations (considering other CE restrictions/requirements)
 - **C.** CE would not be permitted



CE for Year Class Options



- **Tier 2: Addendum VI Conservation Equivalency Programs Splitting the Reduction between Sectors**
- Consider how changing the recreational size limits would impact Addendum VI CE programs that implemented a less than 18% reduction in commercial quota—offset by a larger reduction in recreational removals
 - **A.** Commercial quota levels implemented through those CE programs would carry forward, resulting in some quota levels that are less than an 18% reduction
 - **B.** Commercial quota levels implemented through those CE programs would not carry forward, those states would be subject to the FMP standard quotas



Analysis for Size Limits to Protect Year Classes



Ocean Region Size/Bag Limit Options	Chesapeake Bay Size/Bag Limit Options
Option A Status Quo. 28" to <35" slot/1 fish	Option A Status Quo. 18" minimum/1 fish
Option B. 35" minimum size/1 fish	Option B. 18" to <23" slot/2 fish
Option C. 32" to <40" slot/1 fish	Option C. 18" to <28" slot/1 fish
Option D. 28" to <32" slot/1 fish	

- Estimated length-at-age
- Percent protected from harvest – percent of each year class outside the size limit
- Projections to evaluate the potential impact on stock productivity and rebuilding timeline



Analysis for Size Limits to Protect Year Classes



Table 3. Estimated mean striped bass size-at-age based on the 2012-2016 state age data (weighted by state recreational catch) compiled for the 2018 benchmark stock assessment. Note: These are coastwide estimates based on data from several states along the coast; size-at-age is highly variable along the coast and there is overlap among age classes. Source: ASMFC.

Age	Estimated Mean Total Length (in)
0	3.8
1	6.4
2	12.7
3	17.0
4	20.9
5	24.1
6	26.4
7	28.7
8	31.6
9	33.8
10	35.5
11	37.2
12	39.1
13	41.0
14	42.2
15+	44.0

2018 year class in 2023

2017 year class in 2023

2015 year class in 2023



Analysis for Size Limits to Protect Year Classes



- Percent protected from harvest – percent of each year class outside the size limit
 - All alternative size limits would provide greater protection from harvest for the 2015, 2017, and 2018 year classes in 2023 relative to the status quo
 - Level of protection for each year class will change in future years as those fish grow
- All proposed options are estimated to achieve at least an 18% reduction in removals relative to 2017 levels (consistent with Add VI reduction)



Analysis for Size Limits to Protect Year Classes



- Projections were developed to consider potential effects of alternative size limits on SSB levels as compared to the status quo
- Assumed constant fishing mortality (F target) and constant effort
- Changed the selectivity patterns for each size limit scenario



Analysis for Size Limits to Protect Year Classes



- Key projection findings:
 - Stock recovery timeline is the same for all scenarios, including the status quo scenarios
 - The overall projected change in total SSB (all year classes combined) relative to the status quo is positive for most scenarios; however, the percent change in total SSB is not statistically significant
 - These results indicate that changing the selectivity does not have a significant impact on rebuilding the stock if the F rate remains constant
 - If the goal is to expedite stock rebuilding, controlling the overall F rate is more important than only changing the selectivity



PDT Recommendation for Year Class Options



- The PDT recommends the Board remove ***Section 4.2.1 Measures to Protect the 2015, 2017, and 2018 Year Classes*** from consideration in Draft Amendment 7
- If these options are removed, the Addendum VI FMP standard for recreational size and bag limits would be maintained for Draft Amendment 7
 - Ocean: 28” to less than 35” slot and one fish bag limit
 - Chesapeake: 18” minimum size and one fish bag limit
 - Current state implementation plans and CE programs from Addendum VI would be maintained



PDT Recommendation for Year Class Options



- PDT Rationale 1: Projection results
 - Stock recovery timeline is the same for all scenarios, including the status quo scenarios
 - The Board added year class protection to the draft amendment to support stock rebuilding, but projections indicate that changing size limits does not have a significant impact on rebuilding if F remains constant
- PDT Rationale 2: Timing challenges with 2022 assessment
 - Uncertainty with how Amendment 7 measures would align with assessment results
 - The Board may have to consider changing measures in response to the assessment if Amendment 7 measures are not projected to achieve rebuilding
 - Consider Board's desire for management stability



AP Input on Year Class Options



- One AP member supports removing these options: process of adjusting to size limit changes is costly for the industry
- Several AP members support maintaining these options in the draft:
 - Public should have the opportunity to comment on alternative size limits
 - Some alternative size limit options would result in a greater reduction in harvest and some alternatives may reduce release mortality
- Some AP members noted:
 - Diverse age structure is also important to consider
 - Protecting strong year classes may still provide overall benefit considering future recruitment success is highly variable
 - Potential of closed seasons to protect year classes
 - Potential relationship between protecting larger fish and the quality of eggs/recruits





SECTION 4.4 REBUILDING PLAN

Stock Rebuilding



Statement of the Problem

- Requirement to rebuild SSB to the target by no later than 2029
- Concern about recent low recruitment and potential impact on stock rebuilding
- TC analysis identified 2007-2020 as a low recruitment period
- Considers recruitment assumption for rebuilding calculation and outlines rebuilding plan framework for responding to the 2022 stock assessment



Stock Rebuilding



- 2022 stock assessment update expected in October
 - Update reference point values and evaluation of stock status with terminal year 2021
 - Account for two years of data under Addendum VI (2020-2021)
 - **Calculate F rate required to rebuild female SSB to the target by no later than 2029 (F rebuild)**
 - Stock projections accounting for measures selected in Amendment 7



Option for Rebuilding Calculations



- **Option A (Status Quo):** Rebuild female SSB to the SSB target level by no later than 2029. F rebuild is calculated to achieve the SSB target by no later than 2029 using the standard recruitment method from the stock assessment.
- **Option B:** Rebuild female SSB to the SSB target level by no later than 2029. F rebuild is calculated to achieve the SSB target by no later than 2029 using the low recruitment regime assumption.
 - *More conservative by assuming low recruitment*

AP comments: Some support for the more conservative approach of Option B, especially considering the recent low JAI values.



Rebuilding Plan



May 2022: Amendment 7

- Determine rebuilding calculation assumption
 - Option A: Use standard recruitment method to calculate F rebuild
 - Option B: Use low recruitment assumption to calculate F rebuild
- Select recreational fishery measures
- Maintain status quo commercial measures



October 2022: Stock Assessment Update

(incorporates two years of Addendum VI management)

- Evaluate stock status (terminal year 2021)
- Calculate F rebuild using recruitment method specified in Amendment 7 and compare to F
- Develop projections based on fishery measures specified in Amendment 7



Rebuilding Plan



October 2022: Stock Assessment Update

If projections under Am7 measures indicate rebuilding target will be met, Am7 measures are sufficient for rebuilding

If projections under Am7 measures indicate rebuilding target will not be met, Am7 measures are not sufficient for rebuilding

Calculate reduction needed to achieve F rebuild

2023: Implement recreational and commercial measures as specified in Amendment 7

2023: Develop addendum to replace Am7 measures with new measures designed to achieve F rebuild
(likely implementation 2024)

~2025: Benchmark Stock Assessment:
next opportunity to evaluate rebuilding progress



Questions or modifications to the proposed options?

Section 4.2.1 Measures to Protect Strong Year Classes (Recreational Size/Bag Limits)

Section 4.4 Rebuilding Plan





SECTION 4.2.2 MEASURES TO ADDRESS RECREATIONAL RELEASE MORTALITY

SECTION 4.6.2 CONSERVATION EQUIVALENCY

Recreational Release Mortality



Statement of the Problem

- Large component of fishing mortality
- The current management program primarily uses bag limits and size limits to constrain recreational harvest and is not designed to control effort, which makes it difficult to control overall fishing mortality
- Efforts to reduce overall fishing mortality through harvest reductions may be of limited use unless recreational release mortality can be addressed



Rec Release Mortality



- Option A. Status Quo (Addendum VI circle hook measures)
- Option B. Effort Controls (Seasonal Closures)
- Option C. Gear Restrictions
- Option D. Outreach and Education



Rec Release Mortality



- **Option A: Status Quo Circle Hook Requirement**

The use of circle hooks, as defined herein, is required when recreationally fishing for striped bass with bait, which is defined as any marine or aquatic organism live or dead, whole or parts thereof. This shall not apply to any artificial lure with bait attached... It is recommended that striped bass caught on any unapproved method of take must be returned to the water immediately without unnecessary injury.



Rec Release Mortality



- **Option B. Effort Controls (Seasonal Closures)**
 - Intended to reduce the number of live releases by reducing the number of fishing trips (effort) that interact with striped bass
 - Majority of options are no-targeting options in order to address recreational releases resulting from both harvest trips and catch-and-release fishing trips
 - In advance of future management actions, PDT recommends that the TC discuss and establish a standardized method for estimating the reduction in removals from a no-targeting closure



Rec Release Mortality



- **Option B. Effort Controls (Seasonal Closures)**

- **B1. State-Specific Two-Week No Targeting Closures**

- **B1-a.** States select 2-week closure during a wave with at least 15% of directed trips
 - **B1-b.** States select 2-week closure during a wave with at least 25% of directed trips

- ***Tier 1: Applicability of Existing No-Targeting Closures implemented in 2020 via Add VI CE***

- **A.** Existing no-targeting closures implemented in 2020 would fulfill new closure requirements
 - **B.** Existing no-targeting closures implemented in 2020 would not fulfill new closure requirements. States would need to implement additional closures or implement FMP standard size limit.



Rec Release Mortality



- **Option B. Effort Controls (Seasonal Closures)**

- B2. Spawning Area Closures (existing closures would fulfill these requirements)**

- **B2-a.** No-harvest closure during Wave 1 and Wave 2 in spawning areas
 - **B2-b.** No-targeting closure for minimum 2 weeks on spawning grounds during Wave 2 or 3 (align with peak spawning)



Rec Release Mortality



- **Option C. Gear Restrictions**

- **C1.** Prohibit any device other than a nonlethal device to remove a striped bass from the water or assist in the releasing of striped bass.
- **C2.** Option for Incidental Catch Requirement: Striped bass caught on any unapproved method of take would be returned to the water immediately without unnecessary injury.



Rec Release Mortality



- **Option D. Outreach and Education**
 - **D1.** Required Outreach (required in annual compliance reports)
 - **D2.** Recommended Outreach



LEC Discussion



- December 2021 LEC discussion on proposed options to address recreational release mortality
 - Concern that no-targeting closures would be unenforceable
 - Support for making the incidental catch provision a requirement
 - Recommend conducting outreach to manufacturers to address questions about what qualifies as a circle hook
 - Noted the overall importance of regulatory consistency, particularly for shared waterbodies.
 - Spawning area closures should be clearly defined





SECTION 4.6.2 CONSERVATION EQUIVALENCY

Conservation Equivalency



Statement of the Problem

- Value in allowing states to implement alternative regulations based on the needs of their fisheries
- Results in regulatory inconsistency among states and within shared waterbodies with associated challenges (e.g., enforcement)
- Difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of CE programs due to the challenge of separating out other variables (like angler behavior and availability of fish)
- Concerns that some alternative measures implemented through CE could potentially undermine management objectives
- Limited guidance on how and when CE should be pursued and how “equivalency” is defined



CE Options



- Option A: Status Quo – Board discretion
- Option B: Restrict CE based on Stock Status
- Option C. Precision Standards for MRIP in CE Proposals
- Option D. CE Uncertainty Buffer for Non-Quota Managed Fisheries
- Option E. Definition of Equivalency for Non-Quota Managed Fisheries



CE Options



- **Option A: Status Quo – Board discretion**
 - The Board has final discretion regarding the use of CE and approval of CE programs
 - The Board may restrict the use of CE on an ad hoc basis for any FMP requirement



CE Options



Option B. Restrict the Use of CE Based on Stock Status

- **Option B1: Restrictions**

- B1-a. No CE if stock is overfished (i.e., below the SSB threshold)
- B1-b. No CE if SSB is below target
- B1-c. No CE if overfishing is occurring

- **Option B2. Applicability**

- At a minimum, stock status restrictions would apply to non-quota managed recreational fisheries (except the Hudson River, Delaware River, and Delaware Bay)
- The Board could extend the restrictions to also include one or more of the following:
 - B2-a. Hudson River, Delaware River, Delaware Bay recreational fisheries
 - B2-b. Quota-managed rec fisheries (e.g., bonus programs)
 - B2-c. Commercial fisheries



CE Options



- **Option C. Precision Standards for MRIP**

PSE may not exceed:

- **C1. 50**
- **C2. 40**
- **C3. 30**

- **Option D. CE Uncertainty Buffer for Non-Quota Managed Fisheries**

- **D1. 10%**
- **D2. 25%**
- **D3. 50%**



CE Options



- **Option E. Definition of Equivalency for Non-Quota Managed Fisheries**
 - Proposed CE programs would be required to demonstrate equivalency to:
 - E1. the percent reduction/liberalization projected for the FMP standard at the coastwide level (e.g., each state required to achieve 18% as projected coastwide for Add VI)
 - E2. the percent reduction/liberalization projected for the FMP standard at the state-specific level



Questions or modifications to the proposed options?

Section 4.2.2 Measures to address Recreational Release Mortality

Section 4.6.2 Conservation Equivalency



Draft Amendment 7



Board action for consideration today: Consider approval of Draft Amendment 7 for public comment.



Questions?

