

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
SHAD AND RIVER HERRING MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**The Westin Alexandria
Alexandria, Virginia
February 1, 2017**

Approved August 2, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chairman John Clark..... 2

Approval of Agenda 2

Approval of Proceedings, October 2016 2

Consider Approval of Sustainable Fishery Management Plans (SFMP) 2

New York SFMP for River Herring..... 2

Delaware River Basin Cooperative SFMP for Shad 3

Maine Updated SFMP for River Herring 8

Consider Approval of The American Shad Habitat Plan from Florida..... 9

Election of Vice-Chair 10

Adjournment 10

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of Agenda** by Consent (Page 1).
2. **Approval of Proceedings of October, 2016** by Consent (Page 1).
3. **Move to accept the New York Sustainable Fishery Management Plan (SFMP) for river herring, the Maine SFMP for river herring and the Delaware River Basin Cooperative SFMP for shad** (Page 8). Motion by Adam Nowalsky; second by Terry Stockwell. Motion passes unanimously (Page 8).
4. **Move to approve Florida's American Shad Habitat Plan** (Page 9). Motion by Michelle Duval; second by Malcolm Rhodes. Motion passes unanimously (Page 9).
5. **Move to elect Mike Armstrong as Vice-chair of the Shad and River Herring Management Board** (Page 9). Motion by Ritchie White; second by Robert Boyles. Motion passes unanimously (Page 9).
6. **Move to adjourn** by Consent (Page 9).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Terry Stockwell, ME, proxy for P. Keliher (AA)	Andy Shiels, PA, proxy for J. Arway (AA)
Steve Train, ME, GA	Loren Lustig, PA (GA)
Rep. Jeff Pierce, ME, proxy for Sen. Langley (LA)	John Clark, DE, proxy for D. Saveikis (AA)
Cheri Patterson, NH, proxy for D. Grout (AA)	Craig Pugh, DE, proxy for Rep. Carson (LA)
Dennis Abbott, NH, proxy for Sen. Watters (LA)	Lynn Fegley, MD, proxy for D. Blazer (AA)
Ritchie White, NH (GA)	Rachel Dean, MD (GA)
Mike Armstrong, MA, proxy for D. Pierce (AA)	Kyle Schick, VA, proxy for Sen. Stuart (LA)
Raymond Kane, MA (GA)	Rob O'Reilly, VA, proxy for J. Bull (AA)
Sarah Ferrara, MA, proxy for Rep. Peake (LA)	Michelle Duval, NC, proxy for B. Davis (AA)
Mark Gibson, RI, proxy for J. Coit (AA)	David Bush, NC, proxy for Rep. Steinburg (LA)
Colleen Giannini, CT, proxy for M. Alexander (AA)	Malcolm Rhodes, SC (GA)
Lance Stewart, CT (GA)	Robert Boyles, SC (AA)
John McMurray, NY, proxy for Sen. Boyle (LA)	Pat Geer, GA, proxy for Rep. Nimmer (LA)
Steve Heins, NY, proxy for J. Gilmore (AA)	Kathy Knowlton, GA, proxy for S. Woodward (AA)
Emerson Hasbrouck, NY (GA)	Jim Estes, FL, proxy for J. McCawley (AA)
Russ Allen, NJ, proxy for D. Chanda (AA)	Martin Gary, PRFC
Chris Zeman, NJ, proxy for T. Fote (GA)	Sherry White, USFWS
Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Andrzejczak (LA)	Derek Orner, NMFS

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

Ex-Officio Members

Brad Chase, Technical Committee Chair

Staff

Bob Beal
Toni Kerns
Ashton Harp

Jeff Kipp
Amy Hirrlinger

Guests

The Shad and River Herring Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Edison Ballroom of the Westin Hotel, Alexandria, Virginia, February 1, 2017, and was called to order at 10:00 o'clock a.m. by Chairman John Clark.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN JOHN CLARK: Good morning everybody, and welcome to the Shad and River Herring Board. Will Commissioners please be seated, and will everybody else please take conversations outside; thank you.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN CLARK: All right are there any items to add to the agenda? Seeing none; are there any objections to the agenda as here? Seeing none; the agenda is approved.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Do we have any changes or additions to the minutes from the last meeting? Seeing none; and with no objection then the minutes are approved.

CONSIDER APPROVAL OF SUSTAINABLE FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS (SFMP)

CHAIRMAN CLARK: We have no public comment, and so we'll move right on to Agenda Item 4, which is Consider Approval of Sustainable Fisheries Plans. Brad Chase, the head of the Technical Committee will be giving us a review of each of these plans; and we'll have times for questions after each plan.

NEW YORK SUSTAINABLE FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR RIVER HERRING

MR. BRAD CHASE: Good morning. We're going to start with New York's plan to update their river herring sustainable fishery management plan. This plan is focused on the Hudson River and tributaries. There has been consistent

spawning stock sampling since 2012; and the sampling has found that mean length and mean length at age are increasing, as well as the frequency of repeat spawning.

Mortality estimates from the sampling have been declining. The plan will adopt regulations changes that were implemented in 2013. During this period since the last plan, commercial landings have declined by about 50 percent. The two main data series used as benchmarks are the Seine Series for Blueback Herring and Alewife that are shown here.

There is a fair amount of variability in these series, but you can see that the benchmark is the 25th percentile, the data series that is the line running along the X axis, and the threshold is to stay above that line; and if it goes below for three years there will be a management response. You can see that they have stayed above it with a few exceptions in the time series.

The proposed plan for 2017 to 2021 is essentially the status quo, really no changes to the plan. The fishery just occurs in the Hudson River and tributaries. There is a moratorium otherwise in other state waters. There will be the continuation of the recreational possession limit of 10 fish per person, or 50 fish per boat; again status quo with no changes.

To repeat, the sustainability targets are the young-of-year indices and recruitment failure is considered three years in a row below the 25 percentile of the data series. The state is also pursuing additional sustainability measures; looking at mean length and age, as well as total mortality in the frequency of repeat spawning. These are not quite ready. The duration of the time series needs a little bit more length. They are also looking at catch-per-unit effort of commercial harvest. They hope to develop these additional measures for a future update. The TC recommended approval of the updated sustainable fishery management plan for New

York, and it will adopt the regulation changes in 2013 in this update; otherwise no changes to the plan.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: That was the New York SFP, are there any questions about that plan? Seeing none; Brad, do you want to take the next SFP?

**DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COOPERATIVE SFMP
FOR SHAD**

MR. CHASE: Okay the next would be Maine. Oh, is Delaware cued up. The Delaware River Basin, it's their shad plan that was implemented five years ago. It is an update. It's prepared by the Delaware River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative. This involves the entire Delaware River Basin; including the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware.

The plan is based on four indices of abundance they use to track sustainability for the shad stocks. Pictured here are the four indices. The first one is the Smithfield Beach gillnet, it collects spawning adults for brood stock. It began in 1990. The second one is a title survey for juvenile shad, and then there is a non-title survey for juvenile shad; these are seine surveys.

The title began in 1987, the non-title in 1980. They also have an index developed from commercial reporting of total landings; and they could look at catch-per-unit effort as well. Here are those indices with a fifth added for the update. It also shows the benchmark levels. The first three are fishery independent, and they're using the 25th percentile of the data series.

The management trigger is to have a response if there are three years below that 25 percentile. Then for the two fishery dependent, they use the ratio of commercial harvest to the Smithfield Beach Survey, and they use the 85th

percentile for that. Again, there is a management response if they are three years above the line.

The new proposals for the mixed stock landings, and they're going to use the 75th percentile with a management response if they go two years above that line. Since the last plan was approved there have been no necessary management responses due to these triggers. In terms of harvest restrictions for recreational New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey has a three shad per day with no size limit.

Delaware has a yearlong season also with up to ten shad per day no size limit. For commercial fisheries New Jersey has a directed fishery that has limited entry, and Delaware has a bycatch fishery in the striped bass gillnet fishery that has limited entry as well; but no specific shad restrictions. There is a series of management actions that will occur if the benchmark is exceeded. I won't go through them all.

There are different responses depending on which index is exceeded, and they can involve a closure of the fisheries or reductions of recreational fisheries to catch and release only; or different types of levels or responses, depending on what happens. There are also responses that occur if they have multiple exceedances of the different indices, and they're listed here. Again, the cooperative can decide if they want to have a full fishery closure or if they want to have some interim measure to reduce harvest. In terms of changes from the previous plan, first the nontitle juvenile abundance index will now be calculated as a result of a generalized linear model method, instead of a geometric mean. They are going to use data just for several specific sites, and continue to estimate the geometric mean; but they will use the GLM to produce that index. The next change from the previous plan is to have a new mixed stock benchmark.

The new management benchmark was added in response to concerns that our basin shad stocks are being harvested in lower Delaware Bay. The development of a benchmark required determining a limitation line for the upper and lower Delaware Bay in assigning stock percentages based on that line; and it also imposes limits in the amount of shad that can be harvested from the mixed stock fishery, and imposes gear restrictions in the lower Bay if management actions are warranted.

Further on a new mixed stock benchmark. The demarcation line had been from Leipsic River in Delaware over to Gandys Beach, New Jersey. This was a line where 100 percent of the stock above the line was considered to be Delaware River fish, and below that line was estimated to have 40 percent of Delaware River origin; an otherwise mixed origin.

What is being proposed by the Cooperative is to lower the line, keeping the Gandys Beach origin on the New Jersey side, but lowering it down to Bowers Beach in Delaware. The Cooperative selected Bowers Beach as delineation between the upper Bay and the lower Bay, and decided to assign a 40 percent of commercial landings to Delaware stock for any shad harvested in the lower Bay.

Here is a graph that shows the lines. You can see the original line running from Leipsic River over to Gandys Beach in New Jersey, and that's in blue. Then the orange line is the new proposed line. It's running from Gandys Beach down to Bowers Beach in Delaware. This is what is proposed by the Cooperative. The origin I think relates to past tagging studies, as well as an improvement in reporting for landings with a change in line. This item was discussed at length by the TC.

We did not come to consensus on the topic. There were some members that wished to support the proposal as stated, and other members felt that the line should not be moved

south until there was more information that could be gathered. There is a proposed genetic study that's to be started this year, and there were members that expressed that concern that the line should remain where it is, or be lowered just two miles south down to Port Mahon instead of down to Bowers Beach.

That is where the TC ended. Let me go a little further on TC recreational concerns. The TC expressed concern that this could result in expanded effort in the mixed stock fishery, given some shad were previously in the mixed stock portion of the Bay would now be deemed 100 percent Delaware River stock if the proposed line is approved. They also expressed a concern that mixed stock landing benchmark is artificially high; because it is derived from landings that stretch back to the eighties, when the harvests were much higher and exceeded 100,000 pounds.

The plan says low market values have caused the decline in landings; but Figure 41 in the plan suggested the price of shad is increasing. If the price were to continue to increase, it could lead to unsustainable harvest. Questions were asked why Bowers Beach was selected as the new line as opposed to Port Mahon. There was discussion on ocean bycatch in federal waters; and concerns about the lack of information on mixed stocks in federal waters. Also again, they highlighted the fact that a new genetic study was going to begin in 2017, and some members expressed the interest in having that information before a decision was made. That sums up the TCs comments; otherwise there was support to approve the plan with all those changes; with just the lack of consensus on the line change.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Any questions about the Delaware SFP? Yes, Mike.

MR. MIKE ARMSTRONG: It looks like the TC can go along with most of the plan, it's the line that we should be considering now; where the TC

had a real problem with it. I guess I share a lot of those concerns. But my question and I couldn't find it. It wasn't in your presentation, and I didn't see it in anything. I apologize if I missed it.

Why the move to move itself? Is there a fishery going on along the west coast that needs to be accommodated? I know part of it was, I read that it doesn't match up currently with the reporting lines; and that's a big deal I guess. But that would bring it to Port Mahon, if that's the pronunciation. Why go to Bowers Beach? Is it a fishery issue? If someone could answer that it would be great.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes Mike, I can take that. It is our reporting region, and really if you look at our shad landings they are mostly coming from Leipsic in the upper Bay, which is above Port Mahon and up into the river. We just felt that Bowers Beach was a much better dividing line between where we would expect to see the mixed stock being caught by the fishery.

Most of our effort, as was pointed out this used to actually be a shad fishery when striped bass fishery came back in. Striped bass was actually a bycatch fishery of our shad fishery; but now it's just the opposite, where most of our gillnetters in the spring are targeting striped bass.

They're using 7 to 7.5 inch mesh, because they want to get striped bass that are big enough to sell on the New York market; where they can get a premium price for it. We are not seeing really that much effort targeting shad in the first place and in the lower Bay where they would be most likely to have the interactions with the mixed stock, we figure this line actually is a much better demarcation point for Delaware.

MR. ARMSTRONG: But it does look like biologically that line will then encompass more mixed stock; which would be reported as

Delaware River fish, is that correct, and does that present problems for the TC when you're trying to tease out mortality rates on different stocks?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: As you saw the map of the Bay there, we're still a good ways up the Bay. We're calling lower Bay all the way from Cape Henlopen up to Bowers Beach. It is a big chunk of Delaware Bay there, as you can see. Really the effort that would be catching shad is low in that point; even in the middle Bay it is pretty low.

I think it is pretty much a moot point. I don't think we're going to see a lot of shad landed in either the mid Bay or the lower Bay, more so in the upper part of the mid Bay. We think that this just captures it better if we do see a big increase in shad landings, let's say in the lower Bay that would be concerning. That could indicate that we were fishing more on mixed stock; any other questions? Lynn.

MS. LYNN FEGLEY: I just also had the same concerns that the TC voiced. How inconvenient, what would the impact be on the Delaware fisheries if the line was at Port Mahon and not down to Bowers Beach? What would be the difference for the fishery?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I would have to look again at our landings to see. From what I recall though, based on the triggers we have in there, I don't think it will make a huge practical difference at this point. But we just wanted to make sure in the eventuality that shad landings did pick up again.

I don't see that happening, but if it did we think, and we've looked at it closely, we've had several of our scientists working on this of course. We just think that the Bowers Beach dividing line will protect the mixed stock well without causing unnecessary stoppages to our commercial fishery there. That was the impetus on our part to have that line moved. Cheri.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: Yes, I'm going to have to echo my colleagues concerns. I'm looking at some of these percentages on the boxes in this map, indicating that there could be from the tagging studies I believe, kind of a higher percentage of stock that isn't necessarily specific Delaware River; if you go from Bowers Beach. It looks like you have more, unless I am not understanding this correctly, you have less of a mixed stock if you start from Port Mahon.

Those are Delaware River stock primarily. New York probably does have a concern if some of this mixed stock is Hudson River stock, and they're just barely above their line of maintaining their populations for their fisheries management plan. My thought is to err on caution, until we have a genetic study that the TC can look at; and have that compromise of starting from Port Mahon as opposed to Bowers Beach.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Any other questions? Russ.

MR. RUSS ALLEN: Just a couple things. I'm the Chair of the Delaware River Basin Cooperative Policy Committee. We've had many discussions on this issue, and we've had many discussions on this issue back to the nineties. If you look at some of those tagging studies that were done in the sixties and then we started our tagging program in the nineties.

That information was available when we closed the mixed stock fishery back in 2000. We've known this for a long time that it's a mixed stock fishery. I think the flavor of the Board at that time was to not do anything to these fisheries at that time. At that point we put in limited entry; and I know Delaware has done a lot of work at that portion of their fishery, making sure that landings are down.

We now have three fishermen who landed last year, and I think Delaware was less than ten; so it's working. We really took a lot of time trying to figure this out. The good news is we have

another study coming this year; with the help of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and we're going to do a lot of work.

The goal was to get a mixed stock benchmark in this plan, and we don't want to see it all of a sudden go by the wayside; because we're not happy with the line for New Jersey and Delaware, and we get some votes against that. We don't want that to happen. We put it in here to make sure we had one, because that was a major recommendation from five years ago. The one thing we want to do is use the new technology that's available; the new studies that we're going to do. This is a fluid document and we can change it at any time, as long as this Board agrees to that. We're hoping we can just get this benchmark in here at this time. We took into account the things that are happening, Delaware and their reporting. Maybe they can fix that in a year.

Maybe they can make that better and we can move the line again. But if it helps us get the benchmark right for now; that is the whole point behind this. We're looking forward to the help we can get from the other states, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to make sure we get a good study done this year.

Hopefully that will continue for multiple years. I just wanted to get those points across that we're working hard to make sure this happens. The change in this line doesn't affect anything in New Jersey, this affects Delaware. It is not going to mix anything with our fishermen, but I want to make sure this benchmark is in there; so we can change it even next year if there is a new set of data, and take it to our Policy Committee at the Co-op, and then bring it back to the Board.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Any further questions? Mike.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Not to belabor it, but it seems like we have a decision to either leave it

the way it is or go ahead and move it, and then take a look at the genetics as they come in. A question for either Russ or Brad is the study definite and is the spatial resolution enough to resolve an issue involving 12 miles of coastline? I don't want to kick the can down the road, if in fact we're going to be looking at something that is not going to help us.

MR. CHASE: The TC did not receive a proposal in this study; we just had a brief summary that I think the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are going to initiate. I would ask if any of the other Board members have information on the nature of the study; because the TC was not briefed on it.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay and that's just level of comfort, knowing something is coming.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Sherry, do you have information on the study?

MS. SHERRY WHITE: We don't have a study design yet, but we're working collaboratively with the TC on that.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, I know that obviously the subject has come up in our states. In Delaware we're going to make all efforts to get samples from the entire extent of our fishery; any further questions? Oh, Lynn.

MS. FEGLEY: This is really I think for Russ. I'm trying to understand if the line was changed, if the line was moved up to Port Mahon, would that impact the mixed stock benchmark?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Do you want to take that Russ?

MR. ALLEN: I'll try. We would have to go back and look at the landings and see. But I think the point that John is getting at is he can't differentiate between the two right now. He felt that it was better to put that line where it is, and the information would be more accurate than move the line and then not be sure if it

was accurate. I think I hit that in a nutshell, but we're just trying to make sure we get the best numbers out there for people. But it is still not perfect.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: It was close, Russ. Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes, I have a question for New York, as this was also part of their concern and I'm not hearing anything. Are you guys fine with moving the line down to Bowers, knowing that it could be affecting your stocks in Hudson?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Do you want to take that Steve?

MR. STEVE HEINS: Not really, but I will. Well, obviously we have technical concerns about that. We don't have any, what we think is new information that would tell us that there is any reason to move that line that further south. But I'm not on the Policy Board, was not involved in those discussions.

I don't really know what happened at the Policy Board. I do know that New York and Pennsylvania had the same concerns, so there is no consensus on the Policy Board either on moving the line. But yes, I mean we have the concerns certainly. I would rather see it up at Port Mahon.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: It's Port Mahon. Andy.

MR. ANDY SHIELDS: I have to weigh in because I'm the last state. I was on the call with Russ, John and some others, and Fish and Wildlife Service; and this issue went on for how many months, three, four, five months. We couldn't break the tie. The TC felt very strongly from the science side; that's why they put their comments in. There is a question as to whether or not their comments should show up in a, what was the name of the – something opinion – Dissenting Opinion or something like that. It went that far.

Pennsylvania agreed with New York, because we had the concerns biologically that they're trying to restore their stock in the Hudson, and these fish there is some evidence to prove that fish that mill around the lower part of the Bay also travel up the coast and get into the Hudson fishery. That is why we're supporting it for the conservation reasons. Pennsylvania doesn't have commercial fisheries, so we don't have the same pressures or concerns that New Jersey and Delaware have. That is kind of how it played out and we're kind of at this point today.

MAINE UPDATED SFMP FOR RIVER HERRING

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Are there any further questions on that one? Not seeing any; we'll move on to the final SFP, which is the Maine Updated River Herring SFP.

MR. CHASE: Next up is the Maine update for their sustainable fishery management plan for river herring. Maine has 40 municipalities that are approved to have river herring fisheries in which 24, I believe have viable fisheries currently. What they have typically for commercial fisheries, they have one fixed harvest location that's operated by one harvester.

The harvest can only occur in that one area. The commercial season is allowed to occur four days weekly or with conservation equivalence. Each commercial harvester collects biological data. The harvest is required to be reported by August 1st of each year. Recreational harvest can occur with 25 fish per day and the fishing can occur above in the watersheds where commercial harvest does occur. A brief update on how things are going in Maine, they have had some favorable results since the last update. They generally have seen improved survival in some of the large rivers of herring and reduced mortality.

They're seeing stability in some of the metrics such as maximum age, mean length at age. There have been some favorable responses,

including run counts that have been going up in many of the rivers. A little more on that again, many of these runs are showing increases in the run size since the 1990s. The plan does propose to add an additional commercial harvest in the town of Franklin; and more on that in a minute.

Again, they've found stability in mortality estimates, in some cases declining mortality estimates; and they are seeing a trend of less harvest for resale and more harvest for personal use. The fishery they would like to add is in the town of Franklin, and it involves Card Mill Stream. It's a fishery that was closed in 2012, because they didn't have biological data.

In the eight years since then you can see the graph that shows the counts. Their sustainability target is 35 fish for a spawning acreage. You can see that line running across the X axis and where the counts have been in relation to the line. In the lower left you can see a graph for mortality estimates at this run, and you can see they're declining.

They've also documented increasing numbers of older fish in the run as well. They feel they have a justification based on the eight years of biological monitoring to open this fishery. In terms of their sustainability definition, what they have is a metric based on the number of spawning run fish brood stock needed per acre of spawning surface to sustain the populations.

What they've used as a threshold is 35 fish per surface acre of spawning habitat. Maine has used that for many years, and it's how they base their escapement numbers and also their sustainability measures. The Department of Marine Resources in Maine works with the commercial harvesters to collect biological data from 19 runs, and they also collected 14 noncommercial runs.

They look at repeat spawning rates, annual mortality estimates, and escapement estimates for each commercial fishery; and review these

annually. They review age structure, length frequency data, they conduct run counts where possible, and they relate these run counts to environmental conditions. They also maintain total harvest levels as well.

A little bit more on their management actions and triggers. Again, they use the base of 35 fish per acre. They close the fisheries for three days a week to allow that escapement to occur, and then they review their biological data and they do this annually; and they have management actions in response to exceeding that metric.

It is a metric that goes well back to the seventies and eighties, and it was developed at a time when they had one closed day per week. Now they're at three closed days per week. It is a conservative approach compared to what was done previously. The TC looked at the changes in the update. They reviewed the request to open Card Mill Stream, and they supported this; and they recommended approval of the request to open the new fishery. Also, the TC was interested in seeing an additional sustainability measure. Right now there is the one metric used, and there is a lot of biological data that is being recorded by the state of Maine. The TC expressed interest in seeing an additional metric that could be used as a secondary measure. The one it zeroed in on was the repeat spawning ratio. That was discussed as being included as soon as possible or for the next sustainable fishery management plan as a sustainability measure. Otherwise the TC recommended approval by the Board.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Are there any questions on the Maine updated river herring sustainable fisheries plan? Okay seeing none, I guess it's now time to move to action on these. Is there any further discussion of these plans before I ask for a motion; or do we want to get a motion up and then discuss the motion? All right, Adam.

MR. ADAM NOWALSKY: I move to accept the Sustainable Fishery Management Plans as presented here today.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Do I have a second? Terry Stockwell. Is there any discussion on the motion? Toni.

MS. TONI KERNS: Can we get some specificity for which plans were presented and for which species? We can help you out, Adam with what's on the Board.

MR. NOWALSKY: I'll try this again. I'll move to accept the New York sustainable fishery management plan for river herring, the Maine sustainable fishery management plan for river herring and the Delaware River Basin Cooperative sustainable fishery management plan for shad. Would that address your concerns?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Do we have any discussion of the motion? Seeing none; do we need any time to caucus? It doesn't look that way. **I guess I'll just ask are there any objections to passing the motion as presented here? Seeing none; the motion is passed.**

CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE AMERICAN SHAD HABITAT PLAN FROM FLORIDA

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Our next item on the agenda is to consider approval of the American Shad Habitat Plan from Florida. I'll turn it back over to Brad.

MR. CHASE: The state of Florida submitted a Shad Habitat Plan for the TC to review. It's a new plan from the state of Florida, and it followed the format of all the other plans that have been approved previously. The TC approved the plan with no recommended changes.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Are there any questions about the Florida habitat plan? Seeing none; can we get a motion? Michelle.

DR. MICHELLE DUVAL: I move that we approve Florida's Habitat Plan for American Shad.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Do we have a second? Malcolm Rhodes. **Is there any objection to passing the motion as written? Seeing none; the motion is passed.**

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR

CHAIRMAN CLARK: That brings us on to our next agenda item and our final action item; and that is to elect a Vice-Chair. Ritchie White.

MR. G. RITCHIE WHITE: I would like to nominate the most distinguished and probably the most knowledgeable member of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts team; Mike Armstrong.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mighty high praise, and seconded by Robert Boyles. **I am guessing there is no objection to that so Mike, you're elected, great.**

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Is there any other business to come before the Board? Seeing none; we are adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 10:39 o'clock a.m. on February 1, 2017.)