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## Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Draft Strategic Plan on Black Sea Bass Recreational Reform presented to Council and Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer – winter 2018</td>
<td>Joint FW 14/addendum XXXI, addendum XXXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2019</td>
<td>Council and Board agreed to form joint steering committee and working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar - Oct 2019</td>
<td>Steering committee formed, met several times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Mission Statement

Allow for more regulatory stability and flexibility in the recreational management programs for summer flounder, scup, black sea bass, and bluefish by revising the current annual timeframe for evaluating fishery performance and setting recreational specifications to a new multi-year process.
Two-Year Specifications

- Set rec. specs for 2 years, commit to no changes in interim year.

- **Example** timeline in briefing materials.
  - Year 0: set RHL, fed. rec. measures for yrs 1&2.
  - Early year 1: finalize state measures for yrs 1&2.
  - Make no changes to year 1 & 2 measures after they are finalized.

- Potential to decide on rec measures in Oct rather than Dec?
Guidelines for *Status Quo*

- Standard, repeatable methodology applied every year
- Stock status information
- Expected recreational harvest compared to the RHL
Guidelines for *Status Quo*

- **Stock status**
  - Biomass compared to the target
  - Fishing mortality compared to the threshold
  - Recruitment compared to the average and recent trends
  - Survey indices in years when management track assessment not provided?

- **Multiple positive indicators could support** *status quo* **when moderate reduction in harvest otherwise needed**
Guidelines for *Status Quo*

- **Expected recreational harvest compared to the RHL**
  - SQ justified if expected rec harvest within a pre-defined percentage above or below RHL - needs to go both ways
  - Guidelines for incorporating uncertainty in MRIP estimates (PSEs, smoothing of outliers)
  - Further consider pros/cons of using preliminary and/or projected current year data
  - Simulation testing
F-based management (Fay and McNamee model)
Managing for-hire separately from private recreational sector
Private angler reporting
Coastwide management during all or part of the year
Managing to the ACL vs RHL (concerns about timing of data availability)
Other ways to address discards, e.g. angler education
Discussion

- Continue to evaluate ideas developed by steering committee?
  - Guidelines for maintaining *status quo*
  - Two-year specifications
  - December vs. October decision on rec. measures

- Other topics?

- Priority ranking compared to other needs for these species in 2020?