



**Massachusetts
Striped Bass Association**

Since 1950

**MSBA MEMBERS GUIDE TO PUBLIC COMMENT
ASMFC DRAFT ADDENDUM 2**

When its your turn to comment:

1. Introduce yourself, say where you live and where you fish.
2. Be polite, speak directly to the officials and don't raise your voice.
3. Avoid addressing others in the crowd even if they bait you.

2.2.3 Status of the Fishery

I urge ASMFC to take the 14/5% reduction in removals needed to maintain the current rebuilding timeline and not delay reductions until the 2024 stock assessment update.

3.0 Proposed Management Options

I urge ASMFC to only approve Addendum 2 with a package of measures that meet or exceed a 50% probability of achieving the 14.5% reduction.

3.1.1 Ocean Recreational Fishery Options

Option A Status Quo (28"-35" Slot Limit):

- I oppose the status quo option.

Option B (28" -31" slot limit):

- I support Option B because it provides the best chance of meeting the 14.5% reduction.

Option C (Split Mode – private anglers 28"-31" slot & for-hire anglers 28"-33"):

- I support the idea that "a recreational angler is a recreational angler regardless of the platform from which they are fishing."
- I believe the subject of recreational mode splits is an amendment level decision. Any consideration of recreational mode splits should include discussion and consideration of separate allocation, separate monitoring, separate data requirements, separate accountability measures and separate financial contributions.
- Conservation of striped bass is another reason to reject split mode regulations. Option C provides less reduction in removals than Option B.
- Trip preservation is NOT the reason Addendum 2 was initiated and I urge ASMFC to reject this option.
- Another reason to reject trip preservation is education. Mode splits will discourage for-hire operators & customers from adapting business models & expectations of catch to the current state of the fishery.

Option D (30” -33” slot limit): MSBA opposes Option D for the following reasons:

- Option D is projected to reduce fishing mortality by 12.8% and I prefer Option B which is projected to reduce fishing mortality by the larger number of 14.1%.
- The subsection of the recreational fishing community most affected in a declining fishery are those who fish from shore; many of whom are low income and cannot afford to fish from a boat.

Option E (Split Mode – private anglers 30”-33” slot & for-hire anglers 28”-33”):

- I oppose this option for the same reasons I oppose Options C & D

3.1.2 Chesapeake Bay Recreational Options:

- I support Option B1—1 fish at 19-23” across all Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions with the same 2022 seasons because it meets the required 14.5% reduction to preserve the current rebuilding timeline.

3.2.1 Commercial Quota Reduction Options:

- I support a reduction in the ocean commercial fisheries of 14.5% to preserve the current rebuilding timeline.
- I support a reduction in the Chesapeake Bay commercial fisheries of 14.5% to preserve the current rebuilding timeline.

3.1.3 For-Hire Management Clarification

- I support option A Status Quo
- Option B is unenforceable and fails to advance the purpose of Addendum 2.

3.1.4 Recreational Filleting Allowance Requirements

- I support Option A Status Quo. For Hire & private anglers face the same difficulties when it comes to local file at the dock prohibitions. This document fails to provide justification that this option advances the purpose of Addendum 2.

3.3 Response to Stock Assessment: Option B—Board Action.

- Recreational mode splits being placed into Addendum 2 with very little conservation benefit has violated the trust given last time and prevents me from supporting this idea again.
- I prefer ASMFC prepare to use emergency action for a quick response and be prepared to launch a formal Amendment 8 upon review of the results of the 2024 stock assessment.
- I support Option A Status Quo

MAKE SURE TO THANK THE PANEL FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT