

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
TAUTOG MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**Crowne Plaza Hotel - Old Town
Alexandria, Virginia
May 23, 2013**

Board Approved February 5, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order 1
Approval of Agenda..... 1
Public Comment..... 1
Approval of Proceedings..... 1
2012 FMP Review and State Compliance 1
Technical Committee Report 3
Election of Board Vice Chair..... 8
Adjournment 8

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of Agenda by Consent** (Page 1).
2. **Approval of Proceedings of October, 2012 by Consent** (Page 1).
3. **Move the board approve the 2012 FMP Review and state compliance reports and at the same time approve Delaware and North Carolina's request for de minimis status for 2013** (Page 3). Motion by Pat Augustine; second by Kyle Schick. Motion carried (Page 3).
4. **Move that the board approve the terms of reference for the tautog benchmark stock assessment as presented today** (Page 8). Motion by Mark Gibson; second by Pat Augustine. Motion carried (Page 8).
5. **Move to nominate and close nominations and cast one vote for Adam Nowalsky vice-Chair of the Tautog Management Board** (Page 8). Motion by Mark Gibson; second by Pat Augustine. Motion carried (Page 8).
6. **Motion to adjourn by Consent** (Page 8).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Paul Diodati, MA (AA)	Bernie Pankowski, DE, proxy for Sen. Venables (LA)
William Adler, MA (GA)	John Clark, DE, proxy for D. Saveikis (AA)
Jocelyn Cary, MA, proxy for Rep. Peake (LA)	Roy Miller, DE (GA)
Mark Gibson, RI, proxy for R. Ballou (AA)	Tom O'Connell, MD (AA)
Dave Simpson, CT (AA)	Bill Goldsborough, MD (GA)
James Gilmore, NY (AA)	Rob O'Reilly, VA, proxy for J. Travelstead (AA)
Pat Augustine, NY (GA)	Kyle Schick, VA, proxy for Sen. Stuart (GA)
Peter Himchak, NJ, proxy for D. Chanda (AA)	Bill Cole, NC (GA)
Tom Fote, NJ (GA)	Bill Archambault, USFWS
Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Asm. Albano (LA)	Peter Burns, NMFS

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

Ex-Officio Members

Jason McNamee, Technical Committee Chair

Staff

Bob Beal	Marin Hawk
Melissa Yuen	Katie Drew

Guests

The Tautog Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Presidential Ballroom of the Crowne Plaza Hotel Old Town, Alexandria, Virginia, May 23, 2013, and was called to order at 10:20 o'clock a.m. by Chairman James Gilmore.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN JAMES GILMORE: Good morning, everyone. My name is Jim Gilmore. I'm the administrative commissioner from New York. I will be chairing the Tautog Board today. I'm assuming the chairmanship today, and I would just like to thank Bill Goldsborough for his past two years of chairing this board through some pretty volatile times in terms of mortality rates. Thanks, Bill, for that, and you did all the work. I just have to follow along now.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: The first order of business will be the approval of the agenda. We do have one change. If you do have the older copies, there was a proposal under Item 5 from Maryland. Maryland has withdrawn that, so we are not going to consider that today and that is not going to be part of the discussion.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Are there any other changes to the agenda? Seeing none; we will take that as approved. Is there going to be any new business or anything that anybody wants to add later on?

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: For each meeting we offer public comment. Seeing none; we will move on.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: I will take that we have approval of the proceedings by consent. Thank you. The next order of business to consider the 2012 FMP Report and State Compliance, and Melissa is going to do a presentation on this.

2012 FMP REVIEW AND STATE COMPLIANCE

MS. MELISSA YUEN: I will now go over the FMP Review and State Compliance for the 2012 fishing year. First, a review of the stock status; tautog is currently managed as a single coast-wide stock. The most recent stock assessment was an update completed in 2011 and included data up to 2009. The assessment update concluded that tautog is overfished.

The spawning stock biomass has remained about the same level since 1994 with a very slight upward trend in recent years. In 2009 it was estimated at 23.5 million pounds. This is about 40 percent of the threshold and 53 percent of the target levels. This graph shows the fishing mortality rate.

The black line represents the target fishing mortality rates as required by management documents over time. Every time you see the red above the black line, overfishing is occurring. In 2009 tautog was determined to be experiencing overfishing. Moving on to status of the fishery, tautog is mainly a recreational fishery.

Since this time series began in 1981, an average of 91 percent of the total harvest was attributed to the recreational fishery by weight. Landings peaked in 1986 at nearly 18 million pounds and have generally declined. Since the FMP was implemented in 1996, total harvest averaged 33.4 million pounds per year.

Just looking at the recreational sector, 1998 and 2011 had the lowest landings on record with just over 1.5 million pounds in each of those years. Last year recreational landings increased by 46 percent from 2011. The sector breakdown varies at the state level. In recent years the commercial sector is increasing in proportion for some states such as Massachusetts and New York.

In 2012 the coast-wide recreational sector accounted for 91 percent of landings by weight, which is the as the time series average. At the state level the recreational fishery ranged from

99 percent in Connecticut and Delaware to 41.7 percent in Massachusetts. Taking a closer look at the commercial fishery, which has a time series starting in 1950, tautog was historically considered a trash fish and landings rarely surpassed 200,000 pounds until the late 1970's.

Commercial landings quickly peaked in 1987 with nearly 1.2 million pounds and then sharply declined even before states began implementing regulations in the early 1990's. In 2012 commercial landings is roughly 18 percent of the peak. Around the same time the landings began to rise so did the value of tautog, which is represented by the red line.

In 1950 the price was five cents per pound. In 1988, one year after the peak commercial landings, it was fifty cents a pound, and last year it passed three dollars a pound for the first time. Now I will go over the management plan for tautog. The most recent management document was Addendum VI approved in March 2011.

It reduced the fishing mortality target to 0.15 in order to end overfishing and to rebuild the stock. It also required states to implement a coast-wide reduction of 39 percent harvest reduction relative to the 2008/2009 average by January 1, 2012. Each state must implement board-approved regulations in commercial and/or recreational sectors.

In addition to Addendum XVI's requirements, the FMP specifies a 14-inch minimum size limit for tautog. It also requires fish traps and pots to have biodegradable fasteners and for states to provide fisheries data under the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program. States can also implement seasonal closures and possession limits to reduce fishing mortality.

The plan review team finds that all states have recreational and commercial measures consistent with the FMP. The FMP also requires states to collect 200 opercula for aging each year. In 2012 most states collected 200 or more samples. Some states were not able to collect the 200 samples. For example, New York's sampling program was disrupted by Hurricane Sandy.

The plan review team finds that all states met or tried to the best of their ability to meet the biological sampling requirement. The plan review team also looked at how the 2012 total harvest compared to 2008 to 2009 average. Coastwide there was a 53 percent reduction based on the number of fish.

At the state level the difference ranged from a reduction of 81 percent in Maryland to an increase of 48 percent in Connecticut largely attributed to the large increase in recreational landings in that state. On average, states had a 44 percent reduction. Rhode Island and Massachusetts were not required to implement regulations to meet the required reduction as approved by the board in its March 2012 conference call.

Requests for de minimis status; Amendment 1 to the FMP provides the criteria for de minimis status. A state must demonstrate that its most recent commercial landings is less than 1 percent of the coast-wide landings or 10,000 pounds, whichever is greater. If approved, states with de minimis status will still have to implement the 14-inch minimum size limit and regulations for the biodegradable fasteners.

For 2012 the 10,000 pound figure is greater than 1 of coast-wide landings. Delaware and North Carolina requests de minimis status as they have in previous years and have been approved. The plan review team recommends the board grant de minimis status to these two states based on their most recent commercial landings. Both are well below the 10,000 pound criteria. This concludes my presentation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Thanks, Melissa, great report. Are there any questions for Melissa?

MR ADAM NOWALSKY: In recent years and recent addendums there has been a lot of focus on illegal and unreported harvest. What is the PRT doing to try to include some updated information about that in these FMP reviews?

MS. YUEN: It is assumed that most of the illegal harvest is coming from the commercial fishery; and so for the 2011 stock assessment update the technical committee looked at projections to see like how many illegal fish is needed in order to have an impact on the fishery, and it was estimated to be like a relatively low amount. That is being considered in the upcoming stock assessment which is going on right now. I don't know if Jason has anything to add.

MR. JASON McNAMEE: It is a good question. I think maybe you're wondering if there is anything specifically in the plan, almost like a term of reference, that addresses it, and I don't know that there is. From the technical standpoint we are working with – and I will talk a little bit more about this in a minute, but we're working with techniques and things of that nature that will account for some uncertainty in harvest estimates or the take estimates.

I think we're covered on that side; but as far as having something that is kind of going into the plan review reports and things like that, I don't know if that is an element in there. It might be a good recommendation if enforcement reports or something like that could be an element in these reports.

MR. NOWALSKY: I would certainly recommend doing that in the future as we go through these reviews to have some input from law enforcement as well as what the PRT's thoughts are on the contribution of that impact to both the harvest levels as well as what the impacts could be on stock status.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Yes, a good suggestion, Adam. That is the big issue here so the sooner we get a handle on that the better we end up managing this fishery. Pat.

MR. PATRICK AUGUSTINE: Mr. Chairman, a follow-on comment to Adam's comment is as you recall last year we had the LEC put together a white paper for us as to what the recommendations were that they thought we might want to consider. Unfortunately, at that time we did not adopt any way of tracking.

Contrary to what people think and what your report is on all this black market is commercial fishing, we find it to be contrary to that. There are an awful lot of recreational people that are selling to the black market live. With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion if you ready.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Go ahead, Pat.

MR. AUGUSTINE: **All right, I move the board approve the 2012 FMP Review and state compliance reports and at the same time approve Delaware and North Carolina's request for de minimis status for 2013.**

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: **Seconded by Kyle. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none; we will accept that as approved.** The next item on the agenda – again, we're skipping Item 5 – we're going to Item 6. We're going to consider terms of reference and Jay McNamee is going to do a presentation on this.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. McNAMEE: I'm Jason McNamee. I work for the Rhode Island Division of Fish and Wildlife. I have just a real summary of the stock assessment process to this point, and then I'll quickly go through the terms of reference for you all to take a look at as well, so I'll try to go through this and catch you back up.

Okay, just way of summary, the Tautog Technical Committee and stock assessment subcommittee met at the end of March of this year. That was our data workshop. We reviewed and evaluated all of the available datasets. This was done for the benchmark stock assessment process that we are now in the midst of.

We looked at evaluated all sorts of data, fishery dependent, independent, as well as tautog life history information. It is kind of nice for this benchmark process to really kind of lay it all out and reevaluate all of the data sources that we have been working with and we have also introduced a whole suite of new information that

we're going to try and consider for this benchmark.

The next thing aside from the data that we talked about were the modeling techniques that we're going to employ. As you may remember, we have been using a virtual population analysis as the main technique, and we're hoping to consider that, but we're going to try and move away from that as well. We're doing some techniques that can be more spatially explicit. We have a whole suite of modeling approaches that we're going to take a look at.

Another interesting piece for this stock assessment is that we will be engaging independent peer reviewers, so that is something for the board to kind of keep track of to get a sense of what you think about that process. I believe it has been done by the commission at least one other time for eel, so this will be the next iteration for that process to see how that works out.

From the stock assessment committee and technical committee's view it has been pretty good so far. We've have got some good feedback. We developed a set of terms of reference which I will go into in more detail in a moment, but we drafted those up after the actual meeting. We had a lot to cover in that meeting so we spent the time looking at the data and talking about models and things like that and caught up with the terms of reference piece afterwards.

I have got a couple of slides on that for you. Just in summation, the stock assessment is moving in the right direction, especially considering tautog is a pretty data-poor species certainly in some areas of the stock range. We feel pretty good. We have some new faces on the committee, some old faces as well, but it is a good group and we're looking forward to working together and things have been going well so far.

The technical committee members will contribute additional data and analyses and we will be holding another conference call prior to the assessment workshop in October of this year.

Just a quick overview; these are all of the steps that we intend on hitting during this process. We have gone through the first three. The data workshop, again, was in March.

We talked a lot about data so now we're in the kind of final collection phase of the data and then the analyses will follow that. Then we will get into the actual stock assessment process and should end up with a review in the summer of next year. Okay, terms of reference; they're fairly standard but there are some really good ones for tautog as well, so I will kind of step through these one by one.

The first important step is to characterize the precision and accuracy of the fishery-dependent and independent data used in the assessment. This includes things like just providing a description of the data source, what type of survey it is, what state it is in, how the methodology works, all of that sort of stuff.

Then we will talk about the calculations. We talked a lot about standardization of our abundance indices, something we haven't done too much of with tautog, so we talked a lot about that. We will be talking about that more and describing that as one of the terms of reference. Continuing on with the first term of reference, we will also discuss any trends and associated estimates of uncertainties; standard errors, things like this that uncertainty estimates surround abundance indices or commercial catch or what have you.

We will also, and importantly, include a justification for any removals of any datasets that we drop out of the analyses, so we will have a justification for any of that. Then we will also discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each of the data sources. Okay, this is a very important one for tautog and I think is one that is on a lot of the board members' minds, but we're going to talk a lot about and justify the assumptions about the stock structure and the geographical scale at which the population is assessed.

We currently have kind of a bifurcated process. We've have got a coast-wide assessment and we have then a regional assessment that is occurring

in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. The point of all of that is we don't believe that tautog should be assessed on a coast-wide basis. They're more discrete than that, so we're looking at modeling techniques and data sources at a finer resolution so that we can get to a better place for assessing the tautog stock.

Okay, Term of Reference Number 3 is to develop models to estimate population parameters, things like fishing mortality, biomass, numbers at age, things like that, depending on the model approach used. We talked a bit about the types of models so when we get into the actual process, we will be picking careful notes of each of the modeling types that we're going to look at and strengths and weaknesses of each of them.

Under Sub-Bullet A there we will be describing the model structure, the assumptions, the parameterization for both the population and the reference point of the models. We will be clearly describing the strengths and weaknesses of each modeling type. Some of the types we're going to look at are data-poor methods and some are a little more data-intense methods.

We will be justifying our choice of uncertainty estimates, effective sample sizes, the weighting schemes that we use, so those will be explicitly justified. We will be describing the stability of the model, how it performs, can we get it to converge on a solution. Then we will also be testing the various assumptions that we make for whichever model ends up being our preferred model by running retrospective analyses and sensitivity runs to test the various assumptions that we might make for each modeling type.

Another important thing that we will do is to make sure that we run a continuity run; so even though we don't prefer to run this again on a coast-wide level, we will run where we can some of the models as also a coast-wide set of data and compare it to the coast-wide VPA. It just gives you a level of confidence that the model is not wildly out of sync with what we've looked at in the past.

Then in the end we're going to pick our preferred model and then justify why we've picked that model. Okay, two more; we're going to characterize the uncertainty of the model estimates and biological or empirical reference points; so we will be talking about uncertainty around the reference points that come out of the model outputs.

Then Number 5 is we will be making recommendations on the stock status; so where it is relative to fishing mortality, stock abundance, things like that. The final two; we will be developing in the end a detailed short- and long-term prioritized of research needs. We will talk about what research is underway, our critical research needs and what is something that doesn't exist yet that could really benefit the tautog stock assessment and management of the species.

Then the final thing we will do is recommend the timing of the next benchmark assessment. We will come out of this process with a preferred model, and we will have some sense of a cycle to kind of run this model. Given the data intensity of the model and the life history characteristics of the species, we can recommend a cycle to reassess the species. With that, that is all I have for you. I'm happy to take any questions you might have. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Thanks, Jay, that was great. Obviously, the technical committee has done a great job in including everything I could think of. Are there any questions? Mark.

MR. MARK GIBSON: Jason, on Term of Reference 2, the stock structure and spatial scales, would you talk about that a little bit more. I'm interested in what the thinking is right now on how we can simultaneously drill down on smaller spatial scales versus having to assess on a coast-wide basis to cover areas which are more data poor than others.

We do that now I think with two separate analyses. One is a coast-wide set of data and then an extraction of area-specific or zone-specific data in another model run. Is that still where your thinking is on this term of reference?

I don't want to lose the Massachusetts/Rhode Island locality that we have.

MR. McNAMEE: Yes, a very good question. I think the idea here is to not lose that. In fact, we would like to have a similar situation for all of the states. One of the things we have looked at already is some additional tagging information that has come out of the Mid-Atlantic just to, again, support this notion that tautog don't migrate very far.

They kind of go inshore/offshore and not north/south very far. What has constrained us in the past is data and the level of data that exists. For this benchmark we're looking at data-poor models that could – each individual even might have enough data to feed into these; things such as the DB-SRA, which I think was used for eel.

It is not very data intensive so that is a technique that could be used and most states will have enough information to kind of feed into that model. Other techniques as well – one of the ones we're going to look at is a Bayesian Surplus Production Model. That is another one that as long as you can develop some sort of standardized abundance index, even if it is a recreational CPUE or something like that, we can crank that model and see what comes out of it. The idea here is to we'll run a coast-wide iteration just to do a continuity run, but the idea is to assess the species on a more realistic spatial scale, so that is what we're trying to move.

MR. GIBSON: As it relates to Term of Reference Number of 5; so to the extent that region-specific or even state-specific models come forward that you're comfortable with, those stock status determinations would be at that scale or would we still be in a coast-wide mode.

MR. McNAMEE: I think we would intend on having them viewed on that more discrete scale. I guess that would be a decision for the management board in the end as to how you want to work with that. We will work to produce biological reference points at these more discrete scales.

MR. AUGUSTINE: As a follow-on to Mark, he explained it in such wonderful terms that it went over my head, but I knew what we was talking about. Is it the likelihood then that the result of your assessment could actually regionalize – I will use the word regionalize – let's say regionalize bag sizes and season as opposed to coastal?

In other words, we have made some – we have accepted what Massachusetts did and your survey up there and they set different parameters. Would this lead in that direction; or as you had said it would then give the board an opportunity to either go with a coastwide or go on, again, state by state or regional basis for setting their bag size and season? That sounds like that is the direction we're going, and I think is what Mark was asking, but he asked it more eloquently than I did. Could you help me with that?

MR. McNAMEE: Sure, I'll try. I think you're right. Again, I think it is a choice for the management board in the end, but what we will try to produce for you to be able to make that decision are good estimates at as fine a scale as we can. All of this hinges on our ability to be successful with some of these other approaches.

I guess the first tier is a modeling technique that is not too dissimilar from the current VPA. It will be a statistical catch-at-age model, and that is a little more data intense, and how far we can break down this assessment spatially is sort of up in the air. We're not sure yet. It will depend on the modeling type, but in the end the goal will be to get finer resolution on these more discrete populations and then develop biological reference points on those, and then you would adjust from those discrete parameters.

MR. AUGUSTINE: Thank you for that; and when you're ready for a motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DAVID SIMPSON: Actually not a question; just to share with the board that as Jay knows and as of two days ago Katie knows, the University of Connecticut is seeking Sea Grant funding to do a stock assessment for the Long Island Sound area. I only learned fairly recently

that it is much more ambitious than I thought and would be more toward the full analytical assessment than I envisioned that – I know one of their interests is – you know, they have information about fecundity being much higher than we previously thought – disproportionate of benefit potentially of larger females and their egg contribution relative to smaller females.

In other words, a four pound fish may produce three times as many eggs as – well, five times as many eggs as the fish that is half as big. In other words, a pound is not a pound. We will look forward to that. I think it is in the next couple of years and hopefully I'm going to make sure they integrate closely. I know Jay has been talking with the folks at UConn but I just wanted people to be aware of it, including you.

MR. ROB O'REILLY: Jason, I guess just two questions. One would be more intensive data needs of a statistical catch-at-age approach. How do you see improvements in the independent data in that it is really lacking for the most part south of New Jersey would be one question. Maybe you could respond to that and I will have a followup.

MR. McNAMEE: Good question. That has been one of the big stumbling blocks all along, particularly in the southern extent of the species' range. One of the things that we're looking at are alternate ways of getting at an abundance index, so things like recreational CPUEs. We looked at VTR data.

We're kind of thinking outside of the box and not being completely dependent on scientific surveys to inform the independent stock abundance that we would normally use in a stock assessment. We're thinking about that. How we make out with that sort of information will dictate the level at which we're able to do things with more data-intensive methods like statistical catch-at-age models. We're trying to accommodate that.

MR. O'REILLY: Thank you very much. A second question would be tagging data; how is it planned to utilize tagging data. Not every state has tagging data, but could that be developed

into some type of an index? It is a volunteer tagging system, but at the same time I mean it is used for other purposes. Do you see something there?

MR. McNAMEE: We talked about tagging already a little bit. There were some done in Maryland and I know Virginia also has a pretty robust tagging program that has been going on. The way we have been talking about it so far has been to look at movement, so give ourselves a little more confidence that throughout the range they're not migrating very far and things like that.

There does appear to be that kind of information coming out of the Maryland study that Alexei I Sharov brought forward during our data workshop. We didn't talk too much about this so I can't give you too many details, but we do have as one of our elements to look at the tagging information to see if we can do something a little more analytical with that aside from just kind of looking at species' movement. It is on our radar. I don't have too much other information at this point on that.

MR. O'REILLY: Does anyone typically look other than growth characteristics for an index with the mark and then the recapture sizes as any indication that could be useful?

MR. McNAMEE: Yes, that is actually one of the areas that is kind of problematic. The reason for that is you will frequently – because the reporting is coming from the fishery itself in many cases and not from a scientific survey, the reporting measures are coming in inches and we will get like a negative growth a lot, so there are problems with using it in that way. We have looked at that.

MR. NOWALSKY: Questions in two areas. The first is what was the impetus for the decision to go with the independent peer reviewer and what are the risks/advantages of going in that direction?

MR. McNAMEE: I'm going to take a shot at it; and if anyone else wants to jump in on this, feel free. I believe the idea was to – with the normal

process you have a lot of work that gets done, you kind of move through this process, and then you go into peer review and you go in kind of blind and you don't have any idea of what the reviewers might be looking for or if you've really gone off the rails on some aspect of it.

With tautog we felt this was a good species to do this experiment, and the idea is to get the peer reviewer kind of in working with the actual team and providing advice along the way. If that peer reviewer who is going to be a part of the final peer review team, although not a voting member or something like that – yes, so they're involved but just in a sort of advisory way. But in any case the idea is to get advice along the way so you're not going in blind right at the end. Tautog they felt was a good species to kind of test on and eel was another one to see how the process works.

MR. NOWALSKY: Well, we'll see how the process works; I look forward to that. The second component that is now having had the advantage of having had the data workshop; would you characterize this stock assessment as likely being more of the same or is there something for yourself from a technical nature as well as us as managers to maybe get excited about is this is something different and a step in a better way to assess and facilitate better management of this species?

MR. McNAMEE: Yes, well, I get excited about tautog all the time, so it is always exciting for me. I think there is a lot of reason to be optimistic as far as assessing this species in a more realistic biologically feasible way. Some of the techniques that have been kind of brought forward I think are a big improvement over what we've been doing, even the statistical catch at age; just being able to entertain uncertainty and some of the harvest estimates.

A virtual population analysis assumes your harvest – especially with recreationally dominated species like this, a VPA assumes your harvest is known and that is how it kind of builds its population numbers from that kind of starting point. A statistical catch-at-age model does some something different. It entertains

uncertainty, which we know we have in these estimates, so it is a vast improvement in that regard. Then some of the other modeling techniques I am most familiar with – somewhat familiar with I think are going to help us with regard to this spatial component that we talk about a lot with tautog. I'm optimistic. I think it is going to be a good process and I think it will improve management of this species.

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Are there any other questions for Jason? Go ahead, Pat.

MR. AUGUSTINE: **Mr. Chairman, I move that the board approve the terms of reference for the tautog benchmark stock assessment as presented today.**

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: **Second by Mark Gibson. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none; we will accept that as approved.**

ELECTION OF BOARD VICE CHAIR

The last agenda item we have is I have ascended to the throne here, so there is a vacancy in the vice-chairmanship. I need some nominations from the board for vice-chair. Mark Gibson.

MR. GIBSON: **I'm pleased to nominate Adam Nowalsky for vice-chair.**

MR. AUGUSTINE: **I second that and move to close nominations and cast one vote for Adam Nowalsky as vice-chair.**

CHAIRMAN GILMORE: Congratulations. Adam; welcome to the team. We're really glad to have you aboard. (Applause)

ADJOURNMENT

Are there any other issues to come before the board? If not, I will take a motion to adjourn from Mr. Augustine and seconded by everyone. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 o'clock a.m., May 23, 2013.)