



CBSAC Beyond 2025 Meeting - February 2025

Thursday, February 20· 9:00 – 10:00am EST

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/bca-fxif-dhq>

Or dial: (US)+1 419-684-2906 PIN: 517 635 595#

Agenda

ACTION ITEMS:

- **Action Item:** Mandy to check in with Lynn on including changing environmental conditions as output instead of within main outcome language
- **Action Item:** Mandy Bromilow, Ingrid Braun-Ricks, and Glenn Davis to decide on process for public input and whether to pursue outreach
- **Action Item:** Bruce to send Donna Bilkovic's contact to Mike Wilberg
- **Action Item:** Bruce to revise outcome language based on today's comments and send it back to the group for additional input.

1:00pm - 1:10pm

Update on Beyond 2025:

- **February 13th Management Board meeting update**
 - Overwhelming support (MD, VA, DC) to continue outcome
 - MD- changing environmental conditions and effect on blue crab population in long term (capture in output/indicator to show tracking relative change)
 - VA - support and green light
 - Support to sunset the blue crab management outcome
- **Timeline**
 - February 13: Present outcome assessment to the MB
 - March 27: MB completes outcome assessment
 - March 28: PSC review outcome assessment
 - April 10: Begin revising outcome language



Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

- May 8: Final outcome language
- June: Prepare final outcomes for public review
- Fish GIT Spring meeting at end of March (March 25-26) to review outcome language with rest of the group

1:10pm - 1:20pm

Review [outcome assessment document](#)

1:20pm - 1:55pm

Discussion on outcome structure & language

- Key elements we think should be in the outcome while keeping it SMART
 - *Mike Wilberg*: Put in previous number and say it will be updated- unless that would make things too confusing
 - *Bruce Vogt*: So that would be the 196? Based on 2019?
 - *Mike Wilberg*: Yes, 2017 adopted in 2020
 - *Mike Wilberg*: Achieving exploitation rate targets would be another new thing I would consider including
 - *Bruce Vogt*: Confusion when taking out management outcome, this would help
 - *Tom Miller*: Support Mike's recommendation. Cannot have any range of exploitation/abundance.
 - (Full support on this from group)
 - *Bruce Vogt*: What would that look like for language?
 - *Mike Wilberg*: "Achieve sustainable abundance based on exploitation targets - female". Numbers in outcome language become outdated. Say target and put asterisks on that and say that these numbers are given to CBSAC each year based on stock assessment. Hesitant about putting real numbers in there, in case numbers are misused later on.
 - *Bruce Vogt*: Bc of annual report we have a robust - don't know if we need to put a date on the outcome
 - *Mike Wilberg*: make it timebound by saying it is done annually. Will be refining management reference points- will be done through 2025. A statement like "based on current stock assessment" would be better. How long are these expected to live
 - *Bruce Vogt*: I don't know. I like what you said-



- *Mike Wilberg*: monitor progress towards the targets as the annual exercise- CBSAC resistance to change targets annually. Don't want to take that jump here without talking to management.
- *Bruce Vogt*: So monitor progress towards reference points/exploitation targets annually, and update reference points based on stock assessment. What about changing conditions?
- *Mandy Bromilow*: Leave it out of outcome language but incorporate it into input etc. Something we can't really control but need to learn more about
- *Thomas Miller*: Back up what Mandy said- not clear how changing conditions could be an outcome- something managers need to be aware of. Depends on timeframe of this outcome (5 vs 10 years of changing conditions vary)
- *Bruce Vogt*: Mandy can you check with Lynn on that? I also didn't think it needed to be in the outcome language. Check with Lynn to see if she's okay with that?
 - **Action Item: Mandy to check in with Lynn on including changing environmental conditions as output instead of within main outcome language**
- *Mike Wilberg*: Reference points have been declining- update reference points with a goal that reflects current conditions. Also attempt to describe potential affects on blue crabs. Maybe try to include something saying that we recognize this is something affecting blue crabs or leave it in subtext?
- *Bruce Vogt*: Help people understand that the targets we set are based on best science but there are things that influence that number that are out of our control.
- *Mike Wilberg*: If that is the case then I don't see how that fits into the outcome. Just communicates uncertainty.
- *Bruce Vogt*: specific = conditions changing on the coast and affects on recruitment
- *Mandy Bromilow*: For certain terms in the SRS process- is there one for an action/something you plan to do? It is important to state that there are things outside of management control and that affect abundance.



Cannot predict that but could get a better understanding of them.
Should be included somewhere in here, not in the outcome.

- *Bruce Vogt*: SRS process should continue. Outcome language and outputs and indicators. Outputs could be where we put this (communicate uncertainty to the public, better understand changing conditions...) Different from action plans but things we plan to work on as outputs. Indicators are things that come out of the annual report- essentially population and abundance and exploitation metrics. So I am hearing we don't need to include env. change in outcome but capture it in outputs?
- *Collective agreement/ no opposition*
- **Are there others we should involve in the drafting process (ex. industry)?**
 - *Thomas Miller*: No harm running it through industry - only concern (not due to understanding of science but understanding of CBP process).
 - *Mike Wilberg*: Concern on process- if asking people to provide input, we need to set up a process to actually use input.
 - *Mandy Bromilow*: Can ask the advisory committee. Unsure of responsiveness. Agree with Tom- need meeting with them on what exactly are we trying to do and to stay on topic. We can try.
 - *Ingrid Braun-Ricks*: Unsure we would get enough out of committee to contribute much
 - *Bruce Vogt*: There is an interest to make sure stakeholders are informed of the process and what comes out of it. Hear you but if willing to make sure people are aware this is happening that would be helpful. Make it clear that some things that come up in the meeting would not fall into outcome but are other ways that are addressed or handled but not impacting outcome language. You all can make that determination.
 - *Mike Wilberg*: General outcome is noncontroversial- achieving exploitation rate target, without more context for things idk what we will gain but if we don't start doing it more hard to make progress. Wary of collecting public comment without a clear plan of what to do with it.
 - *Thomas Ihde*: I don't see any benefit- asking for comments but not willing to change outcome = bad recipe



- *Thomas Miller*: That is why we need a lot of communication (outcome/indicators) because they want to talk about things affecting the fishery. All want a healthy fishery- no push back on sustainability but a lot of comments that would not influence the process. Think about the process before you open the door.
- *Bruce Vogt*: Mandy, Ingrid, and Glenn - take this into consideration and see if it is worthwhile to frame this in a way discussed here- will leave it up to jurisdictions
 - **Action Item**: Mandy Bromilow, Ingrid Braun-Ricks, and Glenn Davis to decide on process for public input and whether to pursue outreach
- **Are there connections to other GITs or outcomes we should note (ex. wetlands, SAV, WQ)?**
 - *Mike Wilberg*: Encourage collection and distribution of data among the groups
 - *Bruce Vogt*: particular groups?
 - *Mike Wilberg*: Wetlands, SAV, Oyster, any fish (predators)
 - *Bruce Vogt*: challenges with stock assessment and getting data?
 - *Mike Wilberg*: not sure yet- haven't gotten wetlands data. Good with fish surveys. SAV- easy to get bc widely available. If wanting to do effect of shoreline dynamics on blue crabs not sure where to go
 - *Bruce Vogt*: Donna Bilkovic- does shoreline data. Most of Bay is covered now with update
 - **Action Item**: Bruce to send Donna Bilkovic's contact to Mike Wilberg

1:55pm - 2:00pm

Next Steps

- **Action Item**: Bruce to revise outcome language based on today's comments and send it back to the group for additional input.