

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION II

**World Golf Village Renaissance
St. Augustine, Florida**

June 15-16, 2023

Transcript

Council Members

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Chair
Trish Murphey, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Gary Borland
Tim Griner
Judy Helme

Kerry Marhefka
Jessica McCawley
Tom Roller
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Spud Woodward
Andy Strelcheck

Council Staff

John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
Myra Brouwer
Julia Byrd
Dr. Judd Curtis
John Hadley
Allie Iberle

Kim Iverson
Kelly Klasnick
Michele Ritter
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Nick Smillie
Christina Wiegand

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick Devictor
Dr. Jack McGovern
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. John Walter
Shep Grimes

Dewey Hemilright
Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Nikhil Mehta
David Hugo
Billy Broussard

Observers and Participants

Other observers and participants attached.

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the World Golf Village Renaissance, St. Augustine, Florida, on Thursday, June 15, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: We're going to reorder the agenda a little bit, just to help with flow. We have some individuals that are not going to be available either later today or tomorrow, and so the plan is for John to recognize our outgoing council folks, Chester and Dewey, and we have no litigation brief at the moment, and Monica may come back into that tomorrow, and so staff reports are going to hold off until tomorrow, and the Coordinating Council report we're holding off until tomorrow, and so we will start, when everybody gets back to the table, with the National Standards presentation from Mike, followed by the space operations off of Florida, and then the equity and environmental justice presentation, and then, from there, we'll pick back up into sequence. All right, and so if everybody could please come back to the table.

MR. CARMICHAEL: First up, we have a departing council member, Chester Brewer, who has reached the conclusion of his eligibility for three three-year terms, and so nine years that he's been here, and it seems like only yesterday, but come up, Chester. We have a plaque to present to you, and I think Jessica, as the Florida council state representative, and so, Chester, this is proudly presented by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council to Chester Brewer for his exemplary service and contributions to the conservation and management of South Atlantic fishery resources as a member of the council, and so thank you very much, sir.

MR. BREWER: Thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It has been a pleasure serving with you. Thank you, Chester.

MR. BREWER: I just want to say that it's been a pleasure, and I will miss each and every one of you, and hopefully I will see you around, but I think back about all the years and all the different people who have been through this council, and it's been quite a ride. Thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Chester. (Applause) While not an official member of the South Atlantic Council, we do have Dewey Hemilright, who is also reaching the end of his council eligibility of nine years, and he's been -- I feel like you've been a liaison for us that whole time, and, if not, it sure seems like it, but you've been a fixture here, and we've appreciated all of your guidance on snapper grouper, particularly the North Carolina fishery and your insights there over the many years, your role on the Snapper Grouper Committee and presence here, and you're definitely going to be missed.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well, I certainly appreciate it, and I appreciate this council allowing me to participate to the extent that I do. I am passionate about our fisheries, and I'm passionate about what I do for my livelihood and others, and your meetings will probably go faster now that I'm not here, but I'll be listening online, and I'm still in the fisheries and different things, and maybe it will give me an opportunity to help out the councils a little more, from being on the outside, instead of sitting around the table, but I appreciate it. Thank you. Thank you, all. (Applause)

MR. STRELCHECK: I just have to say that I look forward to Dewey's public testimony in the future.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I've already started writing a book, but I will be changing the names.

MR. RUCCIO: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you, and I will try to be brief, but thorough, because I know you are pressed for time. I am Mike Ruccio, and I'm the Division Chief for the Domestic Fisheries Division at NOAA Fisheries Headquarters, and the Domestic Fisheries Division is primarily the division that deals with council appointments, and the Council Coordinating Committee, and one of our big cornerstone projects is implementation and guidance for the Magnuson-Stevens Act National Standards, and so that's what I'm here to talk to you about today.

As you're aware, we recently published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking to potentially update National Standards 4, 8, and 9, and so an ANPR, if you're not entirely familiar with that, is very analogous to a scoping process that a council might undertake. We're at the very early stages, and we've got some critical questions that we're interesting in learning some more, as well as soliciting general input on things that we might undertake to revise these specific National Standards, and so you can see here that the goal is solicit public input on the current guidelines and areas and issues that may benefit from further consideration or revisions, and our objective is to determine if there are updates that are necessary for these three National Standards.

As a little bit of background, these are the National Standards is question, and the extreme shorthand for each of the National Standards appears in bold and is underlined, and then there's a little bit more of a concise summary of each, but National Standard 4 deals primarily with allocations and states further that they have to be fair and equitable, and they are necessary to provide conservation, and they can't result in excessive shares. National Standard 8 primarily deals with communities and has a requirement to consider impacts to communities and provide their sustained participation, as well as to minimize adverse economic impacts, to the extent that is practicable, and then National Standard 9 is all about bycatch, and it has requirements to minimize bycatch and bycatch mortality, also to the extent practicable.

The ANPR focuses on these three National Standards, and there are two specific kind of topics, and one is climate-related impacts on fisheries and the other is through the lens of equity and environmental justice in fisheries, and so the lay of the rest of the presentation is to kind of walk you through some of the specific areas of interest that we have relative to these two topics for the three National Standards.

You might also know that NOAA Fisheries recently published its EEJ, which is equity and environmental justice, strategy, and it's available, and it published on May 22, and so one of the things that is really valuable, in looking through that, in addition to kind of our roadmap for how we want to try to engage and promote EEJ, is it has a series of critical definitions, like what's an underserved community, what does EEJ mean, how does it apply, and those kinds of things, and so it's a really good document to look at for kind of a companion piece to the ANPR.

Starting with National Standard 4, and, again, that deals with allocation, and this is through the topic of climate issues, and we're looking for specific feedback on approaches to balancing access for users. We recognize that there is a high degree of climate-related change that's ongoing in the oceans, and we're seeing a lot of shifts in distributions for species, changes in their productivity, and so we're asking questions about do we need to have changes to the accompanying National Standard Guidelines to balance access for historical users, communities that may have been

marginalized, who have been historically excluded from fisheries participation, as well as new users, and we're also asking if we need revisions to reinforce the NMFS reallocation policy, and so that was published in 2016. You might recall that one of the requirements within that allocation policy is that there are periodic reviews, a series of recommendations on when and how councils can, and should, go about the process of reevaluating allocations.

One of the other critical parts that we ask for, I think with all these topics, but is really germane for this one, is for comment on the types of documentation and analyses that might be necessary if alternative approaches are recommended for use under this. One of the challenges that we have, particularly for a number of communities, is we don't know what we don't know, and we don't have data to identify communities that are particularly underserved, or how they're even represented in some fisheries, and so getting additional insights from people that are kind of on the front line, on the ground, if you will allow, on what types of data and what alternative analyses we might need, or data collections that we might need, to improve to be able to answer questions related to allocation along these lines.

National Standards 8 and 9, also again through the lens of climate change, the same sort of broad questions for National Standard 9, asking the question of if it's necessary to update the guidelines to improve the ability of communities to adapt to changing climate conditions. For National Standard 9, similarly, asking questions of if it's necessary to change the guidelines to better account for changing distributions of target stocks, bycatch, and protected resources.

Now the next series of slides will deal with the same National Standards through EEJ, equity and environmental justice, and so, for National Standard 4, again allocations, we're looking for input on if additional approaches are necessary to improve consideration of underserved and underrepresented communities, again, previously excluded entrants and new entrants into the process, and, again, that same kind of question about what type of information is necessary, that we may not have now, or additional analyses, that would be beneficial to either help identify issues or help to formulate solutions related to allocation through an EEJ lens.

For National Standard 8, again, on kind of the EEJ front, and one of the things that is very prevalent in the current guidelines is the definition of a fishing community as a place-based entity, and so we're interested in if we should be looking at this in another way. We're looking at the definition of "fishing community" and requesting comments on two specific aspects. First, should the definition of "fishing community" be updated to potentially remove the requirement that fishing communities must reside in a specific location, and this could allow for a fishing community based on characteristics, rather than location, and so, as an example of this, if there's a group of charter fishermen that target a specific species, could they be considered a community, as opposed to a coastal community that is place-based.

Then the second question is on this, related to the definition of "fishing community", is the concept of dependency, and so, as stocks decrease in abundance, and change in their productivity, or are redistributed as a result of climate change and changing oceanographic conditions, we recognize that it's going to be critically important that people are able to adapt, to improve their own resiliency in the face of climate change.

One of the things that is very prevalent right now in National Standard 8 is this concept of dependency, and we've seen, if you will indulge an example, instances where discussions on

changes often reflect back to dependency, and so, for example, summer flounder stock distributions on the east coast have changed appreciably over time, and there is a very robust and important infrastructure and a lot of dependency for permit holders that are on the southern end of the range of summer flounder, and are they still dependent on that fishery in the way they were perhaps in the 1980s and 1990s, or are they still engaged in the fishery in a way that has changed over time, and is that distinction meaningful, and so one of the things that we're asking in this is for direct comment on that kind of concept and if shifting from dependency to engagement can better provide access across the range and allow for people to diversify and kind of improve their own resiliency, as stocks shift and change.

Also on National Standard 8, we're asking questions about how to appropriately balance requirements for sustained participation in fishing communities, with the need to improve consideration, again, of underserved and underrepresented communities, people that may have been previously excluded or who were excluded in initial kind of allocation decisions, new entrants and, as well, communities that may have a high level of social or climate vulnerability, and so maybe going back to that previous example of North Carolina. If you move allocation, or remove access to summer flounder for a state like North Carolina, where there is a lot of infrastructure and a lot of fleet dependency, or at least engagement on that species, that is the end result, and so we're interested in getting direct input on that as kind of a concept and topic.

Then, finally, National Standard 9, which deals with bycatch, we're requesting input on whether or not we need to modify the guidelines to minimize bycatch in a manner that is equitable across different fisheries and gear types. We're also asking if we need to better balance needs of bycatch and target fisheries in a manner that's equitable across all the fisheries and different gear types, especially if one or more of the fisheries are important to underserved populations.

Some of the other challenges that are mentioned in the ANPR is you might recall, on this first bullet, when there was some efforts to reauthorize Magnuson in the last Congress, and one of the things that was proposed was to remove from National Standard 9 this language about "to the extent practicable", and I believe the agency still feels that practicability, within the existing National Standard Guidelines, appropriately balances the various complexities of federal fisheries management, but we're interested in hearing from the public on that, if there's a concept that might either strengthen how "the extent practicable" is applied or if it's in need of revision. Then we're also asking questions about whether or not there could be changes in the guidelines that would incentivize reducing waste that occurs as bycatch.

This is a general timeline, and the ANPR published in mid-May. We made a presentation to the Council Coordinating Committee in Key West in late May, and we've been doing kind of a road show, either virtually or in-person, to go to each of the councils, and that will occur June through August, as everyone kind of has their summer meeting cycle, and we've scheduled two tribal engagements on the ANPR, and we had our one national-level webinar earlier this week, and we had, I think, twenty, or maybe thirty, participants in that, and then the public comment period is scheduled to close on September 12, and, if warranted, based on the input and feedback we get, and, again, recall this is very much a scoping process at this point, we would begin to work on a proposed rule in which we would anticipate further engagement directly with the councils and the public before we would conceivably issue a proposed rule in 2024.

That's a very quick run-through, and I am happy to answer questions or take comments, and I will also note that I will be around for the rest of the day, and so, if you want to save questions and catch me offline, I'm happy to have those conversations with you here in the room, but I will pause there, Madam Chair. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Mike. Do I have questions for Mike at this time? Seeing none, thanks, Mike, your time. Sorry. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mike, for being here, and I did have one question and I wrote it down, because I was going to forget, in the middle of your presentation, and so the National Academy of Sciences study that's being commissioned with regard to equity, how does that intersect in particular with this effort, and, from a timing standpoint, obviously, there's going to be some overlap, and I think there's, obviously, opportunity for that study to help inform the work that you're doing, but I'm just curious if you've talked about that and how that may help.

MR. RUCCIO: Thank you. For the chair, thanks for the question, and I promise it's not a plant, and so Andy is referencing that we have an ongoing study, through the National Academy of Science, Medicine, and Engineering, that is kind of looking at the equitable distribution of fishing rights and looking at primarily not only that as an issue, but the data that is involved with that and what gaps we may have, in terms of our data collections, to be able to inform that conversation and those types of decisions.

Directly to your question, Andy, you know, they're on parallel tracks, and so there's not going to be a -- Depending on the timing that we choose to pursue with a rule, we wouldn't expect much more than some of the preliminary work at the NASME study to be complete, and, obviously, you know, it's all kind of in our shop, and so we'll be well apprised of what's going on in the NASME conversations and can use that, to the extent that it's ready and available, but I think, just given the timing, and the NASME study is planned on 2023 and 2024, with their kind of, you know, trailing process to finalize their recommendations, if any, and provide a report, and I would expect that we wouldn't have the full information from that study to inform this, but it's also possible -- You know, one of the things, in the interest of trying to move quickly, that is really important, that I probably shouldn't have skipped over is that, while this is scoping, there are a number of outcomes that could happen here.

One is that we may receive comment and feel that we do have enough information that we need to undertake rulemaking, in which case, as I mentioned, we would start that process probably this fall. The other thing is it's critically important, and these are national guidelines, and we may get a number of comments that are highly regionalized, or that, you know, in trying to address something through a national lens, that would fix something in one region of the country, it may cause more problems in the other, and so we may choose not to make a national-level revision to the guidelines as a result of that, but we may engage with the regional partners, both with the agency, the fishery management council in that area, and try to develop a more discrete solution, rather than something that's nationwide.

There are a number of outcomes that could occur, one of which also may be a delay in terms of what time we take this up, and we may get further information, but realize we need a little bit more, and so there's nothing that would preclude us from having another round of conversations on further distillation of issues, as necessary, in which case, you know, I think our intent is to try to

move more quickly than that, but we want to do this right, and we want to do this well, and so it's better to get the right answers than to kind of rush headlong into it, and so a little bit long-winded, but hopefully that answers your question, Andy, and gives a little more information on things that I may have glossed over in trying to move quick.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions for Mike? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Not necessarily for Mike, but a process question. If I recall correctly, the slides showed that the public comment period ended in September at some point, and is our intent, as a council, to have time to discuss, you know, what our comments would be and gather input that way, or how are we going to address this, I guess is my question.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Kerry, and, Mike, thanks for that presentation. I think that was a good overview of this issue, and I appreciate you coming to the meeting. The comment is due on September 12, and that's, I think, the Tuesday of our September, or maybe the Wednesday of our September, council meeting, and so we probably need to have something ready to go before then, but, if we did run into some differences of opinion or something, it could give us a chance to maybe talk about it early in that week and get it up and get it in, but I would prefer to not cut it that close.

What I am thinking of is -- I'm assuming you guys want to submit a comment, and so, you know, let me know if you don't, and then, if you could get your thoughts to me by say July 15, that would give us time, and that's a month. You know, it gives you a month to sort of think about it and get your thoughts together and submit it to me, and I will draft a letter, working with Carolyn, and try to get that out to you. You know, then that gives you about -- You know, it gives us about six weeks to get it reviewed and edited, and so it gives us a chance to get it out to you, get comments, get it back to you, and see if we're good to go without bumping into your prep time for the September council meeting. That's kind of what I'm thinking.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions or comments? Okay. Seeing none, thank you again, Mike, for your --

MR. RUCCIO: My pleasure. Thank you for having me and squeezing me in. I know you had to rearrange some things, and we really look forward to your comments.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. The next agenda item, and everybody has been waiting for this, is the space operations off of Florida, which is Dale Ketchum. Officer Post has informed me that he has experience with enforcement on that, and so, if there's certain questions that we have relative to that, he felt that he may be able to help answer some of them for us, and so he may jump in, just so you all aware that he's here.

MR. KETCHUM: I appreciate everybody giving us the opportunity to come explain, and I know this is an issue that's been growing in significance and impact to your industry, as it has with many other industries. The commercial space business is certainly taking off, and our cadence is become ever more frequent, and that's just going to continue. I think the primary is, in the past, most launches were either NASA or the Department of Defense, and everybody sort of got out of the way, whether it was commercial aviation or commercial shipping, commercial fishing, but now eighty-plus percent of all the launches are commercial.

It's one thing -- The people who are most impacted is commercial aviation, United and Delta, because, if you're familiar with Brevard County -- Florida is a very busy commercial aviation route, and it used to be that they would get out of the way for NASA or the Department of Defense. Now it's a question of why is Southwest and United, or American, losing money, and inconveniencing their passengers, so that Elon Musk can make even more money, and I think what we're dealing with primarily here is a question of the government needing to manage an increasingly -- A limited capacity, whether it's airspace, traffic on the oceans, or whatever, but this is the challenge we're meeting, and I'm happy to hear and at least start a dialogue with you all. I will whip through some slides real quick, but I get the feeling there's going to be a lot of questions and concerns, and so I want to get through them and get down to the meat of it.

Just real quick, Space Florida, we're ultimately not the people who make the decisions, and we're a state agency, is the best way to look at us, and we're a part of the State of Florida, but we're like an airport or a seaport authority, but we're a spaceport authority, and we have jurisdiction throughout the state. We're actually pretty neat.

We have been a big part of helping Florida grow, after the retirement of the shuttle, because Florida took it in the teeth, and we lost about 10,000 really high-paying jobs, and that hurt us. Most of what we deal with, primarily, and the concern that's being raised here, is off the space coast, in that area between Daytona Beach, Embry Riddle University, and Melbourne, with FIT, and Orlando with UCF, but we also have space ports in Jacksonville, another one in Titusville, and, just a couple of months ago -- We're going to be suggesting to our board that we also designate Homestead and Tyndall Air Force Base in the Panhandle as space port facilities, and that enables us to deploy our toolkit.

This slide primarily gets to the meat of it, and it's the impact with cruise lines, and I don't know that many of you -- You may be, or may not be, aware of the fact that we've had launches scrubbed in the past over -- I've been in the business for my whole life, and that happens episodically, but the FAA previously had said, if there's a boat in the area, you can't launch, but that got really stupid, because, if you have some guy with more beer than bait, and he wanders his fishing boat into it, you can't shut down a many, many multimillion-dollar effort and recycle, and so the FAA recalibrated their statistics, because they're all based upon what is the likelihood of a death, or injury, of an involved public, and so they -- Now, if it's just a small boat, they're going to launch anyway, because the likelihood of an explosion is small anyway, and the likelihood of it hitting a small boat, but, in that particular case, you had a 5,000-person cruise line, and, for whatever reason, the captain decided to go where he wasn't supposed to go, and they had to scrub that launch.

It also involves general aviation and, as you guys are painfully aware, commercial fishing, recreational fishing, general aviation, and there is just a whole host of impacts, and Florida is where it's all happening first, because we're the busiest space port in the world. Coincidentally, we're also immediately adjacent to what is now the world's busiest cruise port in the world, and so there's a lot of potential challenges there, although, in the grand scheme of things, we're working through all that.

It's not easy, but we're working it, but there are going to be space ports all over the planet eventually, and so the problems we're dealing with now are problems that are going to be confronted elsewhere. They have issues at Wallace Island, Virginia, at Brownsville, Texas, and

Kodiak, Alaska, and, I mean, there's a host of issues to be dealt with, and so we're just -- It's really sort of -- The rubber hits the road in Florida first.

This is just sort of an example of the FAA restrictions. They're working on that. The two big dogs in all of this are, obviously, the FAA for air space and the Coast Guard, for maritime travel, and both of those entities are working hard and have done -- Particularly the Coast Guard has been quite innovative in figuring out better ways to make sure that there is an awareness of what's going on, because we have had problems in the past where there's a four-hour window where there might be a launch, which means there's a four-hour period of time where you are not allowed to transit a certain area, or be in an area of the ocean, and they may have a scrub in the first fifteen minutes.

It took us a while -- We had some meetings at Space Florida, before it sort of became aware of the fact that no one had responsibility to alert maritime traffic that that restriction had been lifted three hours earlier, because we had boats just spinning around out there waiting for the restriction to be lifted, and nobody bothered to tell them, and there's a lot of work going on, and we're happy to help, to the extent that we can.

That's just a quick example, and we use this of the amount of air traffic in Florida is pretty much greater than anywhere else in the United States, and so they're the big dogs helping drive attention to this issue that is impacting you guys. If you're a commercial fisherman, it's your business, and you guys are -- It's a tough job, and whether it's impacting you, because you're out there looking for grouper or snapper, or it's some pilot flying down to Buenos Aires, it really doesn't make any difference. We have a responsibility to work with the federal government and have the government better manage this limited capability.

That's an old Coast Guard designation, and the 45th Space Launch Delta, which is the Space Force unit out there, they pretty much work with the FAA to calibrate what is the likelihood, based upon the rocket, the orbit it's going into, what would -- The weather and a host of other things, and what would a debris field potentially look like, and what do we need to make sure we're keeping the uninformed public out of, and that moves around.

The big challenge, for maritime in particular right now, is SpaceX, who is clearly the industry leader, and they're driving it, but they're not the only ones, and they now -- Their rocket is so robust that they can now launch and do a dogleg and head south and go into polar orbits, and we haven't done that, really, since 1967, because, in 1967, we had dropped a second stage on Cuba, and it killed a cow, and Castro made a thing out of it, and so we stopped doing it, but SpaceX has now got the capability to execute it, but, when you launch out of the Cape, on a southern trajectory, you have shut down the port, and this is the busiest cruise port in the world, and so there are issues to deal with.

Like I said, there's been a lot of meetings, a lot of heated conversations, but, at the end of the day, for the most part, we're working through this, but I think it's safe to say that commercial fishing has not gotten the same level of attention and, subsequently, engagement to help solve the problems that you all are dealing with.

This is another Space Force, and this is a representation, or just charts, to show that's the number of launches we've got now, and, obviously, there's going to be a hell of a lot more. After shuttle, we were managing probably around eight to twelve, or maybe fifteen, launches a year. Two years

ago, we were launching thirty-five. Last year, it was fifty-seven, and this year it's ninety-two. We're going to be at hundreds of launches a year soon, real soon, and that's a lot of launches, and that's a lot of restricted airspace, a lot of restricted sea space, and so there are problems that we need to work through.

Again, Space Florida is anxious to help facilitate, and I would point out to you what I think you were probably already acutely aware of, and Laurilee Thompson is a relentlessly persistent advocate, mercilessly persistent advocate, and so she flogs us, with great regularity, on the issues that you guys need somebody flogging for, and so we're going to continue to work through this. Aviation has got the most attention, because clearly they've got the visibility and the money, but, quite frankly, I'm a big fan of grouper and snapper, and I want to see this -- I want to figure out a way to make this all work, and you guys have livelihoods and families and businesses to run as well, and so we have a responsibility -- Not we, but collectively, we have a responsibility to make sure we are doing the best we can.

This is sort of a reflection of one of the things driving the activity, is this is a Space Force chart, and it's more or less a reflection of their attitude, because they are -- They sort of see themselves as eventually evolving into what the Navy is, and they are going to be responsible for protecting the commercial interests of America, and its allies, in space, because we are going about the business, with great rapidity now, of doing manufacturing, energy production, tourism, and a host of other things in space, and that is just going to get more and more and more, and human activity is going to be a big part of what we do in the future, and it's not tomorrow, but it's damn well in five years, and the kids who are in school today -- A lot of them are going to make their money, mining and manufacturing and tourism, in space, and that's driven, in no small measure, by the fact that it's important that we be leading on this, because space is hard enough without having to do in Mandarin, and we have very serious competition in the Chinese, and that drives a lot of the equations that are moving this industry.

This is sort of a -- This is sort of my get-off-the-stage chart usually, to Rotary clubs and things like that, and our goal is to try to create central Florida, Florida at-large really, as being the equivalent of what London, the Port of London, was to the British empire 200 years ago, where we are the -- Not the only port, but the primary port for people and cargo going, transiting, between this planet and the activity in space. Jeff Bezos, who is the Blue Origin Company, he is working actively -- His goal -- Elon Musk wants to get to Mars, and Jeff Bezos wants -- His goal is millions of people living and working in space, and he says, and he's pretty straightforward, that he created Amazon to be the piggybank for Blue Origin.

He said that I created Amazon because somebody else put together the overnight delivery, the internet, the electronic payment, and so he's building a transportation system that will enable humanity to live and work in space, and so what we're trying to do is position Florida as the place, the primary port, what London was to the British empire and what St. Louis was to the opening of the American west. With that, I will shut up, and I hope there's questions. I hate dead air, but I have never known fishermen to be shy.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Dale. Questions for Dale? Mel.

MR. BELL: Thank you for coming and for the presentation. We've been talking about this for a little while, and Laurilee has done a good job of keeping us in the loop on things, but so the two

levels here of impact, I guess, in our world, and one is, as you've mentioned, the restrictions on commercial activities, or recreational activities, and that's from the timing around the launches in the exclusion areas and that sort of thing, and so that is a real impact.

Then the second one we've heard a little bit about, and actually seen photographs of, is what we're referring to as space junk, or stuff that falls down, debris, and whether -- I don't know how much of that is from catastrophic failures, or some of it's just if they still do stage separations or whatever, but there is stuff raining down, I gather, and so there's sort of two issues.

The second one, it seems to me, and there are real damages caused to people's gear and that sort of thing, but there doesn't seem to be any ability for compensation or anything, or mitigation of that, and so I had this simple concept of all of those that are players in the industry, and I would even include NASA and DOD, as well as commercial, it seems like they could -- To be good neighbors, let's say, they could kick into some, or pay into some, mitigation fund or something, or some compensation fund or bank that exists, and then when folks, at least from the gear perspective, have a -- You know, they have damage done or something, you know, they could maybe -- There would be a source of compensation for nets and gear or whatever, and that one seems fairly simple to me, and maybe it's too simple.

I realize that you can't perhaps identify this particular piece of wreckage with a particular launch, but I do know, from my previous life in working with the Navy, that everything that we did, in terms of our missiles and stuff, had serial numbers on it, you know, and so it was kind of identifiable.

MR. KETCHUM: -- exactly what launch that these parts came from.

MR. BELL: Okay, but the point is how -- That was one that it seems that the industry, or DOD, could kind of address, to at least help them with that, and then the other part is just, you know, that's maybe communication, but, with more and more launches, you're going to have more and more and more restrictions, and so that was my two things. One is that I guess stuff does still rain down from the sky in an area, and, therefore, it's on the bottom, and it can potentially interact with gears and things, and so that -- I guess is that even feasible, in your mind?

MR. KETCHUM: I think the -- Laurilee had discussed this, because we went out and met with them at Port Canaveral, and a bunch of -- A number of fishermen, and we took our flogging, specifically on that issue, because it's a very valid issue, and I took it back to my boss, who is primarily a finance kind of guy, and he is very experienced, and he said, you know, there is precedent for that, and that should be able to -- He wasn't suggesting exactly how it should look, but that there are ways to do that.

It would -- I think, for the most part, most of what NASA launches, and the Department of Defense, they contract out with the commercial guys, and they don't have their own rockets, and so it would just part of your launch license that there's some sort of -- If that's the path they choose to take, and I'm not a finance guy, nor do I want to be, and so I -- Conceptually, I understand what you're saying, and I think that's easy to understand. It would have to be validated that this was indeed space stuff, because there's a lot of stuff floating around in the ocean, and those guys -- The people who are doing the insurance would want to make sure you could validate that that was one of ours.

As it stands right now, eventually, I think we'll get away from that, because, right now, most of the -- Like SpaceX is going to launch eighty times this year, and nothing falls off. They use -- The only thing they don't use is their second stage, and that is a planned D-orbit into the middle of the Pacific, and I don't think anybody is using drag nets in the middle of the Pacific, but, you know, they recover everything. They recover the fairings, the first stage, but a lot of the growth that's coming will be smaller rockets that are not recoverable, launching smaller satellites, because DOD wants to get -- The industry at large wants to go to smaller satellites, instead of multibillion-dollar big, fat targets that the Chinese can take out and took fifteen years to build.

Let's put up a thousand, and, if they take out a hundred, we can replace it in forty-eight hours, but there is still going to be debris for some period of time, and so I really don't want to speculate on exactly what that would look like. I would like to think that is a concept that could be worked, and I think having meetings like this, that help to draw attention to it's not just about the airlines, and it's not just about the cruises, and commercial space is a brand-new industry, and we're having to muscle our way into where other people already existed, and a lot of people in my industry think we're space, and so everybody should get out of our way.

Well, it doesn't work that way. Other people have legitimate claims and businesses and investments, and so we're going to have to get used to evolving a more mature marketplace that has the ability to work with other industries and provide compensation, if what we're -- You know, if we're dumping crap that somebody fouls their nets, and they lose their catch -- The only thing I would suggest is, if you having stuff foul your nets, don't dump it overboard when you cut it out, and bring it in, but, again, that's all part of -- I am babbling here, and I think it's a good idea, and I would like to think it can work. Am I the one who can say it will? No, but I think it can.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry and then Trish.

MS. MARHEFKA: First, I just want to say what a time to be alive. It's just blowing my mind, and it's crazy to me, but, to piggyback off of what Mel was saying, we're often in this position where people come to us and, you know, talk about something that is related to us, but that we can't do anything about, and so I am hearing that there will be some other body, or person, or decision-making situation, that would ultimately mandate, I guess, some sort of relief fund or what's the right word, and what am I thinking of? Anyway, what we were just talking about.

MR. KETCHUM: Right.

MS. MARHEFKA: What would be a step that we could take as a body, and, I mean, is talking to you, expressing our concerns to you, enough, or is there something, another step we need to take, in order to make our feelings heard about it?

MR. KETCHUM: There's certainly not -- I mean, we're going to get -- We're going to be a part of the conversation anyway, simply because we can't seem to avoid it, but we also have a responsibility. I don't want to say it should be an FAA responsibility, but I think that's the most likely scenario, because they're the people who grant the licenses to fly, but it's going to have to be a federal issue, and the FAA is the best positioned now, but they also are, like everybody else, grossly overworked and underbudget, and their budget is not going to get any bigger anytime soon, but it's going to need to be a federal issue. Quite frankly, I think you're going to need to start

flogging your members of Congress, because that will get the attention of whatever agency it is that ultimately has the responsibility.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to say that this is very similar with the wind industry, the offshore wind industry, is dealing with the same thing, of how to compensate fishermen for any lost gear, loss of area to fish, and North Carolina has just become members of an initiative to get fishery compensation mitigation in place, and I was just going to suggest -- That may be -- You know, we're in the early stages, and, just to keep you from reinventing the wheel, maybe we can have some discussions, or you can see how we're trying to work with the wind energy developers to have a fund for mitigation, and so that may be something to look at.

The plan, in the end, is that the developers will pay into, you know, a pot of money, and then there will be criteria to meet, you know, when a fisher applies for something, and we're kind of, again, in the early stages, and an interim place, but I think the end goal is to have a fund just for mitigation.

MR. KETCHUM: Who manages that, if I might ask? Do you know?

MS. MURPHEY: Right now, it is the Offshore Wind Initiative.

MR. KETCHUM: I mean, is it NOAA or the Department of Energy?

MS. MURPHEY: It's a state collaboration.

MR. KETCHUM: Really? In North Carolina?

MS. MURPHEY: It's ten states. It's North Carolina and Virginia, all the way up to New York.

MR. KETCHUM: Is Florida involved?

MS. MURPHEY: No, because most of the wind development is --

MR. KETCHUM: Yes, and we don't have the wind.

MS. MURPHEY: We're the most southern, at this point, in the group, but just to make you aware of that, and, I mean, we are working through that.

MR. KETCHUM: That's a good idea.

MS. MURPHY: With wind developers to try to deal with that.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Trish. Dewey, and then I have Laurilee.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Given that you've been involved in this for you said your whole life, or numerous years, how many metric tons do you estimate of marine debris, from you all's launches, has fell into the ocean, and what type of marine debris recovery system, given that you know how many metric tons of marine debris falls into the ocean, and how much have you cleaned up?

MR. KETCHUM: I don't think there's been any effort to clean up anything. Most of -- I have no idea, because a lot of the debris, especially back in the -- Like, in 1963, there were over 200 launch attempts, but most of those were weapons systems, ICBMs and Snarks, and, you know, we were in a race with the Soviets from the cold war, and we were throwing all kinds of crap out there, and most of it blew up. It was a very entertaining time to be a kid in Cocoa Beach, but I don't think -- That's a valid question, and I have no idea whether or not there's even a remote semblance of an inventory.

A lot of it has gone way offshore, because I know like Jeff Bezos spent a hell of a lot of money, but it's Jeff, and so he can do it, but to recover one of the engines from the Apollo 11 launch, but it was 360 miles offshore, I think, but I will be honest with you. In terms of metrics, how much is there, and what is there in effort to recover any of that, I don't believe that -- I don't know that anybody knows, and I am pretty sure there is no effort to recover any of it.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: So it's kind of alarming, being a partner in something and you don't even clean up your trash, and you have -- I'm thankful for Laurilee being a pain in your butt and being persistent, but you're telling us that we need to talk to our congressmen and senators, but part of being a good neighbor is cleaning up your trash, and so, as this gets further along, and the excitement of space and everything else you're talking about, and the billionaires, do you think it's incumbent upon them to --

At what point of urgency will it reach to clean up your trash, and, also, when you ask about commercial fishermen bringing in the marine debris, that they're out there and it's tore their nets up and stuff, it's not exactly easy to do that at all the times, but I was just mainly curious, and I find it fascinating that you've been in this long enough, and you all have -- You all just dump your trash out there and let it go around wherever and don't have no program to -- You know, your first slide that you had up here was something about going up into space, and I'm like, well, how much of it comes down, you know, and I'm just wondering about that. It's kind of amazing that the large corporation, or community relationships, and what you all are doing, and there's nothing in place for your marine debris, and stuff like that, going into the future. Thank you.

MR. KETCHUM: The vast majority of what is out there, if it's still there, was put out there over the decades, in the race with the Russians and all that sort of stuff, and you would be hard-pressed -- Elon, who is 80 percent of the launches now, his line would be that I don't leave anything, and I don't put any trash out there, and he's had one accident that rained stuff into the Atlantic, and that was fifteen years ago, but, other than that, he pretty much recovers everything, and Jeff Bezos is designing his rockets so that he is even going to reuse his second stage, and so the guys with the big money -- They've got big money, and so they're making investments so that they reuse everything.

I think most of what's out there would have been put out there under government contract, and so that's why I was kind of saying that you probably would need to flog Washington, to initiate anything, because that's where most of what's out there came from, and it was a government launch, and a government contract, and, very often, a government vehicle, back then. I see your point, and it's a valid one, and maybe that's something we should give consideration to, and I don't know, but it hasn't been a topic of conversation to-date.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. I've got Laurilee, Andy, Kerry, and then Jessica. No Kerry. Okay. Laurilee, Andy, Jessica.

MS. THOMPSON: Dale, we really appreciate you making the effort to come here in-person. We really do, and this means a lot to us. I have a billion questions, but I am trying to prioritize them. I guess one of the main things is that, you know, when I look at -- When you do the environmental impact studies, and people are commenting, has NOAA been invited to the table, because, you know, I don't see comments from NOAA in the results, and it's really frustrating, because it seems like, no matter what kind of comments are turned in, there is always a finding of no significant impact, and everything is a FONSI, and, to us, it seems like it was just prearranged, and you go through the environmental study, just so that a box can be checked, but it's like -- It's very frustrating, and so I'm wondering if NOAA is involved.

You've got the offshore, and you've got the marine debris issue, and you've got the closures offshore, but then, also, on the space center itself, you've got three important estuaries, and you've got impoundments on the refuge that were created by NASA that have turned into major, major fish and shrimp and crab nursery habitats, and there is millions of baby fish growing up in those impounds and then coming out into the estuaries, and, you know, I know that we were under the cold war and all that back in the 1960s, but there was severe environmental impacts to our estuary system that was done in the 1960s, when Banana Creek was cut off by the crawler way and the causeway was built across Banana Creek.

You know, you know me, and my passion is the Indian River Lagoon, and I just want to ensure that -- I hate being a pain in your butt, but I just want to make sure that, whatever damage that was done in the past is not repeated now, as new development takes place at the space center, and stormwater is the biggest enemy to the estuary, even if it's treated and the nutrients are pulled out of it, and freshwater itself is a pollutant to healthy estuaries, and it changes the salinity, and so, you know, we've got -- We're spending all this tax money from Brevard County citizens to fix the lagoon, and we just want to ensure that the money that we're spending to fix the lagoon isn't negated by the development at the space center, and, you know, you've got the NASA health plan, and they have identified, I think, twenty-two very good projects that could help the Indian River Lagoon, but there's no funding for it.

It's my understanding that these big companies that are out there, and two of the richest men in the world, they don't even pay rent on the land that they're occupying, and that's land that belongs to the American public, and so they should at least be paying rent, or pay a tax every time they launch, or do something, so that, you know, some money could come back and make sure that the mess gets cleaned up.

I've got pictures of stuff that was hauled in on a rock shrimp boat last December, and it doesn't look like it's been in the water since the 1960s, and it's big. It was very dangerous for them to even pull it in the boat and cut it out of the net, and, with the price of fuel, and the distance that they travel, these guys don't want to bust up a trip to bring in a piece of gear that takes up half their deck so that they can bring it, uncompensated, to the dock and then go all the way back out and go fishing again.

When these big pieces get pulled up, they just get thrown back in the water again, and, you know, we're catching that stuff right next to the Oculina Reef, which is where we fish for rock shrimp,

and so, if it's falling where we're catching rock shrimp, it's falling into some of the most critical essential fish habitat on the whole eastern -- You know, in the whole Southeast, because the Oculina Reef is a nursery ground for basically all of our commercially-harvested snapper and grouper species, as well as the rock shrimp, and so we are concerned, and we want to work with you, and, like I said, we appreciate you coming here in-person, and I'm going to stop and let other people ask questions, and then I will ask some more later. Thank you.

MR. KETCHUM: Thanks, Laurilee. Originally -- I think, in the new projects that SpaceX is doing, they are paying a fair market lease rate, and so they are paying. Regarding -- You're absolutely spot-on relative to stormwater, and that's an issue that needs to be dealt with. I think the challenge is, the way they're working it right now, is NASA can't hold them to more than what the law requires, and, right now, they're meeting what the law requires.

I might be out over my skis, but I think that's what I have heard, which is not -- Then we need to change the law, or do something like that, because I want the Indian River -- I grew up on it myself, and I want it fixed before I'm dead, and so -- But, to get to your point, things are changing, and like Space Florida is working really hard to get a brand-new wastewater treatment facility that will be on the mainland that will be state-of-the-art, to make it so that what we're dumping in the river is cleaner than what the river should be.

DR. BELCHER: I would like to try to get around the room, but we'll come back to you. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks for being here, and great presentation, and I'm really learning a lot. I'm with NOAA Fisheries, and I'm the Regional Administrator in St. Petersburg, and I'm curious, just kind of switching gears, and you talked about the hazard areas, kind of these, you know, areas where it's restricted to fishing activity or other, you know, purposes, and, obviously, launches -- I don't see any launches go in bad weather, right, and so they're going in good weather, and we fish in good weather, and we don't fish in bad weather, and so there's, obviously, a lot of days we're going to overlap and have restrictions for our fishing industry, and so what factors go into kind of deciding when a launch occurs, where it occurs, like the directionality, as well as the size of the hazard area, and is there any way, from a fishing industry standpoint, a fishery management council standpoint, that we're able to influence that that might deconflict, or reduce, some of the conflicts between the fishing industry and the space industry?

MR. KETCHUM: I have little doubt that that's exactly what needs to happen. As I was talking about, our collective federal government, state government, and industry figuring out the best way to work it going forward, because, as it stands right now, the FAA has made some significant improvements. They used to create -- Like with shuttle, they created this giant hole in the sky for four hours, and, you know, why four hours? It goes through the -- It's done in eight minutes, but now -- SpaceX is the perfect example, because they have flown 200 Falcon 9 launches successfully in a row, and so they're very comfortable with the hardware, that it's safe and reliable, and so the hole in the sky that they create, which will apply also to on the surface of the water, is getting much smaller, and the duration is getting much shorter.

We're going to go through that, because, eventually, everybody is not going to launch from Florida, because, eventually, they will be launching these things from St. Louis and Indianapolis, because, if you think about it, right now, nobody thinks -- Nobody has any concern that somebody is flying a fully-loaded, fully-fueled 747 over an elementary school, and there isn't a zero percent

chance it's going to crash, and there is a greater than zero chance, but the FAA, and society, is comfortable with the risk of managing that.

The more technologies mature, the more comfortable they are with the restrictions they have to impose on it, and regarding -- One thing the FAA is doing is they're also saying, if you have -- Like, last year, or this year, there was a test launch of a brand-new company, Relativity, that has - - The entire rocket is ninety-five feet tall, and the whole thing is 3D printed, and they had a test launch, and they launched in the middle of the day, and it was just to test the rocket, and there was no payload, and they flew right in the middle of spring break, and they shut down traffic, and the airlines lost their minds, and it forced -- It was like one of those two-by-fours upside the head that gets the government to do something.

Now the FAA is saying, if you have a test launch, you're not going to launch it in the middle of the day, and they're factoring in things like the Superbowl and spring break and the Miami Boat Show, and so they are adapting, but it's just you need to regularly use that two-by-four upside the head with the federal government, and the state government, and everybody else, to get the motion, the movement, we need in the right direction.

The thing about space is -- The whole purpose is you have a single point in the sky that you need to put a payload, and everything is -- Everything, when you launch, what trajectory you take, everything is dependent upon that, because you have a license for that spot in the sky, because you have to have a license, and you can't just fly up there, and so that drives almost all of your launches, and you've got a specific point that you need to hit at a specific time, but, again, the political pressure is how you get the system to adapt.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. I've got Officer Post that has a statement, and I've got Kerry, and I've still got Laurilee floating, and I've got Judy and Shep and John Walter. Officer Post.

MR. POST: Mr. Strelcheck, for your awareness, when it comes to the waterside aspect of it, and so I can't speak to the FAA side, but our Waterways Division team, what they do is they create a safety zone, or a restricted navigation area, based on all the components that go into that launch. Certain launches that require heavier amounts of fuel, that require longer fuel times, we create a restricted navigation area based on the risk that -- If there's an explosion, for example, we won't allow people within a thousand yards of shore, and so that's something that the Coast Guard is putting into effect for the safety-of-life-at-sea aspect.

I'm on the response side, and so I don't know the finer details of the actual components for it, but, once they build that, and then they build another product to include how many assets we want on the scene, and that's also used to determine like time of year and how many boats we anticipate to have, things like that, and so, if you do have further questions on that, if you reach out to me, I can put you in contact with somebody, and they can give you a very detailed explanation of how they get that product.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that. I didn't mean to overstep Jessica, but Jessica, Kerry, I've got Laurilee again, Judy, and then John Walter.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks. I am with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and I guess I would say -- I know you've mentioned that there's these different industries, and they

are very valuable. In thinking about the industries in Florida that are actually interacting with some of our natural resources, fishing is the most valuable, and it's more valuable than citrus, and it's more valuable than cattle in the State of Florida, and so it's pretty valuable, in thinking about an industry that is harvesting and interacting with our natural resources.

I am concerned, I guess, about these closures, and so, with the closures, I do appreciate the fact that these areas are getting smaller and the time which they're closed is getting shorter, and so I love that, but I guess I'm concerned, because, when boats are tied up to the dock, especially if you're a commercial fisherman, then you can't leave to harvest that product, and so you've got loss of that income, and you've already got other factors that are affecting our commercial fishing industry, and the same thing if you're a charter operator, and you've booked a charter trip, and an entire family comes for a vacation, and maybe their main goal is to do nothing but fishing, and that boat can't leave the dock in the say four-hour window, you know, that you chartered this particular trip, and your entire family vacation is essentially ruined if you came to Florida, the fishing capital of the world, to go on that trip.

I guess I would like to understand how the closures are announced and if there is a schedule or something that commercial fishermen could see, charter operators could see, so that they could more aptly plan their business, because I feel like they're both losing money here in this endeavor, and I hear you also saying, hey, you need to go to the government, and you need to go to your congressional folks and make some noise, and we have, but I would also say that it seems like you're also saying you need to use a federal fishery disaster process to get these people some money, annually, for their losses from the space industry.

There is a federal fishery disaster process that Congress would appropriate money, and NOAA Fisheries, and you heard from Andy, our Regional Administrator, would then determine whether a disaster has occurred, and then they would be given a certain percentage of this congressional funding, because of this disaster, whether it's a hurricane or whether loss of rainfall or what have you, but, in this case, maybe because of the space industry, that it's overly affecting people in the State of Florida, and so I guess I would like to learn more, and I don't really understand how the announcement of the closures occur and if you have some kind of idea, even if it's kind of a strawman idea, of these in the next few months, so that these fishermen could use it to better plan out their schedule, and then if you have other ideas about how -- I mean, I heard Trish talk about North Carolina and wind, but how, or if, you have any thoughts on how these fishermen should be compensated, you know, when these types of things happen.

MR. KETCHUM: I think the best -- There's a number of apps that you can get that will tell you, although it's also the case that -- It used to be the range would put the manifest out for quite a few months, and now, mostly because of SpaceX there, they're so rapid, and they're like, well, we're going to do it in the next two weeks, but they're still -- Usually within a week or so they'll tell you when it's going to be.

The bigger problem is going to be scrubs, because it was supposed to go on the 18th, and the weather was bad, and so now it's slipped to the 19th, or the 20th, or whenever, and that's just -- I don't know how we're going to work that, and I can see -- Again, that is yet another component of how -- This ain't going to be easy, and I don't really have -- But we've got to do it, and that's the best I can offer, I guess.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. I've got Kerry, Laurilee, Judy, and John.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Jessica. You teed me up for that one, because what I am wondering is whether it's the Coast Guard or FAA or you all, and does someone keep statistics on the amount of -- The time that the restricted navigational areas are put in place, and like say for 2022, and could someone give us the information of how many restricted navigational areas were used, and for how many hours or days, so that we can find a way -- One of the things we can do is look at that, as that's time fishermen can't fish, and so maybe we say, well, during those times, hooks are out of the water, and so we can think about how we manage the fish differently, and so is there someone who keeps track of those, and would there be a way for us to get that information? I know you couldn't give us future, but past.

MR. KETCHUM: I would look at the Coast Guard. I think they would be the best people, and the Coast Guard has been really innovative, because it used to be that they printed a sheet of paper that showed that you can't be here at this time on this date, and then there would be a scrub, and people wouldn't be quite as attentive to what came out, and they just -- Captain Vlaun, out of Jacksonville, was brilliant, and he turned it over to a couple of eighteen-year-old recruits, and they said, well, why don't you just put a QR code, and now you just take a picture of the QR code, and it will take you immediately to the most up-to-date range information.

That was a huge help, and it doesn't solve all the problems, but it's a kind of neat deployment of innovation that helped address it in a large way, but I do think that's a very good question relative to accumulating that kind of data to reflect the impact, and it's exactly what you would need if you're on the hill flogging a member, because the staff is going to -- That's the first thing they're going to ask, having been staff myself, is so quantify what you're saying. Plop. There you go, but I would assume the Coast Guard would be the best keepers of that data.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: So part of the -- I mean, a big part of the problem is the way that the permitting is done, and, like he said, it's done by state agencies, but the way they look at these projects is they look at them one at a time, and there is no person, or entity, that is in charge of the cumulative impact of all of these projects added up, and so the DEP just permitted SpaceX to be able to discharge up to 3,000 gallons a day of treated industrial wastewater into a ditch that goes down to the Oyster Prong Impound, and they look at it, and they go, oh, 3,000 gallons a day isn't that much, but if this guy and that guy and the other guy and the other one all want to put 3,000 gallons a day of freshwater into the impounds, we're starting to see a problem.

I think, and maybe I'm being a Pollyanna, but I think that, you know, the state agencies -- If the space industry showed an interest in doing something different, other than having their overflow stormwater go into the refuge estuaries, and like if we could create some small lakes that could hold the stormwater, instead of funneling it to the river, or into the estuaries, maybe DEP might be interested in going along with it.

I approached the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with that concept, a year ago, and they said, no, a saltmarsh, and you're going to be impacting a saltmarsh. Well, they've come back to me now and said we like your lake idea, and so, you know, the water in those lakes could be used for irrigation, and it could maybe be reused again for industrial wastewater, instead of using potable water for -

- It could be even used for the launch suppression system, and you would have these reservoirs of freshwater, and it would also create new freshwater habitat that, right now, doesn't exist on the Merritt Island Wildlife Refuge, and so it would be great for ducks and birds, and, I mean, everybody would win, and the river would win, because we can't keep dumping stormwater, aka freshwater, into the estuary system.

There is no circulation of water up there, and you have a two-and-a-half-year residency time in the Northern Banana River Lagoon and a year in the Southern Mosquito Lagoon, a year-and-a-half in the Northern, and all three of those estuaries surround the space center, and so -- The other thing is a taskforce of stakeholders, you know, from the community and from the space industry and from the permitting agencies -- We all need to get together in one room and talk about how we can keep the development going, but how we can do it in a better way that doesn't impact these estuaries and impoundments and the Oculina Reef that are so important, you know, for our fisheries and our quality of life, and we really would like to see that happen. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: Thank you very much for coming. I just wanted to ask the question, and are they doing anything now to any sort of water quality testing or anything now, currently, in the area and the water around you?

MR. KETCHUM: Yes, and that's part of the Indian River Lagoon estuary, and there is a fair amount, I think we could say, of monitoring, because Brevard County kicked in a lot of their own tax dollars to tax themselves, and there's a -- I am sure there are criticisms as to how well it's being spent, and, any time you have that sort of thing, that's going to occur, and, actually, I would defer to Laurilee on the extent of the monitoring, but I'm sure we're doing some.

MS. THOMPSON: Can I answer that?

DR. BELCHER: I would like to get John, and we're trying to get our time caught back up, and so John Walter.

DR. WALTER: Thanks, Dale. John Walter, and I'm from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, speaking for the center, and one question that I had, among others that we might try to follow-up on, because we do consult on a lot of impacts for different things, particularly wind-related, and that's been a big focus for us in the Southeast, but there's a big industry here who is also very much impacted, in terms of the cruise ship industry, and so I'm wondering where and what the communications for the cruise ship industry have gone, whether they are seeking some other -- Some sort of compensation, because I imagine that, as these -- If they're delayed, that's 5,000 people who are missing their flights, and so where is that communication going? I mean, the fishing industry is kind of a smaller player, compared to the cruise ship industry, but it has similarly, probably, proportional to their size impacts. Thanks.

MR. KETCHUM: There has been a lot of progress, and there's a lot of dialogue, because I think there's like fifteen ship, but there's maybe four different cruise lines, and so there's four people to talk to, and they have worked some degree of arrangements, and so like there has to be a really good reason before the FAA will give you a launch license like on a Sunday afternoon, when twelve ships are trying to get out, and they're working around that.

Is it perfect? Does it still need work? I'm sure it does, but, so far, actually, we have -- Apart from the Harmony of the Seas sailing where it wasn't supposed to go, for the most part, it has worked out pretty well, because it's very -- If you slow down, because you can have 100,000 people trying to get off the boats and 100,000 people trying to get on the boats in the same day, and, if that gets slowed down, that ripples over into Orlando International Airport, because a lot of those flights -- A big part of their passenger manifest is people trying to get off the cruise ships to go home, and so they delay those flights, which then just cascades across the national airspace.

I don't -- All I can tell you, because I don't know the specifics, other than, if it was a real, real problem, we would be hearing about it, but what we hear from the cruise lines, and Port Canaveral and others, is, so far, they're making it work.

Now, when we get to 300 launches a year, I don't know about that, but I don't think, at this point -- To answer your core question, I don't think that the cruise lines have had something happen that they could point to and say this is damage, where they would sue, because this is America, and we're pretty litigious, and Elon has got a lot of money, and he's a pretty big target, and so I don't honestly know, other than to say that it hasn't been a massive problem yet.

DR. BELCHER: Does anybody have any other questions? I am going to narrow our focus down specifically to questions and how it impacts fisheries issues for us in the South Atlantic. Okay. Seeing none, obviously, we're not taking any action on this, and this has been a really good informative thing, and, I mean, obviously, we could keep you here all day, because there's a ton of questions that I know we could come up with, but, if people have more questions for Dale, we can go ahead and take that off the mic for now, because, obviously, we're trying to play a little bit of catchup here. Again, Dale, thank you for your time, and I'm sure that Laurilee will keep you in line.

MR. KETCHUM: She always does, and my email is there on the -- So feel free to follow-up. Thank you, all. I appreciate the opportunity.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. How many people need a break? I am willing to do like five minutes, and I mean like five, and that's it. All right. Everybody is good to go? I am checking, because, otherwise, we're just going to steamroll. Okay. Andy, we have you up next with your equity and environmental justice presentation.

MR. STRELCHECK: Really, I appreciate the time on the agenda, and this is an important topic for NOAA Fisheries. It's a priority of our administration, and we did roll out the National Equity and Environmental Justice Strategy right around the time of the CCC meeting in May, and so I'll be talking some about what's in that national strategy, but then also talking about our regional implementation and work that's going to be ongoing in the Southeast in the coming months, through the end of the year.

John Walter and I have been tag-teaming these presentations with the councils, and so we'll certainly ask John to also jump in and provide further comments and input, if he has any, at the tail-end of the conversation, but John does a much better job, in terms of using props for presentations, and he gave a really good prop at the Caribbean Council, which I think is a good

way to kind of give you an indication of how we're thinking about equity and environmental justice.

In the Caribbean, obviously, one of the primary languages is Spanish, right, and so we are provided headsets, and we can listen to presentations both in English or Spanish, and it's translated for us, right, and that's a huge hurdle, in many places, to then interact with our constituents, the people, the stakeholders, that we work with and build regulations with, but it gives us an opportunity to have, you know, that translation and common conversation and language to discuss issues, and so we are trying to figure out the barriers to equity and environmental justice within the Southeast, as it directly relates to our fishing communities, and so the national strategy has set the stage for that, and then we'll go into the Southeast strategy.

Just to briefly go through the national strategy, and you can read the objectives on the screen, there are six primary objectives, and you can see that they focus on inclusivity, increasing collaboration, enhancing just understanding and information, as well as looking carefully at our policies and plans to ensure equitability. They're also looking at, you know, the distribution of benefits and how those are provided and how we can be more effective with outreach and engagement and, ultimately, convey that empowering environment that we want to work within, and so those are the primary objectives that frame the national EEJ strategy and what we're building kind of our action plan off of.

This is just a small bar plot. When we requested feedback on the national strategy, we got over 500 comments, and the Pacific Islands represented a large number of those comments, and they did some more direct engagement to get input and feedback on the national strategy. You can see, in the Southeast, that we did get probably about twenty to twenty-five comments from individuals and then a smaller number of comments from organizations in the Southeast.

As part of the public feedback, we wanted to know, kind of first and foremost, do people support the strategy, right, and what was their reaction to the strategy, and so this shows that about 80 percent provided an indication that they were supportive of the strategy, and a small portion were no, and some were unclear with regard to whether or not they are offering support for the strategy, and so that's the good news, right, and that's positive, and, obviously, the devil is in the details with regard to how you then move forward and implement this equity and environmental justice strategy.

Key messages, some take-homes, focus on aligning our work, NMFS' work, with local needs. There is a lot of work that we do beyond the fishery management councils in local communities, but trying to, obviously hone-in and provide as much focus on aligning the work that we do with those local communities.

Engage with more diverse groups, right, and so one of the things that we have been focusing on is we don't know how to communicate or interact with people that we don't know, or we haven't interacted with, and so broadening the net and actually determining kind of those underserved communities and individuals we need to be working with is key, and so we are working, obviously, on that, and we are also increasing support for territorial and tribal governments.

As I mentioned earlier, a key source of really the need is collecting demographic data and other information, and we have a lot of good tools at our fingertips, with social indicator analyses,

community-level information, but enhancing and improving that data is really key, obviously, to the success of the strategy, and then measuring success, right, and it just can't be words on paper and people seeing that we're trying to make a good effort, but it's how do we effectively implement the strategy going forward, and we also got some fairly specific comments and concerns related to catch shares, aquaculture, and protected species, and I won't go into detail about that, but it's very helpful, and, in the Gulf of Mexico, and we've been talking about wreckfish this week, but there's certainly a lot of concerns about equity and the distribution of shares, and access to those shares and allocation, and so that's definitely a focus for some of the catch share programs just around the country.

Then implementation of recommendations, and, you know, communicating with our stakeholders early and often, and working with you, the councils, and other agencies, and then supporting capacity for additional EEJ work.

You know, I wanted to then drill down in terms of what happened in the Southeast with feedback, and so council support ranged from enthusiastic to measured, and that's fair, right, and I think that's good information to have. Like almost everything we talk about around this table, it comes back to data, right, and data, data, data to inform our process better. There was an emphasis on boots on the ground, right, getting out to docks, getting out into those local communities, working closely with stakeholders and councils and liaisons and others that are also well positioned to help us advance our outreach and engagement activity, and so that's really key.

We have a fisheries finance program, and I'm not sure how many people are familiar with that, but we did get a number of comments about just improving accessibility to that fisheries finance program, which I think is a great opportunity. Council staff have been a huge supporter of our Marine Resource Education Program, and so it was really encouraging to see input and feedback about supporting, as well as expanding, not only that program, but also other training programs for fishermen, and then ensuring equitable council representation, and the agency has received criticism, in recent years, about council appointments and diversity on councils, and so we got a number of points and feedback with regard to council representation, and then the last thing is, with any new initiative, right, show me the money. Where is the money going to come from to help support us to expand our efforts, and so, obviously, it's very important, in order to make this successful and provide the necessary resources to move this forward.

When I have talked to other councils, other groups that I have met with, you know, my emphasis is this really becomes part of the NOAA Fisheries culture, and this forms the framework, obviously, in our daily work activities, working with our fishing communities and others that are underserved, and we have been requested to do a step-down implementation plan, and so that is the next step in this process for the Southeast Region, and so staff from my team, from Clay and John's team, are working closely together, and we have Christina that's been a huge help, from the South Atlantic Council staff, that's been contributing to this, and so we will be continuing to work on that regional implementation plan between now and the end of the year.

One of the key components of that is really seeking to remove barriers to EEJ and really understanding what those barriers are. I will be talking, in a minute, about a number of focus groups and other activities that we're going to be conducting this summer, throughout the whole region, but specifically in the South Atlantic.

Just a schematic of where we're at in the process, and we started in the spring of 2021 with some working groups, and we've now made it to rolling out the national EEJ strategy and conducting stakeholder outreach is next, and then we will analyze the data and information that comes in from that stakeholder outreach and ultimately inform our regional implementation plan, and we're shooting for a draft by the end of the year.

I'm not sure this is the most recent presentation, but the bottom line is that we have been having some challenges with getting Paperwork Reduction Act clearance for conducting focus groups, and I've been told that, as of today, that we actually just received clearance, but we had planned to do at least twenty focus groups, and maybe some scoping sessions throughout the Southeast, and there are going to be a number of -- There we go. You can just go back one, and the locations.

You can see here there are scoping and focus groups, and that was, in part, because of our Paperwork Reduction Act challenges of how we could proceed with these meetings, and we still think we may do some scoping meetings. There is some overlap, in terms of the locations for scoping and focus groups, but our intent is, over the course of the summer, that we are going to be going and doing these focus groups in these communities, and we don't have necessarily specific locations yet identified, but we're narrowing that down, and that will be a team of people from both the Science Center and Regional Office, and we will be inviting people to participate in those meetings, and so it's a huge opportunity to learn a lot, in terms of from the local communities, and ultimately benefit our EEJ strategy.

Basic needs, in terms of kind of where we go from here, first, we obviously need training time and essentially staff resources to help with this, and we're putting a lot of effort into this already, and so we're excited about that, and we're looking, obviously, for community liaisons, and I've talked a lot about, obviously, needing demographic data collection and information and then collaborating with you as partners, as we work through this.

You work, obviously, closely with constituents up and down the eastern seaboard, and so it's an opportunity to partner with you and many others, and then, as I started with, you know, language translation services, right, and there may be less of a need in the South Atlantic, but still always there can be a need anywhere, and we have, for example, in the Gulf, a Vietnamese community, where there is opportunities to engage more directly with them, using translation services, and we have tribal engagement in the Southeast, and I mentioned the Caribbean, with regard to the Spanish language, and so lots of areas of opportunity to move forward with our EEJ strategy.

I am going to skip this, but this just kind of gives you an indication, and you can look at it on your own time, but some of the things that we are at least starting to think about, in terms of specific strategies that we would be doing, or conducting, to implement the strategy in the Southeast.

I think this is the last one, and so what we are looking for is some input on those locations that I just shared, if you have any thoughts, reactions, to the planned scoping and focus groups, and, if you have any suggestions or input today, or later, in terms of engaging partners and communities, as well as if there is any partnerships, or engagement, that you or your agencies would want to support, and then how can we best collaborate, ultimately, going forward in developing the regional implementation plan, and we look forward to bringing that back to you and sharing more details with regard to the strategies that we're going to be implementing, going forward, and so I will stop there and open it up for questions, or, John, do you want to add anything, first?

DR. BELCHER: Are there questions or comments for Andy? Seeing none at this time, thank you, Andy. The next item is the Southeast Regional Office report.

MR. STRELCHECK: All right. I will keep it short, and I have a few things, and so we have drafted our geographic strategic plan for the Southeast, and we appreciate the council's input on that plan. That's been submitted to Headquarters for review and consideration, and so I just wanted to thank John and team and others that contributed input to that.

We haven't talked red snapper this week, which has been somewhat refreshing. We heard some public testimony. Back in March, I mentioned about the exempted fishing permit process, and I just wanted to give an update that we are continuing to work on a notice of funding opportunity, and so it will be a grant award process, an application, and the focus will be on innovative management strategies to reduce discards of red snapper and other snapper grouper species. I am expecting that announcement probably in late July, or into the August, timeframe, and so we'll certainly be communicating closely with the council when that rolls out, as well as we'll send out a bulletin and try to make sure that it's widely distributed.

The other thing I will do is point you to the Protected Resources updates in your briefing book, and I am not going to go through all of those in detail, but hit a few highlights. There is a number of things coming up this summer to be aware of, and we are working on a proposed rule that would up-list pillar coral from threatened to endangered, after completion of a status review for our coral species.

We have a critical habitat final rule for corals, on the non-Acroporid corals, that is likely to publish sometime this summer, and that's been a multiyear effort, and we also have a proposed rule for green sea turtle critical habitat that we're working on, and then the last thing that I informed the Gulf Council last week is we have a biological opinion for the shrimp industry, and I can't recall if we completed that in 2021 or 2022, but that applies to the Gulf and South Atlantic shrimp fishery.

We have met some reinitiation triggers, and the primary reason that we're having to reinitiate consultation is that giant manta rays were listed previously, and we identified and authorized take for manta rays, but the takes in the biological opinion were for non-lethal take of manta rays, and we now have some observer estimates of take, where manta rays were killed in shrimp trawl nets in the Gulf of Mexico, and so we will be reopening that biological opinion, and I wanted to make you aware of that, since it also applies to the South Atlantic shrimp industry.

The other component of that is that there's been a new publication on smalltooth sawfish, and there was some management recommendations in it, but the main takeaway is that the large adult female smalltooth sawfish habitat significantly overlaps with a lot of the pink shrimp fishery in southwest Florida, and so that's another thing that we'll be looking at.

Jenny Lee shared a detailed memo that our office drafted, and it puts a schedule in place for the reinitiation, and nothing is going to happen immediately, overnight, and we actually need to do a lot of analytical work, and we expect to kind of start drafting the biological opinion sometime next spring, late spring, and complete it probably by the end of next year, and so lots of other updates with regard to protected resources, but I did want to flag those, and then you saw, earlier this week,

kind of where we're at with the status of a lot of fisheries actions, and so I'm happy to take any further questions.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Andy. Questions for Andy? Okay. The next agenda item is the Southeast Fisheries Science Center's report.

DR. WALTER: Okay. Thank you. I will report-out on two things. One, I will just update -- Before I go into the spend plan, I will just update on our surveys that are out right now. Our trap video survey is ongoing, in partnership with South Carolina DNR, on the R/V Palmetto, and I believe they're at-sea, and then the second leg of the SEFIS cruise should depart on the R/V Savannah on June 20, and, right now, the South Atlantic Deepwater Longline Survey is getting ready to go out, and, right now, we're working on getting the contracts administered through South Carolina DNR for that cooperative deepwater longline survey.

What I wanted to go over also is we are asked to develop a spend plan for \$1.8 million in South Atlantic reef fish funding, and this was originally funding that supported the South Atlantic red snapper research program, two years in a row, and then this third year of funding -- If you look at the top, there is the actual congressional language of what this is supposed to support, and I briefed this council, I believe in March, on initial ideas for this, and then we asked for research priorities from the council, and we got them and incorporated a large number of those research priorities into this spend plan, and so this is really serving as the get-back to the council on how we've incorporated them and what we think is going to be the best use of these funds to meet the congressional intent, the needs of the council, and then to improve our knowledge of the fishery.

In particular, the main focus of this round of funding is for better characterization of the discards in the fishery and ensuring incorporation of the South Atlantic red snapper research program findings into the next stock assessment and management advice, and so that's where we're focusing and prioritizing things that will do that.

The first batch of funding is Action 1, which is to improve the recreational and for-hire fishery catch and discard characterization and estimation, and there is a number of different things that can happen with that, to expand for-hire observer coverage, provide biological information on released fish, collect samples for epigenetic ageing, provide catch rate information, genetic or conventional tagging, and one of the things that's ongoing from the previous FY22 year funds that are going to support the South Atlantic red snapper research program is a simulation study of the efficacy of conventional tagging versus gene tagging, to get at discard exploitation rates.

Based on those results, that might motivate whether we would actually put that kind of tagging program into place, and so the next year's money could help support and implement that, if indeed it turns out that either one of them would work, and then we want to improve the spatial resolution of effort and catch information.

The justification is that these efforts would all support better characterization of the magnitude of recreational catch and discards, and we think that most of that money would probably best be done in partnership with the states, where would pass the money to the states, who are well equipped to be able to carry out many of these studies.

The second one is a rather novel idea that we've talked about a bit, in terms of developing pilot study fleets in the private recreational headboat and charter fleet, and, here, these fleets would fish under certain scenarios, where they would be experimenting with different methods that might reduce discard mortality, implement best fishing practices, and then provide better catch and effort data for us to be able to bring into modeling and management.

This pilot fleet concept is something that has been really started in the Northeast, and we think it might be useful here to implement that and provide extra money to the research program that Andy Strelcheck mentioned that SERO is going to administer, and so this extra money will support that and allow for augmenting of that research fleet concept. Ideally, what they would do is have a certain experimental design, fish under those designs, and some of the fleet would fish with a certain type of hook, a certain type of fishing strategy, and another one would fish with a different one, and then you would be able to determine which one is actually improving, or minimizing, dead discards.

The other key aspect of it is we want to improve the recreational fishing experience and opportunity, because we keep hearing that that opportunity is not very good right now, and a two-day season is not particularly desirable by anybody, and are there ways that we could creatively improve that opportunity, and could those study fleets help to get the data to inform that.

The next one is to support the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's best fishing practices, its expansion and release projects, using descender devices and outreach and education. This is a smaller pot of money, \$100,000, to support the release project, to hold a regional symposium on the state of the science regarding descenders and other release mortality efforts, and, ideally, this is to be able to actually effect change in the discard mortality rate, by better engaging with the fishing community.

Then Action 3 is additional support for the snapper grouper management strategy evaluation, and this was identified by the council as a priority, and it's something that we think could help with incorporating whatever the findings are of the research program into the MSE, if indeed there are findings that could be incorporated in time, to better incorporate socioeconomic considerations in the MSE, which was a specific request of this council, and then to augment testing of different potential management procedures and allow for the management strategy evaluation to continue, if indeed it needs further funding.

The fourth action is to incorporate the research program findings into the pending red snapper stock assessment, and, here, one part of the money will go to support a dedicated scientist to do that, since we're going to be getting information that we've actually never used before, and we'll get a close-kin-mark-recapture abundance estimate of the total population size, and we'll also get an abundance estimated based on the Bayesian hierarchical model, and neither one of these things have we actually incorporated into a stock assessment and management framework, and so we really need to lay that scientific foundation to smoothly integrate that into the process, and we want to lay that foundation starting now.

I think that's one of the things that we learned, is that it takes some time to do that, and, even once the research program, or the count, is done, there's a lot of time that it takes before it eventually hits the management advice. It's got to go through the science, and got to go through the SSC. That way, if we begin to lay that foundation early, we will be able to speed up that process.

Then the last action is going to also support integration of the findings, and this is a pre-assessment workshop of SARSRP and SEDAR participants to begin to build out that process of vetting that data and evaluating how it could be used in the research track and how it could be used for management advice. It also will allow us to have a Center for Independent Experts review of the research program, and the review will be funded by NOAA Fisheries, but the actual workshop -- This funding is going to support that workshop, and that funding is going to the council, and so, with that, I will take any questions about the plan or about the Science Center report. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Spud and then Kerry.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, John. I'm just curious. Under the study fleet concept, is there any sort of already targeted number of boats and sort of spatial spread on boats? I am trying to think, and, you know, do we have like a goal that we are setting for ourselves, or is it going to be more opportunistic, to try to see what you can actually do?

DR. WALTER: It really all depends on what the fishing community wants to put together. Ideally, the spatial extent would be the entire region. For red snapper, some of the red snapper fishing is a little more localized in the whole region, and I think, in terms of what would be prioritized, it would be ones that move the bar forward on turning dead discards into fishing opportunities, or landed catch, because I think that's what we really want to try to do, and so, to the extent that the prioritization would be being able to move that bar forward, I think that's probably where the priority would be, but, in terms of -- I don't think we've fleshed out the actual ports or the number of vessels.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: John, my question is also about the pilot study fleets, and is there any intent, among those sort of different fleets, testing different varieties of gear, that would have actually a control fleet? I thought that may address some of the concerns that we all discussed around this table earlier, like Chester's concerns as far as our estimates of recreational discards, and it might be an opportunity to sort of look at what is really happening as we're fishing now.

DR. WALTER: Kerry, that's an excellent point, and I am probably remiss, as a scientist, for not putting a control there specifically, but, yes, we would want to have a status quo fleet, that fishes under the current paradigm, and we probably know what their welfare is, and their happiness, under the current paradigm, and probably no one wants to be in the control group, but, yes, that's a great idea, and I think we would absolutely need that.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions or comments for John Walter at this time? Okay. Thank you, John. The next item, because we went through our liaison and state partner reports earlier in the week, and we were not able to do the Coast Guard report, and so, Officer Post, if you could give us an update on Coast Guard activities in the South Atlantic.

MR. POST: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Overall, fishing activity has been going really well, and there's nothing overly significant, with large violations, with the exception of a pretty -- About a year-and-a-half ago, and I'm sure it's been talked about, and it was 400 pounds of red snapper

caught out of season that we caught with a fisherman trying to sell to a fish house, and that was a joint operation with FWC. That was a good job all around.

One item that I was asked to bring to the table, and just pass for consideration, is something that had been mentioned actually just now, was a possible extension to the season, or spacing out of the season, for safety of vessels. The reason why -- So Sector Jacksonville has 200 nautical miles, or, sorry, 200 statute miles of shoreline, and approximately 10,000 square miles, if you go out to fifty miles from the seaboard.

Why that 10,000 miles matters is that's where small boats can reach out to. From the Georgia line to Melbourne, we have three small boat stations. That means that, at any given time, you might have three boats in that entire area to respond to search and rescue, and our equipment at the 911 dispatch center, our command center, only has one search and rescue unit, who is creating these search and rescue patterns and prosecuting search and rescue cases.

On the opening day of snapper season last year, in one hour, we had eight search and rescue cases that were deemed significant enough for us to respond. Throughout the day, I think we had just over a dozen, in just a thirteen-hour period, and that does not include anything that FWC, the sheriff's office, beach rescue, or any other three-letter agency in our area responded to, and this is because every weekend warrior with a two-stroke Johnson is going out, regardless of what the weather looks like, and almost all of our boardings last year -- People had injuries onboard, because they had five to six-foot waves. People had broken noses, twisted wrists, bad ankles, and we were doing more first aid than actual LMR boardings.

Again, the reason that I bring that to the attention is we cannot accommodate the amount of people that are going out and not taking care of their boats, and it's creating an unsafe environment. I am not a scientist, and so I can't speak to the fishery itself, and you guys have gone to school a lot longer than I have, and so, from my job, for my consideration, that is just something that we asked to maybe be discussed, later on in the future, and something easy to recommend is, you know, the last two weekends of July, or the Wednesday and Thursday, kind of like you do the mini-season, and maybe do two different dates, and it will at least help like spread out our time and make it more reasonable for us to, one, do the law enforcement planning aspect of it, because we essentially couldn't do that last year, and so we didn't really get to do LMR boardings, and we were just concerned with getting everybody off the water safely. That really is all that I have, but, if there's questions, if there's concerns, if you guys have questions about operations, I'm here today, and so I'm here to take any of that.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you for that. Are there questions for Officer Post? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: More of a comment, and so thank you for your input. I did raise concerns throughout an amendment we were working on over the last year with regard to safety-at-sea. It is a huge challenge and problem and concern that I think we all share. The limitation we have right now is we have a set catch level that we have to abide by, and we have immense effort that is able to catch that limit in a very short period of time, and so we -- At this stage, based on the current management structure, we don't have any ability to change it.

I have to set the season and open it based on information prescribed by the council at this stage, and so it will open again for the two days in July, but I think our long-term goal, based on some

science, based on management strategy evaluation, is hopefully can get out of this box that we're in, and the short seasons, and get to something that would provide more flexibility and avoid some of the problems you have outlined, and so I appreciate the input.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks. Anybody else have comments or questions? Thank you. Next up, I have the staff report. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I have been looking forward to this, and you've heard it alluded to in your various updates, but I have to point out that there were six FMPs submitted in the last quarter, and so between the March meeting and the June meeting, and that is unprecedented. I can't ever remember a time where so many FMPs were wrapped up and squeezed through the system in that short period of time, and it absolutely could not have been possible without what was clearly a herculean effort by our IPTs.

You know, our IPTs include council, SERO, the Science Center, and GC staff, and so everybody did an absolute amazing job getting these amendments done, and so we had Snapper Grouper 49, which was led by Mike for us and Mary for the Regional Office, and that was greater amberjack, and 51 was snowy grouper, and this one included a rebuilding plan, and that was Allie and Rick.

52 was tilefish, and that was Roger and Myra for us and Carla for the Regional Office. 53 was gag and black grouper, another rebuilding plan, another Allie, and Frank this time, and so Allie got two out with rebuilding plans, and you all know how much work went into those. The ABC Control Rule was Mike and Nik, another one we've been waiting on for a long time, and we're really glad to see that one out. CMP Framework 34, and the Gulf was the lead, but our folks were involved in that, and it was Christina for us on that one.

There is also -- We really did about 6.9, because there's another one, and the red snapper amendment is nearing its final review, and it will be going to our esteemed Chair, for her final review on that, and, you know, Carolyn did an amazing job of reviewing these, and I can't -- Most chairs don't review six or seven amendments in their entire two years on the council, and Carolyn has done six in the last quarter, and Carolyn doesn't just read a few parts of an amendment. She checks references, and she checks table, and she did the most incredible review job that you have ever seen, and the staff really appreciated it, and she caught many things, and I think everyone learned a lot, and we appreciate your attention to detail on that, but, you know, I would just say that we owe these guys a big hand, all of this crew, for what they've done. (Applause)

Monica is not here, and she certainly reviewed plenty of them, and I think Shep reviewed some of them, and so it was a squeeze across the council offices and the Regional Office, and it's just been a great job, and so I just can't say enough about how proud I am of this whole crew, and I've been looking forward to this for quite a while, to just, you know, give you guys the thanks that you all really deserve.

With that, I will move into a few other things that we have going on, and one is we're looking for some input from you on the allocations review guidelines. In 2019, the GAO reviewed how we in the Gulf of Mexico Council address allocations, and they concluded we should better document our process, and we've gone through that.

We've developed a trigger policy, and we've developed approaches for allocating our reviews, but they would like us to reinforce that a bit, and, in particular, provide more information on how we would address reviews and how we handled allocation reviews when it doesn't result in an amendment action, and so it's summarized in the report there for you how we go about it, but what our proposal is, and we're just really looking for your concurrence on this, is recommending that we develop an allocation review guideline document that will summarize the whole approach that's been developed.

It will outline what we're doing for reviews, and it will include the decision tree process that we've developed and the review trigger policy. The staff will draft this document for your review at the September of 2023 meeting, and then final approval at the December 2023 meeting, and then, once it's finalized, it will be posted to the website, and we'll most likely develop an allocation process page within our website, so we can keep all of this information there, and, you know, for example, if we review an allocation situation, and it doesn't result in an amendment action, that website page would also give us a place to document a report on what our findings were relative to the allocation situation and perhaps why we did not consider changing it at that time, or maybe when we consider changing it in a future amendment, et cetera. That will be a placeholder, and we're going to document the process, and, you know, work it through with staff and then you all's review.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm excited about that allocations page, and so it sounds like -- I think this is what you're saying, is that, on the page, the website, that there would be this table that would indicate the species, the allocation percentages, when the last time it was looked at, et cetera, and it would kind of be like a one-stop table, where you could see all that laid out, and is that what you guys are thinking?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I mean, certainly a document that has that, and whether or not there were actually a table, and that might come down to how extensive that information became, and is that right?

MS. BROUWER: Yes, that's pretty much it, and we haven't yet fleshed out exactly how we're going to do this, but there's a whole bunch of bits and pieces that we're trying to kind of bring together in one spot, so that the public can refer to this documentation, and so it's also easier for you guys to find it all, and so we're going to work all that out and bring you a much better fleshed-out plan in September.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Maybe, building on that, we could have something that gives a sense of allocation reviews that will be coming up, because we have some, like has been mentioned, that will hit like a time trigger, and then we also know the assessments, and we could factor those in there and give kind of a couple-year outlook of what allocation reviews are coming up, and then we could have all the past ones done. All right. Good? Thank you. Stand by, and more on this will be coming.

I want to highlight that the archiving of past briefing books has recently been completed back to 2008, and that covers the bulk of them for which we've been very electronic and have all of that information that you would have received briefing books on CDs and memory sticks, and now over the website, and so the link is there, but it's on the website, and you can go to that and see all

of those old briefing books. We're next moving into -- Nick is going to turn his attention to the AP and SSC briefing books, to start getting all of that information archived as well.

MREP is coming up, and applications are now being accepted, and so, if you have somebody in mind that you think would be a great candidate for that program, be sure to let Kim know. We'll be attending ICAST shortly, and focusing on trying to engage with tackle shop owners, and show them how they can get best fishing practices materials into their shops, and some example displays and that sort of thing, to really continue with our best fishing practices outreach and information in there about a lot of partners we're working with, along with the ICAST program.

We have our stakeholder meetings, and we talked about this at the last meeting, and staff is continuing to work on that idea, as a way to go out and get input from our constituents outside of a potential contentious management situation, which is so often when we do talk to them, and so look for some more details on that at the September meeting.

It's already been announced that David Hugo has been hired at the Reef Fish Communication Fellow, and so this is just highlighting that. Then a bunch of conferences and things that we've been up to, and I've heard a lot of good feedback from the Recreational Economic Conference, and so, you know, thanks to the agency and others, who organized that, but I've heard from a number of folks that they felt that that was a really excellent workshop, and they got a lot out of it, and I know Spud was able to attend it for us, which was nice, and then the last thing I want to give a shoutout on is our Award of Excellence.

If you remember, we created an Award of Excellence, and then COVID came along, and so we didn't really go and award it at the time, and we did give the first award last year, and it went to Marcel Reichert, as some of you all may remember, but nominations are due by the end of the month, and they can be submitted by members, AP, SSC, and it's not a particularly cumbersome process, and we're just looking for a couple-page letter that highlights why you think someone is worthy of this award and summarizing their contributions to South Atlantic fisheries, and it can be, you know, really anybody who you feel like has made a good contribution, and so I just wanted to put another reminder out there and encourage all of you --

If you can think of someone, a past AP member, a past council member, a current AP member or council member, a fisherman who has been really engaged in contributing to conservation and management of our resources, and just think about sitting down, maybe with a colleague, and penning a couple-page letter to shoutout on their accomplishments, and that's the end of the staff report. Any other questions?

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: What are you going to do with all your time, now that you have submitted six amendments, and would you like us to fill up your time for you?

DR. BELCHER: Anyone else have comments or questions for John on the staff report? Okay. Seeing none, the next item is the CCC report. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you, Carolyn, and so the CCC met in May of 2023. We were hosted by the Gulf Council, and we met at Key West, at a place you guys know well, and

were there last June, and this is an unofficial summary, and there is an official summary that is soon to be completed, and it will be posted on the council's website, and you see the link there, and I just wanted to -- Considering the timing of our meeting, I wanted to highlight some of the things that the CCC worked on, particularly some of the motions.

The first issue we talked about was the advance notice of proposed rulemaking for National Standards 4, 8, and 9, which you got a presentation on here today, and the CCC recommended that NMFS extend the comment deadline to October 15, and so I just mentioned that it's in September, and it falls during our council meeting.

A number of the councils, with the scheduling of their meetings, were trying to push it back and give themselves some more time to comment, and we were able to get the presentation here from Mike, and, you know, they acted really quickly, and accommodated our timing, and got here in this meeting, which has been really good, and I think that's put us in a good position to meet the deadline, even if it is not extended, but a number of the councils are also following up on their own and asking that the agency extend it. We haven't heard resolution of that yet.

It goes through a number of topics here, and so I'm just going to hit on a few things, and there was mention of the budget outlook, and a question, at the time, was the Inflation Reduction Act, and we have heard some information, which I shared with you, and the councils are in line to receive about \$20 million toward climate responses and being climate ready with our fisheries, and there is going to be a call, in a few weeks, or maybe a month or so, with NMFS, where the EDs will hear more about that, and I expect that, maybe at that time, we'll hear more about the timeline for that money, how long we have to use it, and whether or not there is particular contingencies on what we're expected to do with it.

We also, as always, highlighted the overall budget, and there is an increase in the FY2024 Presidential Budget, and we all know this is early in that process, and we're not sure where things will end up, and the important part is, in the last couple of years, a big part of this discussion at the CCC, from both the councils and the agency, is that the increases that have been coming in recent years have just not been keeping pace with the inflation rate, and that's of concern to the agency, and we've heard it from Clay at the Steering Committee, loud and clear, and we've heard it from Andy, and we heard it from the agency overall at the CCC, and a number of the councils are starting to feel the crunch as well, and so that's just something that we're keeping our eye on, as we look to the future.

Remember that our five-year grant ends in 2024, and we'll start a new one in 2025, and NMFS has also told us to expect that there will likely be a base four-year grant, because the grants are allowed to be five years, but they graciously allow the councils to do essentially a no-cost extension, and it happens pretty regularly, and so the new thinking is that, well, if you have five years, and then you go a one-year extension, that's actually six years, and so we're going to have to drop the base back to four years, because you always do these one-year extensions, and so we don't exceed five years. I imagine it's new lawyers giving new interpretations of the rules, but that's what we're expecting to happen when we go into our next budget cycle, beginning in 2025.

We got reports on climate change and fisheries, the Atlantic Coast Scenario Planning, which is something we know quite a bit about, and they updated us on antiharassment policies and training, and you guys all did that training recently, and NMFS is looking at extending that training contract,

and so it would be available for maybe every-other-year, for you folks to get updated, and we asked that they keep the contract open on an annual basis, so that, as we get new staff, and we get new council members appointed, we can get them that training when they get joined into our system, and not have to say wait until an odd year, or an even year, whatever the training would be.

The America the Beautiful Initiative continues, and the good news is the CCC's Area-Based Management Working Group has completed its report, and they're developing an interactive webmap application to better show all the many closed areas that are in place through the council system. We're still waiting on this, to find out to what extent things no trawls allowed over the South Atlantic, that we've done, will factor into the America the Beautiful Initiative and the 30 by 30 initiative, and so that's still kind of a work in process, but the group has put together a great report, and it shows that there is a huge amount of the ocean, within the EEZ, protected in some way, and so that report is available through the council's website, and it's definitely worth taking a look at.

I will jump here to the Scientific Coordination Subcommittee, which is representatives of all the SSCs. They met recently and started talking about climate change and how we adapt to that. The CCC passed a motion that we will form a climate workgroup, so that we can try to get the councils working together to understand capacity for dealing with climate change and what our future needs are and how we can respond to climate change issues.

It is one of the concerns of the councils, and it was a good discussion at the CCC, regarding how do you go from having climate information to getting it used in management, and the point that I made during that discussion was, since we respond to fishing level recommendations of our SSCs and ABCs, we really need to have that climate information get into the stock assessment system, or the other analyses that are the basis of our ABCs, so that then we can factor it into our management.

That is somewhat what this group will be doing, but, also, along those lines, we approved to have the next SCS meeting, as it's called, and have the topic of applying ABC control rules in a changing environment, which does get at that role of the ABC control rules determine our ABCs, and how can they be best used within this climate change situation, and so I'm encouraged that we're going to do this, and the plan is to do these SCS meetings every other year and continue to focus on cutting-edge scientific issues.

There is a little bit of a housekeeping motion, just to let NMFS people participate on the planning, which they've been doing all along, and we got an update on the NS 1 technical guidance, and it's been a number of years in development, and our SSC is going to review it, when it meets on July 27, and the deadline for comments is August 31, and so, after the SSC meets, we will draft some comments and run it by you guys and get it into the agency by August 31. There is not a lot in there, I would say, in looking it over, that was a surprise, but it does clarify a lot of the process for dealing with setting reference points, and particularly in data-limited situations, and so I'm looking forward to the SSC's comments, and there may be some interesting things that they raise.

There's a communications subcommittee, and they met and compared communication issues, and those guys keep up the regional councils website, and that's been well received by everybody, and there's a calendar on there that shows all of the national meetings, all of the councils, which can

be quite useful when you're planning something, and then we're going to have the communications group to meet in 2024, and one of the things they're going to start looking forward to is how we respond to the fifty-year anniversary of the Magnuson Act, and it was first passed in 1976, and so the anniversary is coming up, and the councils will want to have probably a pretty nice, glossy document describing the accomplishments and the impacts on U.S. fisheries as a result of the Act.

We had planned a discussion on sanctuaries, which is an issue somewhat near and dear to our hearts, as we deal with some of these, and the folks weren't able to be there, and so that's been pushed off to October. The Western Pacific did weigh-in on this quite a bit, and one of the things that they pointed out was that 50 percent of the EEZ in the Western Pacific region is included in sanctuaries, and so they have a huge burden from dealing with sanctuaries, and a lot of those have really restricted fishing around islands that are very dependent upon the ocean for food security and for jobs, and so it's a very controversial issue out there in the Western Pacific for dealing with sanctuaries, and so they will be planning a presentation at the October meeting, and we'll probably get into this topic quite a bit more.

The CCC, the councils, continue to support the Magnuson Act as the appropriate way to be developing fishing regulations, even that apply in sanctuaries, and so, through a motion, we kind of doubled-down on that position that's been held for a long time.

Updates on the Endangered Species Act, MREP, habitat, what they've been working on, and our CMOD, which is the Council Member Ongoing Development, and it's the training process to get council members together, and so we're hoping to have the second one in 2025. The North Pacific will be hosting it, and they will report out in October on their theme and what the costs and such will be, and so, once we get a theme, our process is to then reach out to you guys and see who has expertise and interest in that theme and send a contingent that's likely to be say four council members and a staff person that will go out there. That concludes the quick update of the CCC, and, as I said, there is far more detail, and a multi, multi-page report that will be available probably in a few weeks.

DR. BELCHER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, John, and a question for you, and maybe actually for Andy, but I see where the councils report on conservation areas basically said 648 areas, covering more than 72 percent, or nearly 3.4 million square miles, of federal waters, and so who has to validate that, so that it ends up being incorporated into the overall national atlas, I guess, that's going to determine whether we're meeting our 30 percent goal, or exceeding it?

MR. STRELCHECK: Good question. I don't know who is going to validate that, but what I can say is we really do appreciate the great work the councils have done, right, to put that document together and help to continue to inform that process, right, and so I think the key still is kind of how is that conservation definition being defined, and what constitutes conservation relative to that 72 percent that's been identified by the councils.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions for John? Okay. Amazingly, we've caught up, and so I'm going to look to my committee chairs, and Snapper Grouper comes to mind, and the question I have for you is do we need extra time to talk about things, to close up anything, because what I'm thinking about is, obviously, it's twelve to, and so the time for us to start anything tonight

I don't see, and we're waiting on reports, but the question I have for the group is do we start a half-hour earlier?

Do you need more time? Does anybody feel like they need more time? Okay. So then we'll stick with the 8:30 start for tomorrow, to wrap-up what we have, which is committee reports, the workplan, and discuss upcoming meetings. Okay, and so, again, thank you everybody, and we'll recess until 8:30 tomorrow.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on June 15, 2023.)

- - -

JUNE 16, 2023

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the World Golf Village Renaissance, St. Augustine, Florida, on Friday, June 16, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Good morning. Welcome, everyone, to Friday, the final day for the June 2023 council meeting, and we have committee reports today, and we'll discuss the workplan and other upcoming meetings, and so we'll start off with the report for Full Council I. This is the closed session, and so we'll have some motions that we'll need to make, as far as appointments coming out of committees.

We started off with a legal briefing, and Monica Smit-Brunello, NOAA GC, briefed the council on MSA requirements addressing closed-session records, and the council is required to report the outcomes of closed-session discussions and to take final actions on some topics in open sessions. Council session minutes are not required, and, in response, the council made a motion to discontinue recording closed-session discussions, and so the motion was move to discontinue recording of the closed-session discussions, and it was unanimously approved.

System Management Plan Workgroup and advisory panel appointments, the council reviewed applications for the SMP Workgroup and several APs. Applicants for the open seats were advertised following the March 2023 council meeting, and both new and applicants on file were presented for consideration, and so, at this point, we'll need a motion. Correct, John, because these are recommendations?

What we'll need from the group is for the motion to be made to appoint individuals in the following workgroups, and we've got the SMP Workgroup was appointing Jot Owens to the North Carolina recreational seat on the SMP Workgroup. Habitat Protection and Ecosystem was appointing Dr. Brendan Runde to the Habitat AP. Reappoint Jeff Soss, who is a South Carolina charter, to the Habitat AP and reappoint Thomas Jones, Georgia recreational, for a one-year term on the AP.

Appoint Tracy Dunn to the Law Enforcement AP, and Joshua Burton also. Appoint Kevin Aman and Edward Olsen to the Mackerel Cobia AP. Appoint Nancy Jones, Jody Shirley, Tom Willis, and Stephen Morrison the Shrimp AP.

In Snapper Grouper, we were reappointing Vincent Bonura, Andrew Fish, Chris Militello, Jack Cox, Robert Freeman, Chris Kimrey. Tony Constant, and Harry Morales. We're appointing Chris Conklin, Joe Matthews, Robert Hallett, and John Polston to the Snapper Grouper AP. With that, do we have a motion? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Carolyn. **I would like to make a motion that add Kathy Knowlton from Georgia to the Recreational Permitting Technical Advisory Panel, to include in this suite of AP appointments, if this is the proper time to do that.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so Spud was wondering if the timing was right to ask about appointing Kathy Knowlton to the rec AP, to the Rec Permitting AP, and so, at the rec was involved initially -- That group was focused on talking about the different surveys that are supplementing, augmenting of MRIP, and so the states that are currently sitting there are represented for North Carolina, Florida, and South Carolina, and Georgia has not had experience with that, and so, at the time, we were not engaged on that, but, now that we're moving into something involving process, we don't have representation on that group, and Kathy has had a longstanding history with working through -- Up through all the iterations of MRIP, and so, for the state --

Plus, her role with the state is very much involved with a lot of our legislative and legal components of what we do, and so Kathy kind of fits that bill for us, and so that's why we're asking for that appointment at this time. Do we have a second for that? It's seconded from Trish. Any discussion or questions? Mel.

MR. BELL: I am not a Roberts snob, but, just for wonkiness, I mean, it's kind of two separate motions, and are you just making that as one motion now? It doesn't matter, and I --

DR. BELCHER: I guess that's -- I guess that's a good question, and that's why I was looking for procedure guidance.

MR. BELL: We could go ahead and do that or something.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so let's go ahead, and we'll go back to the original, and we'll hold this. So back to the original, which was the list that I read in, through Chris Conklin and Robert Hallett. That was what came out of committee one, and so let's vote on that motion first.

MR. BELL: **I would make that motion for you, just as you read it.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so Mel is making that motion. Tom is seconding that, and so any further discussion on the APs, as we suggested? Okay. **Seeing that, motion has been put down.** Now we'll come back to Spud's motion, and apologies for that, which would be to appoint Kathy Knowlton to the Recreational Permitting Advisory Panel. Do I have a second? Trish. Okay, and so is there further discussion or questions? **Seeing none, that has also passed.** Okay.

Moving on. we have the Wreckfish AP and Golden Crab AP structure, and the council reviewed options for the structure of these two advisory panels and provided the following recommendations, and so, from the group, I'm going to need -- I will read the motion in, and then we can work from there.

So the motion is to approve the structure of the Wreckfish AP as follows, with the addition of a seat representing a dealer, and approve the Golden Crab AP as presented. The Wreckfish Advisory Panel is all current ITQ members (eight seats now, but could expand with new entrants into the fishery), one commercial snapper grouper fisherman (non-ITQ, possible Snapper Grouper AP member), one recreational snapper grouper fisherman with deepwater fishing experience, one law enforcement representative, possibly from the LE AP, with a total of eleven seats.

The structure for the Golden Crab Advisory Panel was all current permit holders, which are eleven permits currently, held by six individuals, and the permit is limited-access; two historical seats for past permit holders, as requested by the Golden Crab AP; one science seat, which is historically represented, possibly a deepwater coral scientist from the Coral AP, which gives us a total of nine seats, a maximum of fourteen if the permits were spread out. Does someone want to make that motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: I would make that motion just as you read it.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Is there a second? Laurilee. Any further discussion? Okay. The motion passes. Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team, a motion is appoint Kerry Marhefka as the SAFMC representative to the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team. Do I have someone willing to make that motion? Tim. Do I have second? Tom. Any further discussion? Okay. That motion passes.

Scientific and Statistical Committee appointments, the motion would be to reappoint Walter Bublely from South Carolina DNR, Amy Schueller with NOAA Fisheries, Jie Cao from North Carolina State University, and Fred Scharff, with the University of North Carolina Wilmington, to the SSC. Additionally, we would appoint Jason Walsh to the socioeconomic-designated seat of the SSC and to the Socioeconomic Panel and appoint Steve Turner and Christina Package-Ward to the SSC. Do I have someone willing to make that motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: So moved.

DR. BELCHER: Is there a second? Kerry. Any further discussion? Any objection? Okay. The motion carries. Next, we discussed the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award, and the recommendation, to be considered as a motion, is to present the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year 2022 Award to both nominees, Officer Jason Dozier from South Carolina DNR and Officer Matt Tsiklistas from Georgia DNR Law Enforcement. Do I have someone willing to make that motion? Mel. Is there a second? Kerry. Any further discussion? Any objection? Okay. The motion carries.

SEDAR 89, South Atlantic tilefish, topical working group appointments, a motion, or a recommendation, was to appoint Brent Winner to replace Kevin Thompson as the FWC

representative for SEDAR 89. Do we have anybody for that motion? Kerry. Do we have a second? Mel. Any further discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

Behind that, we have direction to staff. The council discussed the current advisory panel policy regarding meeting attendance and other requirements and provided the following direction to staff: committee chairs will provide a letter to each AP reminder members of the AP policy and participation requirements approved in March of 2023; staff will include AP policy meeting requirements with individual upcoming AP announcements; a letter from the Mackerel Committee Chair will be sent to AP members reminding them of upcoming issues to be addressed by the AP, the importance of obtaining their input on these issues, and the AP policy meeting requirements approved in March of 2023.

We have down for a draft motion to accept the timing and tasks, and those are as stated here, and it's send notification letters to the appointees and email notifications to those not selected by June 30, 2023; conduct an orientation of new AP members by the September 2023 council meeting; advertise for open seats on advisory panels, the SSC, and SEP, as needed, following the September 2023 council meeting. Do I have someone willing to make that? Mel. Do I have a second? Kerry. Is there further discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

We then had a later evening closed session meeting, on Tuesday, June 13, of 2023, and, in the closed session held under MSA Section 302(i)(3)(B) on June 13, 2023, the council discussed a letter received regarding health care reimbursement provisions for retired council employees. The council reviewed the letter and revisited the discussions on this topic held in a closed session at the March 2023 meeting. A motion was made to reconsider the council's March 2023 decision to discontinue the post-retirement healthcare benefit, and the motion was not approved. With that, that is the end of our closed session report. Any questions or further discussion or comments from the group on that? Okay. Give me one second to pull up the open session.

Then we went into the open session, and we approved the agenda for the meeting and the minutes from March 2023. We received reports from NOAA Law Enforcement, state agencies, and council liaisons on current activities, and we received a presentation on a Highly Migratory Species update, on the amendments that they're working on, which included Amendment 15, the advance notice of public -- I never get that right. The public ruling, and it covers options to convert commercial paper logbooks to electronic logbooks.

Amendment 16 considers a range of options to modify commercial and recreational shark fishing management measures, based on their revised catch levels for some shark stocks implemented through Amendment 14, and their comment periods for both the ANPR and Amendment 16 are open until August 18 of 2023.

We had draft guidance to staff to provide guidance to prepare a comment letter for Amendment 16 to support the measures that would increase shark catches and expand markets for shark meat, and so apparently this is a question back to the group, as to what guidance are we giving to staff relative to prepping this letter for Amendment 16 for HMS. Mel.

MR. BELL: Given the timing of it, is this one that -- Or was it a different one that, if we had anything that we wanted to point out, or ask about, because, I mean, it's going to come from you.

DR. BELCHER: Right.

MR. BELL: But if we had any -- If members had anything we wanted to route that way, we would need to get it to staff by a certain time, I guess, if we want to do it that way.

DR. BELCHER: I will let Myra answer that.

MS. BROUWER: Right, and, since the deadline for this one is fastly approaching, that's why we figured we would capture any comments that you all had here, and we could send -- You know, assemble it and send a draft letter to Carolyn, for her to approve, and whoever else, and so that was the intent, and, you know, there was some discussion the other day, and we just couldn't quite recall all of the comments, and so we wanted to see if you all had some more bullets that you wanted us to get started with.

DR. BELCHER: Mel.

MR. BELL: Well, the obvious dilemma we have is, you know, we hear about shark depredation an awful lot, and I'm not saying it's the solution, but, you know, you would think being able to utilize -- To work the shark fishery as much as you could would be the right direction, and so maybe we would encourage them to consider all opportunities to expand, you know, the ability of folks to be able to harvest sharks, and that's kind of a no-brainer, I guess, but -- And I realize they're constrained, but we hear about it, from our fishermen, related to impacts on our fisheries, and that would seem -- In people's minds, that's kind of an obvious solution, and so maybe we would encourage them to explore all opportunities to do that, to expand the shark fishery. Beyond that, I'm not sure what else we could do.

DR. BELCHER: My apologies, because I did miss the Amendment 15 language in there too, which was about the spatial modifications, and those comments are due on September 15, and so I know that one was more -- Having been at the ASMFC meeting, and Erika Burgess had brought up comments about the change of the area scoped, especially in the South Atlantic Bight, and so that would be something too that I think we would need to talk about here. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: When you talk about shark depredation, does that also include destroying the shrimpers nets, or do we want to add another sentence about the impact to the shrimp fishery, because there is two different things going on. They are killing the shrimpers. They rip open their nets, and the shrimp all go out, and it takes them hours to fix the nets, and so, on the shark depredation, it is also impacting both the commercial industry and the recreational industry, and so if you want to add a few more words, and it is devastating to both industries. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The part about spatial management, I was hoping that we could comment on that as well, and so I know the council has previous comment letters about this, and we're definitely going to be commenting on that as well, at FWC, but I would love to comment on the spatial management piece, too.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments from folks on those amendments? Does that help, Myra? Do we need anything more, or are we good to go? Okay. The Commercial Electronic Logbook

Amendment, council staff reviewed progress on the amendment since the March 2023 council meeting, and the draft document is being completed. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center has provided cost estimates for development of the program and maintenance, and the administrative effects section has been drafted. The RIR and other portions of the amendment will be drafted based on cost estimates provided.

Public hearings will be held via webinar in late July or early August, doing them separate from the Gulf Council, but looking to get Southeast Fisheries Science Center participation to demo the software and be there to address technical questions about the workings of the program and implementation. Staff will ensure the Mid-Atlantic Council is aware of the hearings, so they can encourage fishermen who have permits in the Greater Atlantic Region and the Southeast to attend. Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff developed a presentation on the coastal logbook program and a demonstration of the eTRIPS software.

We have a draft motion to request the Fisheries Science Center staff participate in public hearings for the commercial electronic logbook amendment. Would somebody like to make that motion? Okay. I've got Mel. It's seconded by Kerry. Any further discussion? John Walter.

DR. WALTER: Thanks. One thing that I'm always a little concerned about is when staff are directed to do things that we haven't budgeted for, and so I know that we've often had industry participation also, and they've helped demonstrate the software other times, and so maybe there is some -- That could be broadened, because I can't guarantee that we can send staff to all of those meetings.

DR. BELCHER: Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thanks, John, and we were envisioning maybe three webinar meetings, and so it would be a couple of hours in the evening, and so that's the request, and it shouldn't be a very big time commitment.

DR. WALTER: Okay. Then that helps a lot with that. Okay. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks. I guess maybe a question as well to John Walter, and I know industry representatives that have developed the software are kind of an important aspect to this, and would they also be invited, or need to participate in these discussions, and would it be appropriate to be inviting them as well?

DR. BELCHER: John, did you have an answer for that?

DR. WALTER: Yes, and I think that would be the vendors who provide the software application, and I think, if they were to come, that would really be helpful too, because then some of the really technical, specific questions could be answered directly from the source, and so I certainly would say extending that invitation to them, should they choose, would be great, and they have usually wanted to work -- They've been very amenable to wanting to work with us. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that. Further comments? Kerry. Okay. All right. **Any opposition to the motion? Okay. That motion passes as well.** Do you need anything additionally from your end, Myra, or direction to staff? Okay. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: While we're on this electronic logbook, may I also request that, at the next meeting, perhaps we get an update on the backend issues that were happening with NOAA Permits, and we're still not getting -- You're still not able to make an efficient FOIA request for the permits files that we all use often, and I believe there were some other issues, and I would just like a brief update on where we are with that, if possible.

MS. BROUWER: Are you requesting this for the September meeting or just to have that information available for the public hearings?

MS. MARHEFKA: No, and I would like -- The September meeting would be great, if we could just get a quick update.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so any other further direction there, or comments for Myra for staff? All right. We also had the SAFMC research recommendation discussion, and council staff presented the 2023 to 2027 South Atlantic research and monitoring plan, including revisions by the SSC and various advisory panels.

Staff and council developed a list and prioritized the monitoring items, which are highlighted in the revised research and monitoring plan. The council recommended highlighting the need for socioeconomic information on the headboat fishery, changing the years for the assessment section, and highlighting the need for research on a regime shift for red snapper and winter-spawning species. Staff also revised two research recommendations, which are highlighted in yellow below, and the language for that was to develop a socioeconomic profile of commercial and recreational participants involved in council-managed fisheries, which included a list of commercial captain and crew, for-hire captain and crew, and the highlighted section included private, charter, or headboat anglers, et cetera. The second bullet is develop a socioeconomic profile and economic impact model for the South Atlantic headboat component of the for-hire sector, with the highlighted section being "socioeconomic profile" as an add-in.

The revised document will be posted on the council's website, and we currently have a draft motion to approve the 2023 to 2027 South Atlantic Fishery Management Council research and monitoring plan, as modified. Is someone willing to make that motion? Spud. Do I have a second? Mel. Is there further discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion passes.** Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff provided an update on activities related to the 2021 to 2025 research and monitoring plan, and that ends the report from our Full Council session. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: I'm so sorry, but there was an addition on the report that wasn't posted on the website this morning, and so it's up on the screen.

DR. BELCHER: You're going to make me do my eye test now.

MS. BROUWER: This is something that came up in response to the motion that was given under Other Business, offered under Other Business, in the Snapper Grouper Committee, and so we were

thinking that that would be a good thing to include in the research plan, and so we put in here some draft additions for you all to consider.

DR. BELCHER: Okay.

MS. BROUWER: Here comes Chip to talk about it.

DR. COLLIER: Just real quick, the reason that we included the evaluate the changing the way the council applies -- It would be good to have that developed for some of the species that we manage, so that we can see exactly how it's going to play out and be evaluated, but, in order to do that, we also felt like we needed an evaluation of the discard logbook, to know the time series of when we feel like the discards are valid, in order to have a total kill, where it's an accurate number, and that's why you see that second bullet to evaluate the commercial discard logbook program.

DR. BELCHER: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Maybe just a little bit more clarification on what -- When you say "evaluate the logbook", I mean, you're just talking about looking at the subset that was selected for discards and reviewing what they turned in?

DR. COLLIER: No, and we're looking at to determine the time series to consider for developing allocations of total removals, and so what we're trying to do is figure out -- We've heard, quite frequently, that there is some issues with the discard logbook, the increased frequency of the number of zero trips with -- Or the number of trips with zero discards, and so is there a time series when we feel like it's a good estimation of discards.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so I will read the rest of the report in then. Those additions are evaluating changing the way the council applies allocation percentages to the ABC in calculating sector ACLs, which basically, with the bullet associated with that, is allocating total removals and then subtracting sector-specific dead discards to provide sector ACLs. Also added was to evaluate the commercial discard logbook program to determine a time series to consider for developing allocation of the total removals.

I guess that's added in, and we're good to go, and we don't have to revisit the motion. With that, again, I submit the report from our Full Council session, and we'll move into the report coming out of the Citizen Science Committee, and so Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: All right. Let's see. The Citizen Science Committee met on Monday, June 12, and the committee approved the June 2023 Citizen Science Committee meeting agenda and transcript from the June 2022 meeting. We reviewed the citizen science project portal tool, and staff provided an overview of the citizen science project portal that is being developed as an online tool to gather citizen science project ideas from stakeholders.

The portal will be monitored by staff and include a feedback mechanism to follow-up with stakeholders that submit ideas. The information gathered through the tool will be compiled and

considered when updating citizen science research priorities. It could also help connect fishermen and scientists with similar citizen science research interests.

Staff presented the draft questions included in the online tool. The committee recommended the following edits to the questions. Edit the question on project description to read: "Provide a brief description of the project idea and how it would improve conservation and management (about five to seven sentences)." Add the following questions: Do you have support for this project idea from any organizations, and have you submitted this project idea through another venue, for example grant proposal?

The committee provided the following guidance to staff: target keeping the online tool open year-round but consider closing for time periods if the number of submissions presents a challenge for staff; consider incorporating the Citizen Science Operations Committee into the review process; consider making project idea submissions available on the website; keep expectation management in mind when launching this tool; implementing this tool could provide an opportunity to launch the project endorsement plan outlined in the citizen science SOPPS; having an inventory of citizen science projects available in the South Atlantic region could be helpful, so stakeholders could be connected if projects underway are similar to their submissions.

The following motion was made. The motion was to adopt the citizen science project idea portal online tool for use, with modifications, as suggested. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any questions? Any objections? Hearing none, that motion carries.

Finally, the Citizen Science Program Update, staff provided, again, one of the fastest overviews that can be given on citizen science programs and the project activities highlighting current efforts on the SAFMC Release project, upcoming FISHstory scanning nights that will be held this fall, an overview of the program evaluation work being conducted by Rick Bonney, Jennifer Sweeney-Tookes, Tracy Yandle, and Bryan Fluech. We had nothing under Other Business, but I believe Julia, really quick, wanted to point out that we do need -- We have some upcoming appointments that are going to need to be made, and so, Julia, I will let you --

MS. BYRD: Thanks, Kerry. Yes, and I just wanted to give you guys a heads-up that our Citizen Science Operations Committee -- Their appointments were five years, and so their appointment terms will be up kind of this summer, and so we'll be looking for you guys to make appointments, or reappointments, to that group at the December meeting, and so I just wanted to give you all a heads-up on that, and so we'll be advertising for those positions later this fall.

MS. MARHEFKA: Madam Chairwoman, that concludes my report.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Kerry. Next, we have the Mackerel Cobia Committee report, and so Tom.

MR. ROLLER: All right, and so the Mackerel Committee met on June 13, 2023, and the first thing we did was approve the minutes from the March 2023 meeting and the agenda. The first item of business is we went over the Atlantic Spanish mackerel stock assessment, SEDAR 78. At the March 2023 council meeting, the council discussed a letter from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center stating that the revisions to SEDAR 78 requested by the SSC in January are

exploratory in nature and require extensive rework. As such, they cannot be accomplished in a timely fashion.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center recommended the SSC develop ABC advice based on the current assessment. The SSC met again in April 2023 and determined that the SEDAR 78 was sufficient for providing stock status and for providing catch level recommendations using model output, but not projections. Dr. Jeff Buckel provided the committee details of the SSC discussion and catch level recommendations relative to Atlantic Spanish mackerel.

The committee discussed how to move forward with an amendment to address the new catch level recommendations and possible modifications to management measures for Atlantic Spanish mackerel. The committee directed staff to begin work on a framework amendment to update catch levels, but to hold off on development of a full plan amendment to address management measures until after mackerel port meetings have been completed.

We have a motion here from the committee, which was to direct staff to begin a framework amendment to update Atlantic Spanish mackerel catch levels based on SEDAR 78 and SSC recommendations. The committee approved that motion, and so is there any objections to that motion? On behalf of the committee, I so move. That motion is approved.

The next item of business was the Mackerel Advisory Panel Report. The Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel met on April 21st, 2023, via webinar. The AP Chair, Ira Laks, provided a summary of advisory panel discussion and recommendations. The committee noted the importance of AP member attendance, given the critical topics that will be presented to the AP for discussion at upcoming meetings. The importance of attendance will be noted prior to and during the fall AP meeting.

The next item was Mackerel Port Meetings. Based on recommendations from the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel, the council directed staff to begin work on a plan to conduct port meetings for king and Spanish mackerel to gain a comprehensive understanding of the fisheries to improve management efforts. Staff presented a discussion document for the council to review the current CMP FMP goals and objectives, port meeting goals and objectives, draft timeline, and proposed planning team.

The committee provided the following input: gather more information on CMP FMP Objective 6, which is to minimize waste and bycatch in the fishery, during port meetings; discuss why king or Spanish mackerel may be discarded by each sector and how stakeholders would like discards to be considered in management; do not present Objective 5 (Atlantic Spanish mackerel allocations) during port meetings, because it requests the use of data that is no longer supported, and it is the council's intent to remove the objective during the next update.

We added the following to the goals and objectives for port meetings: identification of underserved communities and equity and environmental justice concerns; consideration of interjurisdictional management and cooperation with other councils and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Also, consider whether the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission may be beneficial partners if port meetings are conducted throughout the Gulf of Mexico. The direction to staff is do not bring Objective 5 out for discussion during port meetings, as it is no longer a

viable objective. Also, establish a port meeting planning team, as described in the discussion document.

Our next item was King Mackerel Tournament Landings. At their December 2022 meeting, the council requested NMFS provide information on king and Spanish mackerel tournament landings over the last ten years and how those landings were accounted for against the annual catch limit. The Science Center worked with the state agencies to provide these landings and present them to the council.

The committee provided the following input, and the committee would like more information on what charities are receiving money through the sale of donated tournament fish. Stakeholders have expressed concerns to the committee about the king mackerel stock and the role tournaments may be playing in fishery. The committee requested that the Mackerel Cobia AP discuss these tournaments, their importance to communities, and how the sale of fish from these tournaments affects their fishing activities.

The next item was Topics for the Fall Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel Meeting. The Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel is going to be scheduled to meet in Charleston, South Carolina this fall, for I believe a day-and-a-half meeting, in-person.

The committee approved the following topics for discussion: Atlantic Spanish mackerel catch level recommendations; mackerel port meetings; king mackerel tournament landings; a citizen science update; and an Atlantic king mackerel fishery performance report update. The committee also noted that the fall meeting may be an appropriate time for the ASMFC's Spanish Mackerel AP to meet jointly with the council's Mackerel Cobia AP.

In Other Business, I don't think we had any, and so the last thing we have to do is our timing and tasks, and I want everyone to read that. Do I need to read it in, or does someone want to make a motion? I am going to read the timing and tasks.

The motion is to adopt the following timing tasks: 1) begin work on a framework amendment to update Atlantic Spanish mackerel catch levels based on SEDAR 78 and SSC recommendations; 2) continue development of port meetings, including organizing a planning team to facilitate collaboration with other councils and commissions; 3) convene an in-person meeting of the Mackerel Cobia AP this fall to discuss the topics listed above and note the importance of attendance. Would anybody like to make that motion?

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Mel. Spud, did you second that? **Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing no objection, the motion passes.** With that, I conclude my report.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Tom. Moving on, we have Dolphin Wahoo and Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thank you. The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met this week, on Tuesday, June 13, and we approved the minutes from our last meeting and the agenda. We discussed a summary of the dolphin management strategy evaluation stakeholder workshops, and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is conducting a management strategy evaluation for the Atlantic dolphin fishery.

The goal of this project is to develop an index-based management procedure that may provide catch level and management advice that best achieves the multiple operational management objectives of the fishery. As part of the MSE process, the Science Center staff and council staff conducted stakeholder workshops along the U.S. east coast to gather feedback on dolphin management and regional aspects of the dolphin fishery. Science Center staff briefed the committee on summary feedback gathered during the stakeholder workshops and provided an update on progress of the MSE.

The next item were actions that happened in the Caribbean, and the Caribbean Fishery Management Council has recently developed management actions for the commercial and recreational dolphin fishery for the U.S. EEZ in their region. NMFS Regional Office staff provided an update on the Caribbean Council's recent actions, including the specifications of the management measures, catch levels, and effective dates of the associated regulations.

We then moved into discussing Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 3. Per guidance received at the June 2022 council meeting, this amendment includes measures that would extend the applicable range of the twenty-inch fork length minimum size limit for dolphin, modify recreational retention limits for dolphin, and remove the captain and crew bag limits for dolphin.

Council staff reviewed the committee's previous guidance on draft actions and facilitated a discussion of the committee's plans for developing Regulatory Amendment 3. The committee had a comprehensive discussion on the timing of moving forward with Regulatory Amendment 3 and potentially integrating the findings of the MSE into management.

Upon completion of this discussion, the committee made the following motion to delay development of Reg Amendment 3 until the dolphin MSE report is available or until the December 2024 council meeting, whichever is earlier. Request an update on the MSE at the December 2023 and June 2024 council meetings, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? With one objection, and any other objection? Hearing none, the motion passes twelve to one.

Under Other Business, the committee noted numerous public comments that they have received on regional declines in dolphin availability and the quality of dolphin fishery. Given the extensive migratory range of the species, the committee provided the following direction to staff to gather information on potential sources of declines in the availability of dolphin and efforts to collectively manage dolphin regionally and internationally.

As direction to staff, we decided to reach out to the appropriate management agencies to identify potential sources of declines in the availability of dolphin. Report back to the council on findings of these efforts as well as efforts to collectively manage the dolphin fishery in the western Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico.

We made the following motion for timing and tasks, and the motion is: 1) request that Science Center provide an update on the progress of the dolphin MSE at the December 2023 and June 2024 meeting; 2) prepare Regulatory Amendment 3 for review at the December 2024 meeting or an earlier meeting if the dolphin MSE report is available; 3) report back to the council on findings of efforts to collectively manage the dolphin fishery in the Western

Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico, as well as potential sources of declines in the availability of dolphin. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion is approved. That concludes my report. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Kerry. Moving on, we have the Snapper Grouper report and Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. All right. The committee approved the minutes from the March 2023 meeting and the agenda for the June 2023 meeting, and staff presented a table summarizing the progress on council-approved amendments, which will be included in the agenda overview for future council meetings, and the committee recommended that this be included on the council website.

Then the committee moved into wreckfish, which is Snapper Grouper Amendment 48, and a review of this wreckfish ITQ program was completed in 2019 and included recommendations, and then, at the March 2023 meeting, the council requested that staff bring back options for maintaining monitoring without the offloading site and time requirements, including a possible hail-in/hail-out requirement, and NMFS provided a presentation on monitoring options for the fishery, and staff presented a decision document for the committee to discuss, and the Snapper Grouper AP chair provided a summary of comments and motions on the wreckfish fishery.

Modernizing this wreckfish ITQ program continues to be a complex process, and, to help facilitate continued development of Amendment 48, the committee proposed establishing a wreckfish subcommittee and an ad hoc wreckfish advisory group.

The committee made Motion Number 1 to create an ad hoc wreckfish advisory group, consisting of the current shareholders, for the purpose of discussing Snapper Grouper Amendment 48. A wreckfish advisory panel will be created, as directed by the council, in June of 2023, through the existing AP process. Appointments for this AP will be made in December of 2023. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion passes.

The committee then made Motion Number 2, which is to establish an ad hoc council wreckfish subcommittee to continue development of Amendment 48. The wreckfish subcommittee will report to the Snapper Grouper Committee during regularly-scheduled meetings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? All right. That motion passes.

There was also additional direction to staff to convene a meeting of this wreckfish advisory group and the wreckfish subcommittee prior to September of 2023, and then we talked about SAFE reports, and they are required through National Standard 2, and these will be serving as regular updates to the SSC and the council to aid in discussing the condition of the stock and the potential need for adjusting current management measures. Staff presented information included in the SAFE report and highlighted some of the findings.

Then the committee went into yellowtail snapper, which is Snapper Grouper Amendment 48 and Reef Fish Amendment 55, and so this amendment considers modifying the jurisdictional allocations between the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic regions, modifying the South Atlantic

annual catch limit and annual optimum yield, and the Gulf of Mexico annual catch limit, in response to the most recent stock assessment. The committee reviewed AP and SSC feedback and a decision document and discussed the following.

Under Action 1, we talked about the current jurisdictional allocations were calculated with landings that included a coding issue in the Tortugas region, and this issue doesn't affect the assessment results or the landings used in the Amendment 44 calculations, and so there was direction to staff to have the IPT recalculate the jurisdictional allocation with the revised landings and then adjust the suite of alternatives to include the corrected allocation percentages as well as include the 80 percent/20 percent split that was suggested by the Snapper Grouper AP.

There was more discussion about this, including more discussion about the 80/20 split, and then an updated decision document, with these values, with some of these values, including the 80/20 split, was provided, but we'll receive another update on this at the next council meeting.

Then the council went into scamp and yellowmouth grouper, which is Snapper Grouper Amendment 55, and this amendment considers -- It's in response to SEDAR 68, and it will be establishing a new scamp and yellowmouth grouper complex, modifying the other shallow-water grouper complex, and establishing the following for the new scamp and yellowmouth complex: stock determination criteria, a rebuilding schedule, catch limits, and accountability measures. The council also reviewed SSC and AP feedback and a decision document.

Then we provided direction to staff under multiple actions here, and so, under Action 2, adding alternatives for equilibrium OY. Under Action 3, the SSC will review additional OFL projections during their July SSC meeting and provide additional guidance to the council at the September meeting. Allie, do we need to talk about this requesting additional guidance on the timing of Tmax? Can I pass it over to you guys?

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and I think we were just kind of wanting to get a little bit more clear timeline on when we would have those values, and I think that kind of plays in, a little bit, to the IPT's ability to kind of calculate through the rest of the document, and so I guess I'm looking to get some more clarification on that.

DR. WALTER: We're not confident that we're going to be able to provide a Tmax that's scientifically defensible, and I think you covered that, and we're going to try to see what we can provide, and, now that we have the timing, that it's needed for the July SSC meeting, I think we're going to need to work in between that time to determine what we can provide and what would be a scientifically-defensible reference point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, John. Andy has his hand up. Andy, if you're talking, we can't hear you. Kelly says to enter your PIN again.

MR. KLASNICK: Andy, if you can try switching to computer audio, that might be better.

MR. STRELCHECK: Sorry about that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy, did you have something that you wanted to add here about this Tmax discussion? If you're talking, we can't hear you. Maybe you could work with council staff, after

the meeting, and not about your un-muting problems, but about the Tmax problems. Andy, do you want to try one more time?

MR. STRELCHECK: No, and I'm going to give up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We still can't hear you. It looks like you muted yourself. All right, Andy, and we're going to move on. All right. We're going to move into -- Well, Allie, is there anything else that you need on that discussion of Tmax? Okay. All right. Action 4 there, there was some direction to staff to examine the remaining other shallow-water grouper species, which is red hind, rock hind, coney, graysby, yellowfin, and consider the process for designating them as ecosystem component species within Amendment 55, and, if the species in this complex are not designated as ecosystem component species, then the ABC, ACL, OY, allocations, and sector ACLs will be updated to include FES recreational estimates within this amendment.

Under Action 5, there was direction to staff to add an option that allocates the reduction in catch level proportion to each sector's recent landings, similar to the method used in Amendment 53, and add an option that bases allocations based on the recent years of landings, and I see it's highlighted, and I am going to pass it back to you, Allie.

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and so I wanted to know if you guys had a specific range of recent years that you would like, the most recent ten years, if you wanted to use a specific formula or just distribution of landings, and so I wanted to get some more information so the IPT can put together maybe some more tailored options for you guys.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any suggestions? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: This is the share-the-pain-share-the-gain, right?

MS. IBERLE: So you will have a separate share-the-pain-share-the-gain alternative, but then I think there was a separate suggestion to just have something that incorporated recent landings, and so you can have both, and we were just kind of wondering which years -- I guess that begs the question for which years do you want to include in share-the-pain-share-the-gain, and, if you remember, in 53, we used the most recent there and the most recent five of what we originally brought you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I was thinking maybe go back to 2018, or something like that, 2018 forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Allie.

MS. IBERLE: So that would be for the share-the-pain-share-the-gain or you're wanting to see that kind of with both?

MR. GRINER: I was thinking with both.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Okay. I'm going to keep moving on. Action 6, there was direction to staff to add options to mirror the suite of options for the recreational accountability measures,

and Allie has added a table there, and there is some yellow for what are the new options, and do you want to talk about that for a second, Allie?

MS. IBERLE: I know that AMs can get confusing, especially when you're just spelling them out, and so I wanted to make sure that we just took a look at these tables. What is highlighted in yellow is what was added to each action, and so we kind of -- They're going to match pretty well, and the only difference between the two tables is the recreational has the season announcement. We didn't add that to the commercial, and so, I guess, if you want it to be truly matching, then we would add that one as well, but, just looking at kind of the setup of options in your tables and making sure that that's what the council wants.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are we good here? Are folks still studying it? Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I am good here, but I was just going to -- In your Option 4 -- Okay. You caught the -- That's it. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I had to go back and look at something, and is it okay to go back to the previous discussion regarding share-the-pain-share-the-gain?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and the allocation discussion on the previous action.

MR. ROLLER: I am just not completely comfortable going from 2018 onwards to look at that. I mean, if you look at that, the catches were so depressed at that point in time, particularly recreationally, and I just think it may be helpful to go back maybe five years previous, and I don't want to include more work, but I just think the fishery looks so different from 2008 onward, from 2018 onward. I am just looking for suggestions, and I know that's -- I am trying to remember back to gag and how we did it.

MS. IBERLE: Again, you can always add more options, or whittle things down, as we go, and so, if you want to do five years, to go back five more years, I think, as an additional option, and, again, if it seems bulky, we can always kind of --

MR. ROLLER: As long as -- But I'm also looking to you, and I don't want to increase workload, you know, intensively, but, if we're going to do that, I would like to at least go back another five years, to look at that for another option.

MS. IBERLE: The share-the-pain-share-the-gain, once you have it set up, it's pretty easy to kind of tell it to give you different year ranges, but you just have to -- I think that should be fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I mean, the whole point is to characterize the most recent time series, and this is kind of where we get ourselves into a problem, is we keep going back too far, and so, although I hear what you're saying, I think, at the same time, the whole point of this is to get the most -- To get a very good handle on where the fishery is today. I think we've got to be careful about going

back too far, and I think, you know, we get ourselves in this problem of always trying to go back and use a time series that is so far back that it's not reflective of where we are today. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Why don't we look at both, and then we can make that decision once we see all that in the document? Okay. I see thumbs-up. All right. Back to Tom.

MR. ROLLER: That was my point, is I just want to see, because I agree with Tim that we do need to look at the characterization of the fishery as it is currently for management, but it's kind of helpful to see a little bit of the history, and I don't think going back an extra five years is going too far into the distant past, and I offer that just to see what things would look like in terms of an allocation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks for that discussion, and it looks like we're capturing that there on the screen. All right. Are we good here? We've had some discussion on this Action 6 table, which is the commercial accountability measures, and are we all good here? Okay. I see heads nodding yes. All right, and so then, in Action 7, there was direction to staff to add the status quo option under Action 7, and so we have a new table here, and I'm going to pass it to Allie to walk us through the new alternatives in this table.

MS. IBERLE: Kind of the same thing with the commercial action, and we were just trying to match these up a little bit better between commercial and recreational, and so this is the current scamp status quo recreational AM, and so we provided that, and then those two options that you've been seeing, or the annually will end the season announcement and then the two options that you've kind of been seeing recently in some of the other snapper grouper amendments, and so just trying to match this up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are we good here on this? It looks like people are nodding yes. All right. I'm going to keep moving. **Then the committee made Motion Number 3, which was to approve Amendment 55 for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.** Then it looks like we need to talk about and give guidance to staff on timing and process for conducting scoping hearings, but, first, let's go over to John Walter.

DR. WALTER: Before we leave scamp, I wanted to just follow-up on what Andy was going to follow-up on, because he was able to text it, and the one thing is it does take us a little bit back to Tmax, and I think we also need to revisit the Tmin calculation, because it's based on the assumption of long-term recruitment, and returning to long-term recruitment, and so I think that should also be included there in that revisiting. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so I believe -- Did we actually vote on that motion? Yes, we did, and then so back to Allie about the guidance for staff on timing and process for conducting scoping hearings.

MS. IBERLE: Before we kind of dive into that, again, I wanted to remind there council that there's a lot up in the air, and what we were planning to do was kind of bring this out, specifically to get feedback on kind of a broader scale, not diving into specific actions, like we have been in the past, and so that was kind of a tactic that we were going to take. As far as what we were kind of wanting from you guys, it would be in-person or webinar, and what do you think is more appropriate, and

I know we've got a lot going on right now, and I guess timing is more for us to figure out, but, with that, I will pass it back.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do we need to wait to look at our big sheet of timing of all of those and then kind of think about where this fits in? I mean, I know that we're under a deadline, but do people have thoughts, before we get to that gigantic sheet of work? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Probably the same thing, but we're going to have to scope for black sea bass as well, correct? Okay, and so they're not tracking with each other, because I thought that might be --

UNIDENTIFIED: (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. MARHEFKA: Catch up black sea bass. Okay. Then I think we would have to look at it, and, for scoping, I think a webinar, in this case, specifically because, for this one, it's not like we have management, specific management, issues, and I think a webinar would be fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I think webinar is fine too, and I think what Kerry was trying to do is see if we could pair this up with something else that needed to be scoped via webinar, but I don't know that we can, but I guess let's look at that more when we get to that big, giant sheet, but, yes, it sounds like we're good for webinar. Do you have what you need for now?

MS. IBERLE: Thank you guys so much.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thank you. All right. Next, we talked about the black sea bass stock assessment that indicated that black sea bass are overfished and experiencing overfishing. The SSC Chair presented the SSC's comments on the assessment. However, additional projections were requested by the SSC to develop recommended overfishing limits and acceptable biological catch levels.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center is developing these additional projections and will present them for SSC review in July of 2023, and then council staff presented the fishery overview for black sea bass, and the committee made the following motions and provided the following guidance.

Motion Number 4 is to initiate an amendment process for the black sea bass fishery to respond to the SEDAR 76 stock assessment. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Yes, Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: Andy, Rick, and I were talking about this, and we think perhaps we can do an abbreviated framework for black sea bass, just to adjust the ACL, and then that would allow us to -- You know, we announce the recreational season in April of each year, and we can project what the season would be and close the commercial when that ACL is met, but we'll talk about that further internally.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That sounds great. Thank you, Jack. Any more discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Then there is some bullets there about additional changes to black sea bass management could include

consideration of changes to allocation, reducing the recreational bag limit, and designating on-demand gear as an allowable gear in the FMP, and there is some desire to change catch levels for 2024. Additional discussion is necessary to determine whether and how this could be accomplished, and we heard a little bit about that from Jack.

We then got some additional input from the AP, for topics that were not covered under other agenda items, and this is from their April 25 through 27 meeting, and they discussed additional topics, such as the effects of space center operations on Florida fishing activities, and they discussed commercial permitting.

We then went into the private recreational permitting amendment, which is Amendment 46, and this amendment considers establishing a private recreational permit and education component for South Atlantic snapper grouper fisheries. The amendment was reviewed by the Snapper Grouper AP in April of 2023, as well as the Snapper Grouper Recreational Permitting and Reporting Technical AP in May of 2023. The respective AP chairs provided summary AP feedback, and then the council staff reviewed the decision document, and the committee provided the following direction to staff and made the following motions.

Direction to staff here is to modify Action 1, to remove Alternative 4, remove Alternative 5, and replace “any” with “all”. Then we moved into Action 2, and we gave direction to remove Alternative 6, add yellowmouth grouper and scamp to the list of assessed species, add an alternative that would apply to all snapper grouper species with a size or bag limit, examine the top species that are harvested, and examine species with low PSEs.

Then we suggested removing Action 3 and incorporating this discussion into Action 1. For Action 4, we suggested adding alternatives where a permit would remain valid from one year of issuance and from the date of birth for the permit holder and then remove Alternative 3. For Action 5, we suggested making sure that alternatives maintain that states may issue their own permit, or license, if it meets the requirements of proposed National Marine Fisheries Service specifications and requests that the IPT provide additional information.

For Action 7, we suggested replacing “angler” with “permit holder”, and, for Action 9, add an alternative for each issuance of permit, add an alternative for every other year from issuance of a permit, and then remove Alternative 3 under Action 9.

Then the committee made Motion Number 5, which was approve the purpose and need statements, as modified, for inclusion in Amendment 46. You can see the changes there on the screen. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any additional discussion? **Is there any objection?** All right. **That motion stands approved.**

Then the committee made Motion Number 6, which was to approve the actions and alternatives, as modified, for inclusion in Amendment 46. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Then there were some updates from staff, including updates on the 2027 sunset of the South Atlantic special management zones established in Snapper Grouper Amendment 36, as well as some updates on best fishing practices outreach, and then the Snapper Grouper Committee went into Other Business, and the committee reiterated and clarified its previous direction to include

consideration of changing the two-for-one permit requirement for commercial permits. Then the committee made Motion Number 7, but do I need to make this motion? Didn't we cover it earlier in the Council Session I, Myra?

MS. BROUWER: I think there was a cut-and-paste of this motion, so that you all would know what the addition to the research plan was about, but I would suggest that you do make it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so Myra is indicating that we do need to make this motion on behalf of the committee. **Motion Number 7 is to evaluate changing the way the council applies allocation percentages to the ABC and calculating sector ACLs. Allocate total removals and subtract sector-specific dead discards to provide sector ACLs. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any additional discussion? Tim.

MR. GRINER: So, when we talked -- I didn't realize we were talking about changing the allocation percentages along with this, and I thought we were just looking at the way we handled the discards.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The motion was about the allocation percentages.

MR. GRINER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to be clear, and so, yes, that was the motion. Any more discussion here? All right. **Any objection?** All right. **That motion is approved.** Go ahead, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Just a little clarification, and the sentence there under Other Business reads that it clarified its previous direction to include the consideration in the amendment that follows the MSE?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you for that clarification.

MR. GRINER: Could you repeat that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: While she's typing it up there, yesterday, we had a discussion, because there was an item under Other Business for the Snapper Grouper AP, where they asked some questions about the two-for-one permit, and so we had a discussion, under Other Business, to recognize what the AP discussed and talk about the timing of when we would discuss that again, and so the discussion ended up that we would discuss the two-for-one requirement in the amendment that follows the completion of the MSE. All right.

There is some bullets there under Motion Number 7, including one about providing staff additional guidance on desired timing and process for evaluating the alternative allocation method, and I'm going to turn it to Myra there, since it's highlighted, or somebody, since it's highlighted.

MS. BROUWER: So Chip left the room, but I guess the intent would be to include this evaluation in the research plan, and then, from then on, I guess, you know, are you guys intending for this to be something that we actively work on, or are you thinking about it, and so just a little more clarification of whether this is like a really long-term thing or whether we need to start really fleshing it out.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am just confused, and, Dewey, you were the motion maker, and we did vote on it, but I guess it went over our heads at the time, because, personally, when I voted on it, I wasn't thinking of it in terms of allocation, and nothing -- Like the whole allocation process would happen after, and it doesn't have to trigger any allocation discussion at all, and it's simply how the ABC is created, or the ACLs are created.

MS. MCCAWLEY: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I understand that, that's one of the reasons that I brought up the allocation, because you have to -- You have to acknowledge that the allocations are based totally on landings, and they are not based on total removals by the sectors, and so, if you had a fishery which had, you know, 90 percent discards, and maybe those discards were a huge proportion of the overall removals from the population, when you start allocating, and you use that total, you know, that fishery could end up with very small allocation of the total removals, though, in fact, based on whenever you set your allocations, that fishery was a major remover from the population, and so you have to account for that when you do something like that.

If you change the basis for how you're going to divide up the fish, you have to stay oranges and oranges. Now, that's another reason why, in thinking about evaluation -- Because none of that presupposes you changing how you do allocations in response to this and deciding that maybe you don't think that those historic time periods are the way to do allocations for the stocks that use those historic time periods.

We may go through this evaluation, and it will have to include looking at the catch data and the discard data, and you may get concerns about the quality of the different data sources back in that historic time period, and climate change and equity and all these things that have developed in the last fifteen years, and think that, you know, there's a whole -- There's a much better way to go into allocating our fishery resources than looking back at whatever outcomes were for like, you know, six council generations prior to us.

You know, I'm maybe sounding a little negative towards using the historical data, but I kind of am, scientifically, because I feel like you're sort of taking the past to guide your future, and I always thought the council should take a more forward look into allocations and, you know, consider a lot of other issues, but, you know, the historic data becomes kind of easy for people to feel like they're justifying it based on what they think was an appropriate time period for some degree, but, you know, I just think you can't necessarily just change the currency that you're going to allocate without changing the allocation, because that was based on a whole other currency.

If you want to achieve the intent of those past historic time periods, we'll need to look into that, but part of the evaluation could be you saying, yes, there's a whole better way to go about these

fisheries, and so we'll have to look at that, and I think we do need to look at the data. We need to look at the different species as well, because we're going to have better information for assessed stocks than for unassessed stocks, you know, and that's something that you're probably going to want to factor into this decision as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Dewey and then Jack.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: My intent was not to go back into the past, and my intent was moving forward into the future and using the best available scientific information available, which seems to rule the day, no matter what the data is, and so it was going forward into the future and not dwelling on the past or looking for reparations of any type or that, but it's into the -- It's as we move forward in this, is what I was looking for. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: Like John said, it's different than anything we've done previously, and perhaps it would be good to bring this to the SSC and get their recommendations on the approach to do this and what they think about it all.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, this is definitely one, but, yes, like we had this one simple idea, right, and you're like, oh, not so simple, which is, of course, how it always goes, and I appreciate that guidance, and, you know, I'm inclined -- I know you're sort of hot-to-trot, and I'm curious what you think, but I'm inclined to really trust staff's guidance on this and let you all set the pace and timing, but knowing that it is important, and it sounds like you all are supportive of exploring this idea, because you've thought about it before, but I am way too green to understand sort of, you know, the demand of time and things that that would take, but that's my opinion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim and then Mel.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I think it's important that we don't get caught up in going too far back and looking at the past, because that seems to be what keeps getting us into problems, but, at the same time, if we're going to trust the data that we have, we've got to trust the data, whether it be discard data or landings, and it is what it is, right, and this -- Although it may be something different for us, this is not a new concept, and this is not something that's not done, and it's done in other councils. Other councils do this exact same thing, and so it shouldn't be a difficulty for the Science Center or staff or anyone else, and this should be, you know, easy to navigate through, or maybe not easy, but it should be able to be navigated through. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say that, the way we worded it, I just assumed that, at some point, we would probably consult the SSC, or have them look at it, since they're our science advisors, just to Jack's point, and it's on there, and so --

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I will also add, since we have the consulting here, to also do the AP, you know, to reach out to the Snapper Grouper AP and see their thoughts on it, since you've got to go

through all the gamut of the different advisory panels or different things like this, so it all gets fleshed out, because this might be something that takes a year or two, or into the -- You know, I just feel like it's going to be a way of the future, one way or the other. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We've had a good discussion on that, and we have already passed that motion, and so then we have a draft timing and tasks motion, and I will read that. **Direct staff to do the following: begin development of an amendment responding to SEDAR 76, which is black sea bass; create an ad hoc wreckfish advisory group comprised of current wreckfish ITQ shareholders and create an ad hoc wreckfish committee to discuss Snapper Grouper Amendment 48; convene a meeting of both groups prior to the September 2023 council meeting; conduct scoping hearings for Amendment 55, which is scamp and yellowmouth; continue developing Amendment 46, which is private recreational permitting, for review at the September 2023 meeting; convene the next meeting of the Snapper Grouper Recreational Permitting and Reporting Technical Advisory Panel; and prepare a Snapper Grouper Amendment 44/Reef Fish Amendment 55, which is yellowtail, document in preparation for the council to select preferred alternatives and approve for public hearings in September of 2023.** Do we have a second to that motion? It's seconded by Mel. It looks like we have hands up for questions under discussion. Kerry and then Tom.

MS. MARHEFKA: **I would like to add a bullet point, if it's okay with the committee, to ask staff to send a letter to the appropriate Coast Guard person requesting cumulative data of the navigational safety zones that were put in place in say 2021 and 2022 regarding the space activity.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I want to consider adding a bullet point, if it's okay, and I want to see if we could ask the AP to discuss limited entry in the snapper grouper for-hire fishery at their next meeting. I can provide some rationale, but I also did yesterday in the committee, in Other Business.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Go ahead there.

MR. ROLLER: You know, obviously, we heard from some respected people in the for-hire industry, asking us to look into this, and it's come up multiple times. You know, it's one of the only discussions of effort that we really haven't had recently, and a lot has changed since it has last come up, in terms of the health of our fisheries, and so I would just like to hear what the AP thinks about it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just, to me, the timing and tasks is a summary of what we've already discussed, and I really feel like this particular bullet point needs to go under Other Business, and we should have a discussion about it, because we didn't discuss that, and, yes, we heard that again in public comment, but we didn't discuss it as a committee. Mel.

MR. BELL: I may be confusing this with something else, but didn't we talk about that in relationship to the MSE, as sort of a -- I thought that was in an earlier thing, but I would agree that I think it's probably a little too soon to -- Because I'm pretty sure -- I mean, they had a little discussion of it last time, but, I mean, it wasn't an agenda item, I don't think.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We only talked about -- In committee, we only talked about the two-for-one permit, and we didn't talk about limited entry for the for-hire fishery, and so I don't want to put that in the timing and tasks motion.

MR. ROLLER: That's fair, and I brought it up in Other Business, as we were running out of time, and so I was just looking for a way to try to add it to the discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I mean, we have other business in Snapper Grouper, and so if you just hang tight for a second.

MR. ROLLER: Fair enough.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so we've modified the motion here for timing and tasks, including adding a bullet summarizing what we discussed on the space stuff yesterday. I assume that the seconder is okay with this bullet change, adding this additional item. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Just a clarification, and it's not a splashdown, and it's a launch security zone. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion on this timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to the timing and tasks?** All right. For Other Business, back to Tom on the bullet there, and do you want to bring up that topic again?

MR. ROLLER: Sure, and, as I said, I'm just curious if the council would like the AP to discuss it at their next meeting. You know, it's brought up, and they do discuss it, and we do hear public comment on it, and I would just like to get some more feedback of it, given the current state of our fisheries and the low compliance we have with SEFHIER.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess my question is so a reminder that there's still another council meeting between now and the AP meeting, and the next AP meeting is in October, and can someone remind us whether or not this is being discussed as part of the MSE? Is it in the MSE?

MS. BROUWER: I don't believe that -- I don't believe, per se, that there's anything regarding limited entry currently, and, yes, while I've got the mic, in September, we'll be going over a potential list of items for the AP's October meeting, and we haven't scheduled it yet, and so we can just start keeping bullets of things that have come up, and then you all will get a chance to review those in September again.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Jessica. That's a very good point, and thank you for clarifying that, and so I just will state my interest in having this on the future agenda for -- To be hopefully as a bullet point for AP discussion in the future, and we can bring it up in the September meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thanks for that discussion, Tom. All right. We're making some notes there, Myra is. All right. Is there any other business, any other other business, to come before the Snapper Grouper Committee? All right, Madam Chair. I pass it back to you.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Jessica. I was going to go ahead and suggest that we take a ten to fifteen -- We'll do fifteen minutes, in case people have to checkout, because, obviously, we'll queue up over there, and so a fifteen-minute break, and we'll come back and hit the last couple of items. When we come back from the break, Dewey has requested a couple of minutes of time, and he said it would be quick, and so we're going to hit him first.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. BELCHER: Okay. If everybody would come to the table, we're going to go ahead and get started on these last couple of items, and we're going to start out with Dewey, who would like to talk with the council, and so, Dewey, whenever you're ready.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I know you all have listened to me, over the years, talk about blueline tilefish, and so I wanted to give just a quick overview of blueline and how this council has helped management of blueline tilefish, both in the Mid-Atlantic and in the South Atlantic. Had it not been for the famous 17B closure that you all put on fishermen, we would have never traveled to New Jersey and above to go fishing, and they have been, up there, since we went up there fishing, and they wanted a different -- They didn't really like that, and so they decided they needed to start managing the fish.

Not only that, but, eleven months after this 17B closure, which never produced science until about eight months later, that showed that we don't catch speckled hind and warsaw, and we had to do an exempted fishing permit, the State of North Carolina, and you all rescinded that closure.

At that time, the National Resource Defense Council sued, and the judge in the case, Ketanji Brown Jackson, who is at the Supreme Court now, ruled in favor of the government, and so blueline tilefish has reached from a fisherman in North Carolina that started blueline tile fishing in 2009, until all the way up to a Supreme Court justice, and, back then, when we had unlimited catches, that wasn't sustainable, but the crumbs that we're given now aren't sustainable neither, and so my hope is, into the future, at the next stock assessment, and given the work of the deepwater survey, to possibly use it for trends of abundance, that that crumbs will come in maybe to a piece of cake or so.

What I have here, I wanted to give John, and, also, his staff, who has put up with me over the time, and many emails asking -- You know, I was telling Chip that, a lot of times, when I started out, I would have something in my mind, and I would send it, the one sentence or two, and I might type in bold, and he would send me back a paragraph of everything that was wrong with my thoughts, which he was right, and others were right, because, you know, there is more to it, but I appreciate it, and I appreciate you putting up with me, and also the staff and the great work you all do, because it is difficult, and there's a lot to it.

It's just not something simple, and so, with that, I wanted to give -- This is a blueline tilefish, and, on the back of that tilefish, I wrote my name, and 2023, blueline tilefish, and the annual catch limit is 234,000 pounds, and I do want to make one correction. It is only 233,968, and I just added the thirty-two pounds to round it off. (Applause)

MR. CARMICHAEL: Dewey, we will never forget you, I promise you, and I think we'll start a wall at the council office, and we've got a plaque from Tony, and we'll start doing that, and it is

so true. When you had a question from Dewey, you knew the first question was just the tip of the iceberg, and you didn't know where you might end up, and it was like just get ready, because there's going to be a follow-up, and a follow-up, and a follow-up, and it is true that you would get a lot, and we would learn a lot, and I know that Dewey has learned so much over the years, and so thank you, Dewey, and it has been a great, great run with you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. The last couple of items of the agenda, we're going to talk about the council workplan with John Hadley.

MR. HADLEY: All right, and so in front of you is the revised workplan from this week, and I'm just going to run down a few of the items that have changed, and just try to update the council on where everything stands, and I will start from the top. I will mention that this version is on the website, and so, if you click on it, and you want to kind of look at it yourself on your laptop, it's on the website right now.

I will start from the top and just go through and highlight a few of the items that have sort of shifted around this week, as the council has discussed various items, and so, with that, I will start with the wreckfish ITQ modernization, and so Snapper Grouper Amendment 48, and we did add a couple of meetings in there, to reflect some of the discussion from this week and some of the additional items that may need to be worked out before that amendment can be ready for final approval and make sure that all of the details are properly addressed, and so that timeline has been extended a bit.

Then the red snapper assessment response, and that was actually -- The final approval was moved up, and it was -- On the old workplan, it was in September, and it's now June, depending on the data issues and if that can be worked out, and, you know, there is some additional flexibility there potentially, but we'll just have to see how that goes, but I think, you know, a June approval for that seems like it can likely happen, and so that was shifted up a meeting.

The Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 3 was moved back until the completion of the MSE, and so that's coming back to you in December of 2024, per the guidance, and then -- So that covers the workload underway, and then, for Spanish mackerel, and so the CMP FMP, regarding Spanish mackerel specifically, that was split off into two amendments, to reflect that discussion, and so you have a framework amendment that is intended to move fairly quickly, and so that's something that --

They're all yellow items there, and so indicating that those will be a shorter discussion, likely a shorter document, and that can be worked through with a tentative approval in September of 2024. Then the more lengthy items, and probably the more in-depth discussion on changes to the fishery, have been moved to a plan amendment, and so that reflects that split that you discussed this week, with the plan amendment starting after the mackerel port meetings.

The black sea bass assessment response had originally been -- It was originally supposed to take place, again, in December, and that was moved up to September, and so then you can discuss whether or not you want to split that into two separate amendments or how you want to address

the timing of that amendment, and so that will come to you again in September, and so those are sort of the moving pieces on the top part of it, regarding the FMP workload.

Moving down to sort of the other catchall items, some of the additional items that you discussed during your meeting, for September, and we'll kind of go down to the bottom-half of that, if you will, and you have the wind energy presentation that has been added and moved up to September, and that was a Habitat Committee discussion at the March meeting, and so that's captured there. You have the mackerel port meetings discussion and that's captured, and then you have the addition of the allocation review guidelines that we discussed yesterday during Full Council I, and then it also captures the guidance of the dolphin MSE progress update and then the dolphin MSE reports.

Then, of note, there was the addition of the upcoming five-year wreckfish ITQ review, and so this was added, and there's a requirement to provide a review of ITQs on a five-year basis, and so that was tentatively added to the September 2024 council meeting, and so those are some of the new items.

With that, kind of the take-home, and the bottom line there, at the very bottom of the screen, and it kind of tallies everything up, and the take-home message is you have a very full meeting schedule, and, you know, I think it's something that -- It's going to be similar meetings to what we've had this week, where it's -- You can make it through, but it is going to be a very full meeting, with not much wiggle room to add additional items, either at the September or December meeting. Once you move into 2024, there are some additional spaces there, and so, with that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John. One question I have, based on conversations yesterday with Myra and John, and we had talked about possibly bumping the wind later, if we needed to, and I don't know if that's something that we want to do, and, obviously, December still has the same workload, and so I'm just offering that up, based on our discussions for the agenda for the next meeting. Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: Thanks, Madam Chair. With regard to black sea bass, I think we could set it up in the workplan like we have Spanish mackerel, where, you know, a short-term amendment, and maybe an abbreviated framework, and that possibly could go final then this year, so that we could affect the season for next year, and I guess, if that were the case, we would probably want to see a draft in September and approve it in December.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Jack. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I was going to say something similar to Jack, and I would agree with that, in terms of timing for sea bass. For wreckfish, John mentioned a five-year review timeline. After we've conducted the first review, you can actually have a seven-year timeline for wreckfish, and, given that we're going to be working on Amendment 48, my recommendation is we could push off that review for the longer period of time.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Andy. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: About black sea bass, the impediment could be getting an actual ABC to start building an amendment, and, you know, the SSC is going to meet in July and review more projections, and there were some issues with those, and so I think that could be a challenge to having a draft in September.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that. Other comments from folks on the workplan? Okay. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: One last thing, just to point out the bottom line number there was 8.5, and that 0.5 pretty well represents your Monday morning, and so anticipate getting started on Monday morning, just as we did this week.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thanks for that. All right. The next item on the agenda is upcoming meetings.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and so you guys have the list here of what's coming up, and there's a lot going on, as always, and you can see quite a few things coming up in August, and then, in September, we have the council meeting. In October, we will go into our run of AP meetings and SSC meetings and things of that nature, and then December comes around pretty quick.

Just a reminder that, you know, all these meetings are open public meetings, and the information will make its way to the website, as it becomes available, and, if you ever have any questions about anything that's coming up, or what's being scheduled, please don't hesitate to reach out to us, and, if you see anything there that you have in mind that you think maybe we missed, then let us know.

DR. BELCHER: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Just as a note, we will be moving the Mackerel Cobia AP to October, correct, or some point in the fall?

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so any additional comments or questions for John regarding upcoming meetings? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I had intended to listen in the last Habitat and Ecosystem meeting, but I had a conflict, and did they talk about space debris at the Habitat and Ecosystem AP meeting, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, we didn't talk about the space debris at that, and it was -- That meeting really talked a lot about how the blueprint plan was coming along, and then where we were -- The Habitat AP, and I'm thinking about something -- You said the Habitat AP, and I'm sorry, and I was thinking of the blueprint. My bad. I think they did talk about space debris at the Habitat AP meeting.

MS. THOMPSON: (Ms. Thompson's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think that they are aware, and they did talk about it, and Roger is not here at the meeting, and, Kerry, do you remember what they -- Or Trish? I am trying to think if any -- Myra, do you remember if they got into the Oculina aspect of it?

DR. BELCHER: Laurilee, and not that this needs to be done on the mic, but I know that we have requested the audio from those meetings, and, if it's something that you wanted to go back and listen to, I'm sure that staff could set you up with that as well, if you wanted to hear the conversation.

MR. CARMICHAEL: And we'll have minutes from the meeting, at some point, that you can read, and they're in preparation now.

MS. THOMPSON: Can it be put on the agenda for the October Habitat meeting, and is there a representative from the Coral AP that's on the Habitat Committee?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, I don't think there's a representative, and there has been discussion of having a meeting with the Coral AP jointly to talk about some things.

DR. COLLIER: Steve Ross is on the --

MR. CARMICHAEL: Steve Ross covers both, yes.

DR. BELCHER: Roger, would you like to speak to that?

MR. PUGLIESE: Good morning. It was mentioned at the last AP meeting. However, we had planned on having a session jointly with the Coral AP, and that's either going to happen as a separate webinar or at the October meeting, and we have just had some complications with -- Our AP chair is departing us, and so one of those dates, but it will definitely be addressed in the next couple of months.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Roger. Other comments or questions about the schedule upcoming? Okay. Seeing none, do we have any other business to be brought before the council at this time? Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just some late-breaking news, and, in 2019, NMFS promulgated a final rule to require turtle excluder devices in skimmer trawls. Of the states in the South Atlantic, only North Carolina has a permitted inshore skimmer trawl fishery. Anyway, we were sued on that rule, and we were sued in District Court in D.C., and we were also sued in the Eastern District of Louisiana.

We've been subject to an injunction for a while, but then we eventually won the litigation in District Court. That case was appealed to the 5th Circuit, and, yesterday afternoon, the 5th Circuit handed down a decision upholding the District Court decision that Louisiana basically couldn't challenge the rule, and so we've upheld it again. We still have a pending appeal in the D.C. Circuit Court, but we'll see where that goes. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that, Shep. Anything else from the group, as far as other business goes? Okay. Seeing none, again, thank you to everybody for your time to do this meeting, and we moved through a lot, thank goodness, and recovered from a four-hour lapse, and I look forward to seeing everybody in South Carolina in September, and, with that, we'll call the meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 16, 2023.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
August 4, 2023

Full Council

Thursday, June 15, 2023		
Attendees	Present	Remote
COUNCIL		
Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Chair	✓	
Trish Murphey, Vice Chair	✓	
Robert Beal		
Mel Bell	✓	
Gary Borland		
Lt. Cameron Box	NOT ATTENDING	
Chester Brewer	✓	
Tim Griner	✓	
Judy Helmey	✓	
Kerry Marhefka	✓	
Jessica McCawley	✓	
Tom Roller	✓	
Andy Strelcheck	✓	
Laurilee Thompson	✓	
Spud Woodward	✓	
SAFMC STAFF		
Myra Brouwer	✓	
Julia Byrd	✓	
John Carmichael	✓	
Chip Collier	✓	
Judd Curtis		
John Hadley	✓	
Allie Iberle	✓	
Kim Iverson	✓	
Kelly Klasnick	✓	
Michele Ritter	✓	
Mike Schmidtke	✓	
Nick Smillie	✓	
Christina Wiegand	✓	
OTHER		
David Hugo	✓	
Rick Devictor	✓	
Dr. Jack McGovern	✓	
Monica Smit-Brunello		✓
Dr. John Walter	✓	
Shep Grimes	✓	
Dewey Hemilright	✓	
Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy	✓	
Ally	✓	
Jessie	✓	
Nikhil	✓	

Full Council

Friday, June 16, 2023		
Attendees	Present	Remote
COUNCIL		
Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Chair	✓	
Trish Murphey, Vice Chair	✓	
Robert Beal		
Mel Bell	✓	
Gary Borland	✓	
Lt. Cameron Box	NOT ATTENDING	
Chester Brewer	✓	
Tim Griner	✓	
Judy Helmey	✓	
Kerry Marhefka	✓	
Jessica McCawley	✓	
Tom Roller	✓	
Andy Strelcheck		✓
Laurilee Thompson	✓	
Spud Woodward	✓	
SAFMC STAFF		
Myra Brouwer	✓	
Julia Byrd	✓	
John Carmichael	✓	
Chip Collier	✓	
Judd Curtis	✓	
John Hadley	✓	
Allie Iberle	✓	
Kim Iverson	✓	
Kelly Klasnick	✓	
Michele Ritter	✓	
Mike Schmidtke	✓	
Nick Smillie	✓	
Christina Wiegand	✓	
OTHER		
David Hugo		
Rick Devictor	✓	
Dr. Jack McGovern	✓	
Monica Smit-Brunello		
Dr. John Walter	✓	
Shep Grimes	✓	
Dewey Hemilright	✓	
Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy	✓	
Billy Broussard	✓	
Nikhil	✓	

Attendee Report: SAFMC 2023 June Council Meeting Council Session II

Report Generated:

06/20/2023 01:42 PM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered
147-909-795	06/15/2023 07:16 AM EDT	9 hours 32 minutes	197

Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name
Yes	57	Addis	Dustin
Yes	42	Bailey	Adam
Yes	82	Bell	00 Mel
Yes	93	Berry	James "chip"
Yes	33	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	34	Brennan	Ken
Yes	49	Brouwer	Myra
Yes	93	Busse	James
Yes	91	Cathey	Andrew
Yes	81	Cathey	Andrew
Yes	39	Clinton	Haley
Yes	42	Coggins	Lew
Yes	91	Cox	Jack
Yes	55	Cox	Derek
Yes	49	Crosson	Scott
Yes	58	Curtis	Judd
Yes	46	DeJohn	Frank
Yes	47	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	90	Dover	Miles
Yes	37	Dukes	Amy
Yes	37	Finch	Margaret
Yes	41	Flowers	Jared
Yes	97	Foss	Kristin
Yes	92	Franco	Dawn
Yes	50	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	49	Glazier	Ed
Yes	48	Gore	Karla
Yes	56	Guyas	Martha
Yes	47	HILDRETH	DELAINE
Yes	92	Hallas	Sara
Yes	95	Harrison	Alana
Yes	51	Helies	Frank
Yes	81	Helmey	Judy
Yes	96	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	90	Heyman	William
Yes	92	Hoppe	Walter
Yes	45	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	77	Hudson	Joseph

Yes	89	Iberle	Allie
Yes	39	Iverson	Kim
Yes	33	Karnauskas	Mandy
Yes	39	Kean	Samantha
Yes	35	Kellison	Todd
Yes	91	Keppler	Blaik
Yes	67	Kersting	Anne
Yes	99	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	66	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	40	LaRoche	Kelcie
Yes	96	Laks	Ira
Yes	53	Larkin	Michael
Yes	32	Latanich	Katie
Yes	55	Lazarre	Dominique
Yes	35	Lee	Max
Yes	45	Lee	Jennifer
Yes	32	Lowther	Alan
Yes	87	M Borland	Gary
Yes	97	Mahoney	Andrew
Yes	91	Mahood	Bob
Yes	81	Marhefka	00Kerry
Yes	97	Marinko	Jeff
Yes	35	Masi	Michelle
Yes	35	Mastitski	Anthony
Yes	61	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	68	McGovern	Jack
Yes	90	McWhorter	Will
Yes	68	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	38	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	62	Merrifield	Mike
Yes	38	Moore	Jeff
Yes	33	Morrison	Wendy
Yes	42	Muffley	Brandon
Yes	89	Murphey	00Trish
Yes	67	Myjak	Michael
Yes	52	Neer	Julie
Yes	97	Newman	Thomas
Yes	50	O'Shaughnessy	Pat
Yes	58	Oliver	Ashley
Yes	48	Owens	Marina
Yes	61	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	59	Pehl	Nicole
Yes	93	Petersen	Andrew
Yes	33	Poston	Will
Yes	90	Prewitt	Brian
Yes	52	Pugliese	Roger
Yes	100	Ritter	Michele

Yes	89	Rohrer	Frank
Yes	76	Roller	00Tom
Yes	33	Runde	Brendan
Yes	92	Salmon	Brandi
Yes	48	Sauls	Beverly
Yes	38	Scott	Tara
Yes	34	Sedberry	George
Yes	45	Seward	McLean
Yes	90	Seward	McLean
Yes	36	Shertzer	Kyle
Yes	67	Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Yes	41	Somerset	Carly
Yes	39	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	46	Stemle	Adam
Yes	49	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	44	Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Yes	54	Thompson	00Laurilee
Yes	81	Thompson	Mary Jean
Yes	42	Travis	Michael
Yes	91	Usher	Davis
Yes	39	Vincent	Matthew
Yes	45	Walia	Matthew
Yes	44	Walsh	Jason
Yes	90	Wiegand	Christina
Yes	92	Willingham	Darrin
Yes	59	Withers	Meg
Yes	32	Zamboni	Katharine
Yes	36	blough	heather
Yes	98	brewer	00chester
Yes	86	broussard	billy
Yes	46	collier	chip
Yes	33	gloekner	david
Yes	35	merino	joy
Yes	86	moss	david
Yes	39	sandorf	scott
Yes	36	stephen	jessica
Yes	99	thomas	01 suz
Yes	48	vara	mary
Yes	42	walter	John
No	0	ALHALE	SYDNEY
No	0	Antonaras	Manny
No	0	Atkinson	Seth
No	0	Barrows	Katline
No	0	Batsavage	Chris
No	0	Beal	Bob
No	0	Blair	Holly
No	0	Bonura	Vincent

No	0	Brantley	William
No	0	Byrd	Julia
No	0	Calay	Shannon
No	0	Carr	Kayla
No	0	Cenci	Chris
No	0	Cimo	Laura
No	0	Clinton	Haley
No	0	DeFilippi Simpson	Julie
No	0	Delaney	Glenn
No	0	DuBeck	Guy
No	0	E Brown	Julie
No	0	Franke	Emilie
No	0	Freeman	Matt
No	0	Gray	Alisha
No	0	Groeteke	Mike
No	0	Hadley	John
No	0	Heffernan	Katie
No	0	Hull	James
No	0	Keilin Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
No	0	Kolmos	Kevin
No	0	Kramer	Rob
No	0	L	Kelcie
No	0	Lloyd	Victor
No	0	Locke	Charlie
No	0	Malinowski	Rich
No	0	McPherson	Matthew
No	0	Meehan	Sean
No	0	Merten	Wessley
No	0	Meyers	S
No	0	Nelson	Chasity
No	0	Nelson	David
No	0	Noell	Brian
No	0	O'Donnell	Kelli
No	0	O'Malley	Rachel
No	0	Oden	Jeff
No	0	Pellicer	Joseph
No	0	Peterson	Cassidy
No	0	Privoznik	Sarah
No	0	RINCONES	RON
No	0	Ramsay	Chloe
No	0	Records	David
No	0	Schueller	Amy
No	0	Sheridan	Sean
No	0	Siegfried	Katie
No	0	Smart	Tracey
No	0	Smillie	Nick
No	0	Soltanoff	Carrie

No	0	Sramek	Mark
No	0	Stephenson	Sarah
No	0	Thomas	Lauren
No	0	Thompson	Laurilee
No	0	Tuohy	Chelsea
No	0	Vecchio	Julie
No	0	Wamer	David
No	0	Waters	James
No	0	White	Geoff
No	0	Wolfe	Wes
No	0	alvarez-stratton	ally
No	0	brewer	00chester
No	0	colby	barrett
No	0	froeschke	john
No	0	griner	tim
No	0	kittle	christine
No	0	oden	jeff
No	0	thompson	laurilee

Attendee Report: SAFMC 2023 June Council Meeting OPEN Council Session II

Report Generated:

06/20/2023 01:46 PM EDT

Webinar ID

147-909-795

Actual Start Date/Time

06/16/2023 07:25 AM EDT

Duration

3 hours 15 minutes

Registered

201

Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name
Yes	91	Bell	00 Mel
Yes	37	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	69	Brouwer	Myra
Yes	41	Byrd	01Julia
Yes	67	Cathey	Andrew
Yes	36	Clinton	Haley
Yes	70	Cox	Derek
Yes	32	Crosson	Scott
Yes	65	Curtis	Judd
Yes	52	DeJohn	Frank
Yes	47	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	36	Dover	Miles
Yes	37	Finch	Margaret
Yes	36	Flowers	Jared
Yes	97	Foss	Kristin
Yes	40	Franco	Dawn
Yes	56	Freeman	Matt
Yes	60	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	39	Gore	Karla
Yes	37	Gray	Alisha
Yes	97	Guyas	Martha
Yes	35	HILDRETH	DELAINE
Yes	49	Hadley	John
Yes	91	Hallas	Sara
Yes	92	Harrison	Alana
Yes	67	Helies	Frank
Yes	93	Helmey	Judy
Yes	73	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	40	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	94	Hudson	Joseph
Yes	52	Iverson	Kim
Yes	92	KELLY	BILL
Yes	35	Keppler	Blaik
Yes	92	Kersting	Anne
Yes	95	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	97	Laks	Ira
Yes	42	Lazarre	Dominique
Yes	79	M Borland	Gary

Yes	90	Mahoney	Andrew
Yes	96	Mahood	Bob
Yes	75	Marhefka	00Kerry
Yes	93	Marinko	Jeff
Yes	56	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	61	McGovern	Jack
Yes	62	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	31	Mendez	Natasha
Yes	91	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	52	Muffley	Brandon
Yes	93	Murphey	00Trish
Yes	45	Neer	Julie
Yes	97	Newman	Thomas
Yes	41	O'Shaughnessy	Pat
Yes	60	Oliver	Ashley
Yes	37	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	44	Pugliese	Roger
Yes	69	Records	David
Yes	99	Ritter	Michele
Yes	81	Roller	00Tom
Yes	45	Seward	McLean
Yes	92	Seward	McLean
Yes	33	Siegfried	Katie
Yes	34	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	37	Stemle	Adam
Yes	62	Strelcheck	00-Andy
Yes	43	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	36	Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Yes	40	Travis	Michael
Yes	37	Vincent	Matthew
Yes	35	Walia	Matthew
Yes	82	White	Geoff
Yes	44	Withers	Meg
Yes	95	broussard	billy
Yes	42	collier	chip
Yes	36	gloekner	david
Yes	96	griner	tim
Yes	38	sandorf	scott
Yes	38	stephen	jessica
Yes	97	thomas	01 suz
Yes	89	thompson	laurilee
Yes	39	vara	mary
Yes	38	walter	John
No	0	ALHALE	SYDNEY
No	0	Addis	Dustin
No	0	Antonaras	Manny
No	0	Atkinson	Seth

No	0	Bailey	Adam
No	0	Barrows	Katline
No	0	Batsavage	Chris
No	0	Beal	Bob
No	0	Berry	James "chip"
No	0	Blair	Holly
No	0	Bonura	Vincent
No	0	Brantley	William
No	0	Brennan	Ken
No	0	Busse	James
No	0	Byrd	Julia
No	0	Calay	Shannon
No	0	Carr	Kayla
No	0	Cathey	Andrew
No	0	Cenci	Chris
No	0	Cimo	Laura
No	0	Clinton	Haley
No	0	Coggins	Lew
No	0	Cox	Jack
No	0	DeFilippi Simpson	Julie
No	0	Delaney	Glenn
No	0	DuBeck	Guy
No	0	Dukes	Amy
No	0	E Brown	Julie
No	0	Franke	Emilie
No	0	Glazier	Ed
No	0	Groeteke	Mike
No	0	Heffernan	Katie
No	0	Heyman	William
No	0	Hoppe	Walter
No	0	Hull	James
No	0	Iberle	Allie
No	0	Karnauskas	Mandy
No	0	Kean	Samantha
No	0	Keilin Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
No	0	Kellison	Todd
No	0	Knowlton	Kathy
No	0	Kolmos	Kevin
No	0	Kramer	Rob
No	0	L	Kelcie
No	0	LaRoche	Kelcie
No	0	Larkin	Michael
No	0	Latanich	Katie
No	0	Lee	Jennifer
No	0	Lee	Max
No	0	Lloyd	Victor
No	0	Locke	Charlie

No	0	Lowther	Alan
No	0	Malinowski	Rich
No	0	Masi	Michelle
No	0	Mastitski	Anthony
No	0	McPherson	Matthew
No	0	McWhorter	Will
No	0	Meehan	Sean
No	0	Merrifield	Mike
No	0	Merten	Wessley
No	0	Meyers	S
No	0	Moore	Jeff
No	0	Morrison	Wendy
No	0	Myjak	Michael
No	0	Nelson	Chasity
No	0	Nelson	David
No	0	Noell	Brian
No	0	O'Donnell	Kelli
No	0	O'Malley	Rachel
No	0	Oden	Jeff
No	0	Owens	Marina
No	0	Pehl	Nicole
No	0	Pellicer	Joseph
No	0	Petersen	Andrew
No	0	Peterson	Cassidy
No	0	Poston	Will
No	0	Prewitt	Brian
No	0	Privoznik	Sarah
No	0	RINCONES	RON
No	0	Ramsay	Chloe
No	0	Rohrer	Frank
No	0	Runde	Brendan
No	0	Salmon	Brandi
No	0	Sauls	Beverly
No	0	Schueller	Amy
No	0	Scott	Tara
No	0	Sedberry	George
No	0	Sheridan	Sean
No	0	Shertzer	Kyle
No	0	Smart	Tracey
No	0	Smillie	Nick
No	0	Smit-Brunello	00Monica
No	0	Soltanoff	Carrie
No	0	Somerset	Carly
No	0	Sramek	Mark
No	0	Stephenson	Sarah
No	0	Thomas	Lauren
No	0	Thompson	00Laurilee

No	0	Thompson	Laurilee
No	0	Thompson	Mary Jean
No	0	Tuohy	Chelsea
No	0	Usher	Davis
No	0	Vecchio	Julie
No	0	Walsh	Jason
No	0	Wamer	David
No	0	Waters	James
No	0	Wiegand	Christina
No	0	Willingham	Darrin
No	0	Wolfe	Wes
No	0	Zamboni	Katharine
No	0	alvarez-stratton	ally
No	0	blough	heather
No	0	brewer	00chester
No	0	brewer	00chester
No	0	colby	barrett
No	0	froeschke	john
No	0	kittle	christine
No	0	merino	joy
No	0	moss	david
No	0	oden	jeff