

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COBIA COMMITTEE

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

June 13, 2023

Transcript

Mackerel Cobia Committee

Tom Roller, Chair
Spud Woodward, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Gary Borland
Tim Griner

Judy Helmey
Kerry Marhefka
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
Laurilee Thompson
Dewey Hemilright
Chester Brewer

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

Jeff Buckel
Billy Broussard
Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Frank Helies
Nikhil Mehta

Observers and Participants

Other observers and participants attached.

The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the World Golf Village Renaissance, St. Augustine, Florida, on Tuesday, June 13, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Tom Roller.

MR. ROLLER: My name is Tom Roller, and I'm a council member from North Carolina, a full-time for-hire operator in my real life, and I want to commence the Mackerel Cobia Committee. I just want to start off by reminding the council that king and Spanish mackerel are among the most important finfish the council manages, being first and second in commercial landings and first and third in commercial ex-vessel values, and recreational represent two and three in directed trips, behind only dolphin. To begin, I am going to look for an approval of the agenda, unless anybody has any changes they would like to make.

MS. THOMPSON: I move to approve the agenda for the Mackerel Cobia meeting.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Laurilee. Do we have a second? Thank you, Jack. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. The second thing we're going to start is we're going to look at the minutes, unless anyone has any changes to the minutes from our last meeting, and I will be looking for a motion to approve the minutes. Thank you, Spud. Do we have a second? Thank you. Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion is approved by consensus. The first item of the agenda, we're going to move into the spanish mackerel assessment, and I will hand it over for the SSC report, and I will hand that over to Dr. Jeff Buckel.

DR. BUCKEL: Thank you, Chair Roller, and good morning, everyone. All right, and so we're going to get back to Spanish mackerel, and this was the operational assessment that the SSC received in August of 2022. We had some issues with that assessment, and we had a workgroup come up with some items that we wanted to have modified for the SEDAR 78, some revisions, and, as you all know, in March, we received a letter from the Center that those requests would not be made, because of Center workload issues. Further, the SSC was asked to set an ABC from SEDAR 78.

However, the SSC's concerns with this assessment, particularly natural mortality, are still significant and were discussed extensively during our April 2023 meeting, and so just an aside here, before we get into the ABC recommendations, and the SSC expressed its disappointment that the Center was unable to conduct the requested analyses for SEDAR 78, and we request that arrangements for future assessment reviews should continue to provide the SSC the opportunity to request additional analyses or modifications to the assessment, as has been normal practice.

Often, such analyses and modifications lead to improved catch advice. Equally as important, they enhance trust in the scientific advice process among council members and stakeholders. The SSC has enjoyed a long history of working collaboratively and collegially with stock assessment scientists, to provide the best possible mutually-agreed advice and hopes to continue to do so going forward.

I think we were -- It was kind of a perfect storm of where the council needed to move quickly on Spanish mackerel, and there have been delays, and so you all were looking for an ABC, and that timeline was a little compressed, and the Center wasn't able to make the modifications to SEDAR 78 that we had requested, but we're asking that that time be provided for those modifications in the future.

The SSC has accepted the assessment base run from SEDAR 78 as the basis for stock status determination, but recommends that natural mortality, and the other issues that were raised in the workgroup's report -- Those should be investigated in the next assessment. The SSC concluded that the stock status determination in the Spanish mackerel assessment base run is likely conservative, because of the use of a lower natural mortality, and so, when you look at that stock biomass estimate and fishing mortality estimate, the stock biomass is probably -- Is likely biased low, and the F is likely biased high.

The SSC considered all of this above discussion as justification to deviate from its control rule for setting the ABC for Spanish mackerel, and so the options discussed in April were the third-highest landings, yield at 75 percent FMSY, equilibrium optimum yield. The third-highest landings was not considered further, as that recently has been shown to have poor performance, based on simulation work and other work that's been published in the peer-reviewed literature, though, just to remind everyone, that has been the -- The third-highest landings was what was used since the last stock assessment for Spanish mackerel for setting the ABC. Again, the SSC was most comfortable with using the yield at 75 percent FMSY for setting ABC.

Just to recap, SEDAR 78 is sufficient for providing stock status. At the terminal year, the stock was not overfished and not overfishing. Further, SEDAR 78 is sufficient for also providing catch level recommendations, using model output, but not projections. The SSC was not comfortable with using the projections from SEDAR 78 to set ABC.

This is the last slide that I have, and this is the -- If you look six rows down in that table, you will see the yield at MSY, which is 8.2 million pounds, and so that's the OFL recommendation from the SSC, and so 8.2 million pounds yield at MSY, and then the yield at 75 percent FMSY was recommended for the ABC, and that's 8.02 million pounds. I would be happy to answer any questions.

MR. ROLLER: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Tom. I just wanted to thank the SSC, because I know this wasn't the easiest deliberation, for the amount of time that they've spent trying to see what we could do to rally some of -- You know, get a more robust approach coming out of this, and Chip's approach that was put up during the SSC meeting I thought was really great, in the fact that it did talk to them about here are your options. You know, you can accept it, you can reject it, or we can talk about what's good in the assessment and move forward with that, and I think that the suggestions and recommendations from the group were really well thought out, and they give us a good way to move forward.

DR. BUCKEL: Thanks, Carolyn.

MR. ROLLER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, Tom. Just, I guess, refresh my memory, and where are we at on the SEDAR schedule for the next Spanish mackerel assessment?

MS. WIEGAND: Right now, there is no Spanish mackerel assessment on the schedule.

MR. ROLLER: Do we have any more questions for Dr. Buckel?

MS. WIEGAND: So sort of the next steps would be if you guys would like to have staff begin work on an amendment to incorporate these new catch level recommendations, and we would need a motion to do so.

MR. ROLLER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Tom. Before I make that motion, so this will be a framework amendment, or it's got to be a full amendment to update the catch level recommendations?

MS. WIEGAND: So, because of the switch to FES, we would be updating catch levels, and likely discussing allocations, and, because we would be discussing allocations, this would need to be a full plan amendment, which would also involve coordination with the Gulf Council.

MR. WOODWARD: So we can't do an update of the catch level specifications separate from allocation?

MS. WIEGAND: I believe you can, with the appropriate rationale, and I know that that's what the Gulf Council did with their most recent king mackerel assessment, and they did update catch levels, and they were going to address allocations in a separate amendment that they ultimately stopped working on, and so that's certainly within the council's purview, and I'm going to look to Shep, to make sure I'm not speaking out of turn here, but my understanding is that, yes, you can do that.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. Well, maybe, and I'm not familiar with what had happened in the Gulf, but, essentially, the issue is that your allocations are based on -- The existing allocations, right, are CHTS numbers, and isn't that the --

MS. WIEGAND: The allocations for Spanish mackerel right now are not based on a landings stream.

MR. GRIMES: Then I would say that you don't need to revisit it, right, if you're good with the existing allocation. The other allocations that have been based on CHTS catch history, once we're shifting and using FES, then that stuff is not best available, and you need to revisit it and give a new rationale that's based on the best available scientific information.

MR. ROLLER: Spud, did you want to follow-up?

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, and so I guess my question is that, you know, we've got currently, I think, what our ACL is around six-million pounds, and so we would be looking at adding a couple million pounds of available catch, and is that correct? I think this Coastal Household Telephone Survey and FES thing and all that is a source of confusion about these mixed currencies here, because I think -- Obviously, my goal would be to get as many more fish back on the table as we can to be available as catch, as quick as we can, knowing that any allocation discussion is going to be much more complicated, especially since we're now looking at a more wider distribution of this stock, and fishing pressure is brought on it that we really don't even quite understand yet, and

so, you know, how do we get fish on the table to be available as catch for both sectors, while we do the necessary deliberations to best inform our allocation discussions?

MS. WIEGAND: I guess I just want to clarify, real quick, and so we're kind of comparing apples to oranges here, and so that six-million pounds is in CHTS currency. Because we're switching to FES, we've been sort of undercounting what we believe the recreational harvest to be, and so, while it seems like eight-million pounds is more fish on the water, it's not necessarily more fish, because we're now accurately accounting for recreational harvest, and so it's like comparing apples to oranges, and so it's not actually an additional two-million pounds of fish, and, if that doesn't make sense, I will make Chip come up here and explain it in a way that does make sense.

MR. ROLLER: I will let you follow-up, Spud, but I've had Mel in the queue for a while, and so, after you follow-up, I'm going to go to Mel.

MR. WOODWARD: I mean, it makes perfect sense, as much as anything nonsensical can, but I guess that also brings up the issue that, if we don't update the catch level specifications, we're now calculating recreational catch based on FES effort numbers, and so we're going to continue to -- We would have an ACL based on Coastal Household Telephone Survey numbers, but yet we're going to estimate recreational catch based on FES effort, and so are we going to run into a situation where might exceed our recreational sector if we don't at least update to the FES numbers? I am certainly not trying to make this more complicated, but I'm just trying to keep us out of a situation where we have an accounting problem, I guess you could say.

MS. WIEGAND: Right now, they do sort of -- I am not entirely sure how, but they back-calculate. The landings are being tracked in FES, but they back-calculate them to be able to compare them to an ACL that's in CHTS.

MR. ROLLER: I'm going to go to Mel, because he's been waiting for a while.

MR. BELL: No, and that's okay, and I was -- I got caught-up in the follow-up stuff, and I got a little lost in the apples and oranges part, but the concept that I was kind of work towards was to try to do something -- Thinking that we were going to be bringing on more apples, while we're talking about oranges, but, you know, if there was the ability to provide a new catch level in a timely manner that would be beneficial to the fishery, and do it through a framework, and so stay away from allocations, and that's what I was kind of, I think, like, Spud, thinking would be good to do, but now, with the accounting part, I'm not sure that's good or bad, but it sounds like what you just said was we're kind of tracking in FES, but we're back-calculating to CHTS, and therefore --

So we're tracking in oranges, but we're -- For management purposes, we can manage in apples, and so I don't know if it ends up being better or not, and so I got lost in all of the apples and oranges and fruit salad, but the bottom line is, if there's a way we can provide a fairly timely updated catch levels, which are beneficial, and stay away from allocations right now, because I see allocations being a longer, a much longer, more complex discussion, which, you know, would be a full plan amendment kind of thing, and so, if we have an ability to do a framework, do it quickly, with -- As Spud was saying, if we're not going to get into trouble by, you know, taking management action based on apples, when we're counting in oranges, but that's what I was trying to achieve. If we can do that in a framework, and stay away from allocations right now, that would be good, in my mind.

MS. WIEGAND: You can certainly do a framework amendment to update catch levels without addressing allocations.

MR. ROLLER: I am going to go to Trish first, because she's been waiting for a while, and then I will go to you, Jack.

MS. MURPHEY: I guess I thought we were coming into this as a full-blown amendment, because we've been waiting so long to get to this point, and there's a lot of issues out there between allocations, the north-south allocation, and there are some issues down south, in the two seasons, and ASMFC has been waiting on us to move forward, and so I guess I thought we were going to be doing a full-blown amendment. I understand wanting to get catch levels up quick, so you've got more fish on the table, but I don't know, and I'm just thinking that we really need to kind of put some time into this.

Now, I don't know if it's a possibility -- This is a process thing, and then this is also a workload thing, and can we do a framework amendment to get the catch levels up, but then parallel with a full-blown, to catch everything else, and I'm just concerned, and, I mean, I totally get trying to be timely, but this has been a long-awaited result of a stock assessment, and there's a lot of things on the table to discuss.

I mean, you know, like I said, the north-south, the two seasons, a 500-pound bycatch, and ASMFC, and there's a lot of stuff that's been riding on this assessment, and so my thought is go with a full-blown, but with the understanding -- I do understand where you're coming from with trying to get fish on the table, but I don't know, and is that possible, to do two at the same time, or is it just better to go one or the other?

MR. ROLLER: I am going to let -- Before we go to next person in line, I'm just going to let Christina answer that, because it's a workload question.

MS. WIEGAND: We certainly can. You know, with staff, you've got your sort of workload planning document that you go over at the tail-end of every meeting, and we can sort of adjust that as the council sees fit, and so it is possible to run through two amendments, and not to throw another sort of wrench, or, you know, thing for you all to think about, but we also have port meetings going on, and one of the things we'll talk about in the port meetings document is how you see timing for port meetings interacting with timing for any Spanish mackerel amendment or amendments.

MR. ROLLER: I'm going to go to Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: My question has to do with some of what Christina just said, but one point that Christina made about ACLs being in CHTS units, and then, you know, we have FES now, and we have a number of species where we back-calculate FES into CHTS, because that's the units the ACL was created in, but I was wondering about the timing of this amendment, because I know we're doing all the port meetings and everything, and I thought, you know, we were going to look at those port meetings and try to, you know, build upon the amendment, but I think one thing that could be done, if the council wanted to do this, and we're not changing the allocations, is to do a

framework amendment just to change the ACLs and then to have a second amendment that then does all the management measures that come out of the port meetings.

I think you have to probably discuss, you know, someplace, why you don't want to change the allocations, and I don't remember what the allocations are based on, and, I mean, I think they were established a really long time ago, I believe, but I think that's a possibility.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Jack. I'm going to go to Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: What's the breakdown between commercial and recreational percentage of the allocation?

MS. WIEGAND: Right now, the allocation is 55 percent commercial and 45 percent recreational.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: All right, and my next question is, in this stock assessment, did dead discards come off the top during the assessment?

MS. WIEGAND: Discards came off the top for Spanish mackerel.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Okay, and my next question would be what are the dead discards from each sector?

MS. WIEGAND: I don't know that off the top of my head, but we'll look it up and get back to you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Okay, because my furthering of asking this is, in the Mid-Atlantic, we have taken the route, for numerous species, where, when you do the stock assessment, you spit out a number of an ABC, and you give each sector their quota, and then you take the dead discards off the top of each sector, and so, therefore, each sector is having to account for their dead discards, and they have to clean up their backyard, whether they choose to or not, and so, going through in the future.

When we get to the Snapper Grouper Committee, I will have some more discussion and asking the SSC some questions, but it would be interesting to know the percentage of dead discards and so, therefore, each sector controls their destiny with their discard rates, and one side is not paying for the other, and it makes a better accounting, and so it would be interesting to hear what it is, and that could be done easily, I would think, at the stock assessment level, where you spit out the numbers, and you take the dead discards off the top of each sector, instead of mixing it together before the assessment. Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Dewey. I'm going to go to Kristin and then Spud.

MS. FOSS: Thanks for recognizing me, and so I feel like I have a little bit of concern in doing a full-blown amendment at this time, just because of the upcoming port meetings, and I know we'll probably get a lot of really good feedback, and I probably could get more onboard with dealing with catch limits here, because I also don't want to wait too long, for these numbers to then be old, kind of having to go back to what we did with yellowtail.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you for that, and I am going to go to Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. I am continuing to try to struggle with this, but I guess I'm going back to, you know, we are bound to increase catch levels, once they're recommended to us by the SSC, and I guess there's some question about how quickly you have to do that, and whether to synchronize this with other changes, and I think we all realize that the assessment didn't yield the information we wanted, and needed, going forward, and so we're trying to make the best we can out of what we have here.

It sounds like, if I understand correctly, that we won't have a problem -- If we left the catch levels where they are now, we wouldn't have a risk of exceeding ACLs, because of the back-calculation mathematics, but I guess the question is, you know, do we disadvantage ourselves by doing a framework amendment now to update the catch level recommendations and then initiating an amendment to deal with the allocations and the other issues to run parallel, and is that unnecessarily duplicative, from a workload standpoint? I think that's question that needs to be answered, from staff, and the time-management perspective, but, if not, then I would say go forward with this, and I would be willing to make this motion to dispense with the catch level update and then deal with the bigger issues, based on feedback we get from the port meetings.

It troubles me that we don't have another Spanish mackerel assessment even on the horizon, knowing that we need one in order to truly address the issues that we're dealing with, and I know that -- I mean, there's not enough capacity to go around, but that, to me, is a little troubling, that we know we have bigger issues to deal with, and we need more conclusive information to address those decisions, and it's not even on the schedule, and so, with that, I will conclude, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Spud. I'm going to go to Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am kind of like Spud, and I can't seem to get my arms around the fact that we can't get away from this Coastal Household -- I mean, what are we dealing with here? What currency are we really dealing with, and why are we still talking about anything other than this new currency, and so, first of all, I think we need to fix that, and why are we still talking about the Coastal Household Telephone Survey? Why are we even -- Why is that even part of this?

Secondly, I think Dewey brings up a great point here, and we've talked about this, you know, and I'm not sure I've ever gotten a really good answer to it, whether it's the way that the SEDAR process does the landings and the discards and how it's all figured into the assessment, but, really and truly, what we need is exactly what Dewey said. I mean, if we're going to look at this, and we're going to do allocations, and, you know, if we can get to the right currency to begin with, and then we can make, you know, some logical choices, but, if we can get to the right currency, then we need to do exactly what Dewey said.

We need to have a number that is landings, and then we can separate the allocation, and then we can take everybody's discards off of their allocation, but, until we can get there, I don't really see where we're making progress at all, and so I really want to understand why we are still dealing with the Coastal Household Telephone Survey in any of our species, if we've already moved away from that.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Tim. I'm going to have Christina address that.

MS. WIEGAND: I guess I've got a couple of things now, and so one of the reasons we're still talking about CHTS is because we need to go through a stock assessment to get those updated, and so that's why now Spanish mackerel is being updated, and a lot of the other species that you guys are going to see at this meeting are being updated, because they've got new stock assessments that could use those FES numbers.

In terms of discards, and so, for Spanish mackerel, there were no commercial discards, and there were recreational discards, and then they also accounted for shrimp trawl bycatch, and so that's what it was for the Spanish mackerel assessment. Then, to Spud's point, in terms of workload, it's certainly not duplicative to run a framework amendment to address catch levels and then later on do a full plan amendment to address management, and that wouldn't sort of be doubling up on workload.

MR. ROLLER: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Given that breakdown there, was the numbers for them discards, so we can get an accurate estimation of what was used for the shrimp trawl and the recreational industry, just a poundage number, and something like that would be good.

DR. CURTIS: For the last five years, 2015 to 2020, discards for the shrimp bycatch, and this is in thousands of fish, was 126,000, 125,000, 113,000, 89,000, 119,000, and 117,000, and the same time series for general rec discards, also in thousands of fish, is 213,000, 426,000, 298,000, 628,000, 862,000, and 158,000.

MR. ROLLER: Did you want to follow-up on that?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes, and could you send that to the -- Could you send it me, or send it to everybody, that breakdown, the way you described it? Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Dewey. I'm going to go to Tim.

MR. GRINER: We have a number of -- We know what the discards are, and we know there is no commercial discards, and so why is that we can't work backwards from that? Why can we not go back to knowing exactly what these numbers are without the discards and then apply the discards to who they belong to, and I don't understand why we can't do that.

MR. ROLLER: Can anyone address that?

MS. WIEGAND: I will just say I'm not sure it's that we can't, but it's that we haven't, and that's not how we ran the assessment.

MR. GRINER: So we can do it, is what you're saying, and so I would like to see us do that.

DR. COLLIER: To that one, and then I have a comment on some of the recreational catch estimates as well, but this one is to John Walter. I think, in order to combine the recreational discards and catch estimates, we would have to combine the dead discards MSY with the landings

stream MSY and then come up with a different way to break these out, and is that correct, John, in order to give catch streams in that format?

DR. WALTER: I am a little confused about combining the MSYs, because the MSYs would be something that you would get derived from whatever your assumed distribution of catch across the sectors are, and so you wouldn't really add them up, but, to get to the larger question of can we include, as part of the allocation to each sector, their dead discards, is it something that, yes, that could be done, and then, if a sector were to be able to convert dead discards into retained catch, because they're able to find ways of fishing more efficiently, then presumably they could get more retained catch, and that's a concept that we've been thinking about.

Right now, it hasn't been implemented yet, and the projections could certainly do that, and be run like that. The assessment keeps track of both discards and catch, but, right now, we only give the quotas, or ACLs, in landed catch, and it's simply because that's the way it has been done.

The challenge with doing that is that we don't get -- We can't keep track of discards in real-time, and we can't really keep track of landings quite as well in real-time, but discards are even more challenging for us, and so, for us to be able to say that you've reached your ACL because of discards only, which presumably that would be what happens, if your ACL is in both catch and discards, landed catch and discards, then we would be tracking a very uncertain number, and I think that's probably more a challenge with that approach for being able to track it. Does that make sense? Thanks.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, John. I'm going to go back to Tim.

MR. GRINER: I'm not sure that made a lot of sense for me, John, but, you know, I do appreciate the thought process there, but, I mean, I don't see any reason in the world why this council can't do this. They do it in the Mid-Atlantic, and they do it in other councils, and, regardless of how you look at it, the discards are what they are, and so I don't understand why we cannot have each sector responsible for its own discards and bring those numbers to this council, so that we can make decisions. It can be done with every other species, with every other council, and I don't understand, and I need an answer of why we cannot do that right now, with this species currently. We know what the discards are, and so why can we not work backwards and do like every other council does?

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Tim. I'm going to go to Trish and then Spud.

MS. MURPHEY: This is not about discards, and so, if Spud wants to go before me, if this is a discard discussion, I can give way to Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Again, I think, following this, what I am concerned about, with the approach that you all have been discussing, is that, if the effect of discard mortality on overall fishing mortality is incorporated in the assessment process, and you then come back and deduct discards from available ACL, is that not like double-jeopardy? Are you not somehow finding yourself in circumstance where the contribution of discards to fishing mortality is doubled?

I mean, again, I don't know enough about how that all works out to say, but that's the only thing that I would be cautionary about, is make sure that doesn't happen, you know, where you -- You

know, I hate to use the word “penalize”, but you get penalized for discard mortality in the overall assessment process, as you calculate fishing mortality, and then it comes back and gets added again on top of your ACL, by it being reduced by fishing mortality, and I don’t know how it gets done in the Mid-Atlantic, but that’s the only thing that kind of gives me a little angst about this, and maybe all that can be worked out, but just that’s my concern.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Spud. I’m going to go back to Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: What I was just going to say is, after -- So my sense, around the table, is to move forward with I guess this would be a framework to change the catch levels, right, and then follow that up with a full-blown amendment, and is that what I’m hearing around the -- That seems to be what I’m hearing around the table.

MR. ROLLER: Yes, and I agree. You know, I was looking to wrap-up some comments here and kind of circle back on this conversation, but that’s what I’m hearing around the table, and it sounds like there’s a lot of interest in doing a framework to look at the catch levels right now and then doing a full-blown amendment to address allocations and whatnot, and is that what I’m hearing from everybody? Go ahead, Kristin.

MS. FOSS: Would the full-blown amendment be kind of like during/after the port meetings, and so we’re using that opportunity to get feedback from the public?

MS. MURPHEY: That was -- Well, I guess I’m trying to play this through in my head, a timeline in my head, and so, if we did the framework first -- I mean, we kind of forget that this species at least is not overfished, and overfishing is not occurring, and I know there were concerns about a couple of years of high F, but that seems to have dropped over time, and so I guess I’m -- After listening to all the conversations, I’m feeling like we probably could move forward with the framework, just to get the fish on the table, and then I kind of -- When I made my opinion, I kind of forgot about the port meetings, and so sorry, but, between the port meetings -- I mean, we’re talking about changing goals and objectives in the amendment also, and so it’s a big -- This second amendment would be a big lift, and so I am -- I guess I’m taking a long time to say that I’m good with going with a framework and then following up with a full-blown, based off all the port meetings and, you know, discussion of goals and objectives, and so I’m good with that, and so sorry to take so long to say that.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Trish. I mean, I think this will come up when we discuss the topics for the advisory panel committee, because we had been discussing when to time an AP meeting to get good feedback, and it was looking like that was going to potentially be moved into the fall, depending on what the council wanted to do, and that could help us incorporate some of that port meeting stuff as well, because that will all be going -- You know, starting around that time period, and I’m going to go to Mel.

MR. BELL: Kind of to Kristin’s question, that’s exactly what I was thinking, is simply a framework to bring on the new ACL from the -- You know, that we’ve been given, a simple, and just kind of accept it, and then start at the appropriate time following the -- Informed by the port meetings and all, and the more complex pieces associated with the fishery, and management of the fishery, and then so, when you start that exactly, from a staff timing standpoint, and I would leave that up to you all, but it would basically be a parallel effort with get the framework going, and, at

some point, you start the full plan amendment, and they parallel, or overlap a little bit or something, and then you're on your way, but, again, bring in what we learn from the port meetings and all to inform the full amendment, and that's what I was thinking.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Mel, and I will just add, from North Carolina, I mean, the Northern Zone quota has been a huge issue for our commercial community in general, and, you know, I've heard a lot about it, and so there's a big appetite to at least see if we can address some of these catch levels as quickly as possible, to help the commercial community in North Carolina in particular. I am going to go to Spud, and then I'm going to look around, to see if anybody has a motion that they want to make.

MR. WOODWARD: Actually, I was going to make the motion for you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you. You read my mind. Go ahead.

MR. WOODWARD: **I will move that we direct staff to begin a framework amendment to update Atlantic Spanish mackerel catch levels based on SEDAR 78 and SSC recommendations.** While I've got the microphone, I think one of the -- While this may not put more fish for the recreational sector, it will definitely put more fish for the commercial sector. I mean, approximately a million pounds would be available to be caught under that 55/45 split that's not available now, and so I see that as an immediate benefit to address some need.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Spud. Do we have a second for that motion? Mel. We have a motion on the floor. Do we have any discussion over this motion? All right. **Seeing no discussion on the motion, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes by consensus.** Just real quick, do we -- You know, we had a lot of discussion to also begin a full-blown amendment, and do we need to discuss that now, or should we wait until a later time?

MS. WIEGAND: My recommendation would be to wait until a later time. We are going to talk about port meeting scheduling, and I think it might be helpful to sort of get through that discussion before thinking of when we might want to put a full plan amendment onto the workload planning calendar.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Christina. With the passing of this motion, I think we can move on to the next agenda item, and so I guess that is the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel report, and we'll have our AP chairman, Ira Laks, come give the report.

MR. LAKS: Good morning, everyone. The Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel met via webinar on April 21, 2023. It started out where the committee chair, Tom Roller, gave us an update on what was going on that was relevant in the CMP fishery, and then we got an update on what amendments, particularly Amendment 34, and where they stood. After that, we jumped into a citizen science update, similar to the one that you guys got yesterday afternoon, and I think the AP received it very well, and there was a lot of good information, and we look forward to participating with all of that, and I sensed a lot of excitement. Are there any questions?

Then we got into the conversation of mackerel port meetings, something that the AP, for years, has really wanted to see. As Tom said earlier about the value of the fishery, we felt that it was just a little neglected, and it really needs to be looked at in a more comprehensive way, and we're

excited to see this going forward. Particularly, with the range shift and the expansion of the fish, we thought that it would be important to include people from the Mid-Atlantic and New England and areas there that these fish seem to be going to.

AP members wanted every state to be in it, and we also had some interest in learning more about king mackerel tournaments and the impact it's having on the fishery and the communities. We did give an idea of where we wanted the AP -- The AP members gave an idea of where we wanted the port meetings to be held, and I think we do need to narrow that down a little more, with further discussion, but, overall, we had a pretty good discussion on what we wanted to see with the port meetings and how we think it could be very valuable to fishery, going forward, to get a comprehensive look, up and down the coast, of how it's being prosecuted and the ideas that are coming out of the fishermen. Any questions?

MR. ROLLER: We did have members that were concerned about bringing Objective 5 in the CMP FMP for discussion during port meetings, because it requests data that is considered unreliable and does not reflect the current makeup of the fishery, and we did pass a motion to eliminate Objective 5 from the CMP FMP, and that motion was approved.

Then we went on to talk about South Atlantic research recommendations, and there was a little bit of talk about how the fishery was prosecuted in the past, particularly prior to World War II and after that and, you know, just dealing with how those data streams need to be incorporated into stock assessments, and, also, that we get information from up and down the coast, including the Mid-Atlantic and New England, where these fish seem to be being encountered more often than they have in the past. Any questions on that?

We then went into the effects of the Kennedy Space Center operations on fishing activities, and we had some public comment, and it seems to be an increasing amount of activity in the space center area, around Cape Canaveral, and, when they do a launch, they prohibit fishermen from accessing areas where they normally fish, or even from going out from port, and, as this becomes a more and more commercialized industry, the days that fishermen are being impacted is increasing and cutting into their profits. Both recreational and commercial fisheries are being impacted by it. Any questions?

Then we went into Other Business, and I personally put a plug in for the Marine Resource Education Program, trying to get some people interested in joining us in learning about fisheries management and science, and we look forward to having a meeting in-person, where we can have further discussions on these, and, if there's any questions that I can answer, please let me know.

MR. ROLLER: Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Ira, and thank you for all your work in the MREP program, too. That's an awesome program, and I wish that more people would take advantage of that. It's incredible, but my question for you, and I know that was a webinar, that your April 21 meeting was a webinar, but I looked at the attendance at that thing, and I see that half the members of your AP missed the entire thing. Overall, are you finding that to be an issue, from a chairman's standpoint, that the participation level, overall attendance level, or attendance, and maybe not participation, because the people that do show up participate, and I listened in, and so I know they're participating, but

is the overall attendance -- Would you say that, you know, the people showing up, or being in attendance, is the norm for you guys?

I guess we just want to try to understand where we are, and we have some policies about attendance, coming to these meetings, and we think it's very important, but I want to make sure that these meetings are able to move forward in a way that the attendance level that you do have makes it so that we can get things done, or so that you're happy with the way that things can get done.

MS. WIEGAND: I will certainly defer to Ira to provide, you know, his perspective, as chair of the Mackerel Cobia AP, and I do want to note that, sort of with mackerel, we've sort of holding these webinar meetings as needed, and mackerel is budgeted currently for one in-person meeting a year, and sometimes, depending on where things are in the, you know, development stage, be it port meetings or an amendment, it necessitates an additional meeting, and so we will have a second meeting via webinar, in order to get that information that the council needs without that extra expenditure of a second in-person Mackerel AP meeting, because, again, we're budgeted right now for one in-person AP meeting. Certainly, if you look at the full attendance record, attendance at in-person meetings is always significantly better than attendance on webinars.

MR. ROLLER: Tim, from my perspective, it is disappointing not to see everyone there, right, and, I mean, there's fishermen, like myself and others, who do join, and we're giving up our time, and we made a commitment, but, on the other hand, I do understand, with weather patterns lately, and you know that days are important, right, and days are becoming like weeks, but I think, you know, one or two missed meetings here and there is one thing, but, if it becomes a pattern, I would suggest that we re-look at that, and there's also a technology factor, right? I mean, fishermen are not comfortable with webinars, and I do believe that webinar is not going to have the attendance that in-person does, and it's just -- It's a foreign entity for most fishermen.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Ira, and I think maybe, if you wouldn't mind just a few minutes of conversation around the table with the guys, to make sure they understand how important -- How we do value their attendance, and there's a reason why we have them on there, and it's so that we can get, you know, their knowledge and feedback on these issues, because they are important, and we very highly value what you guys are doing, and so, when the attendance level drops to where, you know, we only have half the guys showing up, even if it is via webinar -- I mean, attendance is attendance, and so we're not going to make a lot of distinction, and you can't make a lot of distinction, and you participate or you don't participate, but maybe just, you know, just some conversation around the table, at the next meeting, whether it be in-person or webinar, that, you know, we really need guys to come bring their knowledge to the seat. Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Tim, and I will at our next meeting in-person. I will convey that publicly and privately to the members. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: First of all, I want to second your plug for MREP. I went to the last session, and it was like the best. It was so well put together, and I learned so much, and it was such a great use of time, and you worked so hard, and so thank you. I mean, it was impressive.

I want to comment on the historical perspective, and I'm glad that it was brought up in the AP, because it's so important to have, you know, the history of what the fishery has been, and I want

to emphasize that, at our last meeting, Mel made a request for the historical king mackerel locations and timing and market and gear changes, and all of that is so important, and so I want to make sure that both Spanish and king mackerel, as we go into these assessments and these activities, that we have a really good understanding of the history of the fishery. Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: Do we have any other questions for Ira? Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Ira. We all appreciate your hard work and dedication to this fishery, and so we're going to move on to our next agenda item, and that will be the mackerel port meetings discussion, and I'm going to hand it over to Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Thanks, guys, and so one of the first things that I wanted to do, before we dive into discussions of port meetings, is sort of refresh your memory on what we discussed back in March, and so just, real quick, if you will remember, you agreed that you wanted to focus this on the Gulf and Atlantic king and Spanish mackerel fisheries specifically, while noting that other species, especially species like Gulf cobia and little tunny, are likely to come up during these discussions and to sort of make sure that staff is prepared with a plan to facilitate those discussions in a way that would gather information that could be helpful for the council, but didn't detract from the overall focus and the needed discussions on king and Spanish mackerel.

You agreed that these port meetings were going to be open to all members of the public, commercial, for-hire, recreational, and others, and that you would have them all sort of attend the same meeting. Then, finally, where possible, the plan is to work with the Gulf Council, and I will talk a little bit more about that in second, and hold port meetings throughout the Gulf and the Atlantic, up to the southern end of Massachusetts, working with ASMFC throughout the Atlantic, and, of course, roping in the Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Councils, as applicable, given that that's their area of jurisdiction.

You guys created sort of a broad list of information that you felt was really necessary to gain a comprehensive understanding of the king and Spanish mackerel fishery, and I'm not going to read over all of it, but, just to sort of refresh your memory of the high points, movement and expansion of these two fisheries was something that you all were very concerned about gathering information on, the dynamics of the commercial fleet, looking at how these sort of commercial and recreational sectors utilize and value king and Spanish mackerel, looking at the role that tournaments are playing in these fisheries, and then, finally, looking at some more environmental factors and how those are affecting the king and Spanish mackerel fisheries.

That's what you talked about in March, and you requested that, in June, you be afforded some time to discuss the current goals and objectives that are in the CMP FMP, in order to sort of develop some key questions that you may want to ask stakeholders during port meetings, and so, in addition to sort of going over those goals and objectives, the other thing that we would like to get done at this meeting is to talk a little bit about the goals and objectives of the port meetings themselves and then look at a draft timeline and sort of a plan for development of these port meetings.

With that, I will have us dive right into the CMP goals and objectives. Again, these haven't been updated since 1992, but, in sort of development of the king mackerel amendment, you all did start some discussions with the Gulf Council about changes you would like to make, and so there's some color-coding here. The blue-gray color, these are ones that have already been sort of updated, and you and the Gulf Council have agreed on this language, but it hasn't been formally adopted

into the FMP, and then the ones that you see in yellow are ones that the Gulf Council has recommended for removal at previous meetings, and so I'm just going to sort of go over these one-by-one, and then I will turn it over for you all to discuss.

The first one, Objective 1, this one you and the Gulf Council went back and forth and updated language on factor in the development of CMP 34, and it essentially talks about the goal of achieving and maintaining optimum yield, to allow for recovery of overfished populations and ensure adequate recruitment.

Objective 2 is currently in the FMP, and it hasn't been modified in any way, and it focuses on creating a flexible management system that, while minimizes regulatory delay, still allows for public input into the management process. Finally, you've got Objective 3, and, again, this is one that you and the Gulf Council went back and forth on, and have now agreed on, and it simply talks about achieving robust fishery reporting and data collection systems, in order to minimize risk uncertainty. Then you've got Objective 4, and it's pretty straightforward, to minimize gear and user conflicts.

Then we get into Objective 5, and this one I do want to focus on for a minute, and so the Gulf Council has recommended that this be removed from the FMP. This is also the objective that the Mackerel Cobia AP passed a motion on, requesting that it be removed or not taken out to port meetings for discussion, and this one talks about distributing the total allowable catch, or the annual catch limit, of Atlantic Spanish mackerel between recreational and commercial user groups based on catches that occurred during the mid-1970, which is prior to the development of the deepwater runaround gillnet fishery and when the resource was not considered overfished.

You've got Objective 6 to minimize waste and bycatch in the fishery. Objective 7 looks to provide appropriate management to address specific migratory groups of king mackerel. The Gulf Council has recommended this to be removed, as the objective has sort of been met with the structure of king mackerel management currently, and then, finally, Objective 8 is to optimize the social and economic benefits of the CMP fishery.

You all wanted an opportunity to sort of discuss those, and discuss whether there were specific questions related to these objectives that you would like to have stakeholders discuss during port meetings, and so, with that, I will turn it back to you, Tom, for discussion.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Christina. Do we have any discussion over the objectives? I've got Shep with his hand up.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I actually just have a question, and so, in the discussion of the Spanish mackerel assessment, I thought you said that Spanish mackerel allocations are not based on historical landings.

MS. WIEGAND: They're not, and so the history of Spanish mackerel allocations in brief is, back in Amendment 2 or 3, whatever amendment split the migratory groups for Spanish mackerel in the early 1990s, they were based on a landing stream, and it was landings from the late 1970s and early 1980s. Then, in Amendment 8 to the CMP FMP, the council, at the time, felt that that landings stream had been sort of negatively skewed, because of that runaround gillnet fishery, and so recreational landings had been affected by that, and were artificially low, and, because both

sectors would have been able to fully harvest the total allowable catch at the time, the council decided the most equitable allocation was splitting it down the middle 50/50, and that allocation was in place for quite some time, until Regulatory Amendment something, and I believe the year was 1998, and the recreational sector was not catching their ACL, whereas the commercial sector was regularly bumping up against theirs, and so they did sort of a 5 percent transfer, which got us to the 55 percent commercial and 45 percent recreational allocation that we have today.

MR. ROLLER: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I guess that just makes the point that Objective 5 here has long been left behind, I guess.

MR. ROLLER: Do we have any more discussion or questions? Kristin.

MS. FOSS: Is there a way we could kind of get maybe like a history of why Objective 5 was kind of put in there? You know, maybe like which amendments we could kind of dig back into to see the rationale that the council had, before we, you know, decide to remove it?

MS. WIEGAND: Yes, and that rationale -- I can't remember whether it was the same amendment that addressed allocations that added this specific objective, but I can go back and find the exact rationale for adding it in.

MR. ROLLER: I mean, this comes up routinely as the AP, and I do personally think that would be really helpful. John.

DR. WALTER: A number of years ago, there was a project called FishSmart, and I don't know if people remember that, which was run by colleagues at the University of Maryland, and they did a lot of workshops to try to identify conceptual management objectives for this fishery, and so probably a lot of our stakeholders participated in that, and I'm wondering -- I know there was a number of -- It was I think about fifteen years ago, and so I'm just wondering whether that's something that's being used, if some of the findings there are being used, or as starting points, for some of the discussions, and it seems like it might be valuable to at least look at those insights and keep some continuity as we go out to stakeholders who say, hey, I already told you this fifteen years ago, and you didn't do anything. Just I know we value our stakeholders' feedback, but I think sometimes they feel that we aren't listening and acting, and I think we want to make sure that we are keeping continuity. Thanks.

MR. ROLLER: Do we have any more questions and discussion on the objectives?

MS. WIEGAND: I guess I might push you all a little. Based on these objectives, is there anything specific you would like us to address with stakeholders during port meetings, or even with the Mackerel Cobia AP, at their upcoming meeting, and then I still sort of want -- With Objective 5, the AP's concern was bringing it out to port meetings for discussion at all, and I can bring you back the rationale, but I would be interested to know if you were comfortable with that going out for discussion.

MR. ROLLER: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I would like the question to be asked, during port meetings, about having dead discards taken from each sector, given the atmosphere of fairly and equitable and the different types of scenarios we're into today, and I think that goes a lot further of making each side be accountable for their discards and part of their landings and fishing, and it would be interesting to see if other folks are for the fairly and equitable accounting of the catch, and so it would be good to ask that, and, that way, we can see how it falls with the public and where other groups, or organizations, are at, with that asking. Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: So, you know, I'm going to go back a little bit to Kristin's comment, based off the history of this, and I think that is a really important thing to bring up, because, if we're not necessarily going to directly address Objective 5, or that's what we're considering now, and we know that allocations are going to come up at the port meetings, and I think maybe it would more pertinent to discuss the history of the allocations and maybe not just Objective 5. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I agree with Dewey, and I think this is important to understand in this fishery, because, you know, the discards, in a fishery like Spanish mackerel, they've coming from the recreational sector, and I think there needs to be some discussion among -- At these port meetings about how the fishery recreationally is prosecuted and what the intent there is, and what do they do with these fish, and, I mean, if you're pulling, you know, a Hopkins, and you're catching a fish like this, that gets drug through the water at five knots, or six knots, it's dead when it gets to the boat, and so what happens to these fish? Are they just getting thrown back overboard? Is that the whole idea, is just to go out and catch these fish and then that's where all these discards are coming from?

I think it's important that that discussion happens around the table and that we have this understanding that, if a sector wants to fish that way, that's fine, but they need to be responsible for those discards, and I'm not sure that anybody around here really understands that, you know, the discards are an issue, and the issue is that, when you catch a fish that that's fragile, that small, in that manner, if you don't intend to keep it, then it's dead, and it's going to be a discard, and you need to be responsible for it, period, and nobody else, no other sector, needs to be penalized for that, and that's exactly what is happening here.

MR. ROLLER: Spud and then Laurilee.

MR. WOODWARD: This discard issue is complicated, I think, in this circumstance, because what do you do with shrimp trawl bycatch discards? I mean, that's not an actively-fishing sector generating a discard, but it can be a considerable contribution to overall removals from the stock, in certain circumstances, and so I think, you know, it's worthwhile subject to discuss, but it's a complicated thing, in terms of who do you credit a discard to, and that's why I go back to what I said about, you know, where is this being addressed in the stock status determinations, and make sure there's not a double-jeopardy issue here, is really important.

MR. ROLLER: Spud, you bring up a good point there, because, I mean, I think back to some of our state fisheries, and we tend to take, you know, shrimp trawl bycatch, which are considerable in some and incrementally small in others, and we tend to take them from the top, looking at the state stock assessments, and I'm going to go to Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Well, the shrimp bycatch, shrimp trawl bycatch, is 10 percent of what the recreational discards are, but my question is what is the main reason that the recreational people are discarding the Spanish mackerel? Is it because they're undersized? When we get to the amendment part, if we made a different -- You know, if we gave them a little -- A couple more inches on the size limit, would that help be able to keep more fish, and then they would -- You know, they would not keep fishing and trying to catch bigger fish.

MR. ROLLER: I will just point out that I think this is good discussion around Objective 6, and so we are staying on task a little bit, and I will address your comment a little bit, Laurilee, just from my perspective, and we just have to keep in mind that recreational fisheries are different, right, and so I know, with my business, I have a lot of customers that they may want to go catch fifteen Spanish, but they want to just keep five of them, right, and so we're going to throw some of them back, and they are fragile, but a lot of the ways that people fish aren't necessarily killing them, right, a lot of the way, whether you're casting for them or fly-fishing for them, and a lot of those fish you can throw back and probably have a pretty high survival, you know, rate, and so it just depends on the individual fisherman. Yes, there are also, like we heard from Tim, people trolling, and they reel them in at six-and-a-half knots, and so I would argue, if you're fishing that way, you're probably fishing to keep them. I'm going to go to Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I will pass, but I just think that it's important we look at this overall, and, to Spud's point about the shrimp fleet and the discards that are there, just take it off the top of that sector's allocation, and the same with the recreational. I think we're going that way, because, when I look at -- It would just be a furthering -- I know of instances, in the Mid-Atlantic, where non-directed fisheries account for some harvest of a directed stock, and so I just think that we need to ask that to individuals during the port meetings, of where we're going, because there is other species here that we can look at, and I will wait to discuss that particularly to black sea bass and red snapper.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Dewey, and I'm going to go to Judy.

MS. HELMEY: We catch a lot of Spanish mackerel in our business, but, a lot of times, you're right that they'll want to keep four or five of them and take them over to the Flying Fish, and they're very good fresh, but we use a lot of ours for bait, and so a lot of people will go out just to catch them for bait, and so they use them for marlin, and also for catching barracuda, and we use just about every one we catch, other than the ones they eat, and we use them for bait, and so I don't know if that has anything to do with it, but I do know that, off our coast, that's what we do with them.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Judy. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for that, Judy, and that's very interesting as well, and I think maybe, you know, Ira, this may be something for the AP to have some discussion about, is, you know, what is the intent, and why are we discarding these, and what do you do, and what is the intent, when you go fishing. Judy, maybe you could elaborate a little bit on -- If you're killing the Spanish to use as bait for barracuda, what do you do with the barracuda?

MS. HELMEY: Okay. I am almost afraid to answer this, but, in our area, it's a very popular fish to eat, and we have -- I mean, actually, they really like it, and we have people that come and charter

the boat just to go catch barracuda, and I know it's -- In a lot of places, people will turn their nose up at it, but, in our area, we've found that there is no -- We haven't had any problem with ciguatera, or poisoning, and we also make sure that they're very well iced down, but that's one of our biggest sources of income, is barracuda fishing, because think about this.

Get in a boat, and we have a four-hour trip. You ride one hour to get to the fishing grounds, and you go catch a Spanish mackerel and automatically the guy looks at me and he goes, this is it, and I'm like give me five seconds, and put this fish out, and this forty-five-pound monster eats it, and jumps out of the water, and he goes off and pulls off 400 feet of line, and we tighten the drag down, and it always pulls him over the wall, and so it's kind of exciting, and so that's what we turn our Spanish mackerel into. Money.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Judy. I will point out that, in my home community, the Big Rock Marlin Tournament, there was -- A lot of the commercial guys were catching Spanish, the last week, and bringing them down and selling them for marlin pitch baits. Do we have any other comments or any other questions on the objectives?

I will just add that I think some of the comments here, the little ideological base of like what is the intent of it, just remind folks that, I mean, recreational fishing is a giant industry that brings a lot of money into our communities, right, and people spend a lot of money to go catch a few fish and throw a few of them back, and, yes, some of them wind up as discards, but there's a lot of economic activity generated with them, even if the intent is not to eat them all. Any other questions, or do we want to move on from this? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Do you need a motion to remove Objective 5, so that we match the Gulf Council and it's the recommendation of your AP?

MS. WIEGAND: So a couple of things. I do have the rationale for Objective 5. I will say, in terms of removing and approving, this will eventually need to go into a full plan amendment to be formally adopted, and the Gulf Council will also need to concur with all of the changes. Sort of, at past meetings, the intent of this council had been to sort of discuss these amongst yourselves, but not make any changes until post-port meetings, and so the question is sort of not really whether or not you want to remove Objective 5 permanently, but it's do you want people to discuss this at port meetings, because that was the concern of the AP, was even having this idea out for discussion among the public, and so, if that's not something you would like the public to discuss, we can just not present Objective 5.

If it is something that you would like the public to discuss during port meetings, we can certainly bring it out for discussion, but like formal adoption of these won't be until sort of post-port meetings, in a larger plan amendment.

Then, just so that you guys have all of the context for Objective 5, so that was Amendment 4 that did revise the allocations to be that 50/50 split, and it was because the resource was overfished from 1979 to 1985, which resulted in lower recreational catches, and the council, at the time, felt that recreational catches were affected by the increase in commercial effort in the mid-1970s, because of that deepwater runaround gillnet fishery, and that qualitative information indicated that recreational catch was quite high during the early to mid-1970s, before the development of that fishery, and then, again, the 50/50 split was determined because capacity and demand for both user

groups was such that either group could harvest all of the available resource, and so 50/50 was the most equitable allocation, and so that's what this objective is getting at.

MR. ROLLER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think including this in the port meetings discussion will be an unnecessary distraction from getting people to focus on some of the other, more important objectives. I mean, look at how long it's taken for us just to understand this, and have some understanding of it, and, I mean, it's part of the history, but how relevant and important is it, going forward, for the future?

I mean, to me it's more Objective 2, and things like that, are ones where I think we really need -- You know, what do the people who are stakeholders in this fishery see as a flexible management system that is responsive to changes? I mean, I think that's where we need to focus the efforts, is getting that kind of feedback, and not so much second-guessing the validity of historical decisions and that kind of thing, but, you know, that's just my personal opinion about it.

MR. ROLLER: Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: I agree with Spud, and I don't think it's -- It's not a viable objective any longer, and it could be distracting, and you could have it in there as background history material, and so these are what the, you know, objectives used to be, but I don't think there's any need to discuss it.

MR. ROLLER: This is some really good discussion, and does anybody else have any more comments on it? Does everybody agree that we should not bring Objective 5 out for discussion? I see a lot of nodding heads. Okay.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so, next, I wanted to talk about sort of taking these broad discussions that you guys have had and channeling them down into specific goals and objectives for port meetings, and so what I have on the board is, obviously, sort of the overall goal is to evaluate those goals and objectives of the CMP FMP, but then, based on sort of the parameters of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as well as the list of topics that you all discussed during your March 2023 meeting, we sort of developed these four key objectives for port meetings.

One is to achieve the maximum economic and social yield from the fishery, maintain the long-term sustainability of stocks, maintain the integrity of fishing communities under climate change, and then achieving the most equitable management structure under climate change, and so these are draft goals and objectives, and we don't necessarily need to approve them formally at this meeting, but I would love you all to have some discussion about whether those sort of four bullet points accurately capture your goals for the port meetings.

MR. ROLLER: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I think those are good goals and objectives. The one that does come to mind, that I just want to ask about, considering we're getting a lot of discussion about environmental justice, is the potential for identifying underserved communities with these.

MR. ROLLER: Any other discussion or comments on the draft goals and objectives? Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Then the other thing is, as we've talked about, the idea of management shifts, and is it something that we need to say whether or not there needs to be changes in how we're managing that jointly with the Mid-Atlantic and New England, depending on how the range expansions go, just as an idea?

MR. ROLLER: Okay. We're going to move on, unless -- Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Just real quickly, I think, under that same last bullet, and I think it's implied, but perhaps it needs to be stated that also a component of that is interjurisdictional management between state and federal jurisdictions, to make sure that that is functioning as well as it can and should be.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so the next thing would be to discuss timing, and I will say this table is now a little outdated, based on discussions this morning, and so the guidance, I think, that would be helpful going forward from the council is, in terms of this future larger plan amendment, at what junction -- I guess how closely do you want that amendment tied to port meetings, and when in the port meeting process would you want that to get started?

Right now, port meetings -- We've got plans to present to ASMFC and the Gulf Council this fall, and the goal would be to have sort of a plan and schedule finalized for port meetings by the end of the year, hold port meetings throughout most of next year, and we did have, you know, a sort of summary report prepared by September of next year, and I will say the purpose of that was to line it up with a full plan Spanish mackerel amendment.

Given your discussion this morning to start a framework and then do a plan amendment later, this could be extended a little bit, which might provide us quite a bit more flexibility in getting these port meetings scheduled, and so my question would be, for this plan amendment, do you want to start it while port meetings are still going on, or would you like to wait until port meetings are complete and you have guidance from those before starting a larger plan amendment?

MR. ROLLER: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Just for conversation's sake, I would vote for waiting until after the port meetings are done and we've got a chance to kind of assimilate everything together and see what it means in the bigger scheme of it.

MR. ROLLER: Kristin.

MS. FOSS: I also felt like the point of the port meetings was for us to kind of go and get like general feedback about specific questions, and, if we go with more of like, hey, the council is considering this, and what's your feedback here, it may bias their influence, and we may just not get the feedback that we're really wanting, and so I would suggest kind of waiting and going along with your timeline that you have here.

MR. ROLLER: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Coming off of Kristin's point too, it's that idea that it would almost -- I think, if you got them too close together, it feels more like what we would do with a general plan amendment, as opposed to the idea of we're wanting to hit this amendment more as a blank slate than one that's already pre-loaded and you're giving us public input on it, and it's kind of helping us do the framework now, as opposed to just fleshing it out.

MR. ROLLER: I go back to, you know, my experience as an advisor, and we had so much discussion, for years, over the want of port meetings, because the fishermen, across these fisheries, felt that there should be -- That they had a lot to say, and they wanted to see their ideas incorporated into this fishery, right, just like you said, very holistically, and I do agree with that. I think it's important that we kind of look at this like a blank slate, right, because there seems to be a lot of appetite to really -- To really look at this from the ground-up. Kristin.

MS. FOSS: Yes, I agree, and I think it will be much more well received from the public if we kind of look at it that way.

MR. ROLLER: Definitely people, I think, will feel that they're actually contributing to what this fishery looks like.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so the last thing we were hoping to get approval for is to develop a planning team for these port meetings, to help sort of facilitate the development. It's clear that, if we do these through the Gulf, and all the way through up to southern Massachusetts, there's going to need to be quite a bit of coordination, and so the hope is to have planning team members come from, you know, the Gulf of Mexico Council, the commission, and we would sort of request that when we meet with them in August, as well as sort of any state agencies that would want to send people to be involved, and then consulting the Mid and New England Councils as needed.

This group would work on discussing how to best facilitate port meetings, identifying key locations for holding port meetings, and, of course, identifying stakeholders and the best way to encourage participation in port meetings, and so, up until now, it's been just sort of me brainstorming to bring to you, but I think we're getting to the point in the development process where it's going to be important to bring other people to the table from these different groups to start discussing the best way forward, and so I just wanted to sort of get approval or, you know, direction to staff to start organizing that type of team.

MR. ROLLER: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: One question, just because I'm not as well-versed in the Gulf Commission, and does the Gulf Commission have any stake in with mackerels in the Gulf? I mean, is it something that we need to consider that commission as well? I know they don't operate quite the same way as ASMFC does, but, I mean, because we're talking about the potential of this coastwide -- It might behoove us to just see.

MS. WIEGAND: To my knowledge, they don't do anything with Spanish mackerel, but I am not as well-versed in what the commission is involved with in the Gulf area, and so, when we talk to the Gulf Council, we can certainly get information on whether or not it would be prudent to include the Gulf Commission as well.

MR. ROLLER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: My thoughts on trying to -- You know, for the planning team, and maybe just if you could have some handouts that maybe has a series of discussion questions, to kind of get folks thinking, and, you know, if they can be provided a week or two in advance of the meetings, I think would be good, and maybe part of that series of questions also is trying to get at the objectives, to see if you want to get -- To get what input you want from looking at the objectives, and I would kind of set it up -- I was thinking that it might be good to just set it up as like a town hall, so that you've got these questions to get the discussion going, and you can have that back-and-forth conversation.

I know, with DMF, we did some town-hall-type meetings with our for-hire folks, and it really went over well, and I think the fishers felt heard, and, you know, that two-way conversation really -- It's good, because it just gains trust, and you get to know people, and, you know, everybody is a person, and, anyway, that's how I would approach it.

MR. ROLLER: Bob.

MR. BEAL: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of thoughts, and, obviously, ASMFC is happy to participate on a planning team, any way you want, and we're happy to help out, and we're happy to help out in running the port meetings, or whatever you help you need, especially from, you know, Virginia through southern New England, Massachusetts or wherever we decide to stop the northern end of this, but just a couple of thoughts on timing, you know, everything we talked about earlier, real quickly.

From the commission perspective, the commission doesn't need to go through an addendum, or a framework process, to adopt the new ACLs. The interstate plan essentially references the federal quota, and so, if this council changes the quotas, we'll all set at the commission, and we don't need to do anything, and we'll just reference that and away we go.

Then, you know, as far as the trailing amendment goes, our board had the conversation that, you know, we're going to let the council take the lead and kind of move in parallel once -- I think our board was anticipating doing the full amendment once the port meetings had already occurred, and so, you know, once the port meetings are done, and this council is sort of off and running with an amendment, we'll move in parallel with that, and we can probably move a little bit quicker at the commission, but not necessarily, and, you know, there are some things that will be unique to the commission's amendment, most likely, because there are some differences between the federal plan and the interstate plan, and we need to sort those out at the commission, and so, you know, we're here to kind of move along with the council any way we can. If we can help with these, you know, port hearings, or port meetings, in the Mid-Atlantic, just let us know. We're more than happy to help out.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Bob. I mean, we've had a lot of discussions here, and it's important to point out that this is a huge lift for our staff here, right, and we're going to need the cooperation of the other councils as well to help make this possible, not just the commission, and, you know, when I was the liaison to the Gulf Commission, we had a lot of discussions on this, and, you know, there seemed to be a little bit of a hesitation, but, you know, I do understand they're doing their

own assessment, and this might correlate coming out after their assessment comes out, which I think would be slightly helpful to them too, and so Jack and then Trish.

DR. MCGOVERN: Two things. First, the Gulf States Commission doesn't have any regulatory authority, and so they wouldn't be involved in the management of Spanish mackerel, and then the second thing is I didn't know if you wanted anybody from NMFS to be a part of these planning teams. If it's no, that's fine.

MS. WIEGAND: That would be fantastic, and I can certainly work with you to identify who would be appropriate to participate on a team like this.

MR. ROLLER: Trish and then Carolyn.

MS. MURPHEY: Just to add some more ideas on how to move forward with this, you talked about identifying key stakeholders, and so you really want those folks that influence, the influencers, you know, and that's probably who you probably want to look for, and I'm thinking you may have folks on the AP that could play that role and help in facilitating at least attendance to these meetings. I will go ahead and volunteer the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries staff, including myself, to help in any meetings in North Carolina.

MS. WIEGAND: I will say that, in talking with the AP about these port meetings, we sort of made it very clear that there was an expectation there of AP members, that they would not only be in attendance at these, but they would be helping us plan and organize them and recruiting individuals to participate, and the AP members we talked to were enthusiastic and excited about participating, and so we will certainly be relying on them quite a bit, but also especially sort of moving up into that Mid-Atlantic and New England area, where we don't have as much experience, and we'll be looking towards ASMFC and the other councils up there to help us identify those key stakeholders.

MR. ROLLER: Yes, and I think, you know, at that point, if there's any, you know, industry groups and whatnot that want to help organize and put the word out, I think that would be helpful too as well. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Jack, just for clarification, I know, obviously there is no ACFCMA for the Gulf, but, in seeing that they have an FMP for Spanish mackerel, how does that -- I guess the regulation management of that, and I'm just, again, just trying to think about people who have a stake in that stock, but can you talk a little bit to how the FMP process then does work, if they've got one defined?

DR. MCGOVERN: Can you repeat part of that? I couldn't hear it very well.

DR. BELCHER: The Gulf Commission does have an FMP for Spanish mackerel, and I know that they don't have ACFCMA, the way that the Atlantic States do, and so I know the regulatory process is different, but, to the level that there is an FMP defined by them, would they still not be part of the equation with our coastal migratory or -- I guess I'm just looking for a little more clarification on why they're not necessarily a player with this.

DR. MCGOVERN: I would have to look into that and get back to you. I'm not aware of an FMP for Spanish that the Gulf Commission has, and so I can look into that.

MR. ROLLER: Any other feedback and suggestions here for the planning team?

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so some of the next steps will be the Gulf Council has graciously allowed us to be on their agenda for their August meeting, to talk a little bit about port meetings and see the extent to which they would like to be involved in the process. The same with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, and we'll be looking to present sort of this draft plan to them at their August meeting, and then the next thing will be to discuss, again, the CMP FMP goals and objectives and the port meeting goals and objectives with the Mackerel Cobia AP. I will say that, if there are specific questions that you would like your AP to discuss relative to port meetings, that information would be very helpful to me as we sort of plan to go into that meeting.

MR. ROLLER: Bob.

MR. BEAL: You know, if there's value in it, in potentially a joint AP meeting -- In other words, if you want to bring ASMFC's AP to meet with your AP to talk -- To get a little bit more representation from farther up the coast, we're happy to do that.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Bob. I see our AP Chair, Ira, is nodding his head yes. Any other comments? Anything you want the AP to discuss, in particular? We're going to sit here for a second, because there should be something. Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: I just got information in response to Carolyn's question, and the Gulf Commission has a guidance document for Spanish mackerel, and so maybe they would be a valuable partner in all of this.

MR. ROLLER: Any other things for the AP to discuss? If we don't have anything now, we're happy to look at this again at Full Council, if anyone wants to bring any thoughts then. I see some nodding heads, and so think about it for a couple of days. That is it for the port meetings, and we're going to move on to our third agenda item, and that is king mackerel tournament landings, and we had some lengthy discussion about this at our last meeting, and I'm expecting the same today, and so let's go ahead.

DR. WALTER: Mr. Chair, I think I will be presenting.

MR. ROLLER: Okay. Go ahead, John.

DR. WALTER: All right, and so this brings me back to I think when I was the analyst for SEDAR 38, a bunch of years ago, and we incorporated tournament landings for the first time, the tournament data, into the stock assessment, both the age and length composition, and I used it as a separate fleet.

At that time, we assumed that tournament removals were 3 percent, in number, of the recreational catch, and that was based on the FishSmart project that actually took a deep dive into tournament fishery, and so I would say, if people want more information on the tournament fishery, that project compiled probably the best amount of information that was available at the time, through extensive discussions with the tournament operators and the Southern Kingfish Association executive director. That is just -- I am just referring to that for more information.

There was a previous concern that was expressed about the possibility of king mackerel tournament landings being counted towards both recreational and commercial landings, and thus the ACLs, and so the tournament landings can end up in a dealer report if the fish are collected by a dealer, and normally donated to a charity, or earnings from sale donated to charity, and so the removals should be considered recreational, because they are primarily caught through recreational processes, and so the landings should be accounted for in MRIP. However, the tournament trips are not excluded from the MRIP survey, effort survey.

What we needed to do is go to each of the individual states that collect this information on their trip tickets, to be able to determine whether those tournament fish are included in the ACL monitoring, and so, for North Carolina, the tournament landings may be reported to ACCSP on a trip ticket, and we're working on a way to identify this, so that they can be separated using the catch source variable, and so North Carolina remains one of the places where they could be reported on trip tickets, and we need to work out that.

In South Carolina, tournament landings do not get reported on trip tickets, and so that's fine. In Georgia, a small amount of tournament landings are reported on trip tickets, and, in Florida, they're actually separated out, and the Science Center separates them out and removes them for ACL calculations.

This is the fraction of tournament landings, in weight, relative to the total commercial catch. The percentages are really low, and so it's a very, very small percentage of the total tournament catch relative to the total commercial catch, and it's nearly always less than 3 percent, and there is two columns, because the first column is the overall, and then the second column is removing Florida, and so the Florida tournament landings already have been removed from the ACL, and so that's the most appropriate column to use, but, in this case, it's largely not a major component.

Then we looked at what the fraction of tournament landings are relative to the total recreational catch in weight, and, again, one column is the overall, and then the second column is excluding Florida, and, in this case, it's less than 1 percent in nearly every year of the total recreational catch in weight, and so this is less than what was assumed in the stock assessment, using the FishSmart data, but, in any case, it's quite a small fraction of the total recreational catch in weight.

The concluding thoughts is that I think the tournament landings should be considered as recreational, but, overall, the tournament landings are a very small percentage of the total removals. However, a small amount of king mackerel landings, less than 2 percent from North Carolina and Georgia, may have been attributed to both commercial and recreational, and that remains somewhat of a sticking point, and we're working with ACCSP to be able to provide a mechanism on the report, the catch source variable, to be able to identify if those landings came from a tournament, and, once we can implement that, then we can exclude all tournament landings for the ACL calculations and accurately attribute the catches to their sector.

For acknowledgments, we would like to acknowledge a lot of our state partners, who helped us take a deep dive into the reporting process in each one of the states, and then, as I mentioned first, the FishSmart colleagues, who really did a lot of the work that allowed us to get those tournament catches, and tournament age and length composition, into the stock assessment, and I put a citation for that publication, and I would recommend, if people want to look further into that, they can see

that work that was done a number of years ago and published. I hope -- That concludes my presentation, and I hope we've sort of settled that issue, as best we can, for now. Thanks.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you for that presentation, John, and I think this is really what we needed to see, going forward in this discussion, but let me open it up, if anybody has any questions for John or any further discussion on this issue. Judy.

MS. HELMEY: Well, I think that Georgia has way, way less than 2 percent, and we used to have a lot of tournaments, many, many years ago, but we don't hardly have any tournaments now. The SKA used to come to Georgia quite often, but now we just don't have that, and so I'm going to say it's way less than 2 percent.

MR. ROLLER: I mean, in the information we have, Georgia is often somewhere around 900 to 1,500 pounds, and some years no landings. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Given that we've heard some public comment, and AP members asking about it, you have the percent landings that you've broken out here, that appear to be small during the tournament landings, and what about the size of the fish, in reference to the small landings there? Is there any data on the size of fish? There's a general conclusion that the targeted size is the larger spawning female size, or something like that, and not that it's to be addressed, but how does one answer that question, even though it's a small percentage in overall weight, and is that 2 percent a large fish, or what the breakdown of the fish size is, and how would that be attained? Thank you.

DR. WALTER: I believe the tournaments report the -- Most of the time, they report the lengths. For this exercise, we didn't look into that, and I think the stock assessment would have done that, and I know for sure, for a fact, the SEDAR 38 stock assessment used the lengths and ages from tournament-caught fish, and they were indeed the largest fish, and one of the benefits of using that was those were -- Because the fishery, or because the tournaments, really target the largest fish, and they only bring back the largest fish, and it was an asymptotic-selectivity fishery, and so it really helped to pin down a lot of the things in the stock assessment, when we explicitly modeled that, but, right now, the tournaments have definitely dropped off in number, and so I can't answer what their sizes are now, and I would imagine they're still targeting the largest fish, and whether we have that data into the stock assessment -- I can look into that and see whether we've got that. Thanks, Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: I am going to let Tim make a comment, and then we're going to -- Ira wanted to say something.

MR. GRINER: I was just curious. When you're saying that these tournaments are dropping off in number, but it doesn't appear that the pounds of fish that are landed in the tournaments are dropping off substantially in numbers, and is that correct? I mean, if you look at -- There is 2012, but, if you put up the next slide, you can see that -- Well, in 2021, there was almost 53,000 pounds, and so maybe the number of tournaments are dropping or something, but I don't see that the overall catch that these tournaments are taking is dropping, and am I correct there?

MR. ROLLER: Our AP Chair, Ira, wanted to address this a little bit.

MR. LAKS: I would appreciate if you would all, you know, have us discuss this at the AP, because this is something that we talk about quite often, and even at this table, and I know I heard Chester say, a few meetings ago, that it's common practice for guys to just throw fish in the back of their truck and sell them, and those fish don't get reported, right, and they go down as commercial catch, and, from my personal experience, that happens a lot, and so, if this is something that we could put on the agenda for the AP meeting, and really bring it up, and I would like to know how many tournaments there are, right, and, I mean, there has to be a way to find out how many tournaments there are. There's a lot more sales, from my personal experience, that go on than are recorded.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Ira, and, before I go to Spud, really quick, that's actually an interesting point, and I don't know how we want to discuss that, and I don't want to put Florida on the spot, but I understand the Florida permit is a tournament permit that would allow you to sell catch, and is that correct, because, in looking at the Florida numbers, I don't believe that there is less than five or six tournaments in Florida.

MR. BREWER: I can respond to that, and they're not -- The permit holder, and let's say, for example, the West Palm Beach Fishing Club, does not sell the fish. They give them to a commercial fisherman, who takes them to the fish house and sells the fish, and so Ira is right that, when you do that, those are going to go against the commercial quota. It's a commercial transaction, even though it's a recreationally-caught fish.

This idea that you're going to be able to say exactly how many, quote, kingfish tournaments there are is, I think, a lot more complicated than you might think, as an initial statement, because a lot of the tournaments that we have -- Yes, kingfish are in the tournament, but they're not exclusively a kingfish tournament. We hold a kingfish/dolphin/wahoo tournament, and all three of those species are targeted in that tournament, and the kingfish is not the focus of those things, or at least ours, and wahoo is the focus, but you're going to have a tough time saying, okay, this is how many, quote, kingfish tournaments there are.

MR. ROLLER: Kristin.

MS. FOSS: So our Florida rule is very similar to what is required in the federal CFR, right, and so, if there is a tournament, they have to register with our division, right, and so the fish are caught in that tournament, and they identify a dealer, if they wish to sell that catch and donate it for profits, right, and so that is marked in our trip ticket system with a specific number "TN", and so we're able to track that, and it is not counted toward the commercial quota. It will be then counted toward the recreational.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you for that clarification. Spud, did you want to comment?

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, and I think, back to this question of does the tournament harvest disproportionately affect larger fish in the population, I think one of the things that you've got to keep in consideration -- Now, I've been out of it for a while, but I was in it, and this is kind of a unique thing to North Carolina, is they have what they call fish bowl drawings, and what it did is it incentivized every participant in that tournament to bring a fish in, regardless of its size, because, for every fish they brought in, they got a ticket to draw for a prize, almost like a little lottery, and

so I think that's one of the reasons we see some of these elevated landings in North Carolina, is, if you have that fish bowl component to a tournament, then it incentivizes, and you end up with a much different size distribution of fish for that tournament than you would in a big fish format tournament, where you don't get anything except based on weight, and so this speaks, I think, to the complexity of this, of understanding how tournament landings affect a fish population, in terms of its, you know, spawning capacity.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, and, I mean, we've heard a lot of comments, you know, and I know I've received some emails, and I've heard from stakeholders on this, and the general concern is about the tournaments targeting the big female fish, but what I would point out is, while the commercial fishing tactics are very different than recreational, I would say, in general, the recreational fishing community, the way they fish, with live bait, is always targeting -- It's always more likely to catch a large fish than say, you know, someone trolling drone spoons looking for more marketable, you know, teenage-sized fish.

The one point I would bring up is, looking at this, what I've heard from a lot of people is there tends to a bit of concern for the stock, right, and there's a concern for conservation here, because I think a lot of us are not experiencing the king mackerel fishery up and down the coast that the stock assessment says that we should be, right, and we're not catching our ACLs, and maybe the quality of the fishery isn't as good as it was, and the distribution of fish isn't as good as it was, and I've heard it from Florida, and I've definitely experienced that in North Carolina, and that is something that I personally flag a little bit here, that there tends to be concern there, right, and that's concerning to me, and I don't know if that's necessarily as much about tournament landings or just general fishermen starting to get concerned about the fishery. Do we have any more discussion here? We're well ahead of schedule, and I think we've had a lot of discussion about this in the past, and I was anticipating some comments. Okay. Tim.

MR. GRINER: So what do we do about it? I mean, where do we go with this? I mean, I understand wanting to have a tournament, or a competition, and prove yourself to be the best out there, or be able to catch the biggest fish, and, you know, I don't -- I guess, to that extent, you know, competition is competition, whether it's bowling or fishing or whatever, or the guys who were playing table tennis last night out on the deck, but, really and truly, you know, what is the real value of having a tournament where these fish are going to be allowed to be sold?

I mean, you can still have this competition without selling the fish, right, and you can still do whatever you want to do, you know, get yourself a trophy, share the prize money, do whatever you want to do, but I think the real issue, for me, is why are these fish entering the commercial end of this, and why are they being sold, and should they be sold? I don't feel like they should be sold, and I think that brings in a whole other aspect of this that we don't really -- You know, that shouldn't be involved, and, you know, we heard some comments earlier about -- You know, Tom alluded to the economic value of recreational fishing, right, and whether it be the economic value of landing that fish or discarding that fish, and so, in that regard, every fish has an economic value already.

Even if you just discard it, it's got worth, and, in that regard, the more you discard, the more economic value there is, because the fish has a worth dead or alive, and so, if you look at it that way, why are we selling these fish, and who is that really benefitting? Are we getting the economic value from killing a fish that should have stayed in the water to begin with, just to say that you

caught the biggest fish, when you don't have to do that just to win that biggest-fish prize, and so, personally, I think we need to put some hard thought into eliminating the sale of fish in a tournament, period. Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Tim. I'm going to go to Christina, to kind of explain the historic rationale behind this.

MS. WIEGAND: I would want to go back and sort of confirm this, by reading the amendment, but my understanding is that the reason the council left the provision in that allowed fish to be donated, sold, and then those profits donated to charity is because it was a historical practice, particularly in Florida, to donate those fish, and/or the sale, money sale, from those fish to charity, and, Chester, I believe you spoke about this at the last meeting, but there was sort of a history there of this occurring in Florida, and so, in order to maintain that ability to donate fish, that was written into the amendment.

MR. ROLLER: I am going to go to Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Georgia is pretty much in that same vein of how that practice worked, and, I mean, for perspective, Georgia really has three that we identify, as far as tournaments, but the issues that you've got is that they're brought in, they're weighed-in, and most people aren't taking them, and so they become an issue of wanton waste at that point, because the fish is discarded, and the people aren't keeping it for themselves, and so it did give a mechanism, through these different tournaments, to support a scholarship for a kid with a fishing club, and so they would sell through a dealer, and we have to have -- That relationship has to be built. When they put in for their permit, the understanding is they can't sell without the state knowing that that's exactly how it's going to be done, so that the paperwork can be tied to it, but, generally, the sale is in support of a scholarship.

MR. GRINER: And I can appreciate that, but, you know, at the same time, if you're interested in sending a kid to school, you don't have to kill a fish to do it, right, and you can donate to a charity, and you can have a charity, but you don't have to kill a fish to do it, and so I understand that, you know, and I understand, historically, that, yes, it started out that way, but that doesn't mean that we need to necessarily continue that.

You can have a tournament, and you can have the proceeds of the entry fee to a tournament going to a charity, and you can raise money for a charity all you want to, and guys run 5Ks and 10Ks, and the money goes to charity, and they didn't kill anything to do it, right, and so killing the fish doesn't mean that that's the only way that you can send a kid to college, and so I don't think that we really need to go down this road of saying that these tournaments are a great thing, and these fish need to go on the market because of a charity, and so I don't really think that that should be part of the discussion.

I think the discussion is that, you know, why are these fish -- Why are we doing something that recreational effort is entering the commercial market and targeting the biggest fish? That, to me, is the real problem. We're taking the biggest fish out of something that, as Tom said, for some reason we're not seeing the fishery like we used to see it, right, and so why is that, and, even if this is a small thing, it's 50,000 pounds of the biggest fish being taken out, and for what reason? To send someone to college? I don't really think that's the way to go.

MR. ROLLER: I am going to let Carolyn address that point, and then I've got Laurilee, Tim, and Kristin in the queue.

DR. BELCHER: The underpinning of that comes down to your tournament structure, and so, if the fish have to be brought in and weighed to be counted towards -- To how the tournament rules are done, you're kind of stuck with that. I don't know, and I'm looking to Spud, because Spud, I know, has a lot of experience in competing in tournaments, and I don't know that there's a lot of the alternative approaches to no-kill tournaments that are applied, and so I think that's part of the issue, but, again, if you've got a recreational angler that is catching it as part of the requirements of the tournament, but they really don't want the fish, do you feel better about the fish being thrown away or the fish actually having a use?

That's kind of where -- You know, I think that's what the states have tried to do in that adaptation, because people just -- They go out, and they catch the fish, and they didn't really want it for themselves, and so it's going to get discarded, and so, if you have a fisherman who is willing to help, in the sense that he's buying the fish to support a scholarship, and it's putting food to the market, it's better than the fish being thrown in the dumpster at the end. I mean, that's -- When you think about that, would you rather see 53,000 pounds of rotting fish in a dumpster?

MR. GRINER: I would just rather see him go ahead and donate to a charity and go fishing on his own, like he did normally, personally, and, I mean, you know, that would be a much better alternative, and so, you know, to have a tournament just to end up with wanton waste is no reason for having a tournament, just to prove that you can catch the biggest fish on any given day. I mean, to me, you can have a tournament a different way, and so I think the idea is that, where you're promoting something that, in and of itself, is going to promote wanton waste, because they don't want -- They know they don't want the fish when they entered the tournament.

MR. ROLLER: Well, I just want to point out that I think that the sale and the targeting of big fish are two separate things. We have a long history of these tournaments, and we have a long history of a lot of fishing tournaments. I mean, we have tournaments for red drum and trout and cobia and king mackerel and marlin and blue marlin and white marlin, and we have all these different things, and people are going to be targeting those big fish, if they can't sell them, right, and, I mean, that's still going to go on, and the recreational community is still going to target big fish, whether they are tournament fishing or not, just based on the tactics that we use to fish. We have a bunch of people who have been waiting very patiently to comment, and so I'm going to go Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I think the point is that the tournaments target the large female fish, the breeding fish, and we're pulling them out of the stock, and, regardless of whether they count towards the commercial quota, or they count towards the recreational quota, the end result is that we're killing fish that could be breeding, and, you know, you have no-kill billfish tournaments, and there's lots of inshore catch-and-release redfish tournaments, and so I would like to see, you know, some investigation into, you know, what is the survivability of one of those large kingfish, by the time you boat it and take pictures of it and measure it and everything, and then put it back in the water, and will the fish survive? Is there a possibility that kingfish tournaments could be catch-and-release tournaments? I think that's the direction we need to go.

MR. ROLLER: I would just point out that, I mean, we can affect the regulations, but we can't affect fishing behavior or how the tournaments want to operate, right, and that's not really under

our purview, but, you know, I do appreciate that comment, and, you know, obviously, the fishing community is changing a lot, and so I'm going to go to Kristin.

MS. FOSS: I think we're kind of getting to a bigger philosophical issue of like tournaments, or whether, you know, you keep a fish or release it, but, you know, tournaments naturally are going to harvest kind of the biggest fish, regardless if you sell it or donate it or not, and, I mean, selling it to donate it there, and so I feel like reducing tournaments now here, or trying to reduce that kind of wanton waste, and, just to clarify, off of Florida, these tournaments are a fairly small number, and these tournament sales are kind of important for that community funding for those scholarships and charity.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Kristin. I'm going to go to Mel.

MR. BELL: We just don't allow it, and we haven't, and I brought up a PowerPoint presentation that I gave to our marine advisory committee and our board back in 2010, and, at one time, you know, we had interest in doing this with flounder tournaments, cobia tournaments, and king mackerel tournaments, and so flounder -- We had issues with flounder, stock-wise. Cobia, the tournament -- What we were doing with cobia actually was a leading contributor to the decimation of our cobia population in our southern county, and it was, because we were -- It was just scary, looking at it.

Then king mackerel, but I guess, you know, we ran this through folks in the state, fishermen, and we decided that there are just too many -- We were having to potentially jump through too many hoops and state laws that were in effect that clearly separated commercial activities from recreational activities, and it just wasn't worth it. It just wasn't deemed to be something that we felt was worth doing, and then other considerations, like how fish enter -- Which can have a problem with scrombrids, dealing with HACCP and stuff, and, I mean, we just -- For a lot of reasons, we just decided not to do it, and we changed no state laws to accommodate it, and so, for us, it's just not legal, and it's not something we're wanting to do.

I realize that we're different, and everybody is different, and the whole thing about you have a tournament, and you have these fish, and we look at as you can still have a tournament. You have a tournament, and it's one fish or two fish, whatever it is, and those were obtained recreationally, and they're your fish.

If you don't want to take those fish home, or take possession of those fish, they're still your fish, and be a responsible, you know, conservationist and handle your fish, you know, and just kind of having the ability to throw it in a bin, and, you know, it's taken care of, because I don't want to take it home, and I don't want to seem overly critical, but, I mean, you made the choice to go out and kill that fish, and you're responsible for that fish. If you don't want it, give it to family, or however you want to -- But it's your fish.

It can't enter over into the commercial world, and it's just -- That's how we're set up, and I realize that we're different, and I'm not criticizing anybody, and that's just for us and how our laws are set up and the decisions that we made back in 2010 and 2011, and we just -- We just don't do it, but you can still have tournaments, but it's just you're responsible for the fish that you kill in that tournament, and that's your fish, you know, but it's not going to enter over across the line as a

commercial product, and so that's just our two-cents' worth, and I know we're completely different, and it's a completely different setup, in terms of our laws and all.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Mel That was really helpful. I'm going to go to Dewey and then Spud.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I get asked by constituents about the question of going down the donation rabbit-hole, and does it actually go to -- The check written from the commercial interest to the charitable organization, and I know of instances, and I've been told in North Carolina, that the check is not written to a charitable organization, and it's written to an individual.

Something else, you know, is these tournaments are great for the economy, and they're great for the states and different things like that, and the fish could be donated to charity. There is marlin tournaments, particularly in Ocean City that I've watched, where fish and species are donated to the food banks, and this shouldn't be entering into commercial commerce. There is enough of the sponsorships, multimillion-dollar corporations and different things, that sponsor these events, and they can write a check to give to a charitable organization for a scholarship fund.

I know I use the word a lot, of shenanigans, and we clean this up a lot and make folks accountable. If you're catching that fish, you use it, and figure out something to donate, but don't enter it into commercial commerce that we have to compete with, and I just see it as that way, but it would be interesting if you saw a breakdown of exactly who the checks were written to and how it is, and it might answer some questions, but, at the same time, there is other ways to do these tournaments than having to enter into commerce, commercial commerce, that commercial fishermen have to compete against. Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you so much, Dewey. I will go to Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think this is a classic example of is a problem real or is it perceived, and, you know, it's a good conversation, and I think it's good for us to air out these things, and sometimes we're just going to have philosophical differences about things, but I think, you know, our discussion should be based on fact and a good understanding of whether or not the impacts we perceive are the impacts that are actually happening.

Just for a little context, I pulled this up, and this is a tournament that was recently held on June 2 and 3 in Georgia, and it had thirty-three boats in it, and this is the total weigh-in by fish. You had a 45.03, a 26.7, a 25.4, a 19.68, a 19.65, a 14.05, an eleven, and that was it, and so that was it, and there wasn't much to it. That's about 250 pounds of fish, you know, for that event, out of thirty-something boats, and, you know, I think it might be interesting, if somebody wanted to take it on as a project, and you can go back and look in the Southern Kingfish Association records, and they've got records of all these fish that were weighed-in, because points are assigned by pounds, to the hundredth of a pound, and so you can extract out and probably get a pretty good idea of what the weight, at least weight, distribution of catches are, to see whether or not a perceived problem is maybe a real problem, and so thank you.

MR. ROLLER: Spud, that is an excellent point, and I really appreciate you bringing that up, being a perceived problem versus facts, because I looked back at some of the comments that I received, you know, from stakeholders, and, like I said earlier, I really appreciate the concern for the

resource, and I think that that is driving some of these comments here, but we also have to be careful that we're not just discussing our philosophical annoyance with tournaments, right, just because we may not like some of the attributes of it.

I understand the sales, but, at the same time, if I sat here and complained about things that annoyed me in the fishing community, I would be here all day, right, and I think that gets a little bit into philosophical conversation, but I'm going to go to Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I can appreciate that as well, you know, and is it a perceived problem or a real problem, and, well, I can assure you that it's a real problem, and, if you don't believe that, then why don't we have us a great red snapper tournament on opening day, recreational opening day, and in the whole South Atlantic we have a red snapper tournament, and we sell those fish, right, for a charity, and so it is a problem. You can't make a distinction of how you're going to do this between species, right, and so, if it's good for king mackerel, it's good for red snapper, and so how about we open up the entire South Atlantic for a giant red snapper tournament, and we take all those fish, and we go sell them, and we take them off the recreational quota, and so, yes, I mean, is it a problem, perceived? I think it's a real problem, and it could be a real problem if you take this across-the-board and you do it for red snapper.

Why are we not doing this with red snapper? If you can do it with king mackerel, you can do it with red snapper, and so why don't we have a big old red snapper tournament, and we sell all the fish, and it's a one-day, free-for-all tournament in the entire South Atlantic, on the opening day of red snapper, and all the fish get sold, and they all go to charity.

MR. ROLLER: I'm going to go to Laurilee in a second, and so the question I would ask is we've brought this up for multiple council meetings in a row now, and what does the council want to do with this, right, and we keep discussing it, and I want you all to think about that. I will go to Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: It would be interesting to see whether the tournament that had the thirty-three boats -- Ten years ago, would it have been sixty-six boats, and would they have caught a whole lot more fish ten years ago than they did today? I think we need to look at the historical perspective of the landings from the tournaments, to see whether there is a pattern. I mean, just studying the landings of the tournaments might tell us a whole lot about what the fish population has been doing historically, and so I don't think it's -- I don't think you can take an existing year, with small numbers, and say there's not a problem, and it could be -- It could be indicative of the problem, if you look at the history and you go back ten years, or twenty years, and compare the number of fishermen that were participating in tournaments and what they were catching, versus what they're doing right now.

MR. ROLLER: Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: I just want to make a note, in case it's helpful, that, in addition to the presentation that John Walter gave, the Science Center did provide us information for each of the states, and that information is in your briefing book, under Attachment 3, and so it's got, you know, the king mackerel tournament landings, including number of tournaments, estimated average weight from 1999 through 2022, and then it's also got information for Georgia and Florida as well that they provided to us.

MR. ROLLER: I would just add, from my personal experience, that, you know, North Carolina's records are excellent here, and they kind of follow a couple of general trends, which I think it's easy to -- Well, let me put it that the tournaments definitely went downhill in the 2008 economic crisis, but, at the same time, king mackerel fishing was pretty poor for a five to eight-year period during that time period, and we were catching very few fish, and I think that also drove some of the less tournaments in that time period. I'm going to go to Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to address Dewey's comment about where the money goes, and so we're slightly different from Florida, in that the tournament gets the tournament license to sell. Within that application, they report where that money is going to go, as far as what charity. Now, I don't know whether we verify that it actually gets there or not, and I don't know, but it is reported what charity those proceeds would go, and, with that said, I think the AP has a lot to talk about.

I mean, I just know that -- I mean, I've been hearing a lot of concerns. Just to sort of sum it up for me, that may be helpful to the AP, it's that the concerns of fishing the big mamas, the technology out there now for fishing these fish, and, you know, just I think there's a perception that this more and more tournaments, and I'm not sure if that's really true, but so I get the impression that this is not impacting the population, but that's also a concern, and so just kind of thinking of things for the AP to discuss, and then, when they come back, maybe we can have a better conversation on where to go with these tournaments.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Trish, and that's kind of where I was starting to go here when I asked the question of what does the committee -- Where does the committee want to take this, and what action do we want to take, and I'm curious if going -- We've already had the chair of the AP suggest that we bring this up for a discussion point at the next AP meeting, and I'm wondering if that's the direction we should go, to let the AP discuss it, and maybe they can bring us back their comments, and we can discuss how we want to move forward with discussion here, and is that a good -- I see some nodding heads, and does anybody have any comments on that? Gary.

MR. BORLAND: A couple of things that I would like to address. First, the tournaments, from the recreational sector, aren't going away, right, and we're going to have tournaments, and we're going to continue to have tournaments, and, if the regulations state that a recreational angler can kill two kingfish a day, he can bring two kingfish back to the dock, and so, really, the decision is around should they go into commerce or not, and I get where it comes from, and it should be -- They should go against the -- In my opinion, they should go against the recreational angler, but they're going to bring them in.

You know, addressing Tim's comment around big fish, targeting big fish, look, if a recreational guy, and I've seen many of them, catch fifty-pound fish, they don't throw them back. They go into the boat too, right, and so, if the concerns is around spawning fish, and big fish that are -- Then let's put regulations around the size of the fish that you can kill, and whether it's commercial or recreational. You know, that could address some of that.

It's just interesting to listen to the dynamics around the table, and everybody's view of what it really means, and, you know, I've witnessed -- I have personally witnessed commercial fishermen begging recreational guys to give them their fish, when they get back to the dock in tournaments,

so they can go sell them, and so where does that fall? Does that go against the commercial sector, or does it go against the recreational sector? There is a lot to dissect in this, and the AP has got a big job to try to dissect it.

MR. ROLLER: Gary, those were excellent comments, and, you know, I've definitely experienced that myself too, where you've got people -- You've got some commercial dealers begging you to give them fish to sell, and so it's definitely something that goes on across many state lines. Do we have any other comments on this? We are at 10:53, and we still have to discuss AP topics. I think we kind of organically moved into that a little bit, but do we have any more comments directly on king mackerel tournament landings, or can we move into AP topics, to stay on schedule? Not seeing any hands up, I think we can move on to the last agenda item.

MS. WIEGAND: What we have right now for AP topics is to have them talk about the catch level recommendations for Spanish mackerel, talk more about port meetings, and, again, if you guys have any input on what you would like them to discuss relative to port meetings, that would be helpful, and then king mackerel tournament landings is on the agenda, as well as the usual citizen science update.

The other thing to discuss, in addition to what topics you would like, this meeting -- So sort of typically we get a stock assessment, and we have the AP meet the following sort of quarter, to discuss and then bring you back information and that does then put the AP meeting in the summer, which some AP members have expressed concerns about, and so whether or not you guys would like to have that meeting in fall instead.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you for that, and so there's really two things here, agenda topic items, and, last month, we started trying to plan the AP meeting, and we were looking at summer dates, and there was not a lot of agreement there, other than there was a lot of concern, from the chair, the vice chair, other AP members, due to lack of participation, and they were concerned about lack of participation in the summer months, because that's when they tend to be a little bit less, because everybody is busy, and there was also a concern, from myself and the vice chair, the former chair, Spud, regarding, as well as the AP chair, Ira, regarding the timing, because we felt that it may be more important for us to hear what the ASMFC discussed, probably at their late summer meeting, and so I'm curious if we could get some feedback around timing on this. We're definitely leaning towards a fall meeting at this point, but I'm curious what the council, or the committee, thinks, regarding the AP timing of the meeting. Go ahead, Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I would recommend that you target the time in which you can get the maximum amount of participation, and so, if that's the fall, then --

MR. ROLLER: I guess there was also some concern that it would change the timing of the amendment, but that could also be a net positive, right, but my other concern is for our staff's time and workload here and the timing of that, because Christina is very accommodating on this stuff, but we don't want to overwork her.

MS. WIEGAND: I will say that's less of a concern now, with the structure that you guys have settled on for how to address the catch level recommendations, because we wouldn't be looking at starting a big plan amendment, where we need AP input regularly, until after port meetings, and so we can certainly bring you guys, you know, a draft framework in September and then take that

to the AP to discuss in the fall, and so much less of a concern with the structure that you all have decided on at this meeting.

MR. ROLLER: Given the discussion today, this would put us on a timeframe for a typical -- Like our typical October meeting, if the scheduling allows? Okay. I am going to look around the room and see if I see agreement with that, that we do a fall AP meeting. Anybody disagree with that? Good, and we should be able to get some of the feedback from the ASMFC at that meeting, right, and I see Bob shaking his head. Excellent. That covers that, I believe. Does anybody else have anything for topics for the fall -- Anything have anything to bring up? Kristin.

MS. FOSS: Well, it maybe kind of depends on how the presentation from Space Florida goes during Full Council, and so maybe we may have additional questions that we want the AP to discuss following that, and so just a plug for maybe we want to revisit this in Full Council.

MR. ROLLER: Excellent. That's a good idea.

MS. WIEGAND: We can also revisit it at the September meeting, now that you guys have expressed being comfortable moving the mackerel meeting to the fall.

MR. ROLLER: When is our next fisheries performance report for mackerel?

MS. WIEGAND: For mackerel, we've been doing them a little differently than say snapper grouper, where they have fifty-some-odd species to get through. If there's time on the agenda, we try to update them every year, or every other year, but they don't have to necessarily be done until the next stock assessment, and the next king mackerel stock assessment isn't until 2025, I believe.

MR. ROLLER: I just want to -- Just an idea, just to bring it up, in relation to the tournament landings, and I think a lot of that is derived from people's concern with the king mackerel fishery in general, and I'm wondering if it would be helpful to get an update from the AP at that time of how they feel about the state of the fishery. I am looking to Ira, and he is shaking his head yes. Just because I feel that there's a lot of concern from that, and I'm just curious what people are experiencing, as, you know, these fisheries are very climate impacted, in general. Would be people be okay with that? I see nodding heads yes.

Any other items for discussion for the advisory panel meeting? Seeing none, I will move us into Other Business. Does anybody have any other business they would like to bring before the committee? I am not seeing any hands, and, at that point, I will conclude the Mackerel Cobia Committee one minute early.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 13, 2023.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
August 2, 2023

Mackerel Cobia Committee

Tuesday, June 13, 2023		
Attendees	Present	Remote
Tom Roller, Chair		
Spud Woodward, Vice Chair	✓	
Robert Beal	✓	
Carolyn Belcher	✓	
Mel Bell	✓	
Gary Borland	✓	
LT Cameron Box	NOT Attending	
Chester Brewer	✓	
Tim Griner	✓	
Judy Helmey	✓	
Kerry Marhefka	✓	
Jessica McCawley	✓	
Trish Murphey	✓	
Andy Strelcheck		
Laurilee Thompson	✓	
Dewey Hemilright, Mid-Atlantic	✓	
Skip Feller, Mid-Atlantic		
Christina Wiegand, Staff Contact	✓	
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 Alvarez-Stratton	✓	
Billy Broussard	✓	
Frank Helles		
Nikhil		

Jeff Buckel ✓

Attendee Report: SAFMC 2023 June Council Meeting Mackerel Cobia

Report Generated:

06/20/2023 01:18 PM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered
147-909-795	06/13/2023 07:26 AM EDT	9 hours 31 minutes	149

Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name
Yes	59	Addis	Dustin
Yes	48	Bailey	Adam
Yes	54	Barrows	Katline
Yes	83	Batsavage	Chris
Yes	41	Beal	Bob
Yes	74	Bell	00 Mel
Yes	94	Berry	James "chip"
Yes	40	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	92	Blair	Holly
Yes	90	Bonura	Vincent
Yes	31	Brantley	William
Yes	63	Brouwer	Myra
Yes	43	Carr	Kayla
Yes	40	Cimo	Laura
Yes	40	Clinton	Haley
Yes	90	Clinton	Haley
Yes	93	Cox	Jack
Yes	39	Cox	Derek
Yes	37	Crosson	Scott
Yes	43	DeJohn	Frank
Yes	50	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	34	Dover	Miles
Yes	37	Finch	Margaret
Yes	48	Flowers	Jared
Yes	71	Foss	Kristin
Yes	34	Franke	Emilie
Yes	54	Freeman	Matt
Yes	40	Gore	Karla
Yes	37	Guyas	Martha
Yes	41	Hadley	John
Yes	71	Harrison	Alana
Yes	46	Helies	Frank
Yes	79	Helmey	Judy
Yes	50	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	37	Heyman	William
Yes	91	Hoppe	Walter
Yes	46	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	74	Hudson	Joseph

Yes	38	Iverson	Kim
Yes	40	Karnauskas	Mandy
Yes	39	Kean	Samantha
Yes	91	Kersting	Anne
Yes	100	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	37	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	42	Kolmos	Kevin
Yes	49	Kramer	Rob
Yes	90	L	Kelcie
Yes	55	LaRoche	Kelcie
Yes	48	Larkin	Michael
Yes	53	Lazarre	Dominique
Yes	38	Lee	Max
Yes	36	Lee	Jennifer
Yes	48	Lowther	Alan
Yes	69	M Borland	Gary
Yes	90	Mahoney	Andrew
Yes	40	Malinowski	Rich
Yes	68	Marhefka	00Kerry
Yes	48	Masi	Michelle
Yes	44	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	64	McGovern	Jack
Yes	32	McPherson	Matthew
Yes	38	Meehan	Sean
Yes	52	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	38	Merten	Wessley
Yes	33	Meyers	S
Yes	69	Murphey	00Trish
Yes	90	Myjak	Michael
Yes	41	Neer	Julie
Yes	97	Newman	Thomas
Yes	92	O'Malley	Rachel
Yes	48	O'Shaughnessy	Pat
Yes	51	Oliver	Ashley
Yes	57	Owens	Marina
Yes	58	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	45	Peterson	Cassidy
Yes	52	Poston	Will
Yes	36	Ramsay	Chloe
Yes	51	Records	David
Yes	100	Ritter	Michele
Yes	62	Roller	00Tom
Yes	90	Scott	Tara
Yes	84	Sedberry	George
Yes	97	Seward	McLean
Yes	32	Siegfried	Katie
Yes	48	Smart	Tracey

Yes	57	Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Yes	40	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	40	Sramek	Mark
Yes	46	Stemle	Adam
Yes	39	Stephenson	Sarah
Yes	46	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	90	Thompson	Laurilee
Yes	42	Travis	Michael
Yes	40	Tuohy	Chelsea
Yes	91	Vecchio	Julie
Yes	42	Vincent	Matthew
Yes	58	Walia	Matthew
Yes	58	Walsh	Jason
Yes	72	Wamer	David
Yes	93	Willingham	Darrin
Yes	52	Withers	Meg
Yes	44	brewer	00chester
Yes	90	brewer	00chester
Yes	79	broussard	billy
Yes	98	colby	barrett
Yes	41	collier	chip
Yes	37	gloeckner	david
Yes	90	merino	joy
Yes	90	oden	jeff
Yes	39	sandorf	scott
Yes	47	stephen	jessica
Yes	100	thomas	01 suz
Yes	45	thompson	laurilee
Yes	36	vara	mary
Yes	39	walter	John
No	0	ALHALE	SYDNEY
No	0	Antonaras	Manny
No	0	Brennan	Ken
No	0	DeFilippi Simpson	Julie
No	0	DuBeck	Guy
No	0	E Brown	Julie
No	0	Franco	Dawn
No	0	Gray	Alisha
No	0	Groeteke	Mike
No	0	Hallas	Sara
No	0	Heffernan	Katie
No	0	Hull	James
No	0	Keilin Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
No	0	Laks	Ira
No	0	McWhorter	Will
No	0	Moore	Jeff
No	0	Muffley	Brandon

No	0

Noell	Brian
Pehl	Nicole
Prewitt	Brian
Privoznik	Sarah
Pugliese	Roger
RINCONES	RON
Rohrer	Frank
Salmon	Brandi
Sauls	Beverly
Sheridan	Sean
Smillie	Nick
Soltanoff	Carrie
Thomas	Lauren
White	Geoff
alvarez-stratton	ally
griner	tim
moss	david