

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **SNAPPER GROUPER COMMITTEE**

**Town and Country Inn  
Charleston, South Carolina**

**September 12-14, 2023**

### **Transcript**

#### **Snapper Grouper Committee**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair  
Dr. Carolyn Belcher  
Mel Bell  
Gary Borland  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey

Trish Murphey  
Tom Roller  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Laurilee Thompson  
Spud Woodward  
Earl "Sonny" Gwin

#### **Council Staff**

John Carmichael  
Dr. Chip Collier  
Myra Brouwer  
Julia Byrd  
Dr. Judd Curtis  
Allie Iberle  
Kim Iverson  
Kathleen Howington  
Meisha Key

John Hadley  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
Nick Smillie  
Christina Wiegand  
Michele Ritter  
Roger Pugliese  
Suzanna Thomas  
Meg Withers  
Ashley Oliver

#### **Attendees and Invited Participants**

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

Nikhil Mehta  
Jeff Buckel  
Richard Cody  
Luiz Barbieri  
Jessica Stephen

#### **Observers and Participants**

Other observers and participants attached.

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Town and Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're going to dive into the Snapper Grouper Committee. First up is the Approval of the Agenda, and I'm actually going to ask Mike to pull up the agenda. Are there any edits to this agenda or comments on the agenda? Tim.

MR. GRINER: The first item, wreckfish, I'm not sure why we have wreckfish on the agenda. Next week, the Wreckfish Committee, and the Wreckfish Subcommittee, are meeting, and I think that should come off the agenda until after next week's meeting with the subcommittee and the wreckfish shareholders has been conducted.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a good point, and I guess I would also ask, and is this presentation going to be presented next week, and I'm not sure about that. Like was it being presented now, instead of being presented next week? Christina, can you help?

MS. WIEGAND: So it's sort of an order of operations thing. You guys first received a cost recovery presentation from the agency in March of this year, and there was some back-and-forth and concerns about the council's current preferreds, as they stood at that time, and you all requested additional information from the agency, particularly on the administrative burden and enforcement of some of the cost recovery fee decision points, particularly standard versus actual ex-vessel value.

Then, in June, you created sort of the subcommittee and the subgroup of shareholders to meet, with the goal of talking about things like monitoring of this fishery, as well as participation and eligibility decisions that we found out needed to be added to this amendment, and so the shareholders have already discussed sort of all of the actions in the amendment, including cost recovery, back last June, and so, since it was this Snapper Grouper Committee, and not the subgroup, that had requested this presentation, we decided to bring it to you all in this meeting, because the intent had not been to discuss cost recovery in detail with the shareholders during the meeting that's scheduled to occur next week.

That's not to say that we can't discuss it with them. I will say that sort of that's why staff structured cost recovery coming to you all at this meeting, and everything else coming to those subgroups next week, and then all of it coming back to this committee in December.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry and then back to Tim.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and, I mean, with all due respect to the last time that the shareholders, or AP, whatever we're calling them, looked at this and got information on how we were going to do cost recovery, they did pick preferreds, and we also picked preferreds, but none of us had all of this information. I am feeling a little bit pigeonholed at this point, as sort of saying we're going to have this presentation because this is what you have to do, and, if that's the case, I would like to know that now, and, if that's not the case, then this needs to go back to the AP/shareholders, because I feel like we keep getting new information about this, and I feel like the goalpost keeps getting shifted, and it was my understanding that we were going to start structuring everything

through the subcommittee, and then coming back to this committee, once a lot of this has been ironed out, but, again, the goalpost keeps getting moved on us, and it's really frustrating.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I mean, I think the most important thing for the cost recovery presentation is the nine guys, or however many there are left, that it affects. I mean, they're the ones that we need to hear about what their thoughts are on these final cost recovery options, or whatever it is that has changed, but, you know, really and truly, that was the whole purpose of having the shareholders decide and the subcommittee reporting coming back to this committee, and not the other way around, which is what this is doing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: This management body has authority to make decisions, and we should make decisions based on information that we're provided. Now, we can argue whether it should go to the AP first or come to us first, and, ultimately, one body is going to benefit from the guidance and advice of the other body, and I think the intent was to have the wreckfish working group before this meeting, but it just didn't happen to work out with schedules, and so I don't view this as moving goalposts. I view it as more information.

I feel it's very important that we share the perspectives of how the other IFQ programs work, how wreckfish could be integrated, what the costs to the agency are, what the costs to fishermen are, what the implications are, and then provide advice, or we choose not to provide advice at this meeting, to the workgroup that's going to meet next week.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I see it as a question, and so let's say we go through the presentation, and let's say, whether we keep the same preferreds or change them at this meeting, and then we get to the meeting next week, and is someone going to be there from the agency to answer the questions of the shareholders about the cost recovery, because I don't think that us, as council members, could answer, you know, everything that we saw in the presentation.

MR. STRELCHECK: We're actually going to have four Southeast Regional Office staff at the meeting, and so we'll be well represented and have our experts available, and, you know, to me, and maybe we don't need to go through the amendment in any detail at this meeting, right, and make recommendations, or even make changes, and we wait until that plays out and come back in December, and that's when we take the advice of both groups into consideration and make recommendations.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. What's the pleasure of this committee in how to modify, or if we want to, this agenda, relative to this item? Tim.

MR. GRINER: I kind of like what Andy was kind of -- So I think maybe we should have the presentation, and just not go through the amendment until after we've had the presentation and after, you know, the shareholders have been able to hear about it. There's going to be plenty of guys from the Center to answer any questions next week, and Andy is right that the wreckfish shareholders' meeting got put off, and we can't control a hurricane, and so, I mean, I think we should just have the presentation, and we can leave that on the agenda, but, you know, as far as

going through the amendment today, I just don't see where we're doing much good there until after the subcommittee and the shareholders have met.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks for that. Mel.

MR. BELL: I would receive the information and the briefing, like Andy was saying, and, I mean, we're under no obligation to have to do something with it right now, but I think we should -- Because, you know, we'll get it now, and maybe they will get something at this other meeting, and then, eventually, you know, we get to December, and then we're pulling it back together or something, but I would certainly go ahead and receive the information.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy and then Christina.

MR. STRELCHECK: I was going to look to Christina, because I said that from the standpoint of the cost recovery discussion and going through alternatives, but I don't know if staff needs some guidance and other input from the council, and so I don't want to say that we're not going to provide any guidance to staff for the amendment if there's a need for that at this meeting.

MS. WIEGAND: I just wanted to be clear about what the committee was looking for, and so the intent had sort of never been to go through the whole wreckfish document at this meeting, and we were going to note sort of what the group that's meeting next week was going to be discussing, the additional, you know, eight actions that are proposed to be added to this amendment and how that affects the timeline, have the cost recovery presentation, and then discuss just the cost recovery actions, but I guess what I'm hearing is that you guys would like to receive the presentation, but then not discuss any of the actions at this point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I see some heads nodding yes, that it seems like maybe that's what people are wanting. I am just looking around the table to see if people have other ideas. Once again, we would receive the presentation, but we wouldn't dive into those particular actions and alternatives in the document until after the AP met and the subcommittee. All right, and so that's one modification to the agenda. I have a couple of items that I would like to add under Other Business. Does anybody have a list of topics that we need to add to Other Business right now? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I would like to give an update on the NOAA Fisheries request for proposals for innovative management strategies to reduce red snapper discards, and so that was released on September 7.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Are you okay that that comes at the end of the committee? Okay. Any other topics? So I would like to talk a little bit about Amendment 35 and its submission, in light of the new FES information, and I would also like to go back and have a discussion about gag grouper and black grouper, and I know that that's already through the Secretary, but I want to talk a little bit about a decision on the vessel limit. Anything else that people know of, at this point in time, that they would like to see covered under Other Business? All right. Are we good to approve the agenda now, with these changes? All right. Any objection to approval of the agenda, as modified? All right. Next up is the Approval of the Minutes from June 2023. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is actually Andy Strelcheck's statement, but I saw it, and top of the page, page 115, three words from the end of the sentence, delete the "T" in the "INT". Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any other edits or changes to the minutes? Are we good to approve the minutes, as modified? All right. Any objection? All right. Seeing none, the minutes stand approved. All right, and so then, Christina, I'm going to pass it over to you to dive into wreckfish.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so this part should be pretty straightforward, especially since we already talked about it just a few minutes ago, but I wanted to give you all an update on what was going to be happening over the next few months related to wreckfish. As you will remember, in June, you proposed the creation of sort of two different bodies, first the wreckfish advisory group, which is essentially all of the shareholders, and then the Wreckfish Subcommittee, which is a subcommittee of the Snapper Grouper Committee, which will meet separately to discuss this amendment before then reporting back out to the larger committee.

At this meeting, you will receive the cost recovery presentation, and then, next week, the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, we've got the shareholders meeting all day on the 20<sup>th</sup>, and then the committee meeting for a half-day -- Or the shareholders meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> and the committee meeting half a day on the 20<sup>th</sup>, to discuss a series of actions that are being proposed to be added to this amendment.

I've got them listed here, the actions that are currently in the amendment, as well as the eight actions that are being proposed to be added, and they are all related to sort of the monitoring of the wreckfish fishery and the participation and eligibility that we talked about back in June, and so the committee will review these, consider them for approval for addition into the amendment, and then it will come to this bigger committee for discussion.

That does -- Because it's a significant number of actions that are going to need to be added, it is going to extend the timeline quite a bit for this amendment, and so, like I said, the advisory group and subcommittee are meeting in December, and we'll update this committee in December. The committee will then hopefully be reviewing draft analysis and be able to select preferreds and approve for a second round of public hearings in March, which would put final approval of this in June of 2024 or so, approximately a year from now, or maybe a little less, and so that's the current timeline that we're working on for this amendment, and I just wanted to sort of briefly over that with you, so that this committee was aware of what was going to be happening next week. Are there any questions on that? Otherwise, we can move into the cost recovery presentation.

DR. STEPHEN: All right, and so, again, there were a couple of questions that were asked in the previous council meetings for clarity, when it comes to cost recovery, and I've put together a few slides to help us work through these different ideas. Just to remind you, the request was to compare the administrative burden, which also includes both our developmental and operational needs, between using actual ex-vessel price and standard ex-vessel price, and then there was an additional request to look into how we do enforcement relating to entering of the ex-vessel value for price as well as payment of cost recovery fees.

I'm going to first step through sort of the administrative burden, the comparison between standard and actual ex-vessel, to remind everyone that actual ex-vessel is the price written down at the time when the fisherman is handing the fish over to the dealer. Standard ex-vessel price is the average

taken for an entire year for that fishery and then applied to the next year, and so, when we're looking at standard ex-vessel price, and we want to think about what the administrative burden is, I want to give a little background that, typically, when you see a standard ex-vessel price done in a catch share program, it's because the actual ex-vessel price is not known at the time of landing.

In the case of wreckfish, we often do know the price at the time of landing, and, in order to calculate it, we do look at what all the annual actual ex-vessel prices are, to create that annual standard ex-vessel price, and then that is what gets applied when we're looking at the cost recovery fee. This does require additional analytical staff and time to do these requests. Because that standard ex-vessel price has to change each year, because it's based on the average, we also need to publish, via Federal Register, notification of what that price would be.

In comparison, when we're looking at actual ex-vessel price, this is just the amount entered in at the landing transaction. When that's entered into our catch share programs, we just automatically calculate the cost recovery fee, based on that ex-vessel price times the amount of pounds landed, and there is no need for additional Federal Register.

In summary, we do see that there is an increased administrative burden to the agency under standard ex-vessel price, because of the analysis, the publication of the Federal Register, and the notification to the fishermen, and then there's also kind of a limited ability for us to predict in advance what that cost recovery from the program will be, because that might change as the average price for ex-vessel changes.

When you look at it in the actual ex-vessel price, it's a much lower burden on the agency to calculate, because it's automatic, and we tend to have a better feel, throughout the year, of what those costs are being, because you're looking directly at the actual ex-vessel prices as they're coming in.

I want to move on a little bit to the development and operation burden comparison between the two, and I will remind everyone that these are in an online system, and so you need a lot of logic built behind it. If we were to build a standard ex-vessel price into this program, this would require additional cost for new development that does not exist in our catch share program systems already. Those would be new tables, new code, new ways to send those bills to pay.gov for collection of them. It would also require us to modify the ledgers we show the fishermen, and so, as an explanation, within our catch share programs, we like to display as much information to the individual fishermen as possible. We've created numerous amounts of ledgers, where they can look at what their landings were, what the ex-vessel value is, and what the cost recovery is, and so this would require a little modification to that ledger.

If we went the route of an actual ex-vessel price, we would simply copy over the existing structure and table within our catch share programs, to create it for wreckfish, and that means we wouldn't need any additional new tables or new mechanisms to connect the information to pay.gov. We could also utilize our existing ledger, in order to show that information to the fishermen.

I'm going to go into a little bit about the Federal Register information with the standard ex-vessel price. This is different than anything we've typically done, and we took some information from other catch share programs that use the standard ex-vessel price. Typically, what's included in the Federal Register is background information about the program and how that selection of standard

ex-vessel price was and how that relates to the cost recovery fee. This includes making sure that the register lists the time period for where the calculation was applied.

We also used a description of how we calculated the data and the calculation procedure, and so think of it as just a way that anyone can take some of that information and follow the process through. It becomes a little tricky with wreckfish, because we would have to consider the potential of confidential data. In general, we do not release any information that has less than three vessels or less than three dealers. There have been times when this program has had less than three dealers, and, in particular, that has created confidential information. If that does occur, we would have to find a way to work around that within the Federal Register, to still send the information, but maybe not show as much of our calculations.

The timeline and process for the Federal Register is it gets started -- In this case, it would be started by one of the analysts, to calculate the information and describe the process. It would then move on to a biologist and technical writer, who would fill out the rest of the information within the Federal Register, and then it would go through a variety of clearance processes, in order to be cleared, and some things to note in this is this does create a timeline, where it has to have clearance through certain levels before it's released to the public, and so we need to backup those timelines of when we're calculating it.

There's then a submission process that goes through, and this gets cleared up by Headquarters, and that can add additional time to this, and then the publication. The publication time is typically around five days after submission. We're normally able to waive those cooling-off periods, because this would be information that we would be releasing each year, and, in theory, there should be nothing overly controversial about it.

In addition to this, we probably would be creating some additional messages for the fishermen. Within our catch share programs, we have messages onboard our online program, where they can see the information coming, as well as sending out Fishery Bulletins or other information to the participants, just so that they're well aware of what the costs will be and not relying solely on the Federal Register for informing the fishermen.

I kind of wanted to talk about timelines, and what I wanted to do is kind of give you an example here of how I backed up what a timeline would be, and so, if we wanted to be able to publish a Federal Register for information, the publication would probably occur in early January. Taking that back for the clearance process, that would need to be cleared, and finalized through that clearance, between November and December. Stepping it back further again of creating the Federal Register, we would be backing up to the beginning of November, and then, for when the calculations would first occur, it would be probably starting around mid-October.

Because we would be starting in mid-October and going through, the way we're going to be calculating the standard ex-vessel price will not be a calendar year, and it would be on a timeline that more fits in with this calculation, so that we have all the data available to begin that calculation.

Just some information about kind of decision points and information about standard ex-vessel price, and it's really recommended that you just use a twelve-month time period, and so, again, this won't be a calendar year, and this would be offset from that. If you go for too long of a time

period, I think the average prices may not be as representative with each new given year, and I will show you, in a few later slides, how that could impact things.

Other regions, when they use standard ex-vessel, also do differences by both port and gear. Again, this is one of our smaller fisheries, and, while we do have different locations where they're fishing, because it's such a small fishery, I don't think we would be able to split the standard ex-vessel calculations by either port or by any type of differences in the gear, and then, below, I just put down the formula, and so, basically, what we would do is take all the ex-vessel prices, times all the pounds, to get you total ex-vessel value for a year, and then divide that by the summation of all the pounds landed, and that results in a standard ex-vessel price for the year.

What does this actually mean to the fishermen within the industry as they're going through it? What I wanted to do is take some data and show you what the difference would be, going through a standard versus an actual ex-vessel price, and so I used some data and went through and calculated, and I wanted to show you here kind of what the differences would be in total for standard versus ex-vessel, and so I'm going to start with this first table in 2019.

You will notice that I have color-coded it green and yellow. Yellow is when their actual ex-vessel price was less than the standard ex-vessel price, and, under this scenario, a fisherman would pay more under the standard ex-vessel price than he would under the actual ex-vessel price. What you see, when it's color-coded, is green is where their actual ex-vessel price was greater than the standard ex-vessel price calculated, and, in this case, the fisherman then would pay -- The fisherman pays more under the standard ex-vessel price. I'm sorry. I flipped those around, and he pays less than under the standard ex-vessel price.

When you're looking at it, just looking at it, you also have to keep in mind that it's not just the price affecting how much more or less than we pay, and it's the price times the number of pounds that they're landing, and so a fisherman who lands more, and either has more or less than the standard vessel, that affects the difference of what their value would be compared to actual ex-vessel price.

Keeping all this in mind, I think this is information that's really relevant, and particularly, I think, to talk to the fishermen at the AP meeting, to get them to understand what those differences would mean, and, in here, I calculated the actual differences in prices and then the differences in the price per pound, and so, in 2019, you can see, the ones that are in yellow, they were paying \$4.35 more, whereas the ones in green were paying anywhere between \$1.65 to \$9.15 per pound less, and it does vary, because of the differences within this fishery.

All right. I'm going to move on to the enforcement of cost recovery, and the way we do it is the dealer initiates the transaction when we are in a catch share system, and then the fisherman verifies that by entering what we call their vessel signature PIN, and so this means that there is agreement between the fisherman and the dealer landing that these are actual values and pounds landed.

Typically, the ex-vessel price that should be entered should be the price before there is any deductions. In the Gulf, we had seen, early on in the program, deductions for goods and services, ice, bait, allocation, and, in 2011, in the Gulf programs, we wrote regulations to prohibit that, and we would use that same definition moving forward, that the ex-vessel price entered would not be minus any deductions for good or services.



In particular, we did hear that there's some concerns existing when the dealer and the vessel operator are actually the same entity, and we have this in the Gulf as well, times where we have the same entity between the two. Typically, what's done is, if we notice that there seems to be an anomalous price, we get on the phone, and we call them, and we explain that they should be entering what the market value is, the same as if the dealer was purchasing it from another fisherman, rather than directly from themselves. This might be an area where, if we're highly concerned, we might want to put in some more codified text to make the regulations, sort of the teeth of it, stronger for law enforcement, to make sure that that is occurring.

Some examples of how we work through the cost recovery payment process in the Gulf of Mexico, and what we do is we send out notifications, and I will remind you that they use the actual ex-vessel price. Notifications are always given when a fisherman enters into the industry, through one of our welcome toolkits, and we also have email notifications to them of when their cost recovery is due, and they are due quarterly within the Gulf program, and we also display messages within the IFQ system, on the main message board or when they're individually logged-in, so that they're aware of when their payment will be due.

When we give them the payment, they have to pay it within thirty days, and they do pay through pay.gov. If no payment is made after thirty days, we set the account to delinquent, and one of the differences here is that the payment is being made by the dealer who collected it from the fishermen, and so it is the dealer's account that is set to delinquent. What that means is, when they are set to delinquent, they can take no more landing transactions from anyone, and all they can do within the system is view their information and pay their cost recovery fee.

We typically send them a notice that they have been delinquent, and that typically results in payment occurring shortly thereafter. If there is no payment after ninety days, they are again sent an email notification, and then we refer that entity to the Treasury Department for collection of the cost recovery.

A couple of notes on the collection of cost recovery from the Treasury, and they do have a minimum value, and that has to be ten-dollars or more, and, once we do submit the payment to Treasury, it becomes outside of our catch share system, and so we have to use different mechanisms to track that, because it does not get paid back to us in the way we collect all the other cost recovery fees. We will keep that account suspended, or in a delinquent status, until we receive proof of payment. Once we have received proof of payment, we manually correct it within our system and then open the account up for business again.

Just some recommendations, based on what we know, and I believe we should continue with cost recovery, regardless of which mechanism you choose, standard or ex-vessel, to have notifications via email within the system and in outreach materials. The payment timeline of thirty days has worked really well, and so I do recommend that we keep that, and, in this case, the non-payment actions would be affecting the fishermen, because that's the preferred alternative at this point in time, and so the fisherman's account would be set to delinquent. What that would mean is that fishermen could not transfer shares or allocation, and they could not land fish while they were in that non-payment status.

Things to consider is, if they were in a non-payment status at the time that we were releasing shares, would the council want shares to be released to them, because they would not be able to utilize that, or the shares, until they had paid their cost recovery. Again, once payment would occur, they would get full access, and so, if we did delay shares or allocation being delivered to them, once payment occurs, they could receive those, and then the other recommendation is to keep to the ninety days for sending it to the Treasury for collections.

Just a little bit more on account suspension and what that would really mean. Typically, our accounts can still log-in, and so it does not stop them from viewing their history or doing any documentation, and it does not stop them from paying their cost recovery fee. If this, again, was with the fishermen, we would suspend not only their shareholder account, but also their vessel account, and just kind of keep in mind that there's probably be some additional burden, because we'll have to use some new code in order to do all those suspensions, to make sure that it's working automatically. What we want is automation of the suspension and not necessarily manual checking of it.

A question to consider is would you want someone who was delinquent in cost recovery to be able to renew their permit at the time when they're still delinquent, and keep in mind that it's the reef fish permit, I think is our preferred alternative, and dropping the wreckfish permit, and so it could affect more than just the wreckfish program.

If you chose the option for dealers, which is currently not the preferred, this is how it works. Again, in the Gulf program, they are stopped from accepting any wreckfish landings. In the Gulf, it's for any IFQ landings, and it does not mean they're stopped from accepting landings from other species. That could be something that the council could consider, as well as consider, again, whether they should be able to renew the permit if they were not in compliance with payment.

Just to give you an idea of how the timeline for cost recovery works, at this point in time, we have chosen that payment would occur in, quote, the last quarter of the year, and so I kind of want to back up how this happens as well, and we would start calculating the cost recovery that would be owed, and it would be from October 1 through September 30, and so, again, we're not going to be in line with a calendar year. That would typically take us probably two weeks to make sure that the calculations are correct, and then we would create the bill that would be sent to the fisherman on November 1. They would have thirty days to pay it. As of December 1, if it was not paid, we would consider those accounts locked, or suspended, and they have up to the ninety days, which would be February 1, before we would send them to Treasury.

I believe questions were asked about how non-payment has worked in the Gulf program, and so I put together some information on the Gulf program. Keep in mind, again, that it's the dealers paying it, and so we have, each quarter, anywhere between eighty-nine to 126 dealers that are active that quarter in the system, and so this analysis is based on that.

Typically, after thirty days, the percentage of delinquent dealers we had paying cost recovery ranged from all of them paying, and so zero percent delinquent, up to about 24 percent of them still delinquent after the thirty days. What we really see is that, after we call and notify them that they're delinquent, or they see that their account is locked and they can't do some of the actions in it, they pay almost immediately. When they pay, within minutes after receiving it, we can turn their account back on.

When I look at the longer days, again, we've ranged from all dealers being compliant after ninety days to only 7 percent that were non-compliant. The 7 percent do tend to be repeat offenders, and so catch share staff knows who they are, and typically starts calling them up, and sometimes we might even call them before the ninety days, knowing that they are repeat offenders. We've only sent a handful of information ever to Treasury, and a lot of these, unfortunately, is we have some dealers who went out of business, and so there were small amounts of cost recovery in the Gulf program that were not able to recoup, and this was earlier in the program, and, nowadays, we tend to be in more communication with them and get better compliance. I think that's my last slide.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Jessica. Are there questions for Jessica about the presentation and what you saw here? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I guess, given that -- The way the presentation showed the cost versus benefit, we're sort of not in alignment with our current preferred, and we've come across this issue once before, which is why I admit that I was a little salty before, and I'm sorry, about the goalpost thing, but that was me being salty, because I am having flashbacks to the whole enforcement call-in and call-out thing that sort of came up late.

I really want to be clear, with us as a body, and with the advisory panel as a body, about, if we do -- Are we really allowed, and I know you're not going to say, no, you're not allowed, and so I'm trying to think of how to form this.

I feel very strongly about the dealer collection, versus the permit collection. How much of an issue is that going to be down the line, if we stick with let's just say both preferreds, and I feel less strongly about the other, and I don't know how the AP will feel, and are we going to find out, like we found out with the whole enforcement thing, that, oh no, really, you have to do it this way? That's just my concern, and that's where this is coming from, is I feel a little guilty, because of how I, you know, sort of felt strongly about the enforcement thing, and ended up causing a bigger issue, and I don't want to send these guys down that path again.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I guess I would answer this, Kerry, with, when we were making decisions on preferreds, I don't think we had the full suite of information to make those decisions, right, and so I think it's really important that you saw this presentation, where we calculate the cost, and we calculate the administrative burden, and we determine, you know, is it worth doing these preferred actions, and, if so, justifying it relative to other options, and, if it is, right, and we can come up with justification, okay, let's proceed. If it's not, and, in my view, based on this presentation, it wouldn't be, right, at least for some of the alternatives that we've selected as preferred, then we should change those, based on the information we have available, and so, like any decision, it's just informed by, you know, the information we have before us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: More questions? Bob.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I come from a position, on this one, of not fully understanding the program for wreckfish, but my first question is I did not see, and perhaps I missed it, what the cost recovery fee is expected to be, and could you expound on that a little?

DR. STEPHEN: Bob, I can answer that, and so, because this is such a small fishery, and the cost to the agency, most likely it will be at the full 3 percent of the ex-vessel price.

MR. GILL: Thank you for that, and I expected that answer, and so have you run a proforma, say for five years or so, to evaluate the anticipated income, versus expenses, to see whether that is the right amount, and so my recollection from the Gulf is we picked that because we didn't have any information. Currently, in the Gulf, there is some information that addresses that, and you have experience with handling this kind of program for specific fisheries, and so have you run an income statement to evaluate the costs and the income on such a cost recovery fee?

DR. STEPHEN: So I didn't have it in this slide, because I wanted to be careful with the data, but we did look at what, based on these last kind of three years here, it would generate, and it was a very low amount, and so the amount of money that would be generated from cost recovery would not cover the cost of running a program electronically, and Andy probably has more to add.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, just to expand, the cost recovery percentage is capped at 3 percent, and so we can't go above that, if that's what you're implying, and we have run the numbers, in the Gulf of Mexico, on a number of occasions, through five year reviews, and determined that it's still exceeding the 3 percent, right, and so we do -- We're required by law, essentially, to review that periodically, to determine the cost recovery. With wreckfish, the cost to the program will far exceed the 3 percent we're able to recover, just simply because the fishery landings are so low relative to the funding we would be able to bring in.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Bob.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so the other thought was you had mentioned various costs that you impute to the program, one of which, for example, is enforcement. Does some of the cost recovery fee therefore go back to the folks that incur those costs, or does the funds go elsewhere?

DR. STEPHEN: So, when we look for what the costs are for the cost recovery payback, we look through the administration, the enforcement, and the management of the program. Typically, those funds then come to the Regional Office, and we determine where funds move from that, to help pay for things, and so, in the Gulf programs, we do supply some money to law enforcement. Within this program, probably because the costs will be so high compared to the agency, we might keep it in, and we do make those decisions annually, based on different priorities and things that are occurring within it, and so it's not set in stone.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Other questions? All right. I don't see any additional hands. Thank you for that presentation, Jessica, and we'll see you at the meetings next week. All right. We said, earlier, that we did not want to dive into the amendment and go into the actions, and we want to let the AP meet, and then the subcommittee meet, and then we'll talk about this more, I believe, in December, but let's see if Christina has anything to add here.

MS. WIEGAND: No, and that should be all for wreckfish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Christina. All right. Next on our list is the private recreational permitting amendment, but we really need Luiz Barbieri, and he, I don't believe, is here yet, and so then I think next up would be the scamp and yellowmouth grouper, Amendment 55. Instead, let's take a five-minute break, and then we'll come back with a surprise on what's next.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're going to get going again, and so we are rearranging the agenda, and so, next up, we're going to do one of the updates, and Chip is going to give us an update on the System Management Plan Workgroup.

DR. COLLIER: All right. For those of you that don't know what a System Management Plan Workgroup is, this is a workgroup that's designed to evaluate our protected areas, or the council's protected areas, and they originally met to work on some outreach materials for the spawning SMZs, and so we are going to reengage with this group, in order to talk about evaluation of these spawning special management zones.

The reason that we're talking about the spawning special management zones is they have a sunset provision where, if the council does not take action, the Warsaw Hole, Devils Hole, as well as the South Cape Lookout Spawning Special Management Zone would no longer have the protections of a marine protected area, and so it would become open to fishing.

This group would work to evaluate this. During the meeting that we're going to be having, coming up November 15, and it's going to be a webinar meeting from 9:00 to 3:00 to reintroduce the workgroup to the topic, and also getting them thinking about some of the new research that has been done in the area to gather information, and so we're going to have three presentations for that.

The first one is going to be from Roger Brothers. He gave a presentation during a seminar series, where he described larval dispersal from the spawning special management zones for scamp and red snapper. He is expanding that work to three other species we're hoping that will be completed by this time, and so he's going to provide an update on the larval dispersal for I think -- In addition to red snapper and scamp, he is going to have red grouper, as well as black sea bass, and I'm drawing a blank on the third, and I think it might be gag grouper, and so some big species for the area.

In addition to that, Will Heyman is going to give a presentation on some of the cooperative research that's been done in the area, looking at some of the fishing vessels that have gone into the area, targeting certain species during their spawning time, and describe some of the research and some of the findings, and then the final presentation will be given by me on working through some of the spreadsheets on marine protected areas and how to evaluate them.

After that, the workgroup will get together and talk about some of the findings and where to go for the next steps. I don't suspect we will have a final report from that first meeting, and I think it's going to take multiple meetings in order to get to a report that can be provided to the council, as well as to other APs, as they're thinking about these spawning special management zones and

whether or not management should change for them, and if they recommend potentially allowing them to sunset.

Once again, this workgroup is only designed to provide recommendations to other APs, and it's more or less to collate all the information, trying to make sure that we're getting everything available that can be considered by the group, and then really just formatting some thoughts and providing it to APs, SSCs, councils, and so, from this workgroup, I suspect we will go to the Law Enforcement AP, the Habitat AP the Snapper Grouper AP, the SSC, and then provide the recommendations also to the council, and so, with that, that's what the System Management Plan Workgroup is going to be working on over the next probably year, in all likelihood, in order to provide you guidance before 2025. That way, an amendment can get started.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any questions? I don't see any questions. All right. Thank you for that, Chip. Next up, we're going to jump around some more, and we're going to jump to one of the Other Business items for gag and black grouper, and I'm hoping that Allie can talk to us about that.

MS. IBERLE: I forget which meeting it was that you guys did the final approval for Amendment 53 for gag and black grouper, and some questions came up during the federal consistency for this one about the vessel limit, and so, as a reminder, we had two separate actions for the vessel limit, one for gag and one for black grouper, but they were the same. They mirrored each other, and so it was two fish per vessel, and then we had different subalternatives for per day or per trip, and so a question arose, because the way that the codified text explained those vessel limits was that the -- You were allowed to have four, essentially four, fish per vessel. You were allowed to have two gag and two black grouper.

What we wanted to do is get a little bit of discussion on the record on the council's intention, which, when we were discussing it internally, I think what we think, and want the clarification on, was that the intention was to be able to retain two gag and two black grouper or if the intention was to have the vessel limit operate very similar to the current bag limit, and so the current bag limit is one fish. You don't have to identify it, and it's a black grouper or a gag, and it doesn't really matter, and so I just want some discussion on whether or not the vessel limit was intended to be two fish and you don't have to identify between the two species.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me try to explain it even further, and so this came up when FWC was considering the federal consistency action, and so, once again, the bag limit is one, and only one can be either black or gag, and so then, when we started talking about the vessel limit, there was some confusion, and so we thought that what was passed by the council was structured similarly to the bag limit, so that it wasn't four total fish, and it was basically two fish, and so one could be gag and one could be black, or two could be gag or two could be black, in this scenario, but not four total fish, and it was just two fish.

That's what we thought passed the council, and so, when we went to do federal consistency at the state level for this action, that's when we realized that's not exactly what passed, and it was more of an additive, a four-fish limit, instead of worded similar to the bag, that it's either or, and so we're just needing to check what the council's intent was, and then, if the council's intent was the "either or" situation, instead of the "and" situation, then I believe, and I'm looking to Monica or

Shep, but I believe that we would have to do an abbreviated framework action, in order to change this, but Monica is coming to the table.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm not sure if you could do an abbreviated framework, but I know you could do a framework action to change it, and so, when this was brought up, I looked back through the record, and it's just as you've described it. It was never really discussed in combination, in terms of it being only two fish total, gag or black, for the vessel limit, and so, if the council -- If that's what the council would like, then we would build a record as to why that's appropriate, and I think we could do that, given the current restrictions, the current bag limit, that addresses them in combination, but, yes, we would need to do a framework measure.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I will look around the table to see what people are thinking here. Like I said, we thought it was the two fish total, instead of four fish total, which seems to make sense, and gag is in trouble, and we're not wanting people in Florida to say, oh, well, these aren't gags, and these are blacks, and to take more fish, and ultimately they're gags, but so we've been trying to keep the regulations the same. Yes, for-hire folks can tell them apart, but, on private vessels, sometimes people can't tell them apart, and sometimes people are trying to keep more gag by calling them black, and so it's trying to make sure that we are helping to improve the status of gag grouper here. Mel.

MR. BELL: I think you stated that nicely, in terms of the concern. Obviously, with the condition of gag and all, you wouldn't want to find yourself with four gag, and so, yes, I mean, in terms of the need to move forward with a framework, I would say that would make sense.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so apparently we need a motion to initiate a framework amendment to fix this. All right. Tim.

MR. GRINER: **I would like to make a draft motion to initiate a framework action to modify the gag and black grouper vessel limit to two fish combined per vessel.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica, will that work?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think that works. If it works for council staff, I think that works, and then what would happen is you would get something brought back to you so you could look at it, and, if it's a single action framework, you know, it shouldn't take that long, if that's what the council wants. Remember that we're going to have to build the record as to why now this is different than what was in Amendment 53, and, while Amendment 53 has been approved, the final rule hasn't been published yet, and that's in the queue, and so, yes, I think that's good enough, Allie, to get started anyway.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so motion by Tim, and it's seconded by Mel. Any more discussion at this point on this? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Does that mean that, if they don't have one of each, they can keep two black grouper or two gag grouper?

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's right. It's just --

MS. THOMPSON: It's not clear. I mean, it basically says you get a combination of two fish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's right, and so you could either have two blacks, two gags, or one black and one gag. Not four total fish.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I saw another hand up over here. Judy.

MS. HELMEY: In regard to the identification for the black and the gag, you know, sharks are about the same way, and you can't identify them, and they're hard to -- In some cases, unless it's the mako or something that you can really identify, but they came up with the "if you don't know, let it go", you know, because, if you don't let it go, and you bring it in, you're going to get fined, and so, you know, you can come up with a policy like that, and that scares people to death, and so I know it scares me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more thoughts here? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: So part of this is I have to think of the unintended consequences of this. If someone catches a decent-sized gag, and then proceeds to catch two thirty-pound black grouper, what's happening to that gag? It's going back in the water, and so, initially, if this to protect gag in deeper water, that thought just crossed my mind.

I'm sorry, and can you hear me better now? My thought was, for folks on the rec side that do know, my concern would be that, you know, if somebody goes out, and we don't catch gag off of the Keys very often in deeper water, but, if it's the first or second grouper you catch, you put it in the box, and, if you catch two big blacks after that, my concern is what happens to that gag? It's going to get tossed back, and, you know, if the purpose of this is to protect those fish, I think we need to kind of lean into people understanding the difference between gags and blacks. Just a thought.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree. We've had this discussion many times, and we couldn't even complete the black grouper stock assessment, because of the identification issues between gag and black grouper. Tim.

MR. GRINER: If I'm understanding the question right, or your statement right, it was, if you've already caught two fish, and then you caught another one that was bigger, you would grade them and throw one back? Well, I mean, that's why it's important for everybody to understand the vessel limit, right, when you go fishing, and so, if you've caught two big thirty-pound grouper, there's no sense to keep grouper fishing. You're at your limit, right, and so you've got to fish for something else, and that really comes back down to our best practices and outreach, but that's a problem that we can never solve by a vessel limit or a bag limit, really, because that's always going to be the case. You can always stay there and keep fishing and high-grade, and so that's kind of something that we're not going to get rid of, I don't think.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Robert.



MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I understand that, but, you know, talking about making a rule for the sake of making a rule, if that's the consensus, right, and that, you know, risk exists either way, but it's just another rule, and, if it's not going to be effective, I just -- I come from the place of, you know, more rules without an actual, you know, tangible result, and I just had to voice that concern.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so we have a motion here, and it's been seconded. Do we want to continue and have staff bring back a framework document, and then we would talk about this more? Okay. I see people nodding yes. Do we need to take an actual vote on this? Mel.

MR. BELL: That makes sense, and I didn't know if we needed to maybe start looking at schedule and stuff, just to factor it in and make sure it fits.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I agree. We need to look at the workplan, for many reasons. Yes, because this is new, yes. All right. Any more discussion on this? **Is there any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, the motion carries.** All right. Now we're going to go to another Other Business item, and we're going to go to Andy, who is going to talk to us about the recent RFP.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Madam Chair. I believe it was distributed through our Fishery Bulletin to you, but, if you haven't received it, I'm happy to share. On September 7, the Southeast Regional Office released a notice of funding opportunity requesting proposals on innovative strategies to reduce red snapper discards in the South Atlantic.

As everyone is aware around this table, we have struggled, for the last couple of years, to come up with measurable ways to reduce discards, and so the agency is putting \$880,000 in federal funds toward projects in 2024 to help address dead discards of red snapper and, more broadly, snapper grouper species. We are soliciting proposals I believe through November 6, and so we have a sixty-day period for application. Application packages are available on [grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov). Institutions of higher education, non-profit organizations, commercial organizations, individuals, and state, local, and Indian tribes are all eligible to apply. Federal agencies and institutions are not.

The main focus will be probably three to five projects that will be funded with this money. The maximum award will be \$250,000, and, given that the recreational sector represents the majority of the landings, we expect that up to 80 percent of the funds set aside would be directed toward recreationally-oriented projects.

There is a number of priorities within the notice of funding opportunity, but I will just briefly mention that we're looking to have representative information collected on recreational and commercial discards, including information on space, depth, and temporal distribution patterns. We're looking for information to collect on catch composition data for red snapper fishing trips, and so it's not just red snapper, but other species that are being caught, and we're looking to improve angler satisfaction, and so testing new and innovative strategies that can be utilized in the fishery, and then also identify methods to improve the economic efficiency of the commercial fishery.

There will be a panel that's selected to review these proposals and provide recommendations to the agency. Ultimately, the highest-priority proposals are going to be those that directly involve recreational and commercial fishers, right, and so we really see this as an important aspect of the

projects. In the proposal, we've also outlined the opportunity to use exempted fishing permits, and so, for those that aren't familiar with exempted fishing permits, we've issued these for experimental purposes, and, essentially, they allow, if approved, to do either research or testing of strategies that otherwise would be in violation of fishing regulations.

From a timing standpoint, the proposals would be submitted in November, and this panel would review the proposals and make recommendations. Grants would be awarded early next year, with the goal of grant awards being announced no later than April 1 of next year, so that projects could be up and running by the summer of 2024, and so lots more information in the grants.gov notice, but I just wanted to share this with you, and I think this is a great opportunity, and I really do encourage the states to be thinking about projects that could help with discards, as well as thinking about industry groups and others that could work hand-in-hand with this council, and others, to come up with innovative new management strategies to address discards in the South Atlantic, and so I will take any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Questions? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks. I got the Fishery Bulletin, and I glanced over it, and is there a match requirement for this grant?

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't recall if there is or not, and it would be in the grants.gov announcement.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Other questions for Andy? Go ahead, Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So one question that came up, when we were having conversations about it last week, is with the exempted fishing permits. If there is removals, where do those removals go to? Are they against -- Do they count towards the quota, if you're still doing a recreational season, and, I mean, do those numbers come off of the recreational quota, or the quota overall?

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, it's kind of complicated, but, ultimately, at the end of the day, we're going to have to balance, obviously, you know, all the proposals that are coming in, looking at that in terms of the overall request for fish to be removed, and determine overall the benefits and drawbacks of those removals, and so it's not as straightforward as say just looking at the removals, because, if you're establishing ways to reduce discards, right, then we are also getting savings from not killing fish that were going over the side. I don't have an obvious answer for you at this point, and I think it really depends on, first, the total contribution of all the projects that would be funded and looking at it holistically with regard to the overall removals requested.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Other questions? I don't see any other questions at this point.

DR. BELCHER: We're enough ahead that it's kind of causing a conundrum, because we don't have all available folks or pieces of information ready to go, and so what we're going to do is we're going to jump out of order, and we're going to go into Full Council Session II, and we're going to look at topics for the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel and topics for the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel. At least it helps us move things along.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on September 12, 2023.)

- - -

SEPTEMBER 13, 2023

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Town and Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Wednesday, September 13, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're going to start in Amendment 46, the private recreational permitting amendment.

MS. BYRD: Before you all get into Amendment 46, I just wanted to say that we're doing the first FISHstory historical fishing photos scanning event at this council meeting, and we'll be doing them at this meeting, all the fall AP meetings, and then at your December meeting, and so if anyone has, or brought, any historic fishing photos, you can come see me, and the Oak Room is across the way, and I'll be in there with some scanners. If you have digital photos, that's great too, and so I just wanted to let you all know we're starting to do that. If you didn't bring any pictures to this meeting, you'll have plenty of opportunities at the December meeting, and so, if you have any questions about it, just let me know. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Julia. Are we going to start with the AP report? All right, and so I believe we're going to start with the report from the technical advisory panel, and I'm going to turn it over here to Dr. Barbieri.

DR. BARBIERI: Thank you, Madam Chair, and good morning, everyone. Good morning council members. I'm glad to be here. As Jessica explained, I'm going to over, briefly, a very summarized report of our last meeting, which took place on August 15, and that was a webinar meeting, and I'll kind of give you a summary of what were our main comments, recommendations, suggestions for moving forward with Amendment 46, which, right there in bold letters in the title, right, is "Snapper Grouper Recreational Permitting and Reporting".

We met on August 15 by webinar, and this is the fourth meeting, and we've been working on this for a while. This is actually -- I am trying to remember if this is the second or third working group that we have -- I guess it's the second working group that we have put together to discuss this, and so we covered the following topics, to comment on potential actions in this amendment, right, to provide feedback and recommendations, and we did not have time to go into the educational component, just because of the meeting time, and we were so engaged in discussing the earlier actions, that are more permit oriented, that we did not get into the education component, and so we're going to have to wait and discuss this further after our next meeting.

Actions in this amendment, just as a refresher, a reminder to you, right, and I think, John, a little later, is going to go over the actual draft amendment document in detail about all these actions, but there are four actions that are permit-related actions to establish this private recreational permit

and then specify the species covered by the permit, specify the length of time that this permit will remain valid, and then establish a mechanism for states to opt-out of the federal permit requirement if they have something else that can substitute for that.

The education component has a number of other education issues, and I am not going to go in detail. Those, we're going to have to cut out of today's presentation, because just discussing Actions 1 through 4 took the whole time of our last webinar meeting.

Again, Action 1 is to establish a private recreational snapper grouper permit to fish for, harvest, or possess snapper grouper species in the South Atlantic region, and I am reading this explicitly, right, so you can actually wrap your brain around what this action is trying to accomplish, and so one of the issues, in terms of establishing -- The key issues, in terms of establishing the permit, is, is this going to be an angler-based or a vessel-based permit, right, and so that's very important, and, from a technical perspective, it doesn't really make too much of a difference whether we use angler or vessel-based, you know, from a sampling, statistical design, and survey design, to tie into the permit, and either one would provide similar levels of precision, right, but the vessel-based permit would have a bit more practical sort of components to it that efficiencies from a vessel-based would facilitate implementation of the permit.

The most important thing that the panel has emphasized is that having a consistent approach, right, over this entire region is very, very important. I mean, if we're going to be collecting this data and designing a permit to generate the sampling frame that will be used for a data collection program, either a survey or a census, right, or whatever data collection program we get that improves recreational data, the idea is that this is to inform assessment and management over the entire South Atlantic region, and having something that's not consistent over this broad geographic area has major consequences, and it would create difficulties that are undesirable. We really emphasized that having a consistent component throughout the region is important, but there are some advantages, some efficiencies, with a vessel-based approach.

Integration into MRIP, and this is, again, because of the angler versus vessel-based, and, you know, would this make a difference for MRIP, and we think about MRIP here in the context of there is something that's already in place, and so we already have a survey that covers this entire area, right, and it's collecting information, and it has history already in the area, and so the idea would be if we can do something that can tie into MRIP, right, and there will be advantages, efficiencies, from that, because the data then is more comparable. I mean, looking back, and looking forward, those data series are actually more comparable to each other, and all of this would be facilitated.

Discussions, and this is why it took so long at our last meeting, kind of leaned toward generating what we called the hybrid approach. The idea would be, after the permit is established, we would most likely generate what's called a supplemental survey, and the supplemental survey would be a more specialized survey, right, that is focused, is designed to be focused, on just this group of the snapper grouper fishery, those species, and, because of that, you have gains in precision, because your entire sampling structure is framed along that design, focused on those species.

Then the hybrid approach also involves the issue of, if this is a survey, then we're going to have a catch component inshore, right, and it's going to be the intercept survey, to generate catch per unit effort, and then an effort survey, right, just like MRIP does, and so we might actually want to look into this, maintaining the intercept survey inshore, the catch per unit of effort, but then develop

some complementary, or substitute, effort survey that ties on top of that and is more focused on this group, right, and so I don't want to get too technical into this, and I'm sorry that I'm going a little bit into the weeds here, but it is important for you to appreciate all the issues that are associated in designing something like this and why the committee has been really, to some extent, challenged, right, to consider all of these factors in looking at the permit at this stage.

The stand-alone supplemental survey, right, and it's called stand-alone, but it would be a hybrid, and potentially tied to MRIP, and all of this is to be discussed. There are no concerns envisioned regarding Florida SRFS, the Florida State Reef Fish Survey, that's already in place and already samples thirteen species off of Florida and functions very much like what I just described. It's very much a supplemental survey that ties into MRIP and has its own dedicated effort survey, and so having an angler or vessel-based permit, through Amendment 46 for the South Atlantic Council, would not really negatively impact our ability to work with SRFS, and there are adjustments that can be made for this to work all together.

Another thing that we wanted to bring up to you is considering funding mechanisms for implementing this survey that would have to be associated, right, with the permit, and that's the whole purpose of this, and we thought, right, just because of all the conversations now going around regarding the IRA, Inflation Reduction Act, funding, that this might provide an opportunity for some funding that we can use to pilot test something, as soon as we are ready to put that in place, and it doesn't have to be necessarily, from this stage, long-term funding, but having something that can allow us to test, pilot test, a version of this initial survey would be important, and we strongly recommend that you work with the service, with the Fisheries Service, and all the other parties that are associated with this discussion of how the use of IRA funding -- I know that there is some dedicated funding coming to the council, and I don't know if that would be sufficient to cover this as well, but it's just something that -- A seed that we wanted to plant.

Our recommendation, in terms of actions that are to be before you, we recommended Alternative 2 in this first Action 1. That would require a federal permit for all vessels participating in the snapper grouper fishery, and that "all vessels" there is underlined, and so our choice, at this point, is to go with vessels instead of anglers.

Action 2 is specify the species that will be covered by a private recreational snapper grouper permit, and, again, and you may remember from the last time, the last summary presentation I gave, we struggled quite a bit with this discussion of what species to include. If you make this more limited to just a smaller suite of species, you have something that is more focused, but then that lack of coverage of all the other species prevents you from having better data on discards, right, and, for example, if you have people who are there who are not getting the permit for that smaller suite of species, but are out there fishing for other species and, you know, discarding the other ones, and so, because that discard information is so important, having a broader group of species is actually beneficial, and so being more inclusive, at this point, is better, and it aligns us with the ACCSP approach that is already in place regionally for this.

Also, you know, thinking about this from the very beginning, and beginning with the end in mind, right, the idea is that, if you start with a smaller suite of species, and I have this experience with the Florida SRFS, and having to add species, it creates some difficulties that are not insurmountable, but why not avoid them, if we can, and so, if we start with a broader group of species, we are likely to actually do better.

The recommendations are we recommend Alternative 2 in Action 2, and so any species within the snapper grouper fishery management unit would be covered for this, and so all the species in the snapper grouper fishery would be covered for this, and we can actually subset those, if we want to do analytical stuff with the data just for harvest, but then we have all the discards for all the species.

There is little to no downside of being more inclusive of species, right, but there is a cost if species, if they are added later, and so why not avoid that, and so this is why we're suggesting that we capture all the species now, as well as the ones that we may want to include in the future, and then, you know, in terms of generating estimates, we can subset from this larger pool of species for the assessment and management analysis that we need.

Action 3 is specify the effective term of the permit, and there are disadvantages of having a calendar-year term, and Kathy Knowlton, a member of our AP, actually brought up the situation that happened in Georgia, right, where they started with a calendar-year term for their saltwater fishing license, and then later regretted it, and so having -- Because it created problems, right, and so having something that -- I'm sorry, Kathy. Did I say something that I shouldn't have?

Basically, having something that is just twelve-months, that lasts a year, from the date of issuance is actually better, right, and so it just is consistent with other supplemental surveys that we have in the region, like the large pelagic survey, and it's more practical all around, and so this is our recommendation, that we go with the one year from the date of issuance, but with the caveat that we as a council, or you as a council, may actually defer to the agency on this issue, because it's something that, if this is implemented at a federal level, they might have that discretion to handle at their level.

Then, finally, Action 4 is to establish a mechanism that would allow a state to opt-out of a federal private recreational snapper grouper permit, and the comments of the committee were, sure, I mean, this is fine, but we just have to be careful that, if we're going to have substitutions for people to be exempted from this federal permit, whatever they put in place as a substitute has to match the criteria that we are developing for our own permit, right, so we don't end up with different things in different areas that won't make a holistic view of the permit over the whole region possible.

Our recommendation is to -- The AP recommends Alternative 2, Subalternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c in Action 4, and that actually means that whatever the states put forth, right, have the same entities, meaning vessel or angler-based, the same snapper grouper species, and have the same period of time as the federal permit that we are proposing in Amendment 46, and so, basically, create something at the state level that would be a mirror, and completely compatible, with the federal survey, the federal permit. The next question is questions. Madam Chair.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Luiz. Great presentation. I know I have a couple of questions for you. On the action that has to do with the species -- John, can you go back to the slide that's on that, Action 2? Did you all talk about the fact that -- Let's say it's all fifty-five species, and so let's say the council doesn't make any of those fifty-five species in the complex ecosystem component, and they are using all fifty-five species. Then, if you use a supplemental survey, or even a survey at the dock, and you're asking people about all fifty-five, is there any concern that people would have like a recall issue, or the survey might take too long there at the dock, because

you're trying to get into so many species, and did you all talk about how to overcome that, or is it not a concern at all?

DR. BARBIERI: That actually is a very good question, Madam Chair, and I tried to mention that in the presentation, but obviously not very effectively. The idea is that the permit itself be more inclusive and having other species.

As you implement the survey, you can apply the survey more focused on just a subset of those species, right, and it doesn't mean that you will not be collecting information on the other ones, in terms of discards, but your focused design would be on the group of species of higher interest, and so you design your whole survey instrument, right, and so there are questionnaires that are administered both at the dockside state, where you ask for harvest and releases, right, and there is the survey that goes on fishing effort. Now, we would develop those questionnaires in a way that allows you to report on discards on all the species covered by the permit, for any discards that you had, but it's focused on the harvest of the species.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and just, continuing with that, so let's say that, of the fifty-five, let's say you have twenty that were the focus. Could you change the focus species over time, so that maybe, three years in, or five years, you think, okay, I want to focus on, of the fifty-five, only the deepwater species, or could you change the focus over time, and it still be statistically sound, that you were asking questions about different focus species in different years?

DR. BARBIERI: Another great question, and, technically, yes, you could. You could do this, from a statistical procedure, right, sampling design and estimation procedure, within the survey. Now, it gets complicated, as you try to develop a time series of fully compatible, right, and so, to be honest with you, those more technical details are going to have to be worked out, and they always are, right, as we bring in -- I mean, something like this would have to involve, really, major advice, and not just from us on the AP, but professional statisticians that do nothing but survey statistics, right, because those are the people who really understand all the different nuances and how those things actually could influence the outcomes. Does that make sense?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so, staying on the species, if you had some states running their own state survey, and they had different focused species, and so let's say Florida has thirteen SRFS species, and let's say those are the focus, even if Florida expands to the fifty-five in the complex, but then let's say North Carolina focuses on the deepwater species in that same year. Then does that mean that the surveys really aren't compatible, and you really can't do an analysis across those surveys, because of the fact that they focused on different species that were common in that particular state?

DR. BARBIERI: Correct, yes, and that would be the case, and so you have to -- You can change over time, right, the species of focus, and it's still tricky to do this over time, from a statistical component, right, perspective, but it can be done, but, if you have, within the region, different areas of the survey implementation that are simultaneously being implemented differently, with a different set of species, it's -- You know, to tell the truth, I'm not technically prepared to answer that, in terms of everything that's possible, but there is all sorts of techniques that you can apply, right, to actually make those things potentially comparable, but it's unlikely -- I mean, all I can say is that it would be difficult to make that work.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then another question on Action 1, and I see lots of hands going up here, and so, on Action 1, and so I see that you all selected vessel here, and I know that, when we started the Gulf Reef Fish Survey, we were all about the vessel in the beginning, and then, ultimately, we switched to angler-based, and I noticed that you all didn't get to the component about the educational requirement, and so it just seems, to me, that, if you think about the other components, the education, the law enforcement, and other pieces, that the vessel component might be challenging, when you bring in these other aspects, versus doing the angler component, because would it be up to the captain to figure out if everybody -- If every angler has a recreational fishing license, and then, if you did an educational course, just the captain takes it, and not all the anglers onboard, and, really, maybe it's the anglers, and not the captain, that should be learning how to use descending devices. Just it sounds like you all didn't get into the components about that and how maybe angler-based would be more beneficial than vessel-based, and is that an accurate representation?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, it is. We had some discussions, and Spud has been our council representative on the panel, and he has, you know, provided some perspective, and, this last time, we talked a little bit about the law enforcement issue, right, and how important it is for us to make sure that, if we design something for federal waters, that we have some level of coverage of how do we handle state waters, where folks would be, you know, fishing for those same species, and so those issues were discussed, to some extent, but it is impossible, at this point, until you start really structuring the survey, and seeing what you have, to predict how all of those things are going to turn out.

To tell the truth, these complexities, right, that you're bringing up, this is the main issue of why the panel has been having these very long meetings, focused on just a few issues, right, because we've been struggling with discussion of the structure of the permit without having the survey component completely thought out yet, right, and so now we start thinking a little more about how the survey would be designed and implemented and trying to address those issues, but there might be a time when, after we start structuring the survey, right, that we might come back and want to revise, and this is why having a pilot study for this is important, to actually collect real data and see, as you implement these things, right, how they turn out with real data.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, and so I have Kerry and then Andy and then Clay. Tim and then Andy and then Clay.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for that, Luiz. That was great. Did you guys have any discussion about using a permit model that's already out there, and like, for example, the Mid-Atlantic already has a recreational permit and reporting, and did you all have any discussion about using that as a starting point, or even that this is already done in other regions, and other councils, and do we really have to start from scratch?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, and that's an excellent point, because why reinvent the wheel, right, when there are examples of other programs that are in place already and successful, right, and they are statistically sound and scientifically valid, and so, yes, we have considered the Mid-Atlantic permit.

Now, if you think about all the attributes, the characteristics, of the Mid-Atlantic permit, it's designed to be something very different than what we have in mind here, right, and it's really a



mandatory reporting, right, and it's a mandatory permit and reporting that covers a very limited number of species, right, and they are not really trying to cover the scope of what we are aiming to do, and so that one -- We actually had presentations from them, and they were very helpful for us to see how those issues are being worked out in their region, but we figured, you know, that wouldn't work for us.

The large pelagic survey that's implemented by NMFS, right, along the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic areas primarily, is very much a supplemental survey, in line with what we have in mind here, and the Florida State Reef Fish Survey is the same thing. Some ten or twelve years ago, we actually worked with a group of professional statisticians and consultants on the fisheries survey on evaluating all the attributes of the large pelagic survey, and how supplemental surveys work, to see how all of this could be designed in a way that you bring in those existing efficiencies, right, and you learn from what has been done before, and so, yes, very good point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Andy and then Clay and then Robert.

MR. STRELCHECK: Luiz, great presentation, and a couple of questions. The effort survey that you administer in Florida goes directly to these fishermen that signed up for the State Reef Fish Survey for those thirteen species, but it doesn't ask any questions as part of the effort survey, with regard to species caught, and so, when you do your sampling, you're still doing intercepts with some augmentation of additional MRIP sites, or state sites that are added to the MRIP sites, right, but you're collecting data on all landings, all fish catch, at that point, correct?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, that's correct.

MR. STRELCHECK: Have you guys looked at, in detail, like, of the thirteen species that are part of the State Reef Fish Survey, are there trips -- How many trips don't land those thirteen species, that are landing snapper grouper, because I would assume a majority, and I mean a high majority, would, and that's why you chose those thirteen species, correct?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, that's correct, and we have looked at that. I mean, all of this is still being evaluated, just because we only have three years of data on the Atlantic, right, and I assume you're talking specifically about the Atlantic component, right, and so, yes, we're still looking at that and trying to -- Because, you know, one thing is -- Think about how people build airplanes, right, and engineers design a blueprint that is highly technical, right, and everything is supposed to work according to the engineering, but still they make a little model, right, and they put those models in wind tunnels, because, when you're actually implementing something, and collecting real data, you have a different perspective than when you're just looking at the blueprint.

We are learning, through these three years of data that we have for SRFS, and, in general, yes, the vast majority of trips is catching those species, but there are some other ones, and think about black sea bass, for example, that are not included in our SRFS, that, as we think about the Atlantic, we will have to expand the scope to be inclusive of those.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, and then the second question, with your Florida hat on, versus your workgroup hat on, the main concern I would have, with some of the recommendations, is this issue of states being able to opt-out and the lack of alignment with the State of Florida's Reef Fish Survey, right, because the Reef Fish Survey not only covers the Atlantic coast, but the Gulf coast,

and so I think it's really important, as we build this federal permit, that there's as much alignment as possible, given the State Reef Fish Survey already exists, and so did the group talk about that and the benefits of, obviously, having that alignment, as well as then the potential for what things would maybe be easier, or more complicated, for the state to change, based on the recommendation of the group?

DR. BARBIERI: Well, yes, and we have been discussing this, and I've been trying to emphasize this every time that I give these presentations to you, right, that consistency -- You know, using a consistent approach throughout the region is very important, and there are lessons learned that we have from other regions, where we didn't follow that, and, you know, things got really complicated, and so, yes, this is very important.

We did not -- Basically, for Action 4, I think is what you're talking about, in terms of the opportunity for states to opt-out, and we did not remove that action, because we did not think that was in our charge, right, or our authority, and we are an advisory panel, right, working with you, and our recommendations are really not prescriptive in nature, right, and so we trust that you're going to consider all of those implications of how you're going to, as a council, work with the states, right, in making sure that we have that consistent approach throughout the region, but we have been trying to emphasize that that consistency is key, right, and should be front and center.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me just add to that. From the management side, I think that species could be added, and you're right that whatever we add on the Atlantic would, in theory, need to be added on the Gulf, because we've got the same survey running on each coast. We do get money from our state legislature to implement this program, but, if we really go up on the number of species, I think that we would need more people to administer the survey, and maybe there is additional people needed at the dock, as well as people that are going to be working on the data components and mailing out the surveys, and is that a fair assessment, Luiz? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and that's why I was asking the question. If like the thirteen species encompass 95 percent of the species that are landed in the snapper grouper complex, adding all of them won't necessarily dramatically increase your sampling universe, because people are already going out and catching those other snapper grouper when they're targeting those thirteen primary species that you've identified, but it would be worth doing a little deeper dive into that to understand that better.

The key, to me, and, obviously, we need to get back to talking about the purpose and need and the survey design, really is how do we improve our sampling universe for the offshore fish populations, and really get much better estimates of fishing effort, and that's what we're trying to do here, obviously, with this permit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair. A couple of points. First of all, I wanted to support the panel's view for the need for having a consistent approach across the states, and you don't have to look very far to see what happens when you don't do that, and I'm talking about the Gulf of Mexico here, where you have, you know, a whole bunch of different state surveys, different methodologies, and, if you ran those same surveys all in the same state, they would get different estimates, and so you end up having to go through all these calibrations, and all these gyrations, and then you try

and stitch it all together in an assessment, and it's extremely difficult. Some states get different species, and some don't get discards, and it's a nightmare, in practice, and so consistency is absolutely key for this.

The other thing is I support the idea of a vessel permit. It's not as important as the consistency aspect, but, still, I think it's going to make for a much better survey, especially for the offshore effort, because you don't go fishing offshore without a boat, and maybe a few brave souls in a kayak, but that's about it, and so I'm not convinced, actually, that it wouldn't lead to some gains in precision, because you're going to have a more refined sampling universe, but I haven't seen any studies to show what those gains in precision might be, but I think that's the most logical approach.

Then, finally, I want to strongly support the idea of the permit being inclusive with respect to species, and I'm not talking about what you're doing at the intercept stage, but the permit itself, and I agree with Dr. Barbieri that it absolutely must be inclusive. Otherwise, you're not going to get valid discard estimates, because it means that people could still go out there fishing, as long as they're not retaining the limited suite of species that you include on the permit, and so they could still be -- So red snapper, gag grouper are all on the permit, but they don't retain any of those, and they can still be catching and discarding them, and we won't have any way to get an idea of what those discards are, and so I think it's critical to be inclusive at the permit level. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Clay. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you, Chair. As we were talking about vessel versus individual permits, and state and federal, I was wondering if you had -- If a Florida resident had a State Reef Fish Permit, could they go to South Carolina and fish for reef fish, or do you need two permits, or, with a federal one, could you go to any state and fish, and how would that be captured in the survey?

DR. BARBIERI: That is a good question, but it's not something -- I don't think we have, John, discussed this explicitly, right, in terms of the correspondence. I mean, if it is a federal survey, I mean a federal permit, for federal waters, of course, it covers the entire South Atlantic region, right, issued as a federal permit.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: So you would have some reciprocity mechanism then with the state? If you agree to acknowledge a state permit, then it would have the same ability as the federal reciprocity across the state.

DR. BARBIERI: Right. Exactly, and so those are the challenges that now we are facing, in terms of how do we handle state waters, right, associated with this permit, and you may remember that, way back when, when we started this we talked about, you know, either having a state or federal or state and federal, and then legal counsel advised us that, really, the council doesn't have jurisdictional authority over state waters, so that this permit could not be extended, right, into state waters, and so that removed the shore-based component and, you know, changed the nature of the permit to be just focused on federal waters.

We have been discussing -- We have an ACCSP, and that's the Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program, right, and the Atlantic States Commission that coordinates collection and

processing of all the recreational fisheries data along the Atlantic seaboard, from Maine all the way to Florida, and so they really implement a whole number of things that integrate the states and feds, and we have talked to them about potentially helping us generate some kind of an approach that is more inclusive of the states working together and making that compatible with the feds, and, you know, I'm not sure about the details on how that would work, but this is something that we still have to kind of solve, right, that issue of state versus federal.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Just one other comment, and Tim raised other programs, and I'm not sure how the federal migratory bird and waterfowl permit might be an example here, but that's something, in Florida, that's free, and you've just got to get it and add it to your hunting stamp, and, you know, every year you've got to do that, and so it's just an example.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Luiz. Obviously, I have a multitude of questions, but I'm not going to bog us down, because they're all about the weeds, and, in the end, that's what will ultimately determine the success or failure of this endeavor, is all those little weeds, but, to what Robert was talking about, there is similarities, sort of like the federal duck stamp thing, except, in this case, and I think it would be good for us to clarify at this point, but, yes, you could use that permit fishing off of any South Atlantic state, but you would not be required to have that permit fishing in the EEZ outside of the South Atlantic region.

I mean, that's one of those weedy little details, and so, for instance, if you were fishing in the EEZ for snapper grouper species off of Virginia, then you wouldn't have to have the permit, because the permit would only be applicable to the South Atlantic region, and so those are some of those little things that we have to sort of work through, because, as we've talked about climate change and fish changing distributions, you know, we want to make sure that surveys capture the presence and occurrence and catches and discards of all these fish in all the places they occur, and so it's just tricky parts of all this stuff.

I just wanted to ask you to elaborate a little bit more on the challenges of how we reconcile having a permit that's only applicable to federal waters with the fact that some of these species are encountered and caught, harvested and discarded, in state waters, and that we will continue to have to depend on elements of MRIP to generate effort estimates for the shore mode, perhaps for the private recreational mode, only in state waters, and so there will have to be some reconciliation between different -- A supplemental survey and the ongoing survey, which, unfortunately, now has some issues that have arisen, and so just a little bit on that just I think would help the group.

DR. BARBIERI: Thank you for that, Spud, and the short answer is we don't know, right, to be perfectly honest, and, I mean, this is a major challenge for us to overcome, and, from the very beginning, this discussion has really been how do we develop something that is as inclusive as possible, right, and so we've been trying to be very inclusive, for the reasons that you specified, right, but then jurisdictional authority is something that we can't really, you know, challenge right, and so it's something that we haven't really completely resolved how we're going to handle that lack of consistency between what's happening in the states, versus the EEZ, and it's something that I don't think that it's completely resolved yet, and I think we can continue this discussion.

At the last meeting, you may remember that I kind of put poor Geoff White, the director of ACCSP, on the spot a little bit, right, and I said, well, Geoff, I mean, that you guys do is be the mortar between the bricks, right, that ties the states together, north to south, along the Atlantic seaboard, and what can you guys do, and perhaps we develop something that's a joint ASMFC and council kind of process that would be then, you know, gluing together, or side-by-site, those two jurisdictional authorities, but whether that would be possible and what the process would be.

Of course, poor Geoff was stumped on that question, because it's a little too much, right, for him to digest right there and then, but it's one thing that I think we should put a pin on, you know, and say we're going to have to revisit this, because, otherwise, the effectiveness of this permit is going to be seriously compromised.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. From a practical standpoint, I don't really see a big concern between state waters and the EEZ. I mean, if you think about it, not very many anglers - - Nobody that -- I can't imagine any angler turning their boat around at the three-mile mark because there was a line there and they didn't have a permit, and so I think everybody that's going to fish for these species is going to go past state waters.

Yes, they may fish in state waters some, but, you know, for the most part, I think we're going to capture everybody that we're after, and I just don't see very many anglers that would not venture into the EEZ, simply because they didn't have this permit, and so I think, really and truly, if you put the permit in place, I think you're going to capture everybody that goes offshore fishing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Certainly I don't want to be argumentative, but I will recall everyone -- Something I said in one of our earlier meetings, that we did have a shore mode estimate of 415,000 discarded black sea bass in one year, and so it is a source of concern, because those fish do get encountered, and, as climate change is manifesting itself -- I mean, we've got gray snapper all over the place inside the estuaries of Georgia now, and so we've got to consider it, or, otherwise, we're going to having the same conversations, three or four years from now, that we're already having about sources of bias, sources of error, and so, I mean, we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good, but we've got to try to bridge the gap between the good and the perfect, as best we can.

DR. BARBIERI: Madam Chair, just real quickly, and to add on top of what Spud said, and I understand the spirit of your thoughts, because it makes sense, right, and, I mean, if you're going to harvest, and you're going to have a directed trip for those species, you're going to likely go into the EEZ, but just think about, you know, the magnitude of discards, right, that are now estimated to be happening within state waters, and how we do we account for that, you know, properly within a statistically designed survey, if we don't have a permit that covers that?

MR. GRINER: Yes, but I just see this as supplemental. I mean, you're not getting rid of MRIP, right, and so you're going to have information from MRIP on that shore-based mode, as good or bad as it really is, and, I mean, let's face it. We're not having this kind of discards and efforts from shore-based, and, I mean, at one point, the State of Georgia had I don't know how many red porgies

landed from shore, and it was so many that you would have had to have lined up anglers shoulder-to-shoulder for the entire coast, and so, you know, really and truly, I don't know that, for this shore-based mode, that we're ever really going to get anything that is any more meaningful than what we have right now from MRIP. I don't think that a permit is going to fix that either, and so all of this is supplemental to MRIP. MRIP is not going away.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Other questions for Luiz? Will you be here if people have other questions and you need to come back to the table?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, absolutely. I will be here all day today and until lunchtime tomorrow, and I'm available to address -- Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you so much. All right. I'm going to turn it over to John to dive into the document.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you, and so I'll be going over the decision document for this, and it's Attachment 2a in your Snapper Grouper Committee folder, and I just want to say thank you to Dr. Barbieri for the excellent review of the AP feedback, and then also really a great introduction to this amendment overall, and so, with that said, I will just give, again, a brief overview of the actions in this amendment.

You went over the permit-related actions, and those will come up first in the discussion, but, also, there are several education-related actions in the amendment, four specifically, and one that would establish the education component, another one that would specify whether the education component would be mandatory or voluntary, specify the timing of implementation, whether the education component would be implemented immediately or delay implementation, or some sort of delayed implementation, and specifying the length of time that an education component will remain valid.

Those are the actions that we'll get into in detail in this discussion, and, really, the objectives for this meeting are to go over the AP feedback, which we just did, and the recommendations, review the IPT feedback and recommendations, and so there are a few actions that I will certainly emphasize that in particular, for both the permit and education-related actions, and then keeping in mind that what we're doing here is trying to prepare this document for approval for public hearings in December, and so we're kind of at the phase where we're trying to sort of make sure things are polished-up, as far as the actions and alternatives, the range of alternatives is in there that you want to consider, and so just keeping that in mind.

Then providing any sort of guidance that can help the IPT in developing the public hearing document, again, that you will be approving in December, and so, really, not necessarily looking for preferreds at this time, unless you feel so inclined, but more so making sure, there again, that those actions and alternatives are looking the way you want them to, so we can develop the analyses to go along with them, the effects analyses.

After the December meeting, assuming this amendment moves forward on time, you will approve it for public hearings in December, and the idea would be to take this out to public hearings in the winter of 2023, or likely early 2024, to gather input, and then, also, in March of 2024, you would review the public hearing comments, and any AP comments, if your technical AP does meet, and

then, in June, ideally, this amendment would be prepared for a final review, and so that's getting towards the end of the timeline, and probably midway at this point, but really starting to get rolling on this amendment and moving towards that final approval date at the June 2024 meeting. I will pause for any questions on that, before we get into a few comments on the purpose and need, and then we'll get into the actions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, John. Any questions at this point? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I'm just curious, and so, if we were to stay on this timeline, and it says regulations effective 2025 to 2026, and the actual implementation of this is going to hinge on the service having the means and the ability to do it, and that's the reason we have such a broad span of years in there, is because that, really, once we do this, is out of our hands, and it will be up to the service to determine whether they can actually implement this, based on available resources, and is that right?

MR. HADLEY: Yes, that's correct, and so, essentially, the council would be -- The council is essentially developing a tool, at this point, with the permit, and then it would be handed over to the service to implement that tool, and then the surveying component, that a lot of the comments revolved around, that's when that side of the process would start getting up and running as well, and so the point of those comments is that, you know, it's really a nebulous timeline after the council approves it. After that June meeting, the amendment would be submitted to the agency, and there's a wide range of timing, as far as when that permit would go into place, and those regulations would go into place.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I did see that Andy had his hand up, and do you want to follow-up, and then we'll go to Andy?

MR. WOODWARD: Actually, my question was for Andy, and that is, realistically, you all develop your budget request, what, two years out in advance, really, or something like that maybe, and so, if you're tasked with doing something, and you've got acquire the fiscal resources to do it, how long does it take you to actually get those resources, assuming that all things move as they should, and there's approval at the budgeting process, and how long does it typically take you to get the resources, if you don't have them at-hand, to do that?

MR. STRELCHECK: It's really hard to answer that question, and I think it's widely variable. It depends on the initiative that we're implementing, and it depends on congressional support for that. We saw, with the SEFHIER program, in the Gulf at least, you know, funding within the next year of actually implementing that program. We have IRA funds, which may be a potential source, you know, to draw from, that are temporary, that are already available and are being planned and executed by the agency, and so I really can't tell you an answer, but you're right, and we typically, with our major congressional budget initiatives -- It's two to three years out that we're planning.

What I wanted to add is, beyond the budget, right, just keep in mind there's an implementation phase for rulemaking that takes time, and then we're not going to instantaneously, even if we had the money, be able to turn around and build a system until that rule is effective, and so the schedule is vague, I think intentionally for that very reason. To the extent that we can frontload things, and have confidence that this is going to go into place, yes, that would be a way to expedite the timeline.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: The reason that I ask this question is I think it's important for us to set realistic expectations that this is not a just flip a switch on kind of thing, and, all of a sudden, it's just kind of -- I mean, there's a lot that's going to have to go into this. I mean, there is survey design elements of this that are going to take time, once we ever make final decisions about how this should look, and so this is a long-term investment of effort.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Mel.

MR. BELL: Not to put an overly fine point on that, but recall that, when we went through the process of developing the for-hire reporting system, and, you know, there was a lot of public anticipation, and expectation, that that would be up and running very quickly, and, you know, we've seen that there's a lot more moving parts to it, and a lot more issues, and I think it's very good to be clear about this, and the public expectations with this would be probably for something more immediate, but we need to be clear that, you know, these things take time, and there are budget issues, or development issues, and that sort of thing, because we certainly experienced that with the for-hire reporting system.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Anything else here at this point? All right. Back to you, John.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you. Before we get into the actions and alternatives, there are a few items in the purpose and need statements that the IPT wanted to bring up during the review of this amendment, and so there are sort of two sets of edits, if you will, or suggested edits in there, and there is the edit highlighted in yellow that was added just to sort of help the structure of the purpose and need, and so the purpose of the amendment is to develop a recreational permitting system. That's really not necessarily substantive, but it helps with the flow of the -- It's intended to help with the flow of the purpose and need statement.

The other two edits are substantive, and I wanted to bring these before the committee, because this was an emphasis of the committee, and it was a change to the purpose and need in June, and, really, it was that addition of "will", and so the develop a permitting system that will better identify the universe of private anglers or vessels and will enhance the ability to collect recreational effort and catch data.

This is something that the IPT discussed in great detail in the meeting that subsequently happened after the council's June meeting, and they suggested the following edit, and, really, they kind of got hung up on the change from "would" to "will", and, really, the IPT felt that, essentially, the use of "will" would be suboptimal, since it's really unclear whether or not the permit will -- A permit will not necessarily result in better data, unless MRIP actually uses it and makes changes and improvements to sampling design, and so what was suggested was to change it, to take "will" out and to add "to" in there, and so, really, the IPT felt that it was suboptimal wording. With that said, it's certainly within the council's -- Within the bounds of the council to maintain it as-is, but I did want to bring that topic up to the council and get your feedback on whether or not you would like to entertain the IPT's suggested edits or if you would like to keep it as-is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Can you scroll back up just a little bit, so we can see the whole purpose and need there? Thanks, John. What's the pleasure of the committee? One thing I will



point out is that, when I read that, “will to better identify”, we would either need to select “will” or delete “that will”, and just use “to”? Is that part of what you’re saying? Okay, because I was trying to add another word in there, like that “will aim to”, and I was trying to add another -- Okay. Now I think I understand. It’s either select “will” or “to”. Okay. Thoughts here? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, I respectfully disagree with the IPT on this one, because, to me, if you can’t use the word “will”, if it’s not going to make those changes, then why the heck are we going through all this? I mean, I just -- That’s just the way I feel about it, and, I mean, that’s a statement of commitment, the use of the word “will”. I mean, it’s kind of like we start putting “shall” and “should” and “may”, and all that kind of stuff, and you start putting all that little wiggle room in there, and, I mean, I think the purpose is it will do that, and, if it’s proven that it won’t, then this will have been an academic exercise, and we won’t ever accomplish anything, but I will yield to the greater wisdom of the collective group on this matter, but that’s my opinion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Spud. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I think Spud makes a great point there. I mean, I think you would be hard-pressed to say that it will not better identify the universe of anglers, because we don’t know anything about the universe of anglers, and so it will -- It absolutely will better identify it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. It sounds like what I’m hearing is -- I’m assuming we’re okay with the part that’s in yellow here, and then it sounds like what we’re hearing so far is that want to keep the word “will”, in both of these instances in green. Okay. I see heads nodding yes, and I heard verbal yes. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Well, I was just speaking to the first part. You know, to the second part, “will enhance the ability to collect recreational effort and data”, I am not so convinced that “will” is the right word there, because, you know, it may, but I don’t know if it will, and it all depends on whether people actually comply, you know, and, I mean, I don’t know. That’s a tricky one there, but, you know, I’m fine leaving “will” in there, but, originally, I was just speaking to the first part of it, and so, yes, I’m good either way on the second one.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks for that clarification. Andy and then Robert.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think we’re splitting a lot of hairs here, and it doesn’t change our intent either way this is worded, in my view. We’re still trying to accomplish an improved data collection system, and that’s the goal, whether we use “will” or we don’t use “will”, and I don’t care at this point, and I think it’s still the same intent.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I was going to -- I know we’re splitting hairs there, but I think the word there is “better”, right, “better identify”, and so what does that mean? Is it just making a small improvement, and is there a goal there, and I know that’s kind of hard to define, but I think that’s really what the conversation is focused on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. What do we want to do here? All right. I hear leave it, but, Tim, when you say leave it, do you mean leave “will” in both sections where it’s identified in the green?

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and are we okay with the yellow change? I see thumbs-up here. Is that enough for you, John, or do we need an actual motion to accept these edits?

MR. HADLEY: I think, at this point, it may be better to just have a motion. I'm glad that the color-coding worked, and so I think I can type up a motion pretty quickly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Can you scroll up a little bit again? I will just read it the way I think the group is trying to state it. The purpose of the amendment is to develop a recreational permitting system that will identify the universe of anglers, and I know that's absolute, but that's what we're trying to get to. If you fall short of that goal, then you do, but I think, to Spud's point, that's what we're trying to get to.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I see people that think that that's okay. All right, and so we're making that edit there on the screen. Okay.

MR. HADLEY: If I could read it, really quickly, because that's a little confusing there, how it's struck out, and so, essentially, the purpose, based on the committee's comments just now, would read: The purpose of the amendment is to develop a recreational permitting system that will better identify the universe of private anglers or vessels targeting South Atlantic snapper grouper species and will enhance the ability to collect recreational catch and effort data. Also work to promote best fishing practices through education. Is that --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, let me ask a question for Robert, and I think that he was also suggesting getting rid of the word "better", and just "will identify". Is that right?

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. All right, and so can folks see it now? All right. Are people okay with that? It looks like heads nodding yes, and then don't run away yet. We need a motion to accept all of these edits. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: **I will make a motion to accept the edits as shown on the screen.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We have a motion, and it's seconded by Mel. I think we've already had some good discussion on this. Any more discussion here on the purpose and need statement, as we're getting this motion on the board? All right. **Is there any objection to accepting these edits to the purpose and need statements?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm sorry. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. If we're going to move to the actions next, this stems, maybe, from the purpose and need, but not related to the actual language, and so I think, stepping back just a little bit, and, when I'm looking at this, and I think it's prompted by the purpose and need, but this is all about data collection and identifying, you know, the universe of anglers, right, and so what's missing in this is an explanation of what is insufficient about the existing registry requirement in the statute, right, and we have the recreational registry, and we did all that, and why we do need to identify the universe of anglers beyond what's already identified in the registry?

I remember hearing some discussion of things, and let's say you want more precise information, or whatever it is, but we need to articulate that in the record, and that's a very important foundational thing, and I would say also then stemming off of that is clearly that this is all about recreational data collection, and data collection is all over the purpose and need, yet there is no data collection tied to it, and that piece has been removed.

To me, that's somewhat riding in let's say a carriage-drawn horse. You know, if you're going to use this for data collection, but you're not improving the data collection along with it, then, you know, these things are going to be out-of-sync somewhat, it seems. I think, if you read through the advice from the technical committee, right, this jumps out at you, that you need consistency across the region, and you need to design this in a way that promotes data collection.

If we're going to do, you know, MRIP, and it's going to feed into MRIP, then, okay, and that is our existing data collection program, but you've seen and heard discussion that, well, if we go this route, if we go with this kind of reporting, or this additional data collection, then we might need to make tweaks, and I think there's an obvious disconnect there and that the council at least needs some serious consideration of what additional data collection is going to be implemented in the future, which is all tied to why we're creating this permit in the first place. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just a question for you, Shep. This additional data collection, are you suggesting this supplemental -- Like what Luiz was talking about, that would be possibly like an add-on on top of MRIP, or are you suggesting that, if we do another amendment in the future, that is more specific to reporting, and I guess I'm not fully understanding what you're suggesting, or the question that you're asking.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. So, if you're going to require reporting, and you're looking to that reporting, then it doesn't make sense, to me, to remove it from this piece. You're doing this permit to facilitate that reporting, and then, you know, you should be doing the reporting at the same time, or at least designing the reporting. A permit to inform the reporting without the reporting is what I meant by the carriage-drawn horse. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Shep. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: This could be a pretty lengthy discussion, but I think the challenge here is that we don't -- It's not the purview of this body to design the survey to use the permit. That will be the Office of Science and Technology and whatever appropriate elements of the service, to make sure that the permit is used in the most valid and effective way to accomplish the end purpose, which is more accurate, precise, and timely data.

I wasn't here whenever the for-hire reporting was developed, but, you know, were the elements of for-hire reported debated and discussed and included in that amendment, or was it the general purpose and intent of what you wanted that reporting to accomplish identified, and then it was passed over to the technical experts to design how that would actually be accomplished, and I think that's the -- I mean, I understand what you're talking about, that, you know, this is a means to an end, and the end being better data, and in between the permit and that end result is the design that uses that permit to accomplish your data collection, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Before I go back to Shep, I saw other hands up, including trying to answer the history of what Spud just asked, and so I want to go to John Carmichael and then Mel and then back to Shep.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, because I think those are, you know, good points, and Shep made a good point about, you know, the data, and I think maybe somewhat, as this is, as Spud said, the means to an end, the effort and catch data became the words, but I think really how this came about, and what it was intended to do, was to improve the estimates, to improve the catch and effort estimates, and the data is one way of doing that, and what the AP has talked about is how the permit, directed towards snapper grouper, can be used within the MRIP program to post-stratify their effort and improve the estimates.

Now, it may not be necessarily doing anything to how they go out and actually catch the raw data, capture the recreational and catch information, but it is very influential to how they can go in and then analyze that data and improve the estimate, and so maybe the purpose and need could focus less on the data and more on the estimate, because that's what we really want to improve, and that is the end, and the means is effort and catch data, but another means, as we've heard at the technical group, from folks like John Foster, is providing them a better way to manage effort that's directed towards snapper grouper fisheries, and that was Shep's other point, you know, is like what's the issue with the current registry.

The main issue, you know, as has been discussed, is that the current registry does not allow any way to identify an angler who was fishing for snapper grouper species from an angler who was trolling for dolphin, and there's nothing in there that identifies anglers other than the fact that they went fishing off of a certain state, in a private boat, and went into the EEZ. You know, those modes are very gross, and so the whole idea of this was to provide a means that the MRIP analysts can post-stratify effort and come up with a universe of trips that is more likely to be associated with snapper grouper fishing.

That's kind of what the Florida survey essentially does, and it identifies a universe of people who are out there and likely to be snapper grouper fishing, and so I think some language like that, worked into the amendment, may help address a number of the concerns that Shep raised about making sure that, you know, we're really clear what this is doing and that the actions are meeting that purpose and need.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That was helpful. Then I have, in the queue here, Mel and then back to Shep.

MR. BELL: To Spud's question about the history of the for-hire reporting amendment, yes, we did talk about what we were going to capture, in terms of data, and what we were doing though is

we were simply taking, as a model, the existing headboat survey kind of elements, and we were trying to say, okay, these data that are collected for headboats right now -- We're going to now bring that into the full community of for-hire vessels, and so the charter boats would report, you know, the same sorts of things, the data, that the headboats were reporting, and that's how that kind of started, was to build a bigger for-hire reporting system that kind of mirrored what was already in existence in the headboat reporting.

There were discussions about species, and there were discussions about South Carolina had, I believe, the only existing state-level for-hire reporting system at the time, charter boat reporting system at the time, and so we wanted to make sure that the data we collected there was compatible, you know, with what we were collecting, and so we did have discussions about it, and then that expanded as we started considering that, oh, well, you know, we could be --

What about compatibility and overlap with the Gulf and other regions, but there was discussion about it, but I think where we are with this one is that we've stayed away from that so far, and, by just establishing the permit first, the permit itself becomes sort of the prerequisite to allow you to build this system, you know, with the data elements in it, and so step one is to have the permit in place, which facilitates your ability to use whatever is developed, in terms of the data elements you're going to collect and all, but, from a historical standpoint, and it was a long time ago, I can remember, you know, simply kind of describing what we were doing as taking what we were already kind of doing with the federal headboat reporting system and expanding that into the charter boat fleet, and so there was discussion of what data are they, you know, collecting, and how is that working, and that's my somewhat fuzzy recollection of many years ago.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to respond to a couple of things that Spud said. One thing is so the reporting versus the survey, right, I mean, those are different things, to me. The survey, the MRIP or whatever, if the agency wants to run a survey of anglers, and it's doing that on its own, and it's specifying the designing the parameters of all of that, right, and the council has input on that, but it's an agency-run thing, and that information feeds into the council process.

The reporting requirement, to me, and let's say a private recreational logbook, the agency can't just do that on its own, and that's got to be something that comes through the fishery management plan, and, you know, that's something that the council decides, or that's implemented through the fishery management plan, and, you know, it's different, to me, than the survey aspect.

I guess part of my point is just that I think you could design this, and it sounds like, to me, reading between the lines, basically this is being designed, at least, you know, implicitly, to inform MRIP. If nothing else, it will inform MRIP sampling and can improve data collection there, and maybe you can go beyond that in the future, but, you know, if the council is thinking we want a reporting requirement, and we're done with -- We don't care if this feeds into MRIP, and we just want a recreational logbook, and we're going to get, you know, recreational catch estimates that way, that's a very different thing, and that's something that the council has, obviously, much more of a role in than any broad-based agency survey of recreational fishing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Shep. That definitely gave me some things to think about there. Trish and then Robert.

MS. MURPHEY: So, to get at what Shep is getting, would it help to change the need of the amendment to, okay, the need of the amendment is to supplement MRIP to improve the precision of effort and catch data for the private component of the recreational sector? Would that address those concerns, Shep's concerns?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I saw Andy shoot his hand up there.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, my recollection is we were being intentionally vague here, because of the potential for future programs, as well as the State Reef Fish Survey, and so, rather than being explicit, it was saying this is to improve MRIP, right, improve recreational data collection as a whole.

While I have the mic, I think the main issue with what Shep is bringing up -- So there's been good discussion, and I agree with John Carmichael in terms of intent and why we're narrowing the universe and why the angler registry, obviously, isn't sufficient, and so we can build that into the record, but in terms of, you know, the reporting requirements, right, unless we foresee that there's going to be some sort of mandatory requirement for reporting, right, then I think we would need to add some sort of action here. Otherwise, I think we would probably need to capture at least the intent of what we're trying to accomplish, with examples and things that MRIP would be using this for, and the State Reef Fish Survey would be used for going forward, but then it would be a voluntary survey at that point, which is essentially how we manage our surveys in the first place.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: That was my understanding of the intent of this, was to improve the base of people that we were going to ask questions about for the survey, and not a reporting requirement, and I just didn't understand what you were talking about with enforcing the reporting requirement, and I wanted to clarify that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess where I was going with this, in my mind, when I initially raised it, was just to address the reporting piece. If we're going to add a reporting requirement, I think it should be in this amendment, and I don't think we should say, you know, have our eye on this reporting that we're going to do later, just because it's controversial and difficult to deal with in the same amendment, but so, with that in mind, the council states its rationale, that, no, maybe we're not really looking to that, and we actually intend this to be, you know, at least initially, an MRIP information supplement of sorts, right, and then that's fine, and, you know, we could draft it that way.

I wouldn't spend time, or I don't advise spending time, wordsmithing the purpose and need in this environment. If you stick with it, I'm on the IPT, and I know you have mixed views about the IPT recommendations, but you can get more feedback through that process, and I think that would be more efficient than sitting here and trying to wordsmith purpose and need with an eye on potential changes in response to issues that I've raised. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I'm glad that Shep said that, because I was going to suggest the same thing. Wordsmithing at the table can be really dangerous for us, and I think the IPT can take this advice and work it out and really give that focus on we need better estimates, however we get there, and I think that's what is really important, and I have agreed with Shep all along.

I feel like, you know, if we wanted to do reporting, we should do all of this right now, but, you know, the issue came up, I guess, with the cost of reporting, and we don't even know how many anglers would go after this permit, and so the way I see that this has evolved has been towards saying, well, you know, we've been told, for almost a decade, since it first came to the SSC, that, if we could identify the universe of snapper grouper anglers, we could get improved estimates from the existing MRIP data collection program.

This, to me, is a step towards saying, okay, we're going to do that part, and we're going to take that step, and we're going to give this universe, and then we'll see if we get improved estimates, and we may get improved estimates for some stocks, and we may not get improved estimates, or we may not get enough improvement, for other stocks, but we may then decide, with those stocks, that we go after reporting, but it may not be every species in the FMU, and it may be some.

Again, I fall back on, you know, if you're familiar with the HMS approach, and the permit, and the large pelagic survey and the dedicated reporting, and they have used that permit that they have to both support a dedicated survey toward those anglers as well as support for some species, making you report every fish, and I think, you know, we may be doing the best we can do to get this identified and see what MRIP can get and see where the PSEs improve, and then we have maybe a group of stocks that we're going, you know, we still want better data, and we're not getting it, and we're not getting better estimates, and what's our next step to deal with those species, and so it becomes sort of step-wise for us in doing this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I appreciate that discussion. Anything else on this topic? Otherwise, we're going to keep going through the amendment. Okay. I'm going to pass it back to John Hadley to keep us moving.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you. With that, we'll jump into the actions in the amendment, and so the first one is really establishing the permit itself and specifying essentially what entity would need to be permitted, whether that would be a vessel or it would be private anglers, and you can see, you know, this action is really necessary to establish that permit requirement, and so this is kind of a step one, if you will, in the process of developing this permit.

Alternative 2 focuses on developing a vessel-based permit, and Alternative 3 would develop a private angler permit. I won't go over the AP comments, since those have already been presented, but they are in the document itself, if you want to look over sort of the full suite of comments that was provided.

I will note, additionally in there, there was the -- In addition to your technical AP recommendations, there are the Snapper Grouper AP recommendations in there as well, and both APs recommended going with Alternative 2, or considering Alternative 2, in Action 1, and so that

was a consensus recommendation between both of the APs, and, really, overall, the vessel-based permit, it was noted, would better identify the universe of participants, and some of the logistics are a little bit easier with the vessel-based permit, and so that was kind of a very quick synopsis of that discussion.

In relation to the IPT comments, and so moving from the AP over to the IPT comments, it was noted that a vessel-based permit could be challenging with rental boats, and so there may be some logistics that need to be worked out with that, as far as the permittee, or the rental boat owner, would not be the one necessarily fishing on the vessel, and then, on the other hand, the IPT discussion noted that an angler-based permit may be tough for some anglers, and perhaps if they're out of town, if they're just fishing for a day, or with short notice, and would they be able to get the permit very quickly, and so some of the logistics side of that, basically, in relation to the IPT comments, but, generally speaking, you know, just looking at this action overall, I just want to make sure that you're okay with the action and the range of alternatives, and no specific action is needed, necessarily, on this at this time, and I will turn it over to the committee.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, John. Just to repeat that one more time, what we're trying to do today on these actions, and the alternatives, is to make sure we're good with the range, and we're not trying to pick a preferred today, and so are we good with this range of alternatives here under this action? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks. Yes, I'm fine with these, and I do have a question. If a permit is issued to a vessel, it's issued to an individual who is the owner, or the lessor, and, at least in the commercial permit world, you can lease a vessel from the owner, and what I am trying to think of is, okay, when that vessel goes to sea, and this gets back to how you ultimately survey, it's, okay, so, if I own the vessel, but my son takes him and his friends and they go, and the vessel is permitted, and so they're covered, but, ultimately, who gets surveyed for the fishing activities?

It's going to me, because I'm the one identified on the permit with the vessel, but I didn't go on the trip, and so just, again, thinking of the practicalities of how all of this will work, and that's -- I mean, once that vessel is permitted, the person identified on that permit doesn't have to always be with that vessel, and that vessel can go out on its own, with other people at the helm, and prosecute the fishery, and is that correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's my understanding, and that's why I was bringing it up and asking Luiz those questions, because I think you would have the same issue if you add an educational component here, which is under discussion, and so, to continue with your example, you would be taking the educational course, but your son took the boat out, with a different crew, and so what was the purpose of you taking the educational course, instead of the people that were out actually fishing? Any more comments on this? Laurilee.

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

MR. HADLEY: I will jump down to that in just the next action, but it should certainly be in there, because it's definitely in the complex.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom.



MR. ROLLER: In terms of a vessel permit, what if the vessel is owned by an LLC or a corporate entity, and who does the permit go -- Who would be -- You know, whose name would the permit be in?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think you just kind of also got to Spud's point. Okay, and so then, to try to wrap up this action here, it sounds like maybe we're good with these alternatives, and we've got some questions about if it's just vessels, versus private anglers, but we don't necessarily need to make that decision today, and we're just looking at the range of alternatives, and so, based on all of our questions and comments here, I see heads nodding that maybe we're okay with this range of alternatives here in the document. Okay. It looks like yes. Wait. Robert, you have a question?

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Is it possible to have both, where, if the vessel has a permit, you don't need one, but, if you're on a vessel that doesn't have a permit --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am thinking. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am not going to weigh-in as to whether we could have both, and I was going to comment that, Robert, when you speak, it's really hard for us to hear you, and so if you could just speak into the microphone.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: My question was is it possible to have it either way, and so, if you hop on a boat with somebody that has a boat permit, could you fish under that, but, if you go on a boat that doesn't have a permit, each individual would need one?

MS. MCCAWLEY: So he's saying an either or. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, it's always possible, right, and I think the question comes down to what do we want to accomplish in the intent, and, you know, I think there's a lot of good things that are coming out of this conversation, in terms of, you know, how it would be practically implemented, but keep in mind that the current survey is going to coastal households with angler permits, right, and so, to me, this is a vast improvement, even if we have a few holes in the data collection system and some unusual circumstances with people not operating the boat, and it might be vessel owner, or, you know, however it might be implemented, and so we need to work through some of that, and I want to talk, I think, more with the data collectors in particular, and like, you know, private rental boats, for example, are a problem, I would think, currently, in terms of how we sample them, and so how do we deal with those, going forward, and is there any ways to improve sampling of those boats as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so do we want to add an alternative that is both? I see people nodding their heads no. No? Okay. All right. Go ahead, John.

MR. HADLEY: If I could, and this was a discussion -- It was originally in the document, or not in the document, but originally discussed by the committee, if I recall, and this was several meetings ago, but there was a -- What was sent out to scoping essentially was along those lines, either an angler or a vessel would need to be permitted, and I think it was a recommendation of the technical AP not to pursue that, just because it's kind of a pick either or, and that will lead to improvements. If you have both, then that sort of muddies the water, as far as identifying the

universe, and so, if I'm recalling that correctly, I think that was the recommendation of the AP, but, again, that was a discussion held a while back.

All right, and so, moving along to Action 2, we're moving from creating the permit and specifying who would need to be permitted, essentially, over to which species would be covered, and so Action 2 is specify the species that would be covered by the private recreational snapper grouper permit, and you have a suite of alternatives here, and so I will go over them very quickly, and then I have a table that shows which species would be covered based on that alternative, and so Alternative 2 would include essentially the entire snapper grouper fishery management unit, and so all fifty-five species.

Then Alternatives 3 through 6 are subsets of that, of the fishery management unit, and so Alternative 3 would include any assessed species for which recreational harvest is allowed, and Alternative 4 would cover the species that are currently under the Florida State Reef Fish Survey, and Alternative 5 would cover the deepwater complex, and Alternative 6 would include any species that is part of a -- That has a size limit or is part of a bag limit.

Another thing to keep in mind is that these could certainly be stacked alternatives, where you wouldn't necessarily need to choose one. If you wanted to -- I'm just throwing this out there as an example, and if you wanted to include the Florida SRFS species, as well as the deepwater complex, you could, in the end, choose Alternative 4 and 5 as preferred, and those species would be combined together, and so these certainly could be stacked, depending on the council's, and the committee's, preference.

There is quite a few species covered there, and so a wide range, and included below, in Table 3, is how that would play out based on the alternative chosen, and so, as you can see, there's a list of the species, and, if golden tilefish isn't in there, it should certainly be in there, and I -- There it is. I saw it. I hope it's in there. It is in there, but it's a list of the species, and so essentially the assessed species would be Alternative 3. If there's an "X" next to that species, that means that it would fall under that category. You can see the Florida State Reef Fish Survey species, the deepwater species, and then any species that has a size limit or is part of an aggregate bag limit, and that sort of shows how it would play out within the snapper grouper fishery management unit, depending on the alternative.

Then I won't go over the Technical Permitting AP's recommendations again, but there was essentially the -- The advisory panel did recommend Alternative 2, and so being more comprehensive in nature, as far as the species that are chosen, and the snapper grouper also recommended Alternative 2 as well, when they discussed this back in April, and, overall, the IPT discussed this, and it was noted that covering a subset of species may make it a little bit more difficult to enforce, and really coming at this from both the law enforcement and angler perspective, just being able to keep up which species would fall under the permit, which species do not fall under the permit, and so, when the council would get to it, including additional rationale for including these alternatives, and, if you do end up choosing them, that would be helpful, and the IPT did bring up whether or not the council wants to consider including all of these alternatives through public hearings.

It was noted that, if Alternative 3 is selected, and so that is the assessed species, and this may be a little bit of a moving target, as new species are assessed, for example scamp and yellowmouth

grouper, if there's a complication with an assessment, where it gets rejected indefinitely, how to handle that situation, or if there's a new harvest prohibition, and so where harvest -- Say recreational harvest was closed for a species, and would it still fall under the permit, and so it's a little bit of a moving target, and a static species list would be beneficial for long-term enforcement and ease of anglers really understanding the permit requirements, as well as decreasing future regulatory burden for the council and NMFS and constituents.

It was noted, for Alternative 4, the Florida State Reef Fish Survey species, it may not be -- Well, essentially, some species -- Some important species may be left out that are part of the -- That are important within the South Atlantic region, and so beyond Florida, and it was noted that deepwater species, some deepwater species, are not included in the SRFS survey currently, and another is black sea bass, which is more important, or tends to be a more important fishery, further up the coast, but still within the South Atlantic region, and, last, it was noted to consider the future need for permitting based on species distributions changes in a warming climate.

Those are the IPT comments, and so really, again, no major action needed at this point, but really making sure that you're comfortable with the action itself and then also the range of alternatives, to further develop, again, into a public hearing document.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Do we want to -- Well, let me back up. Are we good with this range of alternatives here, and, as John mentioned, ultimately, when we go to select preferreds, you could have multiple preferreds under this particular action, and are we good with this range? I see hands up. Andy and then Mel.

MR. STRELCHECK: **I see a need to narrow the range, and I would like to make a motion to move Alternatives 3 and 6 to Considered but Rejected.** If I get a second, I will explain my rationale.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so the motion by Andy, and seconded by Kerry, is, once again, to remove Alternatives 3 and 6 to Considered but Rejected.

MR. STRELCHECK: So my main rationale is, obviously, you could identify a set list of species today, but that list of species is going to evolve and change over time, as more assessments take place, or more species are regulated through size or bag limits, and so I think it's more important to have a consistent group of species identified that would pertain to the snapper grouper permit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion on Andy's motion here? We had people in the queue, but I don't think that that's why you had your hands up. Mel, do you want to speak on this?

MR. BELL: Yes, because that's actually kind of why I had my hand up, going in that direction, but what I was going to say is I couldn't imagine any other permutations that we could come up with, and so it was a long list, but, if we wanted to reduce some, I can see the logic in removing 3 and 6, because they are kind of moving targets, and so I would basically agree with the motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel. Any more discussion here on this motion? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I apologize that I missed golden tile a while ago, but I was looking for the "X" in the deepwater -- You know, identifying it as a deepwater species, and so why are golden tilefish, and I think blueline -- Yes, golden tilefish and blueline tilefish, and why do they not have an "X" in their little box, identifying them as deepwater species?

MR. HADLEY: That's a good question. I need to go back and check, to get you a better answer, and I will have an answer for you afterwards, but I believe, when I was making this table, I was looking at the deepwater complex, and so those are the -- The species there are included in the deepwater complex, and I believe -- Again, I will get a better answer for you, but they're not necessarily in the deepwater complex, and I want to say it may be because they're assessed, and so they were pulled out of the deepwater complex.

MS. BROUWER: John is correct, and so golden tilefish has never been a part of the deepwater complex, and blueline was removed from that complex, through Amendment 32, when it was assessed, and so the species that remained are contained within that complex, and it doesn't mean that they're not deepwater species, and they're just not included in the complex.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so, John, do you mind going back up to the motion? All right. **Once again, the motion is to remove Alternatives 3 and to Considered but Rejected. Any more questions or discussion on that motion? Any objection to that motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.** All right, and so then I'm going to go back to the list of hands here on this action. Spud, you had your hand up. Okay. Anything else, looking at the range of alternatives here in this action, that we want to modify? All right. Then I'm going to assume that we're good, and I'm going to pass it back to John.

MR. HADLEY: Okay. Thank you, and so we'll move along. This next action, this is one that is going to take a little bit of discussion on the committee's part, and so, really, this action specifies the effective term of a private recreational snapper grouper permit, and so essentially how long it would remain valid, and there is -- Outside of Alternative 1, there are three other alternatives. Alternative 2 is a federal snapper grouper permit will remain valid for the calendar year that it was issued, and so, essentially, if it was issued in 2023, it would expire at the end of the year, on December 31, 2023, and so that's the calendar year.

Alternative 3 is the permit would remain valid for one year from the issuance, and so the date of issuance, and it would be 365 days later, and then Alternative 4 is the permit would expire on the date of birth of the permit holder, and so that's the range of alternatives that have been included for this action, and, really, this was something that came up, if you recall, in June, and this was originally an IPT recommendation.

It has been noted, through further discussion, that it may be better for deference to be provided -- I am getting into the IPT comments, but deference provided to the agency to have the flexibility to determine the renewal terms of the permit, for how long a permit would remain valid rather, and, really, it was felt that -- It was noted that a private recreational permit will likely create a relatively high administrative burden if NMFS needs to process what will likely be several thousand, tens of thousands, of permits that would expire on the same date, and so having a staggered expiration date would be better logistically, likely be better logistically, and likely ease that administrative burden, and so it would be preferable if that was a NMFS decision point, and NMFS would benefit from flexibility to figure out the effective term, but likely the basis would be

annual, and so, if you look at how permits, existing permits, are issued, they're typically -- They are issued on an annual basis.

It was an IPT recommendation that the council consider removing this action and discussing an annual effective term, sort of in the discussion of Action 1, and what I mean by that is in the document itself, and so, if you do create a permit, the intent would be that it would have annual effective terms, and so, really, we're looking for guidance here if the committee wants to keep this action in the amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so I saw hands going up. Before we dive deep into this discussion, because I agree this could be a lengthy discussion, and I already saw two hands up, can we take a ten-minute bathroom break and then come back, and so the hands that I saw up were Shep and Tim.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're going to get going again, and so come on back to the table. All right, and so we were on Action 3 here, which is the effective term of this particular permit, and the folks that I had in the queue, that had their hands up before the break, were Shep and then Tim. Shep, are you ready to offer some comments here?

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. I was just going to strongly support the IPT's recommendation. I don't recall that from the discussion, but I've seen a lot of my permits in my years, and I have never seen this level of administrative detail specified by a council. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Shep. Tim, are you ready?

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I was going to make that motion, if it's appropriate.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure. Go ahead.

MR. GRINER: **I would move that we move this action to Considered but Rejected.** Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we've had a motion to remove Action 3 and put it to Considered but Rejected, and it's seconded by Spud, and so a question for you, Tim, just so I understand where you're going with this, and the intent would be that, if this is removed, then, per I think what the IPT recommended, then, in Action 1, it would state that this is an annual permit, and it's up to the agency to figure out how that would work, and is that your intent here?

MR. GRINER: That is correct. It would be an annual permit, and we'll let the service figure out the details.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that. All right. Other folks that want to comment on this particular motion here on Action 3? I don't see any other hands. I see heads nodding. All right. **With no other comments, is there any objection to this motion that would remove Action 3?** All right. **No objection, and the motion carries.** I'm going to turn it back to John.

MR. HADLEY: All right, and so thank you for that, that discussion, and so we're switching gears here over to Action 4, and this is the last permit-related action in the amendment, and what this is doing is establishing a mechanism that will allow a state to opt-out of a federal private recreational snapper grouper permit, and so this is something that the committee has discussed and developed over the past several meetings, and, really, in Alternative 2 there, that is the mechanism that would create this opt-out system for states to opt-out of the federal permit requirement, as long as the measures essentially are equivalent to the federal permit requirements, and those permit requirements are specified in the Subalternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c.

2a is the same entities would need to be permitted as the federal, and so mirroring that federal permit requirement, the same entities, and so angler or vessel. 2b is the same species would need to be mirrored as the federal permit requirement, and 2c is the permit would remain valid for the same period of time, and perhaps that may need to come out, considering that -- Well, maybe not, but that make take some additional discussion, given the last -- Given the last action, and whether or not that needs to stay in there, but, essentially, that's the intent of the subalternatives, is to mirror the federal permit requirements, whatever they may be and how they may be specified by the council.

There's a bit of information, and this is in relation to what was presented at the June meeting, but, specifically speaking, Congress did specifically allow a state exemption under the Recreational Fisheries Registry Program, and that kind of exemption is not necessarily contained under the MSA section that the council would use. However, the MSA does allow the council to require a permit for a fishery that the council manages, and in part requires the permit to be obtained from fees paid to the Secretary, and so it seems that there is some legal footing there, sound legal footing, and I will turn it over to Shep in just a minute, to provide some of the details on that, but, additionally, the council would need to further discuss the exemption and how it should operate, and so some of the mechanics, the details of the mechanics, and how it would operate need to be further discussed and worked out.

Some of the following questions may be helpful, and so how would a state permit fit into -- Or fit within this requirement? How would a state permit system be equivalent to the federal permit requirement, and sort of an issue that was brought up, or a situation that was brought up, earlier is how a permitted entity in one state may or may not be permitted -- Or may or may not be covered in another state, and so, for example, if the State of Florida went with the opt-out of the federal permit requirement, what would happen if a permitted angler in Florida were fishing in the EEZ off of Georgia, and would they be covered? Those sorts of questions are situations that would need to be worked out and specified, and would that angler or vessel be covered or not, and so some of the details and logistics.

It was noted that -- I won't go over the technical AP recommendations, since they were explained earlier, but it was noted that, if the council does move forward with this, making sure that those federal permit requirements would be mirrored in a state to facilitate that opt-out option. As far as the IPT comments, it would be helpful to develop the amendment document, and if the council could provide additional rationale for creating a system that would allow a state to opt-out of the federal permit requirement, and is it to reduce regulatory burden on state anglers or vessels, and what is the real goal of creating an opt-out option?

Allowing an opt-out option may be contrary to the purpose and need, and so it would need to make sure that the federal permit requirements are adopted by the states, and so, if allowed, some states may need to change the licensing program to specify and concentrate on snapper grouper species, and, also, we would need to set a timeframe when the permit data would be made available to MRIP, and, finally, there is some precedent for requiring duplicate permitting for the same purposes, where there is a state and federal permit, if you look at many of the for-hire fisheries, and so there is often a state requirement for a state for-hire permit, and then a federal permitting requirement as well, in say the snapper grouper fishery or dolphin wahoo or coastal migratory pelagics.

Those are the IPT comments, and I believe that Shep may have some additional input on the legal side, and the legal footing, for the council to move forward, but that's a summary of what we had, and so, really, we're looking for some additional feedback from the council on whether or not and how to move forward with this action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to add a little bit more to what John was getting into there, and as a state that already has a permit, I think that we would be open to doing these things. The only thing that concerns me is the one about would remain valid for the same period of time as the federal permit, and so the State Reef Fish Survey is an annual renewal, but let's say that the federal permit gets so specific that it has to be renewed on your birthday, and that's not how our FWC licensing system works, and so, yes, it's an annual renewal, but we don't renew on the birthdate, and so I have a little bit of concern about that Subalternative 2c. The rest of it, I don't think it would be a concern for us, but part of it has to do with the constraints of our licensing system and the licensing issuance. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess I was reading that a little bit differently, in terms of the same period of time, and so I guess I would read that as, you know, renewed annually, right, or effective annually, but maybe we can clarify that. It also would be a question for the survey statisticians, right, that it doesn't matter if the federal permit that we would be issuing is on a different cycle of renewal than maybe what the state is issuing. I think, as long as the universe of participants, permit holders, is updated on a regular basis, the answer would likely be no, but we would want to understand if there would be any sampling biases associated with that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. That was helpful. Comments or questions? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I was going to agree with what Andy said, because I think the purpose would be to make sure that you've got an up-to-date sample frame at any given time, and so 365 days out of the year, regardless of who is permitting them, they're permitted, so they can be identified as part of that universe we sample, but I would really like to hear what Shep has got to say. I think there's a can we do this versus should we do this question that is fundamental to this that needs to be answered.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, I would say that, yes, you can do it, right, on a general conceptual level. In terms of the statutory language, the statute says that a council can require a permit for any vessel fishing in the EEZ, right. If you have a rationale, and you want to require it for some -- You know, like let's take all snapper grouper fishermen. If you have the

rationale for it, and you want to provide that only some of those need to be permitted, then, yes, I think you could require the permit on a subset of those, with the others being covered by some comparable state requirement.

I would separate that from the rationale for why you would do it, right, because, to me, legally, yes, you could do it if you have the rationale, and where I get hung up is I don't see the rationale, necessarily, for why you would exempt certain states, but a lot of that ties to things overall, right, and so this -- For one, I mean, you're requiring a permit to fish in the EEZ, and states don't permit fishing in the EEZ, but you're requiring that permit solely for data collection purposes, right, and this will get back to my initial comments about not touching data collection, but requiring the permit that's all about data collection.

What you would do here then, I presume, is structure this, as we've discussed already, as something to inform MRIP, right, but, if you were going to eventually require let's say a recreational logbook, why would you exempt states, because, then all of a sudden, you just lost the permit requirement and lost the nexus to all those individuals who would be required to report, and so it's a matter of connecting at the docks between what we decide to do. In the context of MRIP, you're saying, yes, you know, this would provide supplementary information, and it would be unnecessary, and thus duplicative in, some states, where this exact information is already collected through the state program. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Other questions, comments, thoughts on this action? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just putting a finer point on what Shep just said, you know, I am supportive of this opt-out position, but the devil is really in the details, in terms of making sure that the federal permit and state permit, you know, marry up and that the requirements are consistent, and I think that will be, you know, part of our challenge going forward, in terms of that consistency.

One question for maybe Shep is, in terms of the opt-out provision, do we need to add more language, either to the alternative or just in the discussion, with regard to an approval process for opting out? It's not like the state just simply says, well, we've met the requirements, and so therefore we're opting out, and what would need to be done to improve the amendment, in terms of any sort of approval or assurance of opting out?

MR. GRIMES: That's a good question. It depends on what you have in mind, and I guess we should have some discussion in there of what's envisioned with it, but, if the council wants to make it very administratively prescriptive, the council could choose to do so, but, at a minimum, yes, there should be some discussion for how this opt-out process would be conducted, right, and what gets you opted out? Is it just having a recreational permit, or you have a recreational -- You know, I wouldn't say permit, but, you know, some sort of connection to fishing activity for snapper grouper in the EEZ that adds that individual to the sampling frame for MRIP.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, I think something similar to what was used when states were allowed to be exempted from the National Saltwater Angler Registry, and that's what we had to do, and there was a set of data elements that were required, and so, in order to create a Saltwater Information Program, we put that proposal forward, and then the service reviewed it, to ensure that



all those data elements were there, the annual updates were all there, and then it was basically approved, and then, you know, that state was granted an exemption for its anglers from the National Saltwater Angler Registry. Now, how prescriptive we could get into that, I don't know, but I think, at least when I was conceptualizing this, that was the same process, is it would be like that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so my recollection of that though is that took multiple rulemakings, right, and the agency conducted a rulemaking and set out criterion for how this is going to occur and conducted it, right, and this -- You know, if we wanted to do something similar here, right, I think we just need to build that additional information in, because, when we go through the rulemaking to implement this, we would presumably implement regs that would cover the exemption process for this permit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep, is this something that we could ask the IPT to look at and come back with more information on that topic, and I guess another question for the IPT would be is this something that the council would be approving, whether the state could opt-out, or is it the agency approving that, because, in the case of like what Spud -- With that approval process, the council was not involved at all about that registry, and it was just through the agency.

MR. GRIMES: So I would say that it needs to be the agency. Ultimately, the agency is the deciding body here, and the council is advisory, and makes recommendations, and you could load that up in your program, and then the agency would implement it consistent with what was approved in the FMP, the FMP amendment with the stuff in it, but I think it would need to be an agency thing, and I think, yes, the IPT is a good place for this. Personally, I think NMFS is likely the one with the most information relevant to this, having gone through the registry, and what they would like to see, in terms of process, and so, yes, I think that is the appropriate starting point. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That sounds good. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for that, Shep, and thank you, Madam Chair. Along those lines then, would it not be appropriate then just to remove this entire action, along the same lines we did with the timeframe, and let them work that out?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: I would say no, because you want -- I mean, this is a specific exemption, and, if you require the permit, and there is no action in here dealing with an exemption, then the agency, if they approve the amendment, is going to have no ability to vary from the basic permit requirement, and you definitely need to build it into the FMP.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: With the National Saltwater Angler Registry, it was Congress who basically authorized the exemptions, and so somebody has to, you know, authorize the opportunity for an exemption.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Based on the discussion we've had thus far, it sounds like we're suggesting that the IPT needs to think about an approval process for allowing a state to opt-out, or be exempt, or whatever words we're using here, and it looks like John is taking some notes. Otherwise, other than that direction, are we okay with the, at this point, the alternatives that are under this action, and it sounds like this action needs to stay in the document? Okay. I see thumbs-up. Are we good here? Okay. All right. Back to you, John.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you. That wraps up the permit side, the permit-related actions, and so we're going to switch gears over to the education-component-related actions. There's really four actions in here, and so the first one starts with establishing the education requirement, or the education component, and so Action 5 would establish an education component for the private recreational portion of the snapper grouper fishery, and the action is really necessary to establish the education component for private anglers or vessels, however the council specifies it, that are targeting snapper grouper species in the South Atlantic region.

Currently, there is not necessarily an education -- There's certainly not an education requirement in place, and Alternative 2, as a two-alternative action, would establish the education component, in conjunction with the private recreational snapper grouper permit.

This one, there's been a little bit of input on this along the way, and it was noted, by your technical AP at previous meetings, that the education requirement, or certification, may not be necessary or required on an annual basis, and, thus, it's not necessarily an adequate substitute for a permit, but an education requirement would pair well with a permit, potentially in the initial issuance or in the renewal process. Additionally, the Snapper Grouper AP did have strong support, or did express strong support, for developing an education component as soon as possible.

Within the Snapper Grouper AP's comments, the education component could be modeled along the lines of what is required for HMS, in relation to sharks, and, in the education materials, it would be helpful to include links to encourage anglers to use existing reporting and regulation apps and potentially consider implementing an education requirement that is valid for as long as the permit is maintained and up-to-date, and, if the permit lapses, or if a new permit is issued, the permit holder would need to go through the education requirement again.

In relation to the IPT's comments on this, it would be helpful to have additional information and additional feedback from the committee on what's envisioned by an education component, or an education requirement, and there are a few sort of discussion questions embedded in there, and so, along the lines of just getting information to help develop the amendment document, and develop some of the effects analysis in general, the council would need to specify additional details of how to develop an education component, such as who does the council envision developing the materials, and is it envisioned that staff would do that, or is it envisioned that the agency would do that, or maybe a third-party, and what is the content, and what is sort of the envisioned format, say a video, a test, an online course, that sort of feedback.

If the council chooses a vessel-based permit, who would be required to take the test, or go through the education requirement, or education component? Would it be all permit holders, or is it envisioned that only the vessel operator would need that, and how could this potentially be tracked? An education component would trigger the Paperwork Reduction Act, and so an approval process, and so this sort of information helps work through that, and the assumption would be that all permit holders would need to take the training, and we'll need to know how long -- Eventually, based on the council's feedback, develop an estimate of how long the training will take and the format to start that process, and so that's another reason why these questions are being asked.

Really, you know, the idea is sort of brainstorming here, and how does the council envision an education component, or an education requirement, and any sort of details that you may have thought about thus far.

MS. MCCAWLEY: John, before the committee responds to that, do you mind talking a little bit about Action Number 6 there, about the whole mandatory versus voluntary? Can you talk about that first?

MR. HADLEY: Absolutely. Action 6 looks at whether or not an education component would be mandatory or voluntary, and, really, this is an action that the committee has wanted to keep in the amendment, particularly for discussion purposes, and keep that thought alive on whether or not an education component would be mandatory or voluntary. You can see, in Alternative 2, the education component would be mandatory. In Alternative 3, it would be voluntary.

This is really something that's been brought up, and it's something that is -- Essentially, the crux of the issue, I guess, on the IPT front, in being able to develop this in an amendment, is, if an education component is voluntary, then there's no sort of regulatory change to go along with that, and you don't necessarily -- You don't need to go through the NEPA process, and, you know, the council is free to create a voluntary program at any time, and so, really, writing the amendment, and moving forward with the amendment, that may be a difficult thing to analyze, if it is a voluntary measure.

If it is envisioned that it would be a mandatory measure, you know, that's something that would certainly go through the rulemaking process and need to be developed and explained, and that could be rolled into the previous action. Since it would be mandatory measure, there would be some sort of regulation change to go along with that, and it would go through the typical council development process within the amendment.

That was something that, since you are getting toward public hearings, that could use more discussion, and, again, if we do want to keep this action in there, that voluntary component, and so Alternative 3, is going to be, I guess, a little bit difficult, on the IPT side, to write up, there again since it's not necessarily a regulatory change, and, if the council wants to go with voluntary measures, you can certainly do that on your own timeline, if you want to, but it would have to be a voluntary measure and not mandatory.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Let's talk about this voluntary or mandatory first. Mel.

MR. BELL: The original concept that I had in my mind was to simply mirror what's done in other fisheries, the HMS fisheries or our own state shellfish fisheries, where we require -- For a permit

in a particular fishery, you're required to have proof of completion of a course, basically dealing with aspect of that fishery that we deem to be important, and so I wasn't trying to make it overly complicated, but my thinking all along was it would be a mandatory requirement, the benefit there also being that, you know, through this training, what we're hoping to do is influence people's behavior or conservation values or awareness of best practices or whatever, and so to actually result in real benefits to the fishery, whether it's dead discards or avoiding discards or that sort of thing, and so I always thought, in my mind, that mandatory made sense, and we do it in other fisheries, in order to receive a permit, and so mandatory was where I was going.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Mel. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: It actually seems to me that, if you look at the language of Alternative 2 in 5, it says "requirement", and requirement sort of implies mandatory, and so I think we've already kind of made that decision, and so, as far as I'm concerned, I think we could get rid of the whole voluntary part of it, and I think we've already set an expectation for ourselves.

MR. HADLEY: So, in that case, it would -- It would be a removal of Action 6, under the notion that this would be a mandatory measure, moving forward, and, Spud, absolutely it's written as such in Action 5 already.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So then, Spud, is that a motion to put Action 6 in Considered but Rejected and just clarify this in another part of the document?

MR. WOODWARD: **I will certainly make that motion, that we move Action 6 to Considered but Rejected and clarify in Action 5 that our intent is for the education component to be mandatory.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and that was seconded by Mel. It's under discussion here, and does everybody understand what we're talking about here? We're suggesting that, the way that the document was set up already, it was implied, or even stated, that it was mandatory, and so we don't need an action here that lists alternatives about it being mandatory or voluntary. Any more discussion on this topic? I see heads nodding no. **Any objection to this motion that removes this action?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: All right, and so, moving back up to Action 5, the wording here now works a little bit better with the rest of the document, and, there again, essentially, this is the first action in a series of actions to implement and create an education component. Really, as I mentioned, there's two alternatives here, and Alternative 2 would be the alternative needed to create and implement that education component. There's really no additional input necessarily needed at this point, unless it needs further discussion, but, you know, I think, as it's stated now, it would be pretty straightforward in moving towards a public hearing document.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: John, can you scroll back up to the action? The only thing that I was going to suggest is that, when you read through the alternatives -- Before, you had worded it with anglers or vessels, and so just to make sure, because, right now, the way that they read, it's almost targeting saying that we're going towards licensing anglers, and so however that language -- Because, right

now, we're not picking anglers or vessels, and so it says there's not a required education component for private recreational anglers to fish, and so anglers or vessels to fish, and then, similarly, when you come down, we're talking about the permit, but then it says for private recreational anglers again, and so just to make sure -- Because we're not committed to either yet.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. 10-4. John is typing that. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. We've been discussing that a little bit down at this end of the table, and it just seems wonky that you have an education requirement for vessels, and that's a logical disconnect.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's what I've tried to say from the beginning.

MR. GRIMES: With a vessel, you can talk to them all day long.

DR. BELCHER: So maybe the better thing is at least to say "permit holder" or something, because, otherwise, it makes it sound like we are targeting this towards permitted anglers, and so I'm punting it back to say at least "the permit holder", however that works.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and I see heads nodding yes, that they like the term "permit holder". I saw another hand go up over here somewhere. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, I just think, in the future, as we go through this, thinking about this vessel or angler thing, I just don't want this action to be the thing that drives that decision, and that's just my concern. I think it's much more important we get Action 1 or 2 right and then fill this in after, and so however that needs to be worded, such that this isn't putting us in that box.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks for that, Kerry. Is there more discussion on this particular action? Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, I was going to mention this in the discussion of Action 6, and I will just go ahead and throw it out now, but my suggestion was going to be that Actions 5 through 8 really parse out fine details that could easily be addressed in a single action, it seems to me, and I know we've taken Action 6 out of the equation, but just keep that in mind when you're looking at Actions 7 and 8. Do they need to be their own actions, and why are we parsing out the details so finely? Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Got it. Thank you, Shep. Anything else on Action 5 here? I don't see any more hands, and I'm going to turn it back to you, John.

MR. HADLEY: Thank you, and so maybe that's something that could be a direction to staff, to reexamine how this action is structured, or series of actions are structured, because I think we split it apart, and it was originally sort of lumped together, and it was split apart for discussion purposes, but maybe, since we've held several discussions since then, we could combine certain aspects of the education-related actions, and that could be task for the IPT.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Yes, I saw heads nodding yes while you were talking, John, and just making sure that folks are okay with that, so this gets to what Shep was talking about, and so this

would be just making the components either sub-actions or pieces of this action, and are we okay? I see thumbs-up and heads nodding yes, and so I guess, that would be direction to the IPT, John.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you, and I didn't know if there was any additional information at this point. You know, those discussion questions at the end, I should point those out, again, but just any way that the council, or the committee, envisions this moving forward will be helpful, or I will note that you do have your Outreach and Education AP that is meeting, and they will be reviewing this document, and so, if you have any questions for them in relation to this, that would be something that we can move forward and ask that AP as well, because certainly that's their area of expertise in general.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like the idea of asking the Outreach and Education AP. I can tell you that FWC has had a lot of experience in this front. We have a shore-based shark permit, and now we have an education -- The shore-based shark permit has an education component, and you have to take the education component first, and then, similarly, we have a permit now for the Skyway Fishing Pier that has an education component at the outset, and so we are very experienced in these education pieces and how that relates to obtaining the permit, and then annual renewals as well, and so -- But we have a rep on the Outreach and Education AP, and she could certainly provide that input, but I like the idea of putting it back to that AP, so they can provide some suggestions, but anything else that the committee wants to add or ask the AP, in addition to what we've already discussed? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I suspect that it's probably an off-the-shelf that we could adopt, and not have to necessarily create a whole new education video or something like that, and I think, you know, maybe we could use the AP to sort of inventory what's out there, and, if there is an off-the-shelf product that could expedite this, whenever, assuming we get to the point of implementing this, it would be useful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes, and I agree totally with Spud. That would be something to pose to them, but I have no problem with shamelessly stealing from, or copying, FWC's efforts, because you're right that you guys have some really good stuff out there, and that's what I was actually thinking about, was, you know, some of this is already done, and so however they kind of pull that together, but, you know, well done.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks. The hard part is meshing it with the licensing system, and it definitely takes some work. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: That's what I was going to say, is we're using the term "we", right, and it sounds like we're using we referring to the South Atlantic Council, but, if NMFS is issuing the permits, right, we're going to have to have an education program that's somehow tied into that licensing system, and then the complexity also would be, if a state like Florida opts out, are they required to then implement the same, or a consistent, type of education program to meet that standard.

One other comment I wanted to make on Action 7, and, you know, we talked about combining Actions 7 and 8 potentially with Action 5, and getting IPT advice, and we have, under Alternative

2, the education component would be implemented immediately, and I would recommend, if we're going to -- To rephrase that would be implemented upon the effective date of the final rule, or something like that, so that it's specific to implementation of the rulemaking.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. John is taking some notes on that, and I guess I would add that I like the idea of this being maybe a subalternative or something that NOAA would figure out. If there is a mandatory education requirement, and a state can opt-out, I would want the state to also have an education requirement, whatever it is, and maybe there's a way that NOAA can review that and make sure that it's part of this process, and so I envision that, yes, that, if a state opts out, and we say that this has to have an education requirement, that the state would have an education requirement. All right. Other thoughts on this?

MR. HADLEY: All right, and we are going to jump down to 7 and 8, and run through those pretty quickly, and I will run through them together, because they are certainly linked, and they may end up being kind of packaged into one or two actions, and so, as it's currently written, there is Action 7, and that would specify the timing of implementation, and so the action would specify when the education component would become effective for the permitted entity, and so private recreational anglers or vessels fishing for or targeting snapper grouper species.

Alternative 2 would implement essentially the education component, or the education requirement, at this point, would be implemented immediately when the snapper grouper -- When the private recreational snapper grouper permit is established, and so they would kind of go into place in alignment. Alternative 3 would specify a delayed implementation for the education requirement.

If the council does want to continue considering this, some sort of delayed implementation would help to have an idea of the length of the delay, and so how many months or years you envision having a delayed implementation of the education requirement in general, and so that's sort of the feedback from -- Particularly from the IPT, and there's the discussion question there of does the council want to continue the consideration of delayed implementation.

If yes, then we will either keep this action in there, or potentially roll those decisions into that sort of larger education requirement action. If not, if the council does not want to continue considering a delayed implementation, this action could be removed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So, Andy, were you suggesting that we didn't need this particular action, or you were actually suggesting the opposite, that it's important to figure out if the implementation of the rule includes, at the same time, the education component, and can you go back to that, what you were saying?

MR. STRELCHECK: I was just suggesting some wordsmithing, and, you know, as we suggested, combining this under Action 5, but the wording of, you know, implement, but immediately, wherever that is, is awkward, to me, right, and so immediately can be interpreted many ways, and we would consider that upon implementation of the rulemaking, right, or effective date of the rulemaking.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Got it, and John is taking some notes over here about that. Anything else on this particular action, which will now be kind of a sub-action under Action 5? Anything else here?

MR. HADLEY: All right, and so, moving along to Action 8, and so this action would specify the timing, and so essentially how long the education requirement, or the education certificate, whatever it ends up being, would remain valid, and so there's a series of alternatives here. Alternative 2 would clarify that the education component would need to be completed each calendar year, and so within that year, and, at the end of the year, essentially it would expire.

Alternative 3 would specify that the education component would need to be completed upon each issuance of the private recreational snapper grouper permit, and so the idea there is it's sort of a predecessor, and so, if you have the education requirement, then that would be one of the items that would need to be completed ahead of receiving -- Of being able to receive a permit.

Alternative 4 clarifies upon every other year, and so, every other year, there would be an education requirement, and Alternative 5 would essentially be upon the initial issuance of a federal private snapper grouper recreational permit, and so the angler, or vessel owner, would need to receive the education requirement, and it would remain valid indefinitely.

We're looking for a little bit of additional feedback here from the committee, and I will note that there was one IPT comment of sort of who was intended to take on and track the education component, and it would be helpful if this was specified by the council, and then there is a few discussion questions in there, and, you know, I think we covered some of those, related to how the council envisions developing materials in relation to that, and the format, and, presumably, NMFS would be responsible for implementing and tracking the education component, and is that how the council envisions it, as well as who would need to obtain proof of completing the education component, in relation to permit holders?

Are there any others that would be envisioned needing to complete this education requirement, and so looking at, you know, examples, which is vessel operators, vessel owners, at least somebody on the vessel has completed the education requirement, and are there other iterations of that that the committee envisions?

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, John. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you, Madam Chair. My question would be if there's any discussion about having an education requirement tied to an update that would require additional education. When you go to renew the permit, could it say, hey, you need to, you know, update your education certificate, because we've made changes or something, but just doing the same thing every year, if there's no update, seems to be somewhat burdensome.

MS. MCCAWLEY: FWC definitely has something like that on the shore-based shark permit, but I am looking over there to the NOAA folks, and is that something that you guys could implement, if you all were implementing the permit?

MR. STRELCHECK: So repeat your last part of the question.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do you want me to repeat the question, or do you want to repeat it?



MR. SPOTTSWOOD: The question was is it possible to have the education requirement, instead of every year or every other year, tied to an update in the rule that would require somebody to learn something that they didn't learn the year before, or to know something they didn't know the year before, like changing the aggregate limit for grouper, for example?

MR. STRELCHECK: So, yes, I mean, I think anything is possible. It would require, I think, greater onus on the agency, in terms of IT updates and changes to determine whether or not someone has completed their training, whether they could skip it if, you know, there's nothing new, or there's new information, and they're required to take it again based on that new information, and so it just increases the complexity of the implementation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I will add to that that I think that may be a good thing, in the world of fisheries rules, down south especially, where we've got several different areas to understand rules from, and so I understand that it may be some additional burden, but I think it would really help with education and, ultimately, enforcement and compliance with rules, all the way downstream.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. A suggestion along those lines, and so, if you make that -- Let's say, just hypothetically speaking, it's a one-time education requirement per angler or whatever, and you come in and do it, and each angler does it. If you have some rulemaking in the future that was affecting that, right, then you could, at the time of that subsequent rulemaking, essentially nullify, or, everybody, you've got to re-up your education requirement, and we've made changes to it, and so the program is different now, and everybody needs to go back through, or some subset, and you could always do that in the future, and that's the only point, really. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess the question is, in the document here, do we need to make some modifications, or specifications, but it looks like those types of alternatives cover all of those things. Mel.

MR. BELL: I don't know that we need to get any more specific with this. I mean, obviously, the simplest program, or process, would be I want a permit, and, okay, do you have your educational requirement, and, boom, here's your permit, and so boom-boom each time, but the educational component could have a shelf life, you know, and so it's valid for whatever.

If there's no changes or anything, it could be valid for two years or three years or whatever, but, every time you renew that permit, you would have to check to see if you had completed a valid, you know, training requirement, but so I don't know, and I think we're covered, in terms of them being able to work something like that out in here, and we don't need to be that specific at this point, but so the training itself sort of has a shelf-life, or a valid period, and then whatever the requirement periodicity ends up being, and just, every time you get that permit, you check to see if you have the valid corresponding training.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Andy and then Robert.

MR. STRELCHECK: Given the removal of Action 3, it seems like Alternative 2 here is no longer relevant, and we could eliminate that, because we're not being specific in terms of when, you know, permits would be issued, and then it could either be tied to the issuance or some of the other options below it. The other suggestion would be maybe changing Alternative 4, and, rather than every other year, you know, based on updates to new training modules, or something along those lines, and we could leave it up to the IPT to change the wording.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Let me try to procedurally parse that out, and so, one, some direction to the IPT to change up how Alternative 4 is worded. Instead of every other year, every time the training module changes, or something to that effect, and then was that a motion to remove Alternative 2 to the Considered but Rejected?

MR. STRELCHECK: **Yes, and I will make the motion to remove Alternative 2 in Action 8 to Considered but Rejected.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Motion by Andy, and seconded by Kerry, and it's under discussion. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I was going to make a motion to remove Alternative 2, or ask if that could be done, and then, from the state perspective, we have hunter safety course requirements with buying a permit, a hunting permit, in Florida, and so that program, that check, kind of exists, at least for us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and we also have it on the saltwater side, like I said, for the share-based shark fishing permit, and now the Skyway Pier fishing education course and other things, and so we definitely have ways to tie this to some type of saltwater permit. All right. Any additional discussion here on removing Alternative 2 underneath Action 8 to Considered but Rejected? Any additional questions or discussion? All right. **Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: All right. Well, that's it. That's the last one, and so thank you. I think that we made some great improvements here, and we definitely streamlined the amendment, and, speaking from the IPT perspective, it's going to help a lot, on the document-writing side, and so I appreciate all of the input and the time dedicated to it. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you so much, John, and I am going to turn it back to our chair to talk to us about lunch.

DR. BELCHER: Just because we're at a good breaking point, and it is 11:30, I'm going to opt for us to go to lunch thirty minutes early, and so we'll still do an hour-and-a-half, but we'll just kind of end up being back at 1:00, and then we'll continue on with Snapper Grouper.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Next up in our agenda is scamp and yellowmouth grouper, and the first topic under that discussion is to get the SSC recommendations from Dr. Buckel.

DR. BUCKEL: Thank you, Chair. Just a reminder that the catch tables was provided to you at the June 2023 meeting. However, that table did not have the OFL levels, and so we requested that from the analysts, and then we received those during our July webinar for review, and so our charge, at that July webinar, was to review additional requested rebuilding projections and timelines, review a presentation that regarded non-stationarity, OFL, and rebuilding schedules that the analysts provided us, and then make OFL recommendations to complete the catch table.

That presentation we received on non-stationarity was to really have the SSC think about what we want to use for the OFL projections, if we wanted to maybe go to a different approach for that, in terms of the short-term recruitment and long-term recruitment, and so there was quite a bit of discussion on that, but we fell back to what we had discussed in previous meetings, and that was consistent with the catch level projections workgroup report that the SSC members put together, and that is that the OFL should be based on long-term recruitment, and the ABC should be based on short-term recent recruitment. The SSC supports the recommendations of this report for setting OFL for scamp and yellowmouth.

Additionally, for the  $T_{min}$  and  $T_{max}$ , as proposed in that report, those would also be based on a long-term recruitment scenario, and so this is consistent with the SSC's prior conclusions of no regime shift, right, that we haven't seen enough evidence of a regime shift, and that was based on the Klaer et al. 2015 paper that we used to assess if a regime shift had occurred, and so we concluded no regime shift, but just to let everyone know, to remind folks, we do have a regime shift workgroup that the SSC is putting together, and we'll start meeting over this next year to look into that further.

Again, just capturing some of the discussion that the SSC had about having an OFL that's based on a different recruitment stream than the ABC, and it was pointed out that, when we do these different recruitment levels for OFL and ABC, it actually creates an additional buffer between these two benchmarks than from the  $P^*$  approach alone, which is important in the situation that we are with scamp and yellowmouth. Again, this approach for setting OFL and ABC values was discussed as part of the workgroup review, and it was accepted by the SSC at a previous meeting.

The other point that we wanted to make to the council is that, because of the uncertainty in recruitment in scamp and yellowmouth, and its influence on the rebuilding schedule, the SSC requests an updated operational stock assessment by 2029, and that's at the termination of the ABC recommendations, and I believe that's the last slide, or the last slide is the catch level recommendations for scamp and yellowmouth that has not only the ABC recommendations that you already saw at the June meeting, but also the OFL recommendations that are now filled out, and you can see that, as you build up the recruitment in that OFL recommendation, with the higher long-term average recruits, you see how the -- For example, in the year 2029, it's a much higher -- That OFL is much different than the ABC in 2029, and that's that difference in the recruitment stream that you're seeing, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

MR. GRINER: So the buffer -- What is exactly the buffer, due to the different recruitment levels in the OFL and the ABC?

DR. BUCKEL: So, right now, there's two built in. There's the  $P^*$ , right, and then the additional buffers. The OFL is using the long-term average recruitment, which is a higher recruitment than the recent several years of recruitment, and that recent recruitment was used for the ABC, and so

recruitment right now is low in scamp, and we're assuming, for setting the ABC -- We're not expecting the recruitment to jump in the next year, and so, for these ABCs in the next three to five years, using that lower recent recruitment, but I don't have the exact numbers, Tim, of what those --

MR. GRINER: But that's what is driving this big gap between say in 2029, between the ABC and the OFL, and is that what you're saying?

DR. BUCKEL: That is correct, yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: What would it look like if you based the OFL on the less recruitment, because, you know, a lot of this is perception, and, you know, when I look at those OFL numbers, versus the ABC, I about had a stroke, you know, and so, for a regular, you know, person, that doesn't know that much about stock assessments and everything, they would look at this and go, well, those people are crazy, and so what -- Do you know what the projections would look like for OFL? Have you run the models using the low recruitment that we're experiencing now, and would it have been more in line with the ABC, or would it still be wonky with them like this?

DR. BUCKEL: I don't recall, Laurilee, if the analysts did an OFL with the short-term recruitment, and I believe they did, and those numbers are closer to the ABC, right, because then the only difference between the OFL and the ABC is based on that P\* buffer, and so those OFL and ABC numbers would be closer together.

MS. THOMPSON: So wouldn't it make more -- Wouldn't the perception look better if you used the OFL based on the low recruitment, because we really don't know whether the recruitment is going to increase or not, and it's just -- You know, if I was a fisherman, and I looked at this, and I saw that the ABC was 84,000, but the overfishing limit was 270,000, I would be compelled to go out and go catch more fish, as many fish as I could, based on that overfishing limit.

DR. BUCKEL: It's a good point, and that's where there was a lot of SSC discussion about, you know, there were some members that discussed how the OFL -- How we shouldn't assume that we're going to go back to that long-term average recruitment, but others were talking about this is a -- That OFL, you can think of it as what the fishery is capable of in this longer-term perspective and that the longer-term -- If there is no regime shift, that, over the long-term, we'll have long-term average recruitment, and so the OFL is more based on that long-term perspective.

MS. THOMPSON: So why -- Did you start with -- Why wouldn't you run the ABC recommendations then based on the improving recruitment also? So you've run your OFLs based on one thing, and your ABCs based on another, and it just doesn't look like it make sense.

DR. BUCKEL: So that OFL, being a long-term perspective, and like what is the stock capable of over the long-term, and it's that long-term average recruitment, but the ABC is going to be setting the catch levels in the near future, and we were not comfortable making the assumption that we're going to jump up to that long-term average recruitment in the next three to five years, and that's why we went with the short-term recent recruitment average for the ABC, because that's going to be more likely the recruitment that we're going to see, is these lower recruitments.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. We've got a lot of folks in the queue, and I see you, Clay. We've got Judd and then Tim and then Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you. I think the SSC's logic, with the ABC, is sound, the way they've computed it based on recent levels of recruitment, because that's a short-term concept, the ABC. OFL, one could also make the argument to use the recent levels of recruitment, but I would point out that the main difference between the OFL and the ABC is actually the buffering for scientific uncertainty. If you included recent levels of recruitment in the OFL computation, and I don't have the exact numbers, but it's not going to make a lot of difference, and it might be a couple of thousand pounds, but the big difference, really, is the fact that they buffer for scientific uncertainty.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Judd and then Tim.

DR. CURTIS: Laurilee, just to kind of add on to what Jeff and Clay said, the projections for the OFL, with the long-term recruitment, were run by the Science Center, and the result for all those did not -- It never rebuilt to your rebuilding threshold, and so it was considered unviable, in a sense. A lot of the work for recommending a different recruitment regime, as far as the long-term average versus the short-term more recent recruitment, comes from that catch levels projections workgroup, and so a lot of scientific information shows that, really, after five years, projections kind of fall by the wayside, and there's not a whole lot of confidence in that predictive capability, and so the best information is to use the more recent recruitment regime in order to project in the short-term. Hence, why you see, for that ABC projection in the short-term, they're using that low-term recruitment, versus the OFL and the rebuilding targets, and you have the long-term recruitment over the entire stock assessment timeframe, if that makes sense.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim and then Andy.

MR. GRINER: Let Andy go ahead and go.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, Laurilee, you're making some great points, and we've actually had a lot of discussions around what you were commenting on, and this really gets to this challenge of is there a regime shift, or a change in productivity, and should we be adjusting the status determination criteria and reference points based on that or not, and there are lots of questions that we don't really have answers to, in terms of whether recruitment is going to bounce back or not, but, ultimately, if we did make a decision, right, that productivity in the long-term, you know out into the future, is not going to return, like we've seen it in the past, you would be lowering your overfishing limits, but also lowering your spawning stock biomass that you're rebuilding to, right, and your target essentially would be changing.

I think what the SSC has done is appropriate, right, and they've set catch levels based on what we're seeing in terms of recent average recruitment, right, in the short-term. If the stock responds, right, it will actually be a boost to our rebuilding plan, and, ultimately, we'll see those recruitments start coming back up. If it doesn't, then I think we're going to be back here, four or five years from now, talking about adjustments to the rebuilding plan and what we need to do to improve the health of the stock.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Tim and then Trish. Tim, are you ready?

MR. GRINER: Yes, and, you know, I understand, and I'm onboard with these buffers, but, you know, the thing that really worries me, when I see these big buffers like this, is we're going to catch what we catch, regardless of what's on this sheet right here, and so, if you lower this ABC too low, then you're going to shut the fishery down. You're going to shut it down at a point where it really doesn't matter, because now all you're going to do is introduce more discards, because the fishery is not going to stop. You're not going to stop catching scamp grouper, as long as the entire grouper complex is open.

Right now, I think the commercial sector is somewhere around -- They've probably already hit 40,000 pounds, and so I'm not saying that we're in danger right now, but, if this stock starts recruiting better, you know, before 2029, we could blow that right out of the water, and then, all of a sudden, we've shut this fishery down, and now, for the rest of the year, we're going to introduce a bunch more discards, and so that won't help this fishery recover either, and so I think it is a delicate balance here, and I just think, possibly, that's a pretty big gap between OFL and -- I mean, if we're hanging our hat and saying, long-term, by 2029, we believe that we'll be back to normal, and that total removals for the overfishing limit is 270,000 pounds, then we're turning around and saying, well, we don't really believe that at all.

You know, I think we're kind of saying one thing and then turning around and saying, well, we don't really believe that either, and so I don't know. You know, I don't know where to go from here, but I know that, if we get this ABC wrong, this fishery will shut down, if we believe that the OFL is going to really come back to the long-term average, and so I don't know, and this is a pretty big buffer right there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I've got more people in the queue, and so just a reminder that these are the SSC's decisions, and the council's decisions rest with things like ACL and ACT, and so setting the OFL and setting the ABC is set by the SSC, and so I just want to put that out there, and that's why Jeff is here, and he's explaining kind of why they came to these conclusions and why they are presenting these numbers, and so I just want to be clear about what's in the realm of what we can control, versus what is the SSC's decision.

DR. BUCKEL: Yes, and thank you for that, and I very well understand that, but I just think -- You know, I just think that they need to understand that there are ramifications to this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I have in the queue Trish and then Andy.

MS. MURPHEY: This really isn't about the ABCs and OFLs, though I think I'm good with this, and it seems like scamp is -- There is issues with scamp that we really don't know enough about, and so where I was going -- You guys are recommending the operational stock assessment, and, with the issues and uncertainties around recruitment and everything, I was wondering, and should we step that up to a benchmark, so maybe we've got some more flexibility in -- The next time it goes around to be run, we've got some flexibility to play with different recruitment regimes, so we don't get stuck in that same spot like with Spanish, with the operational, and so that was just my thought at trying to get at this in the long-term.

It sounds like it's not a regime shift, but like it could have been, and, you know, it's like this close to maybe being a regime shift, and so, to me, at least going to a benchmark, to have the flexibility

to try different datasets and try different recruit numbers, and that was just something that I wanted to suggest, and I have no idea how that fits in the schedule, but it just would make sense to me, to bump that up from an operational to a benchmark.

DR. BUCKEL: I think, if they can fit it in -- You know, anytime you can spend more time on it, it's great. We didn't spend a lot of time discussing, and I don't know if we spent any time, but it was just a thought that we wanted to make sure that the stock assessment -- It came up that we should get this stock assessment sooner than later, and we put operational, but it wasn't -- The SSC didn't have a formal discussion about operational versus benchmark, but the points you made were good, and, if it can fit, then it's always better to do the benchmark, but that can extend the timeline out, and so that's one concern there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I've got Andy and then Clay and then back to Laurilee.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to go back to Tim's comments, and, you know, unlike, I think, a lot of buffers that we see with projections, right, the difference here is OFL is being calculated under a higher recruitment scenario, and ABC under a low-recruitment scenario, and so there is a buffer on paper, right, and the reality is that none of us really know, and we don't have a crystal ball as to what that recruitment is going to look like going forward, and, more likely than not, you know, recruitment is going to be in line with what we're currently seeing and not bouncing back up rapidly based on historically what we've seen.

Keep in mind this fishery is not undergoing overfishing, right, but it has declined, and it's been determined to be overfished, simply because recruitment has fallen off over the last ten to fifteen years, and so I think the key here is, if the SSC had come in and set the ABC closer to that OFL level, right, we run the risk of potentially, you know, the stock further declining, because we're setting catch levels too high, when we're not realizing the recruitments that at least have been projected.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay.

DR. PORCH: I just wanted to go back to the benchmark question and just remind the council that you don't need a benchmark to evaluate things like, you know, changes in recruitment potential, and, I mean, that's already kind of built into, and what the SSC has been considering, and, to the point that benchmark is always better, I mean, that's what got us into the whole conundrum of wanting to make things better, but then you end up dragging out the timelines, and you sacrifice throughput, and so, as long as you're asking for benchmarks, you can't complain about the throughput, because, in benchmarks, we're, you know, turning over lots and lots of stones and revisiting everything, and you don't want to trigger a benchmark unless there is several really fundamental things that need to be addressed, and the recruitment issue is something that they will look at anyway, even in an operational.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: So I go back to my comment about it's perception, and it's how we are perceived, and, unfortunately, we're perceived -- You know, a lot of people don't think we know what we're doing, and so maybe it would be more palatable if there were two columns for the OFL, one that's based on current recruitments and one that's based on if the recruitment returns

back to normal, and it would be easier to explain to people, because this is just so out there that it's hard to swallow.

DR. BUCKEL: Thanks for the feedback on that. You know, we did struggle with what to use for the OFL, and I think this is -- I can take this back to the SSC, in terms of just the perception, when you're looking at the table, and so I appreciate folks' comments.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Are there more questions for Jeff? All right. I don't see any more hands, and I guess we're going to dive into the document with Allie. Thank you, Jeff.

MS. IBERLE: All right, and so I have, to kick us off, the three FES considerations that we talked about in Full Council. Before we do that, I kind of wanted to just go over a really high-level view of what this amendment is doing, so you can think about where these things apply, and so we went over this a little bit in June, but this amendment will be establishing your new complex for scamp and yellowmouth grouper, and so I won't get into too much detail, but the assessment that you were provided assessed these two species together, and so we're going to have to be reorganizing the shallow-water grouper, the other shallow-water grouper, complex and creating this new complex, and, in doing that, you'll be setting an ACL and setting sector allocations for scamp and yellowmouth.

The other kind of big consideration you have to think about is the OSASGWs, as we've been lovingly calling them, and so those are the remaining species of shallow-water grouper that are contained under that single ACL that were going to be less when you remove yellowmouth, and so we have to take action with that complex, because we either need to see if these species are eligible to be designated as ecosystem component species or update the ACL post-yellowmouth removal, and so that's something to think about.

The other deadline issue we have right now is that, according to the assessment, as we've kind of discussed a little bit, the stock status is overfished for scamp and yellowmouth, but it's not experiencing overfishing, and so you will have a deadline for that one, and so, with that, I think I will turn it over to have you guys discuss these points a little bit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Allie. I had a question. I went back to the table that Chip sent us that was from SEDAR about the percentage of recreational, and, also, I didn't see the assessment that Jeff was just talking about on the schedule. Is 2029 the next assessment for this grouping? Is that right, Allie?

MS. IBERLE: I am going to look to -- No? It's not on there? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. White grunt won't die. Anyway, and so it's just the gift that keeps on giving. All right. So then, to try to help run us through some of these questions, then what is the amendment's dependency on the FES data, because I don't see a breakdown, when we were talking about this in SEDAR, and, Allie, is that something that you could help us answer?

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and so, again, the considerations are you've got allocations for the scamp and yellowmouth complex that you'll be putting in place, and then the other thing you'll need to think about is those OSASGWs, and so, if you're updating the OSASHW ACL, right now, what we -- The only advice from the SSC that we have is third-highest in ORCS, and the ORCS may be an



issue, because that's landings-based, and the PSEs for these species are pretty high, and so just some consideration when you're going to update that ACL, and that's where that will come into play.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so then, to kind of jump around among all three of these questions, then, because it's only overfished and not undergoing overfishing, it doesn't have a federal deadline, and is that right? Can you explain that? Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Well, you will get a -- It's overfished, and you will get a notification letter, and I think the issue waiting for that has just been a final determination about what the appropriate reference points were, or that discrepancy between using one recruitment scenario for ABC setting and OFL, and so it's figuring all that out, but I presume that something will be forthcoming. One of the complicating factors with this is that your assessment is technically not for anything that's in your FMP, and it's for a complex, and you have two individual species identified in your FMP, and so how that translates for the report to Congress is there's some bureaucratic hurdles, maybe.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I guess it's good to know that you guys have some challenges, too. Thoughts? I am looking around the table, to others, to help answer and discuss these three questions.

DR. BELCHER: So a question for Allie. What are the ratios? What are the current allocations?

MS. IBERLE: So for who, I guess is a better question, because, when you're looking at it now, you're looking at the OSASWGs with yellowmouth and then scamp by itself.

DR. BELCHER: I think if you could talk to both. I mean, currently, what they are, and I think it's just an idea of, again, where are we going with this to move forward, and are they FES, and, even if it's an aggregate, is it an FES highly-dependent or not, and, yes, we're breaking it out, but the --

MR. GRINER: I think, for scamp, it's like 65/35, 65 commercial and 35 recreational.

MS. IBERLE: Using the website, the amazing webpage that was put together to view this on the fly for you guys, scamp is currently -- Sorry, and I should have looked at this beforehand, and so commercial is first, and then recreational, and so 65.34 commercial and 34.66 recreational, and then the rest of the friends of scamp are kind of split out, but they're all going to be the same, and so if you're looking at -- Let me take a look here. No, they're all together. Sorry. Here you have the hinds, yellowmouth as it currently sits, yellowfin, coney, and graysby.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I've got hands in the queue, but go ahead, Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. Do you have the breakdown of for-hire versus private rec in the recreational sector, because, I mean, what we need -- In terms of this question, you're looking just at private rec and not all recreational.

MS. IBERLE: That I don't have, and I know, when you're looking at the OSASWG species, and we're going to go over this when we get to the document, is that, when you start splitting things

out, there's a lot of confidentiality issues there too, and so I'm sorry that I don't have a better answer for you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and I'm going to go back to my list. I have Tim and then Kerry. Tim, did you have a comment here?

MR. GRINER: (Mr. Griner's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: If I read that right, then yellowmouth is 98.9 recreational, and is that how to read this table? Okay, but we don't know what the breakdown is of private rec of that number. I was sent that from staff, and I have that it's fifty-three-point -- Of the OSASWGs, it's 53.5 commercial and 46.7 recreational.

MS. IBERLE: It's the complex, yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes. Okay. I think that people are debating over here about what they want to say here, but so, Kerry, do you want to jump in front of Tim?

MS. MARHEFKA: I may regret it, but what I was wondering, in the assessment, or I guess let's just say for scamp in general, how much of an issue currently are recreational dead discards, and how much of an issue -- We can see, if it's an issue now, it will only get exacerbated if recruitment does get better, and we keep those low ABC values, and so, in my mind, that sort of points to making me more nervous about the FES issue.

Then the other thing that I just wanted to get clarification on, in regard to just allocation, is we have, of course, our reclarified, streamlined in one place allocation review policy, and it is my understanding that this would trigger a review, but it doesn't necessarily mean -- As long as we have good rationale, it doesn't mean that we have to change any allocation, and we can even say we'll do it later, and I just want to make sure that I understand that clearly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Except what Shep was pointing out is we're changing the structure, and that this isn't scamp, and it's the combination of scamp and -- So that's where it gets messy.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Well, I would say, I mean, I think the allocation question is the same, you know, triggering review. I mean, it's a new assessment, and it may be a new complex, but, you know, I think, in this one, you almost have to address allocation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. There are the questions again. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I have heard a lot of numbers thrown around, but what's the answer to the question? Is it -- Did someone throw a number out that is the percentage of the recreational sector catch that's attributed to private recreational, or we don't know that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We do not know that.

MR. WOODWARD: We do not know that. Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: But, yes, on the not scamp, and the other species, it had a 98.9 percent recreational, but we don't know what component of that is private rec.

MR. WOODWARD: We don't know the divide between for-hire on those either, and so, in other words, it's kind of difficult to answer this question. Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Hands. Tim and then Andy.

MR. GRINER: A couple of things. First of all, do we know what portion of the other shallow-water grouper ACL yellowmouth is of that?

MS. IBERLE: (Ms. Iberle's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MR. GRINER: Okay, and maybe this is a question for Jeff, and so, when you decided to put yellowmouth into the stock assessment, what data -- Did that data come from the same data that would have been used to analyze it in the shallow-water grouper complex, or was there just no data involved in it, and you just really used the scamp data?

MS. IBERLE: Correct me if I'm misstating here, and so it's the data that were used for yellowmouth in SEDAR 68 and where were those data coming from, and yellowmouth has not previously been assessed, too.

DR. CURTIS: The scamp and yellowmouth were all assessed together for the SEDAR 68, right, and I think, because of identification issues and all that, they were all lumped together, and so I don't believe there were separate landings streams for them, but Chip can correct me if I'm wrong on that.

DR. COLLIER: So, I mean, there's definitely different landings streams for the two different species. However, there was concern whether or not the two different species were accurately identified to either scamp or yellowmouth. Even looking at them on the dock, some people have trouble distinguishing between the two species. When I worked at a fish house, we didn't care if it was a yellowmouth or it was a scamp, and it was the same price. They went in the same box, labeled as scamp, and that's why they put it all together as a single species. If you look into some of the recreational data, you know, it hasn't been observed in the recent past ten years, and yellowmouth have not been observed, and so there's some thought that some of those could have been scamp.

While I'm up here, the fishery overview for scamp does have the number of releases in it, and it also has what percent by sector, and so, if you guys have any questions related to those, I would encourage you to look at that. The big difference is I do provide number of releases, and I don't have dead discards, which went into the assessment, and so I looked at the discard mortality for the recreational sector, and that was 26 percent that was used in the stock assessment. For the commercial side, it was a little bit higher, but I do not believe that I have the dead discards, or the number of discards, for the commercial fleet in there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so I'm going to go back to the hands. Tim and then Andy.

MR. GRINER: That's kind of the way I figured it was, and so, in my mind then, if there was no separate landings streams, and this yellowmouth is making us some portion, and, what was it, 4 percent of the other shallow-water grouper ACL, then, if we look at that other shallow-water grouper ACL, and we're going to have to redo that, then you're presumably thinking about removing the yellowmouth from that, which there goes the 4 percent of the ACL, and so, in my mind, that 4 percent of that ACL needs to go jump over here to the scamp and now yellowmouth complex, because you didn't account for their landings stream in the assessment, but yet there is a landings stream, and there is 4 percent of an ACL out there, and so that 4 percent, or whatever that number is, needs to come over to this new ABC for this new complex.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That sounds like a Jeff question, and maybe -- He's thumbing through some things back here, and let's go to Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Don't hold me to this, but I just pulled the MRIP data query, and it looks like a majority of the landings, for recreational, come from the private sector rather than the for-hire sector. The percentage bounces around, and it would vary from year to year, but it's a little bit more private landings than for-hire landings, and so I'm not sure what we're trying to get out of this.

I mean, I think the end is, you know, are we proceeding or not, and I think the bottom line, for me, is, yes, there's a dependency, and, yes, we're going to have to deal with this down the road, with whatever the results of the FES pilot are, but you're mandated to rebuild the stock and implement a rebuilding plan, and so, for that reason, I think we need to proceed and move forward with this action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we've had a recommendation there, and I guess I would also ask, since no letter has been received yet, then timeline hasn't started.

MR. STRELCHECK: That's correct, and we typically don't send a letter until the SSC has provided their advice and guidance, and so the letter will be forthcoming.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Andy has made a suggestion here that some of these answers might not matter, because there's a deadline that's forthcoming, and so he has made a suggestion that we should proceed with this amendment as-is, and so other thoughts from the committee, based on that confusing discussion that we had about the numbers and the percentages? Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I think we're kind of stuck with this, because we're out of the box as it starts, to begin with, because we've gone from a one species to an aggregate species, and it has another impact on another group that ties into this, and you almost have to -- I think we almost have to get into the details of it first, before we can make a decision at this point, because we are just too far off the normal mark for it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I guess my concern comes in, and I think Tim mentioned this earlier, when we get into allocation and how do we figure out -- We have to decide a number, because it's a new complex, and how do we figure out what to do there, but let me look around to the

committee, and I don't want to stop discussion if people have points to add, and I see Chip coming to the table.

DR. COLLIER: There were a lot of questions that we had that I think might have been helpful for the fishery overview, and so it should be coming to you guys in the chat, if you want to look at the fishery overview. If you all look at it at once, it might crash it, but we'll see. Hopefully it doesn't. We're going to be figuring out a better way to do it so that it won't be crashed in the future. If you're online, on the webinar, there's a chat function, and it's coming through that, and this is not a private chat.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for clarifying that. Okay. While Allie is pulling up some graphs here, it sounds like, in thinking about those three questions, and we've already had a recommendation to continue to move forward, and then it sounds like the whole FES is going to come up when we get into what is the allocation going to be, but we're going to have to make a decision, because of the fact that this is a new grouping. Any other thoughts? I don't want to stop discussion, if people have other things to say on this topic. Any other thoughts, other than proceed with this amendment? Go ahead, Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I think, again, it's back to in insolation, and we can already see that scamp looks very different with the rec-commercial ratio, compared to yellowmouth, and so I think, when you aggregate them, that's going to have a very different look, and so that may influence it as well, to have that conversation a little further, and so I think we almost have to look at it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so it sounds like there's been a couple of suggestions to proceed here, and then we would dive further into this discussion when we get into this allocation. All right. I don't see any other hands, and I'm going to pass it back to you, Allie.

MS. IBERLE: All right. I'm not going to spend too much time on the background, since I feel like we've already discussed a lot of it. Just the main thing to remember is that SEDAR 68, that most recent assessment, indicated that the stock is overfished, but not experiencing overfishing. We do have this draft motion, and, Jessica, I don't know if you wanted to talk on this, regarding stock status, and this kind of, I think, related back more to that regime shift, and so I will kind of hand it back to you for that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm trying to remember what the discussion is, Allie, can you start it for me?

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and so I think this kind of came out of concern about I believe there being just a single paper that indicated that there wasn't a regime shift, if I'm recalling correctly, and just maybe asking the SSC to re-look at that and consider the stock status with more information, but I want to make sure that that's correct with you guys.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so I agree, and I thought that when Jeff was going to the presentation, and so they made a decision about the regime shift based on that one peer-reviewed paper that's out there, and it sounded like Jeff indicated that there's a working group that's going to look at regime shifts, that I assume is going to consider that outside of just that one peer-reviewed paper, but, Jeff, I think you said it was going to take two years to get through that working group, and is that right? Judd.

DR. CURTIS: Jessica, we've got the regime group, the SSC workgroup, formed, and we're getting members together in October, and then the idea was to come up with a report that would be reviewed in April, at the April SSC meeting, and then pass it on to the council for the June council meeting of next year. Then that would include both yellowmouth and then other issues as well too, and it was a broader conversation on the regime shift concept than the species-specific.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thank you, Judd. Clay.

DR. PORCH: I just wanted to let the council know that there's two parts to this, and so just identifying there is a regime shift doesn't tell you what it's shifting to. You wouldn't automatically assume that recent low recruitments are going to continue forever, because there is also -- In many cases, it could be a decline in spawning biomass, and so that's also contributing to it, and there's no clear criteria for that, and so one of the things that we'll be working on with the SSC, and Jeff mentioned that there was a presentation, an initial presentation, is how do we manage in light of that uncertainty with recruitment, and that's something that Andy was alluding to, you know, sort of the dynamic reference point approach.

We'll flesh that out more later, but, you know, just saying there's a regime shift, again, doesn't tell you what it's shifting to, and so what we need to do is come up with a flexible approach that can accommodate the fact that we may not know exactly what the long-term recruitment potential is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Hands are going up. Carolyn and then Kerry.

DR. BELCHER: Jeff, this is a question for you, and it may be a bigger question, and you can just shut me down on it, but, if there had been a regime shift, if you guys had gone through and identified a regime shift, would OFL have been selected differently? Again, if it's bigger than you, then just tell me it's bigger than you, but I'm thinking about relative to where Laurilee was going with this, as far as the older recruitment, newer recruitment, and, if there had been a regime shift, would you have then adjusted OFL to be a function of recent recruitment?

DR. BUCKEL: It's bigger than me, because I often predict what the SSC is going to do, and I'm always wrong, and so I cannot say what they would have --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I just can't remember, and is this one of the ones that we talked about when they did base it off that paper, and there's like a score, and, if I recall, and I don't know why like ten is sticking in my mind, but was this close to that score? Was it on the verge of possibly being a regime shift, or was it far away from being a regime shift?

DR. BUCKEL: I will stay up here. It was close.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so then, in light of that information, the almost regime shift, based on that one paper, and then that there is a workgroup, and it sounds like they will have some information in June, but then, based on what Clay is suggesting, that's really just one step, and you would need to talk about dynamic reference points and other things of that nature, which it sounds

like maybe there's some time for that, since a bunch of stock assessments are getting pushed back, and so I guess what do you think the timing would be?

Maybe you guys would have to go back and talk about it more internally and then tell us at another meeting, but, if they get something in June, then how long would it take, or does a dynamic reference point working group start now, or sooner, before the regime shift group is completed? You know, how would this work? Have you thought about that, Clay?

DR. PORCH: Yes, and we've had extensive discussions about it, both within our house at the Southeast Center, but also with the Regional Office and General Counsel and what would look like, both in terms of, you know, scientifically, how do you implement it, but how do you practically implement it in our current regulatory framework, and so those discussions are happening, and we had that opening salvo with the SSC on what we're going to start working on, and, in fact, we have some simulations already, but basically do some computer simulations to show how it would work and demonstrate that it actually can work. It has started, and I think we could, you know, more formalize that approach and establish some working groups, and, yes, the opening in the schedule would allow us to look at that and other ways to kind of streamline the assessment and management process.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so then I think, Shep, you had your hand up. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I will just add -- I mean, I don't know about timing, but I would like -- Obviously it's going to be kind of a joint effort, at some point, between the South Atlantic and the Gulf, because the issues are going to be similar, and, although the Gulf isn't experiencing maybe as many species with these declines in recruitment, they've still seen some species with declines in recruitment, and how do we treat those, going forward, consistently across the region.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So do you guys have a time in mind, a guesstimate, of when something could come forward, based on you all's discussions at both the Regional Office and at the Science Center to the councils to talk about this a little bit more? Are we thinking maybe by June of next year? Thoughts on that?

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't want to speak to a specific timeline at this point, and, you know, when we talked to John and team, a week or two ago, there was suggestions about pulling this into some of the climate-ready fisheries work under IRA, and we feel it's important that we vet this through the SSCs, both in the Gulf and South Atlantic, and so getting it on the SSC agendas, depending on when they're meeting, would dictate some of the schedule.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then another -- Maybe this is a Shep question, and so, if we move forward with this document, considering that there isn't a regime shift, because maybe we don't have enough information yet, and then we learn more about regime shifts and applying it and dynamic reference points, and we get that say summer-ish of 2024, could we still try to bring that into this amendment and still meet the deadline? Shep, is that allowed, or would you have to stay the course with the initial direction that we've taken here?

MR. GRIMES: That's a tough question to answer, because there's a number of issues. As I understand it, if you change -- Moving forward with this now is accepting that, yes, here's our reference points, and here's our status determination, and here's our rebuilding timeline, and here's

our target. If you come back in, at the eleventh hour, and you're obliterating the goalpost, and you've changed a reference point, which is going to change everything, and I see that as being incredibly unsettling, but it is a bit of a quandary.

Given what you're talking about, you could go through this process, and develop a dynamic reference point, and the conclusion be that, relative to the reference point, the stock is not overfished, and you don't need a rebuilding plan, and I would have questions. I mean, given where you already are now, the SSC's advice and accepting the assessment, right, and, if we were in the normal world, then we would have assessed a stock that was actually in the FMP, as managed, and you would trigger a notification letter that would already go, right, and then that triggers a legal obligation to rebuild. Within two years, you've got to have a plan that's as short as possible, and this is -- I mean, changing the reference point is changing all of that, right, but, again, it's also -- In this context, it is a new stock that's not in your FMP, and so it's --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to add, and Shep had mentioned it the other day, when we were talking about National Standard 2, and so there is a provision, in National Standard 2, that, if new information comes forward during FMP development, right, that that could be considered, and it doesn't necessarily mean that you restart the whole process.

Kind of channeling Monica, if she was up here, because she emphasizes it quite regularly, is it will depend on the record that you build then, and, obviously, the information you have, right, and so Shep doesn't pound it into me just as much as Monica does, but that's the key, and I think the challenge is what's the SSC record in that regard, and how do they reach a decision then, if it's going to change, and what does that look like, and, ultimately, do we have time to address it with regard to the mandates of the rebuilding plan.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Shep.

MR. GRIMES: If I could add on, and I think timing is the driving consideration. As Andy is saying, there are provisions in the National Standard Guidelines that encourage moving forward based on the information, and it's what is available, and I suspect that something like this is going to be time-consuming enough, and burdensome, and also controversial enough, that you don't want to delay action on waiting basically on that change, right, because you could have all that time, and you could go through, and you could have your SSC, who has already not reacted very warmly to ideas of dynamic reference points, pooh-pooh it at the end, and we've devoted all this time and not moved forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I hear all that, and I guess I'm just concerned, and clearly it was very close, even on the one peer-reviewed paper, to being a regime shift, I guess near the cusp of being a regime shift, even with this one document, and the SSC has already started the working group that's looking into this, and I agree that it's not just a problem here for these species, and you've got a number of species in the South Atlantic with recruitment issues, and I feel like we're going to have this exact same conversation with black sea bass, but so just part of me wants to wait.

I do get these deadlines, but it just seems like we're kind of on the brink here, and it could contribute to this discussion, and change the course, and I agree that, once we start down this



record, and then we shift to another record, because we got information on regime shifts, it could seem a little strange, especially to the public, but go ahead, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Keep in mind here that, even if there's a regime shift, the SSC has given us ABC advice based on that low recruitment, and so you're going to be held to that lower level of recruitment. I think the only significant change that could come out of this is if there was not an overfished determination reached, but you're going to still have to prevent overfishing and keep fishing levels at fairly low rates, relative to the recruitment that's in the fishery at that time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's go to John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: There's a lot going on here to unpack. The regime shift issue is tough, and we've talked about this on account of the SSC and the Science Center and everything else, and one of the problems with regime shift, to me, you know, just my -- You know my simplistic way of looking at things, and it's, if you just say that, oh, yes, a regime shift has happened in scamp, you're kind of throwing in the towel on the stock. You're saying this stock is never going to be very productive, and that's it.

One risk there is that then you make management actions accordingly, and the stock never has a chance to recover and show you that it actually did have potential, and, you know, that's really one of the reasons why a regime shift is not taken very lightly, and then the other is the reality of, as Andy sort of said, is even the regime shift is shifting. You've still got a situation of, you know, given the number of fish that are out there, and the abundance of the stock, and the allowable F rates, you've got a pretty significant cut in what, you know, can be landed, and it's a pretty low catch level that's out there.

That's regardless of, you know, regime shift or not, and regime shift comes in to saying where is recruitment going to go, and then that's where the dynamic reference points comes to bear, and so what that would really be changing is things like your SSB MSY, and, you know, what is your stock target, and what is your overfished determination, and I would think, as far as timing, you haven't started the clock yet, and we haven't even gotten -- We haven't gotten the notification that the agency considers the assessment BSIA, and we haven't got the determination of stock status, and so the stock hasn't started, and so maybe, you know, June isn't really so far midstream in the pace of how we normally do things, and, if some information came out for some alternative rebuilding approaches, that could just fit into your rebuilding strategy alternatives that you're looking at, that I would think you would not be at the point of picking preferences by June anyway.

You know, you need some alternatives for rebuilding, always, and so, you know, it may not be the end of the game that you don't have some of that information now, and the SSC may become more comfortable with something like a dynamic reference point, and this becomes a place to do that.

One of the reasons on dynamic reference points that I thought this could fit in with IRA is because I do think it matches being climate resilient and addressing the risks. Where I think we could do some work is not with, you know, the calculations side, which is, you know, those guys are fully capable of doing all of that, but it's more of making sure that you, and your AP and your SSC, really understand what it is, because it's a new thing, and it's kind of a new concept, and the SSC -- Some people probably understand it, and some people are like, you know, I know what those words mean, but I don't know what they mean, put together in this case, and so I thought maybe

we could do some -- You know, some workshops, and just some time with the SSC and the AP, and then working up to the council, where we've got some discussion of dynamic reference points, how it works in different stocks, and how it works -- You know, as Clay said, okay, if regimes are shifting, and you've got dynamic things going on, and which way is it going, and how does it work with a stock with really good recruitment, as well as a stock with really bad recruitment?

You know, here, we're looking at a stock that's giving us way less recruitment than we think, but we've got that other stock that we talk about, and I won't say its name, that is giving us way more recruits than we think, and both of those could be candidates for dynamic reference points, and how would that play out? I think we don't know, and so, you know, we do anticipate getting some IRA funding money, you know, this year, and it could be something that we could support a couple of workshops, or something, to get people together and, you know, make sure people get a clear understanding of what this is about and, you know, what Clay's folks can do, as far as analyzing and exploring that.

Really set a couple of days aside to, you know, let them present the information and show how it works and just take, you know, questions, maybe with an SSC/AP/council subset or something, and, you know, I don't know, but I think it's one of those things that is kind of new, and we would be well served by some time outside of the council to talk about it, and so, you know, that's sort of where I think that's going, and maybe we could make that happen fast enough that that still makes its way into this amendment, because I don't think anyone around the table feels the way we're doing this rebuilding plans, particularly, you know, filling in a table based on recruitment that none of us thinks is very likely over the short-term, and maybe hope happens over the long-term, but don't know, is really serving anybody's best interests, and so we've got to try something different, and maybe we can here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have Kerry and then Tim and then Carolyn.

MS. MARHEFKA: John, thank you. That was actually really helpful for me to sort of organize my brain around thinking about this, and I would never make a management decision, and certainly not in this case, based on what I'm about to say, but one of the things that I think of, as we have these discussions about regime shift, is I think of it as sort of saying what's happening to the species isn't necessarily the fault of the fishermen and the fishing, but it's something else, and that's a look, and that's a PR issue, right, and it helps you -- Again, that's not your -- We have to take care of these species, and I'm not saying that's why we should do it, but I do think that that's another important component of naming what it is, because, other than that, it looks like we're doing bad things, as people fishing, and we're doing bad things as a council.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So I was piggybacking off of what John said, and it does tie back to what Laurilee said, because, if you're assuming a higher level of recruitment, and OFL is set based on that higher level, then -- And our ABC is based on the other, you have a very large buffer, and so it looks like there is this high level we're trying to stay away, but, if the lower recruitment is really what's going to hold in time, overfishing is actually lower at the higher, and so there really should be a smaller buffer at a lower level, and so, even though you might exceed ABC, and be within the OFL, based on previous recruitment, if new recruitment carries forward, you may exceed OFL.

under new recruitment, and so there's just I think where Laurilee was trying to get with that, and it is.

It's a perception issue, but you think about how much brainpower we just put around the table to kind of make that statement, and I think this is, again, why some of this keeps putting us back on our heels, and we need to do something, but we just really don't know how to do it, because it's out of the box for everything that we've done relative to scamp in the past.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and, just to add to all of that, so I think that the assessment pointed out that it's not necessarily, to use Kerry's word, the fault of fishing, that there is something else happening, and they can't really name it, and, just like we're saying, it seems like it needs to be done with a new process here, but we don't have tools at the ready to bring in right now to do a new process for things that appear to be in this new category.

I said before that, you know, the last time that Congress was looking at the Magnuson reauthorization, they had a separate category in there that wasn't overfished, that wasn't overfishing, and it was depleted, so that it wasn't considered the fault of fishing, that there could be other factors involved, but that did not pass, and it's not out there, and it's not a tool at this point, but I really like the idea of us continuing down this path of not just regime shift, but, simultaneously, how would we, or how could we, incorporate dynamic reference points, whether there's a regime shift or not, whether it's down or whether it's up here, based on recruitment, and how could we bring that in, because it just seems like we've been struggling here on a number of stocks, and we don't have a good path forward. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, keep in mind that if, you know, you're under a rebuilding plan, and I'm not talking just in the context of this stock, but for any one of them, and you've moved forward based on best available scientific information at the time, and then you have this longer time dynamic reference point discussion, and you decide that you want to fold that in, then you're going to have to change and revisit your rebuilding plan, and the answer might be, to that, that, well, we're no longer overfished, and the plan is done. We've changed the reference point.

I do think, given the number of species that are associated with, you know, let's just say irregular recruitment or whatever, that there are going to pretty widespread ramifications to this, and you might be wanting to use not just -- You know, let's say red snapper and scamp, and you've got black sea bass, and probably vermilion snapper is in there somewhere.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Like you said, it's a potential new tool, and that's where I think it would help us to let the staff and the SSC and others, the IPTs, get to know that tool a little bit better, lest we end up -- You know, you bring it here to the council table, and it would be like where we were a half-hour ago, with everybody trying to scramble and figure out the answers, and there's some really good questions that you guys are answering, but -- You know, you're asking good questions, and nobody had really done the work upfront, and so that's where I think we can benefit from getting to know the tool, because I think it's very promising.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So then, John, is part of the next step here, and not just this document itself and moving that, but it is also where the ExCom Committee needs to think about the workplan and

then the budget and how some of this new funding would be spent? Are those the other pieces of the next step here?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, absolutely, you know, the workplan and doing this, and, you know, it may not take us a lot of money to put a workshop together to go through this, but, you know, this IRA stuff is very flexible, and it's not, you know, looking for great big giant projects, and it's things that we can do, and, you know, if we're supporting an SSC and AP and a few other workshops, you know, that fits within that, and we could do it quick, and it would give us a chance to get moving.

I think, you know, we'll talk about IRA funding a little bit on Friday, with the staff reports, and any ideas that folks have on things, and a lot has come up this week, and then the ExCom will get into it in detail, as we're really trying to get guidance on what we do with the first disbursement of money.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I think this has been a good discussion, but, also, are we proceeding with this amendment as-is? It sounds like there is, based on what Shep is suggesting, that there might be a way, and John is suggesting it too, that, if these workgroups come forward with new ideas, we might not be too far along in this document, in order to kind of shift that thinking and shift the pieces of the document, and is that what you're saying, Shep?

MR. GRIMES: That's a possibility. I guess what I'm saying is that, you know, I would not not accept this, or stop working on this, but, if you want to have them on parallel tracks, and see how they play out, that's fine, but I think these things -- Given the statutory timelines and what will be a forthcoming notification from the agency, you know, keep moving this forward on this path and see where the dynamic reference point goes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thanks for that clarification. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: This is probably a dumb question, but, if there is a regime shift taking place, is there -- Do they track tropical fish, you know, further north, and is there a way that we would know that they were starting to catch scamp up in Virginia and further up the coast, or is there -- Do they -- Is there a way to track weird fish that are being caught further north of us?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, yes, I mean, I think there is, and take just the recreational data, which I know we like to beat up on a lot, but the reality is they observe the fish that people bring into the dock, and that's how they get the catch rates and stuff, and so, yes, if fish start showing up in other places, they would see it.

Most of the state commercial reporting programs require that they report on the fish that they land, and so you're going to see fishing showing up there, and as well as you have surveys that are occurring, and, if the fish are vulnerable to be caught in the gear, they can show up there, and so there are a lot of ways.

Actually, Richard Cody reached out to me and gave some pretty good suggestions for how the MRIP intercept data could be used, and not the effort that gets all the scaling problems that we've talked about with the FES, but the actual access point interviews that they do, and they see the fish, and they ask the fishermen about what they caught, and he said there's probably some ways that

that data could be analyzed to look at like composition in the bag of different species that would be a pretty robust indicator of if a species were moving, and it could be the kind of thing that would be a very good indicator of species actually showing up in new places that they haven't been seen before. One of the good things about fishermen is, when they see unusual stuff, they tend to like to talk about it a lot, and so I do feel like we would get pretty good information of that sort of thing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, John. Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair, and I just wanted to remind folks, again, that there's not, you know, a panacea here with a regime shift, and so, even if, you know, the criteria suggests that, qualitatively, there's a regime shift, it doesn't say what the long-term recruitment potential is, and so don't get the idea that, if you declare a regime shift, you're necessarily going to get higher catch limits or something like that, and, in fact, in the case of scamp, the way the SSC generated the ABC, you will get exactly the same ABC level whether you have a regime shift or not, and so the bottom line isn't going to change. The OFL could have been calculated a little bit differently, assuming the low recruitment, but, again, those are only for the next few years, and so the young recruits aren't even working their way into the scamp catches very much, and so it doesn't change the OFL much.

The big difference is in the buffering for scientific uncertainty that the SSC adopted to set the ABC, and that's the bulk of that difference you see, and so a regime shift isn't going to change things a lot for scamp.

It changes things like long-term reference points, if we could settle on what the long-term recruitment potential is, but, again, this is just a qualitative thing, a regime shift, and exactly how it affects quantitatively these long-term reference points has yet to be determined, and, for something like scamp, probably it would be very difficult to determine, and that's why we're having these conversations about dynamic reference points, and so I just wanted to make sure we keep that in mind. In the case of scamp, the bottom line is the ABC isn't going to change, and, in the case of some of the other species, just recognize that a regime shift doesn't mean that we can actually quantify it.

John mentioned some great points of things that we can look at in terms of how the stock could be moving further north, but the only way to really quantify it is if we had good, consistent surveys all the way up and down the coast, and we can't look at the results from a trawl survey and compare it to the video-trap survey, and so that's something we're working on, but it doesn't exist right now. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Clay. All right. Once again, I think this has been a good discussion, because this is the same issue with multiple species that we're looking at here, and I guess I would ask the committee, and are we good to proceed through the document here, or do people have other questions or other pieces of this discussion?

There was a draft motion that was on the board there about postpone until we take this back to the SSC, and they reconsider stock status, but, based on what Clay was indicating, it's not just -- Even if a regime shift was declared, then you would still have to come up with the goalposts, and there's

a quantitative component as well, and so, yes, it doesn't seem like we're making any motions to postpone, and I'm just looking around the table. Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GRINER: Well, wait a minute. That confused me a little bit there, and so I agree that, regardless of a regime shift, you're not going to change -- You know, we've got to deal with this ABC, and it's not going to change, and the important thing, with the ABC, is that it's above what is physically happening in the recreational and commercial sectors, and I firmly believe that, where we are right now, it is.

I mean, if I look at the last five years, at the recreational and commercial sector, you know, I think we can squeak by on that 84,000, but, regardless of a regime shift, I think the only idea of making this motion was does that give us the opportunity to not be under a statutory timeframe, and a rebuilding timeline, but, as far as having the nuts-and-bolts of having an ABC, and how are we going to deal with that, and, you know, look at allocations and move on with these following fishing years, I think we've got what we need to do that with.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Chip was just saying it's still in the CHTS, right, and scamp is still being tracked in CHTS, and so it's apples and oranges, when you start comparing that stuff, and so sorry, and I know, Tim, and you had it all straight, and now we're like, no, wait.

MR. GRINER: But you did just say -- Somebody said, a minute ago, that, in the past, that we had barely caught -- That there was hardly any intercepts of yellowmouth, right? Okay, and so we've got this new complex, right? We're confident about that, right, and that's regardless of the currency, and we're confident with that, right? Okay. Still, even for -- Well, I'm not even going to get into it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I am looking at Jeff again, and it's more to -- I just went back to look at the sensitivity runs under scamp, and we never did sensitivities for high and low recruitment, with the change in recruitment, and so we don't even know what those potential impacts could have been with a sensitivity run. I'm looking at the SEDAR report, and, as I'm looking down, there is sixteen sensitivity runs that were done, but there was nothing done with the different recruitments.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay.

DR. PORCH: The recruitments are estimated in the stock assessment model, and you wouldn't fix them at high or low levels, but, in the projections that you're using to generate your ABC and OFL, then you might make some assumptions about whether recruitment would increase to the historical average level or whether it would remain low at the recent levels of recruitment that we've seen over the last several years.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are we good to proceed? I feel like Jeff is going to quit being the chair of the SSC after this meeting. Okay. Are we good to proceed here? I feel like we're going to reluctantly proceed here in this amendment, and so we're deleting that draft motion, but we have some direction to staff there, based on that discussion, which was kind of capturing what we talked about, about the workgroups and considering the new funding. Okay. I am going to turn it back to Allie.

MS. IBERLE: All right, and so we're good with direction to staff, nothing to add or delete? Okay. All right, and so I will start with ABC. Again, these values, you saw them earlier in the SSC report, and I kind of just boiled it down, and so you're seeing OFL now and those ABC recommendations.

I wanted to do a quick, fun recap of all of the acronyms that I'm going to be using, because I use a lot, and so, as a reminder, that presentation we went over in June talked about two different kind of groups of grouper, and so the first is the big group, and so the South Atlantic shallow-water grouper, and so that includes everything we think of as a South Atlantic shallow-water grouper, including the hinds, coney, graysby, yellowmouth, and yellowfin, but it also includes those with individual ACLs and AMs, and so, gag, red grouper, black grouper, and scamp, and so all of these species are subject to the spawning season closure at the moment, and so that's what that big group is for, when you're thinking of it on a management perspective.

Then, underneath that, as a subset of that, which is the other South Atlantic shallow-water grouper, or OSASWG, and that includes, currently, the hinds, graysby, coney, yellowmouth, and yellowfin, and, obviously, yellowmouth has an asterisk, because we're going to be removing it in this amendment, and then those species have a complex ACL, and so we were talking about that 4 percent, and so that 4 percent is the yellowmouth portion of that entire ACL, and then they have an AM that's tied to that complex-wide.

In this amendment, we're going to be removing yellowmouth and creating a separate complex of scamp and yellowmouth, and so that will kind of leave the OSASHWs needing some attention afterwards, and so I just wanted to go over and give a quick recap on that, but, if anything gets confusing, please stop me, and we can kind of digest it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you go back to that graphic, because that graphic helps me. I get that we're creating a complex with scamp and yellowmouth, but why are we only changing, you know, the quota and everything for the OSASWG? It is because scamp has its own quota, and it's not part of a bigger grouping in the blue umbrella?

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and so, currently, scamp has a scamp ACL and a scamp AM, and so what the assessment is saying is these levels that are coming out of SEDAR 68 already include scamp and yellowmouth lumped together, and so we're assuming that those ABC numbers are for scamp and yellowmouth, and we're essentially not differentiating them, and they're kind of one species, for the thought process, but then, we're looking at it ACL-wise, we can't have a yellowmouth, you know, allotment in the OSASWG ACL, and we have to remove that portion, and then that portion will be accounted for in the catch levels that you put in place for the scamp and yellowmouth complex.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was talking about the blue grouping, and so there's no overall ACL or quota? Okay. That answers my question. Thank you.

MS. IBERLE: That's a good question, and so think of that blue umbrella as the spawning season closure, and so those species are grouped specifically for the spawning season closure, and I guess the only kind of funky one in there is red grouper, but it's still subject to a spawning season closure,

and it's just a little bit different, and so think of that big group as a spawning season closure and then that small group as the one that has the complex ACL.

All right, and I will go over the scoping sessions, and it will be quick, unfortunately, and so, in June, you approved this amendment for scoping, and we held three webinar scoping sessions. We had two members of the public attend two different webinars, but we didn't receive any comments pertaining to Amendment 55. We did have a really great interaction with a member of the public wanting to get more involved in the process in general, and so a benefit there, but nothing specific to scamp.

For this meeting -- The last meeting, you kind of looked at this amendment with the new complex and the OSASWGs kind of intrinsically tied together, and, to help the document flow a little bit, the IPT kind of separated it into looking at everything that needs to get done with scamp and yellowmouth and then talking about what needs to get done for those OSASWG species, and so that's kind of how we'll tackle it today. We'll review everything that will be put in place for yellowmouth, and then, when we get to the other South Atlantic shallow-water grouper, or OSASWG, we'll talk a little bit about the EC species designation and criteria and your other option, which is that ACL modification.

Timing on this one, again, we're just at the reviewing state for this document, and nothing needs to get approved for public hearing at this meeting. We conducted scoping, and then this will go to your AP in the fall. Tentatively, December is when we could approve for public hearings. I'm going to talk a little bit about the data and presenting and giving you guys catch levels and allocations and sector ACLs, because the IPT has to work a little bit on that, and so a tentative timeline, for sure.

Again, something that's a little bit up in the air, at this point in the game, is the purpose and need, and so, currently, the purpose reads: The purpose of this fishery management plan is to remove yellowmouth grouper from the other South Atlantic shallow-water grouper complex and establish a new South Atlantic scamp and yellowmouth grouper complex. For the new complex, establish a rebuilding plan, specify catch levels, sector allocations, and accountability measures, based on the results of SEDAR 68.

Then the need for this fishery management plan is to rebuild the South Atlantic scamp and yellowmouth grouper complex and achieve optimum yield, while minimizing, to the extent practicable, adverse social and economic effects.

However, when you're looking at the committee action, the IPT noted that, when we're talking about the other South Atlantic shallow-water groupers, whatever you guys decide to do may affect the wording of the purpose and need, and so, if changes are made, and, again, with the dynamic reference points, I'm not exactly sure how the wording would fit there, and so this may be in a little bit of flux, for the moment, but any comments or edits from now?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any thoughts on this? I feel like we're going to come back to this after we get more through the document. It looks like people nodding yes. I think we're okay with this for now.



MS. IBERLE: All right, and so we'll go ahead and get started with the actions, starting with scamp, and so Action 1 is reorganizing that complex, and so I kind of mentioned this in June, and think of this as essentially the like administrative -- You know, you're saying you're removing scamp, and modifying that complex, and there's not really too much, you know, numbers involved here yet, and so this is just removing scamp and creating a complex, and then you've got the OSASWGs just hanging out, and so those alternatives are pretty simple.

Table 4 shows you a status quo for both the scamp fishery, as it stands, and the current other shallow-water grouper, as it stands, and so you have your total ACL, the spawning season closure, those size limit regulations, the rec bag limit, and the commercial trip limit, and so it's very similar between scamp and yellowmouth, because yellowmouth is one of the species in that complex that has a size limit, and so it's pretty similar regulations there, and so that action -- I feel like I breezed through it pretty quick, but any questions on that one?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you go back to see the wording on the actual action?

MS. IBERLE: So we don't have hard-and-fast alternative language right now, but like there's a lot in flux right now, and so I hadn't done that, but the IPT is working on it in the backend, and we just wanted to keep this document a little bit more simple for this meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so then help me, Allie. Today, at this meeting, are we just kind of looking to make sure we have the right actions in the document and talking about possible alternatives, and is that where we are?

MS. IBERLE: Yes, correct, and so, looking at the range of alternatives, does anything need to be added or removed, that kind of thing. Sorry if that wasn't clear.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. It looks okay to me. Other people seem to be thinking that it's okay as well, and it looks like a good range to me, and so, yes, other folks are nodding okay, and I'm going to pass it back to you, Allie.

MS. IBERLE: All right, and so Action 2 will adopt the maximum sustainable yield, maximum fishing mortality -- The MSST, and then minimum stock size threshold, and possibly an equilibrium OY for your scamp and yellowmouth grouper complex, and so Table 7 has a lot of subactions here, and so the way that we're walking through it currently is each subaction is a different stock determination criteria.

You are seeing alternatives here simply because you're creating a new complex, and so you have a status quo for scamp, and you have a status quo for the OSASWGs, and then you also have your assessment advice for scamp and yellowmouth, and so there's kind of a lot going on, and a lot of things that are applicable, but I'm going to go down and use some of the bullets that we've put together to walk through each one of these, to kind of give a little bit more information on why you're seeing these alternatives when you usually don't. For MSY, your maximum sustainable yield, SEDAR 68 included --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Hang on, Allie. Shep has got his hand up.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. Just flagging that this -- The SDCs are not mentioned in the purpose and need, and so that's going to be something for that. Thank you.

MS. IBERLE: We will add that in. Thank you, Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank Nik. It came from him.

MS. IBERLE: All right. Starting with maximum sustainable yield, SEDAR 68 included analyses using an MSY proxy of F 40 percent SPR for your new scamp and yellowmouth complex, and then the post-assessment analyses used an MSY proxy of F 30 percent SPR for this complex. The SSC -- I'm sorry. The SEDAR 68 report and the SSC, in the January 2023 report, recommended using an MSY proxy of F 40 percent, and so that was a formal recommendation.

Then, currently, scamp and yellowmouth both, yellowmouth within that OSASWG group, have an MSY proxy of F 30 percent, and so that's your status quo for both of those currently, and so, kind of based on that information, which MSY proxy does the council feel is most appropriate?

I posed that question, or the group posed that question, not so much as to pick a preferred, but to kind of get the council thinking about the recommendation and then the status quo, and so we obviously don't have information to pick a formal preferred, but it's kind of more of a discussion starting point, and I don't know if you want me to pause before I go into MSST. Okay, and I'm going to have discussion now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I think it would be helpful if we had a little bit of explanation on what the difference is between the F at 30 percent and the F at 40 percent and the implications of that, a little bit more than just saying, you know, based on life history and recent literature.

MS. IBERLE: I might have Chip help explain the difference between F 30 percent and F 40 percent SPR, because I feel like he will do a better job than I.

DR. COLLIER: In the stock assessment report for SEDAR 68, they do document why they recommended the 40 percent over the 30 percent, and some of it was based on the protogynous life history that this species has, or both these species have, and that leads to a complex life history. It's also been documented in several of the papers that they cited that the 40 percent is a more precautionary approach, and leads to better success over time, compared to a 30 percent SPR, and, Clay, if I misspoke on any of that stuff -- Also, it's a fairly long-lived fish, and both of these are fairly long-lived fish, and that also is another need for additional protections, according to SEDAR 68.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think Tim was also asking about kind of the ramifications of that, and can you talk about that a little bit?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and so some of the ramifications are that you're going to get slightly larger fish in the population. Depending on how you structure the selectivity going into it, that's going to influence everything that's going on, but you should have more individuals in the population, and, therefore, you're going to have increases, likely, in the size structure and the age structure,

and, therefore, you're going to have more fish out there breeding, and it could potentially lead to, especially for some of the protogynous fish, more males in the population. Some of these populations that we have in the South Atlantic region are actually -- They seem to be male-limited, or sperm-limited, and so some of these protections might be needed for them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That was helpful. Thank you, Chip. Clay.

DR. PORCH: As Chip said, the choice is based largely on the life history of the animals, and there is some not inconsiderable literature that suggests that something like F 40 percent would be appropriate for these, and, you know, I don't know if Jeff wants to weigh-in on that, but the bottom line is I'm a little uncomfortable with the way it's framed here, and it's just like, hey, here's F 30 percent, and there's F 40 percent, and which does the council want to pick, and the council does need to be consistent with the best scientific information available, which is what the SSC weighed-in on by selecting the F 40 percent, and so, if the council wanted to select something different from the SSC's recommendation, they would need to really justify why their decision is based on better scientific information than what the SSC considered.

If the SSC gave you range of options, and thought they were all equally plausible, then, yes, the council would have complete latitude to pick what proxy they're going to use, but I don't think that's what they did, and they gave a pretty clear recommendation of F 40 percent, and so there would need to be a strong scientific argument advanced of why you would use something other than that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. I noticed that people are getting up and wandering off, and let's take a ten-minute break, and then we'll come back and we'll dive back into this.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: Come on back to the table. We're going to get going again. All right. We're going to dive back into this amendment, and I'm going to pass it back over to you, Allie.

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and I wanted to -- Before I move on to MFMT, I wanted to kind of circle back to why you're seeing alternatives for these, because, like we were saying, we did have a recommendation of F 40 percent, of kind of the looking like the clear choice here, and so the reason that we're having alternatives for these is because we're -- We have the status quo, and we have the recommendation, but, because this is a new complex, we have to, on the record, say, you know, this is what we chose, and so, because of that, we have to have that kind of suite of alternatives.

You know, we have that recommendation, but we are like showing the -- Incorporating the status quo, because, at this point, we have nothing else to build, and so I just wanted to make sure that, since we're not usually seeing these, and that's, you know, why they're here, and so, with that, I will go on to MFMT, and so that's your maximum fishing mortality threshold.

The current MFMT for both scamp and yellowmouth is at 30 percent, and so the MFMT would be set equal to the fishing mortality rate that results in MSY or the FMSY proxy, and so the SSC recommended the MSY proxy of F 40 percent SPR, and so, again, we have that same question, and, you know, we're not looking to pick a preferred, but this is something that, you know, the

council should consider and, moving forward, selecting preferreds in the future, and so would you like me to pause on this one or hop to MSST?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's pause on that one, and so are there more questions? We've already had a bunch of discussion on that, but are there more questions in how this document is going to get set up? To me, that table does help, but any more questions, before we dive into the next category? Okay. I don't see any hands.

MS. IBERLE: All right, and, if you're looking at that table, and I apologize, because I have the opposite, because I need those bullets, but we're in Sub-Action 2c, and so we're in that third chunk, talking about MSST. MSST are your minimum spawning stock size threshold, and so, prior to Regulatory Amendment 21, the MSST for all shallow-water groupers, including scamp and yellowmouth, was SSB MSY, or one minus M, which is your natural mortality, or 0.5, whichever is greater, and this formula has not been altered for scamp or yellowmouth, and so that's currently what's in place.

This amendment essentially sets a precedent that the MSST for species based on their estimated M, or natural mortality, for any species with an M over 0.25 or lower, would be at 75 percent of SSB MSY, and so that amendment set that precedent, but it hasn't been modified for either scamp or yellowmouth.

SEDAR 68 defined MSST as 75 percent of SSB MSY, with M estimated at 0.155 for scamp and yellowmouth, and so that puts you lower than the 0.25, and so, again, we have that same kind of discussion prompt, and so what does the council feel is appropriate, based on that guidance that you were given from SEDAR 68, and then the precedent, you can kind of say, that Regulatory Amendment 21 put in place, and so any questions on MSST?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't see any hands.

MS. IBERLE: All right, and then so the last section of that table is equilibrium OY, and so this council has not typically set an equilibrium, or what is sometimes called a long-term OY, for snapper grouper stocks. Instead, we rely more on an annual OY, which is allowed in Magnuson.

The optimum yield is the long-term average amount desired from a stock or a fishery, and the optimum yield is reduced from the MSY for the fishery based on relevant economic, social, and ecological factors, and so Alternatives 2 through 4 are reduced from the MSY at different percentages to account for factors in the fishery that may influence the greatest benefit to the nation, and so, in thinking about this new complex that you're setting up, because it's brand-new, if you were wanting to go with a long-term OY instead of an annual one, this is where you would consider it. It's not that you are required to have a long-term or an equilibrium OY, but it's just something that the IPT thought was a reasonable thing to consider, but we can still rely on that annual OY, and it's the council's decision.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. Just a little bit of different guidance on that, and I would say you need to have the long-term OY. You don't have an OY on the books for this stock complex, right, and OY is defined as a long-term catch, and so we had a little bit of discussion, and I remember

reviewing it in the minutes from the last meeting, but, yes, we definitely should have the equilibrium or long-term OY in this document for the new complex.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So I'm going to pose a question to Clay, because, most of the time, with the equilibrium, right, we're assuming that it's -- That the stock is at equilibrium, and, obviously, fishing has been going on, and this is a conglomeration, and what's the peril? I mean, I guess I have a hard time with saying, yes, we're going to do equilibrium, when we don't know what equilibrium is.

DR. PORCH: You're exactly right, and that's the conundrum we face, and so there's legal requirements, but, on the other hand, we're talking about potential regime shifts, and I don't think anybody thinks the stock is currently in any equilibrium, and so all we could do is either specify it as an aspirational formula, or you make sort of a proxy for the proxy and just make some assumption about long-term recruitment, so you can do the calculation, but the reality is we don't know what the long-term recruitment potential is, and that's why we're using a proxy to begin with, and so it's hard to come up with a definitive number.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Well, I mean, couldn't you make that same criticism -- I mean, these are all FMSY-based things here, right, and, I mean, how is there more uncertainty in estimating an equilibrium for OY purposes, versus the -- You know, these FMYs that are theoretically based on some equilibrium state, right?

DR. PORCH: Yes, and there's a fundamental difference there when you're talking about the fishing mortality rate, because you can look at work where FMSY has been estimated and figure out, you know, sort of different analyses, looking at other stocks where it might be better determined, and see how that corresponds to FSPR levels. In the work we've done, it suggests that, you know, for a life history strategy like scamp, F 40 percent is the best approximately for FMSY, but that's just the fishing mortality rate. The MSY is the product of fishing mortality rate and some equilibrium biomass, and that's harder to calculate, because the recruitment potential could change.

MS. MCCAWLEY: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: A bit of a comment on this, and not about actually finding the value, but just what's the philosophy behind this, and I've never been comfortable with this idea of the annual OY. You know, it should be an equilibrium thing, and, as Shep said, if you look at all the guidance, you know, MSY is the most yield that can be taken, but we're not supposed to fish there.

We're supposed to fish below there, and so OY, as I understood it from the beginning, was the way of the council telling the fishermen that this is the limit up here, MSY, and you can expect that your fishery, over the long-term, is going to operate at a slightly lower level, which is going to be the optimum yield. This was a way of telling fishermen, over the long-term, what to expect that this fishery is capable of producing, and then, within each individual year, you have a limit on how many you can catch, and that's the overfishing limit, and then you have what you're going to

let them catch, which is the ACL, and those are short-term things, and they're based on F rates and the abundance of fish.

The MSY and OY are the same thing, but they're not based on now's abundance, and they're based on what we think the ideal abundance will be under this stock, and so I always feel like, you know, when you take away the equilibrium role of OY, then you're never telling the fishermen what to really expect out of this fishery, as far as its overall yield. MSY is out there, but you're not supposed to catch MSY.

You're supposed to catch something lower, and so I hope the council, in this one, will see to like get away from this idea of annual OYs, because I just don't think that's how it was ever expected to be used. In the early guidance and discussions of it, it was never presented as an annual thing, and I think this was a bit of stop-gap measure that was done, in some cases, but I think you're on much better footing if you rely on MSY and OY at the equilibrium conditions as a way of saying, you know, when this stock is well managed, and we get what we think we're going to get out of it, fishermen, here's where you're going to be.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Based on that, do you have what you need here, Allie?

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and I think we've got some discussion on the record, and, again, we'll have more discussions of this as we flesh out these actions. All right, and so, moving to Action 3, that deals with the rebuilding plan for South Atlantic scamp and yellowmouth grouper, and so, right now, we have, obviously, the no action alternative, and your T<sub>min</sub>, which right now we have at five years, and Alternative 3, which is T<sub>max</sub>, which we've been told is ten years.

Kind of a review from June, and so rebuilding within ten years is possible, but this is based on that long-term average recruitment, which is higher than recent recruitment and involves the assumption that recruitment will recover to previous levels, and then the SSC noted that T<sub>max</sub> cannot be determined, or sorry. They have since determined that T<sub>max</sub> is ten years, and then the rebuilding probability, and so some reminders about that.

MSA requires that a rebuilding probability be at least 50 percent, and then the ABC values that were provided through that initial Scenario 7 resulted in a zero percent chance of rebuilding, and so then, in looking at T<sub>min</sub>, and so we're basing this off of SEDAR 68, in the following conditions, T<sub>min</sub> would equal five years, for your terminal year, or your end year, at 2030, and so F equals zero starting in 2025, and a probability of rebuilding of 70 percent, and so Figure 2 kind of shows you where you are with that, with that bottom line being 50 percent and that top line, top solid line, being 70 percent, and so I will turn it over for discussion, and, again, right now, what we're kind of wanting out of this is looking at the range of alternatives and making sure that these are acceptable, moving forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Are we good with these alternatives? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm good with the alternatives, but just a couple of comments. With the SSC noting that they couldn't calculate T<sub>max</sub>, and I understand their rationale, and it's more of a confidence issue in calculating T<sub>max</sub> than the ability to calculate T<sub>max</sub>, and so I just wanted to clarify that, if you can calculate the minimum rebuilding time, you can also do the equations to calculate the maximum rebuilding time.

The rebuilding scenario with the zero percent change of rebuilding, so that's contingent, obviously, on the low recruitment, right, and we don't know what recruitment is going to be in the future, but if you essentially took the same yield levels that that has produced, and ran it under high recruitment, it would have a greater than 50 percent probability of rebuilding, and so I think we probably at least need to document that there's a lot of uncertainty here, but there is the potential for rebuilding under the high recruitment scenario.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Was that enough direction for you? Okay. Thank you, Allie.

MS. IBERLE: All right. That brings us to Action 4, which will establish the ABC, ACL, and annual OY, question-mark, and so, again, that will depend on your equilibrium OY, and, obviously, that language will change if you're going to go with an equilibrium OY, and so that will be removed for scamp and yellowmouth, and so, right now, we kind of kept the suite of alternatives simple. We have your no action alternative, which is no catch level, because we don't have one for this new complex.

Alternative 2 would be setting your ACL, and potentially your OY, equal to ABC, and then Alternative 3 incorporates a 10 percent buffer in between your ABC and your ACL, and so, as a reminder, the catch level that we're talking about is for scamp and yellowmouth only and not the OSASWGs, and so the remaining species in that complex, and this is not dealing with their ACL. That will be done in a separate action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So a question for John then. Based on the table as it is, which has the annual OYs, how would this look differently if you do an equilibrium, because we have ACL equals OY equals ABC, and ABC would change.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So you would have an OY that you specified based on say fishing at 75 percent of FMSY, under your equilibrium stock abundance that's expected, and so OY wouldn't be in that table. You have ACL equals ABC, because the council would be saying we're not providing an additional buffer to get to ACL from ABC.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks. I just wanted that clarification.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. I would just note that you don't need the annual OY. I mean, we're following the standard process we did here, but, as you heard John Carmichael say, and as I fully support, I think you ought to move away from it and get rid of it. Thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Let the record show, right, and we totally support this. This is pretty unusual.

MS. IBERLE: All right. Well, I highlighted that for the IPT to edit. Table 10 --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Wait. Hang on. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I just was wondering if there was any thought, if anybody had given any thought, to one more alternative at say 95 percent of the ABC.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It sounds good, and we're capturing it there on the screen.

MS. IBERLE: All right, and so we've got the edits removing annual OY and then direction to staff to include a 95 percent, and I will add the word "buffer", buffer alternative. All right. Anything else for Action 4? Okay. Just really quickly, under Action 4, we had Tables 10 and 11 that kind of just shows you catch levels, and then the percent of the commercial ACL and the recreational ACL used, and the only caveat here is that your recreational ACL usage -- You are thinking of that in the Coastal Household Telephone Survey, and so just remember the kind of survey that you're looking at there.

All right, and then Action 5 will establish the South Atlantic scamp and yellowmouth grouper sector allocations and sector annual catch limits, and so, when you saw this in June, we just had, I believe, Alternative 1, and that was it, and so, in June, we talked about using that split reduction method that was used in Amendment 53, with the years 2018 to 2022, and the years of 2013 to 2022, and then we also added an alternative that would look at just the distribution of landings, with those same year steps, and, as reminder, that split reduction method -- It uses each sector's landings proportional to the baseline of historic average landings to achieve the updated catch levels.

The other thing that I wanted to note is, obviously, we don't have percentages here, and so we're kind of waiting on a couple of things. We're waiting on the ACL to be provided in landings and discards, and, right now, we have it in total removals, and then the other thing we're waiting on is how to package the data, and so, when we were looking at yellowmouth, and when you're removing yellowmouth from the OSASWGs and adding it to -- Or combining it with scamp, you can really easily back-calculate, and there is some confidentiality issues, and so we're -- The IPT is kind of discussing -- They will discuss, at their next meeting, how to package this data and make sure that we're presenting things that we can present and there is no confidentiality issues there. We're expecting, in December, to have percentages and sector allocations to provide for you, but, right now, we're kind of on hold there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you scroll back up to the table? My first question is the split reduction method -- Is that what we're now calling share-the-pain-share-the-gain? Okay. Other questions here? Shep.

MR. GRIMES: I don't know that this is particularly helpful, but I would just put in a plug -- I would love to see councils generally, and this council, move away from landings as the basis for your allocation, right, especially when you have the split and you're constantly dealing with recreational data changes, and then you constantly have to update it, and you're looking back at is this right, and, I mean, ultimately, it's about percentages, and, if you justify the percentages, based on something else, you know, some other formula, but, you know, like all this considers is historical catch, and there are a thousand ways to cut the pie that don't have anything to do with historical catch, and so why aren't any other methods being considered? We never consider those, and not many other councils do, but, anyway, I would just encourage that, and in a way that's not



so tied to the data that's constantly being revisited, every time there is any change in the recreational data collection method. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Can you give us some examples of other ways, other than looking at historical catch?

MR. GRIMES: Well, I know the agency has looked at a lot of stuff like that, and there are publications on it, you know, agency guidance documents on allocation, and I'm not the one to lead the discussion on that, but, you know, you could do some kind of, you know, economic analysis, informed by whatever, and, I mean, there are really no limits on it. You can't base it just on economics, but, you know, there are plenty of ways that you could decide to divide up the pie and justify it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: But you can't use economic comparisons, because the recreational economic impact uses multipliers, and the commercial is just ex-vessel price, and so you can't do that.

MR. GRIMES: Well, you can't do a dollars-to-dollars comparison, because, you know, as I understand, there are disagreements and difficulties with that, but you could consider all of that information and arrive at what you thought was an appropriate allocation, and you can justify it qualitatively, in terms of the objectives of your FMP, and there are plenty of ways that it could be done. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Tim and then Clay.

MR. GRINER: Laurilee, just so you'll know, NOAA did publish a multiplier for the commercial industry, and it was a factor of twenty-six, and so the commercial impact is twenty-six times the ex-vessel. That's from NOAA.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay.

DR. PORCH: I would say there are some ways to put the commercial and recreational impacts on a more even footing. You know, you don't have to just look at total sales for recreational and compare it to ex-vessel prices or anything like that. There are some alternatives out there, and the economists could speak better to it. In fact, we did see an example of that for red grouper with the Gulf of Mexico, comparing commercial and recreational value per pound, and so there are definitely alternatives that the council could look at.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Anything else to add here? All right. Back to you, Allie.

MS. IBERLE: I guess, before we move off of this action, I want to make sure there isn't a direction to staff to look into an additional alternative, and what's the pleasure of the group?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I heard no.

MS. IBERLE: All right. That brings us to --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Wait. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I know this is another dumb question, but why are we using CHTS numbers for this stock assessment? Is it -- Does it take a while for the numbers to be recalculated, or how come some of them are FES and some of them are still CHTS?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: My understanding is that, since this assessment has now been done for this complex, that we will never hear CHTS again, and everything going forward from here for scamp and yellowmouth will be in FES, and, if that's incorrect, somebody needs to tell us right now.

MS. IBERLE: So, right now, the scamp ACL is an ACL based off of CHTS, and the same with yellowmouth within that other shallow-water grouper complex, and so the catch levels that you were provided through SEDAR 68 are inclusive of MRIP-FES, and so, when you're setting allocations for this brand new complex, and, technically, you don't have any, and that's why, in this table, we're looking at kind of the status quo for scamp and yellowmouth separately, and you're going to be basing those allocations off of FES landings. Does that make sense? If you're basing them off of landings, if you're basing the allocations off of landings.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Which is a whole other issue. Just saying. We talked about that earlier. All right. I don't see any other hands about other options to add here.

MS. IBERLE: All right. That brings us to accountability measures, and so we have to establish both commercial and recreational accountability measures for this new complex, and so we're going to start with commercial. We had a little bit of discussion and made some alternations in June to these, and so these alternatives are just updated from what you saw in June, based on those instructions, and so, obviously, we don't have an AM for this complex, and we have status quo for scamp and for yellowmouth.

Alternative 2 has an in-season commercial closure and then a post-season closure, and so this is -  
- Alternative 2 reflects the status quo for both scamp and yellowmouth grouper as it stands right now. Alternative 3 and 4 is what you've been seeing recently in other amendments, where you're either removing or retaining an in-season closure, and so removing in Alternative 3 and retaining in Alternative 4, and then what I've been calling uncoupling the post-season, and so your post-season accountability measure would only be tied to the commercial ACL and not tied to stock status or the total ACL. That is your current suite of alternatives for commercial accountability measures, and so any discussion on the alternatives, anything added or removed, and, again, this is for commercial only.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: So, for Alternative 3, there would be no in-season closure, and they would just let the boats keep on fishing, and catching fish, and then just reduce it off the quota for next year? Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any comments or discussion on the alternatives that we have here? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Maybe we've included it and I just wasn't paying attention, but Alternative 3 just wouldn't be how we would manage the fishery, and allow for overharvest, and so I would recommend that we move it to Considered but Rejected.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry is nodding her head yes, and I don't even think that we're far enough along to do Considered but Rejected, and so just remove from the document.

MS. IBERLE: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Anything else on accountability measures here? Okay.

MS. IBERLE: All right, and so the last action to consider for the new complex for scamp and yellowmouth is going to be a very similar table for the recreational accountability measures, and so you're going to have the same suite of alternatives, with one additional alternative, which includes the season announcement, and so the season would be opened on May 1, and so that would be the end of the current spawning season closure, and then NMFS would annually announce the season end date, and then you would still have -- Alternative 3 represents that status quo, what's currently in place for both scamp and yellowmouth, as they sit now, and then Alternatives 4 and 5 are those kind of uncoupling the post-season AMs. Alternative 4 removes the in-season, and Alternative 5 retains the in-season, and so, again, this is for recreational, and I know we've seen this table twice, and so it can be confusing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I saw the note that the IPT recommends removing Alternative 2, and I understand why, and I'm personally fine with that. I would also suggest that Alternative 3 is a departure from where we've been going, and we've set precedent with all the other species, that we have not been tying even recreational to stock status, and so it's not something that I would personally consider in the future, and I don't know about anyone else.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Allie is getting there on the board, and then I wanted to look at the table one more time, after she gets that typed up, and so what Kerry is suggesting is removing Alternative 2 and 3.

MS. IBERLE: Sorry. I just want to make sure I'm getting it right, and so are you wanting to remove the alternative that reflects the current status quo, or are you wanting to remove the alternative that gets rid of the in-season closure?

MS. MARHEFKA: This one is confusing, because I think Alternative 1 is the current status quo, which is not the case in this document, right, and so, no, obviously, we can't do that, and I understand that, and that's going to throw me off this entire document.

MS. IBERLE: So it's Alternative 4 that we would be removing, the one that has no in-season AM.

MS. MARHEFKA: It's okay, because I'm not clear about it. I was speaking more to the fact that -- I was thinking that was a new alternative that we were tying to stock status, which we've moved

away from with other species we've done recently. I think the in-season closure, I'm not going to speak to, because, for me, that's an agency problem, and, if they have a problem with it, they can speak to it, but I am fine with 4 being in there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so then we're just removing 2, is what it sounds like, Alternative 2. Okay. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Why would we remove Alternative -- I lost my chart here. Why would we remove Alternative 4 from the commercial industry but not from the recreational industry? Why would you not shut down a fishery where they've met their ACLs in-season? It's the same thing, and why would you let them keep fishing and fishing and then they have to have more taken off on the next season?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am not necessarily going to speak to this, but, in my mind, we've heard, over and over again, that we can't really track the recreational fishery in-season. The way we collect data is not intended to monitor a fishery in-season, and so, in every other plan we've done recently, we have done that with post-season measures for the recreational fishery and in-season measures for the commercial fishery, because of how we track the data.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee and then Tim.

MS. THOMPSON: Well, what if they get their amount in the first wave? You're just going to keep letting them go through more waves? I think that -- Andy can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the golden tilefish recreational season got shut down in-season, didn't it?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: That's a post-season accountability measure, where we adjust it based on the prior year's landings. With scamp, and we are talking about an eight-month season right now, and so there would be the ability to receive landings in-season and make some decisions, but keep in mind there's usually about a two-month time lag between when the data is collected and when we are actually able to react to that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I'm glad that you brought that up, and I know there's that time lag, but I think there is value is starting to go down that road, even if there is a two-month time lag, simply because it could occur in the first or second wave, and, if they're moving these waves to one-month waves here in the future, then, you know, I think we need to go ahead and start looking at that. I mean, certainly, if it happens too late in the year, that the data can't support an in-season, then maybe we have the alternative to have a post-season in that event, but certainly there's no reason that we can't have an in-season closure, if the data warrants that and it's available.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: My recommendation is we keep it in for now, because it's been used as an alternative in past amendments, and we debate the merits of what the preferred would be at a future meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm okay with that. Are others okay with that? Okay. People are nodding yes. All right.

MS. IBERLE: All right. I guess I have a question. We're at 3:24, and the OSASWG discussion may be a lengthy one, and so I think that would be a question. Do you want to start with OSASWG or wait on OSASWG?

All right, and so that concludes the scamp and yellowmouth portion, and so we've reviewed all those actions and alternatives, and so now we are going to get into the discussion on what to do with the OSASWGs. In June, we talked a little bit about the ecosystem component designation, and the council wanted to look at those criteria and then what would be involved if these species were designated as ecosystem component species.

The IPT compiled these criteria and then put together kind of a list of discussion items to think about, as far as the ecosystem component designation goes, and what I'm going to do today is just run through this list, go through those bullets, and then, if the ecosystem component designation is something that the council would like to explore further, we can compile more information into a Shiny app, that I believe you've used previously, and go through this species-by-species.

Your criteria for ecosystem component designation is the stock is an important component of the marine environment, the stock is caught by the fishery, whether an FMP can improve or maintain the condition of a stock, the stock is a target of the fishery, the stock is important to commercial, recreational, or subsistence users, the fishery is important to the nation or the regional economy, the need to resolve competing interests and conflicts among user groups and whether an FMP can further that resolution. The economic condition of the fishery and whether an FMP can produce more efficient utilization. The needs of a developing fishery and whether or an FMP can foster orderly growth. The extent to which a fishery is already adequately managed by states, by state or federal programs, or by federal regulations pursuant to other FMPs or international commissions or by industry self-regulation, consistent with the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Those are the things that we would be considering when talking about an ecosystem designation for any of the remaining OSASWG species, which, as a reminder, you've got the hinds, and so rock hind, red hind, coney, and graysby.

All right, and so the IPT was going over and thinking about things to consider if these species are designated as EC species, and so the first thing is the nature of the designation, and so, typically, when species are designated as ecosystem component species, all federal management measures are removed, and so ACLs, AMs, bag limits, trip limits, and you don't have any of those. However, there is an example from the Mid-Atlantic where species were designated as EC species, but they retained -- They were part of an aggregate trip limit, and that aggregate trip limit was retained, and so I included the -- That was the Mid-Atlantic Unmanaged Omnibus Amendment in 2017.

Obviously, the species we're thinking about don't have trip limits, but they are part of that spawning season closure, and they're part of an aggregate bag limit, and then yellowfin grouper is

the only remaining species that has a size limit, and so, if the council decides to designate the remaining OSASWG species the same way that this omnibus amendment did, then think about those three things and what would need to be retained if you chose this method.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you scroll back up a little bit to that paragraph and those bullets? So then, if it's done like the Mid-Atlantic did it, why is the permit requirement not one of those bullets, where it says the spawning season, aggregate bag limit, size limit, and so could you retain the permit requirement or not?

MS. IBERLE: Like the commercial snapper grouper permit?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, you know, I'm sure opinions will vary on this, but so my answer to that would be no. I would look at it, as I have advised -- Remember when we went through this for bullet and frigate mackerel in the Dolphin Wahoo Committee, and we talked about adding them as ecosystem component species, and think of it as what are you regulating, right, and, if you have all of the fish stocks that are in the FMP, and those are the managed stocks, and you have a seasonal area closure, and you're closing for all these spawning grouper that might be in there, you're indirectly managing --

When you close that area, right, to protect that you are managing, you're indirectly managing the harvest of everything else that people might go out there and catch during that time, right, and so it could include these other grouper species that aren't managed, ecosystem components, because you don't want people going out there and targeting those and then having the barotrauma effects on the species that you manage, right, but, when you start going in and imposing direct limits on the ecosystem component species, how many of those fish you can take, what size you can take, that you have to have a permit for them, those kinds of things are starting to cross the line into like you're directly managing something that you have decided is not in need of conservation and management and made an ecosystem component species.

Now, I guess, for permits, I could see, you know, the data collection aspect, and maybe you could make that argument, but we've had, in the past, at least with other councils, species that are included for data collection purposes only, where we don't specify reference points and the like, and we're not really managing, and they're in for data collection, and you need the permit to harvest them, and you have to report them, but there aren't other direct restrictions on what the public can do in terms of harvesting them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That is a big sticking point for me, if we don't require the permit, and so -- The commercial permit, and so, to me, when this comes back, I would love that to be kind of talked about a little bit more in the document, because I agree that I think it's huge, as to what the answer is, whether we can or we can't. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Just to further get evidence, this is a complex that we used to call, and I don't know, Tim, if you all did too, but Heinz 57. The guys just threw them in a bin, and that's how they were classified, but, over the years, as sort of the logbook has come along and everything, they are getting separated out a little bit, but, you know, we're getting the same price for a rock hind as we are for grouper, per pound, and so there's not a lot of -- You know, there's a reason,

and I'm not saying there's that many out there, but people might be compelled, without a snapper grouper permit, to target them, and that's a huge sticking point, and I would not want to remove it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I was going to say the same thing. We don't really think of the rock hind and the red hind, the hinds, as much, but I'm going to tell you something. In the past season, we have caught more than we did in five years put together, and we're not talking about some of these -- We used to catch like really little fish, and Tom will probably tell you the same thing, and the ones that we're catching now are not little fish, comparatively speaking, but we're catching them every single trip, and I will guarantee you, at the end of the year, if you go back, and we get the Science Center to pull numbers just on those hinds, that you're going to see a stark increase in them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to say that, you know, I talked to our staff about this option and everything, and we were -- I don't know if we're at the point where we can just say considered and rejected, or keep it in for more discussion, but I just -- I don't -- I think making these an ecosystem component species would be a mistake, for several reasons, like I think Kerry and Tim and everybody was saying, and they're not necessarily targeted, but they're caught in that group, in that group of groupers.

Talking to our guys that sample the fish house, they were actually saying that they don't see them often, and, granted, this is up in Carteret County and not in Tim's area, but they didn't see them often, but they would see them, and, even now, they're seeing them less, and so our thinking, in discussing it with our staff, is all the other groupers are kind of going down the hill, and it's probably safe, and I'm sorry to say assume, but I think it's safe to assume that these are probably experiencing the same mortalities and declines, and I just -- I feel very strongly that this should not even be considered for an EC species, and I think we should consider it in the ACL. I have no idea how hard it would be to get an ACL for this, but I think, with the nature of how our groupers are going, this would be a mistake to remove any management on them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Judy.

MS. HELMEY: We are seeing a lot of them too, a lot of the species that we never saw before, like these -- In fact, I called them a different thing for a long time, but we're seeing -- We're catching some of them now, some of the biggest ones that I have ever seen, and I could actually take you to a ledge where there would be more of those than regular grouper, and it really might be because there is less grouper there, and maybe they would move to another area, but I think they're going to end up being an important species, before it's over with.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I just wanted to reiterate some of what Tim and Judy said. These rock hinds and red hinds and graysby are becoming a really important component in a lot of our catches, and there are a lot more of them, and I don't know where they came from, but it's really interesting, and it's also -- When we look at it from a complex standpoint, you know, as a for-hire fisherman

recreationally, they really kind of influence your fishing behavior, right, in how you strategy your shallow-water bag limit, and so I think it's really important that we retain at least the spawning season closure on that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: So it sounds like we're reaching consensus to keep the complex together and not remove it to EC species, and so let's remove Action 8a from the document.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we've had a suggestion, based on this discussion, to remove Action 8a, which would be considering these species as ecosystem component. Are we all good with that? All right. I see heads nodding yes. Okay.

MS. IBERLE: Okay, and so we had some more bullets on just considering of what would happen if you took those species out of the aggregate bag limit and discards through the spawning season closure, but it seems like the consensus is we can kind of scoot right past that.

We were talking a little bit more about the breakdown of that ACL, which right now, including yellowmouth, is around 104,000, and, as you can see, that yellowmouth portion is around 4 percent, and so that's what is getting removed, and so you can kind of see the breakdown of each species within that complex.

8b is kind of the flip side of the coin, and so we have to -- We have to move forward in modifying that OSASWG ACL if we're not considering designation, which, right now, it doesn't sound like we are, and so from there, we need to think about what we would do with that ACL. We have kind of mocked up, and I kept these as options, because, at this point, we just needed a little bit more discussion, but this is how the IPT was thinking that this would look with tying in those allocations and not modifying those complex allocations and only updating the ACL.

Again, we don't really have numbers right now, but this is how your options, or alternatives, table would look, but the things to consider, and I will note, really quickly, that what is highlighted in yellow in this version -- I incorrectly labeled this SSC report, and so the years, and what is highlighted in yellow, is correct, but I just wanted to make sure that that wasn't confusing.

The SSC previously recommended OSASWG ACLs be revised in the unassessed species amendment, which, currently, we haven't yet started, and so the updated ABC for the OSASWG complex that was previously developed by the unassessed workgroup in 2020 was developed using both the third-highest and ORCS, and so the third-highest method is no longer considered BSIA, and so the SSC would need to develop a new method for updating this ACL.

The IPT has had discussions about the timeline on this, and this is where it gets a little hairy, and so we likely wouldn't have those until September or December of 2024, and so we're thinking about the deadline that we're on for scamp and yellowmouth, and the other discussion that we had previous to this was either removing yellowmouth in a simple subtraction of CHTS landings or doing this separately, and both of those don't seem like a viable option at this point, and so we're kind of running up against a little bit of a timing issue that we would like to get more discussion on.



Table 16 shows you essentially what we have right now, and so this table shows you the ABC values, but these are based off of the third-highest, or ORCS, and so I guess what we would need is to discuss the options for proceeding with modifying the OSASWG complex and provide guidance to staff, and then I have a reminder about the purpose and need. The IPT will modify that, after this meeting and give you an updated version in December, but I just wanted to make sure that you guys know that that will be edited, and so, with that, I will turn it over.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Why can't you just take the 4,040 pounds of yellowmouth grouper and move it over to scamp and just -- That seems so simple, but, to me, that seems like the thing you would do, and then that would lower your total ABC for the rest of the collection of fish, but why do we try to make things hard all the time, when sometimes it seems like they could be simple?

MS. IBERLE: Shep, correct me if I'm wrong, and the issue there was you would be putting an amendment through rulemaking based off of CHTS -- An ACL that was originally based from CHTS recreational landings, and, therefore, you would be implementing something that isn't technically considered BSIA under Magnuson.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep and then Tim.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. That's right, and I would say the only thing is I would caveat it somewhat that it's not -- It hasn't been considered best available, and it is not generally best available, but that's always a case-by-case decision, and I would say, of the things that we're considering in this amendment, this is the one, to me, that seems most implicated by the pilot study, potentially, the changes to FES, because you're switching from CHTS to FES, and there has already been some discussion about, you know, do we really need to do that, and, in this context, can we not stay with CHTS, and so I will just put that out there, and, whatever the decision is, we have to build the record for why whatever the council's preferred alternative is is consistent with the best available scientific information, because, eventually, that's the standard that the rule, and the amendment, are going to be subject to, and the question is is an ACL in CHTS going to be based on the best available? Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Well, which, to me, comes back to -- You know, I had this discussion yesterday with Clay, that, you know, it's fairly easy for them to transfer currency back and forth from CHTS to FES, and they're doing it currently right now, and, you know, we have every single recreational stock that comes in right now is coming in in FES numbers, but it's being monitored in CHTS, and so I don't see any reason why we can't do exactly what Laurilee said and go ahead and convert the currency right now and then put it over there. Then maybe we can decide who gets it, the recreational or the commercial sector.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: If CHTS is all we have right now, then I would say -- I would personally think that's BSIA.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Well, I mean, my only correction to that is it's not the only thing we have. It's available, and you don't have an ABC recommendation from your SSC that's based on FES, but the FES data that would inform that recommendation are absolutely available.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim, and then we're going to Jeff.

MR. GRINER: Well, I think we do have an ABC based on FES for scamp, and that's what this whole SEDAR just did, and it is based on FES. I don't see why we can't take the yellowmouth portion of it and convert it over to FES, and then it will fit in there just perfectly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm going to go to Jeff in our last minute of the committee, before we stop to go to public comment.

DR. BUCKEL: Just to remind you that, in our April 2023 meeting, and I reported out in June, and we had this question posed to us from you, and here was our response. Remove the yellowmouth ABC from the shallow-water grouper complex total ABC and retain MRIP-CHTS units for remaining species in the complex until the unassessed stocks workgroup convenes to come up with new ABCs using MRIP-FES units, and so I don't know if that satisfies Shep or not, but that --

MR. GRIMES: Well, I would just -- I mean, that's great, but you've still got to get it through the agency, and I think that's competing science that could be a different outcome, maybe.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. To be continued, and I am going to pass it over to our Chair, and we're probably going to be taking a break right now, so that we can go to public comment.

DR. BELCHER: Public comment starts at 4:00, and so we're in recess, at that point, for public comment, and we will come back in here tomorrow at 8:30 and continue with Snapper Grouper. Be back at the table at 4:00 for public comment.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on September 13, 2023.)

- - -

SEPTEMBER 14, 2023

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Snapper Grouper Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Town and Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Thursday, September 14, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're still in scamp and friends, and so I think we're on the final item in there though, but, Allie, can you scroll back to the top, so we can see what the topic is there? Okay. Revise the total annual catch limit, annual optimum yield, and sector annual catch limit for the

other South Atlantic shallow-water grouper complex, and so let me try to remind us where we were when we left off yesterday.

We were debating how to do this, after looking at that pie chart, and I think, after other discussions kind of on the side here, that maybe what Laurilee had suggested yesterday might actually be the best path here, and so I believe that Laurilee was suggesting that, if you -- Allie, can you scroll back to the pie chart one more time? Right there. I think that the path that Laurilee was suggesting is why can't we just kind of pull out that yellowmouth grouper pie here and then recalculate, and is that the best way to explain it? Allie, do you want to try to explain it a little bit better?

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and so, essentially, we're faced with a situation where we removed yellowmouth in the first action on this amendment, and so we have to remove that yellowmouth portion. I'm going to scroll down to Table 15, and so what, Laurilee, I think you were suggesting would be to take out that, I think it's four-thousand-and-change pounds, from the ACL, and your ABC would remain unchanged, since the ACL and ABC are set equal to each other right now, and you would not be modifying sector allocations, and so then the only thing that would change would be the total ACL and then the respective commercial and recreational ACL, and so you would just run that new total through those allocation percentages, and then the ACL would remain based off of CHTS recreational estimates, and so I guess I want to just get some final discussion of if that was the path forward and that we can do is the IPT can kind of flesh that out and bring it back to you as an action, with alternatives, in December.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Allie said it better, and so what do we think about that? I know it's a little early. Tim.

MR. GRINER: So you're going to convert that to FES numbers? Why can we not do that?

MS. IBERLE: So, because these species are unassessed, and Chip is coming, I think, and so he will take it right over.

DR. COLLIER: There's a couple of different reasons. I mean, we could change them over immediately, and there are numbers, right, but the problem is we won't have an ABC for those. In order to develop an ABC, we need to get revised estimates of the recreational landings, and it's going to be a little bit more than what we've done in the past.

Given that MRIP has had a microscope on them, using PSEs of over 50 percent is a bit more of a question now, and so we need to revise the recreational estimates, to make sure that the PSEs are at acceptable levels, and so we're going to need to get new data streams for the recreational values, to make sure that they are at an acceptable precision, and then, once we get those, then we can develop -- Then the SSC can develop an ABC recommendation for that. All of this is going to take time, and so we do have requests, in order to get the recreational data streams that are acceptable, and then, once we get those, then we can take that information to the SSC and start creating the unassessed ABCs, but it's not going to be immediate.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Another question, while you're up here, Chip, and so what we're suggesting here, that's consistent with what Jeff was explaining yesterday that the SSC was suggesting here for this topic, right?

DR. COLLIER: That's correct.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Hi, and, unfortunately, this is Mr. Grimes' issue, and he's not -- Well, that's not unfortunate. What's unfortunate is that he's not able to be with you this morning, but I have a question, and maybe you could remind me, Chip, and I think Shep had a different point of view on this, that we weren't able to talk about before this meeting, but didn't the SSC give ABC recommendations for unassessed species in FES numbers in the past? I think it's kind of old, but don't we have that information?

DR. COLLIER: I think they have provided those in the past. Obviously, they've changed since then, and there's also -- We have these new concerns with the bias that was presented on Monday by Dr. Cody with the FES numbers, and so everything is in flux right now, but, yes, I believe they were provided, and I don't know if that was just for the APAIS adjustments or it was a full FES changeover, and so there's several different pieces that have occurred, and I would have to go back and look to see exactly what the changes were at that point.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So you need to make sure you've got an adequate record as to why those are not being addressed and pulled into this amendment. Mr. Grimes might have other feelings, when we get to the IPT process, but that's just something to keep in mind.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica. I think, Andy, you had your hand up.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I am generally supportive of this approach. I did mention to Monica, yesterday, in kind of a side conversation, whether or not we even needed to change the catch limit and whether this would kind of be considered a *de minimis* change in the overall catch limit.

In looking at yellowmouth grouper MRIP landings, right, and so take it with a grain of salt, because I just kind of quickly pulled the data query, yellowmouth have not been reported in like a decade to the MRIP survey, right, and so they could be, obviously, misidentified as scamp, and we don't know that, but, ultimately, at the end of the day, this may not be contributing to any catches that are going against the catch limit currently, and so I would like, I think, the IPT to explore the idea of whether or not this could be a viable option and whether we would even need to change the catch limit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Great point. Allie is going to type that on the board there as direction to staff.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Just one more point for updating these things. You know, keep in mind that the SSC has been interested in looking at unassessed species, and updating those ABCs, for some time, you know, particularly in response to the revised MRIP numbers that happened a number of years ago, and the process they've been working through on that was to first update the ABC control rule, which they've done, and that amendment has been submitted, and then, once that's approved, they would move into actually developing the new ABCs, and so that's been something that's been part of our workplan for four or five years, you know, and so that has been a long-standing intent of the council.

I's just that, you know, this situation came in with these unassessed species being part of this complex, and the issue with these two stocks, and I think this sort of falls into one of those things where my recollection of earlier discussions is, you know, we recognized that we couldn't hold on this amendment while we waited for those new ABCs to come in, and so it totally fits in the other criteria that Shep often tells us, that you can't wait for information that you're going to get in the future and not act on this now.

We're kind of in a temporary unfortunate situation, where, as much as we would like to update those things to the FES, the reality that it's more difficult to do that, given the timing of information, and I also think there's -- You know, while we've done that for some past stocks, as we've gotten so far from the CHTS, and implementing the FES, there's been a lot less willingness to go back and do those calibrations using that data that may be a decade old now, and so I think that's also part of the hesitancy to give us maybe a conversion now that we might have gotten five years ago, and so there are a lot of factors, and so I think it's been really good to get this on the record and let the IPT get all of those points in there, because I don't feel like we have much alternative either.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and then the bullet, the second bullet, that Allie added there -- It looks like it captures what Andy was suggesting.

MS. IBERLE: Okay, and so that wraps us up for scamp and yellowmouth at this meeting, and, at the next meeting, hopefully we'll have a little bit more numbers in there to show you, and we will have some of these actions fleshed out, and so that does it for scamp, and so are you good to switch over to yellowtail?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. IBERLE: All right. Give me one second.

MR. STRELCHECK: We're not leaving scamp and friends quite yet. I know the IPT, at this point, has not recommended consideration of management measures, and I don't know if, Allie, you could speak to that. One of my concerns is we are dramatically reducing the catch limits, and we have an eight-month season for recreational, and the commercial potentially is going to bump-up against their catch limit, and catch it very quickly, and so can you talk to us about, you know, any investigation of management measures and whether we need to be looking at options that would either avoid or reduce the likelihood of long closures?

MS. IBERLE: To be honest with you, the complexity of this amendment, and the kind of process of new complex OSASWGs, has kind of kept us pretty busy, and so we haven't had too many discussions on that, and so I guess, if the council prefers to have some actions, or wanted to look at some actions, that introduce management measures, the IPT can definitely take a look at that.

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't have any recommendations today, and I think what I would ask is if you could bring back in December kind of an assessment of what the implications are of reducing the catch limit and when we would project maybe the recreational catch limit and commercial catch limit to be met, based on kind of current fishing activities.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Allie is capturing that. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I think Andy is absolutely right. I mean, this will make no sense, to have an unlimited commercial trip limit to share 84,000 pounds of fish, and so we're going to have to look at some fairly low trip limits with this stuff, for all of us, and that's the only way it's going to work.

MS. IBERLE: The other thing that I want to note, and I know this came up, and I apologize, because I forget, off the top of my head, how this will work, but scamp and yellowmouth currently have a twenty-inch size limit, and they're part of that aggregate bag limit, and so I believe the way -- Monica, correct me if I'm wrong, but, if those weren't modified, they would still be in place, with the new complex, but correct me.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I would have to look at the aggregate bag limit regulations, but, normally, unless we change something, what's in place now will stay in place, and so I imagine they would stay -- If your question is would they stay in the aggregate bag limit, and would they stay in that sort of thing, yes, unless we change it.

MS. IBERLE: So then that would mean that you would still have -- Unless you modified it, you would still have the bag limit and the size limit for scamp and yellowmouth, because it already applies to those species where they are now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do you need to make a note of that, as direction to staff, that that needs to be clear in the amendment, that that is either still going to apply, or Monica is going to tell us that it doesn't, and we need to address it some other way, but, I guess, ultimately, coming back and asking the council what is the intent, and is the intent to keep those regs in place or change them.

MS. IBERLE: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. While Allie is typing, Nik is going to come up here.

MR. MEHTA: Thanks, Jessica. The first bullet over there, for direction to staff, I'm a little confused, because yellowmouth is -- Action 1 already took care of that, and yellowmouth and scamp are already combined, with the new complex, and we're setting up ACLs and all that up ahead, or earlier, in the document, and so what we doing with this bullet?

MS. IBERLE: So that action only deals with creating the scamp and yellowmouth complex. A separate action would be modifying that OSASWG ACL, and so Action 1 didn't deal with ACLs, and it only modified that complex, and then we would be coming back and saying that, after this complex is created, then we would be modifying the ACL of the complex that was altered through that action.

MR. MEHTA: I guess what I'm saying is yellowmouth is already out of this, and there's only five species left, and so this bullet shouldn't be including yellowmouth, and yellowmouth is already up ahead, in earlier actions, and we are creating the complex for those two species, right, and then we are changing the ACL already in those earlier actions, and yellowmouth is already part of that, and so this would only apply to those remaining five OSASWGs without yellowmouth, correct?

MS. IBERLE: Correct, and I think we can talk about it, you know, not here, about like how the process -- You know, I think the general direction was that that's the approach that we wanted to use to modify the OSASWG ACL, and so I think we can -- If it needs to go in a different action, that's something we can do on the backend. I think this is more just the process part of it.

MR. MEHTA: Thank you. The last question is am I correct in assuming that the council feels, as of now, that we retain these five species in CHTS units and not update them now, or are we still open to that discussion? That is the suggestion? Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Thanks for the clarification there.

MS. IBERLE: All right. Yellowtail. Okay. The same thing as scamp, and I started off by putting in those three items that we talked about in Full Council, and I added some bullets in here to kind of help facilitate the discussion on this one. However, I wanted to start by kind of going over what our original plan was for what we wanted you guys to get done for this amendment at this meeting, so that you kind of know that before you start talking about this.

The Gulf reviewed this amendment and gave you guys some feedback, and they really kind of looked at Action 1, that jurisdictional allocation, and, in between their meeting and this meeting, the IPT built out Chapter 4 of your draft amendment, and we summarized effects for Action 1 only, and so you have all the information there to pick a preferred, potentially, for Action 1, which is that jurisdictional allocation.

The other thing that we tried to summarize -- This, obviously, has had -- So we've run into some data issues with this one, and some discussion about that happened at the Gulf, and so what we tried to do was really summarize those data issues, show you what's been done by the IPT and others that have been helping us with it, and kind of try to really lay that out and tell you guys where we're at with that, and then my plan was to have you just review the South Atlantic and Gulf ACL actions and your allocation action and just kind of have some discussion on this, keep them in the back of your mind, but not pick preferreds.

That's kind of what was our original plan for this amendment, going into this meeting, and so, as far as the FES discussion goes, with this one, you have two allocations that are going to be based off of that FES data, your jurisdictional allocation, and so, when you were given the assessment, you were given a stock ABC, and so, essentially, you're taking that stock pie and you're dividing it between the regions, and then the South Atlantic will further divide it by sectors, and so you have a sector allocation and a jurisdictional.

As far as deadlines go, yellowtail is not overfished or experiencing overfishing. However, I put a little bit about your assessment history in here, because I think it's relevant, and so the current catch levels are reflective of SEDAR 27A, which was completed in 2012. The stock was assessed in SEDAR 64 in 2020. However, the amendment was paused, because there concerns over the terminal year being too far in the past.

Then that prompted an interim analysis, which was completed in 2022, and that used data through 2020, and so just think about that and how you've gone through several assessments now and haven't implemented catch levels, and so just keep that in mind as you're thinking about that, and, with that, I will turn it over.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Allie. Let me try to get the discussion started here. Once again, yellowtail snapper is one of the stock assessments that's done by FWC-FWRI, and you can see here that they've done a couple of stock assessments, including updating a stock assessment here recently, to try to change that final year of data, so that it was more recent, but, based on the discussion that happened at the mutton snapper stock assessment, when there was a comparison between the State Reef Fish Survey and the FES numbers, and there was just the back-of-the-envelope calculation on that, it looked like there was about a 40 percent difference between the State Reef Fish Survey and the FES numbers, and so my suggestion here, since there aren't really any burning issues on yellowtail snapper, would be to put this back in line for FWC-FWRI to do another assessment and focus primarily on the State Reef Fish Survey data, which is kind of what is happening with mutton.

Right now, in line, if you don't remember from the SEDAR Committee, for FWC, mutton is underway, and hogfish is right after that, and then black grouper, but that's suggested to be done not by our analysts, but maybe through an MSE, through a third-party, and then yellowtail would get in line after it, and so my suggestion would be that we just put this back through the process and bring in the State Reef Fish Survey data. This is primarily a Florida fishery, and I think it would help to look at the information using the State Reef Fish Survey. That's just my suggestion, and I don't know what other folks' thoughts are on this. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, while you're thinking about what Jessica just said, I think you have a legal problem by waiting, and the problem is that your current annual catch limit that's on the books is higher than the ABC that's recommended by your SSC, and so the Magnuson Act says you can't have, essentially, a catch limit that's higher than what is recommended by your SSC, and so you've got that issue to deal with, and, if you wait, this legal problem just persists, and it violates the Act, in a sense, and so we need to talk about how that factors into waiting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So even though there is no deadlines, and it's not overfished, and it's not undergoing overfishing, there is some deadline out there with which we would need to bring in a new number.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right. I mean, when we talk about deadlines, it's an interesting way to think about things, because we're so used to that two-year deadline, where, if something is overfished, you have to get a rebuilding plan in place within two years and that sort of thing, but, you know, the Magnuson Act contains a lot of other limits to it that don't necessarily say you have to do this particular thing by a certain time period, but certainly the Act says that you shall not, in a sense, and those are my words and not the Act, but you should not -- You can't set a catch limit higher than the recommendation from -- The catch level recommendation from your SSC.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

Ms. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Monica. I was thinking about what advice you gave us the other day, and I think you read it straight from the Act, where you were talking about -- It was sort of towards the end of the amendment development process and new information became available, and, you know, you may, or should, react to it, and I wonder if this sort of triggers, or rises to the level of new information available, and that's my first question.



My second question is can we send this back to the SSC and ask them sort of -- Does the concern we have about the FES numbers, especially in this case, knowing we have a good data stream, and it's not like we're waiting for new information, and we have a great data stream that's good to replace it with, and so we're not trying to delay, and we're just trying to get it right, and is that allowed and keep us out of legal trouble?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So what I referred to, and I guess it was on Monday, is the guidelines for National Standard 2, which says you should use the best scientific information available, and that uses the word "drastic", and so I will read that to you, and so think about whether this is a drastic change.

FMPs must take into account the best scientific information available at the time of preparation. Between the initial drafting and its submission for final review, new information often becomes available. This new information should be incorporated into the final FMP, where practicable, but it's unnecessary, and here's the language that you should focus on, but it's unnecessary to start the FMP process over again, unless the information indicates that drastic changes have occurred in the fishery that might require revision of the management objectives or measures.

What I heard, earlier this week, was that there was a pilot study done that showed that there could be changes to the FES information, and I won't try to summarize that at all, but I don't know that you have, before you, enough on the record to say this is a -- That pilot study shows this is a drastic change in the information for yellowtail snapper, such that we need to stop, and so what I've heard so far, to me, doesn't rise to the level of drastic information.

To your other question, could you go back to the SSC, you always have that prerogative, I think, to go back to the SSC and ask them to look at something. I mean, they're your advisors, and so you can ask them those questions, and you will get an answer from them, whether you like the answer or not, but they will respond, and so I think you do have that possibility.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would say that -- So I know, in the Gulf, they waited and reran a couple of assessments, and Gulf gag is the one that I'm thinking of, and took that stock assessment and put it back and reran it with State Reef Fish Survey, Gulf Reef Fish Survey, data, and I think we're suggesting the same thing here, and that there's another primarily south Florida species here where this new FES, when we looked at these things side-by-side for mutton, indicated that there was a 40 percent difference.

I would say it's pretty significant, you know, between these differences, at least for mutton, between the FES and the State Reef Fish Survey data, and so it just seems like it would be best for us to bring that data in here, not just as a sensitivity run, but to focus on that State Reef Fish Survey data.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: To that, do you want to ask those questions of your SSC?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know what the question though is that we're asking them, and I guess that's what my point is, is I don't know what we would be telling them, and we're asking them permission to bring in a new data stream, and I just don't understand what the question is. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, first, I am going to caveat this, and I'm kind of indifferent to the decision here, but what I will say is I think what you're really asking them is whether or not they're willing to withdraw their ABC recommendation, and that would be the first question, and the rationale behind it would be what you've kind of laid out, in terms of the State Reef Fish Survey, as well as the preliminary FES pilot results and the fact that the MRIP-FES estimates may change a year or two from now.

The one concern, or the main concern, I had with the way you laid it out, which is different than Gulf gag, is that, when we incorporated the State Reef Fish Survey, it happened very quickly after the MRIP assessment was completed, and you're kind of saying, well, it will get in line, but it might be three or four species down the line, and, to me, if we're going to do this, we should probably put it at the front of the line, and prioritize it, in order to quickly move forward with this change.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I would need to talk to Dr. Barbieri, who is back there talking to Clay right now, about the timing of this, because I believe that the lead analyst on mutton is the same lead analyst for yellowtail, and so then are we suggesting to pause mutton, or are we suggesting that this analyst try to complete both at the same time, and are we going back through the entire stock assessment process, meaning the review workshop -- You know, the data workshop, the review workshop, et cetera, but I appreciate the feedback of the timing there.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just to add, you know, we do, obviously, have a recent yellowtail assessment, and so we are -- We would be changing the landings data stream, the discard data stream, and I'm not sure what other changes would be required. Obviously, when you insert new data into a model, the model fit might change, and it requires some additional work, but it might be actually more simplistic to try to do it sooner rather than later, and so it would be good to kind of get that information, but, you know, with Kerry's suggestion, I think it's certainly within the council's purview to go back to the SSC and ask if they would be willing to reconsider it, given the information before us. Whether they do or not is still the question, and we would get advice then in December as to how we would have to proceed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then I'm good with doing that, to ask the SSC if they would be willing to withdraw this ABC. In the meantime, I will work with Dr. Barbieri and his staff and try to figure out some timing, and I might be able to have that ready for Full Council, but, otherwise, we could come back with that answer in December. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: We can continue to build the record, but I do want to emphasize that this is a little bit different than some of the species we're dealing with, and it's not undergoing overfishing, and it's not overfished, and we're not trying to work around the system here. We're just looking at the options before us, and I think this is one that fits into your motion the other day, and it could be something that we don't have to act on right now, but we could create a new path forward for it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So, just procedurally, because it's a joint stock, is this something that has to be discussed with the Gulf as well?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and Andy is nodding yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It's probably important to note, since the issue came up with the SSC in their recommendations, is that, you know, the SSC hasn't had a meeting since this revelation about MRIP came out, since this pilot study came out, and they are getting a presentation on it at their meeting in October, but, you know, the idea that we haven't asked the SSC if the outcome of this pilot study would lead them to change any of their ABC recommendations, and any of their opinions regarding stock assessments that they've looked at, you know, and so they've given us the recommendations that they've given us, and now this has come out, and we really just don't know, and they may or may not. I don't know if it would give them heartburn with some of these other recent assessments or not.

I think yellowtail, to me, is really an interesting study, because the pilot that was done did include Florida, and you have the reef fish survey from the State of Florida that shows results consistent with what the pilot shows, and so you've got some, you know, multiple points of evidence that suggests there's at least some validity to those findings for species in Florida.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Right, but I want to be clear that the pilot is generalized in saying there's a 30 to 40 percent reduction, and it is not an equivalent 30 to 40 percent across all the states, right, and so I think that's the caution here, and I think the other emphasis that I would want to place is we're not saying SRFS or MRIP is right or wrong at this point, just because one is higher or lower, right, and we do, obviously, have the pilot study that says that MRIP might be biased high, but, just because there's a difference, it doesn't make one right or wrong.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree with everything that you're saying, which is why I was surprised when we looked at that analysis on mutton, that there was a 40 percent difference, and so it leads me to believe, since this is another south Florida species, that there is likely to be a difference, and I'm not saying that it's equivalent to 40 percent, but just that I think we need to go back and do our due diligence here and bring in those numbers and look at this.

So we've provided some direction to staff here, and you've heard that this has to go not only back to our SSC, but it would have to go back to the Gulf SSC, and are we good with this direction? I am looking around the table, and this kind of goes back to what we were discussing on Monday with looking at each one of these species and the stock assessment, et cetera, and figuring out the next steps, in light of this new information. Mel.

MR. BELL: I think just everything that you and Andy and John just covered makes sense to me. It's a reasonable approach to take, and I think you've got some stuff where you're building the record here on why we're doing it, and, again, it is a Florida-dominant fishery, and so it's a little unique, and realizing Andy's point is that the 30 to 40 percent thing isn't all states, but maybe it is more prone to be Florida, and so, I mean, it sounds logical to me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm sure this is captured within your thoughts, but you can ask your SSC to reconsider, but it's the Gulf's SSC too, as you said, and it's a joint ABC, and so you would

be also asking the Gulf Council to ask their SSC to do the same thing, and so, unless this gets separated, this amendment gets separated out, you're kind of -- You're joined, right, and so you would want the Gulf to do the same thing. To the extent you can capture all of that in a nice summary form, that's the best way to present it to the Gulf Council as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that's how it reads right now, is ask the SSCs, plural, Gulf and South Atlantic Council, and so if you want to look at what's on the screen there, and I think we've captured it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, and just to make sure that you're not asking the Gulf SSC, because they don't advise you, and so you're asking the Gulf Council to ask their SSC, essentially, and I just want to make sure that we're not crossing over any lines, so that the Gulf understands exactly what you're doing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair. Just to remind the council too, there's another layer to the process. As with gag grouper in the Gulf, where we did eventually use the SRFS survey for management advice, but there was a calibration needed back in time, which means an extra layer of review, and that's a fairly fast process, but we do need to make sure that we do that, if we're going to use SRFS for any other assessment, especially where it's predominantly east coast, and it's a little bit different than the Gulf coast, and so the transition team is positioned to do that, and I think it's a fairly quick process, but I just wanted to remind the council that, whenever we consider a different currency, there is that level of review that goes to the transition team that's needed. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Clay. All right. Any other discussion on this? Are people okay with this direction? Bob.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I don't know if what I'm about to say helps or complicates the issue, but I want to offer something for your consideration, and that is that I intend to offer a motion at the Gulf Council meeting next month that adds an alternative to Action 1 that eliminates the allocation regionally on yellowtail, and, effectively, that means working under a stock ACL.

I think there is a number of reasons for that, and the biological ones are fairly obvious. The stock is in good shape, and has been in good shape for years, and the catch levels, at least composite, are well below the ACL, and have been for years, but there's a couple of reasons, issues, that you've discussed this week, and we talked about streamlining, and having an allocation for a species that's not under pressure seems totally unnecessary, to me, and, by eliminating it, you're effectively streamlining a whole lot of effort between two councils, and two staffs, and SERO. Additionally, by eliminating the allocation, you remove the FES mess bugaboo, and it's just limited to catch limits, and so I think it warrants and consideration, and I throw it out for your consideration. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Bob. What Bob is talking about was in a previous iteration of this, and I believe, after the last stock assessment, they talked about combining the ACL. Ultimately, it was removed from the document, but, also, we stopped work on that particular amendment, and

so I think it's fine to talk about it again once this document is picked back after the whole assessment conundrum here. Any more discussion on this? Are we good with this direction? All right. Thanks for that discussion. Let's take a five-minute break, so we can switch staff, and we're going to go into black sea bass next.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: Come on back to the table. We're going to get going here.

DR. BELCHER: Just an order of business, and I've received a request to be mindful of your sidebar conversations, because, even though two people off to the side doesn't seem to think it's impacting, there's a couple of others that go around, and the acoustics kind of get a little bit overwhelming, relative to the speakers on the mics, and so people are getting a little bit of the conversation muddled, and so, if you do need to have a conversation, can you at least move it to the hallway, so it's a little less interfering with what we've got for conversation, and we greatly appreciate that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Madam Chair. We are going to dive into black sea bass, and I believe first up is Jeff is going to give us some recommendations from the SSC.

DR. BUCKEL: Thank you, Chair. While Mike is bringing up the presentation, just to remind everyone that I presented the results of the stock assessment in June, and also the recommendation for projections, and we were expecting to get those results of the projections in our July webinar, but the analysts had more questions for us about those projections, and so I'm going to give a brief presentation on those.

Matthew Vincent, from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, did this assessment, and we had asked for projections, and he came back, during our July webinar, and asked for guidance on the following: the years to calculate the current  $F$ , how to fit the model to landings and discards for the projections, methods to calculate  $F_{0.1}$ , the choice of  $MSY$  proxy, and how to address changing reference points if landings and discards are separated in those projections.

This was a lot to dive into for a one-day webinar, and so we decided to move forward with a technical working group, and so the additional guidance requested by the Center requires more in-depth discussion and review. Given the implications of the many decisions requested for this assessment, and this will also impact future assessments, because we're going to have this issue with separating landings and discards, the SSC recommended a technical workgroup to evaluate approaches to handle harvest and dead discards when selecting proxies, associated reference points, and impacts of these decisions on catch projections.

I will give you a heads-up on the timeline of this. Judd and I were just talking this morning about the initial meeting, and Erik Williams and Matthew Vincent think that this will take about three hours, and so we're going to schedule a three-hour webinar for this workgroup, and that's going to happen in the next two weeks, and then, once we're done with that technical workgroup, we'll provide the guidance to the analysts, the analysts will then conduct projections this fall, there will be a preliminary assessment report that will be presented to us, hopefully, at our October SSC meeting, the full SSC meeting, and then we'll have a follow-up meeting, if necessary, in November, and then the final black sea bass stock assessment review will take place by the full

SSC in January/February of 2024, and that's, again, for these projections, and we've reviewed the assessment, but to get you catch levels.

The workgroup members of this technical workgroup are going to include Erik Williams and Matthew Vincent, and we have four SSC members, all of which are stock assessment scientists, and so that will be helpful for this technical workgroup, and then members of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, including Judd and Mike Schmidtke and Chip Collier, and that's it, and I would be happy to answer any questions, and so we don't have catch levels quite yet, but hopefully we'll have them in January or February, by your March meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Jeff. Questions for Jeff here on this? I see some puzzled looks, and so are the questions? Tim.

MR. GRINER: So, yes, and I don't know if I'm going to ask this right or not, but so, in March, when you come back, will we have projections that show, as we've done it in the past, where there's just an ABC, and that ABC -- The allocation percentages get applied to it, and then we'll also have two separate ABCs that include the discards, and then the discards will be taken out of each sector?

DR. BUCKEL: That's a good question, and so I think the technical workgroup -- That's something that they will talk about, and there will definitely be the ABC that will just be catch, and so that's -- In the past, what we've assumed is we move forward with, you know, the projections on catch, and then we assume that the discards are going to -- We're in a rebuilding schedule, and so there's a reduction in catch, and we assume that there's going to be a reduction in the landings, but also a reduction in the discards, and we know, right, from past experience, that we don't get that reduction in discards, and it's either going to be stable, or maybe even increase, and so the SSC, for these projections, knowing the high discards in black sea bass, asked for the discards -- For that fishing mortality to remain constant in the projections and to not decrease proportionally with the landings, and so that's going to be the difference in these projections, versus how it's been done in the past.

MR. GRINER: Okay, and so what we want to see is the ability to have that projection and then separate the projection out and take each sector's discards, so that each sector is taking their own discards off, and compare that to the other, to the way we were doing it.

DR. BUCKEL: Yes, and, again, we'll see how this technical workgroup decides to proceed, and then, if it's a projection of discards, then how that gets divvied up, and that's maybe a council decision, but Chip, or John, can -- John is nodding his head.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

DR. BUCKEL: Thanks, Tim.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Tim, the SSC has always given, you know, the fishery-wide totals. They give us the ABC, and the discards associated with the ABC, and the same with the OFL, the OFL and then the discards associated with that, and then the council has its -- The IPT and the staff apply the allocations to that, and that comes in your document that you get, and like the SSC never applies the allocation percentages say to the ABC to get the ACLs, but, you know, what you're talking about is having the discards be able to be attributed to each sector, and that's something

that I think the workgroup can get into and consider doing, and it would be a little bit different approach, and it may be different percentages that are used there than are potentially used in the allocation between the two sectors for the landings, right, because, you know, that's based on various other things, and I think you want these discards to be based on, you know, sort of what is happening right now and what has happened in the last few years, and is that right?

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. Good. Thanks.

DR. BUCKEL: So that's helpful guidance for the technical workgroup, and so thank you, Tim.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I guess the one question is, in light of what we've been discussing with FES, how do we get the discussions into what is being proposed with the workgroup at this point in time? I don't know if that's something to put to Jeff, as part of that, or Chip or --

DR. BUCKEL: So the SSC hasn't received the presentation that you received on Monday from MRIP, and so we are going to get that presentation in October, and so maybe the timing, Chip and Judd, and we'll have that presentation before we talk about black sea bass, and so, again, it's hard to -- I don't know, and I can't predict how the SSC is going to take that MRIP presentation, and if they will -- If it will impact decisions on moving forward with black sea bass or other species.

DR. BELCHER: So, sounding like the person who is about to throw a stick in the cogs of the wheel of this process, should we be requesting that the SSC, and this workgroup, postpone until after they get that presentation, because it feels like, if we're going to move forward with projections, and we know that there's a potential, you know, with this going off the rails, and I would hate to see us move a lot forward and to actually have to come back to reengage the process again.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I thought that the workgroup would meet before the SSC meets, and isn't that the order of the schedule?

DR. BUCKEL: Yes, and so the schedule is on the slide there, and so this technical workgroup is going to meet within the next two weeks to provide recommendations to the analysts on how to proceed with the projections, and then the analysts would work on the projections before the October meeting.

DR. BELCHER: So that's my concern, is that we would go forward and we would put work out there, knowing that there's a chance there would be some other things that maybe the SSC would want to see done to address the concerns with the FES.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, but, I mean, I understand the concerns with the FES, but we're not going to have anything to really work off of from these concerns with the FES for quite some time, or am

I misunderstanding something? I mean, this is a pilot study getting ready to start. I mean, is that what you're talking about?

DR. BELCHER: The discussions come down to when we work on whether or not the science is sound for management going forward. It puts some uncertainty into this discussion that we've had before with the way that they've looked at the assessment, and, if they've had concerns about effort and that kind of thing, this might add to that uncertainty, which may change some of the advice that we've gotten from the SSC, and I think that's the reason. It may not change anything, but we feel that the conversation should at least be had, and we're at that stage where the conversation can be had, and that's kind of the way I look at that.

MR. GRINER: Okay. Yes, I mean, I understand having the conversation, but it just seems, to me, that, you know, all of this is based off of a very short pilot study, and now we want to do another pilot study to really dig into it, to see if what this original pilot study was even -- You know, to me, the uncertainty is in the pilot study, right, and so I think it's a conversation worth having, but I just don't -- To me, I'm having a hard time getting my arms around is there really a great level of uncertainty, until we have something that's more certain to tell us it's uncertain, if that makes sense.

DR. BELCHER: So, and, again, I'm not going to dominate, but, again, my concern with it is we come down to there's been a lot of concern voiced around this table about effort estimates, the shore mode in particular, and it impacts the catch levels, which then impacts some of what goes into the assessment, because of how we use recreational landings, based on that effort, tied to the ancillary data that gives us that catch.

Anything that has that potential to say effort is higher than it is, which means the F rate is higher, and maybe we're gimbaling around, and, I mean, obviously, there's other things going on with the stock, and I'm not discounting what's there, but it's just it seems like those conversations need to be had, in light of the fact that this is a recreational fishery, and, you know, what are those potential impacts, moving forward, and so, again, I just think it's one of those things that it's not saying that we need to stop the wheels, but I think we do need to address the fact that there's a higher level of uncertainty with those effort estimates, and is it enough concern that we need to pause and think about how to come at it from a different angle.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We've got a lot of hands up, and I'm going to start over here with John Carmichael, and then I have Clay, Trish, Andy, and Spud.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I was just going to say, like to Carolyn's point about the timing of this, I think that there's a lot of issues with these projections that are not really impacted by the data that's going into them, necessarily, and so I feel like it's probably good for them to do this first meeting and start getting into some of the process-related things. Then they can get that presentation at the SSC, and then they have the follow-up, which is where I would think, you know, we would actually be getting to the point of them having some projections that are getting close to coming to the council table, and so I think, with the multiple meetings, we have the ability to get them started and working with some of the more thorny issues and then respond to the FES, if necessary, at their November meeting, and so I think the timing will work okay.



MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so I'm going to go back to my -- Thank you, John. I'm going to go back to my list here. Clay, you're up next.

DR. PORCH: Thank you. I wanted to remind the council though that most of the catch is north of Florida, and so FES is the only game in town, and what we're talking about here, with the question order business, is really just a scalar change, and so it would be the same change back in time, and that means, as long as you're monitoring in the same currency as you're doing the assessment, there's not going to be much of an effect if you basically increased, or decreased, by even as much as 40 percent, because you would be doing it all through the time series.

Let's say there's a 40 percent decrease in the FES estimates of effort. That's going to translate to a lower ABC from the assessment, and so -- But you're going to be monitoring in a currency that says the catch is lower, and so the net effect, in terms of, you know, what an effective season would be, is going to be about the same, and so I don't think we want to derail any potential progress in this area, and delay, just because there might be a scalar change. Again, the net effect is going to be about the same, as long. As long you assess and monitor in the same currency, you're going to have essentially the same net effect.

The other point I would like to make is, remember from that presentation from the trap video survey, black sea bass is declining precipitously, and so it's another reason we want to be careful about delaying.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm going back to the list. Trish and then Andy and then Spud.

MS. MURPHEY: So I don't know if this is helpful or not, especially after, you know, what John said about timing and getting work going, but this initial meeting, and that's the workgroup, right? I know you've already got three hours scheduled, but why not go ahead and discuss the MRIP issue there, and, that way, at that meeting, and, that way, you can kind of frontload the analysts, if you will, with any kind of need for different analysis that they may need to come at, because everybody is already aware, and I'm sure this workgroup is fully aware of the MRIP pilot.

Go ahead and acknowledge it in this meeting, so that the analysts can, you know, take into account any recommendations, you know, thoughts in there, and so it just -- To me, it doesn't need to be slowed down, but just go ahead and acknowledge it at this initial meeting. They're all aware of it anyway, and that's their job, and so, you know, go ahead and have that discussion at that initial meeting.

DR. BUCKEL: It won't be the full SSC, and it will be that subgroup of folks, but, yes, that could be an additional projection run, but, to Clay's point, it wouldn't -- It's scaled, but that also works for the stock status too, Clay, right, because it's a ratio, and that FMSY is going to change, and so your ratio is going to still show the same stock status, if it's a 40 percent reduction, and so it's a -  
- Yes, we can talk about that with the workgroup, add that to the list. Thanks, Trish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Most of my points have been made, and I just wanted to second what Clay had to say, and then also I agree, and I think the subgroup needs to be move forward. The

information that they're providing for sea bass is going to be relevant for future species that we're managing as well, in terms of how we do projections, and I think it would be helpful if the subgroup could talk about sensitivity runs for black sea bass, in light of the MRIP-FES data, just so that we can kind of share with the council, at future meetings, kind of the implications of whatever the future pilot study results result in, right, and here's what we would expect, in terms of the difference in status determination and ABC and ACL levels.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Spud. All right. Others here, other questions? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think I made a similar point with the FES, and Clay is exactly right that it's a scalar. It's highly unlikely, given the experience with past scalars like this, that your fishing mortality outcomes are going to really change. If a stock is really overfishing, it's going to continue to be overfishing. Where this really comes in is when you're dealing with your biomass. You're scaling to the overall true in-the-world size of the stock, and that's where it becomes more of an issue, in dealing with the relative stuff. If this were just a recreational fishery, and it was just managed by that dataset, then you're going to have a lot of confidence.

Where your management is going to get into some potential issues with this is that you're taking -  
- You know, you're taking the different data streams, the commercial and the recreational, and you put them all together for the MSY and the ABC and all that, and then you back that into shares, based on your allocation percentages, and so you're mixing a potentially biased piece of information with what we consider to be potentially relatively good information, and that's where the issues come up.

In the old days, we didn't manage like this, a lot of times, because we didn't pretend that we could actually scale the populations up in the way that we're forced to do now under Magnuson, and it was pretty common to say, well, you know, you're overfishing by 25 percent, and so cut this sector by 25 percent, based on their data, and cut this other sector by 25 percent in landings, based on their data, and we just often made a simplifying assumption that landings was relative to  $F$ , and, if you cut rec 25 percent, and commercial 25 percent, you hope, in a couple of years, you saw a 25 percent cut overall, and that avoided us getting into these issues with different relative data quality of the two different data streams, and so there's a lot of management that we can still do, but just being aware that there's this potential problem that comes in, and that's why, you know, making changes in allocations is one of the things that's potentially suspected bias, if this bias holds true as you go throughout, but you can still do plenty of things to deal with the overfishing situation and the fishing mortality levels.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay.

DR. PORCH: I just wanted to point out this kind of discussion is exactly why the Gulf made that motion to form a working group to kind of talk through how do we address these sorts of issues, and so I think it would be good if the council entertained joining that group. For instance, what John said is exactly right, and there are ways that you could consider setting allocations in light of that uncertainty, that you don't know exactly the scale of the recreational catch, such as, and I'm just throwing things out there, but you could scale the commercial part of the allocation according to the change in fish biomass, the relative biomass, so that commercial catch goes up or down, and then the recreational would get the remainder of the ABC, but those are things that we would want to talk through and show that it could work, and so I'm not saying do that, but my point is there's

ways that we might be able to deal with this, and we just need to have those conversations, and I think it would be good if we did it in tandem with the Gulf, since there's some common problems there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more questions here for Jeff? All right. Thank you, Jeff, and then I'm going to pass it over to Mike to move into the document.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so, before jumping into the decision document, I'm first going to go over the summary of the ropeless, or on-demand, gear workshop that happened in August, because that comes into play as we get into the decision document. I'm going to give a brief summary over that workshop, and I'm not going to get into all the details, and there's a great amount of detail in this report. The first thing I do want to note is that this is a draft report, and the workgroup is still going through the review process and trying to make sure all the relevant points are captured, but it at least gives you some perspective on what happened in that workshop, but I do want to note that this is draft, and it is subject to change as the review process continues.

The workshop was held August 22 and 23 in Townsend, Georgia. It included commercial fishermen, council members, council staff, representatives from NMFS, from the Southeast Regional Office as well as Protected Resources, Sea Grant staff, and some of the research leads that were working under the exempted fishing permit for ropeless gear.

We began the workshop with several presentations. A lot of these were going into the use and the utility of the on-demand gear, and there were also some discussions about the trials that were conducted under the EFPs, and the results of those, some presentations on the effectiveness of the gear, both in terms of being able to be used to fish for black sea bass as well as avoiding whale entanglements, and then some brief management presentations, as well as a presentation on the most recent stock assessment, giving some description of the current situation of the stock status.

The fishermen that have used the on-demand gear under the EFP, they provided some information on their experiences with the gear, describing its effectiveness, the associated equipment cost, the labor that they need to go through, the training that was needed in order for them to use the gear effectively, and that was one thing that they noted, is they recommended that training be incorporated for fishermen that are newly using this gear, if it continues to move forward.

One of the big, overarching points that was clear, by the end of this meeting, is that there was agreement on all sides, both from the fishermen's perspective as well as the Regional Office and the NMFS folks and the Protected Resources folks, and there was agreement, across-the-board, that the on-demand gear is beneficial for North Atlantic right whale conservation, and it is a useful gear for the commercial fishermen.

Following those introductory presentations and discussions, there was a discussion about the future of on-demand gear, moving forward for that fishery, including desires for incorporating the gear and the fishing methods that are under the EFP right now into the Snapper Grouper FMP and what that would look like. A lot of these discussions are captured in the report, and they will, if we get to that point, be helpful in developing actions and alternatives, but, again, we're kind of giving this in an overarching view right now, before you all direct what your path forward will be.

The fishermen, they want to be able to continue to use the on-demand gear and have access to the nearshore winter black sea bass fishery, or fishing grounds, that are currently closed to rope pots, and they want to be able to have access to those fishing grounds, using that on-demand gear. The access to these fishing grounds provides a greater catch efficiency, not necessarily having to do with anything of the gear itself, but they commented that the -- That's where the fish are at that time of year, and so they're able to fish where the fish are at that time of year that allows them to have a greater efficiency of catch.

There are also, kind of outside of the fishing grounds portion, there are some commercial benefits to the gear itself being used, or made available for us, in that on-demand gear can be marketed as a whale-safe product, and that can come into play when trying to sell fish after the fact, and so the exempted fishing permit expires in April of 2025. The fishermen, ideally, would like no gap in their ability to fish those winter nearshore waters, using the on-demand gear, if possible.

It was noted, within the meeting, that opening a currently closed area to a portion of the fishery would require some more extensive analysis, and this would likely lengthen the amendment process, and this is more than just simply adding an allowable gear to the FMP. There would need to be some type of examination of the catch efficiency versus what the current catch efficiency is and how that would affect the overall harvest for black sea bass.

This very likely would not align with the expiration date for the current FMP, April of 2025. To have an analysis of opening a new area, or opening an area to a new gear, that would probably take some time. It was noted that, if a gap in access to these -- To the winter nearshore fishing grounds is unavoidable, then adding the gear to the FMP, so that it can be used in the current allowable areas for rope pots, is desired by the fishermen. That way, it would be a bit more of a seamless transition when the council is able to more thoroughly evaluate the opening of the area, if the gear was already in place, and that also gives fishermen a bit more flexibility, and a bit more choice, in which type of gear they would like to use, and they might be able to take advantage of that whale-safe marketing type of strategy, and so there is a desire to go ahead and make the gear allowable, even if the grounds are not ideal for what they're looking for.

The next steps for the council at this point, relevant to this action, would be to consider the needs of the commercial fishery and the priority for adding on-demand pots as an allowable gear in the FMP, and, if the council wants to add the gear as allowable under the FMP, then consider the timing and the format of that amendment, to make it happen either within or outside of the context of the recent stock assessment results.

I will remind you that you did initiate an amendment, at your last meeting, to respond to the black sea bass stock assessment, but, as you just heard Jeff describe, there's been some delay in getting the information that's going to be needed to develop that amendment, and so that kind of leaves us where we are right now, and that's highlighted in the decision document that is included, and so I will pause here, to see if there are any questions about the black sea bass workshop, the ropeless gear workshop itself, and I may lean on council members, or other staff that were there, to respond to questions, but I will pause here for those questions, and then we can get into kind of the amendment management questions that will follow-up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Questions. Wes.

MR. TOWNSEND: Out of curiosity, are these pots set overnight, or are they just all manually pulled that day, because I know, like in the Mid-Atlantic, there's a very little drop potters, and, you know, I'm letting my gear sit for ten days, or two weeks, and so I was just curious about that. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: They need to come back to shore at the end of the day. Questions here about this gear, on-demand gear, workshop, or maybe the recommendations from the fishermen that used it, et cetera? Some folks on the council that were there, do you want to add anything? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It was a great workshop, and we absolutely got a lot of information. I'm personally really excited about the gear, and I think that especially the fishermen seem to really want it, and, obviously, cost is still an issue, but that seems to be getting slightly better. I feel like the crux of the issue became, you know, we have competing issues of, yes, all of a sudden, now this area can be safe for the right whales, at the same time that we're having an issue with black sea bass, and so it was sort of hard to have that conversation with folks around the table, to explain that, yes, we know that maybe this area wasn't closed because of a black sea bass problem, and we now have a black sea bass problem, and so we can't just ignore it, and that's sort of where --

We got wrapped-up around that, and then we got wrapped-up around the lag between the really appropriate data that Protected Resources would need to show that this area is safe isn't going to be ready to go along with where we might be in this amendment, in the end of what is the second EFP, and not wanting to do a third one, and so I think, you know, speaking for myself, I left thinking that our best path forward is to just make ropeless gear allowable in the area that is currently allowed, and then we'll deal with the rest later, as Mike said.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that answered a bunch of my questions. Carolyn, I think you were there, and do you want to add anything here?

DR. BELCHER: I had the same conversations that Kerry did, and that was kind of where we were, because, initially, when the conversations were coming up, the idea was this will allow for us to expand the area back, and it's like, well, that's not the cleanest way to go, and, as we went through the conversations, it's easier, for what the ask is, for not affecting -- The analysis doesn't necessarily have the same level that it would have with other substitute gears.

We're not talking about, well, what's the bycatch, because the pot is the pot, and so the efficiency of the gear itself isn't changing, but it's just those potential impacts with protected species are diminished because of the vertical line restrictions, and so that was where, when we were going through the discussions with stakeholders, making sure that they understood that your ask is -- There was a double-level ask initially, and we got them more to understand that they really believe in this gear, and they think it's a great thing for them, again back to the marketing, and so, you know, they want it available as soon as they can possibly have it available for their use.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I saw more hands up. Andy and then Kerry and then Mel and then Laurilee.

MR. STRELCHECK: I appreciate Kerry and Carolyn and others kind of sharing their perspective on the workshop. I got a report-out, and I wasn't at the workshop, and it was very consistent,

obviously, with what you just shared. To me, this is super positive, right, and it's very infrequent that we have alignment between the regulators and fishermen, and we have an opportunity here.

I agree, obviously, with the idea of moving forward with a framework to allow this gear, and I think there's going to be some complexities, in terms of how we allow it in these areas that are now closed, and that might need to be a subsequent action down the road. The other thing I will mention, and I don't know if it was discussed at the workshop, was the Inflation Reduction Act provides us some additional opportunity here.

The agency is receiving some funding support for on-demand gear throughout the eastern seaboard, and the Southeast Regional Office will get some staff support for on-demand gear work, but there's also potentially a reimbursement program that will be established to allow for the purpose of at least some of the on-demand gear, and maybe not all of it, to offset the costs to the industry, and the agency is anxious to, obviously, put this forward with a fishery that's supportive of the gear, and so I think we certainly have an opportunity to do this quickly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn, to that point?

DR. BELCHER: So I appreciate that clarification, because Kerry and I were wondering about that as well, but, you know, when you look at the language of the IRA, it was kind of difficult to understand if this would actually fit under that, and so knowing that that is a carve-out is good to know, because we were thinking about that too, is how do you get this up and running, knowing that the cost and the number of people is fairly low, and the number of pots is fairly low.

I do know that we had one person that was wondering about whether or not they would be able to put these back to a trawl, and it was, well, can we go ahead and just -- With Protected Resources, it was under the understanding of no. It's a single pot, and that's not going to go, because, obviously, that's a greater probability of a problem if they do encounter -- If a whale does encounter that gear. That part of it wouldn't change, but knowing that we could potentially help fishermen with, again, thirty-five pots, a set number, that's great.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy, to that point?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I will caveat it, right, that there's still lots of ongoing discussions about spend plans and decisions that have to be made. Carolyn, or others that attended the workshop, my understanding is they were doing some testing though with paired pots, and potentially four pots connected together, just to reduce the amount of gear, on-demand gear, from a cost perspective, and so I wouldn't rule out that that wouldn't be something that couldn't be considered at this point, and I think that's still something that we would have to analyze and work with protected resources on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn, to that?

DR. BELCHER: I'm looking at Kerry too, and my understanding was, even though they've been doing that, they're extremely heavy and cumbersome pieces to use, and so the four pots -- When you're talking about four standard two-by-two pots, all lashed together with a big piece of iron on the bottom to get it, they are kind of like it's more work than it's worth.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, you guys. I'm going to go back to the queue here. Kerry, you're next.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry to take up so much time, and I do want to say, to that point, that my understanding is that they want to fish exactly the way they're fishing now, and the only reason they would modify that is for cost savings, and so, if the costs can be mitigated, I don't think there would be a big change to how they actually fish those pots, and so that would be amazing.

I don't want to put the cart too far ahead of the horse, but I do want to say that one of the things that's going to be complicated for us, if we do consider opening this closed area, that I want sort of to make sure that, you know, our constituents understand is, while there's only a small number of fishermen operating now, it's because it's not super economically valuable. Well, if that area opens in the winter, and, you know, is open when they're there, then there is some latent effort that could rejoin, and I think, at some point, we may have to consider, you know, maybe a separate quota for the trap guys and the hook-and-line guys, and so that's another reason why that part of the process, of opening that closed area, I think is going to be more cumbersome than people realize.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that. That helped explain that a little bit more as well, and so back to the queue. I have Mel, then Laurilee, then Trish.

MR. BELL: Thank you. Mine is just a process question, and so are we saying that we were considering -- One of the things might just be a simple action that would allow the gear to be used, or would that -- That would happen first, and then we would go back to deal with all the other stuff? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I am really happy to see that the fishermen accepted this, because I was standing in Jimmy Hull's restaurant's parking lot, two years ago, I guess, and I introduced Kim Sawicki to Jimmy, so that she would have a way into the Florida fishermen, and I'm really happy that the fishermen are embracing this, and I'm hoping that, out of this, somehow we could come up with some way to fish crab pots in the estuaries without vertical lines, because it's --

At least in the Indian River, it's a huge problem with dolphin entanglement and manatee entanglement, in the vertical blue crab fishery pot lines, and so I've been trying to figure out if we could do blue crabs, attached to a long line on the bottom, with just, you know, vertical lines maybe on each end, and I've been trying to think of ways to reduce the incidence of entanglements with manatees and dolphins in vertical crab pot lines, and so I'm hoping that, out of this, something could be done there, but I'm really excited that the fishermen have accepted this. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Laurilee. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I just wanted to kind of -- In listening to what Kerry said, I had talked to our staff about ropeless gears and everything, and my understanding is the reason that North Carolina fishers got involved was they had a specific interest in getting into that, into those area that were closed. With that said, I agree with Kerry that maybe making this an allowable gear is fine, but don't -- Address the closed areas at a different time, but, with black sea bass the way it is, you

know, as much as I know our North Carolina fishermen -- That was the driving force for getting involved, is to get in there, but I feel like we need to look at that as a separate time, at a different time, because, also, there's, you know, increased recreational effort going on in those closed areas, because those guys can still fish there.

I think what happened in North Carolina, when they closed those areas, is a lot of the fishermen just had to get out, because they had slow boats, and it just took a lot of time to get out into the areas that were open, and so I think those closed areas had an impact on our North Carolina fishers, but, with that said, I agree with Kerry that I think making it an allowable gear is a good first start, and then, as we hopefully see better stocks in black sea bass, maybe we can, you know, discuss that, opening these areas, and so I just wanted to kind of give a little bit more background on North Carolina fishers.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. This was a good discussion on this, and I guess, kind of procedurally here, in thinking about where does the allowance for ropeless gear go in this amendment process, I thought that it could go to the amendment that we're working on right now, but now, looking at the timing of the workgroup, and the decisions from the SSC, I guess I would ask Mike, and should the allowance for this ropeless gear be a stand-alone document, so that it could move faster?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: If you want to hold that question, I can go into the decision document, because we talk about the timing and the process a bit more, and that's a lot of what the decision document is focused towards.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mike, but let me just look around the room. Any more questions about the ropeless gear, or the ropeless gear workshop, any of that? It looks like heads nodding no.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so, getting into the decision document, one of the reasons why we don't have the formal amendment number with this decision document is because it kind of is in flux right now, as far as how this amendment is going to be structured, and that's much of the decision points that are being forward to you all today, is how to structure the management decisions that are being considered here.

The objectives for what we're looking for here, you've heard some of the background related to the SSC and their decision-making process, as well as points from the ropeless gear workshop, and so, right now, what we're looking for is some direction on the timeline for amendment development, potential actions to include for consideration, and then I would kind of clarify, within those objectives, some direction on the structure that you would like, as far as developing amendments to address some of these potential actions.

I summarized the actions that were brought up following the presentation of the stock assessment, some of the things that were noted or are going to be needed, and one of them would be a rebuilding plan for South Atlantic black sea bass, and that's something that would need to be done through a plan amendment, and so there is additional work by the SSC technical workgroup that's going on right now and information regarding rebuilding plan ABCs, things of that nature, wouldn't be available until January or February of next year, and so think the March meeting of next year.



There's also the revision of the ABC, OY, total annual catch limit, and this is an action that technically can be done through a framework amendment, although, because of the overfished status in this case, not so much, and catch levels would need to be consistent with the rebuilding of the stock, and so, again, we're going to be -- This type of action would need to be considered, in realistic terms, more through a plan amendment.

Consideration of any changes to the sector allocations, or sector annual catch limits, and that's something that would need to be done through a plan amendment, and then the item that we just talked about, including on-demand pots as an allowable gear type, and that is something that can be done through a framework amendment, and, just as a reminder, a framework amendment can move faster than a plan amendment, especially if that framework amendment is simpler, meaning it has fewer actions. If it's a short framework amendment, then it can move through faster than what a more extensive plan amendment would do.

Then any other management measures that would be considered, and it was brought up, at the last meeting, and there was some commentary about changing the recreational bag limit from seven fish to five fish, and changing of a bag limit is something that can be done through a framework amendment, and so, as you consider how you want to structure this, if you want to do one amendment versus two amendments, a plan and a framework, and what timelines you would like them on, and then also what actions you would like considered there.

I did include some of the management-related AP comments that they gave during the last fishery performance report for black sea bass. There was some interest in considering commercial gear allocations between the hook-and-line and the pot fishery, and that's something that, as this discussion of opening a closed area for this on-demand gear -- That kind of comes even more to the forefront of not necessarily going the route of allocations, but considering how you all would want the commercial fishery structured between the hook-and-line and the pots.

Gear management differences have been less of an issue recently, just because the commercial harvest is not approaching its ACL, but that's something that can -- That, you know, could change as the population rebuilds, and so that's something to keep in mind.

There was some interest, during the FPR process, of reducing the recreational minimum size limit, but it was noted not at the expense of season length, and so that was -- Maximizing season length was recommended, by the AP, as the highest priority for recreational management, and then there was also some commentary about looking at the effects of the circle hook requirement that's been in place since 2011 and evaluating whether and how that has helped the fishery and helped the discard mortality.

Now, moving into the timing portion, what I included in the document are two different timelines, and these may operate kind of in a bit of a spectrum, or, you know, kind of as a broad guideline, and we can maybe refine some of the details as you all develop your plan, but, if you want to lump everything together, do all your actions in one plan amendment, one time gap that we would need to account for is that we would be waiting for OFL and ABC recommendations from the SSC until the beginning of next year, and so this would kind of be the fastest time track. If we're lumping all of the management actions into one amendment, that would have regulations potentially effective in early 2026. You would have your final approval in about March of 2025, and so you can kind of see how that process would play out.

If you all wanted to develop a framework amendment, this could move faster, and, even within the process that is defined here, and this is kind of our typical process, but there are potentially some efficiencies that, if you all wanted to -- If it were a shorter amendment, and we were able to potentially combine a couple of these steps, that may be able to speed it up, maybe by a quarter or so, but this is kind of what you would be looking for developing a framework amendment for this process.

With the current timeline laid out, that would have regulations effective mid to late 2025, and just a reminder that the EFP for the on-demand gear expires in April of 2025, but, again, that's a winter fishery, and so that fishery would be effective later in the year, as opposed to not necessarily needing that regulation to be effective in April, to affect that following fishing year, and so that's something for all of your consideration. We have a few questions laid out at the bottom, just kind of things that I've highlighted before, but, overall, we're looking for guidance of how you want the amendments structured at this stage to proceed with any of the management actions that have been considered to this point.

I did also include the motion that was passed earlier at this meeting, just for some context, and, if you want to have any of the MRIP-FES discussion, or consider what's going on with that in this planning process, then that's listed there, just for context for you all, but that's all that I have to present, and I will be happy to take questions and hear discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Mike. Carolyn and then Laurilee.

DR. BELCHER: So what I'm understanding then, and I'm just throwing this out as a hypothetical, and I'm not saying that I support this or anything, but the idea being that you could do a framework, and, on the simplest level, we could do the ropeless gear, operating within the fishery as it is currently is, and we could potentially put the ABC on that, and that would move quicker, and then the management, the additional management, with changing of size limits, trip limits, whatever we're proposing as actions, could be done in a separate, and is that kind of what that suggestion would be?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes, and just clarifying that the statement "operating as it currently is", that would be the ropeless gear would be operating in the same way as a roped gear, and not as it is under the EFP, but, yes, that would be the case.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Laurilee and then Kerry and then Mel.

MS. THOMPSON: So, if we do a framework, will that satisfy the two-year clock, since we've been notified that black sea bass is in trouble, and then, if we did the framework --

MS. MCCAWLEY: We haven't been notified yet.

MS. THOMPSON: We haven't been notified yet?

MS. MCCAWLEY: No.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Well, we're going to be notified, and so I guess my question still stands, and would the framework satisfy the two-year requirement, or the requirement to do something within ten years, or I mean two years, and does the -- Or does it have to be a full-blown fishery management plan to satisfy the two years? We could also, if I heard you right, we can change the -- We can reduce the recreational bag limit through a framework, and so that seems like it would satisfy, you know, addressing the overfishing, you know, on the black sea bass, and it would give us more time to see the MRIP, you know, study and all of that, before we dive into doing a full fishery management plan.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm going to go to Mike on the answers to those questions.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So, with what we can put into a framework amendment here, that would not satisfy what will provoke the two-year clock, in terms of the overfished status. The overfished status needs to be responded to with a rebuilding plan, to show that you will rebuild the fishery to a not overfished status, and you would be changing the acceptable biological catch, annual catch limits, and you would be changing the catch levels accordingly with that rebuilding plan. That's under -- Really, it's under more of the plan amendment umbrella for this case, and there are situations where a framework amendment can be used for that, but that's not what we're looking at here, because we have the overfished status.

The framework that is being talked about here would not respond one way or the other to the two-year clock, and it would be kind of a separate, stand-alone action that would address the inclusion of on-demand gear for this fishery, and if -- As you pointed out, if you all wanted to include a bag limit change, that is a fairly simple measure, and that would probably max out what we could do in a shorter timeframe for a framework amendment, if we had those two actions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, Mike is right, and you spelled it out in a very good way, and I also want to remind you -- So, Laurilee, to put in a rebuilding plan, you need a plan amendment, and this council, a number of years ago, lost part of a lawsuit because they separated out ending overfishing from the rebuilding plan.

They did it in two separate amendments, and so I would advise you, if you're going to couch it in terms of ending overfishing and rebuilding, that you keep that into one plan amendment and not separate it out, because the Magnuson Act says that -- It kind of puts it in the same sector, or section, to prevent overfishing and rebuild overfished stocks, and so you should keep those two things together. If you wanted to couch a bag limit change or something in different terms that does not address overfishing, that's possible, but you would have to build the record for that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I've got a long list of hands. Andy, is it to that point?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and a question for Monica. In instances where we're addressing the overfishing, the council has come in and requested the agency, for example, to do an interim rule, but would there be anything that would prevent the council from doing a framework action to address the overfishing, without ending it, while we work toward a rebuilding plan?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, it depends on the record you build.

MR. STRELCHECK: I've heard that before.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I mean, in that previous lawsuit, and that was a lawsuit about black sea bass and a number of other species, and the council wanted to act quickly, and so they ended overfishing in one amendment, and then they said, well, we're going to put the rebuilding plan in place in another amendment, and the judge said, no, the Magnuson Act says you treat those things together, and so, if your -- It depends on the record you build. If you're stating that you're reducing the bag limit change to end overfishing, that's kind of on a little bit of thin ice, and so it depends on the record you build.

I did want to say one other thing, and we're talking about making this an allowable gear, and so black sea bass pots are an allowable gear, and I guess I think of allowable gear a little bit differently, because, in the regulations, they say these gears are allowed. Well, black sea bass pots are already allowed, and so this ropeless gear, theoretically, is a black sea bass pot. The problem comes in with all the restrictions and regulations that require black sea bass pots to have all these other things, and those are the kinds of things that you're focused on, that I've heard discussion around the table today, that you would like to change for this kind of ropeless gear, or on-demand gear.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I've got a long list of hands, and I think Mike has something else on this topic, and then I'm going to go back to my list.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I guess, trying to aid in potentially how the record can built, for if you all want to go with the framework in, you know, the more immediate route, and then the plan amendment to address the overfishing, overfishing and overfished, status for black sea bass, there is a timing difference that's kind of in front of you all right now, and the ABC and OFL recommendations, and, subsequently, the letter stating stock status, is, I would guess, and I would look to Andy to, you know, kind of confirm this, but that likely would not be available until the beginning of next year, because we wouldn't have the formal review by the SSC completed at that time, whereas the EFP, kind of the timing of the amendment and the EFP exploration, that's happening in a timeframe that's a bit more immediate than that, and so, if you all initiated a framework amendment that got started up right now, that's not addressing the assessment at all, and that's addressing a completely different issue, and you would build your record towards how you're addressing that issue.

Then, once you all get the status letter from the agency, which would be at the beginning of next year, after that review is completed, then you would, I guess, reinitiate, or reestablish, the amendment that you already initiated concerning responding to the assessment status. I did throw out some like assumptions, as far as how the agency would respond, and so, Andy, correct me if anything of that is wrong.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, it's generally correct, and I wouldn't speak to the exact timing, because it depends on the SSC guidance and advice and when we would be able to deliver that letter. While I have the mic, I mean, I think the one concern I have, right, and you are given two years to end overfishing and implement a rebuilding plan, and the concern I have is the degree of

overfishing we're looking at for sea bass is substantial, and so we're going to allow essentially continued overfishing of this stock as we go forward for the next two years, if we take the approach of dealing with this in an amendment, right, and so I'm trying to figure out a way where we could maybe expedite at least some management measures to address the overfishing on the frontend, as we work toward that longer-term rebuilding plan, but I want to talk to Monica more, to make sure that, legally, we're in bounds with regard to what we're able to accomplish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks for that. I'm going back to the hand list. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, I thought I had an idea that was going to solve all this, but Andy might have just messed that up. We do currently have, approved the other day, a framework amendment, a framework plan, for black grouper, and so, if we put the ropeless gear on that framework, and just sent those two off, and then handled everything else in one chunk -- I personally, outside of the timing issues that Andy just mentioned, I would really like to see something comprehensive.

When we sit down to deal with black sea bass, outside of the gear issue, I would like to really take our time and be comprehensive about it, because I think we're going to have to put in management measures and all of those things, and I don't want to rush it through, but, if we put those two items in one framework together, I think we could get that done very quickly, and we're already doing one anyway.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Mel and then Trish.

MR. BELL: Well, after listening to people, I'm kind of changing -- Originally, I was thinking, you know, if we could do the framework and get the modifications of how to use the gear approved, that would be great, and I'm looking at -- If there's some other things we could add, in a framework sense, like, you know, the revised ABC, and I was kind of attracted to the shift of the recreational bag from seven to five, and it sounds like that part might be a little more dicey, but one way, perhaps, you could -- Yes, it's not intended to end overfishing, but we know that it's moving in the right direction of you will find yourself doing eventually in the full plan amendment, but it's sort of couched in the -- It's kind of a precautionary measure, or it's simply fitting the recreational bag limit to the realities of the fishery right now.

I don't think a lot of people are hammering seven fish a trip, or maybe even five, and so it's not - - You know, you could maybe still do those three things, the ABC, the gear, and bag limit, but, again, building the case that you're not doing the bag limit to end overfishing, and you're going to deal with that later in the plan amendment, but you're doing it in a precautionary sense, but also to basically align an appropriate bag with the realities of the fishery, region-wide, and I don't know if that would be sufficient justification, but, that way, you could all three of those things, if you wanted to, maybe.

If not, maybe the bag comes off the table, and you deal with the ABC and the ropeless gear, and I don't know, and that's kind of what will work and what might work best, but it seemed like those three things were -- I won't call them low-hanging fruit, but they were things that you could kind of get moving along in the framework sense, as long as it didn't delay the framework, and then you come back and you deal with the two-year clock and the plan amendment in a different process and different amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mel. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: This timeline that's here now, that incorporates the issues that the SSC has to look at? Okay, and so I was just -- I mean, looking at the timeline, it looks like if you go ahead -- An amendment is only going to take, what, three months longer, and this says the framework is mid to late 2025, and the amendment will be late 2025 or early 2026, and so, in my mind, I'm thinking that's only three months, and then you've knocked it all out, and I don't know how this impacts the gear.

So there's no way to get say an EFP extension, you know, so that those guys can keep working, because, I mean, it's just -- If I'm counting it right, it just looks like it's three months, and so is there a route to do that, because it just seems like we can go ahead and knock everything out and meet the requirements of MSA, just with an extra three months, and so I guess what stems on this is the guys continuing to be able to use their ropeless gear, and is there a way to extend that EFP?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I thought the answer was no, but I will look to Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am certainly not the expert, but my understanding, based on our conversations at the workshop, was that a third EFP is not really preferred, and I am also a little suspicious -- Not suspicious of you and your timeline, Mike, but I've been here for a long time, and I have learned that, while the EFP deadline is hard and fast, this schedule has a lot of room for change, and usually they don't speed up, and so, yes, and I don't know if somebody from NMFS, or Tara from OPR is here, but my understanding is that a third EFP is really not something they like to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: So they couldn't extend the second?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just in response to, I guess, how to frame the schedule in your mind, I would say that the schedule laid out here for an amendment, a plan amendment, this is probably as fast as we can go. This is the probably the fastest that we can go, especially given the nature of what's going to need to be in this plan amendment.

I imagine that there is going to be quite a bit of concern from the public regarding black sea bass and the status and the changes that would need to be made to management to make the management fit into a rebuilding plan, and, right now, it's hard to give perspective to that, because we don't have finalized ABC levels, and some of the projections that came out of the assessment though paint a very stark picture of this fishery, and so that is something that can kind of -- That can potentially lead to issues, as far as the timing and having a lot of -- Extending the timeline for development, as you all go through, and so I would probably frame this as the fastest we could get a full amendment done.

With the framework amendment, this, I would say, is probably closer to a normal timeline/the longest that it could take, and there are possibly some efficiencies to be gained, as far as if it's a simple amendment and potentially combining some things within that process. If there's not as

lengthy of a discussion that you all need to have, if your record is pretty clear and it's not something that is being, you know, highly debated at this table, then we may be able to move a little bit faster, and, by a little bit, I mean possibly a quarter.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. It's stupid Trish question time, and so can you start out with a framework and convert to a full amendment?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes.

MS. MURPHEY: That way, you've already started, and you've got the ball rolling, and I don't know how that works out in the timeline, but just -- I guess my thought is that we're getting the ball rolling, if we start with a framework and move to amendments, but I don't know. Again, it's a stupid Trish question, and I may be just crazy.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So we can start with a framework, and if -- You know, this was kind of the plan for red snapper assessment response, if that -- You know, if it would have taken too long, in terms of making the decisions and getting the final approval of that, then, you know, there was discussion about folding it into a plan amendment, and so the council has done that in the past, of, if it takes too long in a framework amendment, then just making it a plan amendment and doing the whole thing.

One of the things to note, in regard to the timing, is that there is a difference, I guess for the council, on the backend, on the NMFS end, of framework versus plan amendment, and a plan amendment would have a bit of a longer process to get through than NMFS rulemaking, as I understand, after the council gives its final approval, than what a framework amendment would have, and so, as you consider that, that would kind of factor into the expiration of the EFP and when you want this gear to be allowable and regulations to actually go into place.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We've had a lot of discussion on this, and I'm trying to figure out the next steps, and I guess I'm still back on why we wouldn't have a framework with black and gag and ropeless gear and everything else in another document. I think even a bag limit analysis, pulled out separate from all the other discussions, is going to slow down black, gag, and ropeless gear, and so I just -- After all that discussion, that would just be my preference, but let's see what others think, after hearing all that. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: **I would like to make a motion that we include the black sea bass ropeless gear allowable gear issue in the black and gag framework.** If I can get a second, I have one more justification for that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. So it's seconded by Tim. The motion is going on the board there. Go ahead, Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think another reason to sort of get through this, other than the extension of the not extending the EFP, even faster is Andy had discussed the possibility of using IRA money. As we all know, that IRA money has a limited timeframe to be used, and this would line it up, in my mind, quite nicely. As these guys were able to start investing in this gear, those funds, in

theory, should still be available, and that might work out better. I just think, the quicker we get this through, and we'll worry about all the rest of it, and I don't have an opinion on -- Well, I do, but this is just relating to that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Hands on this discussion? Mel.

MR. BELL: I am fine with that, and my initial question was just, since black sea bass gear has nothing to do with black or gag, and, I mean, it's a snapper grouper framework, and I guess you could put it in there, but I didn't know if that would confuse people, but that would be the quickest way. If that works, that would be quickest way to get that in place and that settled, and then we just deal with black sea bass, you know, in the overall amendment, in this package.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just something to think about, and, Kerry, I had the same thought, about this is this gag and black grouper framework potentially moving -- It will move through the system, and my question really is I guess maybe to Myra, is to whether, given the analyses and the comparisons and those sorts of things that are done in these documents, is it easier to have a black sea bass on-demand gear framework separately, just as a standalone framework, and then also have a separate gag and black grouper framework? That's the only thing that I would consider. Otherwise, sure, you can keep them together, under the law.

MS. BROUWER: I think it's about the same, you know, because, if you do two separate frameworks, you still have to pull all the economic description, the social environment, all the stuff, the background information for, you know, both, whatever, species are being addressed. If you do it separately, it's just separate documents, and you have separate IPTs and separate, you know, scheduling of calls, and so I think combining it, in this case, and, I mean, it's a fairly simple couple of actions, and I think that would work best, workload-wise, for everybody.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. More discussion on this motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: So that's fine, and I just would -- I don't want one to confuse the other, or, you know, get the other gummed up somehow, and it could be the other way, and it could be that just dealing with the grouper, black grouper, and the gag slows it down, but, if we're confident that we can get them through that, it can go through that way, without confusing people, that's fine, if that's the quickest way to do it, but it sort of is going to involve two different groups of eyes and people thinking about things, and the ropeless gear is a very specific thing, for a specific group of people, although there is probably some overlap as well, but I just didn't want to -- Whatever works the easiest and the quickest, great.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Other discussions on this motion? **Once again, the motion is to include black sea bass on-demand pot gear in the black and grouper framework amendment.** Any more discussion? All right. **Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.** Let's take a ten-minute break, and we'll come back and figure out what we're doing next.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)



MS. MCCAWLEY: Come on back to the table. We're going to get going. All right. We are going to dive back into this timeline on black sea bass, not on the framework amendment that we just approved and the motion, but we're going to talk about basically the timing of this overall plan amendment and try to give some direction to staff, but I'm going to turn it over to Mike to start the discussion for us.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thank you, and so I just wanted to highlight, relevant to this plan amendment, this is something that, you know, we're just bringing back, and you already initiated this, and there's not necessarily any action that you have to take regarding this, but I wanted to lay out this is the plan forward, the track that we're currently on, so that you all can keep that in mind as we move forward.

This plan amendment, that would include with it the rebuilding plan, revised catch levels, consideration of any allocation changes, and then any other management measures, things like bag limits, trip limits, whatever else you all would want included in that type of amendment to respond to the status of black sea bass coming out of the stock assessment.

That timing, with what we have right now, and so we would wait, and we would get the SSC's recommendations in January or February of next year, and those would come to you in March of next year, and that means that, for the plan amendment, we would be skipping the December meeting, and you all wouldn't see anything on that in December, because we would be awaiting those results.

You would still see something for the framework amendment that you just approved, the gag and black grouper on-demand pots, but not the plan amendment, and so the plan amendment would then come back in front of you in March, when you get those catch level recommendations, and that would tentatively be when you all would approve it for scoping, and so I'm just kind of putting that plan out there, so that you can keep it in mind over the next six months, if you want to talk to constituents or consider what management measures beyond the rebuilding, and the changing of the catch levels, you all would want included in that plan amendment, and that's something that you can either -- There's a couple of things that you've listed in previous discussion that are included in this document.

If you think of anything in between now and then that you want to include in the scoping materials, when those go out, that's where we would kind of finalize that list, and so, if somebody has burning ideas right now, I can take those down, and, if not, you can just communicate with me then, and you can bring those up in March, and they can be listed out, and we could take it out to scoping from there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so does everyone understand what we're talking about here, and so we're not talking about that motion that we just dispensed with on the framework, and this is about the full plan amendment and the timing, and so what we're suggesting here, or staff is suggesting, and this timeline table is suggesting, is that the document would not come back to the council until March of next year, because we are waiting on that workgroup, and we're waiting on the SSC, and so is everybody good with that? Then, when we get to that march meeting, and we go over all the topics, we would figure out what, at that meeting, we want to take out for scoping. All right. Are we good with that? I see heads nodding yes. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess I'm fine with the timeline, and I get back to my earlier comment though, right, and so we're in the midst of the 2023-2024 season, and we know that overfishing is occurring, and we're going to essentially take the two years, and maybe, by the 2025-2026 season, be implementing, you know, management measures to end overfishing and rebuild the stock, and I think it would be worth bringing some information back to the council, at least in December, on what we could do in the interim, potentially in the interim, to help address the overfishing and at least have a more robust discussion around some sort of interim step, whether it's an interim rule, whether it's a framework, like we were talking earlier.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you give me some examples? Are you thinking things like reducing the recreational bag limit, and what would other examples be?

MR. STRELCHECK: That would be one, and, I mean, certainly what seems to be out of sync is I have to announce the season next year, right, and so I'm going to announce essentially a full-year season, because we're not catching the catch limit, right, and the reality is that we're not catching it because the stock is now undergoing overfishing and is overfished, and so do we want a year-round season for black sea bass next year, or the year after that, while we're still continuing to work on this amendment, and so things like that I think would be really important, to at least take a look at, and can we curb some of the overfishing in the interim.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So then, just about the mechanism to do this, so staff would bring back some analysis, but, ultimately, is the council giving you direction, or ideas, or advice, on you issuing some type of interim action? Is that what it's for, or are you thinking that this would be another framework to do something sooner than this full plan amendment?

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I haven't had a chance to talk in more depth with Monica about her comments earlier, right, and the lawsuit that we experienced with 13C, but, if we're able to do a framework with the council, you know, my preference is always to try to do public comment and have a transparent process, rather than doing an interim rule, right, and, if we're not able to do that, then, yes, it could inform the interim rule, if the council is willing to recommend an ABC and to move forward with an interim rule.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so then, specifically, it sounds like your intended -- We'll call them an analysis that you want to see from staff would be the recreational bag limit reduction and a season reduction, and are those the only two things? I'm just trying to figure out what to tell staff to come back with.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I wouldn't necessarily limit it to those, but those would certainly be kind of the two big ones that I can think of on the recreational side, and I don't know, for commercial, if there's anything that would want to be considered. You know, the one thing that might be a challenge is, because we're so far below the catch limit currently, right, and even if we cut back on some of these measures, it might not considerably change fishing mortality. It might have to be very drastic in order to do that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so Mike is going to type up some direction to staff here, but let me look around to the other committee members, because we had a lengthy discussion about trying to keep this all together, plus we've heard some items from Monica here, and is this what other folks are thinking? Tim.

MR. GRINER: Maybe I got a little confused there at the end, and I understand what Andy is saying about trying to -- Even if you had to go to an interim rule, but, on the commercial side, I think that, you know, we really need to flesh this out after the SSC has done -- Has finished all of their work, and I don't know what more we could really do, other than that, and so I don't -- I wouldn't want to see any interim measures imposed on the commercial sector right now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess my other concern is we just tasked staff to go do a framework action and pull some items out, and I'm wondering, Andy, if some of your folks can help with some of these analyses, and then you could bring back some suggestions for an interim action, and I'm just trying to split up the workload here. Thoughts from you, Andy?

MR. STRELCHECK: I would agree that it would have to be a combination of NMFS and South Atlantic Council staff to provide this information, and so, if the council is open to at least discussing this at the December meeting, I think it would be worthwhile to at least bring back some information and determine whether or not we want to take some sort of interim framework action, or interim rule, and move that forward before we, you know, complete the plan amendment. If you guys are wanting to just proceed with the plan amendment, then we would bring that back.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Part of me says just proceed with the plan amendment after we get these items from the SSC, but what do the other committee members think here? Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I think the hard part, and, again, maybe it's just the way that I look at this, but we don't know what the reduction is going to need to be until the SSC goes through and does its work, and so getting a bag analysis with no reference isn't really -- I mean, I guess the question is, if you get the timing about the same, but what if the timing doesn't line up? Then we have these numbers in front of us, and we're still not going to be able to make a decision, because we don't know what will or won't meet the requirements of dropping fishing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am kind of right there with you. Kerry and then Andy.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and here's my other concern, thinking strictly about the commercial fishery, is we have these two separate gears, right, and so say we need to go to like red-porgy-level trip limits, which is, I don't know what now, fifteen fish or something, but it's really small, which is fine, and that would actually probably do well, and most of the commercial hook-and-line fishery for black sea bass would be like no big deal, and we're not catching them anyway, but that's a drastic reduction for the guys that are going out and potting for them, and how do you do that quickly, and so that makes me nervous.

I understand the timing issue, but it is really my preference to keep it in a plan amendment, to keep that moving forward, and I know we're overfishing, and I know we're overfished, and I'm not trying to stall that, but I think it's more complicated than we think it is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that's my concern, and I think you said it better than I could. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I just want to be clear, and, I mean, this would be addressing the overfishing, and it would not be ending the overfishing, if we took any sort of, you know, steps, and so the question would be whether or not, you know, we would want to do that and cut back on

a year-round season for black sea bass and, you know, higher catch than what we will ultimately be implementing for the commercial sector, as far as future catch limits, and so, you know, Carolyn brings up a good point, in terms of we won't have the analysis, in terms of the overall reduction, but we all know the direction, in terms of what's going to have to happen, in terms of reductions in this fishery, right, and they're going to be substantial, and so I'm just trying to get out ahead of, two-plus-years from now, and we're going to fall off a cliff, in terms of implementing very restrictive management measures, and is there a way that we can ease ourselves into this and start phasing out some of the overfishing, or at least addressing the overfishing, in the interim.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I guess some of where I'm thinking, and, again, I know we talk about our alternatives, but I would hate for us to kind of be conservative, and like I'm using the example, and I'm not suggesting these as changes, and so I'm caveating that on the frontend, but, if we talk about dropping to three, and we only use examples of status quo and dropping, and I'm just picking numbers, to five or three, and that's what we put out for scoping and discussion, but we come back and we get the numbers from the SSC, and those aren't adequate, and we're talking zero and one, we're going to end up with a lot of people that are not very happy that we're not -- Now, again, I know we can be extremely liberal in our range, but I don't -- I think you're going to end up -- Either way, you're going to scare people, one way or another, and we're shooting at a target that we don't know what it is yet.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I share those concerns, and I think it would be my preference to wait until after the SSC can discuss this, and we know kind of what the goalpost is, before we start dropping back. Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes, and this is where I was going earlier, with the kind of maybe dealing with the recreational bag in a framework, but you talked me out of that, and so I was fine with the approach we were taking, but I see that there is uncertainty in what's the target, and we don't know, and, I mean, what is it that we're trying to hit? We don't know yet, and so I would be -- I guess, having talked me out of the original approach, in my mind, and I'm fine with kind of holding the course with what we've just decided on, myself.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Similarly, I wouldn't want us -- We're talking specifically about recreational, and, again, I'm not suggesting anything, but, if you don't want people feeling like you're targeting them, you would almost have to have some things to discuss relative to commercial too, and I think that's kind of, again, how do we think about what we need to do to go out with scoping. I just feel like we would be better served to wait.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I think you guys have convinced me to wait and stay the course on the plan that we already had. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Also, I think, from a practicality standpoint, there's a learning curve on all these regulatory changes, and you get yourself in this regulatory whiplash thing, you know, and people say, okay, well, it's this, and then, pretty shortly thereafter, you know, it goes to something

else, and so I think you've got to balance the urgency with the practicality of what you can expect out of people's behavior, when it comes to compliance with regulations.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHER: Well, I agree with Spud, but, you know, I'm not envisioning that, like next April, we're going to have new regulations in place, right, but what I am thinking is if we could take some of next year to come up with some regulations, so the interim would be implemented well before the 2025-2026 season, right, and then the plan amendment comes in after that, and we implement those regulations, rather than waiting that full two-plus years, and it's really going to be two-years-and-three-months, because of by the time we get the SSC advice, right, and so I think there is time in the schedule, and maybe it comes in March, where we could have this more robust discussion to determine if there's anything we could do between March of next year and before the plan amendment goes into effect in late 2026, or 2025, right, that would be meaningful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So the latter part of what you said there was what I was envisioning, is let's have this discussion again in March, after the SSC comes back with the information and we try to tease apart are there some things that come earlier, before the full plan amendment is finalized in 2026. Okay. People are nodding their heads yes. Okay.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: That being the case, I deleted the direction to staff, and there's nothing else, at this point, for black sea bass. Just keep in mind, over the next six months, and think through what are the things that you all would like feedback from the public on, when we get to that scoping discussion in March, because, you know, with the urgency of the stock status, as well as kind of the time that we have available to us in the six-month period, we have a chance here where we can kind of hit the ground running and be able to develop those materials a bit more thoroughly, if folks can be ready to have that discussion in March.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Are we okay with that. All right. Kerry has a question.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry to belabor it. Based on the schedule, how will this affect the AP discussing black sea bass in October? What information will they have, and will they be involved in -- Is it too early to ask them ideas about scoping, or should we wait until we know more?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: The thought was the AP would have probably more of an update for the October meeting, and certainly letting them know what's happening, as far as the framework amendment, letting them know how that's proceeding with the on-demand gear, and now that it's part of the gag and black grouper framework, and they would get probably an update on both of those, because I don't know, at this stage, that we have information to provide them, for them to have a more thorough discussion, but then they could have a larger discussion in April, after we're able to provide them some materials and some context of what you all are thinking for that plan amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Kerry is nodding that she's good with that plan. All right. I think this concludes the discussion of black sea bass. Thank you for walking us through that, Mike, and then I think the next item would be an update on the best fishing practices outreach from Ashley.

MS. OLIVER: All right. Well, we're going to get into the best fishing practices outreach update, and I know you guys haven't had an update about the campaign in a little while, and so we're going to spend some time on it today. The first topic will be the What It Means to Me project proposal, and so this is a new project, and so we would be looking for an approval on this to move forward. The second topic will be about the best fishing practices Master Volunteer Program, and so this was a project that was approved back in December, and so I'll just give you an update on kind of where we're at with development of that, and then I will kind of round-out with the council staff and Sea Grant staff outreach activities update and some future plans for the coming months.

The What It Means to Me project proposal is within your briefing book, if you're interested in looking at that. I also want to note that Nick Smillie here has been my partner-in-crime for this project, and we're both really excited to share this idea with you all today.

A little bit of background on kind of where this idea came about, and I think everybody might be familiar with the fact that not only has building trust, but sustaining trust with fishermen, has long been a challenge for fisheries managers, and, additionally, you know, fostering those positive relationships takes a long time, and it requires regular interactions with stakeholders, and so, because of these two things, you know, the council has expanded its best fishing practices campaign, and it's continuing to educate and build that trust with those fishermen.

We see the What It Means to Me project as just an additional outreach tool to help achieve these goals, and, really the What It Means to Me project aims to bridge that trust gap by capturing, in participants' own words, what best fishing practices means to them and why they are important to the long-term sustainability of South Atlantic Fisheries.

Getting into the project goals, I kind of mentioned this one already, and, that first goal, we just really want to help bridge that trust gap between the council and fishermen. Goal 2 touches on just encouraging more fishermen to use BFPs in their everyday fishing activities, and just to get involved in fisheries management in general, and so that might include, you know, joining an advisory panel, attending a council meeting and making public comment, becoming an SAFMC Release participant, and participating in the Best Fishing Practices Master Volunteer Program.

Then our third project goal is we would like to just document stories of those involved in the South Atlantic fisheries in a positive light. I think we all are aware of the fact that, you know, fisheries management can be quite controversial at times, and so we are, you know, not only wanting this to be a positive experience for the participant, but also those that are watching it from the outside, and so that kind of leads me into what we're looking to do with the project itself.

What we're wanting to do is film and edit informal, short conversations with fishermen and create this cohesive video, and so some potential conversation topics that we might include could be, you know, how that participant began fishing, the importance of fishery preservation and how it can be preserved, how they got involved in fisheries management, whether that was, you know, maybe they're an SAFMC Release participant, or they provided photos for FISHstory, or maybe they sit on the council or an advisory panel. Then, also, we would like to see, or ask, any advice that participant may have for their fellow fishermen.

Of course, we want to share these videos, and so some potential platforms we may want to share them on include social media stories and YouTube. We could create an ArcGIS StoryMap, and,

we, of course, would want to put it on the website that Nick has so beautifully designed, and also share it through other council outreach programs.

We see this project as kind of a soft opening right now, and we've developed this project to be very best fishing practices and citizen science focused, but, you know, if it is effective, we could expand it into other aspects in management, and so, as for the timeline, the last few months, Nick and I have just been developing this project proposal, and we've practiced with staff, and we are currently presenting to you all, and, if it is approved, we would then begin gathering b-roll content, and we would then identify and confirm participants, and we would like to begin filming these at the fall advisory panel meetings, which include Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and Mackerel Cobia. Additionally, if there's anyone that's interested in this program, or this project, sitting at this table, we would absolutely love to set up a time, between now and the December meeting, to film, or at the December council meeting in North Carolina.

Then, for the winter months, we would plan to just edit all these videos, and we would like to begin sharing them at the beginning of 2024, and so this timeline -- You know, it only goes until February, and so that's not really the end-all-be-all. We'll see how this project works out, and then, you know, if we would like to continue on with it, we have the March council meeting, and then, also, there's a lot of advisory panels that meet in the spring as well.

To kind of give you all an idea of what we're looking to do with this project, we do have an example video that we would like to show you all, and so we had the pleasure of filming David Hugo, our Sea Grant Reef Fish Fellow, all the way in the back over there, and, you know, I say it's an example video, but, you know, David is a very avid fisherman, and so it's a real perspective into what his fisheries mean to him and why he thinks they should be preserved, and so I will pull that up now.

(Whereupon, a video was presented and not transcribed.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was going to go to the questions, but it looks like we're working on some screen issues at this point. I agree, and I think this is super cool, and very exciting. It looks like they have some questions for it. Are we good to have them to start filming at the upcoming AP meetings? Okay. I see heads nodding yes, and thumbs-up. Then do we have specific suggestions for conversation topics? Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I am actually going to throw Robert under the bus. We went to dinner last night with Robert, and Robert had a pretty good round-robin with us at the table, and I think his idea of how we all interacted last night might kind of help with some of that. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: When you ask my idea of how we interact, do you mean the question that I asked everybody?

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: So I did have a chance to sit with some folks that have been here for longer than I have, and I won't say how much longer, but longer than I have, and, you know, I asked each of them what really drove them to make the decision to join the council, and what were they expecting to achieve by being here, and I got some really, really warm responses. You know, I

think just my perception of being here, and I think the general public -- You know, this video is a good example of it, but if everybody could take the time, and I'm not sure it's possible, but if everybody could take the time to understand each and every one of you and where you come from and why you do this, they would probably be a lot less critical of the outcomes of some of the decisions.

You know, it's a really complex framework, and everybody here is trying to figure out how to make the best decision we can within the frameworks that we've got to deal with, and everybody has got, I believe, a unified goal of trying to promote our fisheries and promote access, and so I really appreciated the discussion last night, and I'm looking forward to continue to spend time with everybody and work on these issues.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sounds good. Thank you, guys, for sharing. Spud and then Laurilee.

MR. WOODWARD: I think we all ought to put some thought into what the conversation topics should be. You know, one that I think is important is the continue to explain to folks that preservation is not conservation, and that there is wise use, and that this isn't all about no-take, that there's a role for wise consumptive use in successful conservation, and there is times to preserve, places and things of that nature, and so I think that's something that would be useful.

As much as possible, you know, for those of us who are involved in fisheries management, and have been, you know, to give our perspective on what has worked, and what hasn't worked, and how important fishermen compliance and confidence in that -- I mean, it all hinges on that. At the end of the day, I mean, we can sit here, and we can spend a lot of time talking, and we can write a lot of words on paper, but, at the end of the day, if the people on the water don't do it, we really haven't accomplished much of anything.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee and then back to Robert.

MS. THOMPSON: I think we're talking about two different things here, and so you're trying to encourage people to do best fisheries management practices, but we're also trying to -- I can't say we're trying to regain the trust of the fishermen in the management process, because there never was any trust, but what little relationships that we had in the past with the fishermen -- It's obvious. When you look at the public comment last night, and I just checked on our website, to see if we had even gotten one more public comment, and no. We've had one written public comment in relationship to this meeting and one email.

Years ago, we would have had eighty public comments, and, you know, us personally getting emails from the fishermen, and we had three in-person public comments, and two of those were clearly from NGOs, whose job is to come to this meeting and make public comment, and we had three online comments, and one of those was probably from another person from an NGO that was supporting the ropeless fishing gear.

We have lost the trust of the fishermen, and it's very clear, and so I'm not sure -- The video was really, really nice, and I love the video. I think it's excellent for the best fishing, you know, practices, and it would be really good, and I'm not sure who the audience is, when it comes to -- I didn't see anything in that video that would help do anything towards trying to get trust back into



fisheries management again. It was great, you know, and it was a very nice video, but I didn't see where it would do anything that would help.

I mean, the only thing that is going to help us is if people get to catch more fish, and I don't know how we do that under the constraints that we're under and under the environmental challenges that we're under, you know, with climate change and all of that, and that's my first -- That's my first take on it. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Laurilee. Robert and then Mel and then Tim and then Gary.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I think, Laurilee, when you mentioned, you know, trust in us, I think it's almost a process, because, as I look around the table, I want to reiterate that I think there's a lot of people here that fishermen trust, individually, and I think your fishermen trust you, and I think everybody who is sitting here has a group of fishermen and people at home that -- I don't think they question why you're here and what you're doing.

You know, ultimately, it's really the results that we're producing that create that kind of feeling, and, you know, I will just bring it up, and I think what we're dealing with with red snapper is the type of thing that creates issues with, you know, this thing seems to be doing well, and why aren't we, you know, changing this, and discard mortality, and why can't we keep more, and so those types of issues I think are what we need to figure out how to address, and this is an extremely transparent process, but, you know, a video like that may be from a perspective of maybe somebody like Spud, or yourself, or others here that might get, you know, people outside of your area to start to understand, you know, what we're trying to accomplish, and maybe even understand some of your frustrations with the process, as we go through this, and so I just wanted to kind of - - To Spud's other comment, I think one thing I asked last night is have we ever been able to look at, you know, in my world, return on investment, but in terms of making rules?

Like what's the direct return and impact on making those rules and how we track that, and that's probably another 5,000 acronyms involved in getting through discussion, you know, but that's a - - You know, when we make these rules, and, coming from Key West, we live in a very, very vast area.

It's really, really hard to patrol. There's a lot of miles, and a lot of space for law enforcement to have to cover, and so, you know, I think the more trust we can, and we shouldn't back down from that. We have to lean into it, because, if we don't get fishermen to buy into the rules that we're making, and the reason for making them, those practices aren't going to convert into, you know, real-life conservation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Robert. Mel and then Tim and then Gary.

MR. BELL: This doesn't -- First of all, great, and move with this, and full support, and it doesn't really fit perfectly with kind of the direction here, which is geared towards best practices in let's call it the hook-and-line fishery, and so where I'm going with this is that divers are also fishermen, at times, and divers have practices, and divers -- I am speaking from own personal experience.

My passion about offshore fisheries, bottom fisheries, was really from the standpoint of being a diver and down there looking at it harvesting, because you harvest with a spear, rather than a hook,

or both, and a lot of -- Most divers are both, actually, but you can probably get some very passionate people talking about the importance of the resource, the habitat, practices and all, and I know the best practices of, you know, when to shoot fish, when not to shoot fish, sizes, things like that, and we discuss that all the time here, but it doesn't fit kind of the standard best practices that we're kind of focused on, like descending devices and things like that, but divers are a subset of our fishermen.

I know, over the years, of, you know, forty years of looking at the South Carolina bottom, you know, divers kind of get that there have been changes, and there are things going on out there, good and bad, and maybe a lot of it, you know, not so good, in terms of what the bottom looks like, what the fish compositions look like, availability and things, and so, you know, you might want to consider -- If you stumble across a diver or something, or from that perspective, is kind of include them in that discussion, because I know a number of folks that could be -- You know, they can speak passionately about what they actually see down there and the importance of following best practices, and, again, divers are typically both hook-and-line and spear, and so it's just something to think about, in terms of looking at folks, and a different angle on it.

Plus, from a cool video, attractive video, perspective, you know, the underwater video of things is -- That tends to be popular too, and so just something to think about as you kind of look at how to grow this program, but it's great, and you guys have done a great job with this, and so it will be great, and so just keep at it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mel. Gary. Sorry. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mel, you're exactly right, and I've got the perfect diver for this. Randy Batts has been probably diving the South Atlantic for forty years, and he's just such a wealth of knowledge, and he's such a personable, great guy, and, in fact, he runs dive trips for veterans on his own nickel. He takes them out diving.

Anyway, getting back to some of the things that Laurilee touched on, and, you know, that's one of the reasons -- This is one of the reasons why I'm really excited about this program, and part of the problem we have among fishermen is, you know, negativity breeds negativity, and, once you get one guy pounding and saying, you know, that council this and that council that, and NOAA this and NOAA that, blah, blah, blah, and they're all against us, and they don't want us to do this, and they're taking everything away from us, and then it just starts multiplying, and it just -- It's like a wound, and it just starts festering.

This is a way that we can have positive conversations, and the way you have positive conversations, and make those mean something, is you have conversations with trusted people, and so you get trusted sources out there, and then you build -- They build trust, because, when you have trusted people, that everybody respects, saying positive things, then those positive things grow, and this is the way that -- This is a perfect way for guys like me to reach out to guys in the industry that are super positive right now.

I mean, there's a lot of positive things going on in our industry, aside from, you know, things that we can't control, like, you know, recruitment of fish, and prices have never been where they are right now, right, and so there's a lot of positive things out there. If we want this industry to still be here in ten years, we have got to get some positive messages out there that brings young people

to feeling like there's a future, but the best way to do that is to take some of these trusted guys, that are well respected, that have done this for a long time, and get them on camera and let them talk, because they have a lot of positive things to say.

Along those lines, I do think it's going to be important that we, you know -- I don't want to see this like be a rah-rah show either. You know, if you have something negative to say, then I want it to be -- You know, feel free to say that, you know, here's the bad things that we see, but here's what we see that this could be effective, and I don't want it to be one-sided, but, at the end of the day, this needs to be positive discussions that help people become positive about what's going on. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tim. Those were great points, too. Gary and then Andy.

MR. BORLAND: Tim, I just want to go on record saying you missed your calling. You probably should have been in marketing, because you could sell snow to an Eskimo. 100 percent, the citizen science stuff, I'm 100 percent behind it, and I think this is a great platform to do it. I think every platform, and any way we can get the word out positive, is a good thing.

You know, Clay and I were having a conversation at one of the breaks, and we have to continue to educate. I know we think the majority of the public understands what we do, and they don't. I mean, even in the industry, all of us that this side are involved in, they don't know, and you could walk into the office of a major manufacturer, and there may be two people in the whole building that understand what we do, and so any way that we can continue to educate, and continue to spread the word, and I agree with Tim that positivity breeds positivity, and so we have to continue to get the word out, and I applaud this, and applaud anything we can do to continue to spread the word.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Gary. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am going to maybe provide a little bit different perspective, and so I agree with most of what's being said around the table, and I agree there is certainly a strong need for building trust, but I think we need to be measured in this, and I say that because we're a regulatory body, and we make decisions based on the laws of the United States that have been set out, and they affect people's livelihoods, and they affect people's ability to go fishing and boating, and, ultimately, at the end of the day, whether they understand it or not, right, those tend to be negative toward anglers and their activities.

As much trust as you can build with them, in terms of educating them and helping them understand the process, there's still that kind of negative consequence that comes along with implementing regulations, and so, with that said, I totally promote, obviously, building trust.

A few things that I guess I would say is, you know, I think this is a good approach, and I'm not sure it's the best approach. Putting someone behind the camera and an individual talking to a camera, conveying their story and asking questions is good, right, and it kind of tells the story of that individual, the background, asking that person questions, but you then have to make sure the audience is viewing that, right, and, to me, with building trust, it's really about building the relationships, and one of the things that we've been working on, in small steps, is like with the Marine Resource Education Program, right, and only thirty, forty, or fifty people come through it

each year, but the opportunity to sit down and talk about the science and talk about the management in-depth, and so many times, and I'm sure Clay could vouch for this, people come to the end of the meeting and are like, well -- They've said all these bad things about you as an individual, right, and I've kind of broken down those barriers, because we are able to sit down and have dialogue, and they get to know us as individuals.

I really think we need to keep that in mind as well, and I am 100 percent behind what the South Atlantic Council is doing, in terms of outreach and education, and I think you guys are setting the bar, and so I'm super proud of that, but, ultimately, I think it is going to take more than just some videos and putting things out in social media, et cetera.

The other thing I would mention, in terms of topics, is I think it's really important that we get the feedback with regard to kind of the perspectives of individuals and what they've seen, in terms of both positives and negatives, the challenges that they're facing, the changes that they're seeing, as well as probably interview some of the managers and others with regard just to the council process, and how can we educate people about why we make the decisions we do, how do we get to the decisions, why, you know, are some very difficult and, ultimately, maybe people are in disagreement with them.

Then the other thing, which I have given a number of presentations on in the last couple of years, is this idea of a shifting baseline, and so, Laurilee, I love your comments, right, and we've never had trust with the fishermen, and what I often hear here is, well, you never give back to us, right, and, well, the reality is that what we're doing today, as a fishery management body, is being affected by changes that have been occurring for decades now, in the number of people fishing, the fishing power, the boat motors, the electronics, and all of that has made our jobs increasingly more difficult, and so telling that story I think is really important as well, because it kind of puts in perspective that we have hard jobs, and this is all having to be factored into the decisions that we're making.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Others? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you for that, Andy, and I wanted to circle back, Mel, to your comment, and, you know, I understand the distinction between best practices and laws, but I also think that, for the most part, if fishermen would view the laws as a best practice, we would get more adoption. What I mean by that is if they, you know, understood why we need to restrict the bag limit this year, and, from sitting here, it's so that we can manage that species, or we can continue to catch them, going forward, and that's the reason why we're doing it, and so, you know, I will give a small example.

I've got a small hunting club, with a group of five guys, and we all have different approaches on rules we need to put in, you know, rules, in order to try to best manage for shooting the biggest deer, and we sit down, and we have discussions, and some guys want to do some things or another, and the way that works the best is when everybody has buy-in and everybody, you know, understands. Even though they don't necessarily agree, right, or say, you know, like cull bucks, and I'm sorry that I'm going off on a tangent on hunting things, but just, for me, it's a real-life example of, you know, telling somebody you have to do something, versus making sure they understand why we're asking them to do it, and that really makes a big impact, and it translates into, you know, people doing the right thing.

You know, as we go through this, I want to continue to make sure we do focus on trying to build that trust, to the point where, you know, we've got a bunch of fishermen here who are happy with what's going on, or at least happy with the effort, and so I just kind of wanted to circle back on that, you know, best practices, and I think following the law would certainly be the number-one best practice, right, and we put those in place, and so, if everybody does that, that's kind of the foundation where we need to start.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: This has been an excellent conversation, and I really appreciate that, you know, and these guys did a bang-up job. There's a lot of hours of video that went into that, and they put it together. When I first watched it, it was like, oh, see if you have comments or suggestions, and I just sat back and watched it and was just like, oh my gosh, this is amazing.

You know, these guys came up with this idea because, you know, we have this thing that we throw out there of ABO, always be outreaching, and what we've been doing, for the last several years, is constantly looking for ways that we can have more positive messaging, because, you know, it isn't just about regulations that we do here, but those often tend to be all of our negative messaging, and that's where, yes, the trust is not there.

You know, we try to get buy-in, and so much of that is tied to the outcomes, and that's a real challenge. You know, there are ways that we can interact with fishermen on a positive basis, to start building those relationships and build some at least understanding of what's going on, and it is many, many things. You know, it isn't just videos, but it is MRIP, and it is the citizen science program, which is a positive way of interacting with fishermen. It's the best practices. It is the videos, and it's website, and it's all of the little things that folks are doing.

These guys that are working on this stuff are amazing at looking for little places to reach out to people positively. It's going to ICAST and building on relationships, knowing tackle shops and working with tackle shop owners, because that's a trusted resource, and so, you know, what we're kind of doing, and we always describe it, is the outreach that we're doing is like it's pushing a snowball uphill, and you're hoping that it's going to get bigger, and it's going to continue to spread, and we're going to reach more people, but you get a little bit at a time, and you've got to keep pushing. You know, you've got to keep pushing, because, the minute you stop, you fall backwards, and you're back at the bottom of the hill again, and you're picking up your pieces, and you're trying to go.

You know, we're always pushing out, and this crew is just amazingly innovative with finding ways to like, okay, I can push this snowball a little farther, and I think this is a great thing. It could cover all kinds of topics, and I think Tim hit the nail on the head, as far as what we see this potentially doing, and, you know, getting the movers and shakers of the fishery to take part in this, and tell them what the fishery means to them, the Jimmy Hull's of the world, you know, the Ben Hartig's, as former council members, folks like that.

You know, our really influential AP and SSC and council members, you know, who are the ones that could influence others within the community, and I thought Robert's question was great, right, and get your council members to say why are am I here, and what do I want to achieve, and, when

I first met him, I thought he's an insightful guy, and so I'm not surprised at all to see that question, and I think that would be a great topic for you guys as council members.

You know, it sort of started as best fishing practices, but, when I saw the potential for this to grow, and that it would spread into other topics, that's why I thought it was really important to reach out to you and let you see where this is going and not, you know, be surprised by it, but, you know, I'm glad to see there's as much support for it, and, you know, I wasn't sure how it would turn out. When I saw that first video, I'm like, I'm sold, hook, line, and sinker, and, yes, this looks like it has just enormous potential to cover a lot of different questions, and I think it would be an excellent tool in our outreach toolbox, and one more thing that hopefully we can keep moving that snowball up the hill and getting that positivity.

MR. SMILLIE: Can I add something?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, please, because, Nick, the video man, did just an amazing job.

MR. SMILLIE: One of the things too -- I mean, obviously, the goal is, you know, increased trust, if that's possible, and also getting you all's voices to be heard a little bit, but I think like one of the adjacent benefits of conversations with people who are, you know, really involved in the fishery, and have been for almost, you know, a century, and Ashley and I have talked a lot about this, is one of the really cool things that we could have are just kind of these untold stories that may not be documented from a lot of the people who have had a hand in our fisheries for generations, and so I think being able to document those voices, and those stories, in a lasting way, is just kind of a supplemental benefit to this project too, but I know we appreciate you all's feedback a lot, and, yes, don't forget about these questions, too. If you have any conversation topics, and, you know, obviously, we can't harp on best practices for multiple videos over and over and over, and so, if you have any specific ideas about videos, you know, please let us know.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, you guys. I think you should also ask the APs about what topics, and we heard from two different folks last night, including our Snapper Grouper AP chair, about doing some outreach, and so I think that the AP folks would have some good ideas about these topics for conversation. Anything else? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: On Number 4, down there at the bottom, you know, we've had this discussion, I think, at the Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and The Nature Conservancy and others, and I think the direction, at least where I'm seeing most young people being influenced, is being influenced through YouTube videos and getting influencers involved and that sort of stuff.

I think it's kind of hard, and some of these videos are hard to keep people's attention, but, you know, I would be willing to do it, and maybe we could get one of these guys to come up, and we'll go fishing with Miss Judy, and we'll talk about these issues, and get to know people, but I think there's a -- You know, we need to kind of build that connectivity and show the direct connection between some of us that sit here and everyday fishermen, and I think it starts at a young age. We really need to start getting in front of that really young crowd, and I go on YouTube a lot and watch the stuff, and the number of people -- I mean, tens of millions, hundreds of millions, of people are watching this stuff, and I think it would be a good source for us to figure out how to get into.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I see more hands going up. Mel and then Gary and then Kerry.

MR. BELL: Just sort of stating the obvious here is, you know, the council has a certain role, and we spend a lot of time dealing with the regulatory side of things, but, really, for the resources to be well taken care of, and here in the future, it really boils down to the behavior of the folks out there, so folks can choose to -- You know, that helps if they understand the issues, understand the problem, but the most dramatic things I've change in resource conversation, on the marine side, from the state perspective, were really accomplished by the public basically getting onboard with that and realizing it's really up to them.

It's up to them individually, and it's up to them as individual fishermen, or whatever their connection is with the resource, and it's how they behave themselves, and so it's really all about personal behavior, and, in changing personal behavior, it's about creating a culture in which certain behaviors are deemed appropriate, and some aren't, and, if you think, going way back in the day, and I use the example of like pollution, or littering, and, when I was a kid, you know, it was give a hoot and don't pollute, and that's very -- Those kinds of things, and remember the crying Indian? Remember?

Robert is right, and connect where your society is, and, if it's YouTube or whatever, but you've got to culturally -- You've got to change the cultural, and so the culture of the -- Regardless of which piece you're connected to, the fishery or whatever, but you've got to change that culture, and the way you change culture is generationally, and over time, but the stuff that we're doing here, in terms of outreach and trying to present a message, a positive message, is that, look, you have control.

That's well worth it, and we can regulate, and we can regulate all we want, but, again, part of regulation is you hope they really believe, and they follow the regulations, because, if they don't follow the regulations, you're no better off, but this is a very important area, and it's really about changing cultural attitudes from everything, even stuff Andy has brought up about growth and pressure, but, when the folks who love the resource love it enough to change their personal behavior, whether they're hunters or fishermen or just -- You know, however they enjoy the outdoors, and that's going to make a difference, and so this is very important stuff, and I totally agree that the culture right now is into things online, and YouTube or whatever, and that's how you've got to reach them, because you're going to be working that generation.

Then, twenty years from now, you know, you would be amazed. I mean, I've watched things change just with our red drum fishery in South Carolina, where things that were done forty years ago would never be -- Whether they were regulated or not, they would never be tolerated by the public, and you would just be a social outcast, if you did some of the stuff that used to be done, and so, anyway, I totally agree, YouTube or whatever it is that gets to them. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mel. Gary and then Kerry. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Just real quick, and I don't care, and I know I'm going to get blamed for this, but I kid you not, and I'm going to keep banging the TikTok drum, and this is what I ask all of you, and you don't actually have to go on TikTok, but Google -- This is not a political endorsement of this person's views, because, to be honest, I don't quite know what they are, but there's a representative out of North Carolina called Jeff Jackson, and I don't know if you're familiar with him, but he uses TikTok, in one of the most effective ways I have ever seen, to talk about

regulations as they are working their way through Congress, and it's very non-inflammatory, and it's just very matter-of-a-fact.

You guys talk about wanting to meet people where they're at, and, yes, it is YouTube, but, as the parent of twenty-something children, it is -- It's YouTube and TikTok and nowhere else. It's not Facebook, people, and that is very old, and it's not Instagram reels, and there is a way to use it effectively, and I know I'm not going to win this battle yet, but I'm going to keep saying, because you will eventually join me, I promise, or we'll get young enough people -- You had better be on my side, or else don't --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, as soon as you said "TikTok", hands flew up, and Gary's was the first hand, and so we'll go to that, and then we've got more people in the queue here.

MR. BORLAND: Kerry is right that there is, obviously, platforms that which all different ages are looking at, but I just want to make sure that we don't pivot too hard to just videos, right, because there is obviously other vehicles that we need to use to get the word out, and we've been doing some of those already, and so I don't want to see all -- You know, we're all excited about videos, and I just hate to see us put too many resources to just videos.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Trish and then Robert and then Tim.

MS. MURPHEY: I just wanted to -- I think all these discussions has been great, and I just need to put a plug in for habitat and the EFH, and also the importance of the habitat for fisheries, and, you know, that's another piece that's very important. I mean, I know Laurilee is very passionate about water quality in the Indian River, and divers are also -- You know, they're also -- They want to see the corals live, you know, and then, for me, you know, I spent a lot of time working in SAVs, and those are all important habitats to think about, and, also, discuss and educate, because, you know, what you don't see under the water is also important, and so just a plug for our habitat.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Trish. Robert and then back to Tim.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: My kids are not yet old enough to be on TikTok, but, from what I hear, it could use some better content, and so I would be totally supportive of making sure that we're putting some positive stuff on TikTok.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim. I can't imagine what Tim is going to tell us about TikTok.

MR. GRINER: No, and I was just going to say that, having twenty-year-olds, TikTok is very relevant. It's extremely relevant, and so is Instagram, and I think the beauty of these social platforms is, once this video is produced, it's just a click of a button to do them all, and so, really, you just want to flood all of social media with it. You want it on your Facebook, and you want it on your Instagram, your TikTok, or I'm not on TikTok, and I've never been on it in my life, but I have seen -- I have seen people, my kids included, sit on it for hours, and so the YouTube videos as well, and so, yes, I think it's one of those things where you just go ahead and push all the buttons and be done with it. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I appreciate the enthusiasm of this topic, and this has been a great discussion. I want to thank staff again, and I agree to always be outreaching, but I am excited to



see this program get going and blossom even more, but we are at lunchtime, and so I'm going to pass it back to our chair. Wait. One more thing.

MR. CARMICHAEL: They were thinking maybe to do a motion to just put a pin in this thing, for the project.

MS. OLIVER: I do have a draft, if that's helpful.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Throw it up there, and then somebody will read it, and we'll be done.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. There is a draft motion on the board, if someone would like to make it. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: My pleasure. **I move that we approve the What It Means to Me project and begin filming at the fall AP meetings.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Spud, and it's seconded by Mel. I feel like we've had a lot of good discussion on this. **Is there any objection to this motion?** All right. **That motion carries.** Now I'm going to pass it back to our chairman to talk about lunch.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thanks, Jessica, and so we have an hour-and-a-half down for lunch, and it's right at noon, and so we will do that. When we come back, just because I don't know what time limitations we have for the Law Enforcement Office of the Year and the Excellence Award, we'll do that first, and then we'll finish up what's left in Snapper Grouper, and so please be back for 1:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so, with no further ado, we get to go back into Snapper Grouper, and we have a couple more items left on the list, and I guess we're looking at Jeff talking to us about red grouper, SEDAR 86. We'll go ahead and let Ashely finish. Sorry.

MS. OLIVER: All right, and so I will jump back in, real quick, and hopefully this won't take too much more of your time, and so I want to talk to you guys about the Best Fishing Practices Master Volunteer Program, and I'm going to start using BFP MVP, because it's a long name, and so it's a little bit shorter.

Just to kind of jog your memories a little bit, back at your December meeting, this program was approved within the best fishing practices outreach specialist position, and this idea came from the Outreach and Communications AP back in October, and I believe the conversation got started by the chair, Scott Baker, and so the idea really stemmed from the master gardener program, if any of you are familiar or participate in that, and so progress is in development, and we just started phase two, which I will touch on here in a few slides.

As with the entire best fishing practices campaign, our main goal is to improve the survivorship of the snapper grouper fishery, and so we have three goals here that are trying to get at that. The first one is to really expand the reach, by empowering key members of the fishing community to spread the best fishing practices message and method on the council's behalf. The second goal is getting,

at, you know, we want to increase the awareness and use of all BFPs, specifically for snapper grouper species that need to be released and are exhibiting signs of barotrauma. Then our third goal, very similar to a goal with What It Means to Me, is we just want to increase our regular interaction with stakeholders, and just in hopes that they get more involved in fisheries management.

So what is this program, and, you know, how are we going to hit those goals? So we are looking at regional in-person workshops that will train volunteers to become experts in all best fishing practices, in hopes -- We will encourage them to train those in our fishing community as well.

We envision this program to be hosted quarterly in each state and last approximately an hour-and-a-half to two hours long, and so, for example, you know, Florida is a very large state, and so maybe we'll spend quarter one and spent that time in Florida and make multiple visits, and so, as for our target audience, the first target will be key members of the fishing community. We have learned, from many surveys, that, you know, one of the most effective information exchanges comes from word of mouth and local tackle shops, and, so, you know, by targeting this group, we're hoping that the messaging will become more positive and get more people involved. This group might include, you know, advisory panel members, council members, MRIP graduates, federal for-hire permit holders, and SAFMC Release participants.

The second group we'll target is port samplers, and so this group -- You know, they're the front face to anglers returning back at the docks, and they often get questions and complaints about fisheries management, and so, you know, educating the port samplers can, in turn, educate those anglers back at the dock, and they have also expressed a lot of interest in this program and have requested materials, in the past, to give out to folks coming back.

The third group would be novice fishermen, and I do have, indirectly, in parentheses there, that this group is absolutely welcome to come to the program, but we're hoping to capture this audience through those key members and the port samplers. Then our last group, but certainly not least, is the state and federal agency personnel. You know, this group will be targeted just because of their vast involvement with the public.

Getting into what this workshop will contain, the first thing I really want to stress though is we really intend these workshops to be conversational, and we just want to, you know, discuss ways that the participants can get this information out in the public and how we can help, instead of us just telling them how to do it, and so the meat of the workshop will be all about best fishing practices.

Of course, that includes barotrauma, and so, you know, we'll have discussions on depth that they typically see barotrauma, and there may be species, or time of year, that it's worse in, and we'll go over descending devices, what they are, how they work, the regulations involved, and maybe have some discussion on tips and tricks of improving the use of descending devices. We'll get into the additional best practices that pertain to not just snapper grouper, but other species as well, and so handling, limiting air exposure, and avoiding non-target species, and we'll also touch on some hook regulations as well, and, also, we would like to create a descending device with this group.

The second portion of the workshop will be all about getting involved, and so that, of course, includes citizen science, specifically SAFMC Release and FISHstory, and then I would like to talk

a little bit about the council itself and just give a quick, you know, overview of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, a little bit about the jurisdiction of the council and the FMPs, FMPs they're involved in, and then, also, you know, just where they can get involved in advisory panels, the council, and public comment. Then, again, discussion will be throughout. You know, we want this to be a very open forum.

As for the timeline, early on this year, we're just kind of getting the background and figuring out who we wanted to target with this program. We're currently in phase two, and this is where I've developing all the workshop components and program branding, and we plan to take this to the Outreach and Communications AP and talk about evaluation methods, and also some locations to host the workshop at, and I plan to take that question to the Snapper Grouper AP as well.

Then, this winter, we'll just be solidifying everything and promoting the workshop, and we are really hoping to get this thing off and running in the spring of 2024, and so, I guess, pending the schedule for the December meeting, this is something we could bring back to the table and have discussion. I don't necessarily have discussion points, and so I can continue on, if you would like.

All right, and so now I will get into kind of the council staff and Sea Grant staff outreach activities, and a little bit about what we've got planned for the coming months, the rest of 2023 and a little bit of 2024. I do want to note that we've continued our partnership with the Citizen Science Program and the Sea Grant Reef Fish Fellowship, and so we've been going to all these events together and just continuing that natural partnership.

Earlier this year, we went to the Haddrell's Point Fishing Expo in Charleston, and we also, in Charleston, went to the South Carolina DNR open house, and we traveled up to Morehead City and joined NC DMF for their 200 Year Jamboree, and we also went to ICAST in Orlando, Florida, and so, at all of these events, we had a booth that focused on best fishing practices, specifically descending device use, and also citizen science, with a focus on SAFMC Release.

There are also a few seminars that we attended as well, and we had a couple at the Haddrell's Point Fishing Expo, where we teamed up with two local fishermen, and there was a seminar up at Coastal Scuba with North Myrtle Beach, or at North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, and then, most recently, council staff, Sea Grant staff, and FWC staff collaborated for a seminar with the Jacksonville Offshore Fishing Club, and so there were great turnouts at all of these events, and I think it's really interesting to note that, just compared to last year, we've had a lot more people just approach us and want to -- Want us to come to their shops, and their clubs, to speak about this, and so the word is getting out there. People are wanting to get educated, and spread that with that members as well.

Tackle shop outreach is also ongoing. I started this earlier in the year, as the fellow, but David Hugo has now taken my spot, and he is traveling with Meg Withers, with the Citizen Science Program, and, you know, we're passing out SAFMC Release materials and best fishing practices materials, and so these are some general locations that we've been in, the Morehead City, North Carolina area, the central and southern portion of South Carolina, pretty much the entire coast of Georgia, and then some bits and pieces of Florida, and so Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Daytona, Miami, and Key Largo.

We've also been participating in these Pitman Creek mailings, and so Pitman Creek is a Kentucky-based distribution company, and they've really been spreading out into the saltwater world, and so we've been working with John Johnson, and we've selected twenty-eight southeastern tackle shops on their distribution list, and what we do is we'll send citizen science and best fishing practices materials, in one of these mailers shown on your screen, and we'll send that to Pitman Creek, who will then put that in their tackle shop orders and send that with their gear that those tackle shops are ordering. We sent out mailings in April, June, and August, and we have one more for the year in October.

We've also increased our best fishing practices social media presence, and that wouldn't have been possible without the great content we gathered on the citizen science content creation trip, and we've also been participating in the descending device outreach coordination team, and so this team is spearheaded by FWC, and participants include ourselves, The Nature Conservancy, Return 'Em Right, the Gulf of Mexico Council, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, and Sea Grant, and, really, this team is just so we can keep our messaging similar between the regions, and also just, you know, talk about any outreach activities and events that might be coming up that we can collaborate on.

Then David has been working hard to book some charters through his Sea Grant media trips, and so, basically, he's going to be bringing media to these trips, in hopes to capture the best fishing practices message and the SAFMC Release project, and hopefully they will spread that onto their platforms. We did just recently have one out at Isle of Palms, with Captain Chuck Griffin, and, you know, while the bottom fish didn't decide to bite that day, the cobia sure did, but we were really able to showcase our best fishing practices with the cobia, and so using a dehooker and our handling and trying to avoid them as much as possible.

Then we also have some new best fishing practices materials, and we have a create your own descending device rack card, and also using your best fishing practices brochure, which talks about, you know, the regulations that pertain to best fishing practices, and barotrauma as well, and so I have a whole bunch of these in the back. If anybody would be interested in taking some home with you to share in your communities, I would be happy to give those to you.

Then the last little bit here, I just wanted to give you a quick little update on some of our upcoming plans, and so Meg and I are heading to Little River, South Carolina on Monday, to talk with the Seacoast Anglers Fishing Club, and we are also working to do a seminar in south Florida in the fall, and that's specifically with the West Palm Beach Fishing Club and South Dade Recreational Anglers Club. In October, David is going out with Tom Roller on his boat, and is bringing on NC PBS for a Sea Grant media tour, or a charter, and, you know, we're hoping to capture best practices and release in action, and I believe he's going to do some tackle shop outreach in that part of North Carolina as well.

Then, in January, we've got a big outreach trip planned in the Florida Keys, and so we're looking to do some tackle shop outreach, a seminar, potentially a Sea Grant headboat trip, and we plan to have a booth at the Florida Keys Seafood Festival. Then, lastly, again, we just hope to get BFP MVP officially off the ground and running in the spring of 2024, and so, with that, I will take any questions, if there is time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Ashley. Any questions? Yes, Judy.

MS. HELMEY: I just wanted to say thank you very much for the presentation, and we appreciate the good work you're doing, you and the whole team.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: So I was really happy to see you include port agents as sort of line a frontline outreach sort of thing, and we've had this discussion in North Carolina a lot, and I know it's a very complicated thing, but I think we should try to find ways to utilize them more to educate anglers, because they are the front line, and I think it's like a very underutilized resource.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Anybody else? All right. Great. Thank you so much. All right. Now I think we're going to dive into red grouper, and I believe that Jeff is going to come back up here and talk to us about that.

DR. BUCKEL: Thank you, Chair, and so this is SEDAR 86, the red grouper operational assessment, and this is hot off the press, as the SSC just met last week and was given a presentation from Lew Coggins with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and then was asked to address the question to consider including spatial structure in the operational assessment of red grouper, and our response is there.

It's that the SSC is open to alternative data treatment and/or modeling approaches to incorporate spatial structure in the red grouper stock assessment if warranted by the available data. This would also address previous CIE and SSC comments from the previous assessment, and so this different distribution, basically two areas where red grouper occur in the South Atlantic, off of North Carolina and then off of Florida, and this has been known from past assessments. The trends you see in those two different areas differ, and so likely the potential that those are different stocks. Lew Coggins, when he was looking into the data to do the operational saw this and was concerned about keeping them together for the operational assessment.

The SSC recognizes the data challenges involved with doing this two-area modeling approach, or whatever spatial structure modeling approach is done, for example the SERFS chevron trap data, and there's been an attempt to try to use that for the southern region, but the data are too sparse to get an index for that area off of Florida.

There's a lot of discussion about moving within an operational assessment and going from what was the one stock structure to a spatial structure model, and, after a lot of discussion, the SSC recommended a benchmark assessment, because of multiple considerations that exceed the operational assessment framework. These considerations include the spatial structure aspect of the model that I just described, and we were also told that there's a recent study that shows that recruitment of red grouper into the U.S. South Atlantic -- That the bulk of that might be coming from the Gulf of Mexico, and so that's another reason to do a benchmark assessment instead of moving forward with the operational assessment.

Given that red grouper is in a rebuilding plan, there's going to be a substantial length of time between the last assessment and the benchmark result, right, and so the operational would be happening -- Those results would be coming to us sooner. Given that we're not recommending the operational, and we're going with a benchmark, now we're pushing things back several years,

and the SSC was concerned with that, since we're in this rebuilding plan, and so some interim information may be available to serve as a health check, but how this information is used may be dependent on new modeling structure, and so that's something for us to discuss and think about how we're going to move forward with that while we're, you know, moving forward with the process of a benchmark.

The other question we were provided was what additional oversight procedures are required, and so, for the benchmark assessment, new TORs will be developed, and new participants appointed. I believe that's my last slide, and I would be happy to answer questions on red grouper SEDAR 86.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Jeff. Questions? Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: Thanks, Jeff, and thanks, Madam Chair. I know, with white grunt, from years ago, Jessica's favorite species, there's a disjunct distribution, and there is, you know, genetic differences between white grunt off of North Carolina and south Florida, and I don't know if you know of any genetic studies for red grouper that would suggest that or not, or if that's something that you would explore. You know, grouper larvae have a long pelagic stage, and so I could envision that there is connectivity between south Florida and North Carolina, but I don't know if you have more information on that.

DR. BUCKEL: I don't know that, Jack, and so there may be others in the room that know about the genetic work. Chip is coming to the table.

DR. COLLIER: During Lew's presentation, he gave an indication that Dave Portenoy is doing some work on genetics of red grouper. Based on the preliminary findings, they were not seeing evidence of different genetic stocks along the Atlantic coast, but he also -- He did caveat it that was preliminary, and things might change as they get more information.

DR. BUCKEL: So stay tuned on the genetics. We did have a discussion about, you know, the length frequency distributions are quite different, and we see small fish off of the east coast of Florida, and then, in our area off of North Carolina, it's larger fish, and so there was discussion about is that, you know, more juvenile sub-adults, smaller red grouper, that recruit there off the east coast of Florida, and then the adults, or the larger animals, move northward, and there was several lines of evidence against that, that it really was differential recruitment, and so the last recruitment off of North Carolina was probably a long time ago, and that's why we haven't --

Those fish that are there are larger and older, and it's just a lack of recruitment is the reason why we don't have those smaller fish off of North Carolina at this point. Anecdotally, the chevron trap and video teams have seen some larger numbers of smaller grouper, and so that's a positive sign for this stock, and so we'll see, and stay tuned on that, but that's just anecdotal.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any other questions? I can't remember earlier in the week, and did we -- Did the SEDAR Committee recommend that this be converted to a benchmark, or is that something that still needs to be done? Can you remind us what we did, Chip?

DR. COLLIER: We did not, or the committee did not, recommend changing from an operational to a benchmark. That could be done as we go back into -- As we're reviewing that committee report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That would be the committee to do it, and not this committee?

DR. COLLIER: I think that would be the best approach, and it would make it a little bit cleaner.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Clay.

DR. PORCH: I just would say the Southeast Center is comfortable with it being a benchmark, but, of course, the magic is always in the terms of reference, and so, if there are a lot of additional things that are asked for, it could affect the schedule.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that. Any other questions on this? All right. Thank you, Jeff.

DR. BUCKEL: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The next topic on our agenda is to review the list of topics, review and approve the list of topics, for the upcoming Snapper Grouper AP meeting.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so, getting into the topics for the Snapper Grouper AP meeting, a draft list is shown here on the screen, and it's included in your agenda overview, at the bottom, Topic Number 8, and so you'll see what we have there. We have some upcoming assessments for golden tilefish and blueline tilefish, and so we were going to update the fishery performance reports for both of those, being that they're both a deepwater type of fishery, and there is going to be some similar concerns for the stakeholders for those fisheries. We're going to do both of those, and we're also trying to gain some efficiency for the large number of upcoming assessments that we have scheduled for the snapper grouper fishery.

We will have at least one, if not -- I believe one of the folks from Blue Matter Science coming to the AP meeting, to talk through management strategy evaluation, and there was also a requested topic of a discussion of limited entry in the for-hire fishery. We have Amendment 55 and Amendment 46, and both of those, I believe, are in a place where the AP can have some discussion of what's going into those. 44 kind of has a question-mark, given how the meeting went today, as to whether you have specific questions for the AP or if that can be more of an update.

Then we'll have updates on best fishing practices, and, as I mentioned before, black sea bass is going to be more of an update for them, as well as wreckfish will be an update at this meeting, and then of standard -- More or less standard updates from citizen science and SEDAR, as well as just letting them know what happened at the ropeless gear workshop.

Staff has been notified, in between the time of this overview and this meeting, about the potential idea of some discussion about the FES issue happening at the AP. At this point, at least from the staff perspective, I don't know that we would be able, prepared, to present that information, just because that's something that is not coming from us, and so, if we were able to get somebody from MRIP to be able to present that information, that might be helpful. I also -- You know, there may

-- I am not sure what level of discussion the AP is going to have related to the FES issue that would have impact there, and so I'm not sure of the nature of that type of topic, if that would be more of an update type of topic, as this is what's going on right now, or if there would be a discussion tied to that, and so that was brought up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, here comes Chip.

DR. COLLIER: So another option we were thinking about for the MRIP discussion was to have it as part of the seminar series in November. That way, we could have multiple APs talk about it at one time, and council members can also be there to listen-in, as well as SSC members, and we felt like that was going to be a nice, open way to do it, and so I've reached out to Richard Cody, to see if anyone from S&T would be available to do it, and so I will check back with him later today, to see if they are available.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that idea, but I'm just a little concerned, because, since it was part of our discussions this week, it seems like there should be, at least maybe from staff, kind of explaining this information before they provide advice back to us.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: We can certainly -- I guess what I'm envisioning, given what Chip just brought up, is us kind of pointing the AP to these are resources, and this is the seminar series that is coming up, and these are ways that, you know, in the seminar series, we take questions or comments, and people are able to participate in that, and so just to kind of tell people that this is something that you should pay attention to and attend and plan on providing comments to the council, as you see fit, kind of following that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: John Carmichael also pointed out that the Office of Science and Technology has some explanatory information on their website that we can point people towards as well, and so it would be more of council staff pointing the AP to resources for them to get more information, more so than having a discussion at the AP.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and then yellowtail, and I think that could just go under updates. Other thoughts for items for the AP? All right. I don't see any hands. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Let's just be clear that you have black sea bass amendment, and we should probably at least put some sort of update, as far as this new framework with gag and black and the ropeless gear.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That's a good point. Go ahead.

MS. MARHEFKA: The black and gag wasn't on there, and so I just felt like they need to see how it's going to come through.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Myra just reminded me that I think we had discussed having wind updates, offshore wind updates, to the different APs, and that might be -- Especially Snapper Grouper,



especially with Carolina Long Bay being in a hardbottom area, and I think it might be good for a -- If they're available to give a presentation to that AP.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. It looks like Mike is getting that up there. What else? I don't see any other hands. Maybe we're good with this list. This is a ton of items. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: (Ms. Brouwer's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We've got it. All right. Anything else for the AP? All right. So then the next item is the last remaining Other Business item that I already had on the list, and maybe people have thought of other Other Business, but I wanted to have a short discussion of Amendment 35, in light of the new FES information, and so I don't think that that's been submitted to the Secretary.

I think that it's been reviewed, but it hasn't been fully submitted yet, and I guess I just wanted us to have a conversation about the catch, the discards, and how that might be affected by these FES numbers, and do those new results warrant the council pulling back this amendment and reconsidering it, and we can talk about timing and the other things that we were looking at for the other documents that are underway, and so I would really like to have a discussion. This is the red snapper amendment that also had the single -- It had a decrease in the quota and the single-hook rigs in this document. Thoughts? Tim.

MR. GRINER: Could you remind me, and when did we finalize, approve and submit, that amendment?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: You all approved it in March of this year, and it hasn't been submitted, but we are within like one to two weeks, and we've got chair edits back, and so that was the last stage of editing, and so those are largely incorporated. I need to meet back with my Regional Office counterpart, the week after this meeting, and then we -- The next step would be for us to submit it.

MR. GRINER: So we actually haven't even submitted it to the service yet, and is that correct?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: No, not yet.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thoughts on this? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I guess my question is, okay, well, we have two days of allowable recreational harvest, and so we're not really depending on MRIP to generate the harvest estimates, and we're depending on your State Reef Fish Survey and some ancillary data from the other states to sort of inform that, but we are depending on MRIP for discard estimates across the South Atlantic region, and so, obviously, if there's a distortion in the private recreational effort estimates, I assume that it could manifest itself in a distortion of those discard estimates, to some magnitude, which is unknown, and will remain unknown, I guess, until this follow-up study is done.

I mean, I think it's particular vexing, because you've got a recall bias in self-reported discards, and now we've got a -- I guess you could call it a recall bias in the self-reported effort estimates, both of which are sort of unknown, because the discards aren't really validated, and so, you know, I think it calls the question of whether or not those numbers are accurate and precise enough to be

used in the prescriptive manner that we've been told, as regards to a percentage reduction of discards, which I assume is sort of driving the whole thing here, in terms of what we're trying to do with discards.

Again, you know, the shadow of doubt has sort of descended on that one, like it has on the other ones, but I guess the question is what do we do in the meantime? We've got a catch level recommendation, again, from the SSC that they've not had a chance to reevaluate that, I guess, in light of this, and I know everybody keeps going to it being a pilot study, but I think, you know, it still is something that we have to at least consider, that it has introduced error into that. I don't know that I -- I don't really have an answer, per se, other than the fact that I think it has, once again, thrown doubt, and concern, into that what we've done thus far may have an error that is leading us to actions that aren't proportional to the situation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree, because I think the discards are estimated as a scalar of the harvest, and we've been only having two-day seasons already, when the quota was larger, and now the quota is going to be even smaller, and so I feel like, you know, this discard information was already uncertain, and this is just adding another level of uncertainty, and I also thought that one of our reasons, or reasoning, in working on this amendment was because of the magnitude of the discards, but Clay has had his hand up. Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to remind the council that, you know, we showed a sensitivity run where we cut the discards in half, and the stock was still overfished and undergoing overfishing, and so, even if you had a 40 percent reduction, and that's less than the half that we looked at, you would still need to take action, and so I don't really see that it affects this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I'm also hoping that the RFP that's coming out, that's going to be looking at discards, is going to get some additional information, but I am just very concerned, and talk about explaining this to the public, about this amendment is going to go to the Secretary, and we have this new information on the table, and this is going to get reduced, even though there's tons of fish out there, and, I mean, I think that we understand why, but this is certainly going to be a challenge to try to explain this to the public, and we have already pretty much lost the credibility and trust of the public already on this topic, and so I don't know if others have other thoughts here. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So the one thing that I did think about was I know that, when we were trying to figure out actions, we were hearing a lot of caution from Andy, and Andy's shop, about the fact that what we were proposing was probably not going to get at discards the way that was encouraged for us. Hypothetically, if it's an overestimate of the effort, we should have lower amounts of discards, which would argue more for the gain of what we've proposed, and, okay, maybe it's not making up the 65 percent, or whatever the reduction was that we were supposed to have, but it's obviously -- You know, if that bar has been lowered, and say it's 25 percent, if you just say 40 percent, and we're closer to that amount than we would have been at trying to make 65 percent, and so I think that's one part of that.

The fact that it does -- That the catches are tied to the state surveys, and that was the one thing that I had when I was doing the review, is there were some comparisons that are made, and I had a hard time, because we're talking FES on one part and then the state on the other, and then, relative to

this, this happens, and it's like but they're not the same currency, and so I don't know how you argue for that, but the certainty of the catch is, you know, again resting in a different currency than FES, and so I'm just kind of throwing it to that, that there is that part to that too, and, I mean, it's not perfect, but it's not nearly as deficient as -- If that's the case, then there is a reduction, and it's not really as deficient as it would look.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Other thoughts here from the committee? Mel.

MR. BELL: So, procedurally, it's available, and, I mean, given the concerns we've had, and the fact that what's left in certainly is adoption of the new ABC and ACL, but it's one action to deal with discards, which may or may not -- You know, depending on how things stack up, I mean, it may be beneficial or it may not, based on what we've heard, in terms of trying to achieve the larger number we were trying to achieve, but so, if we were sort of like to not move on this, ice it, how would we do that, or what would be the -- You know, how -- Procedurally, what would we need to do, I guess?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that's a Monica question, because, yes, I don't know if the council can pull it back or what, since it hasn't already been submitted, and, procedurally, could you tell us what some of the options are?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think a transmittal date is a kind of a marker here, and you haven't sent it into the Fisheries Service yet, and so, you know, I was just looking at the Act real quick, and I don't think it gets into this kind of issue, because you haven't sent it to the Fisheries Service yet, and so I guess you've got some flexibility into what you want to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I see more hands up. Spud, Robert, Carolyn.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, we do have a timeline on responding to the catch level specification advice, and so there is a clock ticking there that we have to deal with. Now, I guess one could question whether the gear modification thing is, which is problematic in and of itself, in terms of quantifying the benefits, you know, and we could probably talk about this for the rest of the day, and I have still never quite understood how we got a recommendation to reduce discards by 65 percent, but we reduced them by 50 percent, and it didn't do anything, and that's a methodological thing that I'm still trying to get my head around, and I don't --

We can talk about this offline or something, but I think it may a currency of communication issue, of what this means versus what that means, but I think that's part of the optics of this for the public, you know, is we're telling them that discards are the overfishing problem, and those discards are estimated from a data source that we know now had a bias in it of a particular magnitude that we didn't know before, and so, I mean, it's -- I mean, I think we're sort of in a trap here, as far as we've got catch level recommendations that we have to respond to, and, really, I guess it begs the bigger question of what do we do after that, you know, because we're going to need, I guess, a better understanding of what this means on the whole discard issue as we go past Amendment 35, because we're going to have an updated stock status determination at some point, but then, in and of itself, is going to be affected, unless it just solely relies on State Reef Fish Survey numbers, which it will not rely on, because there's going to be MRIP-FES numbers for the discards. Anyway, it's enough to make your head kind of spin around, isn't it?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I have another question for Monica, but I'm going to keep going through the list of hands here. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Spud, when you mentioned modification of gear, were you talking about implementation of descending devices?

MR. WOODWARD: No, and that's the going from double-hook rigs to single-hook rigs when fishing natural baits for the snapper grouper complex, and there's two actions in that amendment, and one of them is the catch level recommendations, and the other one is that gear, and its intended purpose is to reduce encounters, and, thus, discards.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: So, I guess, just a general question. Do the discard projections take into account changes or adoption of use of descending devices?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think so, yes, but they said it wasn't very quantifiable, I think, and so they said outreach, and descending devices in general, weren't very quantifiable.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Regulatory whiplash, as Spud would say. Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I think I just go back to our discussions as we were working on this, because we did have the conversation about whether or not we would just work with the allowable catch, right, when we were talking about what do we keep in and what do we keep out, because, even with putting in the single-hook rigs, we acknowledged that it wasn't going to get us the full amount that we needed, but we were making a strong enough record to say that, in concert with all the outreach that we were doing, which, unfortunately, was not quantifiable at this point, and it was going to get us closer to the mark of reducing the discards.

I still go back to what are we presenting in there, and the catch limit, or the catch values, are predicated on what's coming out of a different survey than FES, and that number is what it is, and it's not based on the FES, which is what we're calling in question. Our biggest debate was over whether or not we could make the rate of reduction, and we acknowledged that we couldn't do it, but we were going to do our best to put something on the table, and, technically, this does that, and it doesn't necessarily -- Our success, we're not measuring it by a metric, and so the idea is we're trying to reduce discards, and it's not by some amount, but we're trying to do that, and the second action is attempting that, and the good news is that we're not falling as short. We don't know how far we're falling short, but, technically, we're not falling as far short of meeting the goals that we were told that we had to meet and weren't meeting, if that makes sense.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I have a couple more questions, but I'm going to keep going through the hands. Mel and then Mike.

MR. BELL: I'm bouncing back and forth, and so where I was going a second ago was we have a time-sensitive obligation to at least deal with the catch, or adopting the new catch, but we don't have a time-sensitive obligation to fiddle with the gear part, and so, you know, one approach would be if you could somehow take that out and just move forward with dealing with the new catch, but you would have work backwards, and we would have to start over again, or something, it seems,

to do that, I would think, and I don't know how you would do that, but I was just trying to imagine moving forward on the one aspect that we do have an obligation with the time clock on it, and I don't even know if we can do that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so a question for Monica. NOAA just put out this call for this RFP to help us figure out ways to reduce discards, you know, innovative management, et cetera, and what would happen -- Yes, there is this time clock, but what would happen if the council said let's just not submit, and then that puts it back to the Secretary of Commerce, right, to then determine that the South Atlantic Council is not meeting their obligations, and then she would decide if, and how, to step in, and is that what would happen next?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I'm not sure what would happen next. A couple of things. One, to get some something Mel just said, about if you took out the gear portion, I don't know that you need to start it all over again from the beginning, but you certainly have different -- A lot of the actions in the amendment, including, remember, your best fishing practices and all that, is an appendix, and so there's a lot of things tied together, and discussed together, and so I would think that staff would have to go back through and untangle those kinds of things and get you a new document to review. You would have to definitely put it on the agenda, so the public would know that you were going to take action on it, if that's what you were going to do.

If you don't submit it at all, what would the Secretary do, and the Fisheries Service will have to talk with us in GC and say what are our options, and one option certainly is potentially a secretarial amendment to end overfishing, and so those kinds of things are all on the table, and I know we've talked about those before, and this is kind of an interesting issue, and I don't know that the council has faced taking action, final action, on something and not transmitting and then deciding, well, maybe we want to pull it back to do something else, and so it's just kind of a novel idea.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I would say that, and I know that it seemed like the timing -- What Andy was saying is that RFP, and so, like if states are going to do EFPs and other things to try out these alternative management techniques, innovative approaches to reduce discards, focusing on the recreational fishery, it seemed like -- I think he was saying that that would start in April of 2024, and it could run up to two years, and so it's almost like we don't even know what tools to suggest at this time, because this new information is going to be forthcoming, and I don't know, and there's just multiple pieces of new information, I guess, and this was our short-term action, and the mid-term action was to try to look at other ways to reduce discards, and then the long-term action is the MSE that's underway.

I don't know, and I just struggle with this, in light of some of the new information and the rationale that was used in the document, having to do so much with discards, and maybe the magnitude of those discards weren't really as suggested, but I know that Mike has been waiting over here, and we can go to Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Actually, it was kind of covered in some of the comments that you and Carolyn made, and I was just going to remind the council kind of your record that's going into that amendment to this point, because you all decided that, in response to the -- In response to the overfished status, it was determined, by the SSC, that the rebuilding plan was progressing adequately, and so that wasn't something that needed to be addressed, and there was no, you know, two-year timeframe, none of that.

In response to the overfishing status, that is the one of ending overfishing immediately, and the case is laid out within the amendment that the council began work immediately to end overfishing, and that is through the MSE. The MSE takes time, and that case is laid out in the amendment, but the work began immediately, and we provide, within the amendment document, a time table of this is each step we've taken, from the time that the overfishing determination was made up until the present, and that work has progressed continuously in that fashion, and so that's kind of what's been built to this point.

Now, Regulatory Amendment 35 is not that action, obviously, and the MSE is that, and then the amendment that follows that, but Regulatory Amendment 35 was the measure to satisfy the SSC's recommended ABC level and then also to have some type of interim measure to reduce discards, and, again, not trying to meet any quantified percentage reduction or amount, but try to slow down the discards as the MSE progresses, and the amendment that follows that is developed, and then you all put in the measure that you would ultimately make as your case to end overfishing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mike. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Mike, remind me of the sequence of events and the timeline for the MSE, because what my question is, is, okay, so we've got this RFP now that's supposed to fund projects that will inform us about innovative methods to reduce discards, and, obviously, reducing discards is going to be integral to the success of the MSE, and so what's the timeline? I mean, when are we supposed to get the deliverables from the MSE that we would then use as a basis for decision-making, or Chip?

DR. COLLIER: The original timeline for the MSE was going to be June of 2024. We are going to have a product that could be ready by then. However, we're going to be working with the University of Florida, in order to get some surveys of stakeholders and try to incorporate their information into the MSE process, and so it's going to be a little bit delayed from June of 2024, and potentially December, and then we can immediately work on other issues that you guys would like to see address through the MSE process, whether it's looking at some of these innovative ideas, what kind of quantifiable changes could we predict to occur with those.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. All right. Clay and then Tim.

DR. PORCH: I wanted to circle back, just because I think, conceptually, people are mixing up the meaning of all these percentage changes, and I get that it's kind of complicated, but so the FES -- Let's say it was a big number, like 40 percent, and we don't know, of course, and, you know, it was a pilot study, but let's say it's 40 percent. That's an adjustment all the way back in time. It's not that you're looking forward and saying, oh, the discards now are going to be, from this point on, reduced by 40 percent. That 40 percent would apply all the way back in time.

If you ran the assessment with those new numbers, it's that scaling thing we were talking about, and you're going to end up just getting estimates of biomass that are a bit lower, and your discards are still going to be high, in a relative sense, and, in fact, that 65 percent number is a reduction relative to recent levels, and so, in other words, relative to the recent past, we still need to reduce discards by 65 percent.

It's going to be a similar number even if the overall number of discards is lower, and it may not be quite 65 percent, but it's not going to be cut in half or something like that, and so the point is, any way you slice it, you still are going to have to reduce discards substantially if you want to stop overfishing, and maybe it's not a 65 percent reduction, and maybe it's a 55, and I don't know the exact number there, but don't make the mistake of multiplying those percentages and thinking that it's only, you know, a 30 or something percent reduction in discards that needs to be achieved, and it will still be substantial.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Clay. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I mean, I'm struggling to get my arms around this, too. I mean, given the indices that we saw, that we were given from the trap survey, and, in my mind, the possibility that 35 never was going to really decrease discards, and, in fact, I think it had the possibility to increase discards, and so, if you delayed this, we would still never get new advice from the SSC, a new ABC, until way sometime after this new pilot study thing was done, and is that correct?

DR. COLLIER: So, currently on the schedule, we have a research track assessment for red snapper starting in 2025, and the likely endpoint for that research track assessment might be 2027, and then we would need to do an operational assessment following that, and so catch advice is likely to come either in late 2027 or in 2028.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Is there any possibility of doing any kind of interim analyses in between now and then that can inform us regarding ABCs and progress in rebuilding that would allow us to maybe fine-tune things a little more? I mean, it's just -- You know, it's kind of hard to sit here and go, my god, that's a long time off into the future, and, I mean, is there nothing there that we can use to do an interim analysis?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would hope, and I think it's a great idea, but is that possible?

DR. COLLIER: I mean, it's currently not on the schedule, and we haven't had discussions like this with the Science Center in regard to it. You know, you're going to be running into some of the same issues with the recreational data. What we could potentially do is maybe talk to the Science Center about, as opposed to having a research track for red snapper, change it to a benchmark assessment. That way, at the end of it, you're getting catch level advice, and you could be chopping off that last year, or year-and-a-half, and so that might be the best approach.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay.

DR. PORCH: I mean, we could explore the interim analysis approach to give advice between now and when the assessment is finished, and I would be very resistant about moving this one to a benchmark assessment, because we are potentially talking about wholesale changes, because remember we're incorporating two estimates of total abundance of red snapper from the South Atlantic Great Red Snapper Count, and that's a lot of work, and it involved a lot of people. In addition to that, there's more work going on with selectivity, and, I mean, this is going to be a massive revolution, in terms of the assessment, and so I would be really nervous about trying to use a conventional benchmark approach.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Other thoughts here? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I think it was about a year ago that we talked about rolling bottom closures, to see whether, you know, some -- Rotating some bottom closures might produce enough reduction in fishing effort to get us some more fishing days, and I think it's been about a year, and I think Andy was going to work on it, and, Jack, do you know anything about that? Has Andy done any work on that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: I don't recall that Andy was going to do anything with that. He'll be here in a minute, and you can ask him.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Hands are going up. Monica and then Clay.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, maybe Clay will speak to this, but, Laurilee, I believe that information was presented to the council in September, maybe two years ago, and I'm not sure, but some information about different time/area closures that could get you the reductions you needed in discards, and that's my recollection anyway.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay and then Tim.

DR. PORCH: Yes, that's correct. We presented that information, and the council, at that time, elected not to pursue any combination of the time/area closures.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I'm glad you reminded me of that, because, you know, I kept kicking that around, and part of me was really thinking that's probably, at the end of the day, the most effective way to accomplish what we really need to accomplish, and it's a bitter pill to swallow, but, if we -- If we delay submitting 35 as we have it now, would that allow us to draw it back in and relook at the spatial time/area closures?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: That would essentially be starting a whole new amendment. That would -- That type of action would essentially be an entire new amendment, and, you know, kind of overshadow whatever you all have in 35 at this point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GRINER: Well, that's what is kind of -- That I'm trying to wrap my arms around, because that's where we started, and we ended up where we are now, but that's where that amendment started, right, and so why would it be starting all over, when we're going back to kind of where we were? I don't understand how it would be starting all over, because I guess you're saying it would be starting all over with more analysis, but, I mean, that's what we were discussing in this amendment to begin with, and so, in my mind, it's just kind of going back and maybe taking a



look back at some other actions that we already had been discussing, and maybe there's new information out there, or maybe there's something that we overlooked, and, you know, maybe there are some areas that we could get some bang for the buck with this discard situation. You know, I'm not so sure that that's not worth another look.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Robert and then Spud.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Spud, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: It was my understanding that we were not even going to talk about time/area closures until we got through this MSE process and take a comprehensive look at all elements of the snapper grouper fishery, because, if you remember, the thing that we choked on was basically shutting out access to the rest of the complex to fix a one-species problem, and that's where we just got hung on it, and so, really, until we invest the time and effort -- Frankly, I'm a little concerned that, you know, we're going to have a lag now in the results of this RFP stuff, versus the MSE, and, I mean, I know that's hard to prevent, and none of us have a crystal ball, but, you know, the success, or failure, of the MSE really depends, as I understand it, on the conclusiveness, and completeness, of what we use as source information for it.

We're going to kind of find ourselves in a little bit of that disconnect again, but back to the fundamental issue here, and I sort of look at the gear modification in 35 like we were talking about the black sea bass bag limit.

You know, we were saying, okay, well, that's a precautionary principle approach, you know, to reduce it down, but, at the same time, we talked ourselves out of it, because it was like, well, that seven to five may be a pointless effort, other than doing something based on perception, and we really won't know whether it's going to make a change or not, and so we've kind of committed ourselves, in 35, to that, to the gear as an intermediate step, and, I mean, to me, procedurally, it's like do we have to vote to rescind it from consideration? Then that leaves us with the current ABC and ACL in place, unless the Secretary takes action to change that to the current catch level recommendations from the SSC, and so it would basically just abolish everything that we're recommended, and it leaves it out there in status quo for somebody else to do something different than status quo.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I'm going to go back to the list. Robert, and then back to Mike to respond to the question that came from Tim, and then Mel.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I don't have a comment anymore.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just in response to, I guess, the timing that would be involved in this action, and considering any type of bottom closure, and so what happened with that is that there were some options developed, and there was analysis from the Science Center, as far as the area of bottom that would -- That would reduce and end overfishing for red snapper, but, if we were to put that into an amendment, and, remember, this is a bottom closure, and so the effects are not just

red snapper effects. This would be snapper grouper effects, and we would have to analyze effects across a wide variety of species.

Because the council decided, in September of, and I believe it was last year, that that wasn't something that you all were going to go forward with at that time, the effects analysis, as far as biological and looking at the different species that would be affected by such a measure, as well as social and economic effects, none of that was developed, and we didn't get to that stage, because that's when you all decided that we weren't pursuing that action any longer, and so that is the part -- That is the part that would take a significant amount of time, just from the sheer number of species that would be affected by that type of measure.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mel.

MR. BELL: Just given the way the conversation has kind of steered in other directions right now, I'm at a point where I think it might be more productive to just move forward and transmit 35 as-is, and I realize that we've got to do one part of it, right, and, if we can't tease out the gear part very easily, and just move on the new catch recommendation -- Then, you know, if you, if you just leave that in there -- We're eventually going to have to deal with discards, at some magnitude, and I would be willing to bet you that what we've proposed in there, in terms of the gear modifications for folks, we'll probably find ourselves revisiting something like that, and that might be more desirable than some of this other stuff that we're talking about, and so we may end up there anyway, in the future, after we get to dealing with discards in a more serious manner, and we know it is going to have some impact on discards, in the direction we're wanting to go, and so, I mean, I'm inclined, at this point, to just transmit 35 and move on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Other -- Carolyn and then Judy.

DR. BELCHER: So Mel said it way better than I was trying to, and my problem, unfortunately, is throwing numbers out, and I understand that things aren't additive, but it was just the idea that we're shooting for -- We're being told 65 percent, and, we don't know how we're going to get there. In good faith, we're trying to put something forward, but now what are we shooting for? We don't know, but I think the fact that, again, we're under a statutory requirement to provide a number, and we've talked about that, and it's not as dependent on FES as other species we have are, and so that one -- I don't see where that can't go forward.

The hook thing, we all know that it wasn't ideal, but we were told that we had to make an attempt to do something. We were told that we couldn't use best practices, because we couldn't quantify it, and this isn't -- You know, again, is it realizing a huge quantity? We don't know, but at least it's showing a good-faith gesture going forward, and, if it's not sufficient, that call is above us, but we're at least making the attempt to meet the things that Andy has pointed out to us that we need to be doing to address those things. It's not perfect, but at least we're making the attempt.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: I just kind of want to go on the record as I'm really not for bottom closures, because it takes the economic effect really for charter boats, regular recreational fishermen, and it's going to have such an impact. Red snapper has had such a big impact on the fisheries now, and even the recreational fishermen, and forget about the charter boat fishermen in Georgia,

because there's not, and, basically, red snapper is a problem, and there's so many red snapper, and so, when you tell everybody that you're going to close the bottom, you can forget anybody at all, any fisherman, believing in what we're doing up here. They're going to think we have lost our minds.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Kerry and then Trish.

MS. MARHEFKA: This feels, unfortunately, like one of sort of my lowest moments in all of my time dealing with fisheries management, because, in my heart, what I feel like is the right thing to do, of pulling this back, and saying to the fishermen that we understand what you're seeing, and we know there's this problem -- You know, that feels like the right thing to do, but I also recognize there's this legal side of it that we have over here, and there's nowhere in Magnuson that says you can't -- You know, you have to -- It's just really frustrating, and I think it's going to be the hardest moment, when that ABC is low, and I don't even know what kind of season there's going to be, and so there's not going to be even a season, and we know these numbers are wrong, and we know there's so much fish out there, and it will be, personally, for me, one of my lowest moments. It's very frustrating, and I don't know the way forward, but this stinks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have Trish and then Tim.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just kind of thinking of our three questions, as we go through, and, as Carolyn has pointed out, the catch data depends on your Florida data, and discards is uncertain, and they're now more uncertain, as Carolyn pointed out, and I guess I'm going through pros and cons now, but they actually may -- Now we have to discard less, and so that's kind of a plus, even though we don't know how much less, and I think it was either Mel or Carolyn -- We made a good-faith effort, as this is one piece of several things that we wanted to work towards, as far as getting -- You know, addressing red snapper overfishing, and, you know, this was one piece, and, talking about the closures, just remember all the negative comments we got on closures, you know, in the early stages of discussing this, and I think that would just be a bad route to go at this point, and so I just feel like, at this point, the best thing to do is move forward with this. You know, like I said, it was one of several things to address discards.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I have Tim and then Laurilee and then Clay.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. As difficult as this is, I'm with Kerry, and I am really struggling with this, but, you know, to me, it just makes sense to pull this back. I mean, I hear Judy, you know, and I understand what she's saying, but, at the same time, if you look at it a little bit different way, the red snapper are everywhere. As Judy said, they're everywhere, and so closing small, little pieces, if they're really everywhere, you've still got plenty of places to go catch them, but, if we keep going -- If this goes forward, and we're back to a full-on closure, and it won't open, and, with it not opening, then it's just a total-discard fishery, and how does it ever reopen from there until 2030, when that next assessment is done, if there is no chance for it to open?

You know, I don't know, and I just -- It seems like we've got a way to pull back a little bit, and get us another, you know, twelve months, or whatever, a little bit longer, to try to get some -- To try to look at some other alternatives, and I am not one for bottom closures, trust me, but I think it would be worth looking at where you could do those, and how they could be structured, and at what times of year they could be done, and let the Science Center tell us if that gives us any bang

for our buck. You know, does that do anything, because that's the only thing that I think, at the end of the day, in reality, is going to change anything about discards. Until this fishery is opened up at a bigger scale, we're always going to have this discard problem.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I have, in the queue, Laurilee and then Clay and then Judy.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay, and so Andy is back, and so maybe he'll remember this, and so, Monica, you're right, and, I mean, we absolutely said, no, no, no, on bottom closures, and that's why we went down the path of Regulatory Amendment 35, but then, out of the very few public comment people that made public comment at our last meeting, there were fishermen there that were saying enough is enough, and let's -- We will consider talking about bottom closures, and they can't fish.

So many people have gone out of business, and Judy can tell you that she's losing charters to the Gulf now. You know, customers that have been with her for decades are calling her up and saying we're tired of going out and catching red snapper and throwing them back in the water, and we're going over to the Gulf, and we're going to take our business to the Gulf, where we can keep some fish, and our industry, in the South Atlantic, cannot keep -- We can't survive at this rate.

You have fishermen, at the last meeting, at the public comment, and you had both recreational and commercial fishermen saying let's take another look at bottom closures. I think it was at the meeting in Key West, where, Andy, you said that you would go back and just take a look and see if there was a possibility that putting in a few bottom closures, and we're not talking about MPAs and permanent closures, but we're talking about little pieces of bottom, and moving them around, so that no one inlet area is impacted for the rest of eternity, and just see if having some closures like that would get us some fishing days, because we can't survive like this.

I don't know how we can go back and tell our fishermen that there's no hope of anything happening until after 2027. I mean, it would be even after that, and it's -- Like Kerry said, this is really, really hard. It's hard for us to talk to the fishermen and look them in the eye and say it isn't going to happen until 2027, and sorry.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The next folks I had in the queue were Clay, then Judy, and then Gary.

DR. PORCH: Kind of following-up on Laurilee's comment, I mean, time/area closures have gotten a bad rap, and I think people misunderstand them, and you mentioned that you got a lot of criticisms about the idea of time/area closures, but I bet that you get just as much, or more, about the two-day season, and, with the right combination of time/area closures, you can also have a much longer season. I mean, depending on -- You can leave some areas open year-round, conceivably, and allow harvest from those areas, and there's a lot of combinations, and so it's not that you would close big areas and still have a two-day season, and you may have, you know, a months'-long season, depending on how you structure the time/area closures.

Those are the sorts of options that we're actually in the process of working on now, and that could be explored, but, you know, kind of a knee-jerk reaction of, no, don't close areas, which I admit, as an individual who likes to go recreational fishing, I don't like closed areas either, and I want to go in my favorite spot, but, you know, that's not the reality anymore. There's so much effort out there that I can't just do what I want anymore, and so don't just shelve the idea of time/area

closures. There's a lot of clever ways we can do it that would actually increase fishing opportunities and lead to longer seasons, as we convert those discards into fish that you can actually land.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Judy and then Gary.

MS. HELMEY: Okay. If you could come up with a way that you possibly could show us that you could close X amount of bottom, and, at the same time, while you're closing X amount of bottom, you're going to give us fish to catch around the places that you didn't close, it might ease it a little bit, but what's going to happen is, if you can't give us that, because you have to wait four or five years so you can see what the assessment is, it's -- I mean, it's going to be the same problem we have now, and everybody is going to be very, very upset. I'm just saying that, if we want to do a study and try to find out what we're going to get if we do close some bottom, and what bottom you're thinking should be closed, I'm -- You know, I'm sure that we'll look at it, and maybe it will help, if we can still get some fish out of it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I'm going to go to Chip, and then I'm going to go back to the list.

DR. COLLIER: This is the exact reason why we're doing the snapper grouper MSE, is we want to be able to evaluate these potential options and what could happen to the season, how much area needs to be closed, that type, and how long a season could be, and so we are going to evaluate these types of options in the MSE.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Gary, Tom, and then Andy, and then Robert.

MR. BORLAND: In lieu of this conversation, I would like to make a motion. **I would make a motion to rescind the submittal of Amendment 35, on the basis of the FES issue and hopefully to explore some other options to get to the target we want to get to.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We have a motion. I see lots of people coming in. Procedurally, Monica -- We don't have a second, and do you want me to wait for a second? Okay. Do we have a second on this motion? Okay. It's seconded by Carolyn. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thank you. I don't know that you can do that. The reason is this isn't on your agenda, and that would be council action, and so I think, if you wanted to put this on your agenda for December, you could do it. You could talk about this, and you could say that you want to rescind that, and you want to submit something else, or not, or whatever, but it's got to be on your agenda, and so the Act says the published agenda of the meeting may not be modified to include additional matters or council action without public notice prior to fourteen days of -- Or within fourteen days of the meeting, unless it's an emergency, and this isn't an emergency under the Act.

I think perhaps you could drag your feet and not submit it, if that's the consensus of the council, and not submit Reg Amendment 35, but, to take action to rescind it, no, please don't do that, because I don't think you ought to do that, according to the Act. Drag your feet, okay. You're not going to submit it, and I guess you could take a poll. You could take a bit of a vote on do we want to talk about this in December, and then think about it more, which is, you know, your way of deciding whether you want to submit the amendment or not.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that was partly my question, Monica, and so, if we have some motion that is saying something that we want to look at Amendment 35 at the December meeting, there's nothing that could, would, happen in the background, because we had already approved it in the past, and that means it's going to go to the Secretary anyway, because we couldn't talk about it until December, and, just procedurally, the council saying that they want to take this up at the next meeting -- Does that actually put a hold on the submission to the Secretary?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I think you're in charge of when you transmit it to the Fisheries Service, or to the Secretary, and so, if you don't transmit it, then that doesn't start the process of where the Secretary, or NMFS, evaluates does this comply with all the law, does it do the thing, and then they start the regulatory process, or they don't start the regulatory process, but they will make a decision on that, but you haven't submitted it yet, and so you've kind of got a little bit of a line to walk down.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to go to John, and then I will go back to the list, and I'm going to start back with Gary, who made the motion, and maybe, in light of this new information, he wants to amend that motion to do something similar, which is more like put it on hold until December, but I am going to John first, and then I'm going back to Gary.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and that's what I was going to suggest. A rescinding type thing affects things that you do in the meeting that you're in, and you made a motion to prepare this for submission, and I think you could provide guidance, and make sure Monica would be comfortable with this, that you would withhold submission of Regulatory Amendment 35 until the council can have further discussion at the December 2023 meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is that a valid motion, Monica, to withhold -- Is that okay, what John just said?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I guess, is it council action -- These are rhetorical questions that we can all think about, but is it council action if you say we're not going to transmit this until the council has had additional time in December to think about -- To discuss it? I think maybe that's the better way to go, is whether putting it on hold -- Essentially, it's the same thing, but you're kind of telling the public too that, all right, we had some discussion under Other Business at this meeting, and it wasn't on the agenda, and so, public, you didn't know about it, but, in December, it's going to be on the agenda, if that's the way you want to go, and then, public, you have an opportunity to weigh-in on it, because remember these are meetings that are done in a public forum.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: If you guys are comfortable with this, it could be direction to staff. Now, if there's not really a consensus on that, then that would be a little bit more of an issue.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Let's try to maybe the change the motion, and let's go back to Gary. I know that this motion now belongs to the committee, but we're trying to get to the original intent of your motion.

MR. BORLAND: So I guess I take back the motion that I stood up, but I would like to give direction to staff to add to the agenda for the December meeting to discuss Amendment 35.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Perhaps we withdraw the motion, because it's out of order, given the "rescind language", and then it can dissipate.

MR. BORLAND: **Okay, and so I withdraw the motion that I stood up, and I would like to give direction to staff to add to the agenda discussion of Amendment 35 in December of 2023.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We now have direction to staff, and I'm going to go back to the list of speakers here. I'm sorry. Monica is back in the queue.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just quick, and does your seconder also agree to withdraw? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Back to the queue. I have Tom and then Andy and then Robert.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Back to the discussion of 35, I definitely support having further discussion of this, in light of, you know, the FES revelations, but what I wanted to add is to kind of go back to Clay's comments, and I know I've made these comments in previous meetings, and, while I'm definitely not one to support, you know, large time and area closures, my frustration with this amendment is we never got as far as to actually see what that could look like, right, because it may actually be beneficial to fishermen, and it may not, but, if we did have the analysis of it -- We're definitely going to hear from the public on it one way or another, and so, you know, it's always been my position that it would be more interesting to see what it looks like, as opposed to just fight it for no particular reason.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: So I'm joining the conversation late. To say that I'm dismayed is probably an understatement. We sat around this table for two years debating the merits of Amendment 35, and we got very little done, and some of the ideas that are being proposed now could have been discussed way back then, but were killed by members around this table.

I, obviously, would opposed this motion. We're out of compliance with the Act right now. We're past the two-year statutory deadline, and this idea of FES kind of being a revelation and a scapegoat, yes, you're right that it's new information, but, if you recall, I asked for a sensitivity run to reduce discards by 50 percent, which is greater than the 30 or 40 percent that FES is telling us, and that still concluded that the stock was overfished and undergoing overfishing.

I recognize that maybe there is an adjustment to the catch level or something that could come out of this, right, that's different than where we're at now, but we have a better obligation even under Amendment 35, and so Amendment 35 at least is a step in the right direction, and to just take it off the table, and not consider submission to the Secretary at this point, is the wrong answer.

The other concern that I have is that we are sitting around the table and now making judgment calls based on a stock assessment process, a lot of smart scientists, our SSC, who gave us these recommendations, and we're essentially dismissing it, and we're throwing the science out the window and saying we don't need to take action, right, and I recognize that we need to take into

consideration all of these factors that affect, obviously, our decisions and the uncertainty surrounding it, but I think this is a bad way to do business.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: So I apologize, Andy, and I didn't have the benefit of having the discussion before, but, as I sit here and listen to the main problem being discard mortality, you know, I wonder if, you know, just having a first five fish you catch you keep, and completely eliminating discard mortality, 100 percent, and then figuring out like what would the impact on that be, moving forward, and, you know, there are other places that, you know, you catch a five-gallon bucket of fish, like the Bahamas, and you're done fishing for the day, and we continue to talk about discard mortality as being the number-one issue we're facing, and I think there's at least one path that would, in my mind, completely eliminate discard mortality, and I wonder, if you did that, what the result would be on the ABC, or whatever the appropriate acronym is, and I'm still trying to catch up on that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Andy. I was going to ask, procedurally -- I am also looking around the table, and so we have direction to staff here to add this discussion to go back and have a discussion on Amendment 35, but you just heard Andy say that I oppose this motion, and it's technically not a motion right now, and so there's not an ability for people to oppose this, and I'm wondering if we need to make it in the form of a motion, so that we could actually take a vote as to whether or not we want to have this discussion at the next meeting, because, right now, it's assuming that there's consensus, and I'm not sure that there is. Monica, procedurally, do we need to make this a motion?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So I guess it wouldn't be council action, per se, I think, if you made it into a motion. I think that would be fine. You know, there are specific things, like rescinding an amendment, approving an amendment, various kinds of things like that, that technically probably -- Not probably, but they are council actions, and so other things like this -- I think you could make that in the form of a motion and get a vote here, and I think that would be fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So then, I guess also procedurally, Monica, if this is -- So let's say it's a motion, and let's say the motion fails. Then does the amendment automatically get submitted to the Secretary, or do you have to have another action and discussion here? I'm just kind of confused about the steps here and what exactly it means if this is a motion and it fails or passes.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I again, we would go back to you are -- The council is in charge of when it gets transmitted to the Secretary, and so let's say the motion failed. You would be in the same position you were a couple of hours ago. Carolyn is reviewing it, and, you know, it goes -- You have your own process. I've looked at it, and Carolyn is now looking at it, and then you all decide when you're going to submit it, and so you're in charge of that part.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I agree with Andy. I don't think that's the right -- I mean, look at all the time that we put into Amendment 35, and, if we throw it in the trash, then all of that staff time has been wasted, all the Science Center's time has been wasted, and we are not in compliance with the two-year mandate to address overfishing for red snapper, and I don't see what it would hurt to go ahead



and send Amendment 35 and then start a discussion and see if we can figure out something else, but I don't think -- I think cancelling Amendment 35, at this point, is not the right thing to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me just clarify, and I don't think that this is cancelling Amendment 35, or throwing it in the trash, and it is having another discussion, possibly before it gets submitted as-is, and it would just be having another discussion at the next council meeting about it, and so I just want to clarify what this discussion is about, and it's not throwing it in the trash. We might be exactly where we are right now after we discuss this in more depth in December, and we don't know, and so Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just reminding the council that, with the results of the last stock assessment, the action on red snapper is not under a two-year statutory deadline. It is in the category of end overfishing immediately, but, from the overfished perspective, it was determined that there is adequate progress being made towards rebuilding, and so there is no two-year statutory deadline.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: To be clear, we've had three seasons since that determination was made, and overfishing is still occurring.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so it doesn't seem like there is consensus on this, and I feel like this should be a motion, and so, Gary, would you be willing to take that direction to staff and make it in the form of a motion?

MR. BORLAND: So am I going back to the original motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: No, and I think you would just make a motion to add discussion of Regulatory Amendment 35 to the December 2023 agenda.

MR. BORLAND: **All right, and so I want to make a motion to add the discussion of Amendment 35 to the December meeting in 2023.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there a second? Okay. It's seconded by Robert. It's under discussion, and so Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I'm going to support the motion, and I just want to make sure, because, Laurilee, I thought kind of the same thing in my first blush at it, but this is not to scrap the amendment, and it's just to put it on the agenda, so that we can formally take action on it without being afoul of the rules.

MS. THOMPSON: What do we hope to accomplish by talking about it again? Are we going to try to make some changes to it, or what do you think we're going to accomplish?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead and say it on the record, so that --

DR. BELCHER: So my understanding is that this would give us the ability to put it on the agenda, to discuss and have a formal motion, if folks want to rescind it. We cannot rescind it under Other Business right now, and so, by bringing it back up, if that's what the group wants to do -- We're

publicly announcing that we're revisiting it, and the outcome could potentially be to rescind this motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Judy and then Spud.

MS. HELMEY: I am for it, and I agree that would be a good idea.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Carolyn said what I was going to say, just to make it clear for the record, because that's the purpose of this motion, is to allow us to have the ability to make that decision.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I guess, taking it one step further, if we vote to have the discussion to rescind it, what -- Does anyone have a vision for what that path would look like if we did rescind it? Then what happens?

DR. BELCHER: My understanding is this gives us the ability to bring it back to discuss it, and it's not to bring it back to rescind it, but it's the idea that we're bringing it back as a discussion point to determine what path we want to take to move forward. You would assume that that's part of that, but that's -- The point is it's not that we're meeting to rescind it. We're not putting it on the agenda to do that, and we're bringing it back to discuss and debate whether or not we're going to keep it or rescind it. I know I'm not supposed to use the term "tabling", but we're technically tabling this until December, that we've asked -- We have concerns, and we're asking for a pause, but we can't make a decision, because of how we're brought it onto our agenda, and it has to be on the agenda for the discussion to be had.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just I want to -- Now I have questions. So then I think what you're saying, Carolyn, is there would be multiple decision points in December, which is what I think Kerry is asking, and so, first, you would have a discussion about whether we want to rescind it or not, and, if we are going to rescind it -- I think Kerry is saying, if we rescind, are we then also, at the December meeting, going to have a discussion of what replaces it, and is that what you're trying to say, or is that what you're asking? Okay.

DR. BELCHER: I guess that's the foreign territory that I don't know. Once you rescind it, what happens, and I guess that's a question to Monica, because -- So what does that mean? I don't know, and I'm just saying that my understanding was that we couldn't take that specific action of rescinding, because of how we brought it onto the agenda at this meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am going to go to Monica first, and then I'm going to go back to the hands.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I would think that you would want to give the public enough notice to let them know that you make take additional action on Amendment 35 in December. I mean, a discussion, that's okay, and I'm okay, but I'm just thinking, on your agenda, to make sure that, you know, we get all our bases covered, not knowing what you all are going to do in December, and you may want to say -- I think it would be appropriate to say that you may take additional action on Amendment 35, and we could put that in the meeting announcement, and I can work

with John, if that's -- I just want to make sure that you're all covered for whatever you want to do in December, whatever you decide to do in December.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I think that's the important thing, and I think we just need to quit talking about the word "rescind". If you decide that you need to further discuss this and look at that amendment, what you're doing is essentially you're reopening it and looking it at again, and you might reevaluate stuff, and you're not rescinding it, and you're not throwing it away, and you're not saying we're going to go back to the drawing board.

You know, you would look at what you've already done and make sure that, given the light of the information you now know that you didn't know back in March, or whenever we did this, are you comfortable proceeding with what you have, and you're going to have to weigh the information that you have that's relative to a lot of the various -- You know, when we got into the weeds here today about specific actions, you're going to have to look at that and weigh that information just as you did before, and you may end up exactly where you are, and so I think "rescinding" is a dangerous word, in that it carries a connotation that's not appropriate, but we'll have this on the agenda and say that you're going to have further discussion of this amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: But further discussion with possible action, and maybe that's --

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, definitely.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Maybe we want that in there, because the Act talks about, you know, not changing the agenda within a certain time period for additional council action, unless it's an emergency, and this won't be an emergency, and so maybe we want to put "for additional action" or something, or discussion and additional action, possible action, and I don't know exactly how we word it, but I do think we ought to let the public know that, hey, this is a possibility, and you may want to tune-in.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So, Monica, are you suggesting that the motion needs to be reworded too? John is saying no, that it's just the direction to staff about how to word it on the agenda, and is that right?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: John, will this be --

MR. CARMICHAEL: I mean, I'm fine with this, but, you know, I take a view of your agenda, when we list specific actions, and when we list specific items, is that those are items you're considering taking action on. You know, my view of it is, if it's a topic, and it's listed on your agenda, then it's something that you can take action on, and that's why we list it on the agenda. Where we get into trouble is taking action on something that's not on the agenda.

Amendment 35 is not on our agenda, and we don't say anything about red snapper on our agenda, and so that's the trouble. I think, if we say we're going to have further discussion of Amendment 35, then that opens the door, and at least how I tend to view agendas is that you can take action, or not, and we often do highlight, when we're taking say final action, because we just want to put people's attention on that, or when we're approving for public hearings, you know, the big

milestones, but, otherwise, you take action, lots of action on agendas, you know, and you take action on agenda topics that is just under the idea of like, you know, the council is going to review it and discuss it, and then you take whatever actions you want to do, and so, unless I am viewing agenda items too broadly, that's sort of how I look at them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I will think about this further. This is a little bit different, because you've taken final action already on this amendment, and so we're in a little bit of a different procedure, I think, than we've been before with other possible things, and you're right. I mean, there are -- You highlight things, like this will be approved for public hearing, or the council intends to take final action, or whatever, and so I want to think about this a little bit, because I want to make sure that you're covered, that you're covered sufficiently to do whatever you decide to do in December and you don't have to kick it down to another meeting or anything like that, and so - - In fact, some of the regulations discuss what's a council decision, which kind of can lead into what's a council action, and a certain council decision could be approval of a fishery management plan, or amending a fishery management plan, those kinds of things, and so I just want to make sure you're clear, and so I will think about this a little further.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so I'm going to go back to the list, while you're thinking about whether the word "action" needs to be in the motion. All right, and so I have Judy, Kerry, Tim, Robert. Judy is passing. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Andy, I really -- I appreciate your comments, and they are not falling on deaf ears over here. I hear you, and I'm -- I will be honest with you all, and I'm very much struggling with this, and I guess my question is -- I understand why we're kicking it to the December, totally, and I'm wondering if we're really going to have new information to further inform this decision in December or if we're just going to have this discussion again, and we're just doing it for a, you know, legal reason.

Is there any way to find out, between now and December, a rough estimate of how this FES issue does affect Amendment 35? Also, is it possible to get some sort of mapping out of what the options would be, should we decide to relook at 35, and is it going back to the SSC, and having them look at this FES issue, or is another option that I'm hearing a secretarial plan, and like I would like to see a flow chart of our decisions. My concern is we're going to end up exactly back where we are, between a rock and a hard place, between what we -- You know, what the service is saying, and these seasons, in which we're having these issues, and all of us knowing that somehow we're not making a decision that is right for the people using this resource. I am really in the -- I don't -- So what changes in December?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was having a debate here with John, and I guess you could put -- So let's say that this motion passes. I guess then you could have direction to staff on what you want brought back in December that would help you have this discussion/take an action, and so that's -- I have -- I'm sorry. Monica again.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Wow, and I didn't even raise my hand that time, and it was just like ESP, and I am okay with this for council action, if action occurs in December, and I think this is fine. I've looked at a couple of things, and I think you're covered.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Monica. I am going to go back to the list. I have Tim and then Robert and then Mel and then Laurilee.

MR. GRINER: Maybe this is a question for Andy, and I'm not sure, but could you remind me -- When we were looking at ABCs that are at the point where the service is going to decide whether or not there's going to be available days for the recreational sector, does that -- If it were to turn out that the service decides that there's just not enough there to open, and not even for a day, does that automatically preclude the commercial sector from opening, or would the commercial sector go ahead and be able to utilize their quota?

MR. STRELCHECK: It does not preclude the commercial sector from reopening, and so I can't envision that we would get down to less than one day, right, but that's essentially where we're at. With two days this past season, I expect, with Amendment 35, we're down to one day.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Andy.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Robert. Robert passes. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was kind of along the lines of Kerry, and I was just trying to figure out what are we going to know in December, and what are we going to be able to do in December, and we're kind of wrapped around the axle right now, and I could just see us kind of confusing things, and I know that 35 wasn't perfect, and 35 wasn't desirable, in some respects, but it just seems like we're causing more confusion, and potentially we're going to be wrapped around the axle in December, and then, basically, what we've done is just delayed it, you know, a few months, and, I mean, Carolyn can also read slowly. Unfortunately, she's a speed reader, but, yes, I just -- I don't know that I see the benefit in it, myself, personally, other than, you know, it might buy a little time, and then maybe you still end up with the same ABC next year, maybe, but I don't know. I'm not a real fan of it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I don't see what we're going to accomplish by postponing this to December. I think I agree with Mel, and I think we're just going to end up in the same place, and we're going to confuse everybody, and my question is can we go ahead and send Amendment 35, and then, if we get new information, or we come up with new ideas, we could do a framework, and then, if we get a new ABC from the SSC, we're going to have to do something anyway, but, to me, it just doesn't make sense to keep kicking the can down the road, and we're just going to delay -- We're going to delay trying to do something productive for another three months, while we continue to beat up Amendment 35, and let's just send it and get done with it and start something new.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: In response to your question about, I guess, following 35, if you were to submit 35 and then you wanted to make some other management change, and you certainly could start another amendment of some sort, a framework, depending on what you want to include in that amendment.

While I have the mic, I am also going to, I guess, throw out, along the lines of what Kerry pointed out, that, if you all decide to revisit this discussion, staff would definitely need some guidance on what information you want, other than what was envisioned to be the final draft of the amendment, but, if you want additional information relevant to your discussion that you plan to have, then I would need some direction on what to get for you all.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mike. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I would probably need some more discussion, from you, Mike, or maybe Andy, to try to figure out exactly what I'm looking for, if I wanted to make the request, but I'm curious, if you had zero discard mortality, and we're projecting up to a 34 percent reduction in landings, and it seems like some big numbers, and so, if you did go with a model that had, you know, zero discards, what would that look like?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I like the direction that we're talking, right, because I feel like we need to turn this into how can we positively look forward toward the future, and what do we need to be looking at, and being constructive, right, and, when I brought up the idea of spatial area analyses, right, it turned into NMFS is shutting down the whole South Atlantic, and that was never what I said during a council meeting, right, and so I'm not here to support spatial area analyses over anything else, right, and I was going to comment earlier about, you know, Robert's comment.

That is exactly the type of work that I hope someone is going to put a proposal in for this funding opportunity for next year, so we can test those concepts, right, and so I really think we're going to get to December, if we pass this motion, and we're going to spin our wheels, like we're doing today, and not make much progress, and, instead, let's channel this effort, rather than debating over 35 and how to proceed, on what's the direction we want to head for the snapper grouper fishery.

I know that red snapper is the poster-child, and politically the one that's most contentious, but you've sat around this council, like I have the last couple of years, and we're dealt with six or eight species that are pretty depleted, or severely overfished, and so what can we do more holistically for the snapper grouper fishery to improve it and benefit our constituents? As Clay said, right, the alternatives aren't necessarily all that glowing either, and who wants a two-day recreational season, or a one-day recreational season, and so, to me, it's an opportunity for us to reevaluate where we're at with current management and maybe come up with something better.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Back to Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Procedurally, how long would it take to come up with another amendment? Is that a very long process? I can tell, by everybody's reaction to that.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So the amendment process would be two years. If you're talking about new catch levels, then there would need to be additional time for catch levels to be developed, and that would have to go through the Science Center, and through the SSC, I guess through some form of interim analysis, and so where that fits in the whole SEDAR and Science Center workload -- Like that would be a completely different discussion, and I have no idea where that would go, but there

would need to be time for the science work to be done, if you're talking catch levels, and then the amendment process itself is about two years from start to implementation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Spud and then Gary.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. After hearing all the discussion, I've sort of changed my perspective on this, and I don't see us getting anything between now and December that's going to change the uncertainty around the efficacy of Amendment 35. I think all we're doing is pushing it to another meeting, and we'll probably end up with the same lack of consensus on this, and so, given that, I will -- I am going to oppose this and say we move forward with it and focus on what our long-term plan was, to get the MSE done, to inform that MSE, as much as it can be, and then try to make the best future decisions that we can. I mean, I say that knowing that we're going to have to swallow a bitter pill. I mean, a one-day season is not -- I mean, I question whether that's even realistic, but, anyway, that's my opinion on this, Madam Chair.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Spud. Gary.

MR. BORLAND: You know, thirty minutes ago, or forty-five minutes ago maybe now, we all sat around this table, and I didn't feel there was any consensus, or any favor, in going forward with 35, the way it sits today, and I think the other piece that frustrates me is we're getting ready to pass, or push, 35 in, and you hear Andy talk about there won't be any season for red snapper for rec fishermen on the east coast, and you look at what's going on in the Gulf, and what some of the states have done, and I think --

Then you look at this FES piece that's been broadcast everywhere and the discrepancy there, and you look at what we're doing as a council, and, I mean, you guys talk about trying to gain credibility, and you've got -- You know, we're trying to do videos to tell people how we're doing the right things, and I don't know that there's anybody that's going to believe we're doing the right things. I hear you, Spud, and maybe there isn't anything we can see before December, but the attempt alone to try to make it right is worth it, to me, to push this motion forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I just seem to hear, you know, the reasons for wanting to push this forward now are, you know, we've wasted a lot of time, and we've not been able to come up with consensus, you know, and other, and so I would ask Monica, and what's the -- If this doesn't go forward, and the Secretary has to take action, what factors, and upon which -- You know, what is the Secretary going to be look at to make some determination to take action, and I think to end overfishing is what I heard can happen.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think you asked me, to make sure that I heard your question, that what will the Secretary consider in deciding to take action?

MS. SPOTTSWOOD: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So, in the Magnuson Act, Section 304(c), it talks about preparation and review of a secretarial plan, and so I'm just going to read you what the Act says. The Secretary may prepare a fishery management plan with respect to any fishery, or any amendment to such

plan, in accordance with the National Standards and the other provisions of the Act and other applicable law, if the appropriate council fails to develop and submit to the Secretary, after a reasonable period of time, a fishery management plan for such fishery, or an amendment to it, if the fishery requires conservation and management.

That's one way, and another way is the Secretary would take action if the Secretary disapproves, or partially disapproves, any plan or amendment and then resubmits it to the council, and the council fails to submit a revised plan, and those are the kinds of things that the Secretary will consider, and so the Secretary will look at does this meet the requirements of the law, and, if it doesn't, the Secretary may return it back to you and say here's the reason you need to do some more on it, and then the council will decide whether they want to do any more or not, but those are the kinds of things. It doesn't happen very often, and I know you're new to the process, and it doesn't happen very often at all, but those are the kinds of things that the Act says the Secretary considers.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you, and I was trying to kind of gauge like, you know, if you don't put it in front of the Secretary, is that, you know, considered a failure on our part to get there, or is it really, you know, in this instance, you know, notwithstanding the effort that I'm hearing has been going on for a long time, and we just haven't been able to figure out what exactly to do next.

You know, I am new to this, and, from what I understand, what ended up happening on the Gulf side, you know, that became highly political, and Congress got involved and that sort of stuff, and I can just see, as I sit here today, this moving forward, and if no rec season comes, it's going to turn into that kind of issue anyway, and so just, you know -- For the benefit of the group, personally, I would like more time to dig further into this and be able to reconsider it in December, but without any, you know, intention on whether we're going to bring up a vote to kill this or not, and so that was why I supported the motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica, so you talked about a reasonable amount of time, and is that defined, or is there case law on that, and then, also, isn't it the case that, even if Amendment 35 got submitted to the Secretary, that the Secretary could also say, oh, I reject this, and couldn't that happen as well, and they could send it back to us?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So, in this sense, because it's a framework, what would happen, if it got submitted, is the Secretary looks at it to determine whether it's consistent with the FMP and other applicable law, and, if the determination is affirmative, as it usually is, you know the process, and a proposed rule gets published, public comment is taken, and then you look at the public comment and see whether you should publish the proposed rule, or the final rule, and in what way.

If you submit it, and the Secretary looks at it and says, no, this isn't consistent with the law, then the Secretary, quote, shall notify the council in writing of the inconsistencies and provide recommendations on revisions that would make the proposed regulations consistent with the fishery management plan or the -- In this case, with the fishery management plan, with the Magnuson Act, and with other applicable law.



One way or the other, I think you will hear back whether it's -- If a determination is affirmative, and they publish a proposed rule, or it's negative and you get back a letter, of some sort, that says here is why it's not in compliance with the law.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica. Others, before we take a vote here? I haven't said much in a little bit, and we've been back and forth on this, and I'm in the same place as Gary is, that I think that we need to bring it back and have a discussion, let the public know we're having a discussion, and make some decisions, but that's where I am, but I don't know that I will get a chance to vote, unless it's tied up. All right. Anything else that people want to add before we vote on this motion? Gary.

MR. BORLAND: So, if it passes, and we get direction to staff, is -- I mean, in three months, will we have the ability -- The information, will it be something we've looked at in the past, or is there anything new we could stand up? If we believe that spatial area closures, or some type of closures, to open up -- I don't think we were presented with specifics, and I don't remember, and is that something that could happen, or not? Is there time for that? You know, again, I'm here to support the rec fisherman, who obviously wants to fish a little more, and we've got to figure out a way to make that happen. Closing it off completely to the Atlantic side is unacceptable, or that's my view for this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I saw more hands go up. First Mike, and then back to Robert.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So, in response to Gary's question, as far as information that we have available, we have the analysis that Clay brought up before that's been completed concerning the area that was at the previous meeting last year, but I could look that up in the materials and grab that again. You would have the amendment itself, in a complete a form as we will have it for you, and then any other information -- That's the place where I had mentioned to you that I need some direction on what you all need, in order to make whatever decision you're intending to make concerning Reg Amendment 35, and that's a place where I'm not sure of what I can give to you, and so I would look for direction of what you want me to try to go find.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Robert and then Spud.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I don't know that we'll have it done in three months, and I think they're trying to figure out how far, but some of this information that I asked -- Could it be presented to the Secretary in this amendment, you know, potential alternatives, I mean, this list of, you know, management options, and it's only got one, and is that opening a can of worms, and making us go back and do work, or could you have an option of maybe including a time and space closure, maybe having, you know, some other option, and is that possible to get in at this point, because, if not, then I would probably question what we're going to do in December.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So I just want to make sure I'm understanding the question clearly, and you're asking if it would be possible to have a potential time/area option available for inclusion? Not by December. That's not very likely, not with the -- Not with the level of effects analysis that we have completed for the rest of the amendment at this point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think we've kind of got ourselves muddled, in terms of what the expectations are for this being discussed in December, and maybe I can help us get out of the mud a little bit. Really, the only thing we can do in December, based on the fact that we probably won't get any more additional information, is either rescind it, in its totality, or modify it within the bounds of what has already been approved, which means you either take out the catch level specification, and leave the gear, or you take out the gear, and leave the catch level specifications, but that's all we would be able to do to that amendment in December, and is that correct? Is that a correct understanding of what our choices would be?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, but, also, couldn't you initiate another amendment as well?

MR. WOODWARD: But I think we don't need to reconsider Amendment 35 to initiate another amendment. I mean, that's -- The two things are not linked together.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I think I saw Robert's hand and Tim's hand.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I hate to ask the question, but, if you get to December, and you get close on some of these other options, is pushing it out to another meeting a possibility, or are you now - - You know, are you waiting on a letter from the Secretary, or what's the effect of going past December on this particular amendment?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Up here, John said, if we developed a new action, then time would need to be taken to work on whatever the new action is, whether it's inside 35 or a new amendment. Go ahead.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You know, that's the kind of thing where, if you do that, you are really extending your timeline out, because you have to do public hearings, and you have to get input from the AP and all that, and so, if you do something like that, it's practically probably no different than if you just start a new amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm going back to hands. Tim and then Andy.

MR. GRINER: I think John just stated it, and I was just going to respond to Spud that it's not exactly like just tossing the amendment out. I mean, you still could keep one, or both, the actions and add something, you know, and so it's not totally like starting over.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess I'm confused, in terms of the discussion we're having, because, when I heard the rationale earlier, it centered around FES, but now it seems like the rationale centers around revisiting what we could have dealt with for the last two-plus years, right, and so, if that's the case, then, to me, Reg 35 goes forward, and you start a new action, and we start working on a new action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Laurilee and then Judy.

MS. THOMPSON: So we have two things that we could work on, and one of them is the catch level, and I didn't know we could change the catch level, because, once you get told by the SSC that this is your catch level -- I don't see how you can -- We can't make it higher, and how can we change the catch level, and so that only leaves changing the one-hook requirement.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Judy. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: The point I was trying to make is those are the only two elements of that amendment that have been fully vetted and approved through our process, and, I mean, we could refuse to accept the catch level specification, which we would be contrary to the Magnuson Act. I mean, that's the whole purpose of 35, was to accept our obligation to accept the SSC's new catch level specification, and then we added on to that the gear, in an attempt to try to do something to demonstrate that we're trying to address the discards, but, you know, if you add things to Amendment 35, then you basically have started all over again, and, like John said, you've got to have all the discussions, and you've got to build a record, and you've got to have a public -- We've already done all that, leading up to what we accepted as Amendment 35.

If there's something new we can do, do you slow down Amendment 35 to try to add on something, and go back through all that process again? I mean, I thought that's why we were doing the MSE, is to be able to have a comprehensive approach to managing this and fixing red snapper, and so I just -- I guess I am still struggling. I mean, I understand the optics of it, and I think, you know, there's a value to that, but this is a little different than the other things we've talked about, and it's unique, in its way, and so, again, that's --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just back to what Laurilee said, I think there were other options for the ACL, including an option to set the ACL at zero, and so that was an option that was not selected by the committee. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Do we have an estimated endpoint for the MSE?

MS. MCCAWLEY: The end of 2024. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: What does it take -- Do we need to make a motion, or request an action, to start the process of reviewing the time and space closure potential, to reduce the discard mortality to zero, and, I mean, either way, it appears, to me, that this council is going to be going down that path, whether we submit this amendment in the form it's in to the Secretary, and she -- The Secretary either, you know, accepts that, or makes some changes, or the Secretary takes its own action, we're going to be trying to figure out how to get into what, you know, Andy has kind of been describing here, and what does it take in order for us to start that ball rolling?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just a motion.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Can we make a motion while there's an option motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, you would be making a substitute motion, but I would rather dispense with this, and so we've been around the table many times here, and I would like to call the question from the Chair's seat here, and I feel like that we're getting repetitive, and we're down a separate rabbit hole, and I appreciate the discussion, and so I would like to take a vote on this.

**Once again, the motion is to add discussion of Regulatory Amendment 35 to the December 2023 agenda. All those in favor, raise your hand; all those opposed; any abstentions. All right. The motion passes seven to five. We're going to take a fifteen-minute break.**

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: So the direction to staff on this particular -- Following that motion, we're going to punt that over to Full Council, and so, that way, you can think about it more tonight, about what direction to staff that you would give here for what you want to see at the December meeting, since this passed, and so then, while Mike is typing that up, that was the last item for Snapper Grouper Other Business that I had already written, and is there any other Other Business to come before the Snapper Grouper Committee? All right. I don't see any hands. Madam Chair, I'm going to turn it back to you.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 14, 2023.)

- - -

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
October 27, 2023

Tue 9/12  
3:00 pm

~~8:30 AM - 3:45 PM~~

<b>Snappe Grouper Committee</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Jessica McCawley, Chair	✓
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair	✓
Mel Bell	✓
Gary Borland	✓
Tim Griner	✓
Judy Helmey	✓
<del>Robert Beal</del>	
<del>Lt. Cameron Box</del>	

Snapper Grouper Committee	Attended
Dr. Carolyn Belcher	✓
Trish Murphey	✓
Andy Strelcheck	✓
Laurilee Thompson	✓
Spud Woodward	✓
Robert Spottswood, Jr.	✓
Tom Roller	✓
Earl "Sonny" Gwin	

<b>SAFMC STAFF</b>	<b>Attended</b>
John Carmichael	✓
Dr. Chip Collier	✓
Myra Brouwer	✓
Julia Byrd	✓
Dr. Judd Curtis	✓
John Hadley	✓
Kathleen Howington	✓
Allie Iberle	✓
Kim Iverson	✓
Kelly Klasnick	

SAFMC STAFF	Attended
Michele Ritter	✓
Roger Pugliese	✓
Ashley Oliver	
Dr. Mike Schmidtke	✓
Nick Smillie	✓
Suzanna Thomas	✓
Christina Wiegand	✓
Meg Withers	
Julie Neer	
Meisha Key	✓

OTHER	Attended
Rick Devictor	✓
Shep Grimes	✓
<del>Dewey Hemilright</del>	
Dr. Jack McGovern	✓
<del>Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy</del>	
Monica Smit-Brunello	
Dr. John Walter	
Kristin Foss	✓
Karla Gore	✓
Nikhil Mehta	✓
Thomas Newman	✓
Jessica Stephen	✓
Paul Townsend	
Luiz Barbieri	
Jeff Buckel	

[illegible]

Wed. Sept 13, 2023  
~~Thursday, September 14, 2023~~  
 8:30 AM - 12:00 Noon

Snapper Grouper Committee	Attended
Jessica McCawley, Chair	✓
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair	✓
Mel Bell	✓
Gary Borland	✓
Tim Griner	✓
Judy Helmey	✓
<del>Robert Beal</del>	
<del>Lt. Cameron Box</del>	

Snapper Grouper Committee	Attended
Dr. Carolyn Belcher	✓
Trish Murphey	✓
Andy Strelcheck	✓
Laurilee Thompson	✓
Spud Woodward	✓
Robert Spottswood, Jr.	✓
Tom Roller	✓
Earl "Sonny" Gwin	

SAFMC STAFF	Attended
John Carmichael	✓
Dr. Chip Collier	✓
Myra Brouwer	✓
Julia Byrd	✓
Dr. Judd Curtis	✓
John Hadley	✓
Kathleen Howington	✓
Allie Iberle	✓
Kim Iverson	✓
Kelly Klasnick	

SAFMC STAFF	Attended
Michele Ritter	✓
Roger Pugliese	✓
Ashley Oliver	✓
Dr. Mike Schmidtke	
Nick Smillie	✓
Suzanna Thomas	✓
Christina Wiegand	✓
Meg Withers	✓
Julie Neer	
Meisha Key	

OTHER	Attended
Rick Devictor	✓
Shep Grimes	✓
<del>Dewey Hemilright</del>	
Dr. Jack McGovern	✓
<del>Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy</del>	
Monica Smit-Brunello	✓
Dr. John Walter	
Kristin Foss	✓
Karla Gore	✓
Nikhil Mehta	✓
Thomas Newman	✓
Jessica Stephen	✓
<del>Paul Townsend</del>	
Jeff Buckel	
Jason Dozier	

OTHER	Attended
Matt Tsiklistas	
David Hugo	✓
Richard Cody	✓
Michael Lind	✓
Wes Townsend	✓
Gabi Tutelo	✓
Walter Bubley	✓
Tracey Smart	✓
Amy Dukes	✓
Martha Guras	✓
Brad Gentner	✓
Luz Barbieri	



**Snapper Grouper Committee**  
**Thursday, September 14, 2023**  
**8:30 AM - 12:00 PM**

<b>Snappe Grouper Committee</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Jessica McCawley, Chair	✓
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair	✓
Mel Bell	✓
Gary Borland	✓
Tim Griner	✓
Judy Helme	✓
Robert Beal	✓

Snapper Grouper Committee	Attended
Dr. Carolyn Belcher	✓
Trish Murphey	✓
Andy Strelcheck	✓
Laurilee Thompson	✓
Spud Woodward	✓
Robert Spottswood, Jr.	✓
Tom Roller	✓
Earl "Sonny" Gwin	✓

<b>SAFMC STAFF</b>	<b>Attended</b>
John Carmichael	✓
Dr. Chip Collier	✓
Myra Brouwer	✓
Julia Byrd	✓
Dr. Judd Curtis	✓
John Hadley	✓
Kathleen Howington	✓
Allie Iberle	✓
Kim Iverson	✓
Kelly Klasnick	

<b>SAFMC STAFF</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Michele Ritter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Roger Pugliese	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ashley Oliver	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dr. Mike Schmidtke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Nick Smillie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Suzanna Thomas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Christina Wiegand	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Meg Withers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Julie Neer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meisha Key	<input type="checkbox"/>

OTHER	Attended
Rick Devictor	✓
Shep Grimes	✓
Dr. Jack McGovern	✓
Monica Smit-Brunello	✓
Dr. John Walter	✓
Kristin Foss	✓
Karla Gore	✓
Nikhil Mehta	✓
Thomas Newman	
Jessica Stephen	✓
Luiz Barbieri	✓
Jeff Buckel	✓
David Hugo	✓
Richard Cody	✓
Michael Lind	✓

[illegible]

## Attendee Report: SAFMC September 2023 Council Meeting (9/11/23 - 9/15/23)

Report Generated:  
09/18/2023 08:56 AM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered	# Attended	Clicked Registration Link
284-120-835	09/12/2023 07:30 AM EDT	9 hours 13 minutes	178	115	284

### Staff Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Role
Yes	Not applicable for staff	Council	South Atlantic	administrator@safmc.net	Organizer

### Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Registration Date/Time
Yes	62	Anderson	Christopher	chris.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:25 PM EDT
Yes	49	Anderson	Dustin	dustin.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/11/2023 05:21 PM EDT
Yes	40	Aukeman	Trip	taukeman@ccaflorida.org	09/12/2023 11:38 AM EDT
Yes	41	Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	90	Batsavage	Chris	chris.batsavage@deq.nc.gov	09/06/2023 10:13 AM EDT
Yes	78	Bell	00Mel	BellM@dnr.sc.gov	09/05/2023 05:23 PM EDT
Yes	35	Berry	James "chip"	chip@chipberry.com	09/05/2023 06:11 PM EDT
Yes	43	Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:40 AM EDT
Yes	32	Bianchi	Akan	alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:04 PM EDT
Yes	88	Blosser	Brooke	brookeb@scccl.org	09/11/2023 02:21 PM EDT
Yes	39	Box	Cameron	boxcameron06@gmail.com	09/06/2023 07:05 AM EDT
Yes	37	Bradshaw	Christopher	christopher.bradshaw@myfwc.com	09/10/2023 09:04 PM EDT
Yes	39	Brantley	William	william.brantley@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 08:24 AM EDT
Yes	57	Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net	08/18/2023 10:33 AM EDT
Yes	39	Bubley	Walter	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 09:26 AM EDT
Yes	89	Buckel	Jeff	jabuckel@ncsu.edu	09/12/2023 10:45 AM EDT
Yes	41	Bunting	Matthew	matthew.bunting@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	41	Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	09/08/2023 09:36 AM EDT
Yes	40	Calay	Shannon	Shannon.Calay@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
Yes	89	Clinton	Haley	haley.clinton@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:05 AM EDT
Yes	41	Cody	Richard	richard.cody@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:12 PM EDT
Yes	63	Coggins	Lew	lewis.coggins@NOAA.gov	09/07/2023 05:03 PM EDT
Yes	86	Crowe	Stacie	crowes@dnr.sc.gov	09/10/2023 08:13 AM EDT
Yes	57	Curtis	Judd	judd.curtis@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	51	DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:37 AM EDT
Yes	44	Dukes	Amy	DukesA@dnr.sc.gov	09/12/2023 09:08 AM EDT
Yes	97	Dunn	Tracy	TADunn76@gmail.com	09/12/2023 09:56 AM EDT
Yes	37	Dyar	Ben	dyarb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:51 PM EDT
Yes	42	Farnell	Paula	paula.farnell@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:25 AM EDT
Yes	68	Finch	Margaret	walkermf@dnr.sc.gov	09/01/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	40	Flowers	Jared	jared.flowers@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 09:48 AM EDT
Yes	40	Foss	Kristin	Kristin.foss@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	36	Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 11:55 AM EDT
Yes	92	Gentry	Lauren	lauren.gentry@myfwc.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
Yes	63	Gill	Bob	flosprey1@gmail.com	09/12/2023 02:16 PM EDT
Yes	55	Glazier	Edward	Edward.Glazier@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 03:18 PM EDT
Yes	50	Gloeckner	David	david.gloeckner@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:07 AM EDT
Yes	54	Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	39	Gray	Alisha	alisha.gray@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 09:01 AM EDT
Yes	43	Guyas	Martha	mguyas@asafishing.org	09/10/2023 08:24 PM EDT
Yes	32	HILDRETH	DELAINE	DELAINE.HILDRETH@DNR.GA.GOV	09/12/2023 02:00 PM EDT
Yes	49	Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:38 AM EDT
Yes	95	Harrison	Alana	alanaharrison22@gmail.com	09/12/2023 08:59 AM EDT
Yes	40	Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	82	Helmey	Judy	judyhelmey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	59	Huber	Jeanette	jeanette.huber@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 10:01 AM EDT
Yes	64	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.com	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
Yes	43	Iverson	Kim	Kim.Iverson@safmc.net	08/28/2023 12:29 PM EDT
Yes	35	Karnauskas	Mandy	mandy.karnauskas@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:49 AM EDT
Yes	96	Kersting	Anne	anne.kersting@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:17 AM EDT
Yes	50	Key	Meisha	meisha.key@safmc.net	09/11/2023 01:52 PM EDT
Yes	98	Klasnick	01Kelly	kelly.klasnick@safmc.net	08/30/2023 12:18 PM EDT
Yes	50	LaRoche	Kelcie	kelcie.laroche@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	97	Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net	09/11/2023 11:46 AM EDT
Yes	35	Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:32 PM EDT
Yes	73	Lazarre	Dominique	Dominique.Lazarre@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:48 AM EDT
Yes	35	Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 04:26 PM EDT
Yes	34	Lee	Max	maxlee@mote.org	09/07/2023 11:43 AM EDT
Yes	45	Lind	Michael	michael.lind@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:15 AM EDT
Yes	98	Locke	Charles	obxlocke@aol.com	09/12/2023 09:10 AM EDT



Yes	37	Lorenzen	Kai	klorenzen@ufl.edu	09/11/2023 02:45 PM EDT
Yes	64	M Borland	Gary	gborlandsafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	42	Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:37 AM EDT
Yes	99	Marhefka	00Kerry	kerryomarhefka@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	90	Maroney	Bradley	captainbradleymaroney@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:31 AM EDT
Yes	48	McCoy	Sherylanne	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 09:51 AM EDT
Yes	54	McGovern	Jack	John.McGovern@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	93	McWhorter	Will	wdmcwhorter@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:30 PM EDT
Yes	59	Meehan	Sean	sean.meehan@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 03:42 PM EDT
Yes	80	Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 12:55 PM EDT
Yes	34	Menegolo	Jean Paul	jpmenegolo@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:15 PM EDT
Yes	37	Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
Yes	74	Murphey	Trish	trish.murphey@deq.nc.gov	08/28/2023 11:26 AM EDT
Yes	91	Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:47 AM EDT
Yes	97	Newman	Thomas	thomas.newman03@gmail.com	09/06/2023 09:27 PM EDT
Yes	47	Oliver	Ashley	ashley.oliver@safmc.net	09/06/2023 08:39 AM EDT
Yes	91	Olsen	Edward	butchnett@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:19 PM EDT
Yes	41	Owens	Marina	marina.owens@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 08:15 AM EDT
Yes	40	Porch	Clay	clay.porch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:32 AM EDT
Yes	79	Rathke	David	execdir@resiliencyflorida.org	09/10/2023 12:22 PM EDT
Yes	60	Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:31 PM EDT
Yes	38	Rinaldi	Mike	mike.rinaldi@accsp.org	09/12/2023 02:35 PM EDT
Yes	100	Ritter	Michele	michele.ritter@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:45 AM EDT
Yes	79	Roller	00Tom	tomrollersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	53	Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 12:25 PM EDT
Yes	43	Sinkus	Wiley	sinkusw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
Yes	37	Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 08:55 AM EDT
Yes	38	Smit-Brunello	00Monica	monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:36 PM EDT
Yes	90	Soss	Alison	alison.soss@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 10:10 AM EDT
Yes	45	Spurgin	Kali	Kali.Spurgin@MyFWC.com	09/11/2023 08:03 AM EDT
Yes	33	Sramek	Mark	Mark.Sramek@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 07:23 AM EDT
Yes	90	Stam	Geoff	grstam@att.net	08/31/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	48	Stemle	Adam	adam.stemle@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 11:24 AM EDT
Yes	52	Sweetman	CJ	Christopher.Sweetman@MyFWC.com	09/06/2023 08:29 AM EDT
Yes	41	Takade-Heumacher	Helen	helen.takade-heumacher@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 12:17 PM EDT
Yes	62	Thompson	00Laurilee	thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	97	Townsend	Wes	pakafish1@yahoo.com	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	43	Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov	08/30/2023 12:23 PM EDT
Yes	34	Tuohy	Chelsea	ctuohy@asmfc.org	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	66	Uchino	Pepper	pepper@fsbpa.com	09/12/2023 10:00 AM EDT
Yes	58	Vara	Mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:23 AM EDT
Yes	81	Walsh	Jason	jason.walsh@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 04:22 PM EDT
Yes	48	Walter	John	john.f.walter@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	61	White	Shelby	shelby.white@deq.nc.gov	09/07/2023 10:59 AM EDT
Yes	33	White	Geoff	geoff.white@accsp.org	09/11/2023 09:54 AM EDT
Yes	37	Wilber	Pace	pace.wilber@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 08:23 AM EDT
Yes	43	Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	59	Withers	Meg	meg.withers@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:34 AM EDT
Yes	42	collier	chip	chip.collier@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:20 AM EDT
Yes	94	griner	tim	timgrinersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	88	kramer	rob	rkramer@wildoceans.org	09/12/2023 09:52 AM EDT
Yes	36	poston	will	will@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/11/2023 03:52 PM EDT
Yes	40	sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
Yes	38	stephen	jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	100	thomas	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:08 AM EDT
No	0	Aines	Alex	aaaines@oceana.org	09/08/2023 11:02 AM EDT
No	0	Anderson	Stacey	stacey.anderson@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:39 PM EDT
No	0	Appelman	Max	max.appelman@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 10:54 AM EDT
No	0	Baker	Marion	marion19@ufl.edu	09/10/2023 04:40 PM EDT
No	0	Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu	09/11/2023 02:27 PM EDT
No	0	Barbieri	Luiz	luiz.barbieri@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
No	0	Beaty	Julia	jbeaty@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:33 PM EDT
No	0	Benevento	Tony	43tonyb@gmail.com	09/07/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	Binion-Rock	Samantha	samantha.binion-rock@noaa.gov	08/31/2023 08:07 AM EDT
No	0	Bogdan	Jennifer	jennifer.bogdan@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 12:59 PM EDT
No	0	Buckson	Bruce	bcbuckson@aol.com	09/07/2023 08:59 AM EDT
No	0	Cimo	Laura	laura.cimo@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 05:06 AM EDT
No	0	Corbett	Ellie	Ellie.Corbett@MYFWC.com	09/06/2023 11:14 AM EDT
No	0	Cox	Derek	decox@sfwmd.gov	09/07/2023 09:51 AM EDT
No	0	Cross	Tiffanie	tiffanie.cross@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:13 PM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kileyjd@gmail.com	09/11/2023 04:37 PM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kdancy@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	DeJohn	Frank	frank.dejohn@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:15 PM EDT

No	0	E Brown	Julie	julie.e.brown@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Gahm	Meghan	meghan.gahm@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Govoni	Beth	beth.govoni@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
No	0	Griffin	Aimee	aimee.griffin@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:42 PM EDT
No	0	Haymans	Doug	doug.haymans@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Heffernan	Katie	katie.heffernan@mail.house.gov	09/05/2023 04:41 PM EDT
No	0	Horn	Calusa	Calusa.horn@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:54 PM EDT
No	0	Hugo	David	david.hugo@safmc.net	09/11/2023 09:39 AM EDT
No	0	Juliano	Jocelyn	jocelyn.juliano@scseagrant.org	09/11/2023 08:40 AM EDT
No	0	Kalinowsky	Chris	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 12:02 PM EDT
No	0	Kappos	Maria	maria.kappos@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 03:32 PM EDT
No	0	Kean	Samantha	samantha.kean@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:18 PM EDT
No	0	Kittle	Christine	christine.kittle@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:11 PM EDT
No	0	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 08:26 AM EDT
No	0	Kumar Ghosh	Bijoy	bkgghoshbuet7@gmail.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
No	0	Mackesey	Brendan	brendan.mackesey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:38 PM EDT
No	0	Masi	Michelle	michelle.masi@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:38 AM EDT
No	0	Menzel	Terri	terri.menzel@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 03:49 PM EDT
No	0	Moore	Jeff	Jeffrey.N.Moore@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:53 PM EDT
No	0	Muffley	Brandon	bmuffley@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:44 AM EDT
No	0	O'Malley	Rachel	rachel.o'malley@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 09:43 PM EDT
No	0	Pierce	Brett	Brett.pierce@bluefindata.com	09/11/2023 11:04 AM EDT
No	0	Pikula	Kyle	bkpikula@yahoo.com	09/11/2023 01:23 PM EDT
No	0	Privoznik	Sarah	sarah.privoznik@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 02:44 PM EDT
No	0	Rainey	Dan	rainmand63@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:48 PM EDT
No	0	Ralston	Kellie	kellie@bonefishtarpontrust.org	09/11/2023 10:06 AM EDT
No	0	Ramsay	Chloe	chloe.ramsay@myfwc.com	09/04/2023 09:12 AM EDT
No	0	Reding	Brandon	redingb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 02:04 PM EDT
No	0	Reichert	Marcel	mreichert2022@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Sabo	Mary	msabo@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:59 PM EDT
No	0	Salmon	Brandi	brandi.salmon@deq.nc.gov	08/31/2023 08:34 AM EDT
No	0	Sartwell	Tim	tim.sartwell@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 02:58 PM EDT
No	0	Sauls	Beverly	bevsauls1@gmail.com	08/31/2023 09:42 AM EDT
No	0	Schwaab	Alexandra	aschwaab@fishwildlife.org	09/06/2023 09:02 AM EDT
No	0	Seramur	Mark	mark.seramur@saltwaterinc.com	09/11/2023 01:41 PM EDT
No	0	Spanik	Kevin	spanikk@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:07 PM EDT
No	0	Stewart	Mark	mstewart@gmail.com	08/31/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	Sweeney Tookes	Jennifer	jtookes@georgiasouthern.edu	09/11/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Turner	Steve	scturner160@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Vecchio	Julie	vecchioj@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 10:51 AM EDT
No	0	Wagner	Warren	whwagner@southernco.com	09/01/2023 08:31 AM EDT
No	0	Waine	Mike	mwaine@asafishing.org	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	shelby.white@nc.deq.gov	09/06/2023 09:58 AM EDT
No	0	mroch	ray	ray.mroch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:21 AM EDT
No	0	white	geoff	Geoff.Kir.white@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:13 PM EDT

## Attendee Report: SAFMC September 2023 Council Meeting (9/11/23 - 9/15/23)

Report Generated:

09/18/2023 09:01 AM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered	# Attended	Clicked Registration Link
284-120-835	09/13/2023 07:41 AM EDT	8 hours 49 minutes	207	132	357

### Staff Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Role
Yes	Not applicable for staff	Council	South Atlantic	administrator@safmc.net	Organizer

### Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Registration Date/Time
Yes	93	Anderson	Christopher	chrisanderson996@gmail.com	09/13/2023 11:57 AM EDT
Yes	33	Anderson	Stacey	stacey.anderson@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:39 PM EDT
Yes	52	Anderson	Dustin	dustin.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/11/2023 05:21 PM EDT
Yes	36	Appelman	Max	max.appelman@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 10:54 AM EDT
Yes	62	Aukeman	Trip	taukeman@ccaflorida.org	09/12/2023 11:38 AM EDT
Yes	37	Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	42	Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu	09/11/2023 02:27 PM EDT
Yes	51	Barbieri	Luiz	luiz.barbieri@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	46	Barger	Jeff	jbarger@oceanconservancy.org	09/13/2023 09:28 AM EDT
Yes	70	Bell	00Mel	BellM@dnr.sc.gov	09/05/2023 05:23 PM EDT
Yes	90	Benevento	Tony	43tonyb@gmail.com	09/07/2023 03:43 PM EDT
Yes	44	Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:40 AM EDT
Yes	34	Binion-Rock	Samantha	samantha.binion-rock@noaa.gov	08/31/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	39	Bradshaw	Christopher	christopher.bradshaw@myfwc.com	09/10/2023 09:04 PM EDT
Yes	41	Brantley	William	william.brantley@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 08:24 AM EDT
Yes	52	Brogan (Oceana)	Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org	09/13/2023 02:31 PM EDT
Yes	51	Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net	08/18/2023 10:33 AM EDT
Yes	41	Bunting	Matthew	matthew.bunting@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	41	Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	09/08/2023 09:36 AM EDT
Yes	40	Clinton	Haley	haley.clinton@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:05 AM EDT
Yes	60	Coggins	Lew	lewis.coggins@NOAA.gov	09/07/2023 05:03 PM EDT
Yes	38	Cross	Tiffanie	tiffanie.cross@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:13 PM EDT
Yes	50	Curtis	Judd	judd.curtis@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	54	DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:37 AM EDT
Yes	67	Dukes	Amy	DukesA@dnr.sc.gov	09/12/2023 09:08 AM EDT
Yes	43	Dunn	Russell	Russell.Dunn@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:14 AM EDT
Yes	94	Dunn	Tracy	TADunn76@gmail.com	09/12/2023 09:56 AM EDT
Yes	35	Farnell	Paula	paula.farnell@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:25 AM EDT
Yes	46	Finch	Margaret	walkermf@dnr.sc.gov	09/01/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	39	Flowers	Jared	jared.flowers@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 09:48 AM EDT
Yes	42	Foss	Kristin	Kristin.foss@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	32	Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 11:55 AM EDT
Yes	53	Friedrich	Tony	tony@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/13/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	37	Froeschke	John	john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org	09/13/2023 10:54 AM EDT
Yes	40	GREENE	Karen	karen.e.greene@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:47 AM EDT
Yes	66	Gentry	Lauren	lauren.gentry@myfwc.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
Yes	40	Gietzmann-Sanders	Marcel	marcelsanders96@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:42 PM EDT
Yes	42	Gill	Bob	flosprey1@gmail.com	09/12/2023 02:16 PM EDT
Yes	49	Glazier	Edward	Edward.Glazier@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 03:18 PM EDT
Yes	91	Gloekner	David	david.gloekner@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:07 AM EDT
Yes	50	Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	36	Gray	Alisha	alisha.gray@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 09:01 AM EDT
Yes	45	Guyas	Martha	mguyas@asafishing.org	09/10/2023 08:24 PM EDT
Yes	38	HILDRETH	DELAINE	DELAINE.HILDRETH@DNR.GA.GOV	09/12/2023 02:00 PM EDT
Yes	91	Harrison	Alana	alanaharrison22@gmail.com	09/12/2023 08:59 AM EDT
Yes	36	Heffernan	Katie	katie.heffernan@mail.house.gov	09/05/2023 04:41 PM EDT
Yes	41	Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	93	Helmey	Judy	judyhelmey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	35	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.con	09/13/2023 01:05 PM EDT
Yes	91	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.com	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
Yes	43	Hugo	David	david.hugo@safmc.net	09/11/2023 09:39 AM EDT
Yes	79	Iberle	Allie	allie.iberle@safmc.net	09/13/2023 09:45 AM EDT
Yes	38	Iverson	Kim	Kim.Iverson@safmc.net	08/28/2023 12:29 PM EDT
Yes	58	Juliano	Jocelyn	jocelyn.juliano@scseagrant.org	09/11/2023 08:40 AM EDT
Yes	91	KELLY	BILL	fkcf1@hotmail.com	09/13/2023 07:17 AM EDT
Yes	33	Karnauskas	Mandy	mandy.karnauskas@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:49 AM EDT
Yes	33	Keppler	Blaik	kepplerb@dnr.sc.gov	09/13/2023 09:56 AM EDT
Yes	91	Kersting	Anne	anne.kersting@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:17 AM EDT
Yes	52	Key	Meisha	meisha.key@safmc.net	09/11/2023 01:52 PM EDT
Yes	39	Kittle	Christine	christine.kittle@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:11 PM EDT
Yes	100	Klasnick	01Kelly	kelly.klasnick@safmc.net	08/30/2023 12:18 PM EDT

Yes	56	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 08:26 AM EDT
Yes	52	LaRoche	Kelcie	kelcie.laroche@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	97	Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net	09/11/2023 11:46 AM EDT
Yes	73	Laney	Reid Wilson	rallaneys@gmail.com	09/13/2023 03:04 PM EDT
Yes	38	Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:32 PM EDT
Yes	59	Lazarre	Dominique	Dominique.Lazarre@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:48 AM EDT
Yes	92	Lee	Max	maxlee@mote.org	09/07/2023 11:43 AM EDT
Yes	49	Lind	Michael	michael.lind@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:15 AM EDT
Yes	97	Locke	Charles	obxlocke@aol.com	09/12/2023 09:10 AM EDT
Yes	87	Lorenzen	Kai	klorenzen@ufl.edu	09/11/2023 02:45 PM EDT
Yes	79	M Borland	Gary	gborlandsafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	63	Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:37 AM EDT
Yes	85	Marhefka	00Kerry	kerryomarhefka@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	92	Marinko	Jeff	putridinnards@hotmail.com	09/13/2023 06:32 AM EDT
Yes	91	Maroney	Bradley	captainbradleymaroney@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:31 AM EDT
Yes	36	McCoy	Sherylanne	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 09:51 AM EDT
Yes	62	McGovern	Jack	John.McGovern@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	93	McWhorter	Will	wdmcwhorter@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:30 PM EDT
Yes	78	Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 12:55 PM EDT
Yes	83	Menendez	Hayden	hayden.menendez@myfwc.com	09/13/2023 10:34 AM EDT
Yes	79	Murphey	Trish	trish.murphey@deq.nc.gov	08/28/2023 11:26 AM EDT
Yes	96	Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:47 AM EDT
Yes	96	Newman	Thomas	thomas.newman03@gmail.com	09/06/2023 09:27 PM EDT
Yes	39	O'Malley	Rachel	rachel.o'malley@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 09:43 PM EDT
Yes	65	Oliver	Ashley	ashley.oliver@safmc.net	09/06/2023 08:39 AM EDT
Yes	90	Pikula	Kyle	bkpikula@yahoo.com	09/11/2023 01:23 PM EDT
Yes	54	Porch	Clay	clay.porch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:32 AM EDT
Yes	66	Rainey	Dan	rainmand63@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:48 PM EDT
Yes	35	Ramsay	Chloe	chloe.ramsay@myfwc.com	09/04/2023 09:12 AM EDT
Yes	60	Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:31 PM EDT
Yes	99	Ritter	Michele	michele.ritter@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:45 AM EDT
Yes	83	Roller	00Tom	tomrollersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	91	Sartwell	Tim	tim.sartwell@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 02:58 PM EDT
Yes	56	Sauls	Beverly	bevsauls1@gmail.com	08/31/2023 09:42 AM EDT
Yes	74	Schmidtke	Michael	Mike.Schmidtke@safmc.net	09/13/2023 01:57 PM EDT
Yes	66	Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 12:25 PM EDT
Yes	92	Shervanick	Kara	kshervanick@gmail.com	09/13/2023 02:00 PM EDT
Yes	92	Simmons	Carrie	carrie.simmons@gulfcouncil.org	09/13/2023 01:35 PM EDT
Yes	46	Sinkus	Wiley	sinkusw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
Yes	89	Smillie	Nick	Nick.smillie@safmc.net	09/13/2023 03:23 PM EDT
Yes	48	Smit-Brunello	00Monica	monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:36 PM EDT
Yes	50	Spurgin	Kali	Kali.Spurgin@MyFWC.com	09/11/2023 08:03 AM EDT
Yes	46	Sramek	Mark	Mark.Sramek@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 07:23 AM EDT
Yes	37	Stam	Geoff	grstam@att.net	08/31/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	41	Stemle	Adam	adam.stemle@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 11:24 AM EDT
Yes	51	Strelcheck	00-Andy	andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 08:32 AM EDT
Yes	58	Sweetman	CJ	Christopher.Sweetman@MyFWC.com	09/06/2023 08:29 AM EDT
Yes	53	Takade-Heumacher	Helen	helen.takade-heumacher@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 12:17 PM EDT
Yes	59	Thompson	00Laurilee	thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	91	Townsend	Wes	pakafish1@yahoo.com	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	45	Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov	08/30/2023 12:23 PM EDT
Yes	34	Vara	Mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:23 AM EDT
Yes	43	Vecchio	Julie	vecchioj@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 10:51 AM EDT
Yes	59	Walsh	Jason	jason.walsh@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 04:22 PM EDT
Yes	99	Walter	John	john.f.walter@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	91	White	Shelby	shelby.white@deq.nc.gov	09/07/2023 10:59 AM EDT
Yes	91	White	Shelby	sbwhite6762@gmail.com	09/13/2023 02:01 PM EDT
Yes	45	White	Geoff	geoff.white@accsp.org	09/11/2023 09:54 AM EDT
Yes	39	Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	90	Willis	Michelle	willisc@dnr.sc.gov	09/13/2023 04:13 PM EDT
Yes	50	Withers	Meg	meg.withers@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:34 AM EDT
Yes	43	collier	chip	chip.collier@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:20 AM EDT
Yes	99	griner	tim	timgrinersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	64	moss	david	david.moss@tnc.org	09/13/2023 09:31 AM EDT
Yes	90	pikula	kyle	bpilula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 11:23 AM EDT
Yes	92	pikula	Kyle	kbpikula@gmail.com	09/13/2023 01:02 PM EDT
Yes	93	poston	will	will@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/11/2023 03:52 PM EDT
Yes	90	rettig	adam	adam.rettig@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:18 AM EDT
Yes	37	sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
Yes	37	stephen	jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	100	thomas	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:08 AM EDT
No	0	Aines	Alex	aaines@oceana.org	09/08/2023 11:02 AM EDT
No	0	Anderson	Christopher	chris.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:25 PM EDT
No	0	Baker	Marion	marion19@ufl.edu	09/10/2023 04:40 PM EDT

No	0	Batsavage	Chris	chris.batsavage@deq.nc.gov	09/06/2023 10:13 AM EDT
No	0	Beaty	Julia	jbeaty@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:33 PM EDT
No	0	Berry	James "chip"	chip@chipberry.com	09/05/2023 06:11 PM EDT
No	0	Bianchi	Akan	alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:04 PM EDT
No	0	Blosser	Brooke	brookeb@sccl.org	09/11/2023 02:21 PM EDT
No	0	Bogdan	Jennifer	jennifer.bogdan@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 12:59 PM EDT
No	0	Box	Cameron	boxcameron06@gmail.com	09/06/2023 07:05 AM EDT
No	0	Box	Cameron	cameron.c.box@uscg.mil	09/13/2023 08:28 AM EDT
No	0	Bubley	Walter	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 09:26 AM EDT
No	0	Buckel	Jeff	jabuckel@ncsu.edu	09/12/2023 10:45 AM EDT
No	0	Buckson	Bruce	bcbuckson@aol.com	09/07/2023 08:59 AM EDT
No	0	Calay	Shannon	Shannon.Calay@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
No	0	Cimo	Laura	laura.cimo@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 05:06 AM EDT
No	0	Cody	Richard	richard.cody@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:12 PM EDT
No	0	Corbett	Ellie	Ellie.Corbett@MYFWC.com	09/06/2023 11:14 AM EDT
No	0	Cox	Derek	decox@sfwmd.gov	09/07/2023 09:51 AM EDT
No	0	Crowe	Stacie	crowes@dnr.sc.gov	09/10/2023 08:13 AM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kileyjd@gmail.com	09/11/2023 04:37 PM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kdancy@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	DeJohn	Frank	frank.dejohn@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:15 PM EDT
No	0	Dyar	Ben	dyarb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:51 PM EDT
No	0	E Brown	Julie	julie.e.brown@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Gahm	Meghan	meghan.gahm@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Govoni	Beth	beth.govoni@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
No	0	Griffin	Aimee	aimee.griffin@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:42 PM EDT
No	0	Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:38 AM EDT
No	0	Haymans	Doug	doug.haymans@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Horn	Calusa	Calusa.horn@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:54 PM EDT
No	0	Huber	Jeanette	jeanette.huber@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 10:01 AM EDT
No	0	Kalinowsky	Chris	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 12:02 PM EDT
No	0	Kappos	Maria	maria.kappos@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 03:32 PM EDT
No	0	Kean	Samantha	samantha.kean@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:18 PM EDT
No	0	Kumar Ghosh	Bijoy	bkgghoshbuet7@gmail.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
No	0	Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 04:26 PM EDT
No	0	Mackesey	Brendan	brendan.mackesey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:38 PM EDT
No	0	Masi	Michelle	michelle.masi@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:38 AM EDT
No	0	Meehan	Sean	sean.meehan@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 03:42 PM EDT
No	0	Menegolo	Jean Paul	jpmenegolo@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:15 PM EDT
No	0	Menzel	Terri	terri.menzel@myfwc.com	09/12/2023 03:49 PM EDT
No	0	Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
No	0	Moore	Jeff	Jeffrey.N.Moore@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:53 PM EDT
No	0	Muffley	Brandon	bmuffley@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:44 AM EDT
No	0	Olsen	Edward	butchnett@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:19 PM EDT
No	0	Owens	Marina	marina.owens@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 08:15 AM EDT
No	0	Pierce	Brett	Brett.pierce@bluefindata.com	09/11/2023 11:04 AM EDT
No	0	Privoznik	Sarah	sarah.privoznik@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 02:44 PM EDT
No	0	Ralston	Kellie	kellie@bonefishtarpontrust.org	09/11/2023 10:06 AM EDT
No	0	Rathke	David	execdir@resiliencyflorida.org	09/10/2023 12:22 PM EDT
No	0	Reding	Brandon	redingb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 02:04 PM EDT
No	0	Reichert	Marcel	mreichert2022@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Rinaldi	Mike	mike.rinaldi@accsp.org	09/12/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Sabo	Mary	msabo@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:59 PM EDT
No	0	Salmon	Brandi	brandi.salmon@deq.nc.gov	08/31/2023 08:34 AM EDT
No	0	Schwaab	Alexandra	aschwaab@fishwildlife.org	09/06/2023 09:02 AM EDT
No	0	Seramur	Mark	mark.seramur@saltwaterinc.com	09/11/2023 01:41 PM EDT
No	0	Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 08:55 AM EDT
No	0	Soss	Alison	alison.soss@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 10:10 AM EDT
No	0	Spanik	Kevin	spanikk@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:07 PM EDT
No	0	Stewart	Mark	mstewart@gmail.com	08/31/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	Sweeney Tookes	Jennifer	jtookes@georgiasouthern.edu	09/11/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Tuohy	Chelsea	ctuohy@asmfc.org	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
No	0	Turner	Steve	scturner160@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Uchino	Pepper	pepper@fsbpa.com	09/12/2023 10:00 AM EDT
No	0	Vega	Andrea	vega.andrea.a@gmail.com	09/13/2023 09:31 AM EDT
No	0	Wagner	Warren	whwagner@southernco.com	09/01/2023 08:31 AM EDT
No	0	Waine	Mike	mwaine@asafishing.org	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Walia	Matt	matthew.walia@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	shelby.white@nc.deq.gov	09/06/2023 09:58 AM EDT
No	0	Wilber	Pace	pace.wilber@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 08:23 AM EDT
No	0	kramer	rob	rkramer@wildoceans.org	09/12/2023 09:52 AM EDT
No	0	mroch	ray	ray.mroch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:21 AM EDT
No	0	white	geoff	Geoff.Kir.white@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:13 PM EDT

## Attendee Report: SAFMC September 2023 Council Meeting (9/11/23 - 9/15/23)

Report Generated:

09/18/2023 09:03 AM EDT

**Webinar ID**

284-120-835

**Actual Start Date/Time**

09/14/2023 06:45 AM EDT

**Duration**

10 hours 27 minutes

**# Registered**

229

**# Attended**

138

**Clicked Registration Link**

426

### Staff Details

**Attended**

Yes

**Interest Rating**

Not applicable for staff

**Last Name**

Council

**First Name**

South Atlantic

**Email Address**

administrator@safmc.net

**Role**

Organizer

### Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Registration Date/Time
Yes	52	Aines	Alex	aaines@oceana.org	09/08/2023 11:02 AM EDT
Yes	36	Allen	Shanae	shanae.allen@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 09:53 AM EDT
Yes	43	Anderson	Stacey	stacey.anderson@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:39 PM EDT
Yes	56	Anderson	Dustin	dustin.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/11/2023 05:21 PM EDT
Yes	90	Anderson	Christopher	chrisanderson996@gmail.com	09/13/2023 11:57 AM EDT
Yes	33	Appelman	Max	max.appelman@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 10:54 AM EDT
Yes	69	Atkinson	Seth	seth@quillbackconsulting.com	09/14/2023 02:15 PM EDT
Yes	52	Aukeman	Trip	taukeman@ccaflorida.org	09/12/2023 11:38 AM EDT
Yes	46	Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	39	Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu	09/11/2023 02:27 PM EDT
Yes	61	Barbieri	Luiz	luiz.barbieri@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	82	Batsavage	Chris	chris.batsavage@deq.nc.gov	09/06/2023 10:13 AM EDT
Yes	69	Bell	00Mel	BellM@dnr.sc.gov	09/05/2023 05:23 PM EDT
Yes	52	Bianchi	Akan	alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:04 PM EDT
Yes	90	Binion-Rock	Samantha	samantha.binion-rock@noaa.gov	08/31/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	41	Bradshaw	Christopher	christopher.bradshaw@myfwc.com	09/10/2023 09:04 PM EDT
Yes	38	Brantley	William	william.brantley@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 08:24 AM EDT
Yes	46	Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 01:25 PM EDT
Yes	49	Brogan (Oceana)	Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org	09/13/2023 02:31 PM EDT
Yes	44	Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net	08/18/2023 10:33 AM EDT
Yes	43	Bruger	Catherine	cbruger@oceanconservancy.org	09/14/2023 01:26 PM EDT
Yes	40	Bubley	Walter	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 09:26 AM EDT
Yes	43	Bunting	Matthew	matthew.bunting@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	44	Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	09/08/2023 09:36 AM EDT
Yes	36	Calay	Shannon	Shannon.Calay@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
Yes	38	Clinton	Haley	haley.clinton@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:05 AM EDT
Yes	70	Coggins	Lew	lewis.coggins@NOAA.gov	09/07/2023 05:03 PM EDT
Yes	90	Coleman	Heather	heather.coleman@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 11:54 AM EDT
Yes	90	Cox	Jack	dayboat1965@gmail.com	09/14/2023 03:06 PM EDT
Yes	43	Crosson	Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 03:29 PM EDT
Yes	62	Curtis	Judd	judd.curtis@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	42	DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:37 AM EDT
Yes	37	Dukes	Amy	DukesA@dnr.sc.gov	09/12/2023 09:08 AM EDT
Yes	92	Dunn	Tracy	TADunn76@gmail.com	09/12/2023 09:56 AM EDT
Yes	39	Dyar	Ben	dyarb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:51 PM EDT
Yes	47	Finch	Margaret	walkermf@dnr.sc.gov	09/01/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	37	Flowers	Jared	jared.flowers@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 09:48 AM EDT
Yes	40	Foss	Kristin	Kristin.foss@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	32	Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 11:55 AM EDT
Yes	33	Froeschke	John	john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org	09/13/2023 10:54 AM EDT
Yes	35	Gahm	Meghan	meghan.gahm@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 02:42 PM EDT
Yes	50	Gentner	BRAD	brad@gentnergroup.com	09/14/2023 08:29 AM EDT
Yes	90	Gentry	Lauren	lauren.gentry@myfwc.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
Yes	47	Gill	Bob	flosprey1@gmail.com	09/12/2023 02:16 PM EDT
Yes	51	Glazier	Edward	Edward.Glazier@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 03:18 PM EDT
Yes	93	Gloeckner	David	david.gloeckner@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:07 AM EDT
Yes	44	Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	38	Gray	Alisha	alisha.gray@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 09:01 AM EDT
Yes	36	Griffin	Aimee	aimee.griffin@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:42 PM EDT
Yes	47	Guyas	Martha	mguyas@asafishing.org	09/10/2023 08:24 PM EDT
Yes	36	HILDRETH	DELAINE	DELAINE.HILDRETH@DNR.GA.GOV	09/12/2023 02:00 PM EDT
Yes	94	Harrison	Alana	alanaharrison22@gmail.com	09/12/2023 08:59 AM EDT
Yes	32	Heffernan	Katie	katie.heffernan@mail.house.gov	09/05/2023 04:41 PM EDT
Yes	42	Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	82	Helmey	Judy	judyhelmey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	36	Hollensead	Lisa	lisa.hollensead@gulfcouncil.org	09/14/2023 01:34 PM EDT
Yes	35	Horn	Calusa	Calusa.horn@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:54 PM EDT
Yes	34	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.con	09/13/2023 01:05 PM EDT
Yes	45	Hugo	David	david.hugo@safmc.net	09/11/2023 09:39 AM EDT
Yes	39	Iverson	Kim	Kim.Iverson@safmc.net	08/28/2023 12:29 PM EDT
Yes	47	Juliano	Jocelyn	jocelyn.juliano@scseagrant.org	09/11/2023 08:40 AM EDT

Yes	91	KELLY	BILL	fkcf1@hotmail.com	09/13/2023 07:17 AM EDT
Yes	32	Karnauskas	Mandy	mandy.karnauskas@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:49 AM EDT
Yes	35	Keppler	Blaik	kepplerb@dnr.sc.gov	09/13/2023 09:56 AM EDT
Yes	32	Kershaw	Francine	fkershaw@nrdc.org	09/14/2023 09:09 AM EDT
Yes	91	Kersting	Anne	anne.kersting@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:17 AM EDT
Yes	90	Key	Meisha	meisha.key@safmc.net	09/11/2023 01:52 PM EDT
Yes	99	Klasnick	01Kelly	kelly.klasnick@safmc.net	08/30/2023 12:18 PM EDT
Yes	92	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org	09/14/2023 01:41 PM EDT
Yes	69	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 08:26 AM EDT
Yes	52	LaRoche	Kelcie	kelcie.laroche@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	97	Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net	09/11/2023 11:46 AM EDT
Yes	90	Laney	Reid Wilson	rallaneys@gmail.com	09/13/2023 03:04 PM EDT
Yes	38	Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:32 PM EDT
Yes	40	Lazarre	Dominique	Dominique.Lazarre@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:48 AM EDT
Yes	37	Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 04:26 PM EDT
Yes	53	Lind	Michael	michael.lind@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:15 AM EDT
Yes	93	Locke	Charles	obxlocke@aol.com	09/12/2023 09:10 AM EDT
Yes	37	Long	Stephen	longs@dnr.sc.gov	09/14/2023 09:50 AM EDT
Yes	91	Lorenzen	Kai	klorenzen@ufl.edu	09/11/2023 02:45 PM EDT
Yes	89	M Borland	Gary	gborlandsafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	36	Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:37 AM EDT
Yes	84	Marhefka	00Kerry	kerryomarhefka@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	91	Marinko	Jeff	putridinnards@hotmail.com	09/13/2023 06:32 AM EDT
Yes	90	Maroney	Bradley	captainbradleymaroney@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:31 AM EDT
Yes	50	McCoy	Sherryllanne	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 09:51 AM EDT
Yes	61	McGovern	Jack	John.McGovern@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	92	McWhorter	Will	wdmcwhorter@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:30 PM EDT
Yes	67	Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 12:55 PM EDT
Yes	43	Moore	Jeff	Jeffrey.N.Moore@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:53 PM EDT
Yes	86	Murphey	Trish	trish.murphey@deq.nc.gov	08/28/2023 11:26 AM EDT
Yes	99	Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:47 AM EDT
Yes	92	Newman	Thomas	thomas.newman03@gmail.com	09/06/2023 09:27 PM EDT
Yes	93	O'Malley	Rachel	rachel.o'malley@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 09:43 PM EDT
Yes	61	Oliver	Ashley	ashley.oliver@safmc.net	09/06/2023 08:39 AM EDT
Yes	32	Package-Ward	Christina	christina.package-ward@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 11:01 AM EDT
Yes	47	Porch	Clay	clay.porch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:32 AM EDT
Yes	33	Privoznik	Sarah	sarah.privoznik@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 02:44 PM EDT
Yes	43	Rainey	Dan	rainmand63@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:48 PM EDT
Yes	36	Ramsay	Chloe	chloe.ramsay@myfwc.com	09/04/2023 09:12 AM EDT
Yes	56	Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:31 PM EDT
Yes	100	Ritter	Michele	michele.ritter@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:45 AM EDT
Yes	41	Robicheaux	Emily	Emily.Robicheaux@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 11:16 AM EDT
Yes	66	Roller	00Tom	tomrollersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	41	Sauls	Beverly	bevsauls1@gmail.com	08/31/2023 09:42 AM EDT
Yes	55	Shervanick	Kara	kshervanick@gmail.com	09/13/2023 02:00 PM EDT
Yes	74	Sinkus	Wiley	sinkusw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
Yes	41	Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 08:55 AM EDT
Yes	56	Smit-Brunello	00Monica	monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:36 PM EDT
Yes	38	Somerset	Carly	carly.somerset@gulfcouncil.org	09/14/2023 09:43 AM EDT
Yes	49	Spurgin	Kali	Kali.Spurgin@MyFWC.com	09/11/2023 08:03 AM EDT
Yes	37	Stemle	Adam	adam.stemle@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 11:24 AM EDT
Yes	41	Strelcheck	00-Andy	andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 08:32 AM EDT
Yes	54	Sweetman	CJ	Christopher.Sweetman@MyFWC.com	09/06/2023 08:29 AM EDT
Yes	61	Thompson	00Laurilee	thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	92	Townsend	Wes	pakafish1@yahoo.com	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	39	Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov	08/30/2023 12:23 PM EDT
Yes	45	Vara	Mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:23 AM EDT
Yes	59	Vecchio	Julie	vecchioj@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 10:51 AM EDT
Yes	90	Vega	Andrea	aavega2@outlook.com	09/14/2023 09:30 AM EDT
Yes	59	Walsh	Jason	jason.walsh@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 04:22 PM EDT
Yes	36	Walter	John	john.f.walter@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	35	Wescoat	Lauren	lauren.wescoat@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 09:13 AM EDT
Yes	49	White	Geoff	geoff.white@accsp.org	09/11/2023 09:54 AM EDT
Yes	95	White	Shelby	shelby.white@deq.nc.gov	09/07/2023 10:59 AM EDT
Yes	34	Wilber	Pace	pace.wilber@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 08:23 AM EDT
Yes	31	Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	36	Willis	Michelle	willisc@dnr.sc.gov	09/13/2023 04:13 PM EDT
Yes	45	Withers	Meg	meg.withers@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:34 AM EDT
Yes	41	collier	chip	chip.collier@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:20 AM EDT
Yes	97	griner	tim	timgrinersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	64	moss	david	david.moss@tnc.org	09/13/2023 09:31 AM EDT
Yes	33	murphy	allison	allison.murphy@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 09:52 AM EDT
Yes	94	oden	jeff	slshcrkwtwks@aol.com	09/14/2023 01:26 PM EDT
Yes	39	sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT

Yes	38	stephen	jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	97	thomas	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:08 AM EDT
Yes	80	thompson	laurilee	00thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/14/2023 11:25 AM EDT
No	0	Anderson	Christopher	chris.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:25 PM EDT
No	0	Baker	Marion	marion19@ufl.edu	09/10/2023 04:40 PM EDT
No	0	Barger	Jeff	jbarger@oceanconservancy.org	09/13/2023 09:28 AM EDT
No	0	Beaty	Julia	jbeaty@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:33 PM EDT
No	0	Benevento	Tony	43tonyb@gmail.com	09/07/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	Berry	James "chip"	chip@chipberry.com	09/05/2023 06:11 PM EDT
No	0	Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:40 AM EDT
No	0	Blosser	Brooke	brookeb@scccl.org	09/11/2023 02:21 PM EDT
No	0	Bogdan	Jennifer	jennifer.bogdan@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 12:59 PM EDT
No	0	Box	Cameron	cameron.c.box@uscg.mil	09/13/2023 08:28 AM EDT
No	0	Box	Cameron	boxcameron06@gmail.com	09/06/2023 07:05 AM EDT
No	0	Buckel	Jeff	jabuckel@ncsu.edu	09/12/2023 10:45 AM EDT
No	0	Buckson	Bruce	bcbuckson@aol.com	09/07/2023 08:59 AM EDT
No	0	Cimo	Laura	laura.cimo@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 05:06 AM EDT
No	0	Cody	Richard	richard.cody@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:12 PM EDT
No	0	Corbett	Ellie	Ellie.Corbett@MYFWC.com	09/06/2023 11:14 AM EDT
No	0	Cox	Derek	decox@sfwmd.gov	09/07/2023 09:51 AM EDT
No	0	Cross	Tiffanie	tiffanie.cross@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:13 PM EDT
No	0	Crowe	Stacie	crowes@dnr.sc.gov	09/10/2023 08:13 AM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kileyjd@gmail.com	09/11/2023 04:37 PM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kdancy@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	DeJohn	Frank	frank.dejohn@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:15 PM EDT
No	0	Dunn	Russell	Russell.Dunn@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:14 AM EDT
No	0	E Brown	Julie	julie.e.brown@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Farnell	Paula	paula.farnell@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:25 AM EDT
No	0	Friedrich	Tony	tony@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/13/2023 08:36 AM EDT
No	0	GREENE	Karen	karen.e.greene@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:47 AM EDT
No	0	Gietzmann-Sanders	Marcel	marcelsanders96@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:42 PM EDT
No	0	Govoni	Beth	beth.govoni@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
No	0	Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:38 AM EDT
No	0	Haymans	Doug	doug.haymans@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Huber	Jeanette	jeanette.huber@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 10:01 AM EDT
No	0	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.com	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
No	0	Iberle	Allie	allie.iberle@safmc.net	09/13/2023 09:45 AM EDT
No	0	Kalinowsky	Chris	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 12:02 PM EDT
No	0	Kappos	Maria	maria.kappos@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 03:32 PM EDT
No	0	Kean	Samantha	samantha.kean@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:18 PM EDT
No	0	Kittle	Christine	christine.kittle@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:11 PM EDT
No	0	Kumar Ghosh	Bijoy	bkgoshbuet7@gmail.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
No	0	Lee	Max	maxlee@mote.org	09/07/2023 11:43 AM EDT
No	0	Mackesey	Brendan	brendan.mackesey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:38 PM EDT
No	0	Masi	Michelle	michelle.masi@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:38 AM EDT
No	0	Meehan	Sean	sean.meehan@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 03:42 PM EDT
No	0	Menegolo	Jean Paul	jpmenegolo@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:15 PM EDT
No	0	Menendez	Hayden	hayden.menendez@myfwc.com	09/13/2023 10:34 AM EDT
No	0	Menzel	Terri	terri.menzel@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 03:49 PM EDT
No	0	Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
No	0	Muffley	Brandon	bmuffley@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:44 AM EDT
No	0	Olsen	Edward	butchnett@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:19 PM EDT
No	0	Owens	Marina	marina.owens@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 08:15 AM EDT
No	0	Pierce	Brett	Brett.pierce@bluefindata.com	09/11/2023 11:04 AM EDT
No	0	Pikula	Kyle	bkpikula@yahoo.com	09/11/2023 01:23 PM EDT
No	0	Ralston	Kellie	kellie@bonefishtarpontrust.org	09/11/2023 10:06 AM EDT
No	0	Rathke	David	execdir@resiliencyflorida.org	09/10/2023 12:22 PM EDT
No	0	Reding	Brandon	redingb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 02:04 PM EDT
No	0	Reichert	Marcel	mreichert2022@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Rinaldi	Mike	mike.rinaldi@accsp.org	09/12/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Sabo	Mary	msabo@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:59 PM EDT
No	0	Salmon	Brandi	brandi.salmon@deq.nc.gov	08/31/2023 08:34 AM EDT
No	0	Sartwell	Tim	tim.sartwell@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 02:58 PM EDT
No	0	Schmidtke	Michael	Mike.Schmidtke@safmc.net	09/13/2023 01:57 PM EDT
No	0	Schwaab	Alexandra	aschwaab@fishwildlife.org	09/06/2023 09:02 AM EDT
No	0	Seramur	Mark	mark.seramur@saltwaterinc.com	09/11/2023 01:41 PM EDT
No	0	Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 12:25 PM EDT
No	0	Simmons	Carrie	carrie.simmons@gulfcouncil.org	09/13/2023 01:35 PM EDT
No	0	Smillie	Nick	Nick.smillie@safmc.net	09/13/2023 03:23 PM EDT
No	0	Soss	Alison	alison.soss@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 10:10 AM EDT
No	0	Spanik	Kevin	spanikk@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:07 PM EDT
No	0	Sramek	Mark	Mark.Sramek@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 07:23 AM EDT
No	0	Stam	Geoff	grstam@att.net	08/31/2023 09:20 AM EDT
No	0	Stewart	Mark	mstewart@gmail.com	08/31/2023 10:22 AM EDT



No	0	Sweeney Tookes	Jennifer	jtookes@georgiasouthern.edu	09/11/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Takade-Heumacher	Helen	helen.takade-heumacher@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 12:17 PM EDT
No	0	Tuohy	Chelsea	ctuohy@asmfc.org	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
No	0	Turner	Steve	scturner160@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Uchino	Pepper	pepper@fsbpa.com	09/12/2023 10:00 AM EDT
No	0	Vega	Andrea	vega.andrea.a@gmail.com	09/13/2023 09:31 AM EDT
No	0	Wagner	Warren	whwagner@southernco.com	09/01/2023 08:31 AM EDT
No	0	Waine	Mike	mwaine@asafishing.org	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Walia	Matt	matthew.walia@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	shelby.white@nc.deq.gov	09/06/2023 09:58 AM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	sbwhite6762@gmail.com	09/13/2023 02:01 PM EDT
No	0	kramer	rob	rkramer@wildoceans.org	09/12/2023 09:52 AM EDT
No	0	mroch	ray	ray.mroch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:21 AM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	bpilula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 11:23 AM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	bkoikula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 04:45 PM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	kpikula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 04:45 PM EDT
No	0	pikula	Kyle	kbikula@gmail.com	09/13/2023 01:02 PM EDT
No	0	poston	will	will@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/11/2023 03:52 PM EDT
No	0	rettig	adam	adam.rettig@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:18 AM EDT
No	0	white	geoff	Geoff.Kir.white@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:13 PM EDT