

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **DOLPHIN WAHOO COMMITTEE**

### **Webinar**

**September 16, 2020**

### **TRANSCRIPT**

#### **Committee Members**

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Chair  
Robert Beal  
Mel Bell  
Dr. Kyle Christiansen  
LT Robert Copeland  
Tim Griner  
Steve Poland  
Spud Woodward

Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chester Brewer  
Chris Conklin  
Dr. Roy Crabtree  
Jessica McCawley  
Art Sapp

#### **Council Staff**

John Carmichael  
Julia Byrd  
Dr. Brian Chevront  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
BeBe Dalton Harrison  
Allie Iberle  
Kelly Klasnick  
Roger Pugliese  
Christina Wiegand

Myra Brouwer  
Cindy Chaya  
Dr. Chip Collier  
John Hadley  
Kathleen Howington  
Kim Iverson  
Dr. Julie Neer  
Cameron Rhodes  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
Suzanna Thomas

#### **Observers/Participants**

Erika Burgess  
Shep Grimes  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
Dr. Clay Porch

Rick DeVictor  
Martha Guyas  
Dr. Genny Nesslage  
Monica Smith-Brunello

The Dolphin Wahoo Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Wednesday, September 16, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Anna Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: It's 9:00, and so welcome, everyone, and I call the Dolphin Wahoo Committee to order, with the first item on the agenda being approval of the agenda, and I would like some flexibility on that. I think we are going to probably start our discussion with Amendment 12, and we may have some other topics that come up under Other Business, including some of the recent public comment that we have received, and so is there any additions or concerns with the agenda? Seeing none, that agenda is approved.

The second item on our agenda is Approval of the June 2020 Minutes. Are there any corrections to the minutes? Seeing none, those minutes are approved.

MR. GRIMES: Madam Chair, I just wanted to mention one thing, and it's not a big deal, but, on page 7, towards the bottom of the page, the word "max" is not correct, and it's actually Art Sapp's statement, and I remember that he was merely pointing out that Ms. Lee could not have meant nautical meters, but rather was intending nautical miles, and that's it. Thanks.

MS. BECKWITH: I really appreciate you reading the minutes alongside. I read them as well, but I don't tend to catch those small details, and so I appreciate your efforts.

MR. GRIMES: You're welcome. It's what I live for.

MS. BECKWITH: With that small correction, the minutes are approved. Okay. I guess I will turn it over to John, and, if John is ready, I think we should start with Amendment 12.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you, Anna. I will bring up a quick orienting presentation here, and then we'll jump right into the amendment itself. Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the Dolphin Wahoo Committee meeting. I'm going to give a quick orientation presentation on where we stand on Amendment 12, just to bring everyone up to speed on where the amendment stands and a reminder of what the council did in June.

You approved edits to the purpose and need statements, and you also approved the amendment for public hearings. The specifications for this were that the public hearings were to take place during the public comment session at this meeting, and so they'll be taking place this afternoon, during the public comment session, and there's also the expectation of a potential final approval of this amendment at this meeting.

Looking at the amendment timing, just a reminder that you did have guidance from NMFS in March on parameters of the council's ability to add EC species to an FMP. Since then, you've been working on moving this amendment forward, and, at this meeting, we're really looking at reviewing the amendment and considering public comments and modifying, as appropriate, and considering for formal review. We're looking at a likely implementation of this amendment sometime in 2021.

This is a single-action amendment, and it has been formatted as a categorical exclusion. If you look at the amendment document itself, the amendment would add bullet mackerel and frigate

mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan and designate them as ecosystem component species, and so what really needs to be done at this meeting is we'll go through the decision document and review the effects summaries, and I will be looking for feedback on the council's rationale, and so we have a draft rationale put together in the document, and I have a summary version of that in the decision document, and I want to make sure that the council is okay with that before submitting this amendment, and also consider voting for formal secretarial review. With that, I will take any questions, while I'm switching over to the decision document.

MS. BECKWITH: I don't see any hands raised.

MR. HADLEY: Give me just a second to size the document appropriately here, so we can keep the raised hands. With that, we have the introduction to the amendment, and we'll jump into the purpose and need statement. You approved some edits to this statement at the last meeting, and I just wanted to give it one last look before moving forward, and there is no action required, but the purpose and need is to add bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic as ecosystem component species to acknowledge their ecological role as forage fish. I just wanted to make sure that there are no -- That the committee is comfortable with moving forward with that purpose and need statement.

MS. BECKWITH: It appears that we are.

MR. HADLEY: All right. No hands. All right. As a reminder, now we'll jump into -- I want to take a few minutes to go over the summary of the environmental effects that are found within the amendment document, and, as a reminder, the council's preferred option, and preferred action, is to add bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP and designate the two mackerel species as ecosystem components.

Some of the biological effects, I would point out that the landings of bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel are relatively inconsequential, and so, as you may recall, you have seen the review of the landings of bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel, and it's shown that they are fairly low throughout the Atlantic, and the two mackerel species, as noted, can also be considered ecosystem component species, because they do not require conservation and management, and there's an appendix in the amendment document that goes through the various steps and various pieces of information that factor into that determination.

The South Atlantic Council has decided to list the two mackerel species in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP to achieve the ecosystem management objectives, and this follows specifications for ecosystem component species found in the National Standards, and the EC designation recognizes the ecosystem role of the two mackerel species, particularly for wahoo. There are no direct or indirect adverse impacts expected from this designation, under species listed under the ESA and Marine Mammal Protection Act, including their critical habitat.

Some of the potential indirect effects could occur through, or biological effects, rather, could occur through public education and awareness of the EC designation, since this may encourage reporting of landings of the two mackerel species more than before, providing some biological benefits. Additionally, there could be some biological benefits obtained from the raised awareness among fishery participants, fishing communities, data collection agencies, and regulatory entities. There again, pointing out that there is nothing required, necessarily. However, the EC designation kind

of raises the profile, so to speak, and so it would be voluntary, and nothing is required under this amendment, in particular.

Moving over to the economic effects, there are not anticipated direct economic effects from the EC species designation, since this designation would not affect the landings of the two mackerel species, and there would be potential indirect economic benefits from this designation, if it leads to better monitoring of landings through public education and increased awareness, and there are no known costs associated with this action, outside of the public costs for regulations, and so, essentially, developing this amendment and putting it into place.

Looking at the social effects, the ecosystem component species designation is not anticipated to result in direct positive or negative social effects, and the designation may have indirect social benefits, since it could foster timelier decision-making, and ensure management is streamlined, should management measures be deemed necessary in the future.

It was also pointed out that, in relation to the numerous public comments in support of the action, acknowledging the key role that the mackerel species play in supporting an important recreational fishery would improve stakeholder perceptions of management efforts, and, really, the overall social effects should be positive for both the recreational and commercial sectors, because it recognizes the role of the two mackerel species as prey for wahoo, while not requiring any unnecessary management constraints for a species that is currently relatively rarely encountered in the Atlantic. I will take a pause there, to see if there any questions on the effects, before I jump into the AP recommendations and the council rationale. I am not seeing any hands go up. All right.

There are no IPT recommendations or comments at this point. As a reminder, the South Atlantic Council's SSC and advisory panels have weighed-in on this amendment. The Dolphin Wahoo AP reviewed the amendment at their most recent webinar meeting, and they passed a motion in support of designating bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel as ecosystem component species in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP.

Furthermore, a similar sentiment was expressed by the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Advisory Panel, where they were supportive of looking at them as ecosystem component species, and really showing support for the idea in general of identifying forage prey, to enable the further development of comprehensive FMPs.

The Scientific and Statistical Committee, the South Atlantic Council's SSC, was presented background information on Amendment 12 and discussed the amendment, as well as recommended that adding bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the FMP -- They recommended adding bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP as ecosystem component species, and so they were supportive of the action.

As you recall, you have received numerous public comments, largely in support, through many of the public hearing and public comment sessions for the different council meetings, as well as in scoping. During scoping, there were several comments received in favor of adding the two mackerel species as ecosystem components in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP.

Additionally, the last, but certainly not least, portion that I wanted to go over was the council's rationale, and so this is a draft rationale, and I wanted to go over it with you before formal approval of this amendment, to make sure that you're comfortable with what is included in the amendment as the rationale, and so the council -- It was brought up that the council took up the action of adding bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP as EC species in response to a request from the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

The South Atlantic Council examined dietary information for dolphin and wahoo, as regulatory measures taken by other fishery management councils to address unmanaged forage species as ecosystem components within their respective FMPs, and that was done in the early development stages of this amendment. Initially, the council explored regulatory measures to accompany the ecosystem component designation, ecosystem component species designation rather, but it did not pursue these measures, after receiving guidance from NMFS and further considering the potential implications of such measures.

The council concluded that the Preferred Option 2 best meets the purpose and need of the amendment, to acknowledge the ecological role of bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel as forage fish. The council noted that the two mackerel species have been documented as important forage species, particularly for wahoo, and, to a lesser extent, for dolphin, and, also, it was pointed out that this action is backed by peer-reviewed literature, recommendations from the South Atlantic Council's SSC, as well as the Dolphin Wahoo and Habitat APs. In addition, there have been numerous public comments supporting and in favor of adding bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP as ecosystem component species.

It's noted that bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel are currently not in need of conservation and management, as mentioned earlier, making them eligible for consideration as ecosystem component species under provisions found within the National Standard Guidelines and complying with requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and other applicable law.

The committee action here is to review the council rationale and modify as appropriate, and so, there again, we want to make sure that you're comfortable with that as being your rationale, and, also, consider recommending the amendment for formal review. There is a draft motion here that would do so at the very bottom, and, with that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, John. Excellent presentation. Are there any comments on anything having to do with this amendment? Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Anna. This is not actually a comment on this amendment, because I'm all in favor of it, 100 percent, but do we have any words as to whether the Mid-Atlantic is going to now take this amendment and use it to add bullet and frigate mackerel to their comprehensive forage fish amendment? Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Unless Dewey can speak to that, I'm not directly aware, because I believe that Tony was primarily following that, but I will go to Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: It's my understanding that that is what is going to take place, what Chester asked about.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Steve.

MR. BREWER: I am very happy to hear that, and that could be another rationale for why we're doing this, but I don't want to add something to this amendment at this point, and so everything is fine as it is.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks, and it sounds like Tony is actually with us.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you for letting me join in remotely this way. Our plan is that, once you include it as an ecosystem component in your wahoo dolphin plan, we will then take any action that's necessary to protect the species, and so, at this point, we're ready to do all the heavy lifting. It must also be noted that what has happened in the past few years is that mahi, dolphinfish, has become actually a directed fishery, at this point, all the way up to New York, and so it's more important than ever that we protect these two species, because they do provide forage to an important species, both recreationally and commercially, in New York waters, and so, again, thank you very much, and I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have, Anna, or the council may have.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks, Tony. Thanks for joining us this morning. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Madam Chair. To that point, I was going to go ahead and dispense with this amendment and get it done and then make the suggestion that the South Atlantic Council just send a letter back to the Mid-Atlantic, since all this stuff started from a former request from the Mid-Atlantic to consider it, and so I feel like we should respond back to them, and I envision that letter just quickly summarizing the actions we took and kind of the rationale and all of that.

MS. BECKWITH: Did I hear you about to make a motion, Steve?

MR. POLAND: Yes, Madam Chair. **I will move to approve Amendment 12 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.**

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for that. Chester, go ahead.

MR. BREWER: I would certainly agree with the motion. I do have a question. We're having a public hearing on this this afternoon, and is it a good idea to go forward with this motion before we have the public hearing?

MS. BECKWITH: We could always move forward with this motion, and, if we were to decide to do something different, we could take it back up at Full Council.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Fine. I'm just trying to make sure that we don't do something that we can get challenged on.

MS. BECKWITH: Would you care to second this, or would you care to do it as a Full Council?

MR. BREWER: I would love to second it, and so I do, but, Shep, could you speak to whether or not we're potentially risking a challenge to this if we go ahead and approve this motion before we have the final public hearing on it, of course with the thought that we could always modify it at Full Council?

MS. BECKWITH: Shep, to that?

MR. GRIMES: There is no problem with that. It's just committee, and so you won't approve it until the council approves it anyway, and that won't occur until you've had the public comment.

MS. BECKWITH: Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to second it, if he didn't.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so it has been made and seconded, and is there any further discussion? Jessica, are we doing all these votes by like one person at a time, or how are we handling it? I don't think we've voted on anything yet.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We can't really vote on this, because it's a roll call vote when we get to Full Council, and so you've just made the motion, but it's a roll call vote when we're all at Full Council, and so it will be a recommendation from the committee.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. **If there is no opposition to this motion, then we'll take it up at Full Council, and is that how we want to handle it? Seeing no opposition, that motion carries, and we will do the roll call vote at Full Council.**

If that brings us to the end of Amendment 12, it sounds like we are ready to tackle Amendment 10 when John is ready. Steve, go ahead.

MR. POLAND: I just wanted to make sure that we didn't need a motion to send a letter to the Mid-Atlantic, if just our discussion on that was sufficient for staff.

MR. HADLEY: I appreciate that, Steve, and I wrote it down in my notes as direction to staff to write a letter to the Mid-Atlantic Council, and I will include that in the Dolphin Wahoo Committee report that we'll review tomorrow.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you.

MR. HADLEY: Shifting gears here, we'll jump into Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, and, again, this is an orienting presentation, just to discuss what the council did last time, at the meeting in June, and where Amendment 10 stands at this point.

The council, in June, received a presentation on the revised ACLs from the SSC, and these are for both dolphin and wahoo. If you recall, the third-highest landings between 1994 and 2007 were used to set the -- That should actually say ABCs and not ACLs, and those were used to set the ABCs for dolphin and wahoo, and, as a reminder, this is inclusive of the new FES estimates, as well as inclusive of Monroe County for the recreational landings.

You reviewed actions in Amendment 10, specifying allocation alternatives that you would like to see, and we'll get into that in the actions, kind of 1 through 4, that look at these different alternatives for the different ACLs. You specified that you wanted to potentially remove the post-season commercial accountability measures, and you looked at an approach to recreational accountability measures that examines a trigger for that accountability measure, and then a following action that specifies the accountability measure that will actually go into place, and these are all post-season recreational accountability measures.

Then, finally, you removed the pelagic-longline-related actions from Amendment 10 to a separate amendment, and, in doing so, you also added an alternative that would disallow the use of longline gear in the dolphin wahoo fishery unless the limited-entry pelagic longline highly migratory species, the tri-pack, so to speak, permits were also held by that vessel.

Looking at the potential amendment timing, the council has been working on this amendment for quite a bit. However, there have been several delays, largely due to data, and, in the process, in the midst of this, we revised the MRIP revisions, and so we're doing the switchover from the Coastal Household Telephone Survey to the Fishing Effort Survey, and that's the CHTS to FES estimates, and so there are several delays in there. However, we've been working on this amendment since December of 2018, to move it along. Looking at some of the potential amendment timing, we'll be looking at the draft purpose and need statements, and potentially providing guidance on the actions in the amendment.

I will remind you, when we get to it, that there is not a committee-approved purpose and need statement just yet, since the actions have changed quite a bit, and we'll get into potentially approving a draft purpose and need statement, but, moving forward, at the December meeting, you would approve the purpose and need statement, review some of the additional preliminary effects, potentially select preferred alternatives, and approve for public hearings. These public hearings would occur in the winter of 2021. You would receive the public hearing comments in March of 2021, further revising the amendment, for potential final approval at the June 2021 meeting. This would result in likely implementing the amendment itself and the actions in the amendment sometime in 2022.

Looking at the actions in the amendment, there are currently fourteen actions, and they can really be broken down into three main categories, those that accommodate revised recreational data and catch level recommendations, those that revise accountability measures for both the commercial and recreational sectors, and those that implement various management revisions in the dolphin and wahoo fisheries.

That first kind of group there, you have Actions 1 and 2 that revise the total annual catch limit for dolphin and the total annual catch limit for wahoo, and then Actions 3 and 4 look at the sector allocations for dolphin and wahoo, and, really, based on those decisions in Actions 1 and 2. That will kind of set the total pie, so to speak, and how large that will be.

The actions that accommodate accountability measures, Actions 5 and 6 would revise the commercial accountability measures for dolphin and wahoo, and these are really looking -- These two actions, and we'll get into the details of them, but they're looking at removing the potential post-season accountability measures, commercial accountability measures, for both dolphin and wahoo. Actions 7, 8, 9, and 10, there again, look at that approach to setting recreational



accountability measures, and it's looking at what will be the trigger for those accountability measures, and then a subsequent action that specifies what the actual accountability measure will be, and that's for both dolphin and wahoo.

Then, last, but certainly not least, we have the Action 11, where there is a few IPT-suggested edits that we'll get into and go over with the committee, but Action 11 would allow possession of dolphin and wahoo when certain unauthorized gears are onboard a vessel. Action 12 would remove the operator card requirement in the dolphin wahoo fishery. Action 13 would reduce the recreational vessel limit for dolphin, potentially coastwide or in Florida only, and then Action 14 would allow filleting of dolphin at-sea onboard a charter or headboat vessel in the waters north of the Virginia/North Carolina border, and so looking at the Mid-Atlantic and New England.

What needs to be done at this meeting is we'll review the decision document, and we'll go over, there again, the draft purpose and need statements and the actions and alternatives. There are a few new actions that the committee would need to pass a motion to add to the amendment, and then there are several proposed revisions. Also, consider the amendment timing and when the committee would like to review the amendment again, and presumably this would be at the December 2020 meeting. With that, I will break for questions and key-up the decision document.

MS. BECKWITH: While we still have quite a few actions in this amendment, it is much easier to flow through, and so I appreciate the work done on this. Are there any questions for John before we begin? Thanks. Go ahead.

MR. HADLEY: I am just bringing up the decision document here. Before I jump into it, we have a draft purpose and need statement that the IPT has put together, but I didn't know if the committee wants to tackle this now or wait until towards the end, after you've gone through all the actions, because, really, the purpose, in particular, is very addressed to the specific action in the amendment, and I didn't know if you wanted to tackle that now or later. Is there any preference?

MS. BECKWITH: I am always a fan of after the fact, to make sure we're not going back and forth a bunch.

MR. HADLEY: All right. That sounds good. With that, we will jump into Action 1. Action 1 would revise the total ACL for dolphin to reflect the updated acceptable biological catch level. Alternative 1 is the total ACL for dolphin is set equal to the current ACL. Then Alternative 2 would set the total ACL for dolphin current to the updated ABC, acceptable biological catch, level. Alternatives 3 and 4 would add a step-down from that between the ABC and ACL, and so, for Alternative 3, the ACL for dolphin would equal 95 percent of the updated ABC. In Alternative 4, the total ACL for dolphin would equal 90 percent of the updated ABC.

A couple of things that I wanted to bring up that come into play towards the end, and potentially how the committee wants to move forward, is I wanted to point out that the ABC is currently set equal to the ACL, as specified in Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5, and this accommodated previous revisions of MRIP data, and the rationale that the council had at the time was that this was the preferred alternative in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, and monitoring efforts had improved significantly at the time, thereby reducing the likelihood that commercial ACLs would be exceeded. Dealers were to begin reporting electronically once a week, further enhancing ACL monitoring efforts, and recreational landings had remained well below recreational ACLs since

implemented, and so certainly some accountability there that was exhibited in part of the council's rationale in setting the ABC equal to the ACL.

With that, I wanted to jump into a few of the figures and tables, just to show you how the different alternatives would play out in comparison to recent landings. In Figure 1, which shows dolphin landings, both commercial and recreational and total dolphin landings, from 1986 through 2019, and you will see, on the far right here, the horizontal lines are the different alternatives, and the top line with the circles, in orange, being Alternative 2, and so that would be ACL equals the new ABC, and then Alternative 3 and 4 are your step-downs there, the line with the squares and the lines with the triangles and how those would play out.

In general, you can see that, with the exception of 2015, when you had that large spike in landings, particularly from the recreational side, these ACLs are largely well below -- The ACLs are largely well above the observed landings.

Looking at some of the PSEs for dolphin, they are relatively low. They're amongst the lowest of the species that the South Atlantic Council manages, and then, looking at a comparison of alternatives, the different alternatives, for the ACLs to the recent dolphin landings, you can see that there's quite a bit of a buffer there. You're looking at a five-year average and a three-year average and the comparison of most recent years. You're looking at a several-million-pounds sort of buffer there, when you look at recent landings in the fishery, or the average recent landings in the fishery. I will note the reason that this is not applicable is that these landings are specified in FES estimates, and the existing dolphin ACL uses CHTS estimates, and so a comparison between the two really wouldn't be appropriate in this circumstance.

Included in this decision document is the projection analysis, and this was done using the average over the past three years of landings, and these are total landings, both commercial and recreational sector landings, in comparison to the potential new ACLs and whether or not they would be exceeded, and, under all of the alternatives, none of the ACLs are expected to be exceeded based on the three-year average.

There is really no committee action required at this point. However, you may want to discuss the actions and alternatives. Also, it was noted -- The IPT has discussed this amendment several times, and it was noted, during these discussions, that it would very much help with the analysis if the committee is comfortable choosing a preferred alternative at this point, and this is really specifically speaking to Actions 1 and 2, but, since the subsequent analyses really depend on these first two decisions from the council, and from the committee, it would help greatly with the analysis on the IPT side. With that, I will hand it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, John. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Madam Chair, I have a motion ready, if you're ready for one.

MS. BECKWITH: Sure. Go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. **I move that we select Alternative 2 as our preferred alternative.** While that's on the screen, I was going to give a little rationale. I feel like this follows the precedent that was established in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment to set ACL equal to ABC.

Based on the last twenty years of landings, it's unlikely that harvest will exceed the ACL or the ABC, except for in rare cases, and commercial landings are well tracked, and a commercial vessel limit that kicks in at this point, when 75 percent of the commercial quota is met, should keep the commercial fishery near, but under, their sector ACL, and, also, we have low PSEs in this fishery.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you for that. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was going to second, so she could explain further and we could discuss.

MS. BECKWITH: Would you still like to second, Mel?

MR. BELL: That's a second.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Great. We have a motion on the table, and it's seconded, and there is rationale. Is there any discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't really have any objections to the preferred, I guess, but I have gotten a number of emails and phone calls, and I guess they're mostly from for-hire guys down in south Florida, but they have a lot of concerns that the stock is not in as good shape as we think, and there are concerns with the extent to which we're raising the ACLs, and it's hard to really evaluate what's going on, but I am wondering if maybe some discussion about -- Maybe this is one where a little bit bigger buffer, to set the ACL at 90 or 95 percent of the ABC, and just put a little bit more conservatism into management, might be at least worth talking about.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have been getting a lot of the same phone calls that Roy is mentioning, and I am probably getting a little bit ahead here, but there's pretty much universal agreement in the phone calls and emails that I've been getting that the vessel limit needs to be lowered. I am also getting emails with regard to some people want to actually lower the per-person limit and take it to five, and I don't know whether I agree with that or not, but, I mean, certainly that has been brought up.

Then, of course, we've got the issue with the pelagic longlines, that I think we've all been getting emails and comments on that, and I probably am a little bit ahead of myself, and so I will wait, but I share Roy's concerns, in that part of the reason that we may not be getting anywhere close to the ACLs is the fishery is not in as good shape as we think it is, and that needs to be explored, and I am going to recommend, a little bit later in this presentation, that we have already taken the issue of pelagic longlines, and we're going to do that in a different amendment, and I am kind of thinking that we might want to do the same thing from the standpoint of both the -- Well, both the pelagic and from the standpoint of a per-person limit or boat limits, vessel limits, recreationally, on dolphin. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester, we will be discussing some of the vessel limits later on in this document, and so we'll get to have that discussion, and I suspect we'll be discussing that public comment. I did have a similar thought to Roy's that I did want to at least have a discussion on the additional options, to see where folks were with that, and so I will take it back to Jessica and then Mel and then Art.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Anna. I had similar concerns as Roy, but, as Chester was alluding to, I would like to see us tackle some of those concerns with some of the actions that are later in this amendment, relative to vessel limits or per-person limits or something of that nature. Yes, I feel comfortable, just because of the biology of dolphin and what we know about it, and I feel comfortable setting ABC equal to ACL, but, in my mind, tackling some of those concerns with some of the actions later in the amendment.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Mel.

MR. BELL: I think, listening to Roy and Chester, and Jessica just summed it up, and, if you want to provide a little bit more of a buffer in there, maybe we could do it on the other end, in some of the things that Chester mentioned, with some limits there, and that might actually be more effective, in terms of an actual conservation value, and so we could kind of go -- I mean, one approach would be to kind of go with what we're thinking here with Jessica's motion and then pick up the conservation later on. If we're not satisfied, I guess we can always come back and revisit the ACL question.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Art.

MR. SAPP: Mel, you nailed the bulls-eye on that one, I think, and, if anybody here doesn't think that dolphin is in a bit of trouble, then they haven't been listening to 90 percent of the people talking about dolphin here in the last couple of years, but I am all for Jessica's motion, and we can tackle those issues down the road with the other amendments.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Madam Chair, when you set a catch limit, and we don't have a catch target, and the goal is to keep the catch limit from being exceeded, but we also want to encourage that to be harvested, and that's part of harvesting optimum yield, and I think it sounds maybe a little illogical to set a higher catch limit and then plan to come in and constrain harvest through the regulations, when we already don't expect them to achieve the catch limit, right, and so, if we want lower harvest, then it seems like we should be reducing the catch limit and then reducing the regulations that are tailored to achieve that catch limit. I know there's a lot of time to go with this still, and it's not a huge deal, but I wanted to lay that out there. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Shep, you just verbalized some of my thoughts, as I was listening to folks. Chester, go ahead.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Anna. When it comes to dolphin, we've had a lot of discussions about the recreational differences from commercial and the fact that the recreational OY, optimum yield, may in fact be a part, or a percentage, of the ACL for recreational, and I'm not talking about commercial, and only recreational. Meaning that fish that are in the water alive, and left in the water alive, have value, and that value is that, hopefully, it will increase the interaction between the recreational fishermen and the fishery, in this case dolphin. I just wanted to make that clear, that I don't know that, in recreational fisheries, you always want to fish right up to the OY, or the ACL.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, and we did have some actions in here previously that did discuss redefining OY, and we have also moved those out of this amendment, to be dealt with in sort of a more comprehensive fashion, for the definition of OY across all of our fisheries, and so that is a great point to bring back to the table. Art.

MR. SAPP: Excellent point there, Chester, and the reason I am so supportive of Jessica's movement here is it gives us a cushion for those years of amazing abundance, such as 2015. If we leave that buffer zone, and that amazing year comes along, we're going to blow right through it, whereas, at least, if it's all the way up as high as we can get it, we've got a chance of staying under it on those exceptional years.

MS. BECKWITH: Art, that's a good point, and we can also occasionally deal with that via the accountability measure, where, if you do have some years of amazing abundance, you don't necessarily kick in an accountability measure, based on one year, and so we should be having those discussions as well a little bit later in this document. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. How do we tie in, given the fact that is not a closed United States population, and that other countries harvest this same mahi that we are putting an annual catch limit on that's not a closed population? The amount of imports have increased, and migratory patterns have changed, and so how do we factor that in when setting this ACL? Are we under the belief that this is a closed population and that we are the only ones -- The United States is the only ones that can mitigate this stock by what measures we take here in the U.S., given these new MRIP estimates of abundance, or new calculation of the way we estimate recreational landings? Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Sure, Dewey. Because we're unable to do a regular stock assessment for dolphin, because of the open population, our SSC has set the ABC of dolphin based on the third-highest year of landings, and so they did base it on landings, and I'm trying to look for the years, and I think they set it at the third-highest landings between 1994 and 2007. Clay.

DR. PORCH: You pretty much said it, but Dewey is exactly right. There are a lot of other countries that catch what we believe to be the same stock of dolphin. We have tried to get the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna to take up dolphin, since they deal with tuna and tuna-like species, and, so far, they have not been willing to bite, and so, internally, we're trying to look at what we might be able to do to provide better advice, but it is hard when a lot of the catch comes from outside the U.S.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester.

MR. BREWER: I agree with Clay and with Mel. I mean, a lot of the catch is taking place outside of our waters. Erika showed us a spreadsheet that showed, and this was on imported catches, but Venezuela is catching almost as many dolphin as the United States, and that's not that big of a country with that big of a fleet, but they are currently waling on dolphin, and so that really complicates what we're trying to accomplish here.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and I want to make sure that we've had every opportunity to think this through as we move forward, because, as John said, this will sort of impact how the staff goes and

does the analysis for the rest of the amendment, and so, if there is any interest amongst the committee to consider putting in a buffer, I do want to hear about that now. Art.

MR. SAPP: I think you misread that a little bit, Chester. Venezuela is catching considerably more than we are, and the Dominican Republic, in the last few years, is actually catching just a little more than we are, and they're half an island, compared to this rather large eastern seaboard, not to mention the Gulf and some of the Pacific, and so the international concerns are huge, for me, and we're going to talk about a lot of it later, and I won't take any more time, but thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was wondering -- It's kind of -- Even though I had thoughts on what other imports might be, because maybe the graph, or chart, that these guys are reading from -- Maybe Erika could share that with this committee, her findings, if possible, please. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I'm sure she heard that. **Also, I am not hearing any desire to discuss any of the other alternatives except Alternative 2, and so, with that, I guess, if there's no additional discussion, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Moving forward, Action 2 is very similar to Action 1, but this is focusing on wahoo, and so, currently, the ACL is set to the ABC. Alternative 2 would set the ACL equal to the updated ABC. Alternative 3 and 4 would provide a step-down, very similar, where Alternative 3 would be 95 percent of the updated ABC, and Alternative 4 is the ACL for wahoo would be 90 percent of the updated ABC.

I will skip through the discussion. The council had the same rationale in Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5 for setting the ABC equal to the ACL, and I will jump into some of the similar figures and tables that I showed for dolphin. Just focusing on wahoo, you have a similar figure here that shows wahoo landings from 1986 through 2019, and you have commercial landings and recreational landings and total landings, and you can see the recreational landings certainly dominate in comparison to the commercial landings in the fishery.

On the far-right here, you can see the different alternatives and how they would play out in comparison to recent landings, noting that there were two years of relatively elevated landings in 2016 and 2017. Looking at the PSEs for wahoo, they're a little bit higher compared to dolphin, but they are still relatively low, particularly in comparison to other species that the South Atlantic Council manages.

Then, looking at the different ACL alternatives, in comparison to recent landings, if you look at the average of the past three years, or just in comparison to 2019 landings, there is still a buffer there between the total landings and what the total ACL would be under the alternatives, but, if you incorporate those elevated landings that I showed earlier in the figure and use a five-year average, there is potential that these ACLs will be met, using that as a baseline assumption.

However, using the average over the past three years, and projecting that forward, none of the ACLs for wahoo are expected to be exceeded going forward. There again, if you use a five-year

average, there is a little bit of a different outcome there, and it really depends on how you incorporate these two years of particularly relatively elevated landings in the recreational sector.

Similar committee action here is nothing is required. However, you do want to discuss the actions and alternatives, and, to help with the analysis, it would be useful if the committee is comfortable with choosing a preferred alternative for further analysis in the document, and, with that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, John. I must admit that I'm not nearly as hopeful as Table 6 for wahoo, and I do have some pretty significant concerns that we are going to start achieving the recreational ACL, and we're going to start having closures, and so I think, as a committee and a council, we're going to have to be really thoughtful about consideration of the accountability measures and if sort of any additional steps might need to be considered for wahoo, to sort of prevent a cobia-style issue from occurring. I've got Shep and then Jessica.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just have a question. Under the discussion, the bullet points under the discussion, the fifth bullet, and the fourth sub-bullet under the fifth bullet says that recreational landings have remained well below the recreational ACL since implemented, and I am just wondering if I could get an explanation of how that's consistent with what's shown in Figure 2 for 2016 and 2017, when total landings are well above any of the alternatives in the table. Thank you.

MR. HADLEY: Shep, just to make sure that -- The bullet that I'm highlighting, is that what you're referring to?

MR. GRIMES: Yes, that's it.

MR. HADLEY: That was the council's rationale in Amendment 5. Essentially, the landings dataset, or stream, has changed between the CHTS and the FES estimates, and that's what -- That assumption back then is not necessarily the case now, or that specification.

MR. GRIMES: If I may follow-up then. If I understand it right, that's just saying, before FES, we thought recreational landings were well below the ACL in existence, but now we know, with FES, that landings were not only above that, but above the new alternatives.

MR. HADLEY: Correct, yes, specifying the change in methodologies there.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you very much.

MS. BECKWITH: Does that maybe need to be clarified in the body of the rationale? I will go to Jessica, if John doesn't have a comment on that.

MR. HADLEY: That's something that we can certainly clarify, and that would be clarified in the discussion of the action in the amendment, and that specific bullet point there is essentially stating the council's rationale at the time for Amendment 5.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Anna. **I would move to select Alternative 2 as our preferred under Action 2.** I have a similar rationale as what I had for dolphin. I feel that there's a precedent that was established in the ACL amendment for ACL being equal to ABC, and the PSEs are also low on wahoo, and, like you, I have some concerns that, with the new FES numbers, that we might be pushing up against the recreational ACL limit in certain years, and possibly even being over, and so that's it.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks. Mel.

MR. BELL: Second, just to move us along.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there any discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Moving along to Action 3, Actions 3 and 4 focus on sector allocations and sector annual catch limits, and Action 3 focuses further in on dolphin in particular, and you will see there are several different edits and changes that have been made to this action, and I will point those out, but those will need to be approved, or potentially an alternate version of those approved, by the committee.

Last time, there was a little bit of a holdup on Alternative 1 and what that would specifically mean, and, really, there's been a great deal of IPT discussion on this, and there was a great deal of committee discussion on this as well at the June meeting, but, really, Alternative 1, no action, would retain the 90/10 split. 90 percent of the ACL, of the total ACL, going to the recreational sector and 10 percent of the total ACL going to the commercial sector.

It's noted that the split would incorporate whatever alternative is chosen in Action 1, and so what you specify as your total ACL would be split accordingly in Action 3, which looks at your sector allocations, and so, in doing so, presumably this would incorporate the new ABC recommendation, which uses FES estimates as well as an updated data stream, which is inclusive of recreational landings from Monroe County, and so, just to be clear, all of the alternatives would use that specification from Action 1.

Under Alternative 1, you have your 90/10 split, and Alternative 2 -- You can see that there's a small change to the percentages here, and this is largely due to an updated dataset, and Alternative 2 uses the total catch between 2008 and 2012, and we received a revised dataset, and so these percentages have changed a little bit from the last time that you viewed them, but, really, what this alternative is doing is using the same time series that was used in the previous amendment to set the sector allocations, which is 2008 through 2012, but inputting the new data stream, and so the new FES estimates, as well as recreational landings from Monroe County, Florida.

Alternative 2 would set the allocation based on the total catch between 1994 and 2007, and the reasoning behind this landings-based alternative in that timeline is that that is the same timeline that the SSC examined when setting the acceptable biological catch recommendation for dolphin, and so use this time series when setting sector allocations.

Alternative 4 aims to approximately maintain the current commercial annual catch limit on a pound basis, and then it allocates the remaining revised total annual catch limit to the recreational sector,



and I will note that this “approximately” was added because, since we are using -- We are going out to two decimal points, two digits, and we can’t exactly get the difference the same, and so there’s kind of a rounding change there, and so it’s not exactly zero between the current and the potential commercial annual catch limit, but it’s very close, and so that aims at essentially maintaining the current commercial ACL as close as possible to what it is now.

Then Alternative 5 splits the total ACL with 93 percent of the total ACL to the recreational sector and 7 percent to the commercial sector. Alternative 6 allocates 92 percent of the total ACL to the recreational sector and 8 percent to the commercial sector, and these were two specific percentages that the committee expressed exploring at the June meeting.

Getting into some of the tables here, Table 7 shows the various percentages and the different alternatives, and then Table 8 looks at what those percentages would equate to on a pound basis, and this table assumes that ABC equals ACL and their new catch level recommendations are adopted in the ACL in Action 1, but, as you can see, it’s still largely to the -- There is a large recreational component, and then some of these don’t have a particularly large difference between the two of them, and we’ll get into that in just a second.

Then, also, when looking specifically at the commercial sector, Table 9 shows how the different alternatives would differ from the current sector ACL, and so, in Alternatives 2 and 3, the commercial sector ACL would be reduced. However, under Alternative 1, or 5 and 6, the commercial sector ACL would be increased.

Certainly, last, but not least, the next table looks at a similar analysis that was done, using the past three years of landings and whether or not either the commercial or recreational sector ACL would be exceeded under any of these alternatives, and, there again, using a three-year average of the landings as a baseline assumption, and, using that assumption, neither the commercial or recreational sectors would exceed the ACL, under any of the alternatives.

Then, looking at how the alternatives may play out, in comparison to recreational and commercial landings, in Figure 3, you have the different potential ACLs plotted out against the landings over the past ten years for the recreational sector. As you can see, with the exception of 2015, none of these alternatives would be constraining on the fishery, per se, or the ACL would not -- The landings would not exceed the ACL, and then a similar figure in Figure 4, looking at the different alternatives in comparison to commercial landings over the past ten years, and, with the exception of Alternative 3, all of these alternatives are above observed commercial landings in recent years.

The IPT, in discussion of this, looked at how the allocations played out on a timeline basis, and they noted that there is very little difference between some of the alternatives, and so, given this outcome, are there some alternatives that the committee does not want to consider, and so, really, kind of two trains of thought here.

One is you have various rationales specified for the different alternatives, and some of those play out in a similar fashion, when you look at the actual pounds that would be allocated to each sector, and so you have the different rationales there. On the other hand, you could combine those and achieve a similar goal in fewer alternatives, and so it’s really up to the committee, as far as how many alternatives you want to move forward with and sort of which school of thought, if you will, you want to go with, but, as far as committee action, we’re looking for approval of the suggested

edits in Action 3 and discussion on if these are the sector allocations that you want to move forward with.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, John. I will go to Jessica first.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Anna. I had some comments and then a question, and then, ultimately, if you would like a motion, let me know. A couple of comments. I really don't like the IPT edits to Alternative 1, no action. I think it's more confusing now, and I wouldn't be in favor of accepting these edits, especially in that top paragraph, the second sentence that says the revised total annual catch limit includes blah, blah, blah. To me, that's not a statement of no action. That's not a statement of why it was in place from the past, and it's about what is happening in this action and into the future, and so it's not reflective, to me, of a no action alternative, and I think it's going to be confusing for the public, and they won't understand it, and I'm not sure that I understand it now.

Also, I'm not sure if I understand, in Alternative 2, why the percentages are different than what we saw in the document for June. The percentages were a little different, and it was 93.95 percent and 6.05 percent in the June version, and it's a little bit different now, and I'm not sure why it changed, and so I would love to hear that.

Then just I am in favor in removing Alternative 3, because it reduces commercial. Otherwise, I like the alternatives, the rest of the alternatives, that we have in there, and so I'm just going to put that out there, and, ultimately, if you would like a motion, after we get through this discussion, then just let me know. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. John, do you want to clarify the Alternative 2? You mentioned that there was a new dataset that was provided which adjusted the numbers.

MR. HADLEY: I will take a step back and address Jessica's comments on the Action 1, and I think that can be -- I can include this in the committee report, but that can be direction to staff to simplify that alternative and see what can be moved to the discussion of the action, rather than in the alternative language itself, and, so, really, direction to staff to, in summary, clean up that action and make it a more simplified version, or that alternative, rather, Alternative 1, no action.

Moving on to Alternative 2, this involves the -- This involves the, quote, unquote, preliminary versus final dataset that the IPT was using, and we received an updated dataset that was inclusive of 2019, 2019 landings. In doing so, some of the historical -- Presumably, some of the historical weight estimates had changed, and so that's -- When you plug that new dataset into the formula, so to speak, those are the percentages that play out, and so, really, just -- It's an artifact of the MRIP data. Sometimes, when it's queried at two different times, the initial information that was used to come up with this alternative was the data was pulled a while ago, and so, when this data was re-queried, that's what the historical landings showed.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you for that. Art.

MR. SAPP: I've got a real hard time supporting 2 or 3. It's going to be a hard pill for these folks to swallow, losing percentage points, but, to actually lose fish, as well as they would in 2 and 3, I

have a hard time thinking we're going to be fair and equitable in making that argument. The rest of them, 4 probably being preferred for me, but the rest of them are at least palatable.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I will come back for a motion in a moment. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Madam Chair. I agree with Art, and I don't think we should consider Alternative 2 and 3. I can't really conceive of any reason why we would want to drop the commercial ACL. I mean, I certainly understand that there is a big discussion to be had, as far as potentially increasing it, but I don't see any clear reason to drop it.

To Jessica's comments, for the IPT's suggested language, for Alternative 1, I do agree that the new first paragraph is a little confusing, but I do like the addition of the second paragraph, because I think that will make it very clear to the public and the stakeholders that all these numbers are based on the assumption that the council will go with Alternative 2 in Action 1, and, just given our discussion earlier under Action 1, there is not a clear set-in-stone kind of direction yet for the council, and so I like that addition, because it at least acknowledges that these numbers are subject to change, based on action in a previous alternative, or a previous action.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Anna. I agree with Art. We shouldn't be taking fish away from commercial folks. To me, the sweet spot is where they stay the same, or maybe even get a few more fish, but certainly I don't think that we should be taking fish away from them, and I don't want to see, and we don't really have it in this set of alternatives, but I don't want to see them get a windfall, but about the same or a few more fish, to me, is -- That's where we should be headed. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so it sounds like we've got a decent consensus, if someone would like to -- It sounds like we would be putting forth a motion to move Alternative 2 and 3 to the Considered but Rejected. I am going someone to technically make that motion and second it, but I will go to Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we move Alternatives 2 and 3 to the Considered but Rejected.**

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, and I'm guessing that Steve is seconding.

MR. POLAND: That's a second.

MS. BECKWITH: All right. Is there any additional discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** We don't need to discuss a preferred on this one, and so, unless someone is ready to do that, which I don't think we are, we can move along. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just going to address the IPT edits. I think I heard John say that they could go clean up Alternative 1 a little bit more, and so I don't know if you want a motion to accept the rest of the IPT edits, and I'm a little confused about how to handle it. Do we just do direction to staff, because Alternative 1 needs to be fixed, in my mind.

MS. BECKWITH: I was thinking about doing that as direction to staff, since we'll see this again in December, but unless John has another preference.

MR. HADLEY: We could do that as direction to staff, I mean particularly for Alternative 1. Alternatives 5 and 6 are new, and I think -- A motion along the lines of approve the edits -- I am trying to think of how to word it. Maybe approve the edits to Action 3 as amended, and that would try to capture that guidance to change Alternative 1, no action, but accept the edits to 4, 5, and 6.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was wondering if the motion is accept new Alternatives 5 and 6 into the document -- I am up for a motion or to approve IPT edits to this action, except for the edits to Alternative 1, and I can move either one of those things, but you're right that Alternative 5 and 6 aren't actually in here yet.

MS. BECKWITH: John, what's going to make it easier for you?

MR. HADLEY: If I could, approve the IPT edits to Alternatives 4, 5, and 6, and that would be the cleanest way to do that. That way, it kind of captures those three changes that are the very top there in Alternatives 4, 5, and 6, but that would be okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: If that looks okay, we still need someone to make the motion and second it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I thought I made the motion, but approve the edits to Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 in Action 3.**

MS. BECKWITH: I am going to assume that Mel is a second.

MR. BELL: Yes, I will second it, and, also, just to clarify, we're going to deal with Alternative 1 through direction to staff, and we've already taken 2 and 3 out, and so we're good to go.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, I believe that's the case. Is there any additional discussion on this motion? Steve, did you have something on that?

MR. POLAND: No, and I was going to be a second, but I guess I'm a third.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there any additional discussion from anyone else? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Thank you, and I apologize for the confusion on that, and so thanks for working through that with me. Moving on to Action 4, this action would revise sector allocations and sector annual catch limits for wahoo. There again, we have similar language in Alternative 1, no action, and that has the note to specify that the alternatives do reflect the decision made in Action 2, and, also, Alternative 1 would retain the current recreational sector and commercial sector allocations for wahoo, and that is 96.07 percent to the recreational sector and 3.93 percent to the commercial sector.

Alternative 2 would revise the sector allocation using essentially the Bow-Tie Formula, the Bow-Tie approach, which is specified below here. However, updating this approach with the new data stream, there again incorporating FES estimates, for the baseline years that are specified, as well as recreational landings from Monroe County, Florida, in addition to the general updated data stream, updated commercial landings and recreational landings in general. Essentially, you're using the same formula that was used before, but with an updated data stream in Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 would use -- It would update the sector allocations using the same landings time series that the SSC used to set the ABC, and this was 1994 through 2007. Alternative 4 aims to maintain, approximately maintain, the current commercial annual catch limit and allocate the remaining total annual catch limit to the recreational sector and then, finally, Alternative 5 would allocate 97 percent of the total ACL for wahoo to the recreational sector and 3 percent of the total ACL for wahoo to the commercial sector, and this was a number that was specified by the committee in June.

Looking at a similar set of tables and analysis for these alternatives, the first table shows the different percentages for each sector and how they would play out under the different alternatives. Alternative 2 applies these percentages to the potential ACL, to the potential ACL in Action 2, and, again, the assumption is that ABC is equal to the ACL and the new catch level recommendations are implemented. If that is done, you can see here your different potential sector allocations.

Specifically for the commercial sector, in comparison, this Table 13 shows the commercial sector ACL and the difference between that ACL and the current ACL, and so you can see, really, in all of the alternatives, the commercial sector is approximately the same, or may see an increase, in landings. I will note, in Alternative 4, there's a small decrease there. There again, with using two decimal places, it's a rounding issue, and you can never -- You can't exactly get it to zero, and so that's why it's 141 pounds different, but, there again, that's close to the current ACL for the commercial sector.

Using an assumption of the average landings over the past three years, neither the commercial sector nor recreational sector are expected to exceed the respective ACLs under any of the alternatives, and then, looking at how the different alternatives would play out in comparison to recent recreational landings, you can see, in Figure 5 here, there's not a whole lot of difference, and I think all the different alternatives are very tightly knit there, and very close to one another. However, it is noted that, in 2015, 2016, and 2017, you did see elevated landings of wahoo overall, and those landings would have exceeded the potential new ACLs.

Moving over to the commercial sector, it's a similar analysis. All of the alternatives, with the exception of Alternative 4 and Alternative 2, are well above exhibited commercial landings over the past ten years, and you can see that Alternative 2 and 4 are pretty close to some of the recent landings, and slightly below the 2019 commercial landings, and so not a whole lot of buffer there. However, a pretty large buffer with Alternative 1, Alternative 3, and Alternative 5 for the commercial sector.

Really, just the same IPT discussion. You have the different rationales that are presented. However, there's not a whole lot of difference between some of the alternatives, and so just some

guidance going forward of are these the alternatives that you would like to move forward with or would you potentially like to look at different alternatives or potentially pare them down, and we're looking for an approval of, potentially, the IPT's suggested edits, noting that there is a new alternative, and there are a couple of new alternatives.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Thank you. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Anna. **Once again, I have the same concerns as I did on the previous action about the wording for Alternative 1, no action, and so I'm hoping that you guys can go back and work on that. Otherwise, I approve the rest of the IPT edits, but I would also remove Alternative 4 from this action, because it reduces commercial, and I don't think we want to go there here.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. That sounded like a motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **Yes, ma'am.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. While John gets that up, I'm going to go to Art.

MR. SAPP: She said it perfectly. I second.

MS. BECKWITH: As she usually does. Steve.

MR. POLAND: I'm third again.

MS. BECKWITH: All right. John.

MR. HADLEY: I did want to just speak very quickly to Alternative 4, noting that it's really a rounding error there, and it's certainly up to the committee how you want to move forward, and, if you did want to keep it, we could change that percentage slightly, so this is positive instead of negative, and it's really up to the committee, but that rationale would mirror what you chose in Action 3, that rationale of maintaining the recreational sector ACL close to what it is right now, and so it's really up to the committee, but I just wanted to point that out.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, because that is the alternative where we're sort of keeping the commercial guys where they currently are and shifting any additional over to the recreational, and so I see Mel with his hand up, and maybe Jessica.

MR. BELL: That's what I was going to ask, and that is basically the equivalent of where we were going previously, even though it shows a minus-141 pounds, but that's effectively holding what we've got, and so maybe we should consider modifying the motion, and that's a possibility.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I am good with modifying the motion to approve the IPT edits except for what's in Alternative 1, and then no motion about removing certain alternatives.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. If we're going to follow sort of what we did with dolphin before, it seems like Alternative 4 keeps it current, and Alternative 5 gives it a bit of a bump, and Alternative 3 gives it a slightly higher bump, and that would match what we were considering in the previous

action for dolphin, and so, if someone wanted to remove an alternative, maybe we could consider removing Alternative 2 and then asking folks to make sure that Alternative 4 is what the current wahoo commercial ACL is. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: That's what I was going to do, because it looks to me like 2 and 4 -- The effects are basically the same, and so, if we're keeping 4, for precedent, then I would -- Wait, where are we? Jessica has a motion on the table, and so I am amending? No, I can't amend.

MS. BECKWITH: No, we'll move through this motion, and then we'll pick that one up in a moment.

MS. MARHEFKA: I would make a motion that we remove --

MS. BECKWITH: Hold tight, because we've got to deal with the motion on the table, and then we'll come back to that one.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry.

MS. BECKWITH: We do have a motion on the table to approve the IPT's suggested edits, with the exception of Alternative 1, in Action 4. That was seconded. The seconder, I believe, was okay with the edits to that, and is any further discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** Now, Kerry, would you like to take us through amending Alternative 4 and maybe removing Alternative 2?

MS. MARHEFKA: I apologize. I really flubbed my first time, didn't I? **I would make a motion that we amend Alternative 4 to reflect the intent that the commercial landings remain the same, with the remainder going to the recreational landings, amending those percentages as necessary, and that we remove Alternative 2 from consideration.**

MS. BECKWITH: I must say, Kerry, you're doing most excellent on your first meeting, probably the best of anyone that I have ever seen, and so no worries. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I would second that motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MR. HADLEY: If I could get a little bit of help there with the motion. So amend Alternative 4 to reflect a small increase in the commercial ACL, and so you're looking at a small change there, and what was the second part of it?

MS. BECKWITH: To get rid of Alternative 2. Kerry and Spud, make sure that covers what you intended. Is there any discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Moving along, we've gone through the set of actions that looks at the new ACLs and potential sector allocations, and we're going to jump into accountability measures, and this will cover the next few actions. Action 5 looks at the commercial accountability measures for dolphin, and so, currently, the current accountability measure includes an in-season closure to take

place if the commercial ACL is met or projected to be met. Additionally, if the commercial annual catch limit is exceeded, it will be reduced by the commercial overage in the following year, only if the species is overfished and the total annual catch limit is exceeded, and so, really, the discussion revolves around that second part and that potential post-season accountability measure for the commercial sector for dolphin.

This is really a two-alternative action at the moment. Alternative 2 would essentially remove that post-season accountability measure, and so, if commercial landings for dolphin reach, or are projected to reach, the commercial annual catch limit, close the commercial sector for the remaining of the fishing year, and, as you will see, notably absent is that post-season accountability measure.

As far as the discussion, as you may recall from the previous council meeting, the discussion really focused around the overfished language, in particular, in that, as well as the potential for a post-season accountability measure, and the committee would not like to see that go into place. Alternative 2 would remove that overfished language from the commercial sector accountability measure, which, based on previous discussions, would be appropriate, since there is no stock assessment planned for dolphin in the near term, or the foreseeable future, and, thus, there is likely not a change to the stock status, where it would become overfished.

Then, as far as the IPT discussion on this, the IPT noted that it would be beneficial to remove the overfished language from the current commercial accountability measure. However, this is not absolutely necessary, since you do have a functioning accountability measure in place that includes an in-season closure. Additionally, it was noted that National Standard 1 encourages consideration of accounting for ACL overages, particularly if the stock is overfished, which is likely, going back to the Comp ACL Amendment, why that language was implemented.

It was noted that it's highly unlikely that the post-season AM would be triggered, since the stock status for dolphin is unlikely to change, and it also is unlikely -- With this being the case, the change to the commercial accountability measure is certainly clear here, that there is a change, and so there would be a change on the books. However, functionally, you would probably not see a big change for the commercial accountability measure by removing that post-season potential, since it's unlikely that the stock would be deemed overfished.

Really, we're looking for approval of the IPT's suggested edits to this action. Additionally, it was noted that -- If we could get some discussion of -- This was the committee's guidance, to move forward with the two-alternative approach, and is that still something that the committee is comfortable with doing? Just to make sure that that's okay to move forward, and it seemed pretty clear during the last discussion, that you were really looking to just remove that post-season, potential post-season, accountability measure for the commercial sector, and, with that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks. We would be looking for a motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 5 in Amendment 10 and if anyone has comments or concerns on this being a two-alternative action, and I'm comfortable with it. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: It just seems to me there is, practically speaking, no difference between the two alternatives, because I don't see any potential that we're going to get an assessment of dolphin



in the foreseeable future, and so I just don't see how the status is going to change, and so it seems, to me, what we ought to do is just remove this action to Considered but Rejected, because it doesn't do anything. I would have some concerns about only having a single alternative, in terms of NEPA purposes. **I will go ahead and make a motion to remove Action 5 to the Considered but Rejected.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

DR. CRABTREE: It just doesn't do anything

MS. BECKWITH: Right. I hear what you're saying. Mel.

MR. BELL: I will second that, for purposes of discussion, but I would say that I get Roy's point that it doesn't seem to make any difference, and so why waste the ink at this point?

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't want to speak for the entire IPT, because I don't have all the notes on this, and John can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think this is predominantly let's say a housekeeping thing. We want to remove this from the recreational accountability measure, and, admittedly, it's very different in the recreational accountability measures, and so you don't have the same level of need, but, anyway, my recollection is that's why it was structured this way.

As far as just having two alternatives, I think that would just be reflective -- I should preface that with saying I'm never a fan of only having two alternatives either, but, in this case, very, very limited changes appear to be necessary, if any, and so that would support limiting the range. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: To Roy's point, recognizing that this really wouldn't functionally make any changes, and that it is a housekeeping sort of cleanup of language, is there another method that is typically used to sort of clean up language, or it really would have to go through this process, which we can move forward with the current motion, but is there an alternative that doesn't require us to go through the whole amendment process, but still clean up the language? Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Ultimately, that text is in the Code of Federal Regulations, and so, to remove it, it takes a rulemaking, whether that's associated with a framework or an FMP amendment, and that doesn't matter, but it does take a regulatory action. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Chester, thoughts?

MR. BREWER: I second Roy's motion.

MS. BECKWITH: It's been seconded. Okay. Is there any additional discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, this motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Moving along to Action 6, at the committee's guidance, this action was added to essentially do the same measure, but for wahoo in the commercial sector, and so amend the commercial accountability measures. Currently, there is an in-season closure that takes place if the commercial ACL is met or projected to be met. Additionally, there is that language from the post-season accountability measure, where, if the commercial ACL is exceeded, it will be reduced by the commercial overage in the following fishing year, but, there again, only if the species is deemed overfished and the total ACL is exceeded.

Alternative 2, there again, maintains the current in-season closure when the commercial ACL is met or projected to be met. However, notably absent is the potentially post-season accountability measure if the species is overfished and the annual catch limit is exceeded. I won't go over the comments again, and they're very similar comments on the discussion, as well as the IPT recommendations, but, as far as this action in particular, we're looking to approve the action and the proposed range of alternatives for consideration in Amendment 10, since this is a new action, if you would like to move forward with the action. With that, I will hand it over.

MS. BECKWITH: We had not approved this action, and so, if we don't want to move forward with this action, we technically don't -- Just direction to staff to not include it, or what's the path forward, because I suspect that Roy is also going to want to see this one go away.

MR. HADLEY: I believe -- I mean, if there's consensus, then that could be handled by direction to staff, that, since it's not in the amendment, this action would essentially go away. If there's, I think, a difference of opinion, and we can't get consensus, then maybe a motion would be appropriate.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there anyone that would like to see Action 6 remain in the document? I would take that as consensus, and so we will move forward with the next action.

MR. HADLEY: Thank you, and I will note in the Dolphin Wahoo Committee report, in the direction to staff, that Action 6 was not approved for inclusion in the amendment. Moving forward to Action 7, we're going to be jumping into the recreational accountability measures, and, if you recall, in the orienting presentation, there is a -- At the last meeting, the committee specified that you would like to look at what would be the trigger for that accountability measure and then what would be the accountability measure itself, and so Action 7 focuses on the trigger for the post-season recreational accountability measures for dolphin, and you have several different alternatives here.

I should take a step back and note, in Alternative 1, no action, kind of the crux of the issue in looking at the accountability measure for the recreational sector is that there is -- There is a specification that, essentially, the accountability measure would not go into place unless the species is deemed overfished and the total ACL is exceeded, and so that's really the crux of the issue here and what we're trying to correct, because, as mentioned earlier, it's unlikely that there will be a stock assessment for dolphin in the near future. Thus, the status of the species is unlikely to change, and, therefore, the accountability measure currently in place is not adequate, and so looking at specifically addressing that language in the accountability measure and fixing that, so to speak.

We have several different alternatives that were specified. Alternative 2, the trigger for the recreational accountability measure would be if the -- It would occur if the recreational annual catch limits are constant and the three-year geometric mean of landings exceeds the recreational annual catch limit, and so you're looking at a three-year geometric mean. At any year the recreational sector annual catch limit is changed, that geometric mean of landings would start over.

Alternative 3 would trigger the post-season accountability measures in the following fishing year if the summed total of the past three years of recreational landings for dolphin exceeds the past three years of the recreational sector annual catch limits for dolphin, and so we're looking at a three-year time block there. Alternative 4 would implement post-season accountability measures if recreational landings exceed the recreational annual catch limit in two of the previous three fishing years or exceeds the total annual catch limit in any one year, and the total annual catch limit would be the commercial and recreational limits combined.

Alternative 5, the trigger would be if the recreational landings -- Rather, if the total ACL is exceeded, in general. In Alternative 6, the trigger would be if the recreational ACL is exceeded, and then the post-season accountability measures would go into place, and so this is a pretty large change from how this action was specified earlier. However, we used the existing -- Based on the committee's guidance, we used the existing triggers that were in the action before to set these different alternatives.

Really, we're looking for approval of the IPT's suggested edits and are you comfortable with this kind of specify the trigger for the accountability measure and then specify the accountability measure itself in the following action approach. With that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: I will go to Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Two of the alternatives I wanted to discuss, briefly. For Alternative 3, I am not sure that this is viable under the National Standard 1 Guidelines. Thinking more about it, the guidelines envision accountability measures based on multiyear average data, and this is a sum total, and not an average, and I don't know if similar approaches have been approved elsewhere, and I have not had the time to look into this with Headquarters, but it certainly seems potentially problematic to me, because, again, it's not an average, and it's the sum total of three years.

As to Alternative 4, I just wanted to note that there is some tension with this alternative and the performance standard in the National Standard Guidelines, which requires, or states, that exceeding the ACL more than once in four years should trigger a review, review of the system of accountability measures, and, in this case, you wouldn't even implement your accountability measure until you had exceeded it two out of the past three years, which would also trigger review. Again, that's just some tension.

I would also note that the guidelines state that, if an ACL was exceeded, AMs must be implemented as soon as possible to correct the operational issue that caused the ACL overage, as well as any consequences to the stock or stock complex resulting from the overage, when it is known, and this is obviously waiting for some period after, and that's all. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, you basically answered something I was considering, because I was going to suggest, under Alternative 4, that “or exceeds the total commercial and recreational combined catch limit in any one year” is the same thing as what’s in Alternative 5, and so I was actually going to suggest taking that portion of Alternative 4 out, and if, as a council, we wanted to implement those two things, we would just make Alternative 4 and 5 preferred, but it sounds to me like you’re suggesting that Alternative 4, on its own, with that first section, would not be acceptable, and it’s barely acceptable with the second sentence, and is that correct, Shep?

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess I would be a little more equivocal, maybe, in that I think -- I foresee potential problems with it, but maybe not to the extent that I am advocating removing it from the document. You can keep it in there and consider it, and I see where you’re coming from, and it makes sense to me to remove that latter part of 4, and then, if you wanted both of them, you would have 4 and 5, but the flip side of that is I would say the fact that there is a total ACL in one year makes Alternative 4 more palatable, despite the sector-based requirement for two overages.

Having said that, you could still select 4 and 5 together and end up in the same place, and so I think that’s sort of an equivocal statement, that I wouldn’t say you had to remove it, but I would just be mindful of that, of the guidance, if I were seeking to include that as one of the preferred alternatives. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I have some of the same concerns that Shep has, that I am not sure that all of these would be doable, or approvable, but it’s awfully complicated, what we’re doing, and I would urge you to try and simplify these. I also think that you ought to have an alternative in here that includes an in-season closure. I understand the reasons that you might not want to do that, but it is a reasonable alternative, and I think you probably ought to consider it, and I also think you need to consider a payback if the stock becomes overfished.

I am worried that our zeal to avoid any sort of closure, under any circumstances, is pushing us -- We’re going too far with it and carrying it too far, and so I guess what I would encourage you is to try and simplify this down, as much as you can, and include an alternative that has the in-season closure in it, at least for consideration.

MS. BECKWITH: Roy, one of the reasons we moved away from the in-season closure is because, the way that we get the data through the waves, it was unlikely that we would be able to really project out a closure until post-season anyways, but, also, about the payback for the overfished status, and, since this is dolphin, and we’re not expecting to have a stock assessment, then does that really make sense to put in? I mean, I understand why we’re keeping it in the commercial accountability measure, because it sort of doesn’t make a difference if we take out that language, but to add the language back in, or leave that language in, does it make sense to add overfished language to a species that we have zero expectation of getting a stock assessment?

DR. CRABTREE: I am not saying you want to select some of these things, but, I mean, we do in-season closures, and we have lived with the timeliness issue for some time. I understand it’s not a particularly appealing way to go, and folks don’t like it, but I’m having difficulty getting to it’s an unreasonable thing to do, just as I had difficulty saying a payback, if a stock becomes

overfished, is an unreasonable thing to consider. I agree with you that, in the case of dolphin, it's not likely that we're going to find ourselves in that situation, but that doesn't mean it's an unreasonable alternative to consider, is what I am saying.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Understood. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Anna, you answered the question I had with your last statement to Roy, and I was trying to wrap my head around why we wouldn't consider in-season closures or the following season payback, but I also hear what Roy is saying, and so I'm wondering if maybe -- Coming in from an outsider and having that question, if we get what Roy wants to do, by including one of these alternatives, or both of them, and then using that to justify that. Then we're just going to use the language that you said, Anna, about not getting the data and things like that, and that has to be laid out, so that the public can see that and the public understands why we're not considering that.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I don't have a problem including Roy's suggestions, but I am just -- Because I think those are -- He's right that they're not unreasonable to consider, but I also want to spend some time making sure that the committee is going through these and trying to figure out which one of these is reasonable to consider for dolphin, given the uniqueness of that fishery. I am sort of open to a path here. Roy, if you want to add those two alternative options, I certainly welcome you to do so, but I also want some feedback from the committee on the alternatives that are sort of presented to us and what makes sense.

I don't see anybody raising their hand, and I'm a little concerned about -- You know, we're going to have this discussion again in a moment for wahoo recreational, and that is going to be even more important of a discussion, because, while it's unlikely for the recreational to really go over their ACL for dolphin, it is going to be really likely for us to do that for wahoo, and so, as we talk about these triggers and these accountability measures -- I get that dolphin is probably not such a big deal, but wahoo is, and it's the same alternative, and so I will go to Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Madam Chair. I was going to help you try to move this along a little bit. I am fine adding in two alternatives, based off of Roy's suggestion. However, I mean, that's probably not something I am going to support as preferred, but I certainly understand the rationale, and I believe, as far as Alternative 3, we heard from Shep that this probably doesn't meet the standards of an accountability measure, given that it's talking about the sum total, and so, I mean, I would be fine removing Alternative 3 from this list.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, and I'm not sure that Shep was ready for us to bounce Alternative 3, but just simply it might need a little bit more consideration from him, but maybe I misunderstood him. Shep, go ahead.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I've gotten some messages here while this is ongoing, and some folks like Alternative 3, and it may be a good way to deal with standard error and catch estimation and all that, and so, I guess at this point, I would say I would prefer to leave it in and let us do a little more, maybe me do a little more, homework relative to it and then see, when picking preferred alternatives down the road, whether we want to remove it. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. It sounds like maybe we would be looking for a motion to accept the IPT's suggested edits and include these new alternatives and add the two alternatives that Roy

suggested, and I suspect that, during the next discussion, the IPT might come back with some additional edits to this. John, do you have a motion up there that would get us to where we need to be? Roy, while he's typing it up.

DR. CRABTREE: So add an alternative that would implement an in-season closure and a payback provision, if overfished. I think that could be one alternative, or you could split it in two, if you prefer.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. **We have the motion, which has not been made by anyone, to accept the IPT's suggested edits to Action 7. Also, add alternatives that would implement an in-season closure once the sector ACL is met and a payback provision if overfished.** Would someone like to make that motion?

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Would someone like to second that motion?

DR. CRABTREE: I will second it.

MR. BELL: Do you want me to read it?

MS. BECKWITH: No. I read it. That's good.

MR. BELL: Okay. I was also going to just add that I'm sure -- As long as that does what we intend it to do, but I just wanted to make sure.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. if everyone is comfortable with that motion. Otherwise, we can certainly fiddle with it. Steve, did you have something else to add?

MR. POLAND: No, and I was just seconding it.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know that this motion fits with this action, because I thought that this action was specific to the trigger and that the closure part would go actually in the next action, and am I confused here? I just feel like this is in the wrong place.

MS. BECKWITH: That is an excellent point. Hold tight. Jessica, you might be right. This motion might be better in the next action, under the actual closure section. Shep, did you have thoughts on that?

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, I was just going to mention that, the way the action is titled, it's post-season accountability measures, and they're all post-season-based, because the council has not included in-season alternatives, and I think maybe you removed in-season options in the past. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: We had previously removed some in-season closure options in the past. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm not sure where you want to go with this then. I think you ought to consider in-season closures. Now, maybe that argument has come and go, and you just don't want to do that, and that's okay, but we've been working on this so long, and, these accountability measures, they get so complicated and hard to wrap your head around that it's hard to remember where we are and what we've done.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, I agree. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to say that I totally agree with Roy that we ought to consider in-season accountability measure alternatives, but I think, at this point, we've made that pitch in the past, and it didn't seem to get any traction, and that's why the actions are structured to be post-season specific, but certainly you could give direction to the IPT to add in-season stuff, and maybe just the action names and the rest of it without having to go through it in great detail here, but, again, it's totally up to you. Thanks.

MS. BECKWITH: I mean, I feel like we've had these discussions in the past. I mean, I'm not opposed to it, but I do feel like we have thought this through as a committee, but, having said that, we have new members to the council, and so I want to be sensitive to that. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am against this motion. I feel like we've already had multiple robust discussions about in-season closures, and I feel like it's disproportionately impacting some people, and we want this fishery open year-round, and we talked about the life history of dolphin, and I just feel like we've already had this discussion, and we said that we didn't want to consider this, and we've been over and over and over this, and so I don't -- I am not supportive of this.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Mel.

MR. BELL: Could we amend the motion to simply take out the everything from also to -- But what we do want to do is accept the IPT's suggested edits to the action soon, but what we were having issues with is the in-season part that we added there, and so, if we struck that, and we just accepted the IPT modifications, we would be good?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Was it my motion, Anna?

MR. BELL: I think I ended up making it.

DR. CRABTREE: Good. Well, I will let you fix this mess then.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. It was made by Mel and seconded by Roy. Would you like to amend that motion? It's been discussed by the committee, or do you guys want a substitute motion? Mel, it's your call.

MR. BELL: Well, I was going to ask you. I mean, if I can simply amend it, and we're okay with keeping within Roberts Rules and all, that's fine.

MS. BECKWITH: If there is consensus by the committee, it's fine. I mean, Roy, are you going to be okay with that amendment, because, otherwise, we're going to have to do a substitute.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm okay if Mel wants to amend the motion.

MS. BECKWITH: All right. Let's do it.

MR. BELL: Great.

MS. BECKWITH: **So we're going to strike everything after "accept the IPT's suggested edits to Action 7".** Okay. Is there any further discussion on this amended motion? **Is there any opposition to this amended motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: All right. Moving along into the next action, we'll look at the specific accountability measure that would be put in place once the trigger was met. There again, all of these are post-season recreational accountability measures, at the guidance of the committee. The Alternative 2 would reduce the recreational annual catch limit by the amount of the overage in the following fishing year. Additionally, you would also reduce the length of the recreational fishing season by the amount necessary to prevent the revised ACL from being exceeded, and so you're looking at a reduced ACL and then a reduced season length to maintain that ACL.

The reason that this -- I want to point out that, during the IPT's discussion of this, if you just reduce the recreational ACL by the amount of the overage in the following fishing year, there is no teeth to the accountability measure, and so that's why that's not a stand-alone option, because you could just keep reducing it, but, if there is no closure or any teeth, so to speak, to the accountability measure, it's not really adequate, and so that's why there is a pairing there between those two.

You will also notice, at the committee's guidance, there is language that's included that specifies the recreational annual catch limit and fishing seasons will not be reduced if the Regional Administrator determines, using the best available science, that it is not necessary, and so that's Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 would reduce the length of the recreational fishing season by the amount necessary to prevent the annual catch limit from being exceeded the following fishing year. Alternative 4 would reduce the bag limit in the following fishing season by the amount necessary to prevent the annual catch limit from being exceeded. Alternative 5 would reduce the vessel limit the following recreational fishing season by the amount necessary to prevent the annual catch limit from being exceeded. Those are your options, and, again, they were the alternatives that were added, and, again, this was at the guidance of the committee.

I will note that, for Alternatives 4 and 5, the way these are written now, they are kind of *carte blanche*, so to speak, in that they would reduce the bag limit by the amount necessary, and there is no specified cap there to how much they could be reduced. That was written as an initial discussion point, and, really, some guidance that we could use on the IPT side is if that's the committee's intent, and the other side to that is that they would be reduced by the amount necessary.

If you do put a cap in there, you might have to look at another potential combination of alternatives, since, if you do have a cap, and say the bag limit couldn't be reduced below eight fish, that might



not be enough to keep the recreational sector within its annual catch limit, and so you might have to look at other options, and so I'm just pointing that out for Alternatives 4 and 5. There is no specified number within those alternatives.

MS. BECKWITH: We had a similar discussion, I believe when we were thinking through cobia, about dropping the bag limit by one and the vessel limit by a certain amount and sort of giving the Regional Administrator a path forward in what the desire was, and it was complicated, but it was potentially doable, and so I see Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so this is the wahoo one, right, just to make sure I'm on track?

MR. HADLEY: We're still on dolphin.

MR. GRIMES: Never mind. Sorry, Madam Chair. Wrong one.

MS. BECKWITH: No worries. Roy, what are your thoughts on Alternatives 4 and 5, and what would we need to offer the Regional Administrator in order to make those alternatives potentially viable options? Any comments from the rest of the committee on these alternatives? Roy might be otherwise engaged.

MS. BYRD: Roy, it looks like you're unmuted on our end, but we can't hear you.

DR. CRABTREE: Can you hear me now?

MS. BYRD: Now we can.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay. The bag limit now is ten?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, the bag limit is ten, and the vessel limit is sixty, at the moment. I think we're losing you, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: The analysis, I suppose, the bag limit analysis, would show how low it would have to go to have the catch limit hit at the end of the year, and we could put that in place. Where it gets tricky is, by the time we get the data in next year, we're probably already two waves into the season.

When you get the catches from the past year, if you decide you have to reduce the bag limit, now you've already had four months of fishing, and you can potentially get to a pretty substantial bag limit reduction to get you where you want to go, and then, if you put a cap on it, that the bag limit can't go below some number, then you're back to looking at shortening the season, in combination with that, and so I think maybe it's doable here, because the bag limit is pretty high, and so you have a lot to work with. I do not believe this is a viable alternative for wahoo, where I think the bag limit is only two, because I think you would end up having to reduce the bag limit to zero, a good chance, and so I guess it's doable, but I'm not sure how much people would like the outcome of it.

MS. BECKWITH: Dewey had requested some data from MRIP, and, particularly for the private recreational, it looked like eighty-seven-odd percent of recreational trips caught from one to ten, as a total, whereas over 50 charter folks caught more than ten, and so I think a reduction in bag limit, or even vessel limit, would have to be pretty dramatic before it made much of an impact, and so I suspect that the easiest way forward on this one would probably be to adjust the following season, so the ACL is not gone over again, but I will open it up to comments, and so I see Art and Steve.

MR. SAPP: I think Roy had something he was going to say there for a second.

MS. BECKWITH: Roy, did you have something else?

DR. CRABTREE: One other comment I would make has to do with Alternative 2. In Alternative 2, you're going to reduce the annual catch limit by the amount of the overage the following year, which is effectively a payback, right? That's how I'm reading it.

MS. BECKWITH: That's correct.

DR. CRABTREE: That's where you get into trouble, because you didn't consider an in-season closure in your other alternatives, and so imagine a situation where NMFS gets the data in August, and realizes that the recreational sector is already substantially over its annual catch limit, but, because there is no in-season closure, NMFS can't do anything, and so they have to let the fishery continue until the end of the year and dig itself deeply into the hole, and then, the next year, you have to pay it all back, and so you can see that these things get a little messed up if you don't consider in-season closures, because there may be circumstances where you wish you had closed it, to avoid getting yourself in trouble the following year.

MS. BECKWITH: Roy, I agree that Alternative 2 could definitely have the potential for some problems. I think probably Alternative 3 would be a more reasonable option for dolphin, but I'll go back to Art.

MR. SAPP: Again, here we go back to 2015, and a few other years, where you have that one extraordinary year, and then seldom -- I don't see anywhere in the records where a following year was great, even close to where we would consider a shutdown, and so I had other ideas, but then, hearing the potential -- Our goal here is to not shut the season down on mahi, because of all the different reasons we have for their -- I don't like calling them an annual crop or whatever, but even if you -- We're going to discuss reducing the bag limits a little bit later, and, even if you were to say that you hit these numbers and you cut the bag limits in half, and the nice thing is, in this country, for the most part, dolphin don't get red hot, and you don't start doing big numbers, until three-and-a-half or four months into the year, and so it kind of gives you guys a little bit of time to recognize the previous year's issues, and potentially cut those bag limits in half, as an accountability measure. It scares me to consider closing the recreational dolphin fishery at all.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for that, Art. If you look back at the PSE numbers for dolphin, in that year of high abundance, the PSEs were actually quite low as well, and so those were honestly-caught fish, and it wasn't sort of an MRIP blip in the data, and so it really was just a year of sort of exceptional abundance, and that is one of the reasons why, in past discussions, we have veered away from the in-season closures, and that additional language in these alternatives about the

Regional Administrator being able to use the sort of best available science is sort of intended to open up consideration of things like year of high abundance, if there's some scientific information that supports that, if there's a particularly high PSE that would call into question the validity of that data, and that sort of thing. Dewey, go ahead.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. The stuff that I sent out to the committee with the bag limit effect on what folks catch was for North Carolina, that showed recreational for-hire. With this particular issue, mahi are prevalent throughout the year in different regions for the recreational industry, and so doing something after the first three months would disadvantage others, where the range of the mahi are located for the recreational industry to catch.

I also believe, as I provided the data from 2006, and I believe the 2018 or 2016, and I got mixed up, but it showed which state caught a percentage of the mahi, and, as things change, this could increase further into the Northeast, but could there be an analysis done that would show that -- I mean, because I clearly think a paper exercise, if you reduce -- What's the bang for the buck with the amount of percentage by reducing it by three fish, because it could very well be that you get very little poundage out of that, and I think there's got to be some further analysis, because this is a real difficult one, as an accountability measure, in reducing seasons and closures and the actuality of doing it, and so there's got to be some further way of looking at it, because this species is all up and down the east coast, and it would disadvantage some in-season closures for the recreational industry all up and down the east coast. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Dewey. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Madam Chair. Anyone that has ever had to do analyses looking at reducing bag limits, to realize some type of reduction or something like that, knows that, a lot of the time, you've got to go almost to the bottom, one fish or two fish, to ever realize any savings, and that's the concern that I have for Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. Just, given the data that's available, I am afraid that any reduction in bag limit or vessel limit would be very, very drastic the following year.

You know, I certainly understand leaving one of these alternatives in here for just covering the suite of potential alternatives. Honestly, I would prefer to see Alternative 5 over Alternative 4, just because I feel like reducing a vessel limit in this fishery is probably a little bit more palatable than reducing the bag limit, but, then again, I would hate to get to a scenario where we would have to reduce the vessel limit to pay back, because Art made a good point that the landings in this fishery are very variable, and we could have a high year and this would be triggered, and then, the following year, it's one of those years where dolphin fishing is off, and then we've reduced the vessel limit, and the fish aren't around.

Then I also have a question, as far as some of the language used in these alternatives, and it seems to flip-flop from fishing season in the following year. For example, in Alternative 2, it mentions an overage the following year, but then a lot of the other alternatives refer to the fishing seasons, and I didn't know if there was some reason why the IPT made a distinction between that, or if that was just kind of an oversight, because the fishing year, I think, for dolphin is the calendar year.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and, just to remind folks, in 2015, the recreational fishery got almost twenty-seven million pounds, and so, yes, a payback would have been quite dramatic at that point. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I mean, it's a tough one. Dewey is right that this is complicated by the fact that these fish migrate, and so, if you close it down early, you may close it before anybody gets a shot at it somewhere else, or, if you reduce the bag limit dramatically, the same kind of thing, and it's even worse, because other countries are fishing on it.

Steve is right that a lot of bag limit analyses show that you've got to get pretty low bag limits before you start having a real impact, because most people aren't catching all these fish. The other thing is the bag limit analysis is going to be highly variable from year to year, and so, if you have a year where there is a lot of fish, a lot of people are going to catch more, and the bag limit reduction is going to have more impact, but, if you have a year where there just aren't many fish around, you probably aren't going to have much impact by reducing the bag limit, but I am not so sure how reasonable it is to think that we can manage any of these recreational fisheries and say under no circumstances do we want a closure.

I just think there's too much recreational effort now, and the technology and the boats and the outboards and the equipment, and it's all just too good, and the fishing power of the recreational fleet has gotten to be so high that I'm just not sure that you can ever say that we don't want recreational closures. You may in fact find that you need them, and then I hear people in the Keys talk about when they used to catch slammers, and how they don't see slammers anymore.

Well, one way you rebuild stocks is, when you have these big year classes, these years of high abundance, you don't pound them, and you don't catch them all, and you leave some of them out there, and so it might not be that bad of a thing, on some occasions, to have a little bit of a shortened season, but I know that's difficult, because of the way these fish move around, but I'm just not sure, in the long run, that you're going to be able to find a way to provide year-round fishing seasons anymore, and I'm just not sure that's not a thing of the past.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks for that, Roy, and that's a great point. I mean -- I'm going to go to Chris and Art in a moment, but I'm going to summarize what I'm hearing so far. The in-season closures are not really palatable for mahi, because it's years of high abundance -- I'm going to go to Art while I pick up this phone call. Go ahead, Art or Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I have never really been one to try and tell the recreational fishery how to do anything, but, from sitting back and listening, and maybe it might be worth thinking about like a diminishing or a step-down in the bag limit once a certain amount comes out after a certain wave or something like that, if that could help. It might be a way to help get where we need to be, but I was just wondering what anybody else might think.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Art, go ahead.

MR. SAPP: A couple of things that I wanted to touch on here. I think, if you ask any fisherman what they would find more palatable, a drastically reduced bag limit or vessel limit, or any of it, or a totally closed season, they're going to pick the lesser of the two evils and take the drastically reduced bag limit.

You hear the migratory patterns or whatever of the mahi, and I can tell you, for a fact, that, the last six years in south Florida, our dolphin fishery has picked up steam and been strongest late in the year. Right now, we're experiencing, by far, our best dolphin fishery, and it has been that way. August, it kind of starts to pick up, but, in September and October, that's our two best months down here in south Florida, and so, the thought that the Northeast or whatever isn't going to get their opportunities, well, it's quite the opposite.

We have plenty of -- We have fish around, year-round, there's no doubt, and the small school fish start to show up in the spring still, but those are measuring fish, and, to be honest, a lot of people don't even mess with them, because they don't -- There is no advantage to catching and measuring a pile of dolphin and throwing most of them back. I want to wipe that concern away, that the Northeast is going to lose their opportunity due to the southern region, and that's just not the way it is now, and it hasn't been for quite some time.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks, Art. Go ahead, Mel.

MR. BELL: A couple of things. I am very sensitive to Roy's concern about not being able to close in a season, and I flash back to cobia. I can remember when we had the issue with cobia and extremely high landings, and then there was payback the following years and all for that, but we couldn't shut it down, and so that is an issue, and I would hope that we wouldn't hit that with dolphin, but that's kind of what he's getting at.

Then how do you deal with, if you do go over, how do you deal with it following on, but I think Chris touched on something. What he was describing is kind of turning down the volume a little bit on the fishery, based on knowing what your landings are and how close you're getting to that part of the ACL, the 50 percent or 75 percent or whatever it is, but, of course, the big problem we have is with the recreational data, and, of course, that we just don't get them.

Particularly for the private boat sector, we don't get them in a timely enough manner to be able to make that adjustment, that in-season adjustment, where you keep the fishery open, but you just scale it back a little bit to allow you to not bust through the ACL, but that is -- What we would hopefully would have in place soon is that you will have sort of a reference index, maybe, of how the fishery is going, since we have mandatory charter boat reporting. You will have a more timely stream of the charter fishery landings and the proportion that they represent of the overall fishery.

I mean, if there was some way that you could key-off of those as close to real-time data, as compared to waiting ninety days or whatever it is on the MRIP waves, you might could do something like that, and I'm not sure how we would incorporate it in there, and then we have to be able to allow ourselves to rely on that, and it doesn't exist in an up-and-running fashion at the moment, and, of course, after January, we'll have that data stream going, but, generally, with new data streams like that, you kind of need to let it run a little bit before you have a lot of confidence in it, but, I mean, I think that was a good idea that Chris had, is how can you kind of turn it down a little bit within the season, to try to avoid shutting it down.

That's all I could think of, unless something else changes, is you do -- We will have those charter landings in kind of close to real-time, compared to the larger portion of the fishery, which is probably, I would imagine, the private boat piece.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Mel. I mean, mahi is its sort of own unique beast within our council, and it is pretty different from every other species that we manage, and so the trouble I am having, and what I'm hearing, is we're trying to get away from in-season closures, so we can take advantage of those years of high abundance, but the new alternatives for post seasons aren't really all that palatable either for this particular fishery, recognizing that the bag and the vessel limit reductions are probably not going to work, and you probably have to drop a vessel limit to below ten to actually see any significant impact, and a bag limit would probably have to be dropped almost to two, or three, possibly, per person, and so reducing the length of the following season could disadvantage different sections, and Alternative 2 could potentially dig us into quite a dramatic hole, if we don't have an in-season closure in a year of high abundance.

I am not actually seeing a path forward that is better than the current accountability measure that we have on the books, and we -- As we sort of move through this process, we are trying to bring most of our accountability measures in line with each other, but, with the differences between the species and how the fisheries are prosecuted, I'm not sure that we're going to be able to get to that, but I have not heard discussion on one of these alternatives that could move forward and work well for this fishery, and so I'm not really sure where we go from here. I'm going to go to Dewey, and I want you guys to sort of think on that, because we could approve these alternatives and discuss them again in December, but I am not seeing -- I am not seeing the answer very clearly etched in the sand. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I am not sure that I know of recreational reporting on certain other species that in-season adjustments are possible, bag limit adjustments, but I think it would be very difficult to track, and also to get to the public the in-season bag limit adjustment for this, and so it's a real difficult one to look at.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. So, we need a path forward on this one, because wahoo is going to be its own animal to discuss, and so what do folks want to do? Do we want to make changes to some of these alternatives, or do we want to accept them and reconsider them in December, or does anyone have an additional brilliant idea for an accountability measure that we could consider? Are the in-season closures sounding better to someone? I mean, it's time to make a move, folks. Art.

MR. SAPP: I think I made it pretty clear that, while I know and understand it, it's very difficult, and I find in-season closures far more palatable. Sorry. Back that up. In-season bag reductions, in whatever means possible, are far more palatable than in-season closures. I don't know if I have any more support there or not, but that's where I am.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: I am sort of with Art on that one. From a recreational standpoint, for Georgia, we have to go so far to get anything, from tuna or dolphin or wahoo or whatever, and, to not be able to catch anything, it sort of puts a bad taste. I think most recreational guys, at least in Georgia, who I'm going to speak for, are much more palatable to be able to catch a couple, as opposed to none. I think, when you shut it down -- I don't think that's a management -- I don't consider that management. Closing the doors is not the way to do it, and I think the reduction is the way to do it. At least, when we go seventy miles, let us catch something.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so, if Alternative 4 and 5 remain, then one of the analyses will be a bag limit and vessel limit reduction, to show what we would have to go down to to get any impact, and I'm sure that that will be enlightening. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Anna. Right now, there is nothing in these alternatives that considers what Art and Kyle were talking about and what came up, and is that correct? There is no in-season bag reduction identified in these alternatives, and is that correct?

MS. BECKWITH: Correct, because we have been concentrating on post-season accountability measures, and so, in order to do an in-season, we would have to add a new alternative and reword such appropriately.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, I have mixed feelings about that concept, and I agree wholeheartedly with what Art and Kyle were saying, and I'm sensitive to what Roy is saying about the total absence of any sort of in-season accountability measure, and I'm just troubled by how we would fairly and equitably apply that, because, if it would come -- It's invariably going to probably come towards the end of the fishing year, and, if you're in one of those areas, geographically, where your better fishing is towards the end of the year, then you're going to be disadvantaged, to some degree, by that in-season bag reduction. You're not going to have the same access to opportunity as the folks who are fishing at the beginning of the year, but maybe that is not as big of a deal as I think it is, but I think it's one we should consider putting in there. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Again, I just -- I'm just going to throw this out there, and I don't know that this is a path forward, but, if we cannot come up with something that is better than what we currently have, we can always keep what we currently have, and so I always want to remind folks that that's an option. Art.

MR. SAPP: Again, I struggle sometimes in conveying my thoughts, and I am a fan of 4 and 5, in that it's the following season. If we have this year of amazing abundance, and we blow through any of our limits, then those bag limits are reduced, and I think, with the way the fishery really generally starts to pick up in April or May, throughout the entire eastern seaboard, that it gives enough time to realize how bad the previous season -- How many fish we did catch the previous year, and that's when those reduced bag limits go in, in the following season, and so it's post-season, I guess.

With that, it's so seldom that two years back-to-back have these giant numbers, this great abundance, that odds are that a greatly reduced bag limit isn't going to have that much effect on those people, because there are fewer fish, and they're generally catching fewer fish, and I believe, and maybe it's too optimistic, but I believe that that kind of accountability would work out, with minimum effect on the fishermen, and I think the fishery just continues on. I hope that I made sense.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I understand what you're saying, and one of the biggest struggles with dolphin have been that we do have these very, very occasional years of overages on our ACLs, and then we don't see them for quite a bit of time, and so to craft an accountability measure that takes into account and acknowledges that out year out, without really penalizing the recreational fishery, was the goal when we started consideration of revising these accountability measures, and I don't see that we've been able to achieve that goal yet. Kyle.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Art and Spud have said pretty much everything that I wanted to say, but the only thing that I would like to point out is that, again, this is very state-specific. An in-season closure, because of the timing, would probably affect the Florida recreational fishermen more than anything, but Georgia basically has been -- We're at the end of April, and May and June is pretty much our whole dolphin season.

By the time they got any numbers back, a reduced bag limit doesn't affect us, and, if you look at some of the numbers on the charts that are floating around, we account for less than 1 percent of the dolphin catch as a whole, and so I don't know where our opinion really matters in this. I mean, it does matter, but the value of it is this is going to affect the late season dolphin catch, which is going to be -- Like Art said, that's going to be now. It's October and the time period in Florida. I am all for an in-season bag reduction, but I just don't know the viability of what we're trying to do, and it looks good on paper, but it would only really affect one area, in my opinion.

DR. CRABTREE: Anna, I heard talking about keeping the current accountability measure, and I don't think the current accountability measure does anything. I don't think it works, and I don't think it complies with the statute, and it shouldn't have ever been approved, but I think this was all put in place when we were doing ACLs for everything, and somehow it slipped through the cracks.

If you look at the current accountability measure, it only does anything if the stock is overfished. If it's not, it does nothing, and so I think you have to do something here, and, again, I think you just have to accept that, at some point, there may, on occasion, be a closure of some sort, and I don't know how you get around it, and somebody said that a closure is not management, and, well, I don't agree with that. It certainly is part of management, and it happens all the time in all kinds of fisheries.

The other thing about these periods of high abundance is, yes, when you have those periods of high abundance, sometimes what happens is the word is out, and everybody goes out and just pounds them, and I can remember catching dolphin and loading up on them in a bonefish skiff, when I lived down in the Keys, and the word would get out that dolphin are everywhere, and they're in close, and everybody and his brother would go out and pounds them, and so sometimes, when you have those periods of abundance, you really need to be careful with them, so that you don't really end up hammering them badly, but I think you're going to have to do something to revise the accountability measures, because I don't think what's on the books now is viable.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thanks for that clarification. Jessica and then Chris.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just going to reiterate what Kyle said, just that I don't want in-season closures, partly because, as he was mentioning, it would disproportionately affect Florida if it comes late in the season, and so I'm just reiterating that that wasn't on my list.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I know, in some regions, they -- Maybe not for recreational, but, I mean, you could do like a zone allocation and have seasons for each zone, if reducing the bag limit wasn't going to work.



MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Anna. I know that we're going to get to this later, but this horse has been beat to death several times now, and it seems to me that one of the ways that you would be able to control the fishery, when you have a phenomenal year, is that you reduce the bag limit, and you reduce the vessel limit, and I've heard that from -- Not with relation to accountability measures, but I've heard -- A number of people have said to me that absolutely you need to reduce the vessel limit. I've had several people say you need to reduce the bag limit and that five fish is enough. It's almost like what we said with regard to mutton snapper, and so that might be a better way around this problem, is further discussion on reducing the bag limit and the vessel limit. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Roy, and then we're going to figure out a way forward, real quick.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, so, taking into account that folks want to have the option of reducing the bag limits, and what I heard from Jessica is that you don't want to do the in-season closure, and I don't think that I can come up with a better solution than take the status quo, but get the reference to the overfished part of it out of it, so that you -- If you go over the annual catch limit, then, the next year, you monitor the recreational landings for persistence, and then, if you project out that the ACL is going to be exceeded, and you do whatever you're going to do with the bag limit reduction, but, if you still project that you're going to exceed the annual catch limit, then you do have a closure at that point.

I just can't come up with a better solution than that, and it's post, and so it's the following year, and I think you can do bag limit reductions and things, but I think, at some point, you're going to have to recognize that, if, after all of that, you're still projecting that you're going to hit the annual catch limit and go over, you're going to have to have a closure.

MS. BECKWITH: Roy, that was sort of where I was going, with what we have is probably better than what we're trying to come up with, minus that overfished requirement. I see John.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Anna. Just listening in, and it brings back memories of some of the challenging things we've had to discuss on the Gulf side, and it seems like, data gathering and reporting challenges aside, the goal here is to avoid a closure, right, and so the only thing I can come up with is reducing some bag limit at some percentage landings threshold, if you can get the data to get you there, and then that would avoid this evolving into seasonal areas to avoid and who got closed out, and it will keep your season open.

I mean, quite frankly, having dolphin fished all my life, I really don't want to clean fifty or sixty dolphin when I get back to the dock, and so I don't think that a reduced bag at some threshold would really hurt the guy who is really, really fishing. That's my two-cents. Good luck with all of this.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks, John. Are we getting Gulf Council complicated yet? All right. I've got Mel, and then I'm going to make a suggestion.

MR. BELL: I am not trying to drag this on, but John was touching on what I was getting it, that the data is the complicated piece. It's how do you make that determination, for the recreational fishery, that you're at 50 or 75 percent, or whatever it is, and at which you would implement that -- You would dial that fishery back a little bit, because, if the prime goal is going to be to never let that fishery close, and that's the worst thing that can happen, then what John described and what I was talking about -- That's the only way that you can do that.

Now, Roy's approach, and this is what -- I actually had a question about what Roy was saying. As a post-season accountability, you would take, I guess -- You would calculate sort of the burn rate that you had in the previous year and apply it into the next year and project if you're going to make it or not, and then you would end up having the season with a predicted end date or something, and I wasn't really sure of the mechanics part of what Roy was saying, but it sounded like more of a -- You're in the post-season realm at that point, and so you're not relying upon the really, really timely data, but I just was trying to figure out the exact mechanics of where he was going with that, because the overall heading of the action here is post-season, and so I guess we sort of have to stay in the post-season realm to fit within the action.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I will let Roy speak to that, but my understanding of the monitoring for persistence and increase in landings would be looking for those first sets of waves, to see if, the following year, if the effort is equal to what the previous year was, and, if it is, and you see that you're going to close, then you start sort of projecting out closure dates and considering bag or vessel limit reductions, but I will let Roy speak to that.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, a couple of things. One, I think the goal that we're talking about, which is to avoid a closure, that's not really the goal. The goal ought to be to comply with the statute and stay below the ACL, and probably the best way to stay below the ACL is to set an annual catch target that is below the ACL, and you structure your management to catch the annual catch target, and, by doing so, you stay below the ACL, and hopefully you get out of a closure, but I suspect that means lower bag limits.

Now, mechanically, if we went over the ACL, we have projected that we have exceeded the ACL in a given year, then, the next year, the fishery would start as it always does, and then it would run a couple of waves, until we got some data in. If the catches were way down again, then maybe there's no problem, and things go on as usual, and maybe it was just some fish came through the area and they're gone now.

If we monitor a couple of waves, and it showed that the catches were high, and we project out that we're going to go over again, then we would do whatever you guys want to do with the bag limit. If it's reduce the bag limit, then we could reduce the bag limit at that point, and, if we projected, even with the lower bag limit, that we're still going to go over the ACL, then we would just project it out, based on what we have, and then we would put out a Federal Register notice showing that the bag limit is reduced to this, and the fishery will close after this long on this date, and it would be based on some in-season data for that year, but also on probably a number of months' worth of projections, and so it would be subject to some error and things, but we can do it.

MS. BECKWITH: To me, that seems like the best path forward, based on the discussions that we've heard. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, what I was thinking was -- **I was going to make a motion to accept the IPT's edits to Action 8, because I feel like some of the things that people are saying are covered in the alternatives in this action.** I was also wondering -- If we pass that motion, I guess I would pose this question to Roy or John, and could we also add an action that does what Roy is saying, which is just modifies what is essentially no action and removes the wording about overfished? If we don't think that that's covered in these alternatives, then maybe we add -- I would call it a simplified alternative, in addition to what we have that does that very simplistic thing that Roy was suggesting. I am just trying to kind of move us past this discussion. It seems like some of the things are already covered, except for at least one point that Roy brought up.

MS. BECKWITH: Right. John, what are your thoughts on that, because I can see an additional alternative being added, and then, through that Alternative 3 and 4, we could give the Regional Administrator direction on the bag limit or the vessel limits to go down to in the case of needing to reduce while monitoring for persistence in landings.

MR. HADLEY: I think we could do that. It's something that the IPT could kind of take as guidance and work with, and we could come back to you with -- I mean, I guess that would be a new alternative, with some sub-alternatives to go along with it, but that's something that we could work with.

MS. BECKWITH: It also sounded to me like nobody was really down with Alternative 2, and so I don't know that we need to -- Do you want us to accept the IPT's recommendations, or do you guys, based on the discussion, want to bring us back something to reconsider in December?

MR. HADLEY: I mean, it's up to you. I think that, if there's an alternative that you don't want to see to move forward, that would be helpful for the IPT, so we're not working on that, noting that there will be at least one additional alternative, or potentially several, added to this action. I believe that Jessica was meaning to make this motion, and so that's why I wrote it up there, but I wasn't clear, and so, with that, if there's something that the committee doesn't want to move forward with, that would be helpful for the IPT, I guess in summary.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I am going to go to Steve, and then we'll go back to Jessica.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Madam Chair. I was actually going to make some comments and then pose a question about the regionality of the stock and the regional management, since someone mentioned it, but, now that Jessica has got a motion on the board, and I certainly recognize that those comments and discussion will probably send us down another rabbit hole, and so I'm going to hold off on that until another time.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me try to address both of those points. **I agree with what John Hadley said, that I don't think we need Alternative 2, based on the discussion, and so if we could modify that motion, however we need to, because we haven't actually added Alternative 2, and so do we say to accept the IPT's suggested edits with the exception of Alternative 2? I am just throwing that out there, to respond to John Hadley.**

Then, to what Steve said, I am good with having that discussion, regional discussion, but I just think we need to figure out what we're doing with this action and then to talk about the regionality and figure out how to address that, and I'm fine adding an action about it, but I think that we would need to continue that discussion after lunch, and I'm just throwing that out there.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I think we gave some direction to add that alternative that would kind of go through what Roy was suggesting, fixing our current no action alternative. I see John and then Mel, and then we're hopefully going to vote on this. Wait. Do we have a second? I need a second.

MR. SAPP: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. John, go ahead.

MR. HADLEY: I just wanted to clarify, and so what I have in my notes is that you would add an alternative that would reduce the vessel or bag limit while monitoring for persistence, and is that a correct interpretation?

MS. BECKWITH: No, and it's not while monitoring for persistence. I think Roy's was you would monitor for persistence during the first couple of waves, and, if you see that the catch rate is still high, then you can adjust the bag limit, or the vessel limit, and, if that still projects out a need for a closure, then you go ahead and you do a closure as well, and so it would be multifaceted. Mel.

MR. BELL: You just covered what I wanted to make sure we were clear on, and so think, the way it's structured now, we take 2 out, and we're good with 3, 4, and 5, and then it's adding that new alternative, and so this is done under direction to staff to figure that out, but, as you were just kind of describing it, it's going to be a bit complex, but that's fine, but that's where we are, right? Staff would bring that one in the next time we see this, and we would have that new alternative in there, right?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and Roy may correct me. Maybe I misspoke. Go ahead, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I would never do that, but there are different ways to skin a cat, and you could say that you believe you went over, and, the next year, you're going to go in and do a bag limit reduction. Then you're going to do the monitoring for persistence and figure out if we need to have a closure in addition to that. I just think that's something that staff would have to work out.

Anna, before we break for lunch, which I recommend that we do very soon, I wanted to let everyone know that the emergency rule on vermilion snapper and king mackerel filed at the Federal Register this morning, and so we'll be sending out an announcement this afternoon.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I see the wisdom in that version of Roy's suggestion, with moving forward with a bag limit and a vessel limit reduction and monitoring for persistence, and so it looks like we've got two potential routes for the IPT to discuss and bring back to us. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just, before we you break for lunch, I wanted to throw out that I think Alternative 2, to me, is one of the more rational ways of dealing with the variability in landings, and that's one of the things that I have heard discussed, not just in the context of

dolphin wahoo, and it was one of the things that I thought was going to end up to be one of the more preferred approaches to this. You guys can do what you want with it, and, if you're not interested in doing it, you're not interested in doing it, but I would, I guess, just put in that plug, and I kind of hate to see it removed. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Did you just try and call us rational? Just kidding.

MR. GRIMES: You were trying to remove it.

MS. BECKWITH: I think our concern with Alternative 2 is just the potential hole that you dig yourself in. If you have a payback and then shorten the season to accommodate that, that new reduced ACL, you can maybe get yourself into a cyclical overage. Anyway, I didn't hear anyone in support of that one, and so we'll let the motion stand as it is, and, if somebody would like to keep Alternative 2, they can vote against the motion. Is there any additional discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

It sounds like we've got a bit of direction to staff on how to work up that new alternative, and it is 11:57, and so I suggest that break for lunch, before we have an equally complicated discussion on wahoo, and I will see you guys back at 1:30. Jessica, is that right?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sounds great.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thanks, folks. See you at 1:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. BECKWITH: Welcome back from lunch. During our lunchbreak, I was asked if Steve and Jessica might take a few minutes and discuss regional management options for dolphin, since it was more or less cued up towards the end of our discussion prior to lunch. I am not sure which one of you guys would like to introduce your thoughts on that.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Anna. I was ready to make these comments and pose this question right before lunch, but I realized that we were kind of down in a hole, and we needed to kind of resolve our discussion on Action 8, but what really stuck out to me with that discussion about in-season and post-season and the fact that something might be triggered and might disproportionately affect one region over the other, and I just wanted to pose the question to the council of -- We kind of went down this road a little bit, and this was about two years ago now, when we were talking about deepwater species, blueline and golden and snowy, and, after a long discussion on that, we kind of decided not to take any action, and we kind of left direction up to I think the staff. The next time that we visited that issue, we would be interested in looking at options for regional management, either kind of regional rolling seasons or allocations or something like that.

I feel like we've kind of got the same concerns, or similar concerns, going on with dolphin right now, and so I just kind of wanted to pose the question to address to the council if that's a potential action that we might want to investigate in this amendment. What is the possibility of looking at regional management for dolphin?

Say, for example, we might have two or three zones, similar to Spanish mackerel right now commercially, with the Northern and Southern Zone, with different limits and different zone ACLs that are tracked and what have you, and so I just feel like that might be a potential way to avoid either in-season closures that might, for example, disproportionately affect south Florida over North Carolina and some of the Mid-Atlantic and New England states, or something like that, and so I see that Jessica has her hand up too, and I think she might have some follow-up comments.

MS. BECKWITH: Go ahead, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree with Steve, and I would like to explore something like that as part of this amendment, and we already have items like vessel limit that is split out with a vessel limit for Florida, and maybe not being considered by other states, and so I was wondering -- I don't have a particular idea in mind for how many regions, and is it two, or is it three, or is it four, and I don't know what it is, but, yes, I think I would like to, like Steve, explore an action in this amendment where maybe there is some quota set aside for how many regions we're going to do here, and then there might be region-specific regulations. I feel like they're already listed out later in the document, in some of the actions, when we were talking about vessel limit and bag limit and stuff, and so I just wanted to throw it out there as an option.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I think it's an interesting discussion. Since everything is throwing things out for the first time, I will throw this out. In the Mid-Atlantic, we, for blueline tilefish, had to constrain our catch to an annual catch limit, and so what we did is we put a different bag limit for the different users of the fish, meaning a headboat at seven fish, a for-hire vessel at five fish, and a private angler at three fish, and the equations that were used for the maker of our motion was, if it was an inspected vessel or uninspected and a private angler.

Also, the fact that you had for-hire and headboats that would be reporting VTRs, and so I would think, since we're having this discussion -- I am not exactly sure how all these regions would work, given the highly migratory nature of this species, but, also, why couldn't you take -- If you're looking for a trigger mechanism, that, after two years, if the ACL was met, that you would look at the private angler and reduce their bag limit as a proportion to the overall catch, and the same for the charter boats, per se.

Hopefully, this will never happen, but I don't know if all these regional management areas and locations -- You know, for the commercial end, you have your quota that you're looking at, but, for this particular one, a lot of recreational folks can travel in different areas, and so I would just throw out what I said about reducing catch. You are not going to reduce effort, but reduce catch, if necessary, by a proportion of who is catching the fish. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Dewey brings up really two great points. One is that we are throwing quite a few things out there for the first time, in an amendment that we've been talking about for a while, but we can deal with that, and I had also been thinking about Dewey's idea about treating the recreational and the charter folks differently.

My biggest personal anxiety, which I'm sure would have come up during the action where we're talking about reducing bag limits and vessel limits for dolphin, is I would be opposed to reducing

the vessel limit for dolphin in consideration of the charter fleet, because that's very important for them as a selling point for charters, but reducing a bag limit/vessel limit for the recreational angler I think would be much more of an easy sell, if that's the route that we wanted to help use to constrain and have some conservation benefit, but I'll go to Tony, and then we'll see if we need any actions on the regional management. Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. If anyone has watched me at the Mid-Atlantic Council, you will know that I am a very big supporter of regional management. I think regional management, particularly as we experience shifting stocks and stocks move up the beach -- Quite frankly, mahi, or dolphinfish, as we call mahi up here, they are becoming a directed fishery offshore of Long Island. This morning, I was with some folks, and we were discussing how mahi has, in effect, become a directed fishery on Long Island.

I respect the rights and the desires of the fishermen on the east coast of Florida that want to catch mahi, but there is no reason why their catch should have an effect on what you might be able to take up in the southern New England or Mid-Atlantic region, and so I would strongly support the committee examining regional management, and I don't have any details yet, but I would be happy to work with some of the staff and some of the other committee members that are working on some of the details, but I think regional management is a great way to go with mahi. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Any additional thoughts from the committee members on interest in pursuing the idea of regional management, and, if so, is this amendment appropriate, or would sort of a separate analysis of that be more appropriate? Those are the two pieces of feedback that I'm looking for. Roy and then Mel.

DR. CRABTREE: If you think about how long we've been working on this amendment, and we still have quite a bit just to get through what we have, it might be worth just going ahead and getting done with the new ACLs and the FES business and tackle the accountability measures, and then we can come back to regional management in another amendment, because you're going to have to do allocations among all the regions, and, if you want to tailor management measures differently, it would be quite a few decisions to be made, and I worry we -- If anything, I think we already have too much in this amendment to get done now, and so I would encourage doing it in another amendment.

MS. BECKWITH: Roy, thank you for that. That's my concern as well. I would like to see this amendment through prior to my abandoning this council, but it does seem like more and more of a challenge to get that done.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I wanted you to get it done before I'm off the council, and that only leaves you one more meeting.

MS. BECKWITH: Alas, but what will we do? I don't know. Mel, go ahead.

MR. BELL: I had the same thoughts as Roy. I was just -- I am thinking the analysis necessary to work that particular type of action along would be pretty intense, and I think it's fine to bring up the topic now and just mention that, because it is certainly something we should consider, I believe, given the peculiarities of this particular fishery, but I think it would just -- I think it would really

slow this way down. I could see that happening, and, if we want to finish before any of us are still here, it would probably be best not to try to add it at this moment.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I definitely don't want to put it in this amendment. You guys can maybe put it in your longlining amendment or whatever, and it might be good to have some long lines drawn for that amendment too, and I think, since you've got another one coming, you can probably do that one together.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Great. I see a path moving forward. Rick.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I think, from a New England perspective, I think there would probably be some interest in exploring regional management for dolphinfish, but I do wonder, and you would probably be able to answer this for me, about the scoping process for this amendment. Would there need to be a re-scoping? Is this inside the bounds of what the amendment's purpose and needs are, or would it have to go back out to a re-scoping and possibly delay it?

MS. BECKWITH: If we were to add it to this amendment, we could probably work around the additional scoping. This hasn't gone, technically, out to the public yet, and it was in line to do that after the December meeting, if I'm not mistaken. I am starting to hear a path about regional management is an interesting topic, but not to be added to this particular amendment, and so I see Steve, Carolyn, and Chester.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Madam Chair. I mean, I'm fine holding off on this, and I feel like the discussion kind of naturally went there, with our discussion around Action 8, and I just wanted to bring that up, but I'm certainly fine addressing this in another amendment, because I agree that we've spent a lot of time on this, and we do need to address the ABC recommendations and get these ACLs and some of these other actions taken care of.

I don't know if I would necessarily want to include it in the same amendment as the potential longline amendment, and I feel like those two things -- Those two particular actions might go kind of two different directions, and I don't know if that wouldn't turn into Dolphin Amendment 10 2.0, and I might would advocate to deal with the longline issue that we kicked down the road in its own amendment and then maybe address this regional approach in a separate amendment.

MS. BECKWITH: I am hearing you say you don't want everyone mad at us at the same time. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I kind of feel like regional is something that's going to take a little bit more exploration too, depending on how you carve it up. Just kind of, again, back to PSEs, and, if you're looking at these with strong recreational fisheries, these PSEs, to me, are really going to start messing with that, when we know that, if we collapse and we do it as one, we still have some sticky ones, and, with dolphin, just at first blush, looking at the MRIP, the North Atlantic, if you just did it by those types of regions, North, Mid, and South, you do have PSEs over fifty for the North Atlantic in a lot of the years.



MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Chester, you've got the last word on this.

MR. BREWER: Thank you. I agree that we shouldn't be adding anything to Amendment 10, nothing, and I would like to suggest that we take something out, and that would be the bag limits that we're going to be talking about, the perhaps lowering bag limits that we're going to be talking about later.

We have talked a little bit about an up-and-coming longline amendment, and it would make sense to me that we would talk about those two issues at the same time, and then you're talking about potentially constraining commercial take, and you're also talking about, at the same time, constraining recreational take, and so that's just a suggestion that I'm going to throw out.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. All right. If no one has anything else on this particular topic, then I think we are ready to move to Action 9.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Moving forward with Action 9, this action looks at revising the trigger for the post-season accountability measure for wahoo, and so, quickly, I will go over the no action alternative, where, currently, for wahoo, if the recreational landings exceed the ACL, then, the following year, landings are monitored for persistence. If the commercial ACL is exceeded, it will be reduced by the amount of the overage in the following fishing year, but, there again, there is that language of only if it is only overfished and the total ACL is exceeded.

That is kind of, there again, the crux of the issue and why we're looking at this accountability measure, in that wahoo, rather, is in the same boat, if you will, as dolphin, where there isn't a stock assessment expected any time soon, and so the status being changed to overfished is unlikely, at least in the near future.

With that, the triggers that are proposed in the following set of alternatives are the same as you have seen in Action 7 for dolphin, but, rather, this is applied to wahoo, and so Alternative 2 is looking at the trigger being -- Looking at the three-year geometric mean, and Alternative 3 is looking at a sum total of the past three years of recreational landings exceeding the summed past three years of the recreational ACL.

Alternative 4 is looking at if the recreational sector exceeds its ACL in any two of three years or exceeds the total ACL in any one year, and the total ACL being the recreational and commercial ACL combined. Alternative 5 is implementing a post-season accountability measure if the total ACL is exceeded, and Alternative 6 is the trigger would be, if the recreational ACL is exceeded, then the post-season accountability measure would go into place.

With that, I think we had a lot of discussion on Action 7, and the comments, at least from the IPT standpoint, are the same as they were before, and so we're looking for approval of the IPT's suggested edits, since this is a major change to this action, if the committee would like to move forward with it.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Are there any comments or a desire to move to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 9 in Amendment 10? Shep, go ahead.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would just reiterate the same things that I had said relative to the dolphin action about Alternatives 3 and 4 and no show-stoppers, but we need to look into whether those would be viewed as consistent with the requirements of the National Standard 1 Guidelines. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there any interest in accepting these recommended changes? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we accept the IPT edits to Action 9.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Do I have a second?

MR. SAPP: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** Of course, as we go through and discuss this, wahoo is a very different situation than mahi, and we are much more likely to bounce against our ACL in the recreational, and it may well be that some consideration of an in-season closure becomes necessary, as potentially a discussion on reducing the bag limit of wahoo down to one, but we can discuss that in the next action, if appropriate. Okay. I'm ready when you are, John.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Moving into Action 10, this looks at the post-season recreational accountability measures for wahoo, and the same Alternative 1 there, and I mentioned the issue with that, the overfished language in that alternative. Alternative 2 through 5 really are very similar to what you saw with dolphin, with Alternative 2, where you reduce the sector ACL by an overage, and also reduce the following fishing season by the amount necessary to ensure that the revised ACL is prevented from being exceeded.

Alternative 3 would reduce the length of the following fishing season by the amount necessary to prevent the ACL from being exceeded in the following year, and Alternative 4 would look at a bag limit reduction in the following fishing season by the amount necessary to prevent the ACL from being exceeded, and I will remind you that there is a two fish per person bag limit, and so there's not a whole lot to work with there, and then, also, in Alternative 5, this would implement a vessel limit in the following fishing season, to prevent the ACL from being exceeded, and, currently, there is a bag limit, but there is not a vessel limit for wahoo, and so that's kind of one of the main differences there between the action for dolphin and the action for wahoo.

Again, there are similar comments from the IPT on this measure, that I won't go into again, but, with that, we're looking for approval and discussion of how you would like to move forward with the alternatives for accountability measures on wahoo.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, John. I suspect that we'll have sort of similar feelings about Alternative 2 and its potential to dig us into a hole for those payback provisions, and I can also see us developing a new alternative, similar to the one that Roy suggested for dolphin, where we take out the no action language that refers to the species being overfished and maybe craft something that says, if the recreational landings exceed the recreational catch limit, the bag limit is reduced to one per person, and the fishery is monitored for persistence in landings. If it's projected to go over, then it closes as early as needed, or however that verbiage might be, and that would be a

suggestion for an additional alternative, and I'm open to any thoughts from anyone else. I will start calling on people.

MR. HADLEY: I am not seeing any hands.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I am good with making that -- I guess I will call it an additional alternative that you suggested and approving this IPT edits.**

MS. BECKWITH: Do you want to leave Alternative 2 in there, or would you like to see that one dispatched?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Did we remove it on dolphin? I can't remember. I think we did.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, we did.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I am good with removing it, but let's see what others think.**

MR. BELL: We did, and, if we're just trying to be consistent here, this would -- The way she's wording the motion would seem to match it up, and so, if we want to go in that direction, that's kind of how we're setting it up.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. So accept the IPT's suggested edits to Action 8, with the exception of Alternative 2, was what we passed, and so he's going to -- Okay. While John is catching up, go ahead, Chester.

MR. BREWER: I will second Jessica's motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Excellent. **The motion on the floor is accept the IPT's suggested edits to Action 10, with the exception of Alternative 2.** We have a second. Mel, did you have something for that, or were you going to second?

MR. BELL: I thought that Chester just did, but I will if I need to. Just for clarity, and then the addition of that other alternative, similar to what we were going to bring in to Action 8, and that was direction to staff, to develop the wording for that, and so we're going to take that same approach here?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, I believe that's accurate. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just trying to confirm that. What happened to that extra alternative? Was it going to be part of the motion, or is it direction to staff? I have the same question.

MS. BECKWITH: We wrote it up as direction to staff for dolphin, so the IPT could sort of figure out the crafted language, and we could specify it in here, but we can also do it as direction to staff, whatever your preference is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am good with direction to staff.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there any further discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: All right. We have the motion that passed, and I have direction to staff to add that additional alternative that we discussed, and I will capture that in the Dolphin Wahoo Committee report, so everybody can see that it was duly noted. With that, I will move on to the next action.

This one is an action that we reviewed a few times, but there were several suggested edits made by the IPT, and so I'm going to take some time to go over those. Action 11 would allow properly permitted commercial vessels with trap, pot, or buoy gear onboard that are not authorized for use in the dolphin wahoo fishery to possess commercial quantities of dolphin and wahoo. There was a bit of a change here, and it starts with the Alternative 1, no action, language, where it specifies the major gear types that the committee has discussed wanting to accommodate, looking at trap, pot, or buoy gear.

It also specifies the current commercial trip limit for wahoo, and that is 500 pounds, as well as the dolphin trip limit that is currently in place, and that's 4,000 pounds, but only after 75 percent of the commercial ACL is reached. That is a change to Alternative 1, kind of fully noting what is on the book and in the regs now, so to speak.

Alternative 2, as you can see at the very beginning there, the language is suggested to be stricken for the necessary state permits, and so, essentially, Alternative 2 would allow a vessel that possesses both an Atlantic dolphin wahoo commercial permit and federal commercial permits required to fish trap, pot, or buoy gear to be authorized to retain dolphin caught by rod-and-reel while in possession of these gears. Dolphin retained by such vessels would not exceed the specified trip limits here in Sub-Alternatives 2a through 2d. A vessel in the EEZ that has aboard other types of gears would still be unauthorized to fish for dolphin or possess dolphin in the EEZ.

In Alternative 3, you can see some of the struck-out language regarding wahoo, and that was kind of addressed through the addition of Alternative 3, because the IPT felt that it would be helpful to move that out, so it's clear that Alternative 2 is focusing on dolphin, and it doesn't necessarily muddy the waters, so to speak, and it makes it clear that the wahoo commercial trip limit would be in place and would be -- This exception would apply to wahoo as well, and so, in this case, the similar provision, where both an Atlantic wahoo commercial permit and a valid commercial permit is required to fish trap, pot, or buoy gear. It would allow such vessels to retain wahoo caught by rod-and-reel while in possession of such gears. The commercial trip limit would be the same as it is now, at 500 pounds.

I want to take a step back to discuss the rationale behind the IPT's suggestion to remove the necessary state portion of this. I know this has been a discussion, and, if you think back to the past committee discussions on this action, the goal is really to try to have an all-encompassing fix, so to speak, and the original ask was from American lobster fishermen, to accommodate their lobster pot gear, or lobster trap gear, and then the discussion evolved that the committee would like to address other gears as well that fall under a similar circumstance, such as sea bass pots or other kind of trap or pot gear, as well as buoy gear.

As the IPT discussed this, there was some question on whether or not the necessary state permits could be required, since this is a federal fishery, and these are federal regulations, and whether or not the state permits could be required in that case.

Also, there was some discussion of whether or not those permits should be specified, if you go with the state permits. Since it is the entire Atlantic east coast, you're going to be specifying several different permits there, and so, to kind of narrow the scope a little bit, that was the suggested edit by the IPT, and, with that, I will turn it over to the committee, and I don't know if Shep maybe wants to add a little bit more on if there are any legal concerns on that, as far as the ability to specify those state permits.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Shep, did you want to speak to that first?

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess I can. I mean, my recollection of the discussion was less legal in nature and more just you're talking about a lot of different states and a lot of different permits. For one, all of the activity that we're regulating is in federal waters, and so there are going to be no necessary state permits, or at least I don't think there are.

Also, I guess, just in a general sense, legally, I'm not sure what our justification is for requiring the state permit with it, but I also think there maybe were enforcement issues that came up when the officer is in federal waters. Not only do they have to know what federal permitting requirements are, but they have to know what all the necessary state permits are. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would like to bring up spiny lobster here, and so I believe that the intent was to allow people that have lobster traps onboard to be able to take dolphin, and we have a federal management plan for lobster, but it is requiring a state permit, and so I don't know how we want to handle that, but I believe, by striking this language about the necessary state permit, you are preventing people with lobster traps from taking dolphin by hook-and-line.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say that we don't have a state permit that, for instance, the dolphin fishermen would have to have to land in South Carolina, but we do require a state license, and so there is a difference between a license and a permit, but, when you come into state waters, regardless of the state, you become subject to that state's jurisdiction, and so, whatever licenses or permits they would have to have to conduct their business from a legal federal fishery in the waters of the state, they would have to have.

That kind of becomes an issue between that person and the particular state, and so I don't know that you need to -- If they want to take that out, fine, but it will be up to the states to enforce what goes on in their waters, and in such a way that they don't prohibit the execution of a legal federal fishery, and so there is a license requirement in South Carolina, but there is not a permit requirement for it.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Jessica, would Mel's explanation of how it would become sort of the state's issue apply to Florida?

MS. MCCAWLEY: No, not exactly, because there is a federal fishery management plan for lobster, and they are adopting those state endorsements in federal waters and requiring those in federal waters, and I cannot accept this new language, because it would be excluding lobster fishermen, and that suggestion by Mel doesn't work, because the lobster FMP is requiring these state licenses in federal waters.

MS. BECKWITH: So do we need to make that language more specific to that particular instance, or what would you like to see happen?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know. I'm not an attorney.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. John, any thoughts on this problem?

MR. HADLEY: I think that we could -- The IPT could discuss this, and, if spiny lobster traps are the main concern, you could specify language in there, particularly because it's kind of a state and federally-managed species. If that's the sole concern, I think that that language could probably be built into Alternative 2, as direction to staff.

As far as -- I think that goes -- That's a very specific fix that I think would address that issue. It doesn't address some of the other issues that have come up in the committee's past discussion, where, if there is some -- I will call it a slightly obscure gear, like an octopus pot or something like that, that wouldn't fall under -- That wouldn't necessarily be a fix for that gear, but I think you can make specific -- If you want to make specific exceptions for special circumstances, such as spiny lobster, we could build that into this alternative. It's just I think, when it's kind of a wide approach to necessary state, that's where it becomes a little bit challenging, and not that it can't be overcome, but it becomes challenging, largely due to the large range that the Dolphin Wahoo FMP covers.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I will let Shep speak, but it sounds like we can maybe fix Jessica's concern with some specific language at some future point. If we're fixing 95 percent of the problem, and there's still 5 percent out there that comes to our attention later on, I think that can be dealt with at a future point. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to say, to Jessica, we weren't thinking spiny lobster when we did this, and I don't recall any discussion of that, and so sorry, and that is a special circumstance, and it is -- As I recall, we incorporate your requirements by reference in the CFR, which could easily be viewed as maybe satisfying the requirement here, or the thinking here, behind that being a federal commercial permit, but, regardless, we could tweak the language to account for it. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so it sounds like we probably don't need to do anything on this action and maybe reconsider some language in December.

MR. HADLEY: We can take that as direction to staff and come back to you with those changes. One point is, if the committee is comfortable with Alternative 3, and we can take that as direction to staff, since we're going to be kind of overhauling this all at one time in December, but is that something that the committee is comfortable with, as far as splitting off wahoo into its own alternative, and, also, that would just be maintained at that 500-pound limit.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I thought that was an improvement to the understanding, the ease of understanding, and is there anyone else that has any other concerns about Alternative 3? Okay. It looks good.

MR. HADLEY: Okay. With that, we'll come back with revisions in December. Action 12, this action removes the requirement of vessel operators or crew to hold an operator card in the dolphin wahoo fishery. Currently, both for-hire and commercial participants in the dolphin wahoo fishery -- The permit is not valid unless the vessel operator or crew member holds a valid operator card issued by either the Southeast Regional Office or by the Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office.

Alternative 2 would remove that requirement for the for-hire sector, and Alternative 3 would remove the vessel operator card requirement for the commercial sector of the dolphin wahoo fishery, and this has been discussed, and I know we've discussed this quite a bit, but just a reminder that this is still in the amendment, and it's a fairly simple action, but it is noted that, at least in the South Atlantic region, operator cards are only required in the dolphin wahoo fishery and the rock shrimp fishery.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and, while I have very little desire to rehash the discussions we've had on this action, since we do have some new folks that have joined us that were not around when we first had these discussions, if there is anybody on the council that would like to touch base with me about the history of this action, please do so, and I'm happy to go back through it with you, and I would like to not sort of hit a wall when we're moving this forward a few months down the line, because people are unclear where the background of this particular action came from, and so I'm happy to go through it with folks one-on-one.

MR. HADLEY: I am not seeing any hands go up, and so I'll move on to Action 13. Action 13 would reduce the recreational vessel limit for dolphin. Currently, there is a daily bag limit of ten fish per person, not to exceed sixty fish per vessel for dolphin, whichever is less, with the exception of onboard headboats, where the limit is ten dolphin per paying passenger.

Alternative 2 would maintain the daily bag limit of ten dolphin per person. However, we would reduce the vessel limit, not to exceed a range between forty and fifty-four, looking at Sub-Alternatives 2a through 2d. Alternative 3 would implement this vessel limit reduction, but it would be -- It would only apply in Florida. It would apply in Florida only, but the alternatives are the same, where the vessel limit would range between forty and fifty-four, depending on the sub-alternative chosen through 3a through 3d.

We discussed this a little bit earlier, and it came up in previous discussions, but, if you look at the analysis that was done, the bag limit analysis, the majority of vessels are harvesting oftentimes less than forty, and many times less than ten dolphin per trip, overall, and, if you look at Florida, and this is the case for -- If you isolate just the east coast of Florida, that's the case for the east coast of Florida, and, also, less so, but a little bit, and you see a few more vessels in the ten to forty range there, but you see very few vessels above the forty range, if you look at just the recreational landings from Maine to Georgia. Really, nothing is required here, but I think Chester brought up a comment earlier that he may want to discuss this, and we're looking for guidance on this action.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester did bring up the idea that this action may be well served even potentially in the same amendment where regional management is discussed, because Dewey also mentioned earlier that it might make sense to treat the recreational fishers independent from the charter fishermen when considering vessel limits and bag limits, and so, if there is interest in maintaining this action in this amendment, I am happy to discuss it. If there's some interest in pushing this action into the next amendment that would consider regional management, that might be appropriate as well, and so I'm open to that. Chester.

MR. BREWER: I don't think that I was advocating for pushing this into the potential amendment dealing with regional management, but I was talking about the amendment that we've already been talking about that deals with longlining in the dolphin fishery, and so my thought is that we would take Action 13 and put it together with the issue on longlines and form one amendment, and then I don't know -- John Carmichael, you can help me with this, but, when we did what is the current commercial dolphin limitation, which is where had the step-down at 75 percent, did we do that as a full-blown amendment, or did we do that by way of a framework?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am not sure offhand. John Hadley may have that a little closer.

MR. HADLEY: I see Brian Chevront with his hand up, and he was the staff lead on that.

MS. BECKWITH: Brian, go ahead.

DR. CHEVRONT: That was a regular plan amendment.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Thank you. I was hoping that maybe we could do that by way of a framework, but, if we can't, I still think -- It's still my thought that we ought to do the reduction on the recreational limits and the longline issue in the same amendment. That way, you are talking about both user groups potentially giving up something, and it might be more palatable, and, with that, I will mute myself.

MS. BECKWITH: Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Alternative 1, no action, I would advocate staying with that at this point. One point to speak to is an issue that Dewey raised. We talked about, in the Mid-Atlantic -- When we talk about for-hire vessels, we talk about inspected and uninspected vessels, and the term that you have in Alternative 1 is a headboat, and my assumption is that the term "headboat" refers to an inspected vessel, which is a vessel carrying seven or more passengers for-hire. If there is room for an editorial change, I would say except onboard an inspected vessel, U.S. Coast inspected vessel, or a t-boat, whatever you want to say, but, other than that, I would leave it as no action at this point. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Art.

MR. SAPP: Not fully understanding what all is being said, and I kind of think I do now a little bit, but there's just way too much public attention and support for this right now to make it go away at all, and I understand maybe linking it over with -- I kind of like the idea of linking it over with the other amendment with the longline deal, but I certainly don't want to see it go anywhere.



MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say, when we started out with Action 1, remember I think we picked, as the preferred alternative, one where ACL equals ABC, and so we're maxing out there, and we had discussed perhaps providing some additional room when we got to this point, and I think, from what Art just said, there is an awful lot of -- I am hearing attention and concern about things right now, and you can certainly bring this up later in another amendment, but I think we're hearing some concerns now, and we didn't provide -- In the preferred alternative in Action 1, we didn't give ourselves any buffer in there, and so I think we were thinking maybe that we would pick up -- Potentially, we could pick up a little buffer this way by potentially reducing the bag in some way, or vessel limit, and so just recall that discussion from Action 1, and I would echo Art's point about we are hearing a lot right now, and there seems to be kind of an immediate call for action to some of this.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. I would just like a little bit of clarity in the things that would be added in another amendment particular to the dolphin longline issue, and, in particular to this, reducing the vessel thing, and it's not the same. One is to restrict, or possibly restrict, a gear to be used, and this one is to restrict the amount of catch, to possibly restrict the harvest, and, particular to the other one, if it goes ahead, and mahi is being restricted from the pelagic longline gear, I would also question what National Standards of not allowing the commercial entity an opportunity to harvest its gear, and I was wondering if maybe Monica or Shep could answer that, about the National Standards of not giving reasonable allowance for the commercial sector to harvest its quota. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Dewey, I had some similar concerns, and I personally wasn't sure that this made quite sense, and, to one of your questions, the topics that we originally had, the action that we originally had in this amendment, and its alternatives, relating to the council boats, per se, and their ability to utilize pelagic longlines for harvest dolphin was what we were discussing pulling out -- That we pulled out of this amendment and the potential to put that in its own amendment for further discussion. I tend to agree with you, and I'm not sure that gear restrictions versus harvest restrictions would pair well in the same amendment, but that's certainly a discussion for the committee.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I felt like some clarity, because it seems like there's getting a lot of fog on the issue of exactly what was pulled out, and it might mean going back to the minutes of the committee meeting, which I have read in the last three days quite a few times, to make sure my memory was correct and the same as yours, as you stated here. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Dewey. Okay. I'm going to go to Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't want this pulled out, this action pulled out, and put into a longline amendment. We haven't gotten to the Executive Committee yet, to figure out what the priorities are, but that amendment -- We stated that we wanted to look at that longline amendment starting in March, but it's not even on the priority list for March, and so I don't know what's going to happen with that.

As I mentioned earlier, and then Mel reminded folks, to me, this kind of goes hand-in-hand with changes in the ACL, and so I would like to see those stay right here in this particular amendment. Also, as Art mentioned, I feel like there's a lot of support for this right now, but I think it goes hand-in-hand with the ACL action.

MS. BECKWITH: I am going to go to Tim and then Chris and then Chester, and then we're going to keep working on this action. Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. I was going to say the same thing. I think this action belongs in this amendment, and it certainly doesn't seem to belong with the issue of commercial longline, and so I really do think it needs to stay where it is, and, when we get to the longline issue, we get to it, and it should be a separate issue, because that is what everybody was asking for, is just to look at that as a separate issue, and so I really think, like Jessica said, this needs to stay where it is, so we can get it done. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: All right. The path is becoming clear, people. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: What Tim said and Jessica.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester.

MR. BREWER: Dewey, I wanted to correct sort of what I was thinking about, from the standpoint of longlines, and I'm not talking about -- My thoughts anyway are not that we would say that they're not an allowable gear. However, I would like to see a trip limit that comes into place for longlines, or excuse me, but just an across-the-board trip limit for commercial that comes in from the very beginning, because the compromise that we have right now may or may not be effective to constrain the catch if we have another set of years like 2014 and 2015.

I know that -- I tend to be hotheaded, and I did make a motion, which has been moved out, that we disallow longline as a gear, and I have kind of rethought that, and I think the trip limit would probably be better, because then you're not facing, hopefully not facing, the discard issues that you would be facing. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and I want to make sure that we don't kind of go down the rabbit hole of talking about the action that is no longer part of this amendment when discussing the pelagic longline stuff. That has its own place at the moment, and so let's keep it within the navigational beacons. Steve and Dewey.

MR. POLAND: I was just going to say let's keep this in here and keep this moving.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Dewey, last word, and then we're going to keep working.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thanks, Chester, for the clarity. It helps a lot.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Most excellent. Okay. So, we're keeping this action in, and I liked -- If we're going to keep this in, I sort of liked Dewey's and Tony's suggestions that maybe we consider the charter fleet separate from the recreational anglers, and, if that was the case, then maybe North Carolina would not be so hell-bent against a reduction in the vessel limit if the charter

folks could be allowed to maintain the current vessel limit, but, if a vessel limit was -- If a change was acceptable and appropriate for the average recreational fishermen, who are catching the majority of those fish, then that might be something that would be more palatable to North Carolina. I am open to thoughts and discussions and if somebody would like to see that. Otherwise, we can simply move on. Thoughts? Okay. Without any hands, then it looks like we could --

MR. SAPP: Wait. Real quick. Sorry.

MS. BECKWITH: Go ahead, Art.

MR. SAPP: Great. Just there's a bit of precedent already with North Carolina avoiding the minimum size limit, which, to be honest, I am not opposed to across-the-board, because I feel like the release mortality on dolphin is relatively high, on those smaller fish especially, but I am more of what's good for the goose is good for the gander, and I want everybody to be under the same - - Recreational anyway, under the same limitations. I just wanted to say that.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so, if Florida wanted to reconsider their minimum size limit, that would certainly be up to Florida to put forth that motion for an alternative considering that. I'm going to go to Tony, real quick.

MR. SAPP: In response, that was within regard to the limits and everything though. It's not just size limits, but bag limits and everything.

MS. BECKWITH: Art, sorry. For clarification, you're suggesting if North Carolina or our region, and I am just speaking from my own perspective. If there was an interest in considering the charter fleet bag and vessel limit different than the recreational, then I would be interested in exploring that, but, as Chair, I will not put a motion forth, and so it has to be something that the committee in general would be interested in considering, and so I am open to that discussion, but I simply cannot push that forward, and so I'm going to go to Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Just to develop this concept, and just to lay out some definitions, when we did blueline tilefish, which was looking at we had to reduce the take of blueline tilefish, we saw three -- From the recreational fishery, we saw three groups of fishermen. We saw the private boat fishermen, which we ended up instituting a three-fish-per-person possession limit.

Then we saw the uninspected vessels, and we make the distinction in the Mid-Atlantic between uninspected and inspected vessels. The term "uninspected vessel" and "inspected vessel" are terms recognized by the United States Coast Guard. An uninspected vessel is carrying six passengers or less for-hire, and what we did there for blueline tilefish is we instituted a five-fish-per-person possession limit.

Finally, for the inspected vessels, and that's vessels carrying seven or more passengers for-hire that undergo a regular annual Coast Guard safety inspection and hull inspection, the inspected vessels, and those vessels also have certificates of inspection issued by the United States Coast Guard -- For those vessels, we instituted a seven-fish-per-person possession limit.

That is what is currently in place in the Mid-Atlantic for blueline tilefish. Recently, we instituted some possession limits in the bluefish fishery, but, in that case, we only had a distinction between the private vessels and the for-hire vessels. We did not separate the for-hire vessels into inspected and uninspected vessels. For bluefish, we have a three-fish-per-person possession limit for the private recreational vessel, and, for the for-hire vessels, we have a five-fish-per-person possession limit. We do have a history, in the Mid-Atlantic, of making a distinction amongst recreational vessels according to the type of activity, economic activity, they are engaged in, and I would be happy to answer any other questions, but thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks, Tony. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am not a fan of mode splits, and I think that's the term that we're using now to describe what Tony just described himself, and I think it opens up a can of worms and create conflict within the recreational sector, and what may work good in some applications, and I don't mind exploring it, but I am certainly not a fan of it.

MS. BECKWITH: Just speaking as sort of a charter representative from North Carolina, I would say that I could not support a reduction in the vessel or the bag limit, because of its impacts to the charter folks and their ability to use it as a selling point, or, really, the charter guys tend to catch more anyways, but, if it was a discussion of, as you would say, a mode split, I think that the charter guys have a separate set of rules anyway, and they've got their captain licenses, and they're hopefully going to have their electronic logbooks, and there is a certain -- There is something different that they're doing anyways, and so I think, in this one instance, where mahi is such an important cornerstone of the charter fleets, that might be more appropriate than it would be for other species, but, as it stands now with these alternatives, if folks are happy with that, we can move on. Is there anyone else that would like to discuss this? Seeing none, it sounds like we can move on.

MR. HADLEY: All right. With that, we will come to the last action in the amendment, Action 14, and this is an action that would allow filleting of dolphin at-sea onboard charter or headboat vessels in the Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone north of the Virginia/North Carolina border. Currently, dolphin possessed in the Atlantic EEZ must be maintained with head and fins intact, with some exceptions for fish lawfully harvested in the Bahamas. Such fish in the Atlantic EEZ may be eviscerated, gilled, and scaled, but, otherwise, dolphin must be maintained in a whole condition.

Alternative 2 would exempt dolphin from these regulations, from the regulations requiring head and fins to remain intact, and this, again, would only be onboard for-hire vessels in the area north of the North Carolina/Virginia border, and so in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions. In this case, dolphin would be allowed to be filleted under the following requirements. Sub-Alternative 2a is the skin must remain intact on the entire fillet of any dolphin carcass, and Sub-Alternative 2b is two fillets of dolphin, regardless of the size of each fillet, would be equivalent to one dolphin, and that's accounting for bag limit and vessel limit purposes.

As a little bit of background and a refresher, this action was added per guidance received at the June 2019 South Atlantic Council meeting and a response from the Mid-Atlantic Council that this be considered in the -- A request that this be considered in the area north of Cape Hatteras. The

committee stated the action should include the options that skin remains on the entire fillet and that two fillets would be equal to one fish.

A few of the IPT comments are it was noted that the recreational ACL for dolphin is tracked in weight, and so allowing filleting at sea would reduce the size and weight -- Or potentially, I should, say reduce the size and weight measurements from recreational catches in that region, due to fewer measurements being collected dockside. Filleting at-sea is not allowed for many federally-regulated -- Sorry. It is allowed, rather, for many federally-regulated groundfish and flounder species in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions, and it is not allowed for golden tilefish, blue-line tilefish, or several HMS species, such as federally-regulated tunas, sharks, and swordfish.

Really, the IPT will be working on an analysis on the catch composition of dolphin trips based on the vessel trip reports, the VTRs, from for-hire trips in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions, which will be provided at a future meeting. No action is required, and, without further discussion, this action will remain in the amendment, and we'll move forward. With that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Is there anyone that has any thoughts or comments? Seeing none, I believe that was the last action in this amendment.

MS. WIEGAND: It looks like Mel has got his hand up.

MS. BECKWITH: Mel, go ahead.

MR. BELL: Party pooper. I was just going to say, on the record, that I was never a fan of the fillets from the Bahamas, from the law enforcement standpoint, and I am not a fan of this from a law enforcement standpoint, but I know we've had those discussions, and I guess it's just going to be good luck, Coast Guard District 5 and north, to deal with this, but it's not a very pretty picture from an enforceability standpoint, I think, and I know, with the Bahama thing, that FWC took on a lot of the burden there, but, in this case, they're just going to have to deal with it, I guess, and I just wanted to get that on the record.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for that. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, there is that, and I know that NOAA Law Enforcement is opposed to this. The other thing I think you need to worry about is I think it's going to be hard, if you allow this north of North Carolina, I think you're going to have a hard time justifying it anywhere south of there. If you don't need this north of Hatteras, then why do you need it anywhere, and then I think it's going to spill over into other fisheries. Well, if they can do it, why can't we do it, and so I think it's sort of precedent setting, and it opens up the door for all kinds of folks to come in and request the same thing.

MS. BECKWITH: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. If I put on my law enforcement hat, it's fraught with problems, and, if I put on my Georgia blue-water fisherman hat, I am asking why not me? I've got to run sixty or seventy miles to get to dolphin, and so why shouldn't I be given the same consideration?

MS. BECKWITH: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I would just throw out what the IPT mentioned in the document about not being able to take the size and weight measurements on these fish, and, if the species is moving north, so that more and more of these are being caught in this particular area of the Atlantic states region, it seems like that we need this information. Those Bahamian fish don't count against U.S. quotas, and so I am just throwing that out there and just posing some questions here about this data that's going to be lost by allowing this and if we have some type of workaround.

MS. BECKWITH: Jessica, I remember we had a bit of that discussion, and the original request from the Mid-Atlantic was for recreational and for charter/for-hire folks to have this exemption, and we landed on just having the charter/for-hire, particularly for -- One of the reasons was that, so that the TIP samplers could still pick up recreationally-caught fish for some of that data collection, and only this one sub-section from these headboats and larger boats that are coming in with numerous clients and have tons of fish to clean at the dock, and so some of that could be done while they were transiting. That was my understanding of -- Maybe we're not losing all that data, and we're just losing it from one sector, or one sub-sector.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that reminder. Just to follow-up, I guess I just don't know even just restricting it to charter and headboats -- I don't know how many fish are caught on those trips in this particular area and if it will become more and more over time, and so I just don't know how much data is lost. I appreciate that we have eliminated private vessels from this, but it's hard for me to determine how much we're losing here.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Thank you for making one of the points that I was going to make regarding the fact that we still have intercepts of the private vessels, and the private vessels count for the majority of the mahis that are taken in the Mid-Atlantic and southern New England region, and so you will still have length and weight data from the MRIP survey.

Also, to Jessica's point, we will have accounting of the fish that are being caught, because we have the VTRs, the mandatory VTRs that we're going to have in the Mid-Atlantic and southern New England, and so you will get your numbers of fish caught that way. Finally, to the law enforcement point of view, we're willing to leave the skin on the fillets, but let me just point out that a mahi fillet has a very distinctive appearance, and I am very confident that the law enforcement officials, the NOAA Law Enforcement officials, can easily distinguish between a mahi fillet and a fillet of some other types of fish, and so you can identify the fillets as coming from a mahi.

Finally, the cutting of fish, or filleting of fish, in the Mid-Atlantic is a very common, and in southern New England it's a very common occurrence, because, unlike our cousin states to the south, we do not have fish cleaning services at the dock. All the fish on the for-hire vessels are cleaned by the deckhands as the boat comes back to the dock, and so there are no businesses, no fish cleaning businesses, unlike what exists in Florida and some of our southern states, and so what I'm asking is for us to be able to engage in a practice that we've done for a number of years, and I believe that we can address the concerns that the South Atlantic Council has regarding the allowing of this practice. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Madam Chair. Since it's been a while since we first had any discussion on this, I just wanted to remind the committee why the request from the Mid-Atlantic was from Hatteras north and why we decided on North Carolina/Virginia north, and there were concerns raised by law enforcement out of North Carolina about having to deal with this north and south of Hatteras, and it would have required either a rule change or put us in conflict with some of our state rules that are pretty explicit that you can't land fish mutilated, other than tunas and a few of the HMS species, and so North Carolina requested that the line be moved up to the North Carolina/Virginia line.

Then I also share some concerns about data collection, since we're getting ready to hear from Wes how -- Some information where there might be some shifts in dolphin northward, and typically they're seeing larger fish, and more fish, up in the Mid-Atlantic and New England, and, really, the landings say that as well, and, if we do get down the road of looking at this regional management, and the Mid-Atlantic and New England area is its own region, then I think that really speaks to those data collection concerns. I just wanted to remind the committee on the two points.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks. Mel.

MR. BELL: Just to Tony's point, Tony has got the eye for it, and he can tell. Any of us that are fisheries biologists and worked around these species can kind of tell, but keep in mind that most of the enforcement is going to be by the Coast Guard petty officers that are trained here in Charleston, and they're from Dubuque or Chicago or someplace, and they're not used to -- They don't have the eye for it, and so it's not quite as easy, I think, for everybody as we might think it is. Those of us who have seen them before, yes, but just keep that in mind, and it's going to add some complexity to the training and enforceability.

MS. BECKWITH: Rick.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to put my voice on support for this action and keeping it in the document, and it's a common practice in New England for the for-hire fleet to fillet their fish. With codfish, we're allowed to fillet the fish, but we have to leave a two-inch piece of the skin on the fillet, to differentiate between cod and haddock, which have different possession limits, and it's definitely a business-friendly option for the for-hire fleet, and the same would apply for dolphin, where you can get decent numbers of fish onboard, and the folks don't want to wait around in the parking lot while the crew has to fillet all those fish, and so I would certainly prefer that this stay in. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I doubt this will be the last time we have this discussion. Is there anything further on Amendment 10 at the moment? Seeing none, thank you, John, for the work on that, because this has been a moving target. I wanted to give Cameron an opportunity to give a reminder about the public comment right after we -- I think we're going to have a presentation, and then we're going to go into public comment. Cameron.

MS. RHODES: Thanks, Anna. Hi, everybody. I just wanted to send around a verbal reminder that we ask that you sign up through the Wufoo form that we've been distributing, and it's a chat,

and so, if you can just go ahead and sign up if you plan to give public comment during the public comment session.

We currently have twenty-seven people signed up to give public comment, and so, if you're interested, please be sure to follow suit and sign up there. If you can't seem to find the link, don't hesitate to reach out to one of us on the webinar and send something around and ask a question, and we'll get you squared away and make sure that you have the appropriate link. That's all. Thanks, Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Cameron. Okay. Great. It sounds like next on our agenda is the dolphin tagging research presentation.

MR. HADLEY: All right. If you give me just a second, I just want to make sure that Wes is ready to go. Wes, you're unmuted, and I'm going to transfer control of the presentation over to you.

DR. MERTEN: Thanks, John, for that introduction, and thank you to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council for requesting this presentation today. My name is Wesley Merten, and I'm the Director of the Beyond of our Shores Foundation, as well as the Dolphinfish Research Program, and we're based in Newport, Rhode Island. I've got a lot to present in twenty minutes, and so I'm going to get started right away.

First off, I would just like to acknowledge our sponsors and thank our sponsors, as well as our private donors. Without their support, as well as their participation in the Dolphinfish Research Program, our tagging program and our research on dolphinfish fisheries would not exist.

What is the Dolphinfish Research Program? Well, it's an international citizen science mark-and-recapture program for dolphinfish. It's designed to collect data on movements, life history patterns, and population dynamics of the species, and it actually started in 2002, and now we're in our nineteenth year of research. Three years ago, we formed a 501(c)(3), which we named Beyond our Shores Foundation, to help grow the Dolphinfish Research Program, and the Beyond Our Shores Foundation was principally founded to increase data collection on dolphinfish, working with the public, and to increase the data collected with the Dolphinfish Research Program.

Obviously, the science of the recreational component of the dolphinfish fishery is significant, and so a citizen science approach is one way to institute both opportunistic and structured research initiatives to increase the amount of data collected, working with the public, that can lead to rational management approaches to ensure the long-term conservation of this species.

In the case of dolphinfish, it's really the ideal citizen science species, for several attributes, including its wide distribution, its ease of catch, its low recreational expense to target, its proximity to the coastline in comfortable marine settings, and it's extremely popular. For these reasons, it's the model species, really, to engage the public in collecting biological and fishing activity data, as it relates to the dolphinfish fisheries, but, in doing so, we're also collecting data that transcends different themes in fisheries science and fisheries management.

Every day, we work to grow the program, really following structured research objectives, and so this table shows the original scientific objectives set forth for the program early on, in 2002 through 2005, and, really, these objectives were based on research along the U.S. east coast, topics such as



identify the spring and fall migration routes, document their international range, collect time-sensitive depth and temperature data.

The only thing that really has changed, relative to these objectives, is that we know view them within a regional context, and we're focused on research still along the U.S. east coast, but we're now focusing in on the Mid-Atlantic Bight, the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, as well as the Eastern Pacific Ocean, and the one thing that I want to point out here is just the relative amount of unknowns relative to all these different objectives across regions, showing that there is a lot to be learned still about this species to better understand this resource throughout its range. We're working every day to address these objectives, and, over the last nineteen years, we have learned quite a bit from following this research objective roadmap.

Moving on to tag deployments and movements, as of today, we have 28,212 fish that have been tagged and released throughout the region, and the majority of these fish fall into the eighteen to twenty-inch-fork-length range, but quite a few fish are released from the twenty to twenty-six-inch-fork-length range, and we have a lot of fishing teams that actually implement their own self-imposed minimum sizes, especially in the State of Florida, but also throughout the Caribbean Sea, and some fishing teams tag and release fish up to thirty inches, and they're doing that because they really don't like to fillet the smaller fish.

In terms of movements, we have logged 707 recaptures, and we've deployed forty-four satellite tags on adult male and female dolphinfish throughout the region, and so I created this animation in 2014, and so it lacks the full extent of all of our movements, but it still captures some of the major trends, and so the blue arrows represent the minimum straight line movements between release and pop-up sites for the satellite tags, while the black arrows that fade to gray are the minimum straight line conventional recapture movements. The lines emanating out of the four boxes are the hundreds of different surface drifter tracks that we've analyzed and compared to the dolphinfish movements.

Largely, due to dolphinfish and their propensity to associate with floating objects, whether it be flotsam or sargassum, and so the drifter data, as you know, are collected and provided by NOAA, but they're an excellent data source to compare to archived movements.

Focusing in on the U.S. east coast, we have logged 580 conventional recoveries along the U.S. east coast, and, using those data, we have defined sixteen different buckets, or different movement types, based on those data. For example, interstate movements, and so Florida to Georgia, Florida to South Carolina, Florida to the Mid-Atlantic Bight coastal states, and so, averaging 169 of those different examples between states, we have a movement rate of 35.18 days.

If you just look at Florida to the Mid-Atlantic Bight, it's actually the average is fifty days, and so, in the context of the young-of-the-year fish, this represents only 13 percent of their annual cycle for young-of-the-year fish moving through the U.S. east coast system, assuming that that fish begins its life in the Loop Current and then follows the Gulf Stream north, which is what our data suggests. This also suggests that individual fish likely spend a lot more time outside the U.S. Atlantic coast EEZ, in international waters, than within the U.S. Atlantic coast EEZ.

Looking at South Carolina in-state movements, we have long retention times and slow dispersal speeds, once fish make it to the South Carolina recreational fishing grounds. There's a maximum

time at-large of up to seventy-six days for fish tagged and recaptured in South Carolina. It's likely that the Charleston Bump and the Charleston Gyre, which are major bathymetric and oceanographic features in this region, have a pretty strong influence on immigration and emigration patterns to and from the state.

It definitely merits future investigation, and it merits future data collection, relative to tagging, to kind of compare the position of the Gulf Stream on an annual and interannual basis and how that couples with a teleconnection pattern, such as the North Atlantic oscillation and the influence that the Charleston Gyre could have on good years and bad years of abundance in the State of South Carolina.

Moving to Florida, 69.3 percent of our tag deployments have occurred in Florida waters, showing swift in-state movements and less movements to South Carolina than to North Carolina and the Mid-Atlantic Bight, which may suggest that fish tend to follow kind of that eastern flank of the Gulf Stream more. We also have several movements down to the Lesser and Greater Antilles, on average eight-and-a-half months.

I would also just like to mention here, briefly, that the Miami-based charter boat, the Thomas Flyer, captained by Jimbo and Rick Thomas, is closing in on their 3,000<sup>th</sup> tag deployment, with thirty-one of their fish showing us examples of the timing, arrival, and movement pathways of this species to locations throughout the Western Central Atlantic, and so very impactful work, and there's a lot of amazing boats that participate in the program and make big impacts in this data collection.

Another observation that relates to Florida comes in from anecdotal reports from anglers in Florida regarding a change in the timing of arrival of fish, as well as kind of the peak season, and so this plot just shows tag deployments by year and by month.

When you break down the time series of our tagging data between 2002 and 2010, and so the first ten years, and then the last nine years, 2011 to 2020, April and May constituted a larger proportion of fish being tagged early on in the program, and August and September, nowadays, constitute a much larger percentage, and we've seen increases of 200 percent for both of those months, and this line plot shows -- That gray bar, or that gray line, is kind of showing the increase in August and September over the past. Certainly it's something that merits future investigation, but it does slightly corroborate what anglers are sensing when fishing in south Florida and the Keys.

Moving to satellite tag deployments, folks sitting on the U.S. east coast, and so deployments off of South Carolina show that fish can begin their movement and presence in the Sargasso Sea, considerably south of the Outer Banks, and, for Florida, we have movements showing that fish can enter the Northwest Province Channel in the Bahamas, and also some follow the main Gulf Stream north, but then those deployed off of Canaveral actually show greater variability in their direction, and so they're showing northerly, northwesterly, or easterly trajectories. The maximum depth obtained along the U.S. east coast for these movements is 255 meters.

One thing that I would just like to mention here too is that our maximum monitoring period is 180 days, and we have nine satellite tags with full monitoring periods, and so quite a bit of time series data, and, focusing in that 180-day geolocation track, this is a forty-three-inch bull that was

deployed by Don Hammond off of Charleston, South Carolina in June of 2014. Here, this is a reconstructed geolocation track of the most likely location movements for this bull.

In June and July, it moves east-northeast, following the Gulf Stream in that direction. Then it meandered in July and August, northeast of Bermuda. In September, it moved further out, into the central Atlantic, and it continued to meander there, likely obviously feeding and spawning along the way, and then, in November, the fish swims down to the northern portion of the Mona Passage, where the tag surfaced on December 4 of 2014, and that was just northeast of Punta Cana, and so a remarkable movement of an adult bull in the western central Atlantic, which, when combined with other movement data, suggests a recycling of fish on an annual cycle.

Considering east coast annual revisits, this example are dolphin return migrants tagged in the Keys in June and returning to the Bahamas, or the U.S. east coast, the following year, and so these fish were tagged off of Key West, Cudjoe or Marathon or Islamorada, those locations, and it's indicated here with the triangles. The squares are where the fish were recaptured, and the number within the squares are the month they were captured, and you have days at liberty and then growth as the superscript numbers.

I am just going to look at three examples here, and so the top one -- You have this fish recaptured in May, and it was at-large for 348 days, and it grew twenty-four inches in that timeframe. Then, moving down to just north of the Abaco Islands, you have April, 304 days at-large, thirty inches of growth. Then, down towards Cat Island and Long Island in the Bahamas, you have April, 309 days at-large, and thirty-three inches of growth. We have forty-eight examples of east coast annual revisits, and that's definitely highlighting the conservation benefit of releasing small fish that can come back through the system as larger year-two fish.

Before they come through, they have to make it through the central Atlantic and make it through the tropical Atlantic and the Caribbean Sea, which brings me back to a point that I made earlier regarding how little time we actually think the species spends during an annual cycle within the U.S. Atlantic coastal states and the U.S. Atlantic EEZ. Data suggests that a lot more time is spent in the central Atlantic, the Sargasso Sea, the tropical Atlantic, and the Caribbean Sea.

Fish arrive to the region dispersing from Florida and the South Atlantic Bight and Charleston in 159 to 557 days, and the latter, the 557 days, is the longest time at-large for fish in our program, and so it's likely made two trips, two circuits, around this region, and it's nearly a three-year-old fish at that point.

We published a paper in 2016 that was looking at the movement dynamics of dolphinfish in the northeastern Caribbean Sea, and we provided evidence of seasonal re-entry into domestic and international fisheries, and so we're continuing to build on that work, and really focusing on the Caribbean Basin, and so our dataset on movements towards U.S. Atlantic coastal states is growing. Last month, we had a new connection established from the Caymans to Key Largo.

Then, in 2019, in the spring of 2019, we deployed several satellite tags south of Puerto Rico, off of Cabo Rojo, and we had one forty-three-inch bull carry a tag for fifty-six days, and it moved 920 miles to the northern part of the Columbia/Panama Gyre, and so it's showing kind of a basin-wide movement there, and so we're continuing to compile more examples of the Caribbean movements.

In 2018, we had Julian Brossel tag and release a sixty-centimeter fish that was actually eaten by a bull, and then Edwin Feliz found the tag in the belly of that bull in the Dominican Republic, and so not a traditional recovery, but, nonetheless, still connecting Guadalupe and Dominican Republic fisheries.

Why is all this information important? Well, it's important when we consider the U.S. Atlantic dolphin supply routes, and so U.S. Atlantic supply routes. We have had a recovery from Panama City to the Bahamas, and we have several examples of movements from the Antilles Current to the U.S. east coast and central Bahamas to the U.S. east coast. We're continuing to get movement data from the Anegada Passage towards the D.R. and then the Lesser Antilles towards the D.R.

We have quite a few examples of movement from the North Drop, USVI's North Coast of Puerto, towards Puerto Plata in Cuba and Old Bahamas Channel, and then we're continuing to deploy satellite tags south of Puerto Rico, to get these westerly Caribbean basin movements.

Then Guy Harvey tagged a fish, and it was only one of forty that he has actually tagged for us, and so it shows that you don't have to tag a lot of fish to make an impact on the science that we're trying to do, but his fish was recaptured in August in Key Largo, and so it's the first connection showing that trajectory that fish can take in through the Loop Current.

The important thing to consider here though are the pathways and the speeds the fish take and how this could potentially relate to fishing mortality as they move through the region, because these fish are passing through national jurisdictions, which definitely begs the question of which nations are landing dolphinfish, and in what quantity, and that's actually a very hard question to answer in our region.

Robin Mahone published a paper in 1999 on data collected through 1995, and that examined eight nations that have consistently reported dolphin landings to the FAO since 1950, and so an ongoing body of our work is to update Mahone's analysis, and so here is Mahone's figure, and we extended out the time series twenty-three years for these nations, and you can see that, for some of the countries, their dolphinfish fishery has expanded, and others have contracted, but these commercial fisheries seldom exceed 3,000 metric tons annually in directed commercial catch, but there are now a lot more nations reporting landings, and so this re-analysis is showing an increase in dolphinfish reported annual landings through the years, with 6,000 metric tons annually being kind of the standard.

In discussions coming out of ICCAT a couple of weeks ago, I heard that 7,000 metric tons is also where they seem to be, but we still lack landings data from sixteen nations, and so those are the nations highlighted here in black, that are not reporting dolphinfish directed catch to FAO, and so there's a lot of uncertainty about how much directed dolphinfish longline catch is really occurring, and so that level of uncertainty really begs the question of how low is this value of 6,000 or 7,000 metric tons annually.

Then, also, you couple that with the unknown level of misreporting for nations that do report landings, and then, also, the unknown level of dolphin bycatch in major international fisheries, where it's an indirectly-harvested species.

Lynch et al. actually published a paper in 2018, and they did an analysis of the U.S. Atlantic longline fleet, and they found that swordfish and yellowfin tuna and dolphinfish are the three most encountered species in that fishery, and the black arrow here indicates dolphinfish, which is actually encountered higher than bigeye tuna.

Given the findings of this study, dolphinfish bycatch among the longline operations, under vessels of different flagged states, could be high. Whatever the level may be, one question that came up, as I prepared for this talk, is where is longlining the most prevalent throughout the western central Atlantic and Caribbean Sea, and so that question set off the following analysis.

Again, revisiting Mahone's work, these countries have the longest and most consistent record of annual longline effort that resulted in landings in the WECAFC region, and so Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission region, and this ICCAT data, and so the upper column chart for effort is in the Atlantic east of national EEZs, and the lower column chart is effort within national EEZs.

When we revisit this analysis, and we extend out the time series to a sixty-two-year time series, you see that longline effort has indeed increased for these nations, but, again, you don't see that magnitude of increase until you incorporate the nations that are now reporting, and that takes basically the chart off the Y-axis. Then, when you adjust the Y-axis, you see that nearly three-times the number of hooks are now being set nowadays than when Mahone did his analysis back in the mid-1990s, and that's both in the Atlantic east of the national EEZs, but also within national EEZs. One thing that is the same with Mahone's analysis is that effort is lower in EEZs, but it's just higher nowadays.

Then another question came of where is this effort aggregated, and so the aggregate of this effort is west and south of Bermuda, which are among the main hotspots for outside national EEZs, but, within national EEZs, effort is highest off of Venezuela, and it's similar up the Lesser Antilles, and then it's high south of Cuba and around the Loop Current, and then these red ovals indicate the activity over the last three years, and then this box kind of zeroes in on an earlier mention about the Atlantic dolphin supply route, and so you see two large ovals on two of the major supply routes to the U.S. Atlantic coastal states, being the Antilles Current and the Loop Current both having a high amount of longlining in that area. Obviously, those boats are probably targeting other species, but we don't know the level of bycatch associated with that effort, or at least I haven't been able to hunt that down.

Remember that we have 6,000 metric tons is the maximum commercial catch, and we have an unknown level of bycatch associated with international fisheries and the longline effort throughout this region, and then Freire et al. did an analysis, and they published a paper this year, on estimating global catches in marine recreational fisheries, and so, since the mid-1990s, they have noted an increase in the global recreational take and landings of dolphinfish.

This set off an analysis of looking at the U.S. record from NOAA, and this dates back to 1981, and this is just U.S. recreational. The black columns are the Florida recreational take, and then you have the Gulf, Hawaii, and Mid-Atlantic, and that's the other colors and patterns. The point here that I want to make though is that, the last three years, the U.S. recreational Florida take has been lower than almost the majority of this time series, and only 2010, 2003, and then 1988 were lower,

but, on average, U.S. recreational take is 8,200 metric tons, versus, over the same time series, commercial take is fifty-two metric tons.

I presented a lot of information here in a short amount of time about movement patterns and commercial take, and so some of the issues that we see facing the western central Atlantic dolphin stock are certainly changing movement patterns, and so shortened seasons have been noted by anglers, size frequency changes, range expansion, and we have had commercial longliners off of Nova Scotia report dolphin being caught up there.

The magnitude of unknowns relative to the movement ecology in and from the Gulf of Mexico, the Mid-Atlantic Bight, and the Caribbean Sea, and so we still don't have a solid understanding about the movement, ecology, and life history in these regions. No population reference points have been established in our region, and so that, obviously, would help, so we could get a status on the population.

Sixteen nations in the western central Atlantic are not reporting dolphin commercial landings to the FAO, and they may be reporting it to another source, but, at the least, that should be the baseline approach for those nations. There is an unknown level of misreporting and underreporting for nations that do submit commercial landings. Quality data on recreational fisheries, yet an increase in the global recreational dolphin landings, and so I continue to work every day to try to get more information on recreational fishing, as it pertains to dolphinfish.

Then, going down this list, indirect harvest in purse seine and longline fisheries, lack of data on and at FADs in the Caribbean Sea, as it pertains to dolphin landings effort. There is increasing demand in major seafood markets and a high discard mortality, as noted by Rudershausen et al., which is extremely important, because there's a lack of use of circle hooks by recreational anglers, and so we have an educational campaign to try to push that.

All of our tagging kits include circle hooks, and Don Hammond did do that in the early years of the program, but we're bringing it back. We really need to push the use of recreational anglers to use circle hooks and to change their drop-back methods, and so try to focus on the morality of catching the fish, rather than just trying to hook it up with a j-hook quick and kill it and get it on the boat, but make it more of kind of a skill, I guess.

Inconsistent regulations on the same stock, despite transient evidence, and so we see the transient evidence, but we have inconsistent regulations on the WAC stock, and then underappreciation of multinational distribution, which fragments data collection and management, and so the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, hands down, is doing the most, in terms of management for this species in our region, and I would hope that the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council interacts with the Caribbean Fishery Management Council to hear about their island-based fishery management plan that they are creating and try to -- I wouldn't say influence, but play a role in trying to get a more regional approach to some sort of conservation and management for the species.

Then, lastly, there is a perception of this species being resistant to overfishing, and there is no shellfish, and there is no fish, species that is completely resistant to overexploitation, or overfishing, and so a lot of doom and gloom here, but, alternatively, we compiled this list because we care about the future of this fishery and this resource, and we intend to continue to work towards

a sustainable dolphinfish fishery across sectors and throughout our region for years to come, and so that was a lot in a short amount of time, and I will take any questions.

MR. HADLEY: With that, Anna, if it's okay with you, I can see the hands column.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. That would be great, John.

MR. HADLEY: Great. Wes, thank you so much for this presentation. I know that's extremely valuable information, and I should have mentioned it and introduced him originally, but Wes also provided the council with a dolphin seminar, and SSC members and AP members were invited to that, and, really, this is a summary presentation of his findings, but I know it's been very well received, and we certainly appreciate the follow-up presentation at the council meeting. With that, I see Tony's hand up. Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you. I was very disappointed to see that there's a high discard mortality in the recreational fishery. Again, in the Mid-Atlantic, in this emerging mahi fishery that we have, when fishing with bait, we use circle hooks, and I don't understand what the resistance is to using circle hooks in the mahi fishery when fishing with bait. Yes, with lures, we still use j-hooks, but the lures are typically -- They capture the front part of the fish's mouth, but we do use circle hooks, and we find them to be very successful, and so perhaps there might be an opportunity for the South Atlantic Council to do some publication and promote the use of circle hooks in the mahi fishery. Thank you.

DR. MERTEN: Thanks, Tony, for that mention. Paul Rudershausen's work definitely eluded to that high discard mortality, and an offshoot of that work is trying to build an educational campaign to get more people to use circle hooks, and catching a lip-hooked dolphinfish is actually really neat, and it's a beautiful thing to see it perfectly lip-hooked, at least to me, rather than using fifty-pound test and a j-hook, and a fish gets gut-hooked, and it's dead upon arrival.

Just, in my history of angling, to me, it's kind of more like flyfishing for dolphin and trying to just lip-hook it perfectly and get that perfect lip-hook and get it on your boat and either harvest it or tag and release it, or release it, if it's undersized, and so I definitely support the council building an educational campaign around that.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Next up, I see Steve Poland's hand is up.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, John, and thanks for this presentation, Wes. I really appreciate the addition of those slides there in the second-half of the talk after your presentation a few weeks ago and some of the questions that you received. I did want to address Dewey, and so I was a co-author on that particular paper, that Rudershausen et al. 2019, and one thing we did look at was kind of location of hooking and how that related to survival of fish, and certainly lip-hooked fish, like Wes said, do have a lot lower rate of discard mortality than those deep-hooking events, and we mostly collected samples from kind of the troll charter fishery in North Carolina, and then we brought in Wes's data, unique disposition data, that he had.

Still the majority of that fishery still trolls dead ballyhoo on j-hooks and that kind of stuff, and it really had a lot more to do with kind of the drop-back and baling activities. If you were fishing j-hooks and doing that, then certainly your incidence of deep-hooking is higher, and so your discard

mortality is higher, and that rate of discard mortality we estimated in that paper is for the entire fishery, and so it takes all the hooks and all the different hooking locations across the entire fishery and gives you a fishery discard mortality.

Then, in the discussion of that paper, we go on to say that, given that, just some kind of conservation-minded changes to fishing practices, like using circle hooks and that kind of stuff, has the high potential to drop that total fishery discard mortality, and I wanted to thank Wes for highlighting that paper.

DR. MERTEN: Thanks, Steve, for chiming in there. I wish I could have put more slides to that study, but, obviously, there are time constraints, but thanks for chiming in there with those additional details, and I definitely agree that drop-back and the baling method that you're referring to could be something that more anglers could gravitate to change to help with conservation of the species.

MR. HADLEY: All right. I am not seeing any other hands up from council members, or committee members, and does anyone else have any questions or comments for Wes? All right. I see that, Art, your hand is up.

MR. SAPP: Not really a question, but I just wanted to say, Wes, excellent job on that presentation, and thank you very much for all the effort. It's greatly appreciated.

DR. MERTEN: Thanks, Art. Thank you very much for that.

MR. HADLEY: I see, Chester, you have your hand up.

MR. BREWER: I do. Wes, thank you for the presentation. It's the second time I've seen it, and this time was better than the last. We are dealing, right now, with a lot of complaints, I guess you would say, from our constituents that the dolphin fishery is in decline and that it's in trouble. I am wondering, since you appear to live dolphin, whether you have heard the same thing and what your thoughts are on what might be causing that situation. Thank you.

DR. MERTEN: Thanks, Chester, for that question. I have been studying this since 2009, and, in the eastern Pacific Ocean, you have fisheries that log 71,000 metric tons annually being caught, the Peruvian and Ecuadorian fisheries, massive fisheries, for dolphinfish over there. With 6,000 metric tons being logged for the FAO for our region, and then, on top of that, the U.S. recreational take being 8,200 metric tons, we're only at 15,000 metric tons being reported within our region, but I will just highlight here that there's such an unknown about misreporting and underreporting and the level of bycatch in Taiwanese longline fleets and other longline fleets in our area, and the Japanese and those other nations.

Also, they likely don't have the same conservation measures, or even police them, like U.S. commercial guys do, and so I would just like to mention that, for us to better understand the status of dolphin in the WCA, we certainly need to have more nations reporting landings and coming to the table to discuss their dolphin fishery or their indirect take of dolphinfish. Until that happens, it's always going to be a question-mark.



Even if a population assessment, or a stock assessment, is done by the U.S., and they pinpoint the U.S. Atlantic EEZ, and maybe the Gulf of Mexico, and maybe the U.S. Caribbean Sea, you're still missing so much of the range of the species over here. We see 2,500 miles out to the Azores that this fish can disperse, and it moves up to 8,000 or 10,000 miles in a year, in an annual circuit, and so the thing between the EPO and the WCA is we have so many more jurisdictions with the national EEZs in our region, and so it adds just this complexity behind this species, which also makes me so intrigued to continue to study and try to push for an international approach to helping this species, because it will impact our society. I hope that gets at your question, but I will just circle back around that, in the EPO, they land 71,000 metric tons on an annual basis, between those large fisheries.

MR. BREWER: It does answer my question, and I just hate to hear how really complicated this situation is, because it apparently is.

MR. HADLEY: All right. I have Dewey up next with your hand up. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I would like to give a plug for circle hooks, and, given Wes's comments about international and ICCAT, if the U.S. fishermen -- If everybody else that imported fish into the U.S. market had to use circle hooks and all the harvesting measures that we have to go by, there would be a lot more fish in the ocean. I, as a U.S. fisherman, don't understand how we're made to use one set of gear to harvest the same highly migratory species that everybody else does, but, yet, they don't have to use that and can ship into our marketplace.

Also, in April of this past year, there was some IUU investigation of a Vanuatu, I believe, vessel that was 270 miles off the coast of Cape Hatteras that had no country of origin since 2016, and so there is other countries out in the high seas that are out there doing harvesting of all kinds of resources that we know nothing about, or no regulations or boarding protocol at ICCAT to board these vessels, and, until there's some teeth that the U.S. puts in in giving our marketplace to other countries, whether it's IUU or accountable fishing, I mean, we're just kind of useless in that aspect, but I appreciate this presentation. I think it's good, and it's something to build upon. Thank you.

DR. MERTEN: Thanks, Dewey, for those comments. It's certainly, obviously, a contentious topic, and obviously it's a passionate topic as well. I don't know if you guys can still see my presentation, but this just brings me back to the slide of the aggregate of effort on a five-by-five grid throughout our region, and this is the WECAFC region used in Mahone's analysis back in 1995, and so, obviously, the red ovals indicate the last three years, and the gray are the aggregate over sixty-two years.

For dolphinfish, it's really that annual effort that is going to affect a year class coming through, because they're so productive, and they're so fast-growing, and so policing that on an international level is outside the scope of what the SAFMC is doing, but, nonetheless, you guys have a very strong voice associated with NOAA Fisheries, and then NOAA Fisheries.

Having worked in the International Affairs Office, I know there's a lot of great people doing amazing work on the international level, and so actually with the E.U. too, and so my hope is that we can make a concerted effort, in the years to come, to have some sort of management in place for dolphin on an international level, because, with the increase in fisheries and the increase in

longlining and the recreational effort, the status of this population is in question, and so I will just leave that mention at that.

MR. HADLEY: All right. I see one more hand up. Kyle.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Great presentation, Wes, and I hadn't seen the whole thing before, and so I appreciate all that. I wanted to mirror some of Dewey's comments that we are, unfortunately, a very small percentage who takes the time and effort and money and everything else to manage the species, and it seems like sometimes we're just managing it for the rest of the world to kill it as it goes by them, I mean, and it's a frustrating situation from our standpoint, because we're trying our best to save a species, where it doesn't sound like a lot of the other countries are onboard, or even worried about it.

You know, we look at -- One of my questions for Wes is, when we look at some of the numbers from the nations of Venezuela and things like that, are their numbers any more accurate than us, or are they just guesswork, or are they more of a charter boat and commercial society than a recreational society? I mean, ours is flip-flopped, I'm sure, from other countries, but how accurate are their numbers, and are we affecting the population that much when other countries are not, are not even working towards it? I have more questions, but I will end it there.

DR. MERTEN: I think the efforts within the U.S. Atlantic coast are making an impact, especially when you consider the east coast annual revisits. Again, this is just some of the examples of fish being released and coming back as year-two fish. We don't know the proportion that go through the system in year-one and then come back in year-two, and that's a pretty difficult question to address, considering you have to have a population estimate of biomass and stuff like that, but, nonetheless, I do think that conservation and management by the council is making an impact, especially with your engagement with other councils, the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Council as well as the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council.

Again, on the international scale, it is tough, because you are right that fisheries are flopped, in terms of the sectors, when you look at Haiti or the Dominican Republic or Venezuela, and so, obviously, their recreational fleets are not nearly the size as the U.S. recreational fleet. There's a lot of artisanal angling down there, and so, in terms of small-scale artisanal effort, there's really little known about how much dolphin is being caught in those fisheries, and so that's another big unknown.

The commercial stuff that I was presenting today is the large-scale longline effort, and so I will just mention that the work that is being done by your council is making an impact, and there are more nations reporting dolphin landings, and there are more nations at the table discussing IUU and discussing those big issues that are affecting ocean health and fish population abundance and size, and so it is making an impact.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Thank you very much. You actually answered my second question, which was are we a nation alone doing this, or are you getting help, or at least interest, from other nations who can affect the total population? I mean, when you look at some of -- You know, we keep thinking, in our minds, and in our recreational fishermen and commercial fishermen, that we're the only ones fishing for these dolphin, but, in truth, when you look at the numbers, we're in the top five, but that's it. We are not number-one on this scale.

DR. MERTEN: I mean, obviously, there are other countries, and the E.U. has a very strong fisheries management scheme, and they do bilateral work with the U.S. There is multilateral work between the U.S. and Chile and Mexico, and, having been in some of those rooms, it is a contentious topic, fisheries.

When it comes to dolphinfish, there is this notion that it's a mid-trophic-level species, and it's likely highly abundant and that, on an annual scale, it's not going to be affected if you hit it too hard, and so you do have those negative kind of perceptions regarding the species, but, as apex predators are dwindling from the ocean, the next in line are the mid-trophic-level species, and so ecosystem-based fisheries management and fishery management on that scale is where a lot of the discussion goes, and so there is big, high-level discussions occurring, trying to take a holistic approach at the management of fisheries, and dolphin are in that, and there is more science being done at universities, and at the federal level.

I think there was just a NOAA biological opinion conducted on dolphin, but I haven't seen the results yet, and so I'm interested to hear from that, but there are people on this council that are extremely knowledgeable about dolphin at the international level, and so I'm hoping to engage with those individuals more as I continue my quest to help with the conservation of this species.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Perfect. Thanks a lot. Thanks for the presentation.

MR. HADLEY: I see no further hands, and I do want to reiterate a big thank you to Wes for being willing to present, and I think this is a tremendous resource for the council and kind of an eye-opener in the greater picture of what's going on with dolphin, and so, Wes, thank you very much. I appreciate it, and I think that may be all of the questions for now, and so thank you.

DR. MERTEN: Thank you so much, John, and thank you to the entire council and everybody for asking those questions. I really enjoyed it.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Okay. We've got public comment beginning at 4:00, and so I did want to go ahead and take a few minutes and acknowledge the public comment that we have been receiving as council members in relation to this meeting.

I encourage any and all public comment, and, as managers, I think it's our job to sort through and help identify what the concerns of the public are and consider those concerns against the data that's sort of available to us and the time that we spend thoughtfully considering these issues, and one of the things that came through loud and clear, in my perspective, was that we did receive quite a bit of recreational comment, and those comments had a primary concern for the health of the dolphinfish fishery, and a lot of the comment was focused on the use of the specific gear type of pelagic longline.

What I wanted to note, for the public listening, is that this council has spent quite a bit of time discussing these issues through the Amendment 10 process, and the issues were complicated enough, and worth the time for discussion, that we did choose to move those actions that were related to anything that would alter the use of pelagic longlines or that gear type into its own amendment to be discussed in the future, but it certainly came through that the public had some concerns and some interest in us acknowledging that.

I want to open it up to the rest of the committee members, if anyone wants to speak specifically to those public comments. Otherwise, I would simply say that we heard you, and we certainly are going to continue discussing dolphinfish management as a whole, and certainly all gear types are considered in our discussions of management, and so I'm going to allow Tim to go first.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. That was a very timely presentation, and I thought it was great, and it actually reinforced a lot of what my suspicions have been all along, and, although I can appreciate the sentiments from a lot of the recreational public, with maybe the perception that longlining in the dolphin fishery is having a detrimental effect, we can clearly see, from this presentation, that 600,000 pounds annually out of the entire South Atlantic from longlines is not the issue here, not at all.

I did hear some public comments that were actually geared specifically to longlining off the coast of North Carolina, landings in North Carolina, and landings in North Carolina this year were 200,000 pounds, 200,000 pounds, only a third of what was landed in the entire South Atlantic, and so, clearly, looking at these numbers, and you're talking about 750 tons of fish, and we're not talking about 75,000 metric tons of fish here, and so clearly the issues that are happening in the dolphin fishery are not related to any kind of detrimental effect that the longline fleet is having on this fishery in the South Atlantic. I just want to -- Although I am very sympathetic to maybe the heartburn of that gear in particular, from a scientific standpoint, that is not the issue with our dolphin fishery, and so, again, I appreciate the presentation, and it couldn't have come at a more timely time. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Tim. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. I've been involved in the dolphin wahoo fishery, in either management or in the fishing of it, since 1997. The recent what I call a hack job article that was put out on August 12 or 14 was written to solicit comments and to appeal to the emotions of the public, to stir public comments, and I think we've all seen that. The administrative record, to date, and also the committee meetings records to date, do not reflect the inaccuracy of what the article was written. It was written to stir public comment.

The fact of the matter is, if it was not for pelagic longline fishing, folks would not get access to the dolphin mahi by harvesting of the quota. Also, understand that, in 2015, the pelagic longline industry caught the majority of the fish, given there was a lot of fish in the water, and the council took the proactive approach to implement a 75 percent step-down, a 4,000-pound trip limit, and allow the public to get access to mahi-mahi through pelagic longlining, and that action has worked, but it really galls me, and this ain't the first time, probably, that somebody would write articles to appeal to emotions to gather public comment. I feel like that somebody owes this council, the staff that has worked very hard, and committee members, an apology, and hopefully that will be forthcoming in the future. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Dewey. Art.

MR. SAPP: I too, obviously, got a lot of those emails, and, if I replied to one, I replied to fifty, or more, and, after replying, a vast majority of them came back explaining that they didn't understand exactly how it went, and a few of them, even after letting them know that the commercial sector

was limited to 10 percent of the ACL, and that, with the new MRIP numbers, that that number was going to be reduced, they felt like, well, I'm not talking about the hook-and-line rod-and-reel fishery of the commercial sector, and they felt like the longline sector was something entirely separate, which, again, trying to explain that to them -- That didn't seem to work, and so hopefully they watched that presentation and they understand better that, to try to villainize our commercial dolphin fishery just isn't fair.

They get such a small piece of the pie that it just -- It seemed rude to try to take it away from them, and it's definitely not fair and equitable, and, with the regulations that they are held to, with the large circle hooks and everything else, and then they've got to try to compete with these imports, it's just impossible, and so hopefully people are getting a little closer on what the reality is in this fishery and will allow these guys to make a living.

With all that said, there is that thing coming up with directed dolphin fishing, longlines or whatever, and them not having to be under the same regulations as the HMS longliners, and I still definitely want to talk a lot about that with this council, but thanks for giving us a minute here, Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: My pleasure. I think the comments are great, and the data and background, again, that's available to us and the education and research that we as council members do is really hard to expect from the average public, and so it is our job to make sure that folks are educated and can look at the big picture and really, more than anything, I think recognize that we are attempting to look at the fishery as a whole and the big picture and make sure that conservation is our primary goal here. Chester.

MR. BREWER: Just a little bit of history, because I know we've got some new folks. When this issue came up, and it would have been probably in late 2015 or early 2016, we didn't know, essentially, who had, all of a sudden, started taking a lot more dolphin, and commercially now, and so we set about trying to find out about it, and I remember, and I think we were at the Hutchinson Island meeting, and I could be wrong on that, but it seems like, to me, that's where it was, and the head of the Bluewater Fishermen's Association, and, just so everybody knows, that the longline trade association.

They were there, and there was a fellow that operated a longline boat, a very nice gentleman, and we point blank asked them, during the meeting, whether it was the tri-pack folks that had caught all these fish or was it somebody else, and they said, no, it was not us. For us, dolphin is a bycatch fishery, and we might, on a trip, bring back 600 pounds, and we haven't changed our methods.

Then they went on specifically, specifically, to state that it was the, quote, council boats that had caught all those fish, and I have been friends with the head of the Bluewater Fishermen's Association for a lot of years, and I took her at her word. A meeting or so ago, John Hadley finally got ahold of the information that we had been trying to get for years, literally years, and, in that, it didn't specify which tri-pack boats were catching the fish, but it showed that, in fact, they had caught in excess of a million pounds and that that was what shut the fishery down in 2015.

This fishery, commercially, is incredibly important, and it's not just -- Well, it's not just important recreationally, but it commercially is very important, and, from the first day that the -- From the

very first of the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan, a requirement was in place of a trip limit of 3,000 pounds.

In the fishery management plan, it was specifically stated that that was being done to prevent a directed longline fishery for dolphin and to, hopefully, prevent it from developing. Now, unfortunately, it is developing, and I think we need to look at that very carefully, because that can turn out to be very unfair to the hook-and-line commercial guys, if that gets cranked up and gets big, and I think we need to nip it before it does.

It has already shut down the entire commercial fishery, from Key West to Maine, for six months in 2015, and that is an economic disaster, particularly for the State of Florida, and so I do think that this warrants looking at, and I hope that we will go forward, as we have said we are going to, with an amendment to look at this issue. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: To be fair, just to note, I mean, the commercial guys did close down in 2015, because they have an in-season closure, versus the recreational did go over their ACL by like ten-million pounds, because we don't have an in-season closure. A couple of other points, just for conversation, is the pelagic longline boats have been reduced by 50 percent since 2009, and about 30 percent since 2015, and so there is a reduction in the amount of active pelagic longline tri-pack-type permits out there. I am going to jump to Chris, Dewey, Art, and Kyle, and I'm going to remind you that we have a hard stop for public comment, and so we need to wrap this up. Chris, go ahead.

MR. CONKLIN: That was probably the year when there was just a ton of fish. I mean, obviously, the recreational and the commercial both did their job and caught a bunch of fish. You guys put us down to 7 percent of the quota now, and you get 93 percent, and now you're going to tell us how to catch them, and it's just like when is this going to stop, and I guess it's worth looking, but, I mean, you can't take an efficient fishery and gear type and demonize it because it delivers a fish to the non-boat-owning public, and that's one of our charges, is to make sure that that gets done and see that it's done in the right way.

I just feel like the public, especially that article that probably triggered a ton of these comments, put out a lot of misnomers and misconceptions to the public, and I'm pretty disturbed by it. You know, the commercial longline fishermen are the most heavily regulated in the world, and we're in a world playing field, and it's just other people aren't following the rules, and we are, and it's just -- I mean, enough is enough.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I would just like to clarify some comments. The meeting minutes that go back when this conversation started in 2015, and I believe it was at the Hilton Head, South Carolina meeting, and Terri Beideman, at that time, was the Executive Director of the Blue Water Fishermen's Association. The Bluewater Fishermen's Association is a representative of a longline fleet, and they do not represent every longline boat. Terri's comments said that vessels catch fish incidentally, and there is a directed fishery, and Jim Butte's comments was that his boats don't participate in a directed fishery, but he knows of them.

In addressing the 2004 management plan, the reason why -- I don't mean to put words in SERO's mouth, or the folks that took away the trip limit, but it was because of the closure, the Florida east coast closure, had already taken away a lot of boats, and they felt like that any evolving amount of

boats would be taken care of with that closure. That is the reason why, if you go to the FMP, and you read in the Federal Register the Discussion 6, it will explain why -- Thank god that National Marine Fisheries did that, took that away, and it allowed the harvest of the commercial quota.

The things that I am addressing is actually from the meeting minutes, as we go forward, and so implore others, when they hear something, if it doesn't seem right, reach out, or, if your memory doesn't seem right, go back to the meeting minutes that we approve after every committee meeting, because the article that was placed out there to gather comments, if you went back and look at the meeting minutes, it is factually inaccurate. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Kyle, and then we're going to get ready for public comment.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Real quick, this is going to go back to more of the world economics scale. Even if we do, and we should, and we do have trip limits now for all the longline boats, but what we have to realize and think about is, on a global scale, we can make all the laws we want, and we can make all the trip limits we want, but all they have to do is go somewhere else to sell their fish, and these boats are made to travel the ocean. They are not coming just from North Carolina or just from Florida.

I usually hit the other side of the Gulf Stream three or four times a year, and it's 140 miles from land, and never once I have been to the other side and not encountered longline boats 150 miles from shore, and it's not like we're policing them, or we're checking them, and we don't have the funds. The DNR can barely put gas in their own tanks the last couple of years, and so it's not a matter of us making the rules or doing trip limits. It's a drop in the bucket, when these guys can come from all over and fish 200 miles off our shore and then go sell their fish wherever they want. We have to realize what we're doing is great if we live in a vacuum, but we don't live in a vacuum.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. That was the last word. We have one more topic on our agenda, but, Madam Chair, I believe we can cover that during Full Council, and so I would suggest us stopping now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great. Thank you, Anna. Let's go ahead and take a ten-minute break, and, when we come back, we will move into public comment. At this point, I think we're going to be doing four minutes per commenter, and so a ten-minute break.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 16, 2020.)

- - -

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
November 3, 2020

## Council Meeting (9/14/20)

### Attendee Report: - 9/17/20)

Report Generated:

09/17/2020 07:34 AM EDT

**Webinar ID**

340-892-107

**Actual Start Date/Time**

09/16/2020 08:25 AM EDT

<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>
00Sanchez	00John
Aukemam	Trip
BLOUGH	HEATHER
BYRD	01JULIA
Bauer	Tracey
Baugess	Kenneth
Beal	00Bob
Beaty	Julia
Beckwith	00Anna
Belcher	00Carolyn
Bell	00Mel
Bellavance	10-Rick
Bianchi	Alan
Bonura	Vincent
Brame	Richen
Brooks	James
Brouwer	01Myra
Brown	Julie
Bubley	Walter
Burgess	Erika
Carmichael	01John
Chaya	01Cindy
Cheshire	Rob
Cheuvront	01Brian
Clarke	Lora
Conklin	00Chris
Copeland	00 Bobby
Corey	Morgan
Covin	Doug
Cox	Derek
Cox	Jack
Craig	Nico
Crimian	Robert
Dalton Harrison	BeBe
Dancy	Kiley
DeLizza	Richard
DeVictor	00Rick



DiLernia	Tony
Dixon	Michael
Dover	Miles
Drimer	Janice
Dunn	Russell
Duval	Michelle
Errigo	01Michael
Evans	Joseph
Finch	Margaret
Fitzpatrick	Eric
Flowers	Jared
Foss	Kristin
Frens	Kathryn
Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
Gentry	Lauren
Glasgow	Dawn
Goldsmith	Willy
Goodhue	David
Greenberg	Zack
Gregory	Randy
Grimes	00 Shepherd
Griner	00Tim
Guyas	Martha
Hadley	01John
Hart	Hannah
Haymans	00 Doug
Helies	02Frank
Hemilright	Dewey
Hiers	Homer
Horton	Chris
Howington	02Kathleen
Hudson	Rusty
Iberle	01Allie
Iverson	Kim
Jobes	Chris
Johnson	Alison
Keener	Paula
Kennedy	Teddy
Kolmos	Kevin
LARKIN	Michael
LaMarre	Brian
Laks	Ira
Laney	Wilson
Long	Stephen
Lundgren	Ian
Lyons Gromen	Pam
Mahoney	Andrew

Marhefka	00Kerry
McCawley	00-Jessica
McGovern	00Jack
Mehta	Nikhil
Merten	Wessley
Mobley	Kit Carson
Morrison	Wendy
Nee	Shannon
Neer	Julie
Nesslage	Genny
Norris	Kathryn
Phillips	Charlie
Pieper	Nicholas
Poland	00Stephen
Porch	00Clay
Price	Patrick
Pugliese	01Roger
Pulver	Jeff
Ralston	Kellie
Records	David
Rehage	Jennifer
Reichert	Marcel
Reynolds	Brian
Reynolds	Jon
Rhodes	01Cameron
Robins	Rick
Salmon	Brandi
Santos	Rolando
Sapp	Art
Schmidtke	01Michael
Scott	Tara
Sedberry	George
Seward	McLean
Sinkus	Wiley
Smart	Tracey
Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Smith	Duane
Sosnow	Greg
Spanik	Kevin
Spurgin	Kali
Stephen	Jessica
Surrency	Ron
Sweetman	CJ
Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Travis	Michael
Vara	Mary
Vrtis	Rick

Walia	Matthew
Whitaker	David
Whitley	Chris
Wiegand	01Christina
Williams	Erik
Willis	Michelle
Wojcik	Arkadiusz
Woodward	00Spud
Zachelmayer	Robert
Zamboni	Katharine
brewer	00chester
brookshire	jordan
christiansen	00kyle
colby	barrett
collier	01chip
cox	Jack
crabtree	00Roy
crosson	scott
moss	david
sandorf	scott
thomas	01suz
walter	john