

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DOLPHIN WAHOO COMMITTEE

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

June 13, 2023

Transcript

Dolphin Wahoo Committee

Kerry Marhefka, Chair
Tom Roller, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Gary Borland
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner

Judy Helme
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Spud Woodward
Dewey Hemilright

Council Staff

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

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

Attendees and Invited Participants

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

Shep Grimes
Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Nikhil Mehta

Observers and Participants

Other observers and participants attached.

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

MS. MARHEFKA: I would like to call to order the meeting of the Dolphin Wahoo Committee. Our first agenda item is Approval of the Minutes. Are there any changes to the minutes from our June 2022 meeting? Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is actually Clay Porch's statement, but, on page 16, he's talking about international management strategy evaluation, but it says "FRMO", and that acronym should be "RFMO", and that is all. Thank you.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thank you. Very thorough. Any other changes to the minutes? All right. Seeing none, the minutes are approved. Moving on to approval of the agenda, does anyone have anything they want to add or change on the agenda? All right. Seeing no changes to the agenda, that is approved.

For this meeting, we have three topics that we're going to be covering, and we're going to be looking at a summary of the MSE, given by Cassidy Peterson, followed by Nik Mehta, who is going to talk to us about what's happening in the Caribbean, and then we will discuss Amendment 3, and, if that goes along, we have some plans for how we can still eat lunch, and so, with that being said, we will hand it over to Cassidy, if you're there, Cassidy.

DR. PETERSON: I am here. Can you hear me?

MS. MARHEFKA: You're a little low for me, and I don't know about everyone else.

DR. PETERSON: I switched microphones, and is this better?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and just speak as loudly as you can, if possible, and I think the issue is not on your end as much as it is on the acoustics of this room.

DR. PETERSON: Okay. I will talk really loud. Thanks for giving me some time today, and I'm talking about the dolphin management strategy evaluation, and, of course, I want to acknowledge the many individuals who worked really hard to put together the stakeholder workshops, the technical modeling team and Wes Merten and all of the stakeholder participants.

Just really briefly, a reminder that this MSE originated with the 2020 dolphin wahoo stakeholder participatory workshops, where we learned that there is some increased user conflicts, and a new management approach might be better to maximize the achievement of stakeholder-defined management objectives and might be more appropriate for the life history strategy of dolphin.

Given the internationally-exploited nature of the fishery, we don't have sufficient data to conduct full stock assessments, and we are limited in our capacity to manage the species, and dolphin are, of course, very -- Their productivity is really variable, and we're currently managing with a static catch limit, and so we're proposing a more adaptive approach, using an empirical or indicator-based management procedure, and to build, or test out, some empirical management procedures, we're embarking on a full stakeholder MSE.

The first step is stakeholder workshops that are designed to introduce MSE and management procedures to stakeholders, to understand conceptual management objectives, understand uncertainties that we should build into the MSE, to make sure that our management procedures are robust to those uncertainties, and to identify some key participants for continued involvement in the process. We started out these workshops in October of 2022, and we just conducted our most recent virtual workshop on May 30.

Some general trends that we got, as far as management objectives, is everyone was really focusing on ensuring continued opportunity to fish and to catch fish and continued access to the fishery, and this included preventing fishery closures, where possible, and, you know, more stringent management measures would be preferable to closure of the fishery. Unsurprisingly, large sizes were preferred, in terms of the quality of the catch, and there was usually a tradeoff in management performance between stability of regulations and overall maximizing catch over time. Generally, the stakeholders preferred stability in regulations, and there were very clear regional and sector differences in fishery goals and dynamics.

As far as what we heard from these meetings, the general regions that tended to be the most similar fell out following this sort of crude graph on the side, and so our regions that we're proposing for the management strategy evaluation are Virginia and north, northern North Carolina, which includes the Outer Banks and Morehead City, southern North Carolina all the way through northern Florida, which we heard was most similar, and then south Florida was certainly distinct from the other regions. Here, I highlighted Wanchese and Islamorada with stars, because these are the two stakeholder workshops where we had some particularly rambunctious participants.

I will very quickly go through some of the regional trends, and I will refer back to these slides, because I won't have time to really go into detail for each of these regions, but just to give an overall feeling from what we heard at each region. Starting at the furthest north region, this is generally an opportunistic bycatch fishery, and they prioritize bringing home meat, but the overall sentiment was that fish aren't really accessible, or dolphin aren't really accessible, to make management changes really impactful in the region, and the feeling was that, overall, dolphin were probably underexploited in this region.

In northern North Carolina, this is a hugely important target fishery for this area, and it's a meat fishery, and the overall sentiment, in regard to preferred management objectives, was to reduce management objectives. Dolphinfish are really fast-growing, and so these stakeholders really felt that the ocean regulates them and that we don't need to be subjecting them to really stringent management recommendations.

In Charleston and Wilmington, there was certainly an observed reduction in accessibility and availability of dolphin for these regions, and so they were much more conservation-minded, in terms of their management objectives, and they were open to reducing trip and bag limits and exploring different trip and bag limits and size limits to something that's going to be viable for the fishery, and so they were really reliant on science to come up with the best management procedures in this region.

South Florida was really distinct, and it's much more about sport, or recreation, and they can go out in an afternoon and readily catch fish for supper, and they have certainly experienced a

reduction in availability of fish in this region, and a huge increase in effort, and so their management objectives were much more conservation oriented, and, overall, they wanted to reduce the commercial longline.

Overall patterns in what we were hearing is, in the north, the stakeholders were much more exploitation-minded, and fishing is much more expensive up north, and they have experienced less clear patterns in availability in abundance, so that they're either stable or increasing, whereas, in the south, particularly where fishing is less expensive, and fish are more easily available, they had noticed a clear decline in availability or local abundance, and they were much more conservation-minded, because they have been seeing those declines in availability.

There is certainly a correlation between how expensive it is to go fishing and the desire to bring home meat, and particularly in Wilmington and the northern Mid-Atlantic, and we heard that fish are really hard to get to, that dolphinfish are really hard to get to, and they're probably underexploited in these regions. Overall, there's been increased recreational effort, and increased costs, to fishing for dolphin, and the areas that -- The areas for which dolphinfish were more of a bycatch species, or opportunistically caught, these stakeholders were more likely to highlight the importance of dolphin as an ecosystem species, because they're catching dolphin when they're fishing for tuna and swordfish, and so they really want to make sure that those dolphin will continue to feed those tuna and swordfish.

Some of the uncertainties that the stakeholders highlighted was, of course, mistrust and uncertainty in our ability to measure recreational catch and the uncertainty related to international exploitation rates, and we heard conflicting, regionally conflicting, reports of the significance of post-release mortality on depredation, and, of course, in areas where the sharks are more prevalent, post-release mortality is much higher.

Dolphin are really difficult to measure onboard, and so, particularly in North Carolina, there might be some challenges with enforcing size limits, and we heard a lot of alternate movement patterns, or hypotheses for alternate movement patterns, and, typically, we think of dolphin as sort of following the Gulf Stream around the Atlantic Basin, but we've heard reports of fish moving onshore and offshore, resident populations higher up north, and we've heard proposition that dolphin might be even swimming southward along the coast, and particularly that Caribbean fish might be skipping over south Florida and moving around up to the Mid-Atlantic.

We heard that availability and catchability is definitely changing over time. Some propose that this could be due to fishing, and some believe it's more related to temperature or a shift in the Gulf Stream or sargassum health and availability. We also, interestingly, heard of some potential anthropogenic impacts in the future that might impact catchability and availability beyond fishing pressure. Up north, lobster pot buoys congregate fish, and, as whale entanglements stimulate those lobster pot fisheries moving towards ropeless technology, that might have a reduction in catchability, or availability, of dolphin in those regions.

On the other hand, areas where there is going to be large offshore windfarms, those windmills are going to be structure that's going to congregate fish, and so there was a hypothesis that windfarms might congregate fish and have an impact on hyperstability, or hyperdepletion, in those regions, but, overall, it was clear that the fishery dynamics were definitely different by area.

Some of the management recommendations that we heard from the stakeholder participants, and this is certainly not a consensus, was to expand the minimum size limit and consider area, sector, or gear-specific management measures, and these are all things that we can directly include in our MSE. Some things that we heard that we maybe don't have the capacity to measure right now is to more purposely collaborate with the other councils, including the Gulf, Caribbean, Mid-Atlantic, and New England Councils, as well as other nations, through ICCAT or WECAFC, and we also heard about regulating importing, to sort of increase demand for locally-caught dolphin, which is something that we could include in the MSE if we had sufficient time.

A few noteworthy take-homes that I flagged was that we did hear that there was a clear link between weather patterns in the South Atlantic and Puerto Rico and the availability of fish in south Florida, and this might be important when we start to think about what indicators are going to be useful to predict abundance in the empirical MP, and we very clearly heard that looser regulations are what sell charter trips, and so, specifically, in the Mid-Atlantic and North Carolina, the stakeholders were really adamant about maintaining high trip limits, because that is what sells charter trips, and so, even if they don't intend to kind of go out and bring home fifty-four dolphin, if those trip limits are reduced, their charter clientele may not be as likely to go out on charter trips, because they feel like they are not going to get as much for their money.

We also heard a lot that sort of management is just taking from the fishermen and not giving them anything back, and so I think, with this analysis, it will certainly be important to clearly demonstrate the carrots that we might be able to give back if we pursue certain management options, and really clearly look at those tradeoffs.

Very briefly, the modeling dynamics will pursue a spatial, seasonal, length-based operating model, and we're going to test out different empirical management procedures, and, right now, we're sort of building and refining the spatiotemporal component of those operating model dynamics, and we're starting to explore indices for their predictive ability.

What this process looks like overall is that we're sort of -- The first round of stakeholder workshops is sort of the starting place, and we're using this information to inform how we build the management strategy evaluation operating models and management procedures, and so now we're sort of shifting to start developing the MSE model, and we'll also use this first round of stakeholder workshops to select a small group of stakeholders who want to continue to be involved in the process who will then iteratively interact with this small group and the council to build and refine the management procedures and analyze results, and hopefully that will lead to the identification of maybe a small group of best-performing management procedures that we can then put forward to the council.

We're hoping to really develop the operating model and management procedure and sort of the MSE, the connected MSE loop, by the end of this calendar year. At the beginning of next year, we're going to start the iterative stakeholder engagement, with the stakeholders and the council, to operationalize management objectives, refine the management procedures, and analyze tradeoffs and performance of the management procedures, and, hopefully by the end of the Calendar Year 2024, we will report out on our results.

This is a slide that is a strawman proposal for sort of the roles that each of the players can have in this MSE process, and I believe that you've seen this before, by John Walter, but, just to reiterate,

the modeling team is really tasked with queuing all of the comments and advice from the stakeholders, the SSC, and the council and quantifying that and constructing that into the operating model's management objectives and management procedures, starting with the operating model, and it's really important that these are defined with stakeholder advisement, to understand the structure and uncertainties that should be built into the model.

Similarly, we're looking for council advice on the operating model as well, and it will be up to the SSC to adopt these operating models and ensure that they are representative of best available science. In building the management objectives, stakeholders and the SSC should advise, in terms of what the management objectives should be, and the stakeholders are tasked with sort of giving us an understanding of the desires for the fishery, and the SSC should advise us on what we're kind of calling the biological must-pays, and this is sort of to ensure that status and performance measures are appropriate and in line with Magnuson-Stevens, and these will be adopted by the council, according to this strawman, and, lastly, management procedures will be built, tested, and refined by the modeling team, with advisement from the stakeholders and the SSC.

Hopefully we will be able to take this MSE modeling exercise, use this to sort of inform some potential alternate management actions that can be put forth to the council, voted on, adopted, and implemented, and I believe that is the last slide. Yes, and so thank you very much, and I will take questions, if we have time.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Cassidy. I really appreciate that and everyone's hard work on those stakeholder meetings. Before we go to questions for Cassidy, I just wanted to remind everyone, or John wanted me to remind everyone, that these stakeholder workshops actually also served as scoping for Reg Amendment 3, and so you may want to keep that in mind as you think about any questions that you may have about items that came out of those workshops, and so, with that said, does anyone have any questions for Cassidy? Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you for the presentation. One of the big concerns, in my area and south, and I live in south Florida, is that there is -- There seems to be a fairly drastic decrease in the size of dolphin that are being caught, and we have postulated, or guessed, I guess you would say, at what the cause of that might be, and I've taken a lot of time to read Wes' work on dolphin, which is excellent, and it looks like the problem, if it in fact it is a problem and not just a perception, is south of Puerto Rico, south of the Caribbean Sea, and it's not within U.S. territorial waters, and the thought is that these fish are being longlined in international waters.

Given their migration patterns, that can be done, and is there anything within this program whereby, and I saw it mentioned, and maybe you could flesh it out a little bit, whereby the different councils, perhaps, or ICCAT, or the State Department can be tasked with or, somehow or another, coerced into discovering exactly what the problem is, and I think that's the first step, is you have to identify the problem.

We had some thoughts as to what it was, and one of the leading contenders has turned out to not be the problem, and so I guess my question, in shorthand, is, within this program, are there vehicles, or are there things being explored, to bring different councils, and perhaps the State Department and ICCAT, into the process? Thank you.

DR. PETERSON: Thanks for that question, and it's a great question, and it's important. Right now, this -- What we're focused on is developing management procedures that can operate just within the scope of U.S. federal fisheries management, and it's less about sort of identifying the causal mechanisms for why the dynamics of the stock are changing, and it's more about developing approaches that will work, even though we don't know exactly what is causing the underlying dynamics to change.

Within our MSE, we're going to build different operating models, which are different hypotheses of the underlying dynamics and states of the stock, and we're going to include dynamics where international exploitation is really driving reduction in availability to areas within the U.S., and we're going to see if we can build a management procedure that will equitably allocate fish among the different sectors and regions within the U.S., even though, sort of externally, abundance might be declining because of outside fishing pressure.

There are some attempts to coordinate -- I am not familiar with what's going on WECAFC, and so I'm not the right person to talk about it, but there are some sort of initial discussions to sort of coordinate those efforts more broadly, but that's sort of external to this process, and this is really just dealing with what we have available to us in the U.S.

MR. BREWER: Thank you very much.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Cassidy. Any other questions for Cassidy? All right, Cassidy. I am seeing none. Thank you for your time, and we really appreciate it. John Walter just stuck up his hand.

DR. WALTER: Thanks. Thank you, Cassidy and the team that's working on this and doing these stakeholder meetings. The slide that Cassidy went over, in terms of the roles and responsibilities for MSE, is something that really we've just started drafting and putting together, because this process really hasn't gone through the council for development of actually binding management advice, and so it's something that I think we're working through, how that's going to happen and what the different roles and responsibilities of the different groups are and the different subsidiary bodies, and so this is, as the image shows, a strawman.

It's sort of our initial view, and what we would like to get is some feedback as to whether this council sees the roles and responsibilities as something that they could support, because it is going to -- I think there's a clear role for the SSC to evaluate the scientific aspects of the MSE, and I think there's a clear role, and our intent is that the council, and this body, will be adopting a management procedure at the end of this, which will be the recipe for developing the catch advice and all of the rest of the management, and so, if it comes to that eventual conclusion, which is what we're recommending that it be, that we're not doing this just for fun, and we're doing this to make it count, that it's going to need to go through that process, and so I just wanted to know if there was any concerns or feedback on that or a desire for further clarification. Thanks.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, John. Kristin.

MS. FOSS: Thanks for your presentation, Cassidy. This may be kind of like a procedural, how this works, and so will you guys develop the management objectives based on the stakeholder

feedback and then come back to the council for us to adopt, or agree to those, and how will that kind of work?

DR. PETERSON: Yes, and I think that's certainly the intention, and so, right now, we have -- What we presented is sort of the conceptual management objectives, and, working with the council and the small stakeholder group that we plan to identify and sort of iterate with, over the next year, we're hoping to sort of operationalize those management objectives, and so, in other words, defining a performance metric, or a statistic, with some hard numbers on it that defines the goals that we want to achieve for the fishery, and so, yes, we're planning to work with the council, where we can to identify those management objectives.

MS. MARHEFKA: I guess that leads me to, real quick, a question, and we already have, obviously, management objectives in the original FMP, and where these fit into that, and these sort of subservient to our original management objectives? Do they overlay them? You know, I'm just trying to figure out how that would work, and, John, maybe that's a question for you, or maybe that's a question for NMFS, and I'm not sure, and then I have Andy.

DR. PETERSON: I mean, I don't know if John has an opinion, or he wants to speak up, but these are intended to be sort of additive to the management objectives that are already outlined in the FMP.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Going back to John's question, you know, I see our role, obviously, not just adopting the management objectives, and we, obviously, help to define those management objectives, right, and be part of this process.

The management procedure, I think in response to you, John, is we kind of view this as like, you know, we're putting this through a SEDAR stock assessment, right, but this is an MSE and not a stock assessment, and we'll be looking toward the end outcome, and there's going to be this iterative process and updates from Cassidy and team throughout the process, but, ultimately, at the end of the day, I think what you're asking for is kind of that buy-in and support, that, you know, whatever comes out of this process will be supported and used by this council, and it, at least in my understanding, won't be as definitive as like a stock assessment outcome, and it will give us some options and information with regard to how to proceed with management.

You know, from my perspective, and not speaking for the full council, I think we can be onboard with that, and we just need to make sure that we're engaged and involved throughout the process, which is, I think, the intent all along.

MS. MARHEFKA: John Walter.

DR. WALTER: Thanks, and I think it's a great question on the operational management objectives and how they would really augment, or be more specific, than -- The conceptual objectives are clearly in the FMP, but then how they are actually quantified, in terms of how we achieve equitable distribution across sectors, how we minimize conflicts, and it doesn't specify how we would minimize conflicts, and we would then -- How you do that is going to need to be spelled out very specifically as part of this process, minimize conflicts by allocating across different states in this

manner, and that would go into the management procedure, which would be the recipe for achieving those conceptual goals.

We're trying to get down to really the brass tacks of how you achieve those conceptual goals by particular tactics, and I think that's what is going to come out, and then we will simulation test different types of management procedures, as to how well they achieve those operational objectives, and I think it's going to be a nice product to be able to say, okay, these different options, similar to the way that there are multiple different options in any kind of rulemaking that the council can choose, and there's the no action alternative, and then there's Action 1, 2, 3, and 4, and each of them are going to have certain pros and cons, and we'll be able to fairly nicely elucidate the pros and cons relative to the stated objectives, and I think that will help to facilitate decision-making. Thanks.

MS. MARHEFKA: That helps me, and I know one of the questions I'm sitting here thinking about, and this may have been answered when we talked about this before, but, as far as our Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel, do they sort of fall under the stakeholder column or the council column, as part of the council process, as far as their input?

DR. WALTER: I think that's probably a question for the council, in terms of where you see their role, because, I mean, this is not set in stone by any means, and I think is where -- Would you want to task your AP to play more of a role and have a formal role here, and I know that the Reef Fish AP, I think, has a fairly in-depth role in the reef fish MSE, and so probably, and I would maybe let Cassidy weigh-in, but I think we probably see that could potentially be that group of the more deep-dive stakeholders, or at least pull from that group to develop that group, and, Cassidy, maybe you've given some thought to that?

DR. PETERSON: You're echoing sort of my thinking. My thinking is that they would be really useful to have as sort of the small group of stakeholders, anyone who had the time and availability to participate, yes.

MS. MARHEFKA: It was a little mumbled, again, and it's not your -- It's not because of you, and I think it's because of us, but I think you said that you thought that it would be helpful to use them as another small group of stakeholders, and is that what I heard, Cassidy?

DR. PETERSON: Yes, and I'm sorry, and I'm echoing John's thoughts. I think it would be useful to have AP members on the small group, if they have the time, yes.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, and, again, it's on our end, and so forgive us. I guess then that leads me to the question of we normally convene our Dolphin Wahoo AP around October, and I had, based on your presentation, that you were looking at fall of 2023 for initial management procedure development, and so I'm wondering, and do we need to sort of think about the timing of the AP on that, because I personally don't know how the committee feels, and I would certainly be interested to hear from everyone else, but I personally feel like it's important that we really utilize our Dolphin Wahoo AP.

I am seeing heads shake around the table, and so then my question is, if they meet in October, how does that fit with the timing of the initial management procedure development that you had for the fall?

DR. PETERSON: We might not have any sort of preliminary analyses to sort of help inform that transition from conceptual to operational management objectives by that time. The small group of stakeholders is sort of a group of volunteers that will meet more frequently than the AP over the course of 2024, and so I think -- I mean, I would be happy to prepare some materials and have a discussion at the AP meeting in October to discuss sort of what we have so far, but I can't promise that we will have a lot of modeling results prepared by that time.

MS. MARHEFKA: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments, whether it's to the general topic of the MSE or questions related to timing? All right. I am not seeing. Thank you, Cassidy. I appreciate it, and thanks for putting up with our sound issues and answering all of our questions.

DR. PETERSON: Thank you so much.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks. I was talking to our chairwoman over here about lunch, and I know we're standing in between everyone's lunch, and so I think she thought the best idea was maybe to break here and come back in an hour-and-a-half, and then we will move on to Nik and talk about the Caribbean and the rest of our committee, and so I don't want to speak on your behalf, and I will hand it over to you.

DR. BELCHER: Just knowing that there's some places close by, but it still takes a little bit of time, if you go offsite, and so we're going to stick with the one-and-a-half hours, and so come back at 1:30, and we'll get started and finish what's left of the agenda with Dolphin Wahoo.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MARHEFKA: Welcome back, everyone. First up this afternoon, and our two other items of business are hearing from Nik about what's happening in the Caribbean, and then we'll get into discussions of sort of timing and how we want to proceed with Dolphin Wahoo Reg Amendment 3, and so I will hand it over to you, Nik, whenever you're ready.

MR. MEHTA: Good afternoon, and thank you, Madam Chair. Dolphin and wahoo are actually new to management in the U.S. Caribbean, and, as of October of last year, dolphin and wahoo were added into three island-based fishery management plans. Before that, there were four species-based fishery management plans, and dolphin and wahoo were not included in any of those FMPs, and so the three island-based fishery management plans are the Puerto Rico FMP, the St. Croix FMP, and the St. Thomas and St. John FMP.

The current regulations for the Puerto Rico FMP, there are ACLs and ACTs and AMs for two sectors in Puerto Rico. The commercial ACL and ACT and the recreational ACL and ACT are as shown, and I'm not going to read all the numbers, but you can feel free to stop me and ask me questions if you wish, and the AMs are actually, like it says before, at the beginning of the fishing year, landings for each stock, stock complex, or indicator stock will be evaluated relative to the ACT for the stock or stock complex.

For the St. Croix FMP, these are the current regulations, and, here, you will see there is no commercial and recreational ACL and ACT separation. For the St. Thomas and St. John FMP, it's similar to the St. Croix FMP, and you have the ACLs here for dolphin and wahoo, and then,

in addition, all these general regulations apply to dolphin and wahoo, for example regulations such as landing the fish intact, seasonal area closures, and these are all the seasonal area closures, where all fishing is prohibited and the respective times of the year, and so, in Puerto Rico, you see those two bullets there, and in St. Croix, and then for St. Thomas and St. John. You probably have seen Fishery Bulletins announcing these closures, as applicable, during the calendar year.

The next steps are the Caribbean Council, as we speak, is working on Amendment 3 to the island-based FMPs, and so, currently, they have a preferred alternative for the minimum size limit of twenty-four inches fork length for dolphin for all sectors and then a preferred alternative for a minimum size limit of forty inches fork length for wahoo for all sectors. They also selected a preferred alternative for the recreational bag limit of dolphin in St. Croix and St. Thomas and St. John, and the ten-per-person-per-day and then thirty-two-per-vessel-per-day.

Then they moved to -- This is back in April, and so very recent, like two months, they added an alternative for a recreational bag limit of wahoo of two-per-person-per-day and ten-per-vessel-per-day. They decided that they did not want to look at commercial trip limits for dolphin and wahoo, and they directed staff to include size and recreational bag limit options for dolphin and wahoo in Puerto Rico, and so, in the near future, the Caribbean Council -- The timeline, as of now, is they will review the amendment at their August 2023 meeting and finalize the selection of preferred alternatives. It is possible that they could take final action at their December 2023 meeting, and so that's all I had.

I want to acknowledge Sarah Stephenson, my colleague at SERO, and she supplied me with all the data and information that went into this presentation. At this point, if you have any questions, I would be happy to take them.

MS. MARHEFKA: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: When I'm looking at this, and it says ten-fish-per-person-per day, and thirty-two-per-vessel-per-day, and so I assume that it's going to be the least, and so, if you only have four people on a trip, they only get -- They're maxed out at thirty-two, and so, if you have five people on the vessel, they don't get to catch fifty fish, and the maximum is the per-vessel-per-day, and is that correct?

MR. MEHTA: It's not implemented yet, and so we don't have the text in the regulations yet, but, yes, they would follow the same kind of protocol that we have for current regulations for bag and vessel limits in our council, and that's what I would imagine. Usually it's the more restrictive, but all of that is yet to be done, because they just selected this, right, and so they would have to finish the amendment, and it goes into rulemaking, and then it goes into codified, and then that's when those details would be online.

MS. MARHEFKA: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I was just curious why they chose thirty-two dolphin per-vessel-per-day, and ten per-person, and I'm just curious what the impetus behind that was.

MR. MEHTA: I really don't know, because I wasn't there, but I could look at the minutes, if you wish, and then get back to you on that, but I would imagine -- So there was a lot of discussion

about what is happening in the South Atlantic, or, for us, it's really the Atlantic, right, and they wanted to see that, and so they saw that we had ten-per-person-per-day, and then what the Caribbean Council did do is that they were proactive, and conservation-minded, and so, for example, with their ACLs, their SSC looked at like the longest term of years, and then they added some scalers, and then they added buffers, because there's no OFL, right, and there's no stock assessment, but they wanted to be very proactive, and they could see that there could be targeting of dolphin happening there, and they see what's happening on the Atlantic coast, and so they wanted to be very proactive, and so I would imagine -- But I'm not party to those discussions, as to like, you know, if they looked at sixty per vessel or what, and so that I don't know, but I do know that what they have so far, and what they're considering in the future, they want to make sure that they are conservation-minded and be proactive about it.

MS. MARHEFKA: It sounds like Andy may -- Andy or Jack, and, Jack, you were pointing to Andy, correct? Okay.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, and so, in response to Tom's question, I don't recall the rationale that the territory decided for the thirty-two fish, but, at least for the council's rationale, it's to align the federal regulations with the territorial regulations that are proposed for dolphin, and so that's where we landed on the ten fish and thirty-two-per-vessel. The twenty-four-inch size limit, that was based on some scientific information and data and studies that are being conducted by Wes Merton in the Caribbean and supported by the science.

MS. MARHEFKA: Any other questions for Nik regarding the Caribbean's plans for dolphin? All right. Seeing none, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

MR. MEHTA: Thank you.

MS. MARHEFKA: Okay. Moving on, our next order of business is to talk about changes to the minimum size limit, recreational retention limit, and for-hire captain and crew limits for dolphin, AKA Dolphin Reg Amendment 3, and I will hand it over to John to lead us through that.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you, and what I'm going to be going over is the attachment, and it's Attachment 3 in the briefing book, if you want to follow along on your own, but, just to kind of orient everyone, and to kind of bring everyone up-to-speed on where this stands, as you recall, Regulatory Amendment 3 was discussed by the committee and the council in late 2021 and early 2022, and you did approve the amendment for scoping at the March meeting. During subsequent discussion in June, you wanted to incorporate the dolphin MSE stakeholder workshops into the scoping process, and so there were workshops that were held, along with the comments that you've received during council meetings, to help -- To come together and incorporate the scoping process.

Of note is, in recent actions related to dolphin, you do have a Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, which went into place of May of 2022, and there are several actions in there, but one of them being a reduction in the vessel limit from sixty to fifty-four fish, and so it is fifty-four fish at the moment on the recreational side, and then, also, there is recent actions that were taken by FWC, and so the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. They enacted state regulations on the Atlantic side in Florida, where there is currently a bag limit, and the bag limit went from ten fish to five fish per person in Atlantic state waters, and there was a reduction in the vessel limit for private vessels, from sixty fish to thirty fish, and clarification that for-hire captain and crew may

not retain dolphin, and so there are no captain and crew bag limits, so to speak, in the state Atlantic waters in Florida.

Those are the two recent sort of regulatory changes that have come about on the Atlantic side, and you just got a briefing on some of the actions that are underway in the Caribbean, or that have been taken or are underway in the Caribbean, and so, with that, what I was going to do was kind of go over the actions that are currently in the amendment, and so just a very brief overview of that, to remind you of the contents of the amendment, and, really, the goal here, at the very end, is to get guidance as far as timing, and so what would you like to do with this amendment? Would you like to keep developing this amendment, as it is currently in the council's workplan, or would you like to sort of hit the pause button and come back to this at a later date, and so that's sort of the final role.

MS. MARHEFKA: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. This is for Jessica, and so the Florida Wildlife Commission's new rules, those are possession in state waters, and so, no matter where you caught the fish, once you get stopped back in state waters, and you get to the dock, those are the rules, correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am double-checking to make sure, but, no, and I think, if you can prove that those fish were harvested in federal waters, that they're not just being enforced at the dock, if that makes sense.

MR. ROLLER: If I recall correctly, we discussed that at-length at a previous meeting last year, and I think we heard from FWC Enforcement on that, regarding your state-water transit rule.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just got a message from staff, and they can transit from federal waters with those fish onboard.

MR. HADLEY: All right, and so just -- I'm going to have a quick overview of, there again, what's in the amendment, just to kind of remind everyone, and then we'll get into the discussion of timing, and you did develop a draft purpose and need statement to extend the applicable -- The purpose of the amendment is to extend the applicable geographic range of the minimum size limit and modify recreational retention limits for dolphin, and the need is to provide increased conservation benefits for the dolphin fishery in the Atlantic region.

Currently, there are four draft actions in the amendment, and so I will briefly go over those. Action 1 would extend the applicable geographic range of the twenty-inch fork length minimum size limit for dolphin. Currently, there's a twenty-inch size limit for commercial and recreationally-caught dolphin in place in the waters off of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina. Action 1 would essentially extend that geographic range potentially up through the State of Maine, and so you have the option to add North Carolina in there, add North Carolina as well as the Mid-Atlantic, and then the whole range, from Florida through Maine, would have -- It would be the area where the twenty-inch minimum size limit for dolphin would be applicable.

Action 2 would modify the daily recreational bag limit for dolphin, and what this really looks at is having potentially a different bag limit based on the mode, or the type of vessel, and so Alternative 2 focuses on a range of two to ten dolphin per vessel, or per person rather, onboard private vessels.

That is a bit of a typo, and that should say “per person”, and I apologize for that, but the bag limit is for dolphin onboard private vessels, and so you would have a range of two to ten dolphin per person on private vessels, a range of two to ten dolphin per person on charter vessels, and a range of two to ten dolphin per person on headboat vessels, and so that’s looking at a change in bag limits based on the type of vessel.

Alternative 3 would focus on moving gear -- Switching gears from the bag limit over to the vessel limit, and Action 3 would look at specifying various different vessel limits onboard, based on the vessel type, and so Alternative 2 looks at potentially changing the vessel limit onboard private vessels, and 3 would be changing the vessel limit onboard charter vessels, and Alternative 4 looks at changing the limit on -- The vessel limit onboard headboat vessels.

Per the previous guidance from the committee, this would also include options that would apply for the entire Atlantic region, and so you would be potentially changing the vessel limit throughout the management range of the FMP, which would be the entire Atlantic east coast, U.S. east coast, or specifically changing the vessel limit off of Florida only, and so those are the two additional options that you wanted to include in there, and last, but not least, is modifying the captain and crew bag limits.

Essentially, a captain and crew bag limit is currently allowable, provided that the vessel limit is not exceeded, and you have two options in there that would eliminate the captain and crew bag limit throughout the entire Atlantic region and then an option that would eliminate captain and crew bag limits off of Florida only, and so that’s sort of a quick overview of the main actions, and so looking at, there again, changing the geographic application of the minimum size limit for dolphin, potentially changing the bag limit for dolphin, depending on the vessel type, potentially changing the vessel limit, depending on the vessel type, and then potentially removing captain and crew bag limits for dolphin.

I’m happy to answer any questions on that, but, really, the question that’s posed to the committee here is what would you like to do with this amendment at this point, and so you’ve sort of specified the range of actions and initial what will become alternatives in the amendment, but how would you like to proceed, from a timing perspective? Would you like to keep moving forward with this, in which case you would see it again in September, on your fairly normal progression of an amendment, development of an amendment, sort of that normal timeline, or do you want to sort of hit the pause button, and, if so, when would you like to see this amendment again and start -- Well, restart developing the amendment, and so that’s sort of the question that’s being asked of the committee.

MS. MARHEFKA: Hands in the air everywhere. I will go in order that I saw them, which was Jessica, Trish, and then Tim.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think, based on the timing of the MSE, and I appreciate that update that you guys got earlier, but, based on the timing of the MSE, I think I would like to continue working on this, because it seems like, by the time we pick this back up again after the MSE, and we’re talking about getting regs in place in 2026, or 2027, and it seems a little far away for me, and I would like to see us continue working on this document.

MS. MARHEFKA: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I appreciate the length of time that it could take to do this, but I'm in favor of moving forward with the MSE and pausing on this, until we do get that information, and I know - I forgot what I was going to say, and never mind, but I would rather do that, and I do appreciate that -- You know, I know Florida is having different issues than the rest of the Atlantic states, more or less, and so I would rather wait on the MSE, and that was the purpose that the MSE was started, was to inform this amendment.

I mean, we could discuss looking at these -- If it's important enough to move forward for Florida, I could see maybe looking at this as addressing Florida's issues, and maybe holding off on the MSE, waiting on the MSE, for the rest of the Atlantic coast, and so trying to kind of find that compromise and address everybody's concerns in each region.

MS. MARHEFKA: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. Given what we heard from the workshop outcome, that, you know, most of these issues were Florida issues, or the big differences in the problems that they were having in Florida, or the issues they were bringing up in Florida, and given that Florida has addressed those issues now, I think I agree with Trish, and I would like to see what outcomes we have with this MSE before, you know, we keep spending time on something that doesn't -- That may not really be necessary to begin with. Thank you.

MS. MARHEFKA: I have Carolyn, Tom, Laurilee, and Jessica.

DR. BELCHER: So this is a question probably for John Hadley, and so, if the final report is likely due in mid to late 2024, why is it mid to late 2026 before the SSC will review it?

MR. HADLEY: With that, I compared the timeline from the MSE presentation, and then, also, I was looking at the SEDAR schedule, and so I think that, once you have the completion of the report, it's going to take some time to run through the typical process, through the essential external review process, and so it's building in that time buffer there. You know, maybe that's a little generous, but that's using those two timelines. There again, likely wrapping up the MSE and the final report in late 2024 and then building in some sort of time buffer for review, and that would likely take several meetings, or several rounds of review, before it's ready to come before the council.

MS. MARHEFKA: Tom and then Laurilee.

MR. ROLLER: So, you know, what I found so interesting about the MSE meetings in North Carolina was the great diversity of opinions even within our own state, between the different regions, the different sectors, and also the different needs of each regional area of the state, right, and so I'm concerned that, if we move forward now with an amendment to address some of the concerns right now, with the MSE process moving forward, we'll be putting ourselves in a position where we'll need to be looking at it again.

I mean, one of the major complaints we're hearing is that we just had the last amendment go into place, and we're working immediately on another amendment. If we move forward now and finish it, we'll probably have to be looking at it a third time, once we get the results of the MSE, and

that's a lot of whiplash for our stakeholders, and so I'm just curious if we're going to get a better result if we wait a little bit longer.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks. Laurilee and then Jessica and then Andy.

MS. THOMPSON: So, if it's going to be mid to late 2026 by the time this gets reviewed by the SSC, and then we start working on the amendment, we're not looking at -- It takes two years to develop the amendment, and we're looking at 2028, and we have a problem in Florida. I mean, you heard it from the fishermen in Key West, and you actually have fishermen coming to the meeting and saying you've got to catch less fish, because we have -- That's a really -- That is probably our most important fishery, especially in south Florida.

Can we do like an emergency framework amendment to address what's going on in Florida, while we wait to do the regular -- You know, the real amendment, and, you know, another thing is that the FWC has reacted, and they have tried to put some reductions in place, but you can't prove whether you caught the fish in state waters or whether you were out in federal waters, and how can anybody prove where the fish got caught? You could go out into federal waters and catch, you know, fifty-four fish, and cross to state waters and bring them to the dock, and we need to do something now about what's happening in Florida and address, you know, what Florida needs and what Florida's fishermen are asking for. We can't wait until 2028.

MS. MARHEFKA: It seems so far away, but it's going to come fast. Jessica and then Andy and then Chester.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would say that I agree with Laurilee, with one exception, and I don't know only that fixing this in federal waters off of Florida, because of the migratory nature of dolphin, that that's going to fix anything. I would say that the letter that we got from Wes was very telling, and then the fact that the Caribbean is, you know, putting proactive regulations in place, some of which appear to be more stringent than what we put in place, and so I just -- I share the concerns that folks have from Florida, and then I also share the concerns about the timing, and so, yes, in theory, I would love to wait for the MSE, but I agree with Laurilee. If we go by the dates that we have there on the screen, we're talking like maybe 2028, and so I'm a little concerned about that.

MS. MARHEFKA: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am going to agree with those that are speaking in favor of continuing to move forward with this action. I continue to receive a number of phone calls between council meetings, concerns about the abundance and the size of dolphin, and, yes, a lot of those are coming out of Florida, but, in looking at the presentation that we received this morning, I don't think this is just a Florida problem, and it's maybe front and center for Florida fishermen, but it's broader than that.

Yes, we can't control climate, and we can't control migratory patterns of dolphin, but what we can do is be proactive and be thoughtful with regard to management options that we think would benefit this population and stock of fish, and so I think, you know, given what we did in Amendment 10, which, to me, was a very lengthy process, and very dissatisfying, I think, for most involved, and I don't view this as whiplash. I feel like this is continuing to try to hammer out some

tough decisions that we didn't get to in Amendment 10, and then, ultimately, the MSE can come behind this and inform us even further, in terms of next steps.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Andy. Chester, Trish, then Mel.

MR. BREWER: A lot of what has been going on with regard to dolphin, and our actions, and a lot of reactions, is, number one, reports and requests for people who are on the water who are fishing, and the fishermen are saying there's a problem. They're coming to us and saying that, and this is one of the few times, that I can remember, where they have actually -- That that's happened, and usually it's like what the hell are you guys doing taking away this and that and the other thing, and this is we have a problem, and we have a problem.

We need to move forward, really, because the other thing that is involved, besides the reports and requests from the fishermen, is optics. I know that there were requests, certainly from my area, that we go to five fish, and a lot of that was based on optics, and people just felt like, you know what, you don't need more than five fish per person, and that's enough to clean, and that's enough to take home for supper, and you don't need any more than that, and so what are we doing, and we're watching a fishery that seems to be headed towards trouble, and let's cut it to five.

I think that we need to continue to develop, if we can, solutions, so that the people who are our constituents see us responding in some way to their concerns and that we are working on a plan to try to address their concerns. Putting this thing off until -- I may be dead by then. It's just not a good idea, and we need to move forward and not put it off until, what, 2028, or the different numbers that have come around here, and we've heard 2026, 2028, but we need to continue to move forward, and certainly I would support that.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Chester. Trish and then Mel.

MS. MURPHEY: So, you know, the -- As you said, we used this as scoping, and, even within the scoping, you hear that the input has been that it's very regional and different in each region, the north and the south, and it seems mostly southern Florida and Wanchese north, and so it's already pointing out that it's a regional issue. I mean, the Wanchese folks were very upset, and, just to tell you, I was there at the Wanchese meeting, and folks were very upset because they already thought that we were doing a public hearing for an FMP, and that's why it was rambunctious, you know, and they were saying we can't live with a thirty-dolphin vessel limit, and, also, what the MSE pointed out, so far, is, you know, that they need those bag limits, and vessel limits, to sell their trips.

Further north, they say they're underexploited, you know, and so that management is really not needed, and so, again, I kind of come back that I would really like to see the end of the MSE, and I'm not even saying wait until 2026. We could look, you know, when the final report is out, I mean, just based off of what we're hearing now. I mean, I talked to one of the fishermen from Wanchese last week, and they were catching their limits, and I asked them, and I said, have your clients said, if they start dropping the limit, we're not coming back, and they actually said -- He said yes, and, I mean, they came from Virginia, and, you know, again, this fishery up there is more, you know, the meat fishery, and they come down and get it for the winter, you know, get their fifty-four dolphin and take them up and keep them for the winter.

I know it's a different fishery down in Florida, and I totally get that Florida has got a totally different issue. You know, Florida also has an incredible effort, compared to us up north, and, again, I -- If we really feel like we need to move forward to address south Florida's issues, I really think it should be talking about options off of Florida then, and so that's, again, trying to get at that compromise, but I think this MSE is something that I think can be very informative, and it's going to be simple.

The other thing that I wanted to point out, and I had forgotten earlier, was staff workload, and, I mean, they're getting ready to start Spanish mackerel, and they may have another -- They've got the port meetings, and they're going to have black sea bass starting up, and they've got scamp going on, and we have EFH review, and, I mean, they've got a full load, and I know they were in red already on their workplan, and so, you know, just thinking of priorities for this council, and I just kind of wonder if dolphin, with the exception of understanding that Florida -- It is a concern, but I just think we can -- The rest of the Atlantic states I think are good. We've got fifty-four dolphin in place, and so, if there is a need to move forward with Reg 3, I really think that we need to just look at it for Florida, the federal waters off of Florida.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks. I have Mel and then Tom.

MR. BELL: I think what I'm hearing is that folks, maybe primarily to the south -- Obviously, we've been hearing about concerns for a while, and so that's nothing new, and that seems to be ramping up maybe a little bit, but we agreed to follow this MSE process, and then we had agreed to inform the decisions we make in this amendment, when it comes, by the MSE, but now it sounds like we're maybe trying to rush ahead of the MSE.

If the MSE report is not going to be available until 2024, we can't inform any decision with the MSE results, if it sticks to this, until late 2024, and then another option here was, you know, let the SSC take a look at it and wait on them, and, well, that takes you to 2026, and I get that, and that's even longer, but I guess what I am struggling with is, if we're not going to wait on a completed at least MSE report, to inform the decisions we're making, then why are we even doing the MSE, I guess, if we're going to go ahead and rush ahead and make decisions? I am just struggling with that a little bit, because people are thinking that we're going to look at this MSE and we're going to utilize it to make our decisions.

Now, maybe we could time the process such that you're still moving, but you're trying to hit -- You're trying to hit it where the MSE report comes, if that's what we're willing to work with, is the MSE report, and not worry about the SSC, then it lands right at the point where you would be making those sort of final decisions to move an amendment forward, but the MSE has always been critical, I thought, to the decision-making process of what we were going to do, and so that's why I'm just struggling with that a little bit, and, if we're not going to inform our decision, then why are -- Why bother with the MSE, I guess, is where I'm coming from.

Yes, there's obviously regional differences here, drastically, and it's even within the regions, and maybe it's even a smaller part of the fishery in North Carolina that's really focused on the contrast between say the Florida Keys and Wanchese, and that's the extremes, I suppose, but that's just what hits me, is we seem to be ready to jump to there's a crisis, and this is going to fix it, and the MSE -- We're ahead of the MSE, I guess, and it just seems that way to me.

MS. MARHEFKA: I have Tom and then Jessica and then Tim and then Andy.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Chair. I want to go back to Chester's comments about optics, because we discussed that, I want to say, at our June Key West meeting, and that kind of highlights my frustrations with moving forward with this amendment as it stands, because the regulations, as proposed by Florida, if I remember correctly, don't really amount to any sort of biological catch reduction, and they're mostly about optics.

If we were to take those reductions, they will have an inordinate impact on the North Carolina charter fleet, particularly out of the northern Outer Banks, which really also doesn't amount to much of a catch reduction, and so that's the impetus of why we went down the MSE route in the first place, given these great regional differences and the fact that we weren't looking at very much of a catch reduction, because not that many people are keeping fifty-four dolphin as it is, and a lot of people are self-regulating, and so, I mean, I feel like, if we're going to be pursuing this amendment now, we just might need to be just addressing Florida's concerns regarding their state versus federal waters and still letting this play out, because, if we rush forward, I believe we're going to have a lot of really unhappy stakeholders, and we could do a much better job.

MS. MARHEFKA: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I don't know that we all agreed to wait until the end of the MSE. We were going to wait to get an update and then make a decision, like we're doing right now. In my mind, to me, it was a two-part process, where we would look to possibly do something now, while the MSE continued to happen in the background, and then do something else again at the end of the MSE.

I felt like we've had conversations at other meetings, including is there something we could do regionally, et cetera, and we felt like we weren't ready for that until we get more information from the MSE, and so, in my mind, just doing something in federal waters off of Florida, because of the highly-migratory nature of this species, I just don't know that that's really where we need to be at this point, and I thought that we were trying to be proactive here, and so my vote would be to continue moving forward with this document and continue with the MSE, and then, when we get to the end of that, see if there's something unique or different that we could do, whether it's differences regionally, et cetera, when we get to the MSE.

MS. MARHEFKA: I have Tim and then Andy and then Trish.

MR. GRINER: I am struggling with that, and, as Mel said, you know, that was the whole point of going through this MSE, was to get that report and get some information, but it's pretty clear that this is a Florida issue. Even though it's a migratory species, but Florida can fix their problem, and they've already addressed it. If they want to address the transit issues, they can address that as well, but you talk about you want to catch less fish, and that's easy to do. You just catch less fish, but, overall, we've moved this fishery to the new FES standard, and, last year, you caught 40 percent of the new numbers, and so how much less do you want to catch?

It's a pulse fishery for everyone else, and so I don't know -- Other than getting some information from this MSE, I don't know what any of this will have, if we don't give these new FES numbers some time to see what really happens, but, if Florida wants to address what they perceive to be

issues, and I'm not even sure they really are issues, and, when I look at the pictures that are being posted by the charter captains down in the Florida Keys, right now today, and the fish that they're hanging up on their boards, there does not appear to be a problem with dolphin, and so, you know, I don't know what more we can do but let some time go by, and let's get this MSE done and see where this thing shakes out, but, you know, next year could be a banner dolphin year, and we don't know. This year, I'm seeing -- From what I've seen, even in Florida, it's been a pretty darned good dolphin year, and so weather has got -- It's been bad for us, but, up in North Carolina, there's been plenty of dolphin, nice-sized dolphin.

MS. MARHEFKA: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: This is being painted as kind of a Florida issue versus everyone else, and I want to try to steer us a little bit away from that. So the South Atlantic Council -- You're responsible for conservation and management of fisheries in your jurisdiction, but, in this case, it spans, obviously, beyond, obviously, the South Atlantic, and we're also dealing with a species that's caught internationally, right, and so there's lots of added complexities.

I am hearing concerns about kind of moving forward with this, and to have the MSE kind of follow shortly behind this, and I don't think this is a new problem, and I think this is an extension of Amendment 10, and we were hearing complaints and concerns about the health and status of dolphin as we worked through the tail-end of that process, and so, you know, to me, there's an opportunity here to take some proactive steps to address concerns that we're hearing from fishermen that we often don't hear, right, in terms of them coming to us and saying, hey, we need to do more.

I also want to caution against just simply basing our decisions on public comment and social media and other posts. I think it's important that those help inform our decisions, but, at the end of the day, this should be a data-driven process, right, and so, if there aren't problems in North Carolina or Georgia or South Carolina, and there are in Florida, let's let the data show that. Let's let the data show us that there's still large quantities of fish showing up in those areas, and that the fish are larger in those areas, and then we can make a decision, geographically, about how to manage this fishery and what regulations may or may not need to be imposed, but we can't, right out of the gate, be pre-decisional and say we're only going to do this for Florida, because we have a National Standard 4 mandate to ensure fairness and equity across the states.

MS. MARHEFKA: I have Trish, Dewey, and Gary, and then we'll have heard from almost everyone, and Georgia is being a little quiet down there, which is suspicious. No, I'm just kidding, and I am just trying to break up the -- We haven't laughed in a while, and so let's hear from Trish and Dewey and Gary and see if anyone else has a burning point to make, but I suspect we all know that there will probably need to be a motion at some point, and I will be looking for a motion, maybe after we have that discussion, to see where we want to go from there, and so, with that, Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to add to the conversation, just the biology of this species, and, I mean, it may not be fair to say it's an annual crop, but it's something that grows fast, and it's very fecund, and it's migratory. The climate change, and, I mean, you know, you all got the letter from our commission.

One of the things too is it's very vulnerable, and it's got a high potential for impacts from climate change, and that's in that -- Granted, it's still unpublished, but it's the vulnerability analysis, and, I mean, even during the discussion from the Caribbean, there on the Caribbean, they were saying it's possible that they're just not hitting Florida anymore, and I guess they're making the turn early, and so I get what Andy is saying too, that let's look at the science as well, but that's part of the science, is the biology of this fish, and I think, you know, from the input that I've heard from up north, and from our area, I mean they are seeing them further up north, and so I just -- I guess I will just repeat again that I think I am comfortable waiting for the report in 2024, for the MSE, but, if there is a need for Florida to address its federal waters, I'm fine with that, and I will shut up.

MS. MARHEFKA: Dewey and then Gary.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was reading the Beyond Our Shores letter that was sent to the council, and I was curious if Wes is going to do any type of analysis in the Mid-Atlantic, or further up, similar to the recreational effort that he shows on three recreational vessels in the Florida Straits and different things like that, and I take a little exception, which is nothing really, I mean, about his first paragraph.

He's showing a reduction in the commercial landings of pounds, and, in 1997, you had probably over 300 pelagic longline boats, and, in 2021, you had seventy, and so, when we're putting these things together here, we need to show the full spectrum of the participation, and I suspect that, in North Carolina, if you followed some charter boats around, you would see a different picture than some of these analyses that he has there.

There is no doubt, in my opinion, which is very limited, for what it's worth, that the migratory patterns of fish have changed for mahi, and we have seen that particularly in North Carolina, and we've seen that in our commercial fishing, as we're doing other fisheries, but these fish have got tails, and they swim, and things change. I know, for North Carolina, we don't have no more striped bass, and is that because there's no more striped bass or the migratory patterns have changed, and I don't know how we get to that part, but something we've got to have access to, and hopefully one day we'll see, is the SEFHIER reporting.

Even though it could be 37 percent compliance as of December, it gives us an idea of what charter boats are catching in different areas, based on, you know, is everybody catching fifty-four fish, and probably not, and so that's an idea that we're now over two-and-a-half years, or two years into, two-and-a-half years into, that it could give us some valuable data to see exactly what has happened, and so I will stop there. Thank you.

MS. MARHEFKA: I have Gary and then Judy.

MR. BORLAND: I agree with Andy, and, obviously, this has got to be data-driven, but my personal observation is the dolphin are in trouble. We see continued decline in size and catch, and I hear Tim talk about some fish in the Keys on the boards, but, you know, we just had a 210-boat tournament in Palm Beach County, Florida, and it's been going on for twenty years, and the size and amount of dolphin has been declining since it started twenty years ago, and it only took a four-pound fish to get in tenth place, out of 210 boats this year.

I was lucky enough to spend a week in Bahamas, in four different ports traveling back, helping a guy bring a boat back, and I talked to fishermen in the Bahamas, and I talked to some of the marlin-fishing tournament boats in the Bahamas, and, yes, they're catching a few dolphin, but, you know, ten years ago, they couldn't even put out a small lure, because that's all they caught was dolphin, and they're not seeing the dolphin numbers, even in the Bahamas, where there is little to no pressure compared to Florida, and the reports coming in from South Carolina, from fishermen that I know, is that the fishing is tough, and so it's a bigger problem, and I believe we need to move forward with anything that we can do to protect dolphin.

MS. MARHEFKA: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: Okay. We're going to talk about Georgia. We have -- Our dolphin is about seventy to eighty miles offshore, and, as far as what we caught this year, I don't even think we've run to the Gulf Stream this year five times, and that's been because of weather, not being able to get to them, and I used to run 100 trips a year to the Gulf Stream myself, personally, when I was much younger, but so our problem is weather, but, when we do get to go -- Last year, we had a pretty good dolphin year, and I'm not going to say it's like it was twenty years ago or anything like that, but we still do have fish come across the Georgia coast.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Georgia. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Chair. I just want to bring up the climate impact to this species in particular, something we're seeing, right, and, I mean, granted, it's just anecdotal, but I have a lot of friends who are in the charter industry up off of New England, and they are routinely catching thirty or forty-pound fish now, and this is not something that was happening five to ten years ago, and I imagine that that could be displayed in data somehow, but it's also to point out, going back to Dewey's comment, that we're seeing a lot of impacted migrations with fish, right, and, I mean, now I see Spanish mackerel showing up in the end of February and the beginning of March every year, and this was a fish that we would see at Memorial Day, or the beginning of May, and now we see them show up in low-sixty-degree water, which boggles my mind.

You know, if you go to Oregon Inlet, even as well as Spanish are doing now, for some reason, they're catching less of them in the summer and more of them to the north, and so the dynamics of our fisheries have changed completely in the last decade, and I don't think that we can say that that means that all of these stocks are in trouble, and they're just changing, and that's kind of why I was hopeful that we would continue to use this MSE process to drive our decision-making here.

MS. MARHEFKA: All right, and so the way I see it is what we're here to make a decision on is the timing of Reg Amendment 3, and a decision on the timing does not affect what the final outcome is, and there will still be time to sort of take action or not take action, but this committee needs to decide on the timing. I think everyone who has felt passionately about it has had a chance to talk, and so what I would hope is that we could get a motion, because we do need to give John some direction, and we need to come to some sort of thank you -- Tom, if you're ready to make a motion, then that's what we need.

MR. ROLLER: **I move that we delay development of the amendment until the MSE report comes out.**

MS. MARHEFKA: We have a motion by Tom, and it's seconded by Trish, and so we have a motion on the floor. Chester.

MR. BREWER: **The substitute motion is that we forward with Amendment 3 at this time.** That's it.

MS. MARHEFKA: Let's give John a second to get the first motion on there, and then we'll get the substitute motion on there, and then I will remember Roberts Rules of how we proceed.

MR. HADLEY: Tom, really quickly, your motion -- You wanted to delay the development of Regulatory Amendment 3 until the MSE report was available?

MR. ROLLER: **Yes, in 2024, ideally.**

MR. HADLEY: Thank you.

MS. MARHEFKA: Okay. **My Roberts Rules committee, over here to my right, has reminded me that the first thing we're going to do then is vote on the substitute motion on the floor, and then we will figure out whether that becomes the main motion, and so the substitute motion, at this time, is to move forward with Amendment 3 at this time, with review at the September 2023 meeting.**

Just for my sanity, I think we're going to need to -- Do you have to have a second for a substitute? No, there's not. Sorry. You left that out of my brief instructions. It's seconded by Jessica, and so now it's really a substitute motion. Once again, what we've voting on right now is the substitute motion, and that is do we move forward with Amendment 3 at this time, with review at the September 2023 meeting. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Do we have time for discussion, Madam Chair? The first question I've got is, in the decision document, I don't see a timeline for Amendment 3, and so what does continuing moving forward with Amendment 3 actually mean, in terms of potential timeline for implementation of any decisions made pursuant to that amendment?

MS. MARHEFKA: John is pulling that up right now. Give us just one second.

MR. HADLEY: As it's currently budgeted, or scheduled, in the council's workplan, you would be reviewing this -- Assuming that it went from meeting to meeting without any breaks in between, you would be developing this through the end of this year and into the middle part of next year, and so likely looking at a vote for final approval at the June or September meeting in 2024.

MR. WOODWARD: So that would basically mean implementation of whatever was made in 2025, the 2025 fishing year? Can I follow-up a little bit more? I want to borrow something from a former member of this council, and a good friend, Robert Boyles, Jr. Robert always talked about making durable decisions, and I think that's the challenge we've got with this species. Well, with any species we deal with, but particularly with this one, and that's making sure that the decisions that you make are as durable as they can be, given the unpredictable nature of how fish populations respond to management.

I have never been involved in taking an MSE from concept to implementation, to implementation, and so is this kind of new territory for me, but I agree with some of the previous speakers that, you know, we've invested in this to get a big-picture perspective on things, and, if we go forward with this, and make decisions on Amendment 3 that could impact all along the Atlantic coast, are those ultimately going to be the durable decisions that we need to make, and so, with that, I am going to vote against this motion, Madam Chair.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks. Tom, discussion on the substitute motion?

MR. ROLLER: Thank you. I appreciated the update on the timeline, being that we would voting for approval in June of 2024, and probably shortly thereafter, or at the same time, the MSE report will be coming out, and so I feel, and I will go back to my original comments, that we're going to be almost creating some sort of triple jeopardy here, with probably another amendment to address the things that we did in Amendment 3 that are going to make people upset and weren't fully fleshed out, like we were trying to do with the MSE process, and so that's why I will not be supportive of the substitute motion.

MS. MARHEFKA: Would anyone else like to speak on the substitute motion, before we vote? All right. **Not seeing any hands, I will remind you that the substitute motion, at this time, is to move forward with Reg Amendment now, with review at the September 2023 meeting. All in favor, raise your hands, please; all opposed. The substitute motion fails.** All right. **The substitute motion fails.**

If I'm correct, and tell me if I'm wrong, that means we're back to the main motion, which is delay development of Reg Amendment 3 until the dolphin MSE final report is available. That motion has been made and seconded, and is there any discussion on this motion? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Just a clarifying question, and so, by delaying development, I assume what we mean is that Amendment 3 will now become the mechanism for things that come out of the MSE, and so there will be a change in its content, or does it stay in its existing form, and there has to be a whole separate amendment to deal with the MSE recommendations, or results?

MR. HADLEY: Some things can be added to the Regulatory Amendment 3 at this point, and, I mean, it's been scoped, but, as long as it's loosely within that range that you've considered so far, which there is several items within the MSE that fall under some of the items in Regulatory Amendment 3, it could be expanded, or changed, in some way.

I will say that the final report is due in mid to late 2024, and that will just be the sort of output final report for the MSE, and that additional review process would probably need to move forward first, and, you know, think along the lines of a typical stock assessment review, that sort of thing, where you have the SSC review it, and you run through the SEDAR process, as it's currently been budgeted, and so you're probably looking at -- In 2024, I don't know if you will have peer-reviewed items that are reviewing by your advisors, and so you will not have that likely until 2026, and so, to your question, it likely would not necessarily pull in -- Starting in 2024, you're not necessarily pulling in Regulatory Amendment 3. You would probably start a new amendment after you've gone through the peer-reviewed process, and I'm looking over to Chip, and does that sound about right?

DR. COLLIER: (Dr. Collier's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MR. HADLEY: Okay, and so it may be before that, but the being that, at the end of 2024, what you're going to have in front of you is a final report from the MSE, and there will be additional time necessary to go through a peer review, or an external process, for that MSE and the output from that MSE, and so there may be -- There may be a little bit of a six-month, or one-year-ish, buffer between that final report in 2024 and when you have a peer-reviewed document, or product, if you will, and so there's a little bit of a gray area in the timeline there, as far as taking it at the end of 2024 and just moving forward with Regulatory Amendment 3.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, and, again, acknowledging my lack of experience with the MSE process, and so, if there are outputs from the MSE that are directly relevant to the content of Amendment 3, that could inform us about the risk versus benefits and so forth of certain things, and we can't accept the results of the MSE until they have been vetted through the SSC and others? I mean, that's what I am trying to understand, is are there parts and pieces that have to be identified as the best scientific information available, before we can accept and act on them, or is there things that the MSE would produce and would inform us and then we could use that as the basis for making our decisions?

MR. CARMICHAEL: The simple answer is you have to go by the fishing level recommendations of your SSC, and so perhaps they can use the MSE to modify fishing level recommendations, at which time, you know, you would be acting to implement them, and, you know, you kind of don't -- We don't know what's going to come out of the MSE, and so a bit of a positive spin on this, and at least you're saying like, once we get the final report, knowing it's not peer-reviewed, and hopefully you then have some idea of what's coming out of the MSE and whether or not it is going to be able to inform catch levels, and potentially change things, and you could start thinking about how you respond while it goes through the peer review, which Chip mentioned could be a desk review or something at that time, and it may not take, you know, the same time as a regular full SEDAR review.

The motion does give you some flexibility there, and I think you just have to wait and see what comes out of the MSE, and, you know, maybe you get -- It supports revised catch levels, which your SSC gives you, and maybe it comes up with some other way of developing catch recommendations, and maybe adaptive management and how you respond to whatever is used to measure the population that might take, you know, a full amendment, and you could possibly take a regulatory framework to deal with some immediate catch levels and a longer amendment to implement what would be, for us, kind of a novel approach to managing a fishery, tying it to like an MSE and a management procedure and stuff, and so I think there's a lot of unknowns until we see the MSE forward, and it would probably --

You know, we'll probably regret it if we try to lock ourselves in too much at this time, or try to presume just what all is coming out of it, but, as I said in the start, you know, it's really going to come down to how does the SSC respond, and what do they give you, in terms of fishing level recommendations.

MS. MARHEFKA: All right. I have Mel and then Trish.

MR. BELL: That's what I was struggling with, because the way it was presented here was we had sort of two options, postpone until 2024 or postpone until 2026, and that was whether or not you

had the SSC review, but it sounds like, the way you just explained that, and the way we set this motion up, is that we're waiting on the report, and the report is going to be mid or late 2024, like you said, and so then it sounds like we've got the report, and we could start something.

I mean, we could pick it back up at that point and inform whatever we pull out of it, and, again, I'm totally ignorant of MSEs and how that works, and I really didn't understand it when maybe we're kind of treating it like a stock assessment, where we would normally have the peer review or whatever done by the SSC, but it sounds like, the way we're set up, we could take action, and we could begin this thing up again, as soon as we have that report in our hand, or we have maybe even some concept of what's going to be in the report or something, but the way that's worded is the report is available in some form, and it doesn't say peer review, and so it doesn't have to be until 2026, is what I'm getting at.

MS. MARHEFKA: Trish and then Andy.

MS. MURPHEY: I was with Mel, and what was presented was you had these choices of the final report in 2024 and SEDAR, or SSC, in 2026, but maybe, to help the process along, is there a way that, when the SSC meets each time, they can at least maybe get an update on what's going on with the MSE, and so, that way, they're kind of -- If they see something wacky, they can catch it early, and so is that a possibility?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I mean, yes, to that, Trish, we do try to keep the SSC informed as these things develop, and so you do want to head-off any surprises hitting them, and, you know, presumably, as the model gets more into being developed, there will be opportunities for them to perhaps weigh-in and provide some recommendations and see how it's going, so that it isn't a big surprise and they're not sure how they're going to deal with it. I mean, we've been giving them regular updates along the way, and I anticipate that will continue.

MS. MARHEFKA: Andy and then Chester.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am not a fan of boxing ourselves in, and I think, with this motion, the reference to a final report is giving me pause, and so I would ask for a potential friendly amendment just to strike that, to just say, when the dolphin MSE is available, and we're less definitive of whether we have a report in-hand or we're getting a presentation of outcomes, whether it's going through some process that's informing us, but, ultimately, at the end of the day, I think we will have a decision point before us, at some point down the road, that we're going to need to decide that, okay, do we have enough information to move forward, or do we need to wait until the ink is dried on a final report, or can we go ahead and start considering some sort of regulatory response, and so I would just recommend striking "final report" from the motion.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am just going to pause for a minute here, with the motion maker and the seconder, and what do you think of that recommendation?

MR. ROLLER: Just to be clear, my intent, with this motion, was simply for when the report comes out in 2024, and is that what you're getting at, Andy?

MR. STRELCHECK: What happens if the report is delayed until 2025, or some other timeframe, right, but we're getting information, and we're getting regular presentations, and it's an iterative

process, and we feel like there's enough information now that's come forward, without the report being finalized, that we could actually move forward?

MS. MARHEFKA: All right. Let's hear from Chester, while the motion maker and seconder work that out.

MR. BREWER: Andy actually said what I was going to ask, but I was also concerned, because, when you say "final report", and we hear all the things about the peer review and all of that -- From my memory, you're talking 2028 before that occurs?

MR. HADLEY: No, and I'm going to look down the table towards John here, but I believe that the schedule for the MSE is to have -- It's basically being developed, and being worked on, through the next year or year-and-a-half or so, and then there will be a final report that explains the findings of the MSE, and so that's likely late in 2024, as far as the timeline, and, John, please correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Thank you.

DR. WALTER: Whenever I see the word "final", it always kind of concerns me, because I have written so many final reports that are now the final, final report, or the final, final, final report, that I try to avoid ever using that word on anything, but I think the key thing that I wanted to kind of say is that this is literally going to be an iterative process, and so the -- What Cassidy presented is a report-out on the results, and what that means is that there's going to be initial results, and this council is going to say, okay, that's pretty good, but can you tune this up to get better performance, because a management procedure is really something that you can tune to achieve your objectives, and say, actually, can we try this size limit, and this combination of bag limits, and see how it does.

It's through that iteration that you learn what works and what doesn't work, and, rather than having a final report where we, or whoever is running the MSE, says here's the answer, it needs that necessary back-and-forth, and so what we're hoping is that, in the schedule, there is those opportunities for that back-and-forth.

In the sort of roles and responsibilities that we laid out, we put a specific place for the SSC to make some decisions on some of the biological aspects, and, in particular, it would be good for them to agree that the operating models, which are meant to represent the biology and the fishery, meet their approval, because that's fundamentally a biological decision, and then, second, that the management objectives are indeed ones that this council can adopt as their own, as they have come through the process and the council says, yes, they are the tactical implementation of our overall conceptual objectives.

Having that iterative process is going to be really critical as we get towards the kind of later stages of it, and I think the system is actually set up to allow that, because you see multiple cracks at an amendment, and you say, hey, could you add this to it, or could you test this, and we've really got this tool that allows us to quantitatively do that kind of testing and then bring it back at the next council meeting, potentially having the SSC review in between, to vet and ensure that it meets the biological must-pays that are under there for review. I hope that helped to explain what we see as kind of the final stages being iterative, and, truly, we haven't worked this process through, and so this is going to be a learning experience for us all. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John. Kerry had to excuse herself, and so I'm continuing on the list, and I've got Tom, who is next.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you. I think I'm the Vice Chair, and so I don't know what's going -- Okay, and so I want to go back to Andy's comments regarding a friendly amendment, and I want to say how much I appreciate that clarification, because I do agree that we should not be boxing ourselves in with this motion, right, and that was not my intention with this motion, and my intention was to follow the timeline of the MSE process.

Now, I do understand that we don't know what's going to happen, and it could be delayed, and we don't want to box ourselves into that, and so, as far as this motion goes, I mean, I would be amicable if we changed "final report" to "MSE results", or add "or until the December 2024 meeting", or something in that regard, just so that we are putting it on this motion that we will be picking it up next year and not indefinitely delaying it and boxing ourselves in in that regard, and so I'm just -- I'm curious to hear some thoughts on that.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Tim, but Tim is over there, and so I'm going to jump to Shep and then come back to Tim.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chairman. To that point, I was just going to suggest that why don't you leave it more open-ended? I mean, regardless of what decision you make here today, you could revisit it at the next meeting, right, and so you're not setting anything in stone. The point is, if you don't want to -- You know, if you're deciding today that you're not going to direct staff to continue to move forward on Framework 3, then that's what you're doing, and when you'll pick it back up is something you could decide in the future.

If you want to give general guidance, and, you know, I thought -- I was going to suggest that until you have some feedback from the MSE process, right, and so then, if it's two meetings, if it's three meetings, or the next meeting, you can decide at that point when you want to direct your staff to pick this up or start some new amendment, based on the new information. Thank you.

MR. GRINER: I like the way that Shep put that, and that's kind of what I thought. I mean, John really convinced me, with the way that he phrased that, that, you know, we really do need to wait until we have something out of this process, whether you call it a final report or information or whatever it is, but it is a process, and, if we don't wait for that process to get a little bit further down the road, then we're not using the -- We're not going to use anything from it, and so I think, however we phrase this, we definitely need to wait until we have some kind of information from this MSE process.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am going to let John step into that point, real quick.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I appreciate Shep pointing out that you don't box yourselves in, and you have great flexibility in dealing with this, and, you know, you can revisit this, as he said, and I think there seems to be two sort of camps here. One is we want to get some information from the MSE, and the other is we don't want to go too long, you know, and so I think, Tom, based on what you said, and what Shep said, you know, you could say delay development until the dolphin MSE, just the report, is available, or December of 2024, so that, if the dolphin MSE gets delayed, you at

least look back at this issue formally, and you're declaring that, in December of 2024, you're going to take a look at this thing, and that might help with those who don't want this to go too long, because we don't know how long things are really going to take, as has been stated, and so that might -- You know, perhaps that will give some confidence to those that it won't go too long.

MS. MARHEFKA: All right. Tom, it sounds like you might be coming to a --

MR. ROLLER: I am going to see if I can make an amendment to my motion, and so I would say delay development of the Regulatory Amendment 3 until the dolphin MSE report is available or to the December 2024 council meeting, whichever is earlier.

MS. MARHEFKA: Trish, I'm assuming that you all spoke and that's okay with the seconder?

MS. MURPHEY: Yes.

MS. MARHEFKA: Okay. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I don't know that I really want to -- So where I'm kind of conflicted is because of the science review of this, and I understand the immediacy of it, but hanging this, again, as John was saying, on a report, and, if the report keeps getting punted down the way, we're still trying to go with something that we just can't quite our hands to, and so I'm almost wondering if we shouldn't be looking at this with the idea that we're -- That we revisit this in September or December of this year, and, if things aren't looking like they're moving along quick enough that we can get it into the hands of the SSC for a proper review -- Because I would hate for us to pick a product, and there's things that we like about it, but there's certain things that the SSC is conflicted about, and then we're sponging that back out again.

Maybe the thing to do is to revisit, again, the next meeting, or the meeting after, and see what the progress is coming forward, and, if we're not making the progress we want, then we're going to have to have a decision as to how important it is that we need to get actions moving.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Perhaps you request, you know, an update on this MSE process in December of 2023, and then, you know, as has been said, if you decide, based on progress, that you feel like you can accelerate this, you can revisit this and add it on the workplan at that time. You know, I think this is sort of a placeholder, and it expresses your intent, but you do have the ability to adjust it, and I think, you know, you do that maybe by requesting that you get a regular update, and maybe every six months get an update on how the process is going. If you think about the SSC meeting in October and in April, and so you could get updates in December and in June, and you would have the benefit of the SSC talking about it and know how it's going, and then you could respond.

DR. BELCHER: Then, God forbid, it does get mired down, this is next June, and we can make a decision to jump into it, if we have to.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and, as John had said over here a couple of times, nothing is permanent, right, and so I think what I need now then is either you all want to change your motion again, or let's vote on the motion, and/or someone give me a substitute motion, but we need to dispense with this and move forward. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: So, based off of John's comments, you're suggesting that we add something requesting regular updates on the MSE, and so would it be applicable to add that we're also requesting an update on the MSE every six months, or every other meeting, at the June and December meetings?

MS. MARHEFKA: I am seeing a visual nodding that the seconder is okay with that.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes.

MS. MARHEFKA: We've had a lot of discussion on this. I think that what we need to do now is vote on this motion. **The motion on the table, as it's been changed many times, is delay the development of Reg Amendment 3 until the dolphin MSE report is available or to the December 2024 council meeting, whichever is earliest. In addition, request an update on the MSE at the December 2023 and June 2024 council meetings.**

That motion has been made by Tom and seconded by Trish. Is there any further discussion on that motion? All right. Hearing none, let's vote. **All in favor, raise your hands, please, seven in favor; all opposed, four opposed. The motion carries.**

That brings us to the end of what we needed to deal with with Amendment 3, and we're now on to Other Business before the Dolphin Wahoo Committee. Does anyone have any other business that they would like to bring before this committee at this time? Chester, it's your last meeting, right? It's now or never. If you think you want to do it, do it. You've earned it.

MR. BREWER: We have talked a little bit about trying to get the State Department, or other entities, involved in trying to find out exactly what is going on with dolphin. I mean, are they migrating around to somewhere on the other side of the Bahamas, and it's just a migratory change, or are they having the devil longlined out of them down off of South America? We don't know.

I don't know -- This is not a motion to have some new assessment or amendment or anything else, but it's I would like to see the council reach out to the entities involved, John, with a request that this be investigated, because, right now, again, we're kind of operating on maybe yes and maybe no, and we've got no real hard information, and I think the first step really, on this track, and I'm not talking about on some of the other tracks that we're discussing for dolphin, but the first step is getting the information as to what in the world is going on.

There is something going on, and we hear, over and over and over again, from people who -- You know, they're the ones that are regulated, and they're the ones that are on the water, and they're coming to us and saying, hey, there's a problem, and so I'm given to believe that there is a problem, and I would like to see us try to figure out some way of going forward and identifying the source of the problem. Thank you.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Chester, and, as you can see, John is taking that down as direction to staff. Are you comfortable with that? Great. Any other business to come before this committee? All right. Seeing none, the Dolphin Wahoo Committee is adjourned.

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

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
August 8, 2023

Dolphin Wahoo Committee

Tuesday, June 13, 2023		
Attendees	Present	Remote
Kerry Marhefka, Chair	✓	
Tom Roller, Vice Chair	✓	
Robert Beal	✓	
Carolyn Belcher	✓	
Mel Bell	✓	
Gary Borland	✓	
LT Cameron Box	NOT ATTENDING	
Chester Brewer	✓	
Tim Griner	✓	
Judy Helmey	✓	
Jessica McCawley	✓	
Trish Murphey	✓	
Andy Strelcheck	✓	
Laurilee Thompson	✓	
Spud Woodward	✓	
Dewey Hemilright, Mid-Atlantic	✓	
Scott Lenox, Mid-Atlantic		
Rick Bellavance, New England		
John Hadley, Staff Contact	✓	
SAFMC STAFF		
Myra Brouwer	✓	
Julia Byrd	✓	
John Carmichael	✓	
Chip Collier	✓	
Judd Curtis	✓	
John Hadley	✓	
Allie Iberle	✓	
Kim Iverson	✓	
Kelly Klasnick	✓	
Michele Ritter	✓	
Mike Schmidtke	✓	
Nick Smillie	✓	
Christina Wiegand	✓	
OTHER		
David Hugo	✓	
Rick Devictor	✓	
Dr. Jack McGovern	✓	
Monica Smit-Brunello		
Dr. John Walter	✓	
Shep Grimes	✓	
Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy	✓	

Attendee Report: SAFMC 2023 June Council Meeting Dolphin Wahoo Committee

Report Generated:

06/20/2023 01:18 PM EDT

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

Attendee Details

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

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

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

No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0
No	0

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