

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **FULL COUNCIL SESSION III**

**The Beaufort Hotel  
Beaufort, South Carolina**

**December 9-10, 2021**

### **TRANSCRIPT**

#### **COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Mel Bell, Chair  
Robert Beal  
Chris Conklin  
Tim Griner  
Kerry Marhefka  
Trish Murphey  
Andy Strelcheck  
Spud Woodward

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair  
Chester Brewer  
LT Robert Copeland  
Judy Helmey  
Jessica McCawley  
Tom Roller  
Laurilee Thompson

#### **COUNCIL STAFF**

Myra Brouwer  
John Carmichael  
Dr. Chip Collier  
John Hadley  
Allie Iberle  
Kelly Klasnick  
Roger Pugliese  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
Suz Thomas

Julia Byrd  
Cindy Chaya  
Dr. Judd Curtis  
Kathleen Howington  
Kim Iverson  
Dr. Julie Neer  
Cameron Rhodes  
Nick Smillie  
Christina Wiegand

#### **ATTENDEES/INVITED PARTICIPANTS**

Rick DeVictor  
Shep Grimes  
Dr. Genny Nessler  
Dr. Clay Porch  
Dr. John Walter

Dale Diaz  
Dewey Hemilright  
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy  
Monica Smit-Brunello

Additional attendees and invited participants attached.

The Full Council Session III of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Beaufort Hotel, Beaufort, North Carolina, on Thursday, December 9, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: In the interest of trying to stay on time here, let's go ahead and get going. We'll call the Full Council into session, and this is Session III from your briefing binders, and the first order would be to Adopt the Agenda, and so the agenda that is listed as Full Council Session III, and are there any changes to that agenda? This will take us all the way through tomorrow. Any changes to the agenda? I don't see any, and so the agenda stands approved.

That will take us to our first order of business, which will be Presentation of the Law Enforcement of the Year 2020 Award, and so, Lieutenant Bruce, if you could join us up front here, we would appreciate it. I am going to do some reading here, and then I will stand up, and so I apologize for not standing up just yet. Assisting me up here today is Captain Spud, who is also Chairman of the Law Enforcement Committee, and so, for some of the newer folks, and some of you are probably aware of this, but, every year, we give a Law Enforcement of the Year Award.

It's a competitive award, and we get nominations from all of the states, as well as our federal partners, NOAA OLE and the Coast Guard, and so, this year, we will be presenting the award to Lieutenant Bruce, and I'm going to just read a few things, background-wise, and, for those of you who were here when he was -- When we actually selected him, and, normally, we would be doing this in September, but we weren't together in September, and so we wanted to really do this in person.

Currently, Lieutenant Bruce is serving as the Commanding Officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Southeast Regional Training Center in Charleston, South Carolina. I call it Fish University sometimes, but he oversees training, the curriculum, and certification of all the Coast Guard fisheries law enforcement officers in the South Atlantic region, and that's an important thing. If you think about the complexity of the regulations we have, across all of the fisheries, folks coming into the Coast Guard need to be trained in that before they can actually go out and implement the regulations on the water, and that's no small feat.

If you think about it, these guys could be from Topeka, Kansas, or they could be from Chicago, or St. Louis, Missouri, and so they don't necessarily have the knowledge that local folks on the coast would have, and so, anyway, he also serves on the Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary Council and is a guest lecturer on marine policy and conservation at the College of Charleston and fisheries science and fisheries management at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. I also note that he's on the Outreach and Communications AP.

With an academic background in marine biodiversity and conservation, including a master's degree from Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Lieutenant Bruce also serves as the Coast Guard's primary liaison and subject matter expert on fisheries conservation in the South Atlantic to the U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters.

Since assuming command of the Southeast Fisheries Training Center in 2019, Lieutenant Bruce has pioneered several initiatives directly impacting fisheries enforcement, including expanding the footprint of the training center, closing the gap between training and operations, by providing

support before, during, and after fisheries boardings. Basically, I think that is sort of like being a real live consultant, in terms of how to deal with enforcement issues out there.

He has facilitated engagement with Coast Guard cutters and shore units, including surge operations and increased training, directly resulting in a 13 percent increase in fisheries boardings and a 7 percent increase in dedicated violations in the South Atlantic between 2019 and 2020. Working with NOAA Fisheries HMS office, Lieutenant Bruce created a status of fisheries website to track, in real time, opening and closings of commercial trip limits and recreational bag limits, enabling officers to have this information readily available.

Under his guidance, the training center has also produced the first of its kind QR-coded reference, and that's quick response, coded reference guides for on-the-scene enforcement officers dealing with possible HMS, Lacey Act, and Florida recreational lobster regulations. Using his background in fisheries and data analysis, Lieutenant Bruce coauthored a brief on illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing and spiny lobster fishing and has provided briefs to senior Coast Guard management on published research regarding the impact of recreational fishing and survey methods in the South Atlantic, shedding light on the largest recreational fishing fleet in the nation.

Lieutenant Bruce continuously strives to find the best way to educate officers and the fishing public, and I will say that, from my experience, and I've known a lot of Coast Guard officers, and he is a sharp officer, and we are very fortunate to have him, and so, Lieutenant Bruce, congratulations. Thank you, and thank you, folks, for participating in this. I think it's really important that we do this each year, and we had a little hiccup in 2020, just because of the COVID and all, and so we didn't make a presentation back then, but this is a good thing. All right.

Moving along in the schedule, next we have the exempted fishing permit discussion, and remember that we talked about some of these earlier, and I think this just wraps it up. John, are you going to walk us through that, or is that Rick, or -- Rick is not here. What do we really need to do?

MR. CARMICHAEL: You received a presentation earlier in the week, and we do that earlier in the week, and then we have the opportunity for you to take public comment, as we did last night, and then this is just a chance for you to develop any recommendations.

MR. BELL: Okay, and remember that we had three of them, and I don't have the list in front of me.

MR. DEVICTOR: Mel, the three were the South Carolina aquarium was the first one, and then you had the lionfish study down in Florida, and then the last one is the black sea bass ropeless.

MR. BELL: Okay, so those were the three. Chester, did you have a question or a comment?

MR. BREWER: As the person who has been the most critical of certain EFPs, I think these are all fine. They're exactly what EFP -- They do exactly what EFPs are supposed to do, and I think we should support all three.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, Chester, and I recall, at our discussions, that we didn't have any issues with them at the time, and we also didn't receive any public comment, really, and so nothing new. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I just wanted to pass along a comment from Jimmy Hull on Kim Sawicki and the ropeless fishing gear. She did make some trips with Jimmy, and Jimmy saw the gear working, and he's really impressed with it, and he wants to participate, and his comment was that, you know, if we -- How will we ever move forward if we don't get this stuff to try out and get it approved, and so he very much hopes that we will approve the ropeless fishing gear EFP.

MR. BELL: All right. Is everybody in agreement that those three are good to go from our perspective, and no negative comments or anything? Do we need a motion or anything to that effect at this point, or would that be tomorrow?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, I don't think -- You don't really approve them, right, and you're providing comments to the agency, who will decide what to do.

MR. BELL: Yes, and so I think it's understood that we're in support of those, or have no issues with them.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You can do a motion if you want, and Myra has got a motion for you, to make it clear. She was expecting a little bit more of this to come on tomorrow, but do you want to do the motion tomorrow, with like the committee reports and stuff?

MR. BELL: I've got it right here.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So there you go. We need to display it and all that stuff, and so --

MR. BELL: We'll do it tomorrow. We'll do an actual motion tomorrow.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So just knowing that people support the three of them.

MR. BELL: Yes, that's all we need to know right now.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Cool. That's the hopeful for the outcome today.

MR. BELL: There you go. Thank you. All right. Next is the legal brief with Monica. Is there anything that you need to brief us on?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do not. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Well, thank you for being here. Okay. SSC recommendations not covered under the committees, and so that would be anything else that Genny might want to present to us, and I guess she will be driving that remotely.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I was going to ask Chip, and did Genny have more to present on the SSC? Okay.

MR. BELL: Okay. Great. Wow. Okay. Then that takes us to council staff reports, and so, John, you're listed as first.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am listed as first, and so, in the Executive Director Report, I wanted to hit on a few things. First of all, the CCC, Council Coordinating Committee, we met via webinar in October, and we got the continued updates that we've been getting on NMFS activities under COVID and the status of the budgets, the science operations, various technical memorandums that they're working on, and we're routing them through the review process, where we have a chance to weigh-in on things.

A big part of the meeting was discussion of the Huffman draft of the MSA, and so we drafted a letter, and that was sent around earlier, and the CCC has sent a letter, and the Chairman of the Pacific Council, since they were the CCC host this year, provided testimony at the hearing that was a few weeks ago on the MSA draft, and so that's continuing to proceed, and we'll keep track of that and the progress on it, and we anticipate probably additional comment opportunities along the way.

Then, along that lines, we'll also be working on updating the South Atlantic's legislative positions for the overall -- Let's call it omnibus CCC legislative document, where there's the CCC position as well as each individual council's position on various legislative topics that might come up, and so it's been stressed that we as councils -- We do not lobby, and we cannot lobby, but what we can do is provide information about how the different things that are being proposed will affect us, and so, if you look at the CCC document, or if you look at our comments, you will notice that we take great care not to say support or do not support particular items, but it's just to say this is how this will affect our ability to do things under the MSA and to comply with the provisions of the MSA, and that something that certainly is stressed at every CCC meeting and every time we talk about that.

There is some guidance that I will send around that has come up, and there's some new guidance that has come out on that, and also on the recusal stuff, that has just made its way out of NMFS recently, which will be relevant to quite a few of you folks as well, and so we'll get that around.

The other issue that came up, and there was a lot of discussion, is the Environmental Justice, and the agency is making a lot of progress in that realm, and they're interested in seeing greater diversity in council membership, on APs, and making sure that we are reaching underserved communities, and so the CCC is planning a workshop, probably, in February of this year to try and have some in-depth discussions about that, to understand what is meant by it, and particularly what is the council's role and what is the council's opportunities to get involved and reach out to these different communities, to identify them and figure out how we engage them, are there communities we're not reaching, and there's a lot of questions in there.

Right now, it's sort of a high-level discussion coming down from NMFS, and so the CCC is hoping to have the councils dig into this a little bit deeper, and there is an organizing committee of staffs from all of the councils that are working on that, and they will be meeting two weeks from now, I think, and Christina is our representative, and they will meet and give some details and probably start finding out what the workshop is going to look like and when it will be. It's something that we want to do in-person, and so COVID is weighing heavily, and so post-holiday COVID spikes may have an impact on that, and so we're just waiting and seeing. Then the next meeting of the CCC will be in May in Annapolis.

Another item that I want to hit on, in talking about awards, is that, if you recall, we implemented an Awards of Excellence for the council right before COVID hit, and so we've held off on that, because it wasn't something that we wanted to do with COVID going on initially and handing it out remotely, but the plan is to dust that off and get it going this year. I think, if I recall, it called for nominations by June 30, and so I will probably send out a reminder, and it's nominations from council members, and so look for a reminder in May about submitting nominations, and so you might want to start thinking about people who have made significant contributions to South Atlantic fisheries that you might want to nominate.

On the staff side, of course, you met Nick, our new staffer, and we acknowledged Cameron, who, unfortunately, is leaving with some pretty big shoes to fill, and I'm going to look into that fine print that Spud mentioned, because I do recall something about that, and we may be able to hold onto her a little bit, if we can, and the other item to highlight is the seminar series.

There's a couple of interesting ones coming up in the early part of the year. In January, we're getting a presentation from the Pacific Council on how they manage groundfish. If you're not aware, the groundfish and the rockfish and such up there is very similar to our snapper grouper fishery, and it has commercial and recreational components, and it's actually, by our standards, a very complex management system, area closures, depth closures, seasonal closures, geographic gradation and how they approach that, and they have used that as a way to deal with discard problems in that fishery.

The Pacific gets really deep really fast, and so they have -- Barotrauma has always been an issue they've dealt with, and so that's going to be a seminar to provide you guys information on how they have approached that problem and how their management system has evolved to deal with it, and that one is going to be interesting.

Then, in February, Jennifer Sweeney-Tookes, who is on our SSC, is going to present on Georgia's working waterfronts, a social census about the waterfronts themselves, and so I think that's going to be an interesting one, too. You know, we struggle to get much social information, and so it's really great to see that, and working waterfronts is another one of those topics, as we're hearing a lot about, that's actually a potential section in the MSA draft to talk about supporting waterfronts, and so that's going to be very timely as well.

I guess the last thing is I think just thanks for everybody coming in here this week and being in-person and getting used to being in-person. I think, here by the end of the week, we're all pretty well back to where we were back in March of 2020, when we started our last in-person meeting, and so it's gone pretty well this week, and I appreciate everybody's patience and understanding through all that has been COVID, and hopefully we don't have to go back to remote webinar council meetings anytime soon and we can move ahead from here.

MR. BELL: Great. Thanks, John. Lots going on, and I will second John's comment there, and I think it is great that we are back together, and you can -- I mean, I can sense that the meeting just works a lot better, and there's a lot of interaction, and you have many opportunities to exchange information with people and talk and develop relationships, and, really, this is all about relationships, and so thanks, everybody, for being here. Any questions for John? Okay. Then the next is going to be climate change scenario planning, and is that -- Are you doing that, John, or is Roger doing it? Okay. So we'll hear Roger's voice here in a second.

MR. PUGLIESE: Good afternoon, everyone. I just wanted to provide you all an update on the east coast climate change scenario planning effort, and this is drawing on recent activities of the NRCC, the Northeast Regional Coordinating Committee, that met in November, and updating some of the activities, some of the timing, some of the products, and, basically, giving us an idea of where we're going.

What we're looking at is really what the future of the east coast fisheries are relative to some of the issues on climate change and how to use this scenario process to inform and advance discussions on management and governance.

The Northeast Regional Coordinating Committee met in November, as I mentioned, to get an update on the scoping process that was moving forward and provide additional guidance and recommendations to advance the effort. One of the efforts, as part of the scoping process, was to look at the existing objectives and draw from information from scoping, and what they did is adopted some revised objectives for the effort, and the first objective now reads as explore how the east coast fishery governance and management issues will be affected by climate-driven change in fisheries, particularly changing stock availability and distribution, and the second is to advance a set of tools and processes that provide flexible and robust fishery management strategies, which continue to promote fishery conservation and resilient fishing communities and address uncertainty in the era of climate change.

What you see is the overall process from orientation to scoping and exploration and creation and application and then monitoring, and we advance first from the orientation into the scoping phase, which we wrapped up pretty much through November, and we're wrapping up documentation in December. The document that was provided as one of the attachments was the summary that was provided to the NRCC that highlights some of the outcomes from the scoping phase, which included both informational webinars and input as well as a follow-up questionnaire to provide input and guide some of the next stages, and that's where we're moving now, is we're moving into the next step, which is known as basically an exploration phase.

This is intended to analyze forces driving the change and provide some input and greater detail, so that it sets the stage to go actually into the full climate scenario process, and the timing for this is that we're looking at holding three webinars between February and March of next year that will highlight and provide education and background and understanding of the different drivers and set the stage to create the inputs and the components that will lead to a workshop, which is going to be held in the spring of next year.

Originally, we were looking at April, and it's getting pretty tough to look at some of these timeframes, with everything getting stacked on it, and so the core team is working hard to try to figure out the best layout to do this with, and this advances into actually the scenario planning and then all the way into the longer term, which goes into 2023, on the monitoring of the efforts.

What we have is, as I mentioned, right now, we are actually -- Today, I was earlier involved directly with the core team in finalizing an overall summary of the scoping process, which will be wrapped up and then posted to the climate website that has this, and it will also be provided as we move forward into the webinars, and that's the next stage, the explanation that I mentioned before,

and, in February and March, we're going to hold a small number of basically three webinars, and the intent of those webinars, the main purpose of those, are threefold.

One is education, to share information about and discuss the key drivers that could shape the east coast fisheries over the next twenty years, which would be the building blocks for the scenario creation, and the engagement is to provide an update on the initiative and the opportunity for participants to reengage and to focus and set the scene for the next phases, to ensure that participants know the scenario focus on changing stock ability and distribution and overall goals to identify implications for fisheries governance and management.

Those webinars are going to be a context that they will look into details on research behind possible factors and really focus on three major areas of physical, climate drivers, and uncertainties, such as ocean temperatures, sea level rise, acidification, ocean currents, biological drivers of uncertainties, such as changing spatial distributions, health of stocks, habitat loss and rate of ecosystem change, and social and economic drivers and uncertainties, such as competing ocean uses, community impacts, and consumer demand.

That really is to identify how those may shape the fisheries over the next twenty years on the east coast, and these will all be online webinars, and we're looking at the last two weeks of February and the first week of March, one day, and within those areas.

We're looking at the technical representatives that would provide it, and the context that those are going to be like is there will be a presentation, and we are pinning down now by a lead presentation, with a technical panel, and then the ability to have some input and maybe some polling, and so we're finalizing some of those details.

That will be -- As this gets wrapped up, we'll be notified in January, and it's going to take a little while to get everybody secured and pinned down, and so the notification will go out, and, originally, we were talking in-house, to make sure we have the full participation by our members and individuals in the Southeast Region about trying to get something out a little earlier, but we have to pin down the details before we can actually get a formal output. We've had some coordination directly in-house on what the next stages and how to engage and make sure that that's going to happen, and so, as we get the details, we will advance those efforts.

What that ultimately brings us to is an in-person workshop that will create the framework and set of scenarios that describe how climate change might affect stock distribution and availability and other aspects of fisheries by 2040. The workshop will be in-person, and that's one of the big things that I think the realization is that's about the only way this will really be effective, and I know there were some caveats about thinking about trying to do it remotely, but this, I think, is going to be important enough to make sure, and, originally, we had April pinned down, but, as I mentioned earlier, we put down spring, just to give some latitude, depending on if we're able to actually secure the dates, and we have to get the participation really pinned down, and this will be by invite to be able to work on this.

I think that's actually the end of this, and I originally had a little bit longer of a presentation, but I think the details are within the summary document that was provided, and I just mainly wanted to provide a context, and there will be more to come, as I said, the summary of the scoping, and then, when we get down to pin down timing for both the webinars and then, ultimately, timing for the

climate scenario workshop, which is going to be kind of the real focus, once we get all the way down to that point.

That provides everything that's been going on and coordinating through the NRCC and the core team activities and where we plan to go within 2022, and, as I mentioned, it will probably go into, in terms of monitoring, all the way into 2023, and, with that, that's the update for the climate scenario planning initiative.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for the presentation, Roger, and this is something we've been talking about for a while, and it's good to see that it's actually underway, and we appreciate your involvement in it and the update. Any questions for Roger? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I did want to comment. When we reviewed the earlier webinars and such that were held at the NRCC, one of the things that was noted, because they had demographics about who participated from what area and what sector, et cetera, and it was noted that the Mid to South Atlantic commercial sectors were not as well represented as desired, and so, as we come into this next round, we're going to need to try to find a way to engage some broader representation, from our region in particular.

Then I wanted to say, Roger, has the group talked yet about, at the in-person workshop, participants? Are we thinking council members, AP, SSC, as sort of the primary participants, or a combination of that, and I am just sort of curious as to the planning, for planning purposes, where we are on that.

MR. PUGLIESE: Literally, that's where we're at right now, and we have focused mainly on getting the webinar and information advancing and finalizing those aspects of it, and we had the initial discussions, and that's all in the mix right now, talking about panel members and the balance between that, because it's going to be important to make sure that we have adequately represented for our region and a balance between management, fishermen, et cetera, and advisors.

I think it's going to be -- We will have further discussions, but I think the individuals mentioned are going to be a core part of it. How we expand and make sure that the representation for all the areas is covered is going to be the challenge, because we're originally talking about maybe forty to fifty people as part of the workshop, and that's going to be an effort, to make sure that we have full representation to move this forward.

The answer to your question is, yes, that's going to be part of the core, and that's why we've already been laying out any interaction between council meetings and SSC meetings and the APs, different things to try to avoid timelines that are going to be problematic, to make sure that there's participation.

MR. BELL: Just some more things to participate in and to schedule. If your schedule is not busy enough, there is other opportunities. Thanks, Roger. I appreciate it.

MR. PUGLIESE: Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. It looks like that takes us to National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science Center report, and so we've got three of those, all remotely, I guess, if we've got

everybody, and so the first one that I have here is commercial e-logbook update and Julie Brown. Julie, thanks for being here.

MS. BROWN: Thank you. I'm Julie Brown, the Fishery Monitoring Branch, and all that is right. It is December though, and so my apologies on that date. These are the questions that I hope to have answered by the end of the presentation. Who is affected by changes to the SEFSC logbook reporting, how will e-logbook reporting look in the short term, what are the upcoming deadlines, and what are the future e-logbook needs in the long term?

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center has a multitude of permits that are required to submit logbooks, issued both from the Gulf and the South Atlantic Councils and from the Highly Migratory Species Headquarters. This is just a rough estimate of the permits that were issued as of a few months ago, and the majority have to report on what we call coastal logbooks, which ask questions at the trip level, and then, down here at the bottom, we have the HMS logbooks, contrasting, which asks for effort at the set level. We also have these tiny little fisheries down here that have their own accounting systems, but we're not going to get into that.

There is a common misconception, which is that permit owners only need to report logbook details if they catch the species that is federally permitted. In fact, regardless of what you catch, or even if you catch anything, if you get skunked, and we need to have a logbook report if you took a commercial trip. Right now, permits that are issued by the Gulf and the South Atlantic are not subject to separate logbook requirements, and we want to keep it that way. Splitting the logbooks even further would not be good, and we need to move towards unifying the requirements, and, in fact, we are starting to move in that direction.

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center isn't the only logbook game in town, and the Greater Atlantic Fisheries Office is also running a logbook program, as well as the Southeast Charter Headboat Logbook Program. Many vessel owners have what we call dual permits, which just means that they have multiple permits on their vessel, or they would be in the overlapping sections of this graph, either by type, and they do commercial and charter fishing, or by region, and so Southeast Fisheries Science and the Greater Atlantic Region.

Under the current paper logbook system, anyone with dual commercial permits should have been reporting multiple logbooks each time they go commercial fishing, which would have been mailed to separate science centers, and another common misconception, especially for people who have like, for example, the Atlantic dolphin wahoo permit, people would commonly only send in the Southeast Fisheries Science Center trip report if they caught dolphin or wahoo, when, in fact, they should have been sending it in every time they go commercial fishing.

This is the type of confusion that we're trying to alleviate with electronic reporting. For any software system that meets what we call the one-stop reporting guidelines, people who we consider these dual reporters would only have to submit a single trip report to get compliance in both of their regions. However, under these conditions, dual permit owners would need to meet the stricter program's requirements. Like, for instance, if you had charter permits in the Gulf, and they require a VMS, then, when you go commercial fishing, you would also have to turn that VMS unit on, and that's just one little example.

How many commercial fishing vessels have these dual permits that I just referred to in the North Atlantic region? As of September, we were in the about a hundred-vessel ballpark. Of course, that changes day to day, but that's our ballpark, and they're mostly fishing in the North Carolina and Virginia areas, right on that border, where our regions are distinct. Initially, volunteer reporting for the South Atlantic Regional Office commercial users is going to be accommodate those GARFO participants who have dual permits.

The original plan was to unify all of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center logbooks into one logbook program, and that would have included all of the logbooks that I listed earlier, the two surveys that are associated with the logbooks, and also the monthly no fishing reports for people who didn't fish. That would have looked like the HMS version of the logbook, which, as a reminder, just simply asks for slightly more detailed locations and times of fishing effort, which we refer to as set-based.

However, based on feedback from the Gulf, and, let's see, and it was the Reef Fish and also the Coastal Migratory APs, we're taking a little detour from that game plan, and they did not want to see their fisheries reporting at the higher precision, set-based information, and so we adjusted the electronic logbook structure, and we're having separate requirements, depending on what fishery is being participated in, similar to the paper logbook.

HMS fisheries will still report set-based, just like paper logbook, and the coastal fisheries can still report trip-based, if they like. This was ready on November 10, again to accommodate those people who have dual permits with GARFO who will have that as their mandatory reporting deadline in the Northeast. Right now, we're not opening up electronic reporting to the entire fleet at this time, and so just be a little bit patient, and so that's covering who is affected in the short-term.

I think there was a comment earlier, during Julia's presentation, and I'm sorry, and I forget who the commenter was, but they said something to the effect that the commercial spatial data leaves a lot to be desired, and we completely agree with that, and we have always had our intention to move towards a higher precision spatial collection, but, after this feedback from the Gulf, it looks like we're going to have to move in that direction in even smaller baby steps, and so that's the game plan for now.

What does this actually look like? On the left is the paper logbook that I'm sure a lot of people are familiar with, and the HMS permits have something that looks very, very similar, and then, on the right, we have the electronic version, which is basically different screens on either a cellphone or a tablet that are going to ask you about your trip or your effort information and then, depending on what gear you select, then you move on to a new section for your catches and your dealer information. Again, just to keep reiterating, we're only encouraging those dual reporters with GARFO right now to use eTRIPS, and that opened up on November 10. We're going to open it up to other volunteers hopefully very soon.

These are just some common questions, and I will just go through one by one. What are the timing deadlines for e-logbooks, and so we would like for you to have your effort details filled out at the time of landing, and so how long you're fishing, what gear, how many hooks you had, et cetera, and then submit the full report, with your catches and everything that's required for your dealer stuff, within seven days, and that's for the Southeast Regional Office. Now, GARFO wants theirs

turned in within forty-eight hours, and so, for those dual-reporting vessels, the stricter deadline applies, and so forty-eight hours.

Why do I need to report any location on a logbook if I have my VMS turned on? Remember my very first slide, and we're accommodating a lot of different fisheries, and some of those fisheries have VMS units, but the majority of vessels do not have VMS units. Furthermore, these VMS units don't actually tell us where the fishing effort is taking place. They simply tell us where the vessel is located once an hour.

Lastly, can I report my logbook requirements through my VMS device, if you have a VMS device? Not yet. However, VMS vendors have the opportunity to develop forms, if they choose to, and their data rates would apply, if that was the route that you ended up going. Currently, we have the free software, which is eTRIPS, and that uses either Wi-Fi or cellular-based data transmission.

I mentioned earlier that we're taking a detour from the original plan, based on feedback from the Gulf APs. We do still want to continue negotiating an evolution for higher-precision geographic location points for the coastal fleet for scientific assessment purposes. Just as an example, on the left, we have the sort of assessment we can do with the red snapper, and I'm sorry you guys keep hearing red snapper as the go-to example for the day.

On the left is the current logbook precision, which is a one-by-one-degree grid. Contrast that with the one on the right, which is part of the Great Red Snapper Count that happened recently, which had much higher precision and sampling rate, and this report actually concluded that there are portions of the red snapper population that are being underutilized by fishers, and so that was great news, the sort of thing that we want to hear. This is the direction we need to start going with all fisheries to be able to use these more advanced scientific assessment tools.

The other transition that we want to eventually bring up is what I've been referring to as set-based reporting, which the HMS-permitted fishing vessels are already doing, and so, for pelagic longlines and some other gears, fishing behavior falls pretty naturally into what we call sets, clearly-defined sets, and we would like to be able to capture that higher-resolution information for the coastal fisheries.

For some gears through, and like trolling is a good example, it does not naturally, or traditionally, fall into what we label as a set, and we have defined the fishing behavior, so that there is usually only, and I say usually, one fishing effort per trip, and so, in that scenario, the pink and the green diagrams would actually look the same, but, to just reiterate, for now, people who have coastal permits will continue to report trip-based, like the pink diagram, just like they have been doing on their paper logbooks.

Here is just a generalized diagram of the pathway forward to accommodate more advanced scientific assessment tools, and we're going to accept electronic logbooks initially with no changes from the paper logbook requirements, but, through ongoing research and collaboration with the different council APs, coordinating with other agencies that are also running logbook programs, and input from those users whose reporting burden we need to consider, we do want to eventually move towards a joint resolution with the councils that will update and modernize the requirements. Hopefully that makes sense.

That was kind of the long-term plan, and here is the slide where I always like to remind everyone listening of the current logbook reporting at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Fishers can now register and submit the no-fish reports electronically, and that refers to anyone, and not just the dual-permitted people, and the Science Center is no longer accepting faxed or emailed reports, and that's been a rule for several years at this point, but I like to remind people, when I can. That being said, no-fishing reports need to either be mailed or submitted through our fisheries electronic reporting website.

This is just to summarize, and so who is affected by changes to the SEFSC logbook reporting, and we have a diversity of permit owners in the Southeast, and some of those have dual permits with other regions. How will e-logbook reporting look in the short-term? It's going to have exactly the same reporting elements as the paper logbook, but simply a mobile app. What are upcoming deadlines? The November launch happened for those dual permit owners only, and sit tight for other types of permits to allow volunteers. What are future e-logbook needs in the long-term? We want to have ongoing discussions about the resolution of logbook data and moving towards a sort of universal logbook, and I don't know if universal logbook is the right word, but having efficient reporting guidelines between different partners. I think that's it, and so I will take questions now, if anybody has any.

MR. BELL: Okay. Julie, thank you for the presentation. Any questions? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just on the timing, and so I am curious as to when you think you might be ready to accept commercial electronic logbook reporting from not just dual permit holders, but from everybody, and then the councils will need to -- Before that ever happens, you would hope that the councils would have an amendment to make it all electronic, so that it would be a pretty seamless kind of thing, so to speak, and I would hope that both councils have the same requirements, because I'm not quite sure how the center would deal with that otherwise, and so I think the devil is in the details a little bit, just in terms of working -- Maybe talking with the center and thinking about what it is exactly you would like, because this question says what would you - - How will e-logbook reporting look in the short term? It's the exact same reporting elements as paper logbooks, and so it seems like we could do this in a one-action kind of amendment, but, anyway, that's just some thoughts, thinking about council planning and their workload.

MR. BELL: But it would need to be like a joint amendment kind of thing with the Gulf or--

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's up to you. I think that it would necessarily have to be a joint amendment for coastal migratory pelagics, probably, and so it's just something to think about from workload, both from the SERO and the councils.

MR. BELL: Okay.

MS. BROWN: We absolutely agree, and we would hope that things would move forward jointly with the Gulf Council and not have disparate reporting guidelines and deadlines and that sort of thing. I can't give you an exact deadline of when we will open this up to other permit types and not just the dual permits, but it's always been our intention of having a minimum, minimum, minimum, of one year of voluntary reporting, which we hope would give the councils enough time to set up those amendments to transition towards electronic being the mandatory way of reporting, and so does that answer your questions?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's close enough.

MS. BROWN: Okay.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks. That gives us something to shoot for, I guess. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm sorry about if we've talked about this before and it's left my head, but I am frustrated with this lack of sort of more detailed information, like the backing off of the spatial information, and I forget how that process works, and is that something that NMFS has the authority to determine that this is what we needed, or is it a council action that has to happen? I mean, we're going to move forward with this new platform, and, while it will be easier, if it doesn't improve the information we're getting, that's just frustrating to me.

MR. BELL: You're saying who would prescribe that?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and I guess that's what I can't figure out. I mean, it's interesting, and the way it's worded here is there was resistance from advisory panel members, which we have lots of -- With all due respect to the advisory panels, we often have resistance from advisory panel members on all kinds of things we need to collect, but we still need to go ahead and do it, for scientific reasons, and I'm just not sure what the regulatory process of requiring a better spatial scale is.

MR. BELL: Do you want to answer that, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Sure. I'm not entirely sure the answer to your question, but I will get you an answer, but, right now, the requirements are those who are selected to report must maintain a fishing record on a form available from the Science Center, and so, really, the dictation of what's in that -- The requirements of what's in that form, right now, it appears to me that it's based on what the Science Center requires, and so I'm not quite sure how we -- In terms of spatial, yes, we'll look at that and see what could be done.

MR. BELL: Okay. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Well, it's based on a grid that they provide us, and I don't know -- For our coastal logbook, I mean, I don't know why you would really need a better grid, and that information is not used in any assessment data, and it's not used in any quota monitoring data, and so, I mean, I don't really -- I am one of the ones that have always thought that a grid is fine, and, I mean, you don't need to narrow down exactly where you are very much, as long as you know that you're in this area, and it's a fairly small grid, but that data is just not used in that way.

If it was going to be used in some way that would be beneficial in a stock assessment, with some type of fishery-dependent data that was honing-in on even a lat/long, then that's fine, but that's not what it's used for, and so I don't really see the need in doing anything more than we're already doing, in that regard, you know the spatial regard.

MR. BELL: Just for reference, if I saw that correctly, that's a 3,600-square-mile box, sixty-by-sixty miles. That's a pretty big box. John.

DR. WALTER: I think the question is what would we do with it if we got it, and I will make the case that the set-by-set datasets that you see for HMS -- We actually use those for our indices, for our stock assessments, and that is the driving indices for most of our HMS assessments, is set-by-set longline data, and we don't have that, right now, for our handline data, and those indices are generally not recommended for use.

This would probably allow them to be better considered, because we would get that set-by-set information. Within that large spatial area, where you set probably makes a big difference, and then the information on a particular set, i.e., the number of hooks or the bait or the other things that we use when we do what's called standardizing those indices, and turn them into something that reflects abundance, is we account for those kind of factors. Like, in the longlines, we account for hook type, and we account sometimes for bait, and this would potentially allow us the ability to turn that fishery-dependent data into more usable indices.

MR. BELL: Tim.

MR. GRINER: As a follow-up, well, that's what we need to hear. I mean, if you're going to use it, and it can help, then, yes, let's narrow it down as small as you want to, but, until you decide to use it, it's not really of any benefit to anybody, and so I don't know of anybody who wouldn't want to narrow it down if it's actually going to be used as some indices of abundance or be able to really hone-in effort and hooks and lines and hours spent, but it's just not being used that way.

MR. BELL: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It's not just the assessment, but it can also be used in the analysis of management actions, especially when you're looking at spatial management measures, which we have talked about and used in the past. I don't believe that -- I know, for the marine protected areas, and I'm sure I wasn't around when the spawning SMZs -- I wasn't paying as close attention, and that big sixty-by-sixty box did not allow you to really understand what the economic impact was of closing a small area within that sixty-by-sixty box, and so it's not just what goes into stock assessments, but it's also what helps with the analysis and looking at the impacts of spatial management measures. I'm not suggesting that we go so small as to you know exactly where you're fishing, but that is a huge box, and I think it could be smaller, and I think it would help us make it -- It would just make our jobs easier.

MR. BELL: Okay. Other questions? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: The pelagic longline industry is done by sets, and so it would be conducive to longline to record your sets. I don't see everybody going and doing a bandit drop and writing down the location of where they're bandit dropping 50,000 times. If you've got a sixty-mile area, what you need to do is break it up, particularly to these logbooks, in fifteen-mile areas, and you're already reporting the depth for each species that you've done on the coastal logbook, and so it would probably help a lot more to get a better idea of what you're catching in certain areas, as others have said.

Something else that's kind of confusing here is we started, in the Mid, in November of the reporting part, but we had a heavy layout of a lot of webinars and staff interaction and a private contractor

and this type of stuff before it was rolled out, and it was -- It did a good job of rolling out, but getting all these agencies to talk amongst themselves and one-stop shopping, I am still not convinced that everybody is there, because there's still like five different logbooks, and they are not all meshed together, where you're bandit fishing and trolling and all these other things, and they're still not talking to each other, and so I think it's still kind of confusing as heck.

One last thing that I don't understand is why, and I've asked this numerous times, particularly to GARFO, and why is that their regulation is -- Because I possess a permit, and I don't fish in that area, and I have to dual report, and I have to send them something just because I possess a permit, and I have never understood, and I still have never got an answer, of what the purpose of me fishing in the South Atlantic and catching South Atlantic species and landing in North Carolina, which is considered the South Atlantic also, but yet I have to report to GARFO, just because I possess a permit.

That's all, and it seems like it's kind of confusing, and it would be the same way almost with the Gulf. Even if you're not fishing in the Gulf, not landing in the Gulf, and you're catching South Atlantic species, and just because you possess that, and what is the rationale for having to report to the Gulf, just because they say you've got my permit. Has anybody got an answer?

MR. BELL: It's a fair question. I noticed that Dave Gloeckner had his hand up. I don't know if Dave wants to walk into that, and he might have actually had something else. Dave, I just saw your hand, and I'm not holding you to that.

DR. GLOECKNER: It's a complicated question, but that's what we're trying to resolve with having an electronic logbook that can satisfy the requirements of all of those reporting requirements with one report, and that's what we're trying to get to. Unfortunately, we're also talking about getting HMS and the Southeast Center and GARFO all on the same page, and I've been having almost monthly conversations with all of those groups and trying to get us on the same page of what is the basic data that we need for the whole Atlantic coast. Dewey, we're trying to work on it, and it takes us time to get there, and it is the government, but I think, eventually, we will get there.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thanks, Dave. Did you have something else too, or was that it?

DR. GLOECKNER: I think John got to it, but, I mean, essentially, we don't use the logbook data for some analyses, because we can't. It doesn't have the resolution we need for those analyses. A perfect example is we just have to use ratios to figure out what logbook data comes from the South Atlantic versus the Gulf, because we don't know exactly on which side of the Keys you're fishing, and so, if we actually had at least the lat and long for the primary area that you were fishing in, we could do that, and that's just one example, but there's a myriad of other uses for this data, if we actually had good spatial information.

MR. BELL: Right, and so good spatial resolution would help in a lot of things, I guess.

DR. GLOECKNER: Yes, and, when we start talking about the resistance by the Gulf, yes, the Gulf resisted the set level, and I think there were also a lot of -- There were some misunderstandings about some of the terms, and like we say set level, and we may mean set level for longlines, but, for say vertical lines, we may be talking about a fishing event, which may be a

different kind of resolution than set, because of course we have gears that don't really fit into a natural set, and so I think, if we look at the Northeast logbooks, they do have different requirements for each gear, what they're actually looking for on the logbook, and that might be something that we work with, so that we can make it clear what we're actually looking for.

There is different levels of resolution here. I mean, I would like to have industry buy-in with whatever we do, and I would like to get eventually with set level, but it may be baby steps that we use to get there, and maybe we go with a sub-trip level, and so, if they change fishing area, or if they change gear, then we get another record, and so that improves the spatial data that we might need as well, and so it doesn't go all the way to set level, but it would be an improvement over what we have now.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Dave. Any other questions at this time or comments? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Just to sort of bring it around to what we've talked about doing, as far as the workplan on this, and based on your various priorities, it's to consider a pretty straightforward amendment, as Monica mentioned, that essentially gives the authority for the existing logbooks to be submitted electronically. Then that would address the first need, and I think, once they know the system is ready to go, and they start making it available voluntarily, we can go ahead and do that. I mean, I would presume we could do that and get the authority in place, and get the council's role done, and then the agency can decide on that actual implementation date, which is something that happens quite often in reporting environments.

I think, when we get the opportunity to do this on the workload through -- It's a simple action, and we've got the language, and we know what we need to do, and we should go ahead and jump on that and do it and get that out of the way, and then the bigger question of do we increase the resolution, because, if you want to do greater spatial resolution, you have probably got to do set-level resolution to have the two go together.

Resolution is resolution, and the only way that spatial means anything is if you get a better sense of how much effort occurred in that particular smaller space, and that's going to be a debate, and, if we want to do anything joint with the Gulf, that's going to be a debate, and so we would like to get the authority out of the way, and then that opens if the door. If you want to do additional changes, we can do that through a longer process. We don't want the authority to just do the electronic logbooks, as you've been asking for, to be held up, and look how much discussion we've had today just on even the idea of changing the resolution, and it will be a long, drawn-out discussion.

MR. BELL: Good point, John. Any other discussion and questions on commercial e-logbooks? Okay. I don't see any. Julie, thanks for the presentation.

MS. BROWN: Thanks for having me.

MR. BELL: All right. We'll go to the next presentation, which will be the Headboat Annual Report from Ken Brennan, also remotely. Ken, if you're with us, we can start when you're ready.

MR. BRENNAN: Good afternoon. I'm Ken Brennan, and I coordinate the Southeast Region Headboat Survey that is administered by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. I would like to

present the Southeast Region Headboat Survey 2020 South Atlantic annual report today, and I would also like to acknowledge that this report was prepared by Eric Fitzpatrick and Kelly Fitzpatrick.

Just some history about what led to this report. In the 1990s, until around 2003, the Beaufort Laboratory's reef fish life history team provided a trends report to the South Atlantic Council on the trends and catches for fifteen important species in the Southeast. The purpose was to provide a snapshot of where catches were going and to give the council a perspective over time for these species. Since the headboat survey data is very important for assessments and management, we thought this same format would be a useful way to show trends in the headboat fishery in the Southeast.

The report is meant to not only inform the councils, but we want the headboat survey participants to be able to see how their data could be used and what the trends are for the various species in their region, and then, also, other audiences that might be interested in the report. Then, also, I would like to report out that this report contains the most recent estimates up to 2020.

The structure of the report includes the introduction, which includes a brief history of the headboat survey, and also a section on events that may have impacted the headboat fishery, such as COVID or storms that occurred in 2020, and the data collection section outlines the survey design, sampling protocols, and any changes that have occurred to the headboat survey, such as electronic reporting.

Then, finally, in the first part of the report, there are tables that include total landings by species and numbers, species numbers and weight, effort, angler days back to 1981, and a summary of the dockside sampling, and there's also a discard table and a catch per unit effort in that section as well. Then, the species that are covered, there are twenty-eight federally-managed species, and the report includes a total of fifty-five species.

This is a current list of the South Atlantic species, the federally-managed species, that are included in the report. Each species is contained in a one-page summary, but it's hard to see if you just put it up as that one page, and so I broke out the different sections. Within that one page, we have -- Of course, I used spottail pinfish as an example here, and there's nothing controversial, but it's just a commonly-caught species on headboats, and, for each species, there is a ten-year table of the landings, in this case back to 2011, and that would be in numbers and weight in pounds, and then annual discard estimates in number by region, and I would also like to point out that these asterisks are where the data is confidential, meaning that less than three boats reported catching those species, and so, wherever you see the asterisk, that's what that represents.

Part of the one page also is a summary of the dockside intercepts by region, and there is a five-year and ten-year cumulative average, and you could -- Also, within this table, the average lengths and the average weights are displayed for each region. In this, you can pretty much see what the effects of COVID are, compared to we had to suspend sampling due to COVID, and the ten-year and five-year averages are quite high for this species.

The next table would be the positive trips that caught or discarded this species, and that's also broken down by region, and then, finally, the CPUE, nominal CPUE, for this species, and that's back until we had collected records for this species, and this is how the one-page summary of that

species looks. It's just a snapshot, and it gives you an idea of what's happening with that particular species, and it can be a useful tool for just seeing any trends that are going on historically for that species, and that was our intent, that it would just give the councils and, like I said, other audiences a quick look at different species and what their catches have been looking like on headboats.

We plan on -- There is some lag between years, where we're working on the 2021 estimates now, and so we need to get those in place, and so we're saying December of the following year will be the release date for the previous year, and so, in this case, the report is based on 2020 estimated landings and effort, and the report is in the briefing book for distribution. Any questions? I would be glad to take them.

MR. BELL: All right. Ken, thanks for the presentation. Like Ken said, the full report is 2c, Attachment 2c, in your briefing book. Does anybody have any questions for Ken right now? It's a pretty good-sized report, and we appreciate you guys putting that together, and it's there for reference, if you guys want to look at anything, and I do appreciate you picking spottail pinfish as an example and not something else. All right. Anything for Ken? I am not seeing any hands. Thanks, Ken, for the presentation. I appreciate you being here.

MR. BRENNAN: All right. You're welcome, Mel. Thanks.

MR. BELL: All right. We've got one more report here on the Southeast Reef Fish Survey, SERFS, and that will be Todd Kellison, remotely.

DR. KELLISON: I'm Todd Kellison, and I'm with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. I will provide a short update on the Southeast Reef Fish survey sampling from 2021. As background, the Southeast Reef Fish Survey serves as a cooperative trap and video survey focused on the cooperative efforts between National Marine Fisheries Service and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources.

The Southeast Fishery-Independent Survey Group is based in Beaufort, and it works cooperatively with the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, and these efforts are funded through the Marine Resources Monitoring, Assessment, and Prediction program, known as MARMAP, and one is the Southeast Area Monitoring and Assessment program, or SEAMAP South Atlantic.

This cooperative survey goes from just south of Cape Hatteras down to Port St. Lucie in Florida, and the survey goes from shelf-based waters down to about 100 meters. In 2021, we cooperatively completed more than 2,000 trap and video deployments, and you can see the breakdown by group in those top two sub-bullets. The total number of samples was the greatest number of samples we have completed annually ever in the survey, and the previous top number of samples was from 2018, and the reason that we were able to reach such a large sampling number was because we carried some sea days from 2020, when we could not sample, due to COVID.

MR. BELL: Todd, we're really having a -- We can't really hear anything you're saying, and so I'm thinking maybe we could try this again, and I don't know, and are you -- If we slide some other things in here this afternoon, are you available at all tomorrow?

DR. KELLISON: Yes, but can we try -- Can you give me sixty seconds, and I will see if I can make it work by phone?

MR. BELL: Okay. We can try that.

MR. KLASNICK: Todd, if you can try switching to phone audio on your side, and maybe give that a shot.

MR. BELL: Stand by with technical difficulties. Everything has gone pretty well so far.

DR. KELLISON: So sorry about that. I know it's late, but I will just briefly back up, in case you couldn't hear me on the first slide.

MR. BELL: That would be fine.

DR. KELLISON: The points that I was stressing here is that this is a cooperative trap and video survey focused on reef fish in the South Atlantic waters, and it's a cooperative effort between National Marine Fisheries Service and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources. The NMFS component is the Southeast Fishery Independent Survey group, or SEFIS, that is based in Beaufort, and the South Carolina DNR component is funded through two funding lines, the Marine Resources Monitoring, Assessment, and Prediction program line, or MARMAP, and the Southeast Area Monitoring and Assessment program, or SEAMAP, South Atlantic, and so we all work together to perform this regional-scale survey, which is shown here in the figure on the right, our survey area, which is from just south of Cape Hatteras down to Port St. Lucie, Florida.

The survey occurs in middle shelf and shelf-break waters, out to about 100 meters. In 2021, we completed a little more than 2,000 trap and video deployments, and you can see the breakdown by group in those top two sub-bullets, and this was the greatest number of samples that we have completed ever during a sampling year for the survey, and we were able to reach that high number because had more days at-sea than we typically do, and that was because we carried over some days that we weren't able to use in 2020, when we didn't do any of our normal sampling, due to COVID.

The bottom figure on the left is just a time series of sampling efforts, starting in 2011, and the trap survey goes back to the late 1980s, and this just shows from 2011, because the SEFIS group became a cooperator of that, between SEFIS and SC DNR, in 2010, and we added videos region-wide in 2011, and so you can see, from 2011 through 2021, we have basically doubled our sample size, again with no sampling last year, due to COVID.

We anticipate that this number is going to come down some in 2022, because we're going to have fewer days at-sea than we had in 2021. A lot of this increase over time in sampling effort is due to increasing sampling efficiency across our component groups. Then, briefly, this slide just shows the top fifteen species caught in traps, ranked by number, and so in this column on the right is the total number of fish caught in traps for that particular species, and so I will take just a moment for you to review the list of species.

Then this table shows the ten species for which we collected the most biological samples and the number of otoliths, or reproductive tissues, or DNA samples, that we took, and I will say that some of these numbers are a little lower than they would be in our typical sample years. Some of these numbers are a little lower than they would be in a typical sampling year for us, and that's because,

although we did have more days at-sea than typical this year, during 2021, we typically sent fewer people out on those ships, just because of COVID constraints, and it reduced our biological sampling a little bit, and then, lastly, I will point out this large number of DNA samples for red snapper was in support of the ongoing South Atlantic great red snapper count.

Then, lastly, just a couple of points about indices of abundance, and so a core purpose, or maybe the main purpose, of our regional-scale fishery, and independent surveys in general, is to generate species-specific indices of abundance for use in stock assessments, and we do that for both the trap gear and the video gear in this survey, and South Carolina DNR has, in the past, developed annual updated trap-based indices, and they are going to continue to do that, and they communicated that in their annual trends report.

We previously have not developed annual updates to the video-based indices, and we've only developed those video indices during SEDAR assessments, but that is changing now, and so the development of annual indices, or updated annual indices, is underway for a suite of species that have undergone a SEDAR assessment that utilized a SERFS-based video index, and that's probably a list of about seven to nine species, like red snapper, black sea bass, vermilion snapper, red porgy, red grouper, gag, scamp, and I think greater amberjack.

We're in the process of developing those. They are pretty far along, and so I would anticipate that we would be able to communicate those, that we would have them completed and be able to communicate them no later than the spring of 2022, and so please stay tuned, and we would envision updating those annually each year and making those available early in the calendar years, and then, lastly, we're exploring options for developing similar updated annually indices for a broader range of species, and I think making good progress on that front, and so, again, with apologies for the IT difficulties, I will stop there and see if there are any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Todd. We appreciate the presentation, and I will note that the presentation is Attachment 2d, and the report is 2e, in your binder, for reference, if folks want to look at it later, but any questions for Todd right now? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I don't have a question, but, Todd, it would help me immensely if you could like the common names of the fish next time, because I'm not a scientist, and I'm not sure -- It would really help, if you could tell us what the fish are. I don't know what a Haemulon is.

DR. KELLISON: Thank you, Laurilee. The reason that I wanted to present from my computer today is because I realized that what I submitted in the briefing book had the scientific names, and so I think what I am still presenting, if I'm still presenting, has the common names on there now, and I can work with council staff to provide the updated presentation with the common names to everyone.

MS. THOMPSON: I see that, but it's time for me to get new glasses, and all I can see on this big screen is a blur.

MR. BELL: That's not your problem, Todd.

DR. KELLISON: The briefing book version does have scientific names in it, and so, Mel, if it's okay, I will follow-up and submit this version that has the common names.

MR. BELL: Okay. That's fine, Todd. Thanks. Any questions for Todd? I don't see any. Thanks, Todd. I appreciate you participating here.

DR. KELLISON: Okay. Thanks, everyone, for your time.

MR. BELL: All right. What I would like to do -- That was the last presentation that we had scheduled. Rick, if you're available, what I would like to do is pull your presentation for the SAFE report for tomorrow, if you could do it now. That will buy us a little time tomorrow. We don't have any Other Business scheduled right now for tomorrow, and I am sensitive to the fact that people actually do have to drive six to eight hours plus, or two days, for some people, and some of you do have flights, I guess, and so we can kind of buy a little time today, and I expect that --

Tomorrow, we have several presentations to do, and we'll have committee reports, and we'll probably need to spend a little time fine-tuning our workplan, and so the workplan gets more and more complex as time goes by, and so I think we'll be fine, but if we could get this one presentation -- There's really nothing else we can do today, because everybody else is remote and set up for tomorrow, I believe, and so, Rick, if you could buy us a little time for tomorrow, that would be great.

MR. DEVICTOR: I will try. This is not a long presentation. It's pretty short and pretty straightforward, and it's on SAFE reports, as you were talking earlier today, and council staff asked me to give a presentation and give you an update on the progress of SAFE reports in the region. As some of you may recall, we have produced SAFE reports before. I think the most recent was 2016, and so it's been a little while, and it was a team effort with NMFS and council staff to produce the SAFE reports in the region.

What I thought I would do in this presentation is kind of take a step back and go over National Standard 2 Guidelines a little bit, because that's where it outlines the requirements for a SAFE report, what should be in the SAFE report, who should do a SAFE report, like who should be responsible for writing it, and so, of course "SAFE" stands for stock assessment and fishery evaluation.

Real quick, the purpose is to go over the SAFE reports and then to discuss the recent conversations that SERO, that I had, with council staff, Chip and Myra and John, and we sort of talked about this and say, hey, is there a way that we can work on these SAFE reports without greatly impacting current projects and current amendments.

What is a SAFE report? Again, this is straight out of National Standard 2 Guidelines, which is about scientific information, and it says that it's a public document that summarizes, on a periodic basis, the best scientific information available concerning the past, present, and possible future conditions of the stock, EFH, marine ecosystems, and fisheries being managed under federal regulations, and so, as you talked about today, it's basically to give you information to help you make better management decisions. That's the purpose, and you want to do it on a periodic basis, whether it's every year or every two years or what have you, and, again, you put it on a website so the public can access this information.

National Standard 2 Guidelines goes through what should be in a SAFE report, and here it is on the slide here, and so it's status determination criteria, the OFL and ABC, landings and bycatch, information on EFH, stock status, whether it's approaching an overfished or overfishing status, and pertinent economic, social, community, and ecological information for assessing the success and impacts of management measures.

If you go over this list, certainly if you look at the first five bullets there, this is information that we have, right, and we have it, whether it's in an amendment or a stock assessment or in a report, and the status determination criteria, and so, of course, this is your MSY and OY and MSST and MFMT, and this is information that we have in our plans.

The OFL and ABC, I remember seeing a spreadsheet that council staff had, and it clearly had the OFLs and the ABCs for all species, and so we can certainly get that information. Landings information, that's on our website, and so you can see, for example, commercial landings that we get weekly, and we have final landings there for recreational, headboat, and commercial, and so it's available. Bycatch is going to take a little more digging into to get, because that is not on at least SERO's website, and then, of course, information on EFH, and we can get that. Stock status, we do a report to Congress each year that goes over the stock status of the species that you manage.

Whether approaching overfishing or overfished, that's something that we can do. That's going to take a little more of a lift, but we can find that information, and then, finally, the pertinent economic, social, and community information, and I should have mentioned it, and there is an Attachment 5b, and it goes through a report of a possible plan that we can do to produce this, and it gives some examples, and, in that, there's a report that the Science Center does, and it's a tech memo, and it's called *Economics of the U.S. South Atlantic Snapper Grouper Fishery*, and that's just an example of information that could be used to satisfy this last bullet, and it has costs and revenue and landings information, price per pound, et cetera.

Again, the main point right here is this information is out there for a lot of this, and it's a matter of pulling it in and putting it into report or linking to existing reports, for some of it. Some of it, again, is going to take a little more work.

Who develops the SAFE report? That's the big question, right, and so, again, if you look to the guidelines, it says the Secretary has the responsibility to ensure that SAFE reports are prepared, and so that's kind of broad, of course, and is that NMFS, or is it the Science Center, or is it SERO, or is it the council? Like I said before, what we've done in the region is that we use a team approach, not unlike the IPT process that we work together to produce those reports.

If we go to the next slide, I did a little homework, and I called around. I called the different regions, and I called sometimes the council staff, and sometimes NMFS, and I just was curious who produces it in your region, and do you do it every year, what is the format, and is it for all fishery management plans, and so, just quickly going through this, the North Pacific, it's really tied to the assessment process, I've found, and it sounds like, after they do an assessment, the authors of that at the Science Center will take the lead on that, and they do have an assessment plan team, which is a council body that will look over and contribute, as needed.

The Pacific, the council staff takes the lead, and their advisory panel and NMFS will contribute content. The Western Pacific is most like what we've done in the past, and, again, where you have

this team of the council, Science Center, and the Regional Office. What was interesting here is they have a fulltime contractor that just works on SAFE reports, year-round, and I talked to the person on the phone, and it's a lot of herding cats, as you can imagine, that this contractor does, is getting people to contribute to the report.

The Greater Atlantic is similar to the Pacific, where their council staff writes the SAFE reports, and HMS, as we all know, they don't have a council, and they're a little bit different, but their staff will write the SAFE reports with data from the Science Centers. Then I was curious of do you do it every year, or do you do it every two years, or what have you, and most, as you can see from this table, they do it every year, the SAFE reports, and they produce it, but, of course, some are every two years or every three years.

Then I was interested in what kind of format, because I was talking to Chip about this some, and is there a way that this information -- It's going to be the same information each year, and can it be populated into a table and it could sort of produce a report from that data, and is there software out there to do that that would help us with this process, and most do just a simple Word PDF and out it online, but I believe it was the Pacific Council where they started using a program where you put in the data, and then you can produce a report, and what the person told me on the phone is it helps, but you still have to write the text and such, and so there's still some lift to that, but, in terms of putting in the information, it would definitely help them when they put it into the tables. Then all FMPs, and all of them do it for all FMPs, but the Greater Atlantic did not, and so that's the approach, and, again, you can see the approach is different for each region.

They have been developed in the past, and I just want to say that we have done it, and so the first one was in 2005, and then 2012, 2013, and 2016, and I didn't work on it, but people in this room did, I'm sure, and you can see that sometimes we produce the SAFE report by the fishery, snapper grouper fishery, and sometimes it was for a species, such as red grouper or gag.

Challenges, and so we all know the challenges. The latest count that I have was sixty-seven species managed, at least by the council, the South Atlantic Council, and information is always changing, as we know, and landings information changes, and we get information through stock assessments, and that's always changing, and so that's the challenge, to keep up with this many species and to update that information and make it as pertinent as possible.

Then, also, as I've talked about, much of this information is found in other documents, other databases, elsewhere, and so, for example, in the SAFE report, are we going to put landings there, pull it from outside sources and bring it in, or are we going to link somewhere that has the landings information, where it's updated on that site, and so those are the things that we have to talk about as we go forward. Finally, the big one is workload. Obviously, if we start working on this every year, it will certainly take some time away from existing amendments and existing projects, to some degree.

Discussions I had with council staff so far, and this is outlined in that attachment document in more detail, but, obviously, it's going to take staff time to produce SAFE reports, and that likely will affect other projects, and, again, are there ways to auto-populate the information or link to documents, websites, what have you, what may help us with this information?

Should SAFE reports be added to the council's workplan? Certainly, if council staff is going to work on this, do you want to put it in your workplan, and the next steps, and so I suggest that I keep talking with council staff on this and see if there's ways to make this, again, so we can minimize the potential impacts, is there a way forward with this.

I will highlight, in the attachment, that GARFO did a document, when they first started to look into this more, like we're doing right now, and they actually formed a SAFE report committee, and they came up with this report, where they looked at different alternatives to ways forward to produce the reports and the alternatives compared the cost logistics between these four ways, and so maybe we can start working on a similar type evaluation of, hey, what are possible ways forward, and there is different alternatives to do this, and so that's it.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Rick. That's a good presentation, and I'm better educated now, and I know we've talked about SAFE reports for a while, and they obviously are quite a bit of potential work there, and then, of course, sixty-seven species, and do you pick and choose or prioritize? Any questions or comments for Rick or discussion on SAFE reports? I am very sensitive to the workload aspect for all of us. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel, and I think that's a really good point that I would want to emphasize here. John and I had lunch the other day, and we talked a little bit about this, and, you know, if we move forward with preparing SAFE reports, even for a subset of species, I would really want to give some very careful thought as to how does this help us streamline our management process, how does it help with amendment development, and doing reports for the sake of doing reports, given there is information that really is going to get contained in these reports that is just all over a bunch of other reports, seems like an unproductive exercise, right, but, if there is ways to take the SAFE reports and then help us plug in information into our amendments and make the process faster and more streamlined, I'm all for that, and I'm certainly supportive of Rick continuing to work with South Atlantic Council staff to come up with ways to maybe accomplish that.

MR. BELL: Good point, Andy. I think reports for reports sake is definitely what you don't want to do. If there is some utility in it and value for us to be able to move forward with things we need to move forward with, it becomes an investment of time, and, if it's a good investment, then we can make it, and we would need to choose, decide, if that is for all of us. Any questions or comments? Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Would it be beneficial to think about the interim approaches and the management procedures that you all were discussing earlier in the day, and is that something that could be part of the SAFE report? I mean, it just seems like, for what we would be using the interims for, that would kind of -- If you built in with the SAFE report, and, I mean, if we're talking about how these are going to feed into amendments and that kind of thing, it just seems like somehow the integration of those approaches would be beneficial.

MR. BELL: John.

DR. WALTER: In my kind of vision for the future of how we could be giving advice on an annual basis, through a management procedure, where an index adjusts the ACL each year, it could be that the SAFE report includes that, and it's essentially the one-stop shop for the ACL advice, and

we really wouldn't need to be producing anything more than that, and that could really streamline everything for people, because they would have this really condensed, nice, concise thing with everything.

We would just need to set up a process for doing those management procedures, and Andy and I were talking about this, and some of our stocks, and like white grunt, really just could be another perfect one, because it looks like we've got some pretty good indices for white grunt, and we just modify the previous ACL.

I think, yes, it could fit in there. We're not quite ready there, in terms of having those management procedures yet, and then, in the meantime, the interim approach to modify the catch advice from the assessment does go through a -- It's going to have to go through the SSC, and I think it could be compiled in there, but it might need something else to back it up, in the sense that it might need more documentation, but I think, ultimately, we can get to something that is really streamlined each year when we're giving that advice.

DR. BELCHER: I think it would be good, because I know, again, going back in time, that was one of the things that the SSC was constantly stressing about wanting the SAFE reports available to them, and so that idea, again, of, if the interim is something that's more beneficial to the SSC, it seems like it's another kind of push for the idea that maybe there is a better integration amongst those procedures. Like I said, it's just we have really wanted to see those for a number of years, and it would be great to see that much information go into a SAFE report and know that it does have that much value across both the council and the SSC.

MR. BELL: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't necessarily view that the interim analysis and the SAFE report have to be linked together. We're certainly not doing that in the Gulf, and so I think they could be separate, but information provided is relevant. I did want to ask, and maybe this is directed at John Carmichael or Chip or Myra, but, in terms of kind of the push for the SAFE reports, because, for example, if you think back, and it was either the June or September meeting, you gave the great presentation and kind of walked us through the web pages that you've been developing that summarize landings and a lot of the biological information and things that very much would be contained in these various SAFE reports, right?

You're, in some ways, actually writing portions of a SAFE report without calling it a SAFE report, and I'm wondering if maybe there's opportunities with that effort, maybe just to build upon that, given that you've already done a lot of that work, and then the question becomes like how simple it is to update that kind of keep on top of that information.

DR. COLLIER: That's our thought, is to utilize some of that information directly to the SAFE report, and it's a simple program. It does take a couple of hours to do it for each species, but, I mean, that is only a couple of hours, and it would be available for the year, and so we could do that, and maybe we're not doing every species every year, but we could definitely look at selecting maybe a subset of the snapper grouper species and then a couple of FMPs, because all the other FMPs are a little bit shorter, or have much fewer species in it, maybe one or two species, and so I think we could easily do it and incorporate this, and we do have other pieces of information out there. Some of the biological information is already out there in a digital format as well, and so

we could pop that over and potentially use it for other pieces, and so, yes, we definitely want to work together with Rick on how to develop this and what pieces are best.

MR. BELL: Anything else? I think we're in agreement that it's worth continuing to explore with Rick, and so we'll just, staff-to-staff, just kind of work through how to best work through this and see what will work. Okay. All right. Anything else on SAFE reports? I don't see anything.

I don't have anything else that we can do today, and, basically, what I would like to do is we'll go and adjourn, and we'll pick it up at 8:30 tomorrow, and we'll have four presentations, it looks like, and we'll deal with the workplan, and, of course, we'll have our committee reports, and so well done, guys. You're staying on track here, and we're doing a great job, and so have a good evening, and we'll see you in the morning.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on December 9, 2021.)

- - -

DECEMBER 10, 2021

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session III of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Beaufort Hotel, Beaufort, North Carolina, on Friday, December 10, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: We'll go ahead and get started, in the interest of maybe getting out on time today, which would be a great thing. Good morning. We'll reconvene the South Atlantic Council meeting in Full Council. This is the remainder of Council Session III. We've got a few presentations today, and we've got to do committee reports, and then we'll need to work on the workplan, and so we'll start right out, and our first presenter will be Rick Robbins, our old friend from the Mid, who is now doing some interesting stuff, and he's going to talk to us about the Kitty Hawk offshore wind efforts. Go ahead, Rick, whenever you're ready.

MR. ROBBINS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I'm Rick Robbins, fisheries liaison for Kitty Hawk Offshore Wind, and I will just reiterate how great it is to be with you all in person today. I saw Spud this morning, and we were talking about the last time that I think we were together, and it was at the March meeting in Jekyll Island of this council, and I think we've all been through a lot since then, but it's great to see everybody, and I look forward to giving you a quick presentation today, and I know it's the last day of your council meeting, but run through an update on the Kitty Hawk offshore wind project that I've been involved with since 2019.

Kitty Hawk offshore wind, the lease and project is owned by Avangrid Renewables. Avangrid is a major renewable power generator in the United States, with approximately eight gigawatts and wind and solar power currently in operation. They also have offshore wind lease capacity of about 6.9 gigawatts, and that includes the Kitty Hawk project.

In terms of where we are in the process, the lease was awarded and executed in 2017. The site assessment work has been going on fairly intensively since then, and it really picked up speed in 2019, with offshore survey work, and it continues today, and the first construction and operations plan for the first component of the project was submitted in December of 2020, and that was deemed complete and sufficient by BOEM this summer, and they issued a notice of intent and began scoping. That was conducted earlier this year, and the remaining lease area, to the east of the first part of the project, is currently being evaluated, and a construction and operations plan, or COP, as we refer to it, is being developed right now for submission in 2022. We would expect in-water construction to begin in 2025 for the first phase of the project, and we would expect a record of decision from BOEM on the project in 2023.

This is sort of a quick orientation about where the project is, and I think most of the council members are already familiar with it, but it's located approximately twenty-seven miles east of Corolla, North Carolina. The first phase of the project is what we refer to as Kitty Hawk North. The project comprises two components, Kitty Hawk North and Kitty Hawk South.

Kitty Hawk North is basically the northwest 40 percent of the project area, and it has an export cable corridor that runs up to Sandbridge Beach, just below Virginia Beach, Virginia. That project will generate about 800 megawatts of power, with a total of seventy positions, including sixty-nine turbines and one offshore substation. Kitty Hawk South is situated slightly deeper, out to about twenty fathoms, and that would include 108 turbines and two offshore stations, generating 1,700 megawatts of power. That will provide clean power, just to put it in perspective, to about 700,000 homes.

The nice thing about solar is it's not just clean, but reliable power, and so the new machines will cut in and start generating power at just over six knots of wind, and they will cut out at about sixty knots, and, if you consider the hub height on the turbines, that covers about 95 percent of the conditions, in terms of wind conditions, in the area, and so it will produce power for about that many homes.

We're currently conducting reconnaissance-level surveys and outreach to inform the permitting process. One of the challenges is getting power to the grid, and we're evaluating that right now in North Carolina. There are a number of ways to do that, but we can't simply go due west to the closest point on land and connect to the grid, and so we're conducting a comprehensive study of the grid and potential routes, and we're actively surveying an offshore route, which is a long route that would come down here approximately to Atlantic Beach to connect to the power grid in the New Bern area. We're also considering other routes that would go through the sounds, potentially, and the engineers are studying that, and studying the grid as well.

We have offshore survey campaigns that are active right now, and they will be wrapping up at the end of this month. We deployed a FLiDAR buoy, and these are floating LiDAR buoys, and we deployed the first one in the first part of the project, and that's just above the Triple Zeros in about sixteen fathoms of water, and we're deploying, imminently, a second one that will be in about twenty fathoms, just below the Triple Zeroes.

Those are collecting radar wind data up to the hub height, to collect all the environmental data necessary to evaluate the project, and that weather data is being collected and made available to the public, in terms of wind speeds and water temperature, and so is the second met buoy, and this

gives you an idea, and these are twenty feet long, and they're equipped with AIS, and they're lighted for safety, but they are collecting a lot of environmental data.

If you go to the website at [kittyhawkoffshore.com/fishing](http://kittyhawkoffshore.com/fishing), you can get the real-time weather data. This morning, the wind was blowing at seven knots, and the seas were two feet at six seconds, and so the conditions were pretty nice.

When I was on the Mid-Atlantic Council, and we talked a lot with BOEM, to say we're getting underway with the development of offshore wind and the permitting of offshore wind, and they would talk to us a lot about two concepts. They would talk about the issue of macro siting and micro siting, when it came to avoiding fisheries impacts, and macro siting is critically important. You have to have a good site in order to avoid significant fisheries impacts, and Kitty Hawk has that.

Kitty Hawk is one of the best-sited lease areas on the east coast, and it has the lowest commercial fisheries exposure per acre of any project on the east coast, and so it begins with that, but, when you think about micro siting, typically, we might think about avoiding a specific piece of habitat or a wreck or some particular benthic feature, and that can come into play in the development of the site, but there is something else that is critical, I think, to avoiding impacts, and that is essentially a systematic integration of fisheries considerations in the project design process.

In order to do that, you have to be able to front-load it, and so you have to have the information, and you have to frontload it, and I feel very fortunate to have worked with this private team, because they have been highly responsive to the fisheries information that I have fed into the process, and so we've been focused on the curation of local knowledge to get the information we need, and you can't get all of the information that you would need to inform a project from existing datasets, and so a lot of this information has come out of wheelhouses.

Dewey served as the fisheries representative for the project, and he's been instrumental in helping us curate some of that, but the trawl boat captains have been very forthcoming and have documented the predominant trawl tow directionality that they work in this area, and so the entire grid is laid out along that predominant trawl tow directionality access, which is approximately fourteen degrees true east of north, or twenty-five degrees magnetic, and then that also aligns with the Loran-C 2-lines in the area, which is coincident with the long-distance commercial fisheries transits.

Some of the captains will come out of Oregon Inlet, the trawl boat captains would come out, and, when they're heading from Carolina up to the grounds off of New York to go fluking, they would hold the 2-line and navigate up that line as they went through the area, and this is coincident with that. The spacing between the turbines is just over three-quarters of a mile east to west and over one-and-a-tenth mile north to south.

In terms of what we're accommodating in historical fisheries in the area, if you look, there's been a dramatic decline in trawl boat fishing in the area, and these are total VTRs in red, and you will see, for the last decade, that effort has dropped off substantially. Historically, there was some fishing in there, but the nature of the summer flounder fishery has shifted substantially to the north. The model VTRs is actually modeled catch, and that's from National Marine Fisheries Service.

About half of that is squid, which is fished seaward of the area and doesn't actually occur within the lease area.

This is looking at it from a slightly different dataset, and this is state data provided by the State of North Carolina from their biological sampling program, and these are all the records northeast of Oregon Inlet. Summer flounder catch is in excess of a thousand pounds, and you can see the dramatic change in intensity of that fishery in the last decade, and there basically have not been any records out of that program, and this shows the amount of changes that occurred in the fluke fishery.

This is zoomed-out, but I just wanted to give you a sense of where the project is relative to the two inlets with respect to transit considerations. The project is almost equidistant between Rudee Inlet and Oregon Inlet, and so there are a number of fisheries transits that occur, and that's probably the most frequent interaction with the site, is going to be transit interactions from HMS boats, boats fishing seaward of the area for tuna and billfish and swordfish, and what we've done is rotated the entire array 34 degrees east of North, and that opens the array up to those transits, and, in addition to that, in terms of considering some of the safety things related to the transits, there will be marking and lighting and AIS that will comply with the Coast Guard regulations for private aids to navigation.

This is that same array zoomed-in, and so you can see the little rudder. With respect to the layout, everything is going to be laid out in straight lines, as far as the alignment of turbines and substations. A boat will be able to chart a course directly from Rudee Inlet to the Triple Zeroes, on a direct heading through the array, and that's because that's been opened up by rotating it clockwise. Boats operating from both inlets will be able to chart courses to destinations seaward of the array, either directly or with minimal intermediate waypoints.

I thought you might like to see what we're seeing, and this is some high-resolution bathymetry. That little scale down in the bottom left-hand corner is about 600 feet, and it shows some of the high-resolution geophysical work. These are basically large sand ripples, and this is what the bottom looks like in the area, and, if you recall the orientation of those trawl towlines, heading north-northeast and south-southwest, they pretty much line up with this and that's what the area looks like on the bottom.

Those red lines are video transects that were taken to do geophysical work, and then, in the middle of those, we do vibracore samples, to collect benthic samples, and those are predominantly sand, but this is typical of the area.

We currently have a self-guided open house available, and we've had to adapt to the conditions during the pandemic, and so a lot of things have been done virtually, but there is an open house available, if you want to get a lot more information on the project, and that's all I have this morning, but, again, it's great to be with you, and I would be happy to take any questions, and I look forward to following-up on the project.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Rick. Any questions for Rick? Spud and then Laurilee.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, Rick. Just a curiosity question, and, if you've got weather, like a hurricane or something, bearing down, are you all retrieving the met buoy and bringing it back in, or does it ride out the storm?

MR. ROBBINS: I think the met buoy is set up to ride it out. It's anchored with a very large mooring anchor.

MR. BELL: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you. That was a good presentation. What about bird strikes? Have you guys done studies, and have you looked at other existing windmill operations at-sea, to figure out what kind of bird mortality you have associated with the blades?

MR. ROBBINS: I appreciate the question. The construction and operations plan that the company prepared and submitted to BOEM has to consider bird issues as well, and so that's part of it. I've been connected with the fisheries side of it, but they do look at birds and bats as part of the process, and BOEM has to take all of that into consideration.

MR. BELL: Any other questions? John.

DR. WALTER: Thanks for the presentation, and I'm just wondering if, during the monitoring process here, whether there is going to be any passive acoustic monitoring, because, recently, there is the new guidance on passive acoustic monitoring for projects that has come out from BOEM and NOAA and whether that's part of any of the monitoring.

MR. ROBBINS: John, I appreciate the question. We're still developing the monitoring plan for the project, but I think passive acoustic monitoring would be something that will be considered as that goes forward, and we would expect a pretty comprehensive, multifaceted approach to monitoring, and I think part of that may include a trawl survey component, a pot or trap survey component, and other technologies like passive acoustic monitoring.

There may be other elements for oceanographic conditions, to collect additional environmental data, and there has even been some discussion about environmental DNA as a monitoring tool, and I think there are going to be a lot of exciting opportunities to apply new technologies to the monitoring plans that go into place, and, with respect to this project, this is different than some of the projects in the Northeast, and so the same thing that is -- The focal points of some of those include things like lobster, and we're not going to have the focal point at Kitty Hawk, but we're going to have things like mahi-mahi and king mackerel and some pelagic species that we're going to want to understand, and those things aren't going to lend themselves to a trawl survey, and so I think there will be some nice opportunities for innovation on the fisheries monitoring side.

MR. BELL: All right. Laurilee and then Kerry.

MS. THOMPSON: So it says the operation period is anticipated to be twenty-five years. What happens after twenty-five years? Do you come out and take all the windmills down or change the batteries or what?

MR. ROBBINS: Well, so there is a decommissioning provision in the plan, and BOEM has guidelines also that require decommissioning, and it means they will literally be taken out, unless there was some plan to upgrade the machines at that point, but the understanding is that BOEM requires them to be decommissioned.

MS. THOMPSON: Do they replace them with newer, more modern machines then, or --

MR. ROBBINS: I think all of that would be to be determined at that point in time.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. BELL: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: You had said that the arrays, if I'm using the right terminology, have been rotated clockwise to adjust for fishing effort and transiting, and I would just like to find out -- It seems like probably you used some pretty good spatial data from the VTRs to figure out -- To sort of determine that you needed to do that, and that was really helpful in the process.

MR. ROBBINS: Actually, the VTRs had very low utility, because there are almost none in the area, and so the information for that comes out of the interaction with fishermen. We got the trawl tow directionality directly from captains, about how they trawl through the area, and so that's that first axis, but the second axis is actually not at ninety degrees, and it's more than that, and so there is additional clockwise rotation in the array, and that opens those lanes up for the transits, both out of Oregon Inlet and out of Rudee Inlet.

MR. BELL: All right. Any other questions for Rick? Trish.

MR. MURPHEY: This is not really a question, and it's just a comment. I know our Department of Environmental Quality has been working closely with you guys on all of this, and I just wanted to reiterate that partnership, and, if you all are considering running the cable corridor through Pamlico Sound, it's going to be very important to work with the Division of Marine Fisheries and DEQ and our fishermen in the inside waters, because there's a lot of habitat concerns there, and so I wanted to just state that.

MR. ROBBINS: Again, if I may, Mr. Chair, I appreciate that comment, and we have been in close discussion with DMF, and will remain so, and I think we all appreciate the potential complexities of going through the sound, and this is all part of a fairly comprehensive evaluation of potential routes. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you Rick, could you tell me how many windmills will be in the longest axis?

MR. ROBBINS: I would have to count those and get back to you, man. They're there in that array, and so they're in the slide deck, but, off the top of my head, I don't know.

MR. GRINER: But it's like twenty, and so it would be like twenty miles' worth or something like that?

MR. ROBBINS: It's probably on the order of -- I think it's twelve miles deep, and so it just depends on the angle, but we can pull it off the array and get that information to you.

MR. BELL: Any other questions? The one thing that I think -- We heard some stuff from the public and some potential excitement about their utility as artificial reefs, and then, of course, I don't know if there's going to be exclusion zones around them, but some of the fishermen have commented on that, and hoping to be able to utilize them in that capacity, and so I don't know what your exclusion areas are or that sort of thing.

MR. ROBBINS: That's a great point, Mr. Chairman. That something that we've discussed. When I was on the council, we discussed this with the Coast Guard seven ways from Sunday, because we all had interest in whether the Coast Guard would take any action, and the Coast Guard and BOEM have both been consistent in saying that they would not restrict access when they're in the operations phase.

Now, there has been the expectation that, during construction, there will be some safety zones, and hopefully that's going to be managed in a rolling way, to minimize disturbance, but, once they're built and commissioned -- Like there are two right now off of Virginia, and you can go right up to them and fish, and that's been BOEM's position, and that's been the Coast Guard's position, and that's been the developers' position throughout this process.

MR. BELL: Okay. That's good to know. All right. Anything else? I don't see anything. Rick, thanks for coming. It's good to see you, and it's good to see you actually in-person.

MR. ROBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's great to see all of you.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, we're just going to stick to the schedule, and so the next thing we have on the agenda is the committee and Full Council reports, and we'll just start running through those, and then, at some point, if we need to take a break, we'll take a break. The first report we're going to give is actually from the Executive Committee meeting that we had on November 10.

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Executive Committee met via webinar on November 10. We discussed the budget and activities schedule review, and Kelly presented an overview of the 2021 budget and expenditures and the proposed draft budget for 2022. Expenditures during 2021 are below budget, due to the lower than anticipated travel expenses due to COVID, and so no surprise there.

I won't try to read every bit of this, but the total budget amount is slightly above anticipated funding, due to increased potential travel costs associated with additional AP meetings in 2022 and increased working group activities. I am not going to read every bit of this, because I can't see it, honestly, but good news on the budget. We're in good shape.

For the workplan review, we did have some discussion of the workplan review for 2022/2023. Then we went into closed session and approved increasing the SSC compensation from \$250 to \$300 per day, calculated on an hourly basis of \$37.50, and we had a motion. **Motion 1 is approve**

**the draft 2022 operational budget as presented.** That was approved by the committee, and so that's a motion from the committee. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any opposition to approving the budget? Seeing none, then that motion would carry here.**

That's all we did there, and it was a pretty quick meeting, and it was very focused, and so now we'll get to this meeting, and so this will be the report for Full Council Session I on Monday, and this is the closed session. The council met Monday in closed session to review applications for the open seats on the Systems Management Workgroup Advisory Panel. Applicants for the council's Socioeconomic Panel (SEP), Scientific and Statistical Committee, as well as participants in SEDAR, seats on the Golden Crab Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management, Law Enforcement, Mackerel/Cobia, Deepwater Shrimp, and Snapper Grouper Advisory Panels were considered. Open seats on the SEP and SSC were also reviewed and applicants considered.

The council provided the following recommendations, because remember we were operating -- What we developed were recommendations, and so here's our following recommendations. Advisory panel appointments, Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management, reappoint David Webb from Florida and appoint Joel Fodrie from North Carolina to the Habitat Advisory Panel. That would be in the form of a motion for us then, right, or we're going to go all the way through these and knock them out.

Law Enforcement AP, reappoint Bruce Buckson to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. Mackerel Cobia, reappoint Rusty Hudson, Aaron Kelly, John Mallette, and Brad Phillips to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. Appoint William Jones and Charles Proudfoot to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel.

Then, under Snapper Grouper, reappoint Dick Brame to the NGO seat, Randy Beardsley from Florida, Randy McKinley from North Carolina, and Andy Piland from North Carolina to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. Then appoint Tom Meeks from Georgia, Paul Nelson from Florida, and Scott Buff from North Carolina to the Snapper Grouper AP. I will pause here for a second. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to make a substitute motion to replace Scott Buff with Selby Lewis.

MR. BELL: Okay. Just a procedural question. Since we were going to attack these as one motion, what we would be doing is amending the final motion, if we wanted to make that change, and so we would need to discuss that. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: (Mr. Carmichael's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, then let's have some discussion on that, Tim, if you want to.

MR. GRINER: Do you need a second or just discussion?

MR. BELL: Well, just discussion at this point, because it's not technically a motion yet.

MR. GRINER: So, to get some discussion started, this was a very tough decision, and, in the very beginning, we went round and round and round and round about it, and, from North Carolina's

perspective, Selby came to the meeting, and he drove all the way here to the meeting, and he wants to be engaged. He came and he gave comments, and he's been in the business for over forty years, and it's what he does. It's all he does. He sat down with us, and he had some nice, frank discussions with us.

One of my concerns with Selby was that he just would not -- That he would not find the time to follow through and stay engaged, but he told us that, and he assured us, that he was going to stay engaged that he's at a point now, with both his fishing schedule and the research work that he's doing with UNC-W and his market, Intercoastal Seafood, that he's at a place now where he can dedicate the time to this, and he feels it's very important, and he wants to be engaged, and I think we would be missing out on a heck of an opportunity to have another diverse voice on this AP, and so we kind of think that we should give him the opportunity to get involved and stay involved.

He has a big following among the younger fishermen too, and I think that's very important. A lot, a lot, of guys look up to Selby, and so that was kind of our rationale, and it's nothing against the other candidate, but it's just taking advantage of an opportunity to have a guy like Selby involved. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Okay, and so North Carolina would like to make that adjustment. Any further discussion with that? Are we okay with changing that, because, at this point, this isn't a motion, and this is just discussion and a recommendation, but, if that's North Carolina's desire for that seat, are we good? Okay, and so we can make that adjustment in there, and then, when we get to the end of all this, then it will officially be a motion, and we'll deal with all of it. Okay.

Additional AP items, replace Richard Reed on the Deepwater Shrimp AP. Accept the New England Fishery Management Council's recommendations for representatives on the Dolphin Wahoo AP, and we'll reach out to them. SSC appointments, appoint Dr. Kai Lorenzen to the vacant SSC seat.

SEDAR recommendations, approve the participant list table for SEDAR 82, South Atlantic gray triggerfish, as modified in Table 1. Approve the modifications to SEDAR 76, South Atlantic black sea bass, participant list, Table 2. Approval changing Tom Roller to the council representative observer role for SEDAR 78, because Tom is on the council now, and that's Spanish mackerel, replacing Steve Poland.

That would be the motion. Everything that I just read, we need to turn that into a motion, and so someone could just, without having to read all that again, just make that a motion, everything that I just read, with the modified name. Jessica, and you don't have to read all of it.

**MS. MCCAWLEY: Move to approve the appointments in Full Council I.**

MR. BELL: Do we have a second? Second by Chris. Okay. I apologize for the wonkiness. When we had an AP committee, then it was officially motions from the committee, but, the way we're doing it now, without a committee, it's a little awkward, but it works. All right. Any further discussion on the motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion passes.**

Then we had direction to staff. For the system management plan workgroup open seats, reach out to the appropriate AP members to encourage applying for the North Carolina recreational and

South Carolina commercial seats and readvertise for consideration during the council's June 2022 meeting. Review the membership of the Golden Crab AP and the fishery, to ensure that current participants are represented on the AP and readvertise open seats, as needed. For the Mackerel Cobia AP, request the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council provide recommendations for one commercial and one recreational representative on the AP and continue to work with the ASMFC, as appropriate, for Spanish mackerel management issues. Readvertise for the SEP open for consideration at the June 2022 council meeting. These are the tables that we referenced. Okay. Now that was the closed session.

Now this is the Full Council Session I open session, and so the council approved the agenda, and we had reports from NOAA OLE, state agencies, and the council liaisons. We had a presentation on standardized bycatch reporting methodology, and we had some discussion on that, and then we had a motion from that. Basically, we were asked to determine if the review -- We didn't approve the review, but we just said that it met the necessary criteria.

Motion 1 is the review satisfies the language in the final rule for the standard bycatch reporting. That was approved by the council, and so that's technically a motion, and then that would be -- No, we did that, because we were in Full Council. Okay. Good. Never mind. This wonkiness -- I'm used to reporting for a committee. Okay.

Then we had some discussion of exempted fishing permits, and SERO staff briefed the council on two exempted fishing permit EFP applications. One application was submitted by REEF, requesting authorizing to test non-containment traps for lionfish. The second EFP application was submitted by the South Carolina Aquarium, requesting authorization to allow harvest of council-managed species, and we had a third request submitted by Sustainable Seas Technology to test acoustic sub-sea buoy retrieval systems.

Basically, we looked at all three of those and felt that all three were worth moving along, and we would like to see that happen, and so we had a motion, which we recommended approval of the three EFP applications presented to the council. We're bringing that here. We had the discussion there, and we're bringing them here, and now this actually is a draft motion for us, and so someone would need to make that motion. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, sir. **Mr. Chairman, I recommend approval of the three EFP applications presented to the council.**

MR. BELL: Great. Do we have a second? Second by Carolyn. Any further discussion? **Any objection to the motion? Then that motion carries.** Thank you. All right. Well, we got through that. All right. Now on to the Mackerel Cobia Committee.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will make reference to the report that is available to everybody. The Mackerel Cobia Committee met on December 6, 2021. After approval of the agenda and approval of the minutes, we moved into a discussion of CMP Amendment 34, which is updates to king mackerel management based on the SEDAR 38 update in 2020.

Public hearings on this amendment were held via webinar on November 15 and 16. Council staff reviewed public hearing comments, the decision document, and a draft document for that

amendment, with updated action alternative language, based on guidance provided by NOAA GC and the council at their September 2021 meeting.

**The first discussion was on some very minor changes to the purpose and need statement, and that resulted in a committee motion to approve the purpose and need statements, as modified, and so, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved by the council.**

**Then we moved on to Action 1, and, again, we had some recommended changes, and these were sort of housekeeping changes to make this language consistent with other amendments, and so, after committee discussion on that, there was a motion to approve the edits for Action 1, and so, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved by the Full Council.**

Then we moved down to our next discussion, and that was on Action 2, which was actually we had a motion that failed for lack of a second. **Then we moved on to Action 3, where, again, we had some discussions and approved some recommended changes for Action 3, and so, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved by the council.**

Then we moved down to discussion on revising the recreational annual catch target for Atlantic migratory group king mackerel, and, after discussion, the committee -- **There was a motion to select Alternative 1, no action, as the preferred under Action 3 in the amendment, and so, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved by the council. Go ahead, Chester.**

MR. BREWER: I just wanted to say that I object.

MR. WOODWARD: I missed that. Can you repeat that, Chester?

MR. BREWER: I'm sorry. I object. I vote no.

MR. WOODWARD: Okay, and so we have one objection to the committee motion on Motion 4. Okay. All right. Then we moved into the Action 5, which is related to minimum size changes, and that's actually sort of bifurcated into addressing the minimum size for recreational harvest and addressing the minimum size for commercial harvest.

**Our first discussion was on the recreational harvest, and there was a committee motion approved to change the preferred alternative to Alternative 1, which is no action. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**Then we discussed the potential changes in the minimum size limit for commercial harvest, and, after a lot of discussion, we had a committee motion to change the preferred to Alternative 1, which is no action, on the second part of Action 5. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion on this motion? Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved by the council.**

**Then we moved to Action 7, which is related to modifying the recreational requirement for Atlantic group king mackerel and Spanish mackerel to be landed with heads and fins intact, and, after some discussion on that topic, the committee approved a motion to select Alternative 2, Sub-Alternatives 2a and 2b, as the preferred for Action 7. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on this motion? Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Now that CMP Amendment 34 will go back to the Gulf Council for review, and then we'll see it again in March. The next discussion topic was -- Go ahead, Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Did we have any more consideration of whether we would move those actions to Considered but Rejected? That way, if it goes to the Gulf, and the Gulf approves it, and it comes back, you wouldn't have to potentially ping back and forth with that.

MS. WIEGAND: I mean, my understanding is that it's ultimately up to the council. We can keep the two actions, Action 5 and Action 6, which are the minimum size limit actions that you guys ended up selecting no action on, and we can keep those in the amendment if you think that you might want to reconsider in March, but, if you're comfortable with the decision you've made, and you think this is the direction that you would like to go, you can pass a motion to send them to Considered but Rejected, which means staff won't have to do all of the write-up and everything for that, and we would take that motion to the Gulf Council in January, to see if they concur, but, ultimately, that's up to the council. It does simplify the amendment if you move them to Considered but Rejected.

MR. GRIMES: What about Action 4? That's -- Excuse me. Actions 3, 5, and 6 are all no action as the preferred alternative.

MS. WIEGAND: This is one of those funky situations, and Action 3 is a catch level recommendation, and so you cannot move to that to Considered but Rejected, because it is actually a change, because it's tiering off that ABC action, whereas Actions 5 and 6 are not related to catch levels, and so the no action is just status quo, and so you can send those to Considered but Rejected.

MR. GRIMES: Okay, and so a little bit different than what I said in committee, but we talked about this, and I'm not a fan of keeping actions where you're not taking action, and so, if you don't think you're going to revisit those, I think I would go ahead and vote to remove it. If the Gulf Council doesn't agree, then they're going to stay in the document, I guess, but, that way, you won't have to -- The next time the Gulf Council sees it can be the last time.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thank you, Shep. There is no action no actions, and then there's the no action actions, and I think we're all trying to keep this straight, but certainly I would entertain a motion from the council to do as has been suggested, to move Action 5, and I guess it's technically Action 6, to the Considered but Rejected portion of the plan. Go ahead, Mel.

MR. BELL: I would make that motion, with the understanding that that would minimize the potential problem and delay that might happen, and, I mean, it's just -- Unless we have an intent to look at those again.

MR. WOODWARD: I certainly don't get a sense that --

MR. BELL: Okay. **Then I move that we send Actions 5 and 6 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix.**

MR. WOODWARD: All right. We have a motion. Do we have a second? We have a second from Jessica. Any discussion on this motion? **Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, then the motion is approved by the council.** Thank you, Shep, for reminding us. I was mission focused here in trying to get through.

All right, and so back to CMP Amendment 32, which is Gulf cobia. We had a discussion about that, and it's an update to the SEDAR 28 assessment for Gulf cobia that was completed in July of 2020, and the results indicate that Gulf cobia are undergoing overfishing, which puts the stock at risk. The Gulf SSC reviewed the results of the assessment and provided recommendations for new ABCs for Gulf cobia. There were public hearings for this amendment held in-person the week of October 18.

The Gulf Council reviewed this amendment at their October meeting and approved the document for formal review. Council staff reviewed the comments, decision document, and draft document for this amendment, as well as discussions at the Gulf Council meeting in August. We discussed this, and we didn't recommend any changes inconsistent with what had already been considered and approved by the Gulf, and so we have a draft motion before us, if someone would like to make that motion and read it into the record, please. Go ahead, Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Sure. **I would like to make a motion to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 32 for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any editorial changes to the document and codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.**

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Chris. Do we have a second? We've got a second from Tim Griner. Do we have to have a roll call vote on this, because it's final action? All right. Then I will let you proceed with that, John, if you would.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you. I will proceed with the roll call vote, alphabetically. Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: HelmeY.

MS. HELMEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roller.

MR. ROLLER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Strelcheck.

MR. DEVICTOR: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Chairman Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **The motion carries unanimously.**

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thank you, John. The next discussion was on CMP Amendment 33, which is updates to Gulf king mackerel management based on the SEDAR 38 update in 2020. Ryan Rindone, Gulf Council staff, presented draft options to be considered in Amendment 33, which proposes modifications to catch limits and sector allocations for Gulf king mackerel, based on the results of the most recent assessment.

The stock assessment found that Gulf king mackerel were not overfished or undergoing overfishing. However, recruitment has been low for the last ten years, when the spawning stock biomass is below SSB at MSY, and so the committee reviewed the proposed actions and alternatives.

**There was some action taken by the Gulf Council to modify an alternative in Action 2, and we were asked to take action consistent with what the Gulf did and so there was a motion made and approved by the committee to move Alternative 3 in Action 2 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved by the council.**

In Other Business, we had a discussion about the timing of SEDAR 78, the Atlantic Spanish mackerel assessment, and there was considerable concern about possible delays and the effect that that would have on moving management forward and synchronizing management between interstate and federal fisheries management. There was discussion that, if there was no way to keep the assessment on track, then it might be necessary to have a called meeting of the SSC to review the assessment, so that that would offset the delays caused by the Center.

Then, last, but certainly not least, I have some timing and tasks here, and so I have a draft motion, and, if someone would like to read this into the record, we will make a decision on it. Is someone willing to do that for me? Go ahead, Mel.

**MR. BELL: I can see it from here. I move to adopt the following timing and tasks: bring Action 7 (cut/damaged fish) in Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34 to the Law Enforcement AP for discussion at their upcoming meeting; prepare Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34 for consideration of final action at the March 2022 council meeting; work with Gulf Council staff to prepare Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 32 for transmittal to the Secretary of Commerce; work with Gulf Council staff, as needed, to continue work on Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 33.**

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mel. Do we have a second?

DR. BELCHER: I will second.

MR. WOODWARD: We have a second from Carolyn. Any discussion on this motion? **Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, then that motion carries.** That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman, although I would certainly like to acknowledge and thank staff, particularly Christina, for their usual stellar work on this. It makes things flow very smoothly, and especially with these joint plans, and so I very much appreciate it.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Spud. I agree. All right. Next up is Snapper Grouper.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The Snapper Grouper Committee met this week and approved the minutes and some changes to the agenda. Then we got a report on the Ecopath project on red snapper recruitment from FWRI and then the response to that from the SSC Chair.

Then the committee went into Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Revisions, and we got comments from the AP, and then we started talking about the release mortality reduction

framework, and we gave the following guidance to staff, and this is lengthy here, but I will read it.

To compile information or analyses to inform whether a demonstrable change in recreational dead releases can be estimated, such that it could be used in estimation of the acceptable biological catch, by the following potential management changes: area closures by depth and defined area identified as a species hot spot; gear modifications of single hook, leader length, hook size, lines per person; also weight limit per person, and that was red-snapper-specific; seasons; and to consider sector differences and regional differences as possible and appropriate.

In March of 2022, staff will present the information or analyses to the committee, and then the committee will select potential management changes for the SSC to consider at their April meeting. At the April meeting, the SSC will review potential management changes and determine whether the gathered information could adequately support an estimated change in dead releases and an adjustment to the recommended ABC for red snapper. Also, direction was to continue to promote best practices through outreach and determine a timeline and mechanism for incorporating the most recently recommended ABC and annual catch limit for red snapper. Then we have some additional items there for consideration. I am going to turn it over to Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Jessica. We wanted to get more clarification on how we're going to proceed about this. The desire, I think, is to include an action to modify the ABC, to set the ABC. If we do that and not address sector allocations, this can continue to be a framework amendment, and so the allocation revisions could be considered after an ABC is determined, and so the way we would prepare that in the document is the alternatives for the ABC level could include the option that would be level that your SSC has recommended, and that has already been recommended to the council, and alternatives that would be considering these potential adjustments resulting from the gear modifications in the remaining actions in the framework amendment.

We also thought that you might want to start gathering public input prior to the March 2022 council meeting, and that's certainly entirely up to you, and then request, as Jessica already went over, feedback from the SSC during their April 2022 meeting, and you could still continue to gather public input after that time, and so I'm just putting those things out there, because that was -- I think some of it was discussed, and it just wasn't clear whether the committee was wanting us to proceed in that manner.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Myra. Let me just try to add to this, and so I agree that we had some discussions about what do we do with the ABC, and so, to try to restate what Myra is saying, there would then be an action to modify the ABC in this framework mechanism, and there would be options in there to set it at the one that the SSC already recommended as well as, based on the actions that are in that document, if there are other credits, if you will, that we could achieve, there would be other options underneath that particular action for the ABC.

One thing that I wanted to point out here, and so Myra also mentioned that we could start scoping this prior to the March 2022 council meeting, and I will just put this out there, that I have some concerns about that, because we haven't seen the whole document and what this looks like. We've just kind of thrown the kitchen sink in there, and I'm a little concerned, without us having one more discussion on this, that, if it goes out to scoping, that the public is just going to be like, okay,

we hate this, we hate this, we hate this, we hate this, like no to everything, and so I'm wondering if we need to discuss it one more time and then maybe start scoping after that March meeting, and so I will just put that out there. What do folks think about this? Mel.

MR. BELL: Well, I think the concept of trying to engage the public sooner rather than later, and I understand what you're saying, was to, one, demonstrate that we are moving quickly, but, two, to sort of just try to maybe acclimate them a little bit in the general direction we're going, without being too specific, and then we can get -- It also kind of goes to what we were talking about with scoping, where we've always scoped in a very regimented way, I guess, before. We developed a scoping document that we've approved, and boom, and then we did a set number of meetings and things, but this is kind of maybe allowing scoping to be a little bit more flexible and a longer process and allowing staff to figure out ways of engaging properly.

I do agree that you've got to be careful how you present it, but it's just that maybe you get some general feedback on what you're trying to achieve, or the process itself we're trying to follow, without getting into specifics, and so, I mean, it seemed to have merit to me, but, if it seems too scary to folks, we don't have to go that way.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I will defer to everyone else's judgment. I don't feel super strongly about it, but I will say that, one, I think anything short of saying, here, you can have all the red snapper you want, is -- They're going to hate it, and they're going to say no, no, no, no anyway, and so I don't know how much that will change. I think, if we do it before March, while it's sort of this rough, there's going to just have to be a way to articulate, so that they come to almost the same thought process that we came to.

In other words, here's the very low ABC that we're presented with, and this is one option, and here are all these other things that we're trying to come up with so that we don't have to go to this option, and hopefully there is a way that we can make them see we're in this really bad position, but I'm not the one who has to do that, and I will never take as much heat as you all do, and so I will go along with whatever you decide, but I think they're going to hate everything we do no matter what.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I just have concerns about the fact that they're going to dislike pretty much everything, and so, before we can even get it off the ground, they're just going to have something negative to say about every piece of it, and I'm willing to do whatever, but it's just I have some significant concerns, and I do think that they're going to dislike most of it, and so I don't know. Mel.

MR. BELL: I think that, yes, they will dislike any specifics we put at them at this point, but I thought that maybe what we were trying to do was ease them into the -- First of all, clearly stating the situation we're in and clearly stating that we're going to need their help and cooperation and assistance in this, if this is the way we're trying to figure out a way to work some things in that might afford us some additional ABC, and, without us being specific, ask them --

It's really all about reducing discards, and ask them for some initial thoughts on that, but it was really more of a sense of the approach we're taking, kind of a step-wise approach, and then, from

what we hear from them, unless it's all just get out of our face, and either give us more fish or go away -- If we do get some constructive input, then we can incorporate that into some specifics that would evolve into the amendment that we would further scope. I think that was the idea there, but I think Kerry is right that it probably doesn't matter what we put down, and they may not like it.

MS. BROUWER: I guess we will just throw out, from a staff perspective, what we can offer to do, and that's to begin gathering input, through your Wufoo forms, and not do a very targeted and aggressive, so to speak, scoping of specific items, but do a more general beginning to gather input, and then the more targeted scoping would be after the March meeting, and so it's a more protracted way of just gathering input, and it's entirely up to you how we approach it. I mean, what I'm hearing Mel say is that it would be much more general, more trying to bring out additional ideas from the public besides what you've already discussed and not really saying, hey, these are the things we're thinking about, and does that make sense?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that sounds better. That makes me feel more comfortable. Let's go to Chester. He's had his hand up.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, ma'am. I think you may be surprised at the reaction to some of the alternatives that we're looking at here and talking about. In particular, the season and the depth-based closure, and not full-time, but a partial, because I've talked to a lot of people, and, essentially, once they understand the catch-twenty-two that we're in, from the stance of bycatch mortality, they understand that that's got to change, and, just like you had a lot of support for descending devices as a way to try to help lower bycatch mortality, the fact of the matter is that you're going to eventually have to come to some sort of a season for snapper grouper, and I think we could go ahead and start educating people, number one, as to what the problem is and, number two, that this may be a solution, or a way to go, and see what they have to say on that. I think you might be surprised.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Chester, and so Myra is typing some things inside that blue highlighted area that would indicate beginning gathering general public input prior to the March 2022 council meeting via online means, such as the Wufoo form, to solicit any additional ideas. The rest of that blue area stays the same, and so are we good? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think that's good, and I am just wondering. In this sort of expanded version of scoping, is it kosher to reach out to people we know, whether it's a CCA person, the state CCA person, who has the ability to sort of talk to people, and is that outside of what we can legally do? Just start talking to people who haven't necessarily been on the AP and engaged in the process, and then my second question would be just make it very clear somehow that, as you -- However you do the Wufoo form, I think the potential ABC that we're faced with has to kind of be laid out, so that it's very clear what we're dealing with.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Are we good? Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes, and, I mean, you can talk to people. I think folks need to have a clear understanding of the situation we're in and their ability to help with this, because -- We can talk to people informally, and there's nothing in the law that says how we have to do scoping, and that's what we were talking about earlier. We can kind of let scoping evolve into a little more dynamic process, where you scope in accordance with whatever it is you're dealing with, and so

certainly I would have honest discussions with people and just make sure we clearly state the problem and that we really need -- If anybody has got any great ideas, we need to hear them now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. One other thing that maybe we've done before, and maybe we haven't, and I don't know, but it would be nice if we could somehow include in there something about making sure that we inform everybody that this council doesn't set that ABC. I mean, to me, there's a big disconnect out there with a lot of recreational anglers, that they think we make up the quota, that we just pull it out of thin air, and I don't know if we've gone far enough to educate the general public that the council deals with the quota that we're given by the SSC and not the other way around. We don't make up the quota, but it just doesn't seem like the public has their arms wrapped around that, and I think it's important that they do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tim. The other thing, which is the final bullet that you see there in the blue section, is just a reminder that we would be requesting SSC feedback during the April 2022 meeting, and then continue to gather public input after the March council meeting, possibly through more structured in-person meetings, as well as the AP meetings. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Tim brought up something, and I guess we might should have talked about it a little bit yesterday in the Outreach and Communications, but I know that Cameron and Kim were working on some frequently-asked questions about red snapper, to get to exactly what you're talking about, to sort of walk people through the hierarchy of responsibility and decision-making, and I'm not sure where that's at, but that's something that can certainly be done, and needs to be done, ASAP.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We've had some good discussion on this, and I'm going to assume that everybody is okay with the items that we edited here in blue, and I am going to move on in the committee report. Next up, we got an update from the private recreational workgroup that met on December 1 to continue discussing the approaches to private recreational report. The next workgroup meeting will occur prior to the March 2022 council meeting, and so the final recommendations from that workgroup will come to the next council meeting.

Also, there was a request to provide presentations, or information, on the following items prior to the March 2022 council meeting, including the Mid-Atlantic Council, the Mid-Atlantic recreational tilefish permit and reporting; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service federal duck stamp; the FWC State Reef Fish Survey; NOAA's HMS permit; and NOAA's how the recreational permit system could fit with MRIP. Then staff would also provide us a synthesis of this information, to facilitate the discussion. Next up, we got into the red snapper response and holistic management approach. Go ahead.

MS. MARHEFKA: I just want to make sure that the way this is sort of ordered here doesn't prevent us, from when we're looking at the spreadsheet, for working in the potential to revisit whatever amendment that you all had tabled, and I wasn't here then, and so I just want to make sure that, even though it's not said here, we had a discussion that we were going to try to work it into the workplan and that that's kosher.

MS. BROUWER: Yes, and so Amendment 46 is the one that I think you are wanting to resurrect, and it's been dormant for some time, and so that would be on your agenda for the March meeting, and so this information -- The idea is to give it to you ahead of the March meeting, packaged in a way that will have comparisons or some information that is going to be more easily digestible, so that it doesn't take up half a day during the March council meeting, but it will help you inform discussions on that specific amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks for that clarification. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, Jessica. To that point, it's my hope that we will be able to hold this next workgroup meeting and then work with staff and actually develop an options paper that will feed into 46 and then allow us to develop some content for 46, to start moving forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Sounds great. Then we got into the red snapper response and holistic management approach. Staff presented a proposed workplan for the project evaluating management strategies for the snapper grouper fishery to address this directive, and the committee directed work on this project to continue as proposed, and we'll continue to receive updates as the project progresses.

Then we moved into the white paper on commercial snapper grouper permits, and this is the two-for-one. The committee indicated that the information presented at the September 2021 and December 2021 council meetings provided a satisfactory response to the Executive Order and that further consideration of the changes to the commercial snapper grouper permit could be considered in the management strategy evaluation that will examine holistic management changes to the snapper grouper fishery.

Then we went into SEDAR 68, the scamp research track assessment. We got a presentation on that, and then the SSC Chair presented the SSC's comments and recommendations, and then an operational assessment will begin in 2022, using the methods developed through the SEDAR 68 research track assessment, and provide management advice for Atlantic scamp.

Then we moved into snowy grouper, which is Amendment 51, and, first, we reviewed the AP's recommendations, and then we reviewed the updated options paper, which included modifications from the IPT and feedback from the AP, and the committee accepted the IPT changes and made the following motion and gave guidance to staff. The guidance to staff was to include an action within the amendment that would shift the recreational season to non-peak spawning months and gather information from the public on how the alterations to the snowy grouper season would affect blueline tilefish.

Then the committee made its first motion. **Motion Number 1 is approve Amendment 51 for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion of this motion? All right. **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **That motion stands approved.**

Then the committee started talking about golden tilefish, which is Amendment 52, and the AP Chair presented the AP's comments and recommendations. The committee reviewed those recommendations and an options paper and also had guidance and a motion. The guidance was to include actions for different start dates for the commercial hook-and-line and longline season and include actions to revise the accountability measures.

**Then the committee made another motion, Motion 2, to approve Amendment 52, which is this golden tilefish amendment, for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion stands approved.**

Then the committee jumped into gag grouper, which is Amendment 53, and we got some information from the SSC, along with the AP's recommendations, and then staff reviewed an options paper, and the committee gave guidance to staff and then made some motions, and so there is lengthy guidance to staff. Let me see if I can hit the high notes on this.

We're requesting a rebuilding projection based on P rebuild of 60 percent and requested that the SSC provide ABC values based on the projection to minimize social and economic impacts, while preventing overfishing, and the committee noted the willingness to deviate from the standard application of the ABC Control Rule. More guidance to staff to incorporate an allocation action that uses the most recent year of gag grouper landings currently available.

MS. BROUWER: The date there is highlighted in blue because the example that the committee worked through -- Recall this is the approach that Tim proposed, and that was based on 2021 landings, and that's still preliminary information, and so we wanted to clarify that, when we go and look at this again, we're going to use the last complete year of data, which would be 2020.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks for that clarification, Myra. Also, requesting considering other baseline scenarios for the year-one reduction split, which is the average of the most recent three or five years. Also, direction to estimate sector ACLs, based on the ACL being set equal to the ABC, including a number of potential commercial management modifications for scoping.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Here, and in a section below, it was just kind of clarifying that that was the intent of the direction, was that bang sticks would be included in that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Yes. All right. This is under the item that would remove spearfishing gear from allowable gear when harvesting gag, and so we were just clarifying there, in blue, that spearfishing gear included bang sticks. All right. Then there were a number of items to include for potential recreational management modifications, and I am not going to read all of those. You can see them there on the screen, and then, also, including modifications to recreational accountability measures for scoping. Also, include alternatives for the post-season AM being triggered by exceeding the total ACL or the stock status.

MS. BROUWER: Yes, and that one is also highlighted in blue, and I wanted to make sure that I had captured -- I believe it was Trish who brought it up, and so we not only would look at structuring things similarly to how it's been done in the red porgy amendment, but also look at an alternative that would be either triggered by exceeding the total ACL or the stock status.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish is nodding that that does capture what she was intending. All right. **Then the committee made the following motion, Motion Number 3, to approve Amendment 53 for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? All right. Any objections? All right. That motion stands approved.**

Then we jumped into greater amberjack and looked at a decision document, and the committee reviewed the proposed actions and corresponding analyses and had some direction to staff, as well as some motions, and so the direction included incorporating the IPT's recommended edits to the draft purpose and need and add revision of the ABC to the draft purpose and need statements and add revision to the ABC to Action 1, and then the committee made the following motion.

**Motion Number 4 is to remove Action 1, Alternative 5 from further consideration. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? All right. That motion stands approved.**

**Then the committee made another motion, Motion Number 5, to select Alternative 1, no action, as the preferred alternative under Action 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion stands approved.**

Then the committee made a number of other motions, and so, once again, just a reminder that we're inside the greater amberjack discussion. **Motion Number 6 is add an alternative to Action 3 to increase the recreational minimum size limit to thirty inches fork length. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion stands approved.**

**The committee then made Motion Number 7 to select the alternative for thirty inches fork length for the recreational minimum size limit as the preferred alternative for Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? All right. That motion stands approved.**

**Then the committee made Motion 8 to add an alternative to Action 4 to decrease the commercial minimum size limit to thirty inches fork length. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion is approved.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 9 to select the alternative for thirty inches fork length for the commercial minimum size limit as the preferred alternative for Action 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion stands approved.**

**Then the committee made Motion 10 to edit Action 5 to pertain to both commercial seasons and add alternatives for 1,500, 2,000, and 2,500 pounds for each of commercial Seasons 1 and 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right.**

Then there was discussion about the April spawning season closure, and so we wanted to revisit this discussion at Full Council, and so I'm going to turn it over to Mike, who has gone back and looked at the previous information when this was originally put in place.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thank you, Jessica. The April spawning closure was really -- It kind of evolved, over the course of two amendments, into something close to what the current form was. The first spawning closure that was put in place was through Amendment 4, and this prohibited harvest or landing in excess of the recreational bag limit during April, but it was only for the south of Cape Canaveral region of the South Atlantic, and some of the rationale that was included in that

amendment included that the spawning closure provides additional biological protection above that provided by the approved bag limit and size limits.

The council did express concern, at that time, about the high catch rates from spawning aggregations, and the only known areas of spawning that were noted, at that time, occurred south of Cape Canaveral, and so they noted that amberjack are densely aggregated and very aggressive during that time and area, making them especially vulnerable to fishing.

There was also rationale included for allowing the harvest up to the recreational bag limit, and that was to promote public understanding of and compliance with the bag limit regulations. Changing the bag limit to zero for one month would have limited biological benefits and create significant negative public and enforcement costs, and then the amendment commented that leaving the recreational fishery open during the April closure was equitable, because, at the time, the commercial fishery was not limited by a quota, while the recreational fishery operated under a three-fish bag limit, and so that was some of the rationale included in Amendment 4.

Then Amendment 9 expanded that spawning closure throughout the South Atlantic EEZ and lowered the recreational bag limit from three fish to one fish, and that brought it to kind of the current status, kind of what it looks like today, and some of the notes on rationale within that amendment were the council was concerned about the status of greater amberjack, and there was a stock assessment that was done, and NMFS expressed serious concerns about the uncertainty involved with that assessment.

The council, in that amendment, did reject a -- The council rejected the no action alternative, which would have kept it the same, and so their reason for changing from what was currently in place was that it would not provide additional biological protection at a time when the status of the greater amberjack stock was unknown, and then, also, within that, the council did reject an alternative to prohibit retention during April, which is the alternative that is being considered in this amendment, and the statement related to that was because it would prevent any harvest during the month of April, and the council decided its preferred action is more appropriate, based on the uncertainty with the assessment and conditions in the fishery. That's just some of the rationale that was included in those two amendments.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Got it. Chip, did we have a hand up? Chester. Go ahead, Chester.

MR. BREWER: Well, with that information, a lot of those concerns really don't have any meaning anymore, and so I don't see any great reason to have an April spawning closure.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just -- Thank you, Chester. I was just discussing that with Mike, to figure out what we needed to do here. I guess some of the options are we could no longer consider that action, and so we could remove that action from the document.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Currently, the alternatives that are considered are to leave the April spawning closure as-is, where there is the one-fish bag limit for everybody during April, and the other alternative is no retention at all during April, and so what Chester brought up of not having an April spawning closure, that would be an additional alternative. That's something that, if the council wants to do that, that can be considered. The other route that you could go would be to kind of keep this action as it is. The document is not being considered for public hearings until

the March meeting now, with the revised timeline, and so you could just leave it alone and pick it up and make any changes that you want to make to it in March, before you approve it for public hearings.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. What's the pleasure of the committee? Chester, did you have a suggestion? It sounds like your suggestion would actually add an alternative under that action.

MR. BREWER: **I think that's exactly what it would do, and so I move that we add the alternative that the April spawning be done away with completely.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Chester. We're getting that on the board. Is there a second to that motion? It's seconded by Kerry. All right. We've got the motion on the board. Basically, this adds an alternative to the action that considers the April spawning closure and to remove the closure. The motion has been made and seconded, and it's under discussion. Any more discussion on this? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I assume -- I would like just to see some of updated science, anything out there that's talking about when they do spawn, and maybe anything updated. Everything in Amendment 9 focused on them aggregating to spawn in the Keys, and so, if we can find out if there's anything updated, that would be great.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I know the most recent at least timing information -- I would have to look back and see if they have more on the area, but SEDAR 15, I believe, was the last amberjack assessment that did kind of that in-depth look at the reproduction. The more recent assessment pulled the reproductive information there and said that it was still applicable today, and the timing peak spawning was, I believe, April to May, and so the timing still aligns with when the closure occurs, but I would have to look a little bit more to see what the area -- If there was any change in the area.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: That just made me think, and so we've got this great amberjack count going on out there, and what is the timeline for the conclusion of that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chip is thinking.

MR. WOODWARD: The reason I ask is that it perhaps can be informative to some of this discussion, but I certainly don't want to hold things back by waiting for something that may be three years from now before we get any kind of definitive information from it, but I'm just curious.

MS. MCCAWLEY: John.

DR. WALTER: The research is supposed to end in 2023, and then there's the process of trying to incorporate it into management advice, and, if the Great Red Snapper Count is any indication, it takes a little bit of time before the numbers come in and it gets incorporated. We are going to try to learn from that experience and get the process of incorporating the numbers earlier on in the

process, so that there's some work in parallel, so that it won't be as long, but 2023 would be the first time that we get those numbers, I think, and so it probably would be after that that they would be actionable. Thanks.

DR. COLLIER: Just to build on that a little bit, if you look at the SEDAR schedule, we do have a research track assessment for greater amberjack shortly after that, I believe, starting in maybe 2026, and I think that's what the current schedule is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Just real quick, and I want to make sure, and I can't find the document right away, but our three options currently then are no action, which would retain the prohibition of sale or harvest in April, an alternative that prohibits all catch in April, and an alternative that you can fish all year? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, that's correct. All right. Any more discussion? All right **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 11 to select Alternative 2 under Action 7 as the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection?** All right. **That motion stands approved.**

Then we jumped into the yellowtail snapper, Amendment 44, and there was the following guidance provided, to suspend work on this amendment and request that the FWC conduct an update to the assessment to incorporate three additional years of data and a constant catch projection to set an ABC.

Then we moved into the red porgy, Amendment 50, and staff reviewed some changes and some language of the actions and alternatives, as well as input from the Snapper Grouper AP. The committee also requested that staff obtain additional feedback from the Law Enforcement AP prior to the March 2022 council meeting. Additionally, staff reviewed draft rationale for each of the actions, and the committee approved the following motion.

**Motion Number 12 is approve all actions, as modified, in Snapper Grouper Amendment 50. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Then we heard from Jimmy about the AP comments that were not previously covered, and so we went over that, and then we got updates on the South Atlantic red snapper count and the greater amberjack count, and then we went into some Other Business.

The first item for Other Business was correcting a regulatory error for the Fort Pierce Offshore Reef Special Management Zone and then a discussion, a lengthy discussion, that we had on blueline tilefish. The committee discussed information that was contained in a report and approved motions and gave guidance to staff, and I am going to turn it over to Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Jessica. Before we discuss the upcoming motion, I wanted to get a little bit more discussion, perhaps, on considerations for blueline tilefish, and so the guidance so

far is to include one action in this framework amendment to possibly modify the recreational accountability measure, especially the post-season accountability measure, for blueline tilefish. Perhaps the council want to also consider including an action to reduce the recreational bag limit, and the reason for that is, if you modify the accountability measure, and overages continue to occur, then there is the danger that your season will get shorter and shorter, until perhaps there would not be a season for blueline tilefish, and recall that that is just a four-month season, currently.

I would suggest that you talk about that, and then the other thing that I was going to put out there is if you would like to consider adding both of these actions to the golden tilefish amendment, and I know this was discussed somewhat during the committee, and it was not clear, to me at least, whether that was something you would like to entertain or not. Both amendments would be on similar timelines, and that's why we're suggesting that it would really optimize staff time if it was all packaged into one document.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Myra. Let me just kind of restate that a little bit, and then we'll go to hands, and so it's seeming like we need an action to reduce the recreational bag limit, and so, instead of just looking at the accountability measures, that we would need to look at the recreational bag limit, some type of reduction, and then, also, Myra brought up that we had a lot of discussion about is this a standalone item, with just the one action, but, now that we're adding a second action, maybe we can put this in the golden tilefish amendment, and so there was just a one council meeting difference between it being a standalone, as a single action, and adding it to the golden tilefish amendment.

Now that we're going to have more than one action, it's not going to be as simple, and, you know, there is no IPT for this established yet, et cetera, and so my suggestion, in order to optimize workload, is to add this to the existing vehicle, which would be the golden tilefish amendment, and so it's under discussion. Tim, you had your hand up.

MR. GRINER: I think you just answered my question, and I was curious as to whether that would still be on that same timeframe, or whether we're just really talking about one meeting, and so I guess it doesn't really matter.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It was my understanding, and Myra can correct me if I'm wrong, that the golden tilefish amendment, I believe, is set to be approved in December of 2022. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Just to add, if you choose to include these two actions in that amendment, I suppose you would also be considering scoping at the same time, and you've already approved Amendment 52 for scoping, and so that would give you the opportunity to scope these additional two actions on blueline tilefish this upcoming winter.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. So, ultimately, we would need a motion to do these things, one to add the action to reduce the recreational bag limit, and then also to add this blueline tilefish item to the golden tilefish amendment, and then we could just indicate that we intend that it be scoped at the same time as the golden tilefish amendment. All right. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Before I do the motion, and this may complicate things, and, if it does, we can leave it as it is, but I was actually wondering if adding -- I guess my understanding is, the more actions you add, the longer it takes, and so I guess this will be fine, but just to throw this out, and

would it be good to consider a mix of bag limits and seasons, because I was like thinking, the first wave, maybe one fish, and, for the second wave, two fish, something like that, or, if that just complicates things, then I'm fine, but I just wanted to throw that one there, too.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know how to respond to that.

MR. GRINER: What is the recreational bag limit, currently?

MS. BROUWER: I believe captain and mate can keep the recreational bag limit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: If that complicates things, this is fine, but I just wanted to throw that option out there, as trying to be cognizant of changing size limits, or bag limits, and so, anyway, I am good with this, but, if that's an additional option that can be thrown in that won't be too much work, or it's up to the -- Whatever the rest of the folks think.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mel, did you have your hand up?

MR. BELL: Yes, and I was just going to say that I like the approach of incorporating it in with the other amendment, one because of understanding what the impact is on staff and time, and we'll get into this when we get into the work schedule, but I think it is smart to address the recreational limit and keep it as simple as possible, and, if you're already at three -- I mean, you can get some reduction in harvest that way without maybe getting -- When you start adding other factors, like other aspects, then it gets way more complicated, perhaps, and it's more of a simple -- Because the idea is to do this quickly, to get something in place quickly, and so, I mean, I would probably tend to just focus on the bag limit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I think that, if you look at the analysis that would be done, I don't know that you would need a one-fish during the front season, and a simple behind-the-back-of-the-envelope math, and, if you took eighteen fish, times 6.5 pounds, and you put it on forty boats, it's 4,600 pounds a day, and the season is 120 days. Just say you did forty days, and it's still 187,000 pounds, and so just a simple back-of-the-envelope, using that analogy that I just did, at six-and-a-half pounds, based on the thing, and, I mean, the fish -- Some are larger, but it's still -- We're not getting there, but that's for you all to decide, and also for the recreational industry to decide, on how they want to manage their piece of the pie.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to say that I am -- If we want to just keep it simple, I'm all for the KISS principle too, but I just wanted to just throw that option out there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think the desire was to move it relatively quick. All right. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: If we add an action to modify the bag limit, it doesn't have to be just a reduction, and so we could title the action "Modify the Recreational Bag Limit", and maybe include an

alternative that would do what you are suggesting, Trish, and so, you know, it's fine, and we'll have to figure out what the range of alternatives is for such an action, and so that could be one of the ones that get analyzed for you to consider.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess my other question would be could we modify the captain and crew bag limit under that action as well, and it looks like they're saying yes. All right. Any more discussion here? All right. Would someone like to make this motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: All right. **I move to add an action to adjust the recreational bag limit for blueline tilefish and add this action and the action to modify recreational AMs to Amendment 52 (golden tilefish). Intent to conduct scoping in winter of 2022.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Do we have a second? It's seconded by Trish. It's under discussion. Also, Myra is getting some additional direction there on the board to include modification to the captain and crew limit and different seasonal bag limits. All right. Any more discussion here? All right. **Is there any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Then the committee made -- We don't need Motion Number 13 anymore, because we just made a different motion about what to do with the blueline tilefish, and so we deleted that. Now we have a timing and tasks motion, but, Myra, I think we need to edit this to get the blueline tilefish changes in there, and there's a fourth bullet that says to conduct scoping meetings that I think is about red snapper, and we edited that a little bit, and so I'm going to stop and let you edit this a little bit.

MR. BELL: While they're doing that, my intent is to get through the Snapper Grouper report, which we're really close, and then we'll take a break, and people can check out or whatever they need to do, and then we'll just be a couple of minutes, and then we'll come back and finish up. We've got a couple more reports, and then we've got a few more things to do, and we've got to do the workplan, and so we'll just take a break here in a second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We think we have appropriately edited the timing and tasks motion to cover all the changes that we made in this document, and who would like to make this timing and tasks? Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: **I would like to propose the following motion, to direct staff to do the following work: compile information or analyses to inform whether a demonstrable change in recreational releases can be estimated, such that it could be used in estimation of the acceptable biological catch, by potential management changes; conduct informal scoping for the Release Mortality Reduction Framework Amendment; conduct scoping meetings for Amendment 51 (snowy grouper), Amendment 52 (golden tilefish and blueline tilefish), and Amendment 53 (gag grouper); schedule an SSC meeting before the March 2022 council meeting for consideration of other P rebuild and ABC values for gag grouper; prepare Amendment 49 (greater amberjack), as modified, for discussion and approval for public hearings at the March 2022 council meeting; suspend work on Amendment 44 (yellowtail snapper) and request that FWC conduct an update to the yellowtail snapper assessment; prepare Amendment 50 (red porgy) for final approval at the March 2022 Council meeting.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Carolyn and seconded by Mel. It's under discussion. We're adding another bullet here about the recreational permits, and so stand by. All right. Carolyn, do you mind reading that additional bullet there for the timing and tasks motion?

DR. BELCHER: Sure. **An additional modification to the motion that I just proposed is to add Amendment 46 to the Snapper Grouper Committee agenda for the March 2022 meeting.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Carolyn. The seconder, Mel, is okay with that. It's under discussion. All right. **Any objection to the timing and tasks motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion is approved.** That concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee report. Back to you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Jessica. Well done. All right. Let's go ahead and take a break, in case anybody needs to check out or conduct business with the hotel, and let's just plan on being back here at 10:30. We will reconvene at 10:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: We'll go ahead and get started. We've got three committee reports to cover, and then we'll get into the workplan and a couple of presentations, and so this will be the SEDAR Committee report. We met on December 9, and the first thing we did was viewed the SEDAR Steering Committee report.

The committee discussed a summary of the SEDAR Steering Committee, and the council expressed concern about SEDAR 78, Spanish mackerel, delays, and we discussed that at-length, the ripple effect from that, even if it's a month, and the committee then discussed a future assessment for Atlantic migratory group cobia. The commission indicated they would like the species to be assessed in 2024, and the committee requested consideration of adding cobia to the CMP slot in 2024/2025 and not -- Add them to one of the four South Atlantic assessment slots, and so the idea was to try to do cobia as quickly as we could, and there was plenty of discussion on that.

Then we discussed revisions to SEDAR and council process and approvals. The committee reviewed the process and approvals for SEDAR items, and we had a good bit of discussion on that, the statement of work, and we discussed the details of the SEDAR schedule. Due to a limited schedule of the SEFSC staff working on assessments, there was little flexibility in the timing meetings and milestones, but the committee still has the ability to discuss the year when assessments would be considered, and so we've got flexibility moving into the future.

**That took us to our first motion, which was to select Option 3 as the preferred option for statements of work. The council and the SSC will review pre- and post-negotiated statements of work. The council changes the SEDAR Committee meetings to the March and September council meetings and requests the SSC to develop the statements of work working group. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then the motion passes.**

**That will take us to Motion 2, which is select Option 2 as the preferred option for reviewing SEDAR schedules and to no longer require approval of detailed SEDAR schedules. On**

**behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion of the motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.**

Approval of terms of reference and statements of work, we had a bit of discussion, and the committee was provided terms of reference for SEDAR 68, the scamp operational assessment, SEDAR 82, the gray triggerfish research track assessment, SEDAR 83, the vermilion snapper operational assessment, and SEDAR 86, the red grouper operational assessment, as well as statement of work for the 2024 golden tile operational assessment. The committee made minor modifications to the terms of reference for SEDARs 68, 83, and 86, and they are listed below. The committee was also briefed on each assessment schedule, and it was noted that SEDAR 83 and 86 would not have public meetings. From that, the following motions were approved. Is this where we need to start talking about color boxes here? Do you want to do that, Chip?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and I apologize. When I was putting together the original motion, we did not indicate that there was a modification to SEDAR 68, and so, if you look at the motion in blue there, that does move it down to the area where the modifications were listed, and you can see which modifications were there above it, but, if you just -- That motion in blue would cover everything that you guys did and discussed during the committee.

MR. BELL: So will we need to make that as a new motion, or was the just revised wording or what?

DR. COLLIER: Just make it as a new motion for the council.

MR. BELL: Okay, and so this is a better version of what we were trying to accomplish, and it covers everything, and so if someone would like to make that as a motion. Thank you, Carolyn.

**DR. BELCHER: I would like to suggest the following motion, the approve the terms of reference for SEDAR 82 for gray triggerfish research track assessment; terms of reference for SEDAR 68 scamp operational assessment; terms of reference for SEDAR 83 vermilion snapper operational assessment; and terms of reference for SEDAR 86 red grouper operational assessment, as modified, and statement of work for the 2024 golden tilefish operational assessment.**

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you. Can we get a second to that motion? Tim, thank you. Any discussion of the motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion passes.**

The next item was we discussed stock prioritization, and the committee didn't make any recommended changes to the species list for the South Atlantic assessment slots in 2025. The committee recommended to consider changing white grunt from a potential age-based assessment to a more data-limited approach, to enable fitting of other species into limited assessment slots. Catch level advice for white grunt and dolphinfish could be developed through a management procedure approach. The committee also wanted wreckfish added into the grid. Other Business, there was no other business, and there was no timing and tasks motion made, and so that concludes the report. That takes us to Citizen Science. Did you have a question, Tim?

MR. GRINER: Yes, and can you scroll back up a little bit more? I was just looking at the draft, and was there not some other things in the draft that was talking about looking at the change from

estimated recreational landings from MRIP from the Coastal Household Telephone to the Fishing Effort Survey? I think these were some things that maybe Andy had asked for.

MR. BELL: Chip, did you want to address that, the highlighted language there?

DR. COLLIER: If you look at these modifications here, in the motion, it says “where modified”, and so it captures it right there for SEDAR 83 and SEDAR 86. It does capture that CHTS to FES change.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks.

MS. MARHEFKA: Moving on to the Citizen Science Committee, we met yesterday, and Julia was with us remotely, and we were introduced to Nick Smillie, who it looks like has already gone back, who is a new staff member working with Julia, and we’re excited to have him onboard.

The key discussion points from yesterday’s discussion was just sort of a reminder that citizen science research priorities are used to guide Citizen Science Program -- That the Citizen Science Program supports or pursues, and it’s not always sort of projects that our staff takes on, but they’re supportive of and helping to push forward. They, obviously, work with partners throughout the region, and they do encourage collaboration in development of projects, based on the way we identify these priorities.

We did discuss the fact that, in the future, it would be helpful to prioritize, or rank, these priorities, and potentially target species within a priority, to help focus program efforts. We talked about the fact that some of the projects may be more complicated and may require more of a lift from agencies than other projects, and so we talked about sort of this tiering system, where we will identify and make sure it really spells out those sorts of projects, versus other projects, which can truly be done with just citizen science alone, and, of course, collaborating is a top priority.

We said that, when developing citizen science projects, it was just really important, again, to collaborate and complement existing programs, and we had a long discussion, as I’m sure everyone remembers, on when we talked about the movement and migration project with dolphin and wahoo.

The committee looked at all of the priorities, and we did decide to modify the list somewhat. We removed diet samples from the list of citizen science research priorities. If you recall, the bullet that was about personal fishing logbooks, we made sure to identify that we’re talking about historic personal fishing logbooks and not people’s current fishing logbooks, and we had a long discussion about the item that was titled “monitoring in managed areas”, and we have decided that it’s best to call that “observations in managed areas”, and that has been amended. Again, back to the movement and migration item, and it’s very clear that we will be focusing on programs that are already doing the work and being supportive of that.

**With those modifications, the following motion was made, and it was to adopt the updated citizen science research priorities, with modifications, as suggested, and, on behalf of the**

**committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **The motion is approved by the council.**

Unfortunately, we then had to sort of cut Julia off, because we were running behind, and we were really hungry, and she was very gracious about it, but you can look at Attachment 2 in the briefing book and see all the wonderful things that they're up to with all the citizen science they're doing, and I personally, as someone who remembers long before we did any of this stuff, am very grateful, and I think it's incredibly helpful, and we're so lucky to have that going on in our region, and so I hope that she doesn't feel slighted, but she was very gracious about it, and that concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Kerry. Any questions? Okay. Then we'll go to our last report, which will be Outreach and Communications and Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Outreach and Communications Committee met on December 9. After our housekeeping actions, we were provided a summary of the report from the most recent meeting of the advisory panel, which was held via webinar on November 18 and 19, and the AP discussions covered a wide variety of agenda topics that you can see listed here in this summary report, as well as in the full report that is provided in the briefing materials.

A topic of particular interest to the committee, and that stimulated some discussion, was the council's social media presence. There is concerns about engagement and how to engage, when to engage, do we engage, how do you deal with negative comments and the amount of time, and so all of this prompted some interesting discussion, and those discussions will continue at future committee meetings, as we work to develop some guidelines that are flexible and allow staff to maximize the potential of social media.

Then we received an update on the Sea Grant fellowship. This is a four-year project, with two terms, two two-year terms, that will assist regional Sea Grant partners and the council with snapper grouper outreach and communication efforts. The job duties of the fellow will include tackle shop tours, media tours, reef fish research symposiums, and participation in regional meetings, when possible. Ashley Oliver was recently selected to take on this role and is scheduled to begin work in mid-January of next year.

Then we were provided some background information on why the council chose to redesign the website. Stephen Locker of Happy Prime, the web contractor, gave us some demos of the preliminary design, and that stimulated quite a bit of discussion about various aspects of the website, and specific concerns were whether or not we would receive a brand package that we would then use in other outreach and communication products. Stephen indicated that the colors and fonts would be available for council staff, but would not be provided in a more formal branding package.

The committee also had some discussions on how to improve the public comment forms, to make them more easily usable, and then staff responded by the revisions to the format would likely come up for discussion following the site's initial launch, and, lastly, committee members urged the staff to make amendment documents available as their current links through redirects, once the site is live. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to once again thank Cameron Rhodes for her work over the last four-and-a-half years, and she's done a great job, and she's moved us

forward, and I hope we can continue that momentum, and so that concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Spud, and, yes, I echo your comments about Cameron. We will certainly miss her. All right. Well, that concludes all of our reports from committees, and that takes us to the workplan review, which is no small task. It's just a little thing to talk about, the magical and colorful Excel spreadsheet, and then we've got two presentations, and then we're about done. Are you going to drive that, John?

MR. HADLEY: I am. I will start off walking through, but John is also going to be here. It's the John and John show.

MR. BELL: John squared.

MR. HADLEY: Yes. I will start off by kind of orienting everyone and point out some of the moving parts that have occurred as we've gone through discussion this week, but in front of you is the general workplan for the council, and there's a lot of different pretty colors there, but we'll work through it kind of from top to bottom. At the very top, we'll start with the FMP workload and explain some of the changes that have been made there, and then, towards the end, we'll get into the other topics that the council does go through during a council meeting and show how that has changed in general.

At the very top, you have your three -- This is the must-do workload, if you will, and you have your three assessment response amendments, looking at red porgy, snowy grouper, and gag grouper, and those are on a statutory deadline. Then, moving down, you get into the red snapper response, and so you have your short-term framework, which has been discussed, and then the more long-term response that was gone over during the week, and some of the more long-term items for holistic change in the snapper grouper fishery.

If you look, the short-term framework is highlighted as an orange, which is indicated as a longer time period, and so, as a general estimate, looking at a two to four-hour discussion, and that's orange throughout, since that generally does take a while to get through the topics, and, also, it allows a little bit of a time buffer, if there are some items that need to come before the council regarding the MSE and that long-term response, and there's a little bit of a buffer built in there, where those can be kind of bumped up.

As you can see, there's kind of a gray area below that, looking at the long-term response, where that's going to be going on in the background. As you know, there will be some items that do need to come before the council, but that is put there indicating that we won't have to come to the council every time, but work will be ongoing, looking at getting the MSE up and running, looking at scoping and gathering public input and moving that along. The long-term response amendment is not scheduled to begin until after that MSE wraps up, and that would likely be sometime in 2023, and so that is kind of the red snapper, in general, response and time black for the council to examine.

Moving down, we have the wreckfish ITQ and then, also, we kind of have the first compromise, if you will, which is compromise that moving parts and how to fit it all in, based on the discussion this week, and we've moved yellowtail snapper to 2023, and the idea there is that that allows the

blueline tilefish framework amendment to be brought up into the council's active workplan. As we just discussed, that's getting folded into golden tilefish, which is Snapper Grouper Amendment 52, but, really, it's kind of a -- While it has been budgeted for, it's kind of a -- The golden tilefish amendment is going to be bumped up a little bit, because there's going to be more content there, and it requires more council time, and so it's really kind of not much of a net change, looking at it from a council perspective, but, from a workload perspective, it is, and there are some efficiencies there, but that wasn't quite built in, but that's the first kind of major shift in the timeline from what was presented in the original briefing book.

Moving down, we have the recreational permit and reporting restart, and so the reboot of Amendment 46, and that's been built in with some fairly lengthy discussions likely later on in the year for the council, looking at the June through December meeting. One thing of note here is to make this fit, and one of the proposed changes was to delay one of the dolphin wahoo amendments, and there are two dolphin wahoo amendments being considered.

One is more of a short-term framework, looking at recreational measures, and then there is also the other amendment looking at potential changes in the longline fishery, and so one commercial and one recreational amendment. The idea there is to make that recreational reporting amendment fit in. One of those would likely need to slide, or the council could pick another amendment, and that was at least the initial starting place, as far as kind of what has to get moved to fit in that recreational reporting amendment.

Moving down, you see that we do have several As on the overall workplan, which is great, and that's something to note throughout, and so, as long as everything stays on schedule, the council is scheduled to wrap up several amendments in 2022.

Moving through CMP, you will also be moving through the ABC Control Rule, and then the time is budgeted in there for that dolphin wahoo recreational measures amendment, and then, once we get down towards the bottom, sort of the planned workload, there is the Spanish mackerel assessment response, as well as the scamp assessment response, later in the year, and then, of note, you have several snapper grouper assessment responses coming up in 2023, and so those were kind of the new additions that were brought up from placeholders at the bottom and added to the planned workload.

Just something to keep in mind is that, as we have it right now, I believe all the pieces fit together, but there is that upcoming workload in 2023, and so we do need to make sure that those different As, and so final approvals, do get met in 2022.

As we move down, we're looking at other council activities, and so all other non-FMP, directly-related items that the council discusses throughout the year, and you have your SSC and AP Selection, SEDAR Committee, Citizen Science Committee, and kind of down the list there, and, overall, those are largely intact, compared to what was originally set in the briefing book. One thing that has moved is the Habitat Committee, and it was scheduled to meet in March and September, and the proposal is to move this back to December, sort of to make all of the other -- Kind of the heavy FMP workload work earlier in the year.

There is always time for updates at Full Council, but, as far as the committee meeting, the proposal is to have it meet in December, and there is a drop of the Outreach and Communications Committee

in June, and, there again, there will be some time for updates at Full Council, and delay the start of the five-year EFH review to December, and so that's something that we'll begin sort of towards the end of the year.

At the very bottom here, we kind of have your workload in general, to kind of get an idea of what you're looking at overall, and it certainly full. The target is eight, but it's staying relatively close to eight. There is a little bit of wiggle room built in there, looking at there was time budgeted for, for example, CMP 33, where that will largely be a Gulf amendment, and so, in theory, that won't take -- In theory, it won't take a great deal of the council's time, but that is budgeted in there, and so there's a little bit of a buffer. Not too much, but, overall, you have what I would say is a full but manageable workload for 2022.

Then, moving down to the very bottom, you do have the other amendments, sort of a placeholder of amendments and assessment responses, coming up. You have the unassessed ABC and ACL snapper grouper species, and the suggestion is to start this after you have the ABC Control Rule completed, since that will really change how those ABC recommendations move forward. There's a placeholder for a dolphin wahoo regional management amendment, several assessment responses, the rec AMs amendment, which was suspended, and then mackerel port meetings, which is suggested to be delayed at least until after the Spanish mackerel assessment.

That's it, overall, and, just as a reminder, at the December meeting, we do tend to try to look at the whole year, and so things do change, inevitably, but the idea is to try to really take a holistic look at that 2022 workload and make sure that you're comfortable with it and see if there are any other parts that we need to move around.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The one thing we really want guidance on is with the shifts that we made to accommodate the additional work that we've talked about here, because we mentioned the dolphin situation, and so we had two amendments that were planned, the recreational measures and the longline, and we're suggesting that you delay starting the longline amendment, and one of the big reasons for that is because we are awaiting a bi-op from Protected Resources that would affect that, and we probably don't really want to get working on that until we get that bi-op, and we want to try to avoid starting things that we know may have a big lull in there somewhere, because that tends to cost us a lot of time down the road.

Our preference is to try and keep these things that are on the list to be completed, to keep proceeding with those, and delay starting something new, so that we can accommodate the workload changes discussed this week, and that seems like one that has -- That is probably most likely to be able to be delayed here now without potentially significantly delaying when it would ultimately be completed, because we won't get started and then have that bi-op be delayed and then get a lull, and we would be essentially restarting, and so that one just seemed to be appealing, from that regard, to be the one to delay and to continue on the rec measures.

MR. BELL: Okay, and, as you can see, it's a more and more complex schedule, and you're trying to process through multiple amendments, which is kind of the bulk of what we do, and there's only so many hours in a day, and so many days in a council meeting, and so many council meetings in a year, and so it's a limited amount of time. We have been able to flex with some other things and have special meetings, but this is, you know, just utilizing the normal meeting schedule, and that's about all you can cram in there, and so any thoughts about what's been discussed? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think that plan makes the most sense overall, and I just want to make sure that I understand that what will happen is -- The way I understand, under the green sub-heading, FMP workload subtotal, are those three items -- That the rec reporting restart is the same thing as really the rec permit? Okay.

That would then move up to that dolphin wahoo spot, and I am just trying to figure out where that then gets moved up to, such that we see it in -- Because we are discussing it in March, I think we said, right? Then the order after that of those three items, of the dolphin wahoo items, would be recreational measures and then longline, and my understanding is the commercial e-logbooks is - - We're kind of waiting to see when they say they're going to go live for everyone, because we still have some time after that, is what I got out of the report yesterday.

MR. HADLEY: The way that this was calculated, the recreational permit amendment, and so Amendment 46, was moved up into the active workplan, and then the final -- Basically, the calculations there, on the workload, were made assuming that one of the dolphin amendments would be dropped, and so that's kind of already budgeted for. If we do want to keep the -- Well, basically, it was calculated without the longline amendment basically taking place in 2022, and so, if we do want to bring that back up, those totals will change, but, to your point, it has been actively moved up into the workload for the recreational permit.

The other thing of note that I forgot to mention is that we did build in the commercial e-logbooks. The intent here is to start in June and wrap up in December, and it's hopefully a very simple, single-action amendment that would at least give the authority to have e-logbooks, and so it's already there, but it's not necessarily mandating that they have to be done, and so, basically, it's getting out in front of that, so that the authority is there whenever the electronic logbooks are ready to roll, and they can go ahead and proceed.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, John. Chester, go ahead. Then Jessica is next.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Mel. Well, I'm going to surprise everybody and agree that the dolphin longline issue can be put off for a while, and the reason that, and after a lot of thought, by the way, that I have come to that way of thinking is, in 2015, when the longliners shut down the commercial dolphin fishery and blew out the quota, it happened when conditions were perfect for the blue-water boats to come in and really whack them.

We have not had that situation since 2015, and, as I'm sure you all know, dolphin is a fishery of great concern in Florida, and we're getting report after report that they're in trouble, and there have been a number of letters from credible sources to the council saying there is something wrong, and so I started trying to do a little investigation on my own, as to what in the world is going on, and, in speaking with some folks on the Caribbean Council, they are seeing the same thing that we're seeing, and that is that there's a paucity of larger fish.

Those fish have got to be getting hit somewhere, and it's not going to be just a, quote, climate change issue, because dolphin are very migratory, and they're just not migrating through, and so I would like to suggest that, while we put off the FMP, or whatever it is that we were doing with the dolphin longline, that we do get onto the schedule sort of a -- I don't know what you -- A short-term study, and I'm not sure that the council and council staff, and even the Southeast Region,

would be the one to do the study, and I think it's probably going to have to be the State Department, because something is happening outside of our EEZ that is adversely affecting dolphin.

I'm not sure what it is, and it may be that they're getting longlined off of Brazil, and I don't know, but we need to find out what is going on there, and, until we've got a better idea, I think going off willy-nilly and saying, okay, we're going to try to do away with longlines, or we're going to put a trip limit in, I think is premature. I put that bug in everybody's ear because we spend a lot of time on some species that are not -- Maybe their dockside value is in the millions, or a few million, or ten million, or whatever, but dolphin -- You're talking hundreds of millions of dollars in economic resource, and I think that we need to be careful, but I think that we do need to find out exactly what's going on with dolphin and what can be done, if anything, to reverse the trend. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Chester, for that, and certainly the dolphin fishery is extremely important, and we all know that and realize it and realize there is some things going on, and we'll be looking at that, and we are moving forward, at least with something of the things we can move with quicker on dolphin, and we've still got placeholders for the two aspects, but the rec thing is still in there, and we're moving in that direction, but I agree with you that there is bigger issues at play here, and we've got think through that as well. Any other -- Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sorry, and it's just really hard to read that thing, even on the screen, and I couldn't find the updated one, and so, when I got closer, I looked, and so yellowtail -- It looks like it's gone all the way to March of 2023, in order to make time for FWC to make the changes, but then what is that item that's like on Line 15 that is -- It looks like it says "new 2022 rec permitting reporting", and what is that?

MR. HADLEY: That is bringing the recreational -- Essentially the recreational permit, and so that is Snapper Grouper Amendment 46.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I couldn't tell. The name did not -- I thought that that was what it was, but I didn't see 46, and I see it now, because now that you blew it up a little bit, but sorry.

MR. BELL: Don't panic. We're not all going blind here, and it's just a little fuzzy. All right. Any other comments or suggestions or questions or concerns or things you can't read? All right.

MR. HADLEY: This updated version is in the late materials folder.

MR. BELL: Okay, and so you will be able to actually read that on your computer.

MR. HADLEY: I'm sorry. I should have said that right off the bat. I do apologize. This version is in the briefing book, if anybody wants to kind of blow it up on their own computer screen, and it's under late materials.

MR. BELL: Okay. All right. Any other -- What else do you need from us on this? Do we need to approve it, or it's just good to go? All right. As you can see, it's just more and more challenging, the more things that come up and we try to cram in, and, when we adjust things, there are ripple effects throughout the entire schedule in multiple years. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mel, and I know we're doing this, but I think we're really going to have to be more aggressive about filling in between meetings with topic-specific webinars, and maybe even move things like Outreach and Communications and Citizen Science briefings to webinars, just to free up the room, so we're not so compressed when we have to deal with these really difficult topics that we're grappling with, and, I mean, that's more time, and it's more out of people's lives, but we need to use the time together in-person the most efficiently we can.

MR. BELL: Good point, Spud, and we've talked about that. Again, if you think about what we do here, a lot of the business at these meetings is really pushing through these amendments, and we're sort of the amendment factory, and it may be that, just given the number of hours in a meeting that we have, we have to take some other things, like briefings and updates, and just push them into a different format, a different venue, or something, to maximize our actual meeting time, and we started this meeting on Monday morning, and that may just be the habit we get into, is running a five-day meeting, and then we'll see how Friday afternoons go, but there's only so much time. Having said that, I will shut up. Anything else on this? Okay. Then we're good on that, and then we've got two presentations left.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We do have the highlight of the upcoming meetings that is also coming up with this, and you have the document in there, but I just wanted to highlight a few things. There is a lot of extra APs going on this year, and that's based on the policy change that we talked about last year of having APs meet every year. We have some that have gone years without meeting, and so this is to get them more engaged and get feedback from them on the fisheries and maybe get ahead of some things before they develop.

We'll be adding the SSC meeting that will be looking at gag, and we'll be filling out the various scoping plans on things that we talked about here, and this will be things that are happening in January and February, and the MREP management meeting will be in April, the 11 through 14, and so this will be picking up that cohort from 2020 that got through science and then COVID came along, and so that's now April 11 through 14.

The December 2022 meeting will be in Wrightsville and not Beaufort, as shown in the document for this meeting, and so we'll get that corrected for March, but, in December, we will be in Wrightsville. We will be back here in 2023, at this hotel.

The rec working group, that Spud chairs that we mentioned a couple of times, that will be February 9, a Wednesday, from 1:00 to 5:00, and we have the allocation meeting, which was mentioned a few times, and that's on there, and so that's now -- That will be February 7, and so, that week in February, you're going to have a few things going on, and we will continue -- As the plan shows, we will have probably more of these topical meetings happening during the year, via webinar, as Spud mentioned. The habitat blueprint work is one that likely will come up as a dedicated meeting and not a part of the amendment factory meetings, as they may come to be known, thanks to Mel, and so any questions on the plans we have?

MR. BELL: Go ahead.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The SSC meeting to deal with gag, do you think that will be like February or something like that? Did you say before the March meeting?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It will be before the March meeting. I don't know if you've gotten a date yet.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It could be January, but it definitely is before the March meeting, and the March meeting is early in March.

DR. COLLIER: Judd is coming up to talk about that right now.

DR. CURTIS: We were looking at possibly the week of February 7 to 11 to hold that SSC meeting to review the gag projections, and that gives us enough time to get it into the briefing book ahead of the March council meeting.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thank you.

MR. BELL: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Just to Judd, we have got -- On the 7<sup>th</sup> and the 9<sup>th</sup> right now is the allocation and the rec thing, and so, because I'm on those, and I'm the liaison, just so you know that that's -- To be aware of those dates from John, and just check with him, but there's two days spoken for that week.

DR. CURTIS: Okay. Sounds good. I will consider that and let you know.

DR. COLLIER: We also have our seminar series that week, and so don't forget about that one.

MR. BELL: So you see how difficult this is. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This is for Spud. Spud, I think you said February 9 was going to be the recreational workgroup meeting. That's a yes? Okay. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Yes, that's what we're -- We're kind of dealing with stomping all over each other at this point, and so there's a lot of moving parts. What else have you got, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's all I have. I guess we're moving to an era of having a virtual council meeting with a variety of meetings a month before a council meeting. It's certainly going to feel that way in February, and so just sort of figure that as a virtual assorted council meeting business week.

MR. BELL: Okay. It's a brave new world. Okay. That takes us to our last item of business, which would be a presentation on the Southeast For-Hire Electronic Reporting Program, and so Michelle is going to be doing this remotely?

DR. COLLIER: Yes. Let me unmute Michelle.

DR. MASI: Hi, everyone. I'm Dr. Michelle Masi, the SEFHIER Program Manager. Today, what I want to do is just show you a few updates on where we're at with the implementation of the SEFHIER program. This slide provides an overview of the number of permit user accounts that are set up with each reporting platform, and the reporting platform type is listed for you in the

rows, with the permit type in the columns, and the numbers that are in black are the number of active permit accounts, as of November 3, and the numbers in orange are showing the increase in the number of accounts since the last time that I presented this information to the South Atlantic Council.

Based on those numbers, we do still see the number of accounts increasing, and, on that note, I just want to take a moment to recognize that we definitely appreciate all of our constituents who are already registered with a vendor account and are actively reporting.

The bottom row there is showing that we have a total of 1,257 permit accounts that have been set up in the South Atlantic, and that's actually an increase of forty-eight accounts since August 1. Also, in that total row, for the South Atlantic, you can see we have about 900 permit holders that have yet to register with an approved reporting vendor, noting that we had 968 the last time that I presented, and so, given we are expecting about a 20 to 30 percent permit latency, we are getting pretty close to having about 60 percent compliance with the program in the South Atlantic at this point, based on the numbers shown.

In total, for both the Gulf and South Atlantic, we have about 1,580 permit holders, and that's including dually-Gulf-and-South-Atlantic-permitted vessels who have yet to register with an approved vendor. However, since November 3, we have over 2,300 registered SEFHIER accounts, and I want to remind you that the number of accounts does include both permit holders and captains, and so the number of registered user accounts to permit holders is really not a one-to-one relationship. Then, as I mentioned on the previous slide, we are expecting that 20 to 30 percent permit latency.

Also, as of November 3, there were about 500 South-Atlantic-permitted vessels that had never submitted a logbook or a no-fishing report, and so, just as a note, this compliance information is now being sent to the Office of Law Enforcement for further investigation, and, more positively, we have received more than 30,000 logbooks in 2021 from South-Atlantic-permitted vessels. Finally, we are anticipating that we'll see an increase in SEFHIER program participation as permits come up for renewal in 2022.

In regard to specific outreach efforts to reach our constituents who are not yet complying with the SEFHIER program, we held a series of weekly VMS-regulation-specific webinars throughout September, and each of those webinars had about ten participants each at them. We had some really great questions from our constituents there, and so I just wanted to thank those folks that tuned in and asked those questions. Just a reminder to the folks listening today that SEFHIER constituents who are dually Gulf and South Atlantic permitted will need to meet the Gulf VMS requirements.

Regarding the second bullet, in October, SERO hosted two SEFHIER constituent calls with Mr. Andy Strelcheck, our Regional Administrator, and those calls offered our callers an opportunity to have some direct one-on-one time with Mr. Strelcheck, where they could call in and ask questions or express concerns about the program. Our South Atlantic call was held on October 14, and, again, just to take a moment to thank those folks that did call in and ask us some really thoughtful questions during each of those sessions.

For anyone who may still have questions about the SEFHIER program or how to get into compliance, I have provided that information on the additional slides, if you refer to Slides 10 and 11 of this presentation. In addition to the constituent calls in October, the Gulf Council hosted VMS vendor webinars, where our constituents heard some information from the vendors on the available type-approved VMS options that are out there, and, finally, in October, we hosted several SEFHIER validation surveyor trainings for state surveyors in the Gulf states.

In regard to some additional outreach efforts, SERO recently posted an updated permit renewal letter to our SEFHIER website, which was also mailed out to constituents, and that letter explains the SEFHIER VMS requirements, but it also provides links for users to find the information they need to get into compliance with the SEFHIER program.

Regarding the validation survey, there is what is called a rack card available on our SEFHIER website, at the link provided under the second bullet, and so, for anyone who is interested in learning more about the SEFHIER validation survey, including how that data will be used, I recommend that you start with that rack card, and then, if you have any additional questions, you can reach out to me through email, and, just as a note, my email is provided on Slide 11.

Finally, as we hear from our constituents and colleagues, we do try to find ways to improve our SEFHIER program website and the materials that we post there, and so, for example, we now have over sixty helpful questions with answers posted at the link that I provided there at the bottom of the slide, and those FAQs cover topics that range from how and why do you need to report to FAQs that will help guide constituents who are dually permitted, and so that SEFHIER page really has been adapted to be an incredibly outreach tool all in itself.

On this slide, I just wanted to take a minute to review the VMS requirements for Gulf for-hire federally-permitted vessels. As a reminder, the VMS implementation date has been delayed to March 1, 2022. That means that, by March 1, our Gulf for-hire permitted vessels will be required to have a type-approved unit that includes a GPS device affixed to the vessel that can, at a minimum archive the vessel position data for submission to NOAA Fisheries.

Also, highlighted here is that we do currently have three cellular VMS, or cVMS, units that have been type approved, and those are the Faria, the CLS NEMO, and the Nautic Alert Insight X3, and then that last bullet is just a reminder that the hail-outs and VMS units are expected to provide better data on fishing effort and allow for better enforcement of fishing regulations in the Gulf. At the bottom of the slide, I provided the link to our list of type-approved VMS units.

Finally, on this slide, I just wanted to highlight some general SEFHIER discussion items, and so the first topic is just a reminder for our dually-GARFO-SERO-permitted vessels, and so a little bit of a change from what's shown here. VESL is actually now certified with GARFO, and so, that said, if a dual-GARFO-SERO-permitted vessel is using the VESL app to report, they would still need to submit two separate reports in VESL, and so that's one for GARFO and one for SEFHIER. There is two reasons that you need to do that. It's because, one, that these reports go to different places, and so our SEFHIER reports go to ACCSP, but the GARFO reports go from VESL to GARFO, and then the second reason is that neither of those reports are asking all the questions needed for compliance with both programs.

As an alternative, a dual-GARFO-SERO-permitted vessel could use eTRIPS to satisfy both GARFO and SEFHIER permit reporting requirements, in which case just one report would be needed, and, for eTRIPS users, an important thing to remember is that, to meet the reporting requirements of both the GARFO and SEFHIER programs, you need to fill out the approved form when offloading the catch and then submit that form within forty-eight hours of the trip ending.

Then the last point here is, for our SEFHIER constituents who are catching HMS species, if you're using the VESL app, you will still need to complete the HMS electronic logbook report as a separate report. If you're using eTRIPS, the app will prompt for the HMS-required questions.

With that, I just want to wrap-up by highlighting the continued dedication of our SEFHIER program staff who are helping our for-hire constituents get in compliance with the program, and, of course, a special thanks to our for-hire constituents, especially the ones that are reaching out to us with their feedback, to try to help us improve the program. Before I open the floor, I just want to note that Dr. Jessica Stephen is on the webinar today to help me answer questions, since I'm still relatively new to the program, and so if council staff can just make sure she's unmuted, please, and then, with that, I will turn it over, and thanks for your attention.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you for the presentation, Michelle. Certainly it's something we started a long time ago, but it's getting underway and kind of moving along. Any questions for Michelle? I am not seeing any hands. Have you got something? Tom.

DR. ROLLER: A question here. Regarding the number of permits that have yet to register, is there any trend among states there, meaning is there any states that have higher lack of compliance or anything like that?

DR. MASI: I think I will take that question. So we haven't really been looking at the data state-by-state. That's something that we'll probably start to do more of in 2022, and I don't know that we're ready to share that information yet, but, if Jessica wants to jump on and add anything, please feel free.

DR. STEPHEN: Michelle has it right, and we haven't looked yet at the state level of data, and keep in mind that sometimes permit holders might have vessels that have their hailing ports in more than one state, and so what we want to do, when we look at that, is kind of a take a comprehensive look and look at it both by the permit holder as well as the different vessels and where their hailing ports are.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. Maybe this is a question for John, but is there a certain number of participation that helps get us closer to validating the data and using the data, or is that not a consideration, or what gets us closer to using the data?

DR. STEPHEN: I'll take that one, Tim. As we get towards using the data, what we can start to do with the preliminary data that we get and the data that are coming in is use it indirectly in management actions and to help inform us of things that are going on. To use it directly into management, what we would need to do is do a calibration against the MRIP data that we've collected in the past and get kind of a side-by-side comparison and then a calibration, so we can

effectively use it within the time series. Typically, calibrations, I would suggest, be more than one year, particularly having COVID involved, and this might be an unusual year, and so we would want a couple of years, so that we make sure that those calibrations and converting factors are correct.

MR. BELL: Does that get it, Tim? All right. Any other questions? Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Just to point out that this is something that was done also for the conversion from CHTS to FES, and so they had three years of a side-by-side survey, and similar opportunities could be going on for this project as well.

MR. BELL: Okay. Yes, it does take a little time. All right. Any other questions? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Regarding the logbooks, and just a question, and I'm using eTRIPS for my charter operation, and I had a database failure on the app this summer that prevented me from reporting for a couple of weeks, and I was just curious if that's been addressed or if that was a known problem.

DR. STEPHEN: We're working hand-in-hand with ACCSP and eTRIPS, and what we do is we are right now getting some nightly downloads of information between them. I would say, if you have any issues particular to eTRIPS, definitely reach out to ACCSP and the group that they have that's helping to work with eTRIPS, and they can help you more with that information. I see that Geoff has his hand up there, and he'll probably better be able to answer that than I can.

MR. ROLLER: They were great in helping me, just to be very clear.

MR. BELL: Okay, and I see that Geoff White has got his hand up. Geoff. Geoff, did you want to add something? Bob.

UNIDENTIFIED: Geoff just told me that he doesn't have a microphone.

MR. BELL: Okay. All right. Anything else? I am not seeing any hands. All right. Well, thank you, Michelle, for the presentation, and we'll conclude this and go on to the next one. Geoff, did you want to say something?

MR. WHITE: Sorry. I had a microphone problem there for a moment. We have experienced a few individual device database items, but those generally have been fixed and can be caught up. There hasn't been, as Jessica and Michelle pointed out, compliance issues with catching up those records and making sure that those things function, but both the SAFIS app and the infrastructure for the reporting, whether that's through several different applications or SAFIS eTRIPS, the ACCSP support has been up and running and kind of continually improving with individual features that we've been working with our staff and Harbor Light and SERO staff on updating. The issues that may have been experienced on a day-to-day point, or earlier in the year, we're not -- We believe those are fixed. Sorry for the delay.

MR. BELL: No problem at all. Thanks, Geoff. We appreciate your comments. All right. If there's nothing else on this, we'll move on to the last briefing.

DR. COLLIER: There is an updated version of this one in late materials.

MR. BELL: Okay, and this would be Jenny Lee.

MS. LEE: Hello, everyone. I hope you've had a great week. This will be very brief. I just have a few updates for you, and we'll just get started. With respect to ESA actions related to listing and rulemaking, the only update I have is just a slight slip in the schedule under the five-year status review on seven threatened coral species, and the status review is projected to be completed in early 2022, and so I think, last time, I said it might be around this time. That's really all there.

In ESA-related actions, in other ESA news, I know, at your last September meeting, I provided I think more of a lengthy update with respect to dolphin and wahoo and FMP consultation, and so I really don't have an update for you at this time, other than, I guess, I am looking at a draft biological assessment that we've been working on, and, for the coastal migratory pelagic resources consultation, this was reinitiated a while ago to address oceanic whitetip and giant manta ray. I did put this on your brief, just to let you know that we are working on an amendment to the existing bi-op to address both of those species, and there's been some progress moving forward on that, and so that consultation I don't think I have noted before, but we are working to do it as an amendment, just for those species, and that's our current plan, and we have been making some progress on that.

Other than that, really the updates that I have for you all fall under the Marine Mammal Protection Act actions and news and the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team, and so just to let you know, as far as how progress is going with respect to recent rulemaking under the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team, the restricted area closure in the Northeast is now in effect. Back in October, there was a district court that issued an order to -- A temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction that prevented that closure from going into effect as planned, but then that was reversed with the court of appeals for 1<sup>st</sup> Court, staying the preliminary injunction, and so that is now in effect.

The lobster and Jonah crab trap and pot fishermen fishing in that restricted area have to remove all of their trap and pot gear and may not reset trawls being actively fished or set new trawls in that area, and that area is closed through January 31 of next year, and the gear modifications required by that rule go into effect next May.

As far as Phase 2, which pertains to our region, and you as the council, the scoping period for input on efforts to reduce the risk of entanglement to right, humpback, and fin whales closed back on October 21, and there was a November 2 team webinar, which provided an update to population estimates and a new risk reduction target of 90 percent for Phase 2 rulemaking, but the next team meeting, which was originally scheduled for December 1 and 2, and so I thought I would perhaps that I would have something to share there, but that's actually been postponed to January 11 through 13, and so, really, it's just a stay tuned and more to follow.

Then the last item that I put in the brief relates to the right whale calving season, and just to let you know that aerial surveys off of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, and Florida are all in operation, and, so far, we've had two mom-calf pairs detected, and the first pair was detected back in late November, and that was off of Pawleys Island, South Carolina, and then the more recent

pair was sighted ten nautical miles off Cumberland Island, Georgia, on December 2, and that was a whale that we have nicknamed Snow Cone.

Unfortunately, the mother was entangled, and I have included, in the brief, just a little of the background on that mom, and she's been kind of sad case, with respect to her 2020 calf was struck and killed off of New Jersey last year, and, like I said, she's been the subject of multiple disentanglements, and she does still have two trailing lines from the left mouth that are short of the peduncle, but, at this point, there aren't plans to attempt a buoy attachment or anything. With that, that's really all I've got for you, and so, if you have any questions, let me know. Otherwise, I hope you have great and safe travels home.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Jenny. Any questions of the report, anything in there? It is in late materials, you said, Chip, if you want to look at it in any more detail. I am not seeing any hands. Thanks for tuning in and closing us out, Jenny.

MS. LEE: You're welcome.

MR. BELL: All right. That takes us to Other Business. Does anybody have any other business? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I just have a question on how you fill the AP seats, and so we have two open seats now on the Deepwater Shrimp AP, and I see that you've got a meeting scheduled for the July/August timeframe, and do you make selections to the AP once a year, or is that something that you do every meeting?

MR. BELL: We don't do it at every meeting. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Generally, AP selection occurs in June and December, and so what we would likely do is make some announcements after the March meeting and bring those to you for consideration in June.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you, and so hopefully we'll fill those two seats before the meeting. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Before July. Okay. Anything else? John.

DR. WALTER: Yes, sir. Thanks, and I have the great opportunity to announce that the ecosystem status report for the South Atlantic is just now live and published, and so, after several years, it's finally out there, and I just wanted to note that that is actually breaking news as of today, and so you will be getting emails about that, with the link to the report, and so I know that it will be of interest to the council here, and it's something the Science Center and our partners have worked on for a number of years.

MR. BELL: Great. Thanks. Yes, a lot of work, and it's just in time for Christmas.

DR. WALTER: A stocking stuffer. You can print it out and give it to all of your family and friends.

MR. BELL: Yes, it would make a great stocking stuffer. Okay. Anything else? All right. Seeing no other business, we will call this meeting concluded. We are adjourned. We're out. Thank you, guys, and you all have a great holiday season, Christmas, Groundhog Day, and we'll see you in March in Georgia.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on December 10, 2021.)

---

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

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
1/27/2022

# ATTENDEES - COUNCIL SESSION III

(Thursday, 12/9/21 - 3:00 PM - 5:30 PM)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

## 2021 COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mel Bell, **Chair** ✓  
SCDNR-Marine Resources Division  
P.O. Box 12559  
217 Ft. Johnson Road  
Charleston, SC 29422  
(843)953-9007 (ph); (843)953-9159 (fax)  
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, **Vice Chair** ✓  
GA DNR - Coastal Resources Division  
One Conservation Way, Suite 300  
Brunswick, GA 31520  
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-3143 (f)  
Carolyn.belcher@dnr.ga.gov

Robert Beal ✓  
Executive Director  
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission  
1050 N. Highland St. Suite 200 A-N  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(703)842-0740 (ph); (703)842-0741 (f)  
rbeal@asmfc.org

Chester Brewer ✓ *web*  
4440 PGA Boulevard, Suite 600  
West Palm Beach, FL 33408  
(561)655-4777  
wbsafmc@gmail.com

Chris Conklin ✓  
P.O. Box 972  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
(843)543-3833  
conklinsafmc@gmail.com

LT Robert Copeland ✓ *web*  
Seventh Coast Guard District  
909 SE 1st Ave.  
Miami, FL 33131  
(305) 415-6781(ph); (786)457--6419(c)  
Robert.R.Copeland@uscg.mil

Tim Griner ✓  
4446 Woodlark Lane  
Charlotte, NC 28211  
(980)722-0918 (ph)  
timgrinersafmc@gmail.com

Judy Helmey ✓  
124 Palmetto Drive  
Savannah, GA 31410  
(912) 897-4921  
JudyHelmey@gmail.com

Kerry Marhefka ✓  
347 Plantation View Lane  
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464  
(843)452-7352 (ph)  
KerryOMarhefka@gmail.com

Jessica McCawley ✓  
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission  
620 South Meridian St  
Tallahassee, FL 32399  
(850)487-0554 (ph); (850)487-4847 (f)  
Jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

Trish Murphey ✓  
NC Division of Marine Fisheries  
P.O. Box 769  
3441 Arendell Street  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
(242) 808-8011 (O); (252)241-9310 (c)  
Trish.murphey@ncdenr.gov

Tom Roller ✓ *web*  
807 Deerfield Drive  
Beaufort, NC 28516  
(252) 728-7907 (ph);(919)423-6310 (c)  
tomrollersafmc@gmail.com

Andy Strelcheck ✓  
Acting Regional Administrator  
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region  
263 13th Avenue South  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701  
(727)551-5702  
Andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov

Laurilee Thompson ✓  
P.O. Box 307  
Mims, FL 3274  
(321) 794-6866  
thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com

dewey  
shep  
monica

John Walter  
rick devictor

genny (web)  
pat O'Shaughnessy  
(web)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**2021 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued**

Deirdre Warner-Kramer ✕  
Office of Marine Conservation OES/OMC  
2201 C Street, N.W. Department of State, Room 5806  
Washington, DC 20520  
(202)647-3228 (ph)  
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

Spud Woodward ✓  
860 Buck Swamp Road  
Brunswick, GA 31523  
(912)258-8970 (ph)  
swoodwardsafmc@gmail.com

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Representative  
TBD

ATTENDEE LIST - COUNCIL  
SESSION 3 (12/9/21)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
COUNCIL STAFF

**Executive Director**

John Carmichael  
john.carmichael@safmc.net

**Deputy Director - Science**

Dr. Chip Collier  
chip.collier@safmc.net

**Deputy Director - Management**

Myra Brouwer  
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

---

**Citizen Science Program Manager**

Julia Byrd  
julia.byrd@safmc.net

web

**Outreach Program Manager**

Cameron Rhodes  
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

web

**Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya  
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

web

**Fishery Scientist**

Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net

**Quantitative Fishery Scientist**

Dr. Judd Curtis  
judd.curthis@safmc.net

**Citizen Science Project Coordinator**

Nicholas Smillie  
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net

**Fishery Economist &  
FMP Coordinator**

John Hadley  
john.hadley@safmc.net

**Staff Accountant**

Suzanna Thomas  
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

**Fishery Scientist**

Allie Iberle  
Allie.iberle@safmc.net

**Fishery Social Scientist**

Christina Wiegand  
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

**Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson  
kim.iverson@safmc.net

**SEDAR**

**Administrative Officer**

Kelly Klasnick  
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

**SEDAR Program Manager**

Dr. Julie Neer  
Julie.neer@safmc.net

web

**Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist**

Roger Pugliese  
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

web

**SEDAR Coordinator**

Kathleen Howington  
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

web

all present

ATTENDEES - COUNCIL SESSION III  
(FRIDAY, 12/10/21 - 8:30am - 12:00pm)  
SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
2021 COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mel Bell, **Chair** ✓  
SCDNR-Marine Resources Division  
P.O. Box 12559  
217 Ft. Johnson Road  
Charleston, SC 29422  
(843)953-9007 (ph); (843)953-9159 (fax)  
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, **Vice Chair** ✓  
GA DNR - Coastal Resources Division  
One Conservation Way, Suite 300  
Brunswick, GA 31520  
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-3143 (f)  
Carolyn.belcher@dnr.ga.gov

Robert Beal ✓  
Executive Director  
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission  
1050 N. Highland St. Suite 200 A-N  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(703)842-0740 (ph); (703)842-0741 (f)  
rbeal@asmfc.org

Chester Brewer ✓ *web*  
4440 PGA Boulevard, Suite 600  
West Palm Beach, FL 33408  
(561)655-4777  
wcbsafmc@gmail.com

Chris Conklin ✓  
P.O. Box 972  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
(843)543-3833  
conklinsafmc@gmail.com

LT Robert Copeland ✓ *web*  
Seventh Coast Guard District  
909 SE 1st Ave.  
Miami, FL 33131  
(305) 415-6781(ph); (786)457--6419(c)  
Robert.R.Copeland@uscg.mil

Tim Griner ✓  
4446 Woodlark Lane  
Charlotte, NC 28211  
(980)722-0918 (ph)  
timgrinersafmc@gmail.com

Judy Helmey ✓  
124 Palmetto Drive  
Savannah, GA 31410  
(912) 897-4921  
JudyHelmey@gmail.com

Kerry Marhefka ✓  
347 Plantation View Lane  
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464  
(843)452-7352 (ph)  
KerryOMarhefka@gmail.com

Jessica McCawley ✓  
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission  
620 South Meridian St  
Tallahassee, FL 32399  
(850)487-0554 (ph); (850)487-4847 (f)  
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

Trish Murphey ✓  
NC Division of Marine Fisheries  
P.O. Box 769  
3441 Arendell Street  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
(242) 808-8011 (O); (252)241-9310 (c)  
Trish.murphey@ncdenr.gov

Tom Roller ✓ *web*  
807 Deerfield Drive  
Beaufort, NC 28516  
(252) 728-7907 (ph); (919)423-6310 (c)  
tomrollersafmc@gmail.com

Andy Strelcheck ✗  
Acting Regional Administrator  
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region  
263 13th Avenue South  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701  
(727)551-5702  
Andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov

Laurilee Thompson ✓  
P.O. Box 307  
Mims, FL 3274  
(321) 794-6866  
thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com

Dewey  
Rick DeVictor  
John Walter

Monica *shep*  
Dale Diaz  
Pat O'Shaun

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
2021 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

Deirdre Warner-Kramer ✕  
Office of Marine Conservation OES/OMC  
2201 C Street, N.W. Department of State, Room 5306  
Washington, DC 20520  
(202)647-3228 (ph)  
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

Spud Woodward ✓  
860 Buck Swamp Road  
Brunswick, GA 31523  
(912)258-8970 (ph)  
swoodwardsafmc@gmail.com

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Representative  
TBD

ATTENDEES - COUNCIL SESSION III  
12/10/2021

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
COUNCIL STAFF

**Executive Director**

John Carmichael  
john.carmichael@safmc.net

**Deputy Director - Science**

Dr. Chip Collier  
chip.collier@safmc.net

**Deputy Director - Management**

Myra Brouwer  
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

**Citizen Science Program Manager**

Julia Byrd  
julia.byrd@safmc.net

web

**Outreach Program Manager**

Cameron Rhodes  
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

web

**Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya  
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

**Fishery Scientist**

Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net

**Quantitative Fishery Scientist**

Dr. Judd Curtis  
Judd.curthis@safmc.net

**Citizen Science Project Coordinator**

Nicholas Smillie  
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net

**Fishery Economist &  
FMP Coordinator**

John Hadley  
john.hadley@safmc.net

**Staff Accountant**

Suzanna Thomas  
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

**Fishery Scientist**

Allie Iberle  
Allie.iberle@safmc.net

**Fishery Social Scientist**

Christina Wiegand  
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

**Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson  
kim.iverson@safmc.net

**SEDAR**

**SEDAR Program Manager**

Dr. Julie Neer  
Julie.neer@safmc.net

web

**Administrative Officer**

Kelly Klasnick  
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

**SEDAR Coordinator**

Kathleen Howington  
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

web

**Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist**

Roger Pugliese  
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

web

all present  
9

## SAFMC December Council

### Attendee Report: Meeting (12/6/21 - 12/10/21)

Report Generated:

12/14/2021 01:58 PM EST

**Webinar ID**

509-177-083

**Actual Start Date/Time**

12/09/2021 09:09 AM EST

**Duration**

8 hours 23 minutes

### Attendee Details

<b>Attended</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>
Yes	BROUWER	MYRA
Yes	BYRD	01JULIA
Yes	Bachelor	Nate
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Bonura	Vincent
Yes	Brennan	Ken
Yes	Brown	Julie
Yes	Burgess	Aurora
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Chaya	01Cindy
Yes	Cheshire	Rob
Yes	Christmas	Merry
Yes	Clarke	Lora
Yes	Conklin	The Real Chris
Yes	Copeland	00 Robert
Yes	Cox	Derek
Yes	Curtis	01Judd
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	Diaz	Dale
Yes	FRANCO	DAWN
Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Fitzpatrick	Eric
Yes	Foor	Brandon
Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Friedman	Leah
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Glazier	Edward
Yes	Godwin	Joelle
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Guyas	Martha
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	Herrera	John
Yes	Hoke	David

Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Iberle	01Allie
Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01Kim
Yes	Johnson	Denise
Yes	Johnston	Lane
Yes	Karnauskas	Mandy
Yes	Kellison	Todd
Yes	Kelly	Aaron
Yes	Kerns	Toni
Yes	Kittle	Christine
Yes	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	Krikstan	Catherine
Yes	LARKIN	Michael
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Locker	Stephen
Yes	M TARVER	TIM
Yes	Malinowski	Rich
Yes	Martin	Drew
Yes	Masi	Michelle
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	Meehan	Sean
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	Muehlstein	Emily
Yes	Muffley	Brandon
Yes	Muñoz	Roldan
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Donnell	Kelli
Yes	OShaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	O'Brien	Lauren
Yes	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	Porch	Clay
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Rhodes	01Cameron
Yes	Roller	00Tom
Yes	Runde	Brendan
Yes	Sagarese	Skyler
Yes	Schobernd	Christina
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Simpson	Julie

Yes	Smillie	01Nicholas
Yes	Sramek	Mark
Yes	Stemle	Adam
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	Vincent	Matthew
Yes	Walia	Matt
Yes	Waters	Jim
Yes	White	Geoff
Yes	Whitten	Meredith
Yes	Wiegand	01Christina
Yes	Wiseman	adam
Yes	Wyanski	David
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	colby	barrett
Yes	emery	jeff
Yes	gloeckner	david
Yes	locke	charles
Yes	moss	david
Yes	sandorf	scott
Yes	schiaffo	charlotte
Yes	thomas	01suz
Yes	vara	mary

## SAFMC December Council

### Attendee Report: Meeting (12/6/21 - 12/10/21)

Report Generated:

12/14/2021 01:59 PM EST

**Webinar ID**

509-177-083

**Actual Start Date/Time**

12/10/2021 08:11 AM EST

**Duration**

3 hours 28 minutes

### Attendee Details

<b>Attended</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>
Yes	BROUWER	MYRA
Yes	BYRD	01JULIA
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Blough	Heather
Yes	Bonura	Vincent
Yes	Breton	Alicia
Yes	Bubley	Walter
Yes	Burgess	Aurora
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Collier	01Chip
Yes	Copeland	00 Robert
Yes	Coutre	Karson
Yes	Cox	Derek
Yes	Curtis	01Judd
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	Diaz	Dale
Yes	Dukes	Amy
Yes	FRANCO	DAWN
Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Fitzpatrick	Eric
Yes	Foor	Brandon
Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Friedman	Leah
Yes	Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Glazier	Edward
Yes	Godwin	Joelle
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Guyas	Martha
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	Herrera	John
Yes	Hoke	David
Yes	Howington	Kathleen

Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01Kim
Yes	Karnauskas	Mandy
Yes	Kittle	Christine
Yes	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Lee	Jennifer
Yes	Malinowski	Rich
Yes	Masi	Michelle
Yes	McCallister	Kevin
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	Meehan	Sean
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Muñoz	Roldan
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	OShaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Petersen	Andrew
Yes	Pierce	Brett
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Rhodes	01Cameron
Yes	Roller	00Tom
Yes	Sawicki	Kim
Yes	Schmidtke	01Michael
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Siegfried	Katie
Yes	Simpson	Julie
Yes	Smart	Tracey
Yes	Sramek	Mark
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	Vincent	Matthew
Yes	Walia	Matt
Yes	Wamer	David
Yes	White	Geoff
Yes	Whitten	Meredith
Yes	Wiegand	01Christina
Yes	Wilber	Pace
Yes	Wiseman	adam
Yes	Wyanski	David
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	hager	christian
Yes	moss	david
Yes	sandorf	scott

Yes  
Yes

thomas  
vara

01suz  
mary