

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION I

**Blockade Runner
Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina**

December 5, 2022

Transcript

Council Members

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Chair
Mel Bell
LT Cameron Box
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Tom Roller
Laurilee Thompson

Trish Murphey, Vice Chair
Gary Borland
Chester Brewer
Judy Helmey
Jessica McCawley
Andy Strelcheck
Spud Woodward

Council Staff

Myra Brouwer
John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
John Hadley
Allie Iberle
Kelly Klasnick
Roger Pugliese
Nick Smillie
Christina Wiegand

Julia Byrd
Cindy Chaya
Dr. Judd Curtis
Kathleen Howington
Kim Iverson
Dr. Julie Neer
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Suz Thomas

Attendees and Invited Participants

Susan Boggs
Frank Helies
LeAnn Hogan
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Jonathan Star

Rick DeVictor
Dewey Hemilright
Jamal Ingram
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. John Walter

Other attendees and invited participants are attached.

The Full Council Session I of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Blockade Runner, Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina, on Monday, December 5, 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Good late morning to everybody who is joining us at 11:20 this morning. This is Council Session I, and we're going to start out with just the Call to Order and Introductions, for folks that are not part of the South Atlantic Council family proper, and we have Susan Boggs, who is representing the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, as their liaison, and we have Dewey Hemilright for the Mid-Atlantic. John Walter is sitting in for Clay Porch today, for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Rick DeVictor is at the table right now, and Andy Strelcheck, for the Southeast Regional Office, will be here after lunch, and so Rick is doing his job.

At this point, what I'm going to ask is what we're doing with the agenda, and does anybody have any objection to the agenda as currently published? Any additions? Seeing none, we'll move forward onto the transcript. I'm looking to the group for an approval of the transcript. Did anybody have any changes that needed to be made at this time to the transcript, as published? Okay. Seeing none, the transcript stands.

Our first agenda item is going to be our reports from agencies. Our Coast Guard liaison is not going to be able to do his report, as of right now, and we're probably going to circle back around, for his report, later in the week, and so we'll stay-tuned on that one, but what we'll do is we'll start off with the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement first.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Good morning, everybody. A quick OLE brief, and there's not a whole lot to cover here. A brief summary, we had 187 open incidents during this quarter, and eight cases were referred to General Counsel, and those consisted of a Lacey Act Bahamas violation, an unpermitted charter violation, some observer issues, exceeding the trip limit, and then reef fish as bait and disposal upon approach.

I did have some questions on how we make that decision, whether cases go to General Counsel or not, and we have a summary settlement schedule, which is like our ticket process, where, if it's listed on there, we can do a summary settlement. The more serious, or more egregious, type cases, they go to General Counsel, and so that's the breakdown between the two. Also, General Counsel had issued a couple of NOVAs from past cases that were submitted. Two that I wanted to point out, and improperly-marked crab pots was issued for \$5,500, and then there was a second case of exceeding the bag limit, false statements, and that notice of violation was issued for \$132,800, with a 132-day permit sanction, and so those are two outcomes from cases that we submitted.

On the summary settlement side, there were twenty-five summary settlements, and the low was an undersized-possession-type case, for \$300, and the high was a \$2,500, for failure to take an observer. Otherwise, the other cases were retention during a closure, undersized possession, descending device requirements, and we are writing more of those cases, because those rules have been out for a while now. Observer program requirements, and the remaining were unfounded, or were fix-its, or a lot are just handled with compliance assistance, where we can help the fishermen on-scene.

Two other cases that I wanted to highlight there were a domestic import false labeling case, and those links are on your briefing materials, if you wanted to read those, and it was a false labeling

case of 5,666 pounds of shark fins down in the Port of Miami, and the second one was an unlicensed dealer making purchases at truck stops up and down the highway on the east coast, and so two cases that were handled, rather large cases.

Otherwise, we have partnerships and training, and we are doing more and more work in the ports, and we have IUU enforcement officers in the Port of Savannah and Miami, and they're working with our state and federal partners, and then we have a number of joint patrols. This shows our partners there, and we had 108 overall enforcement referrals, and that encompasses the entire Southeast Division. Within the South Atlantic, we had cases from FWC, South Carolina, and Georgia is not listed there, but we did receive some Georgia cases, and the U.S. Coast Guard as well.

A couple of the highlights, and we had Operation Sanctuary Savior, which was the Florida mini-season, and I think I covered that a little bit last time, and six boat crews came across the Southeast Division and went down to the Keys, and we patrolled with FWC, the Coast Guard, CBP, and the county and local police department, and there were 133 different boardings. There were a number of violations for fishing in the SPAs, lobster take, spearfishing, and groundings, but that's an annual event that we try to get a lot of vessels down there to patrol the sanctuary areas.

On the U.S. Coast Guard side, we've had a number of our officers go offshore with the Coast Guard, doing red snapper patrols, illegal charter patrols, and we've had a couple get underway for multi-day patrols up and down, from North Carolina down to Miami.

Current spotlight are seafood imports, as I mentioned, SEFHIER, and my guys are up and down the east coast and trying to meet with as many fishermen and associations, trying to educate folks on the SEFHIER enforcement, and we've seen a lot of improvement in those areas. Unpermitted charter operations, the Coast Guard has a big emphasis on those, on the unpermitted side, with the captain's license, and we are equally focusing on those that are doing charters without having the proper South Atlantic permits, and we continue with the North Atlantic right whale enforcement measures.

Those are the OLE resources, and I did want to highlight one case. On Friday, there was a jury trial in Miami that just completed, and it was a theft within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction, and it was a permitted shark research fishery vessel, whose gear, bottom longline, was stolen and destroyed. We did press criminal charges on that, and there was a jury trial held on Thursday and Friday in Miami, and we did get a conviction on those charges, with the sentencing to be done in February. Again, it was a permitted shark research fishery whose gear had been taken by some other individuals, and so that's all the stuff that I had to brief. I will be here all week. If anybody has any follow-up questions, please give me a holler.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thank you for your report. I don't want to put you on the spot, and I don't know how much you can say, but we were kind of curious about the \$132,000 NOVA and sort of what escalates -- If you look at your report, that is orders of magnitude bigger than others, and we were wondering sort of what escalates something to a number that high, even if you can't be specific about that case, and that's up to you, and 132 days of no fishing, and is there a case where

something can -- If it's big enough to be \$132,000, when does it become big enough to sort of lose your permit, and has that ever happened?

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: On the first part, that particular case, I was involved with -- That's the same individual doing similar type offenses, and he got, I think, around a \$30,000 fine the first time, and a \$70,000 fine the second time, and, if you want to see our NOAA General Counsel for the third time, for the same type of offense, where you're not learning, time and time again, that's where those fines start escalating. Regarding the permit, losing a permit, that's something I would defer to General Counsel. I know, in this particular case, this was a permit sanction, which is, you know, pretty egregious as well, but I would have to defer to them on those decision processes.

DR. BELCHER: Are there additional questions? Seeing none, thank you for your report.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Our next report will be from the Gulf of Mexico Council, and so Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Good morning, Madam Chair. Thank you for having me here today. One thing that is not on my report is red snapper, if anyone can believe, and so that's kind of unusual for the Gulf Council, and I did review my report, and there are several items that you all will also be discussing, and so, if I may just wait, and we'll discuss those, most specifically to the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

On amberjack, our council took final action on our Reef Fish Amendment 54, which revised the allocations between the commercial and recreational sectors, based on the new MRIP-FES-adjusted landings. The new allocation is for 20 percent commercial and 80 percent recreational, and, if anybody cares, it was 27 commercial and 73 percent recreational.

We also began a framework action on gray triggerfish, for the commercial trip limits, and the commercial fishermen have been asking us to increase it from sixteen, with several options, and the council chose to go with twenty-five fish per trip, and this should go final at our January meeting. It was pretty simple, and so we're trying to move it along as quickly as we can.

Then I know, at the last -- At your last meeting, Dale touched on our IFQ Focus Group, and they did meet last week. I haven't heard a report-out of that meeting, we did kind of change their charge. We added to their charge, if you will, to ask them to look at the benefits of drawbacks of getting increases in annual allocation, as well as the allocations held by NOAA Fisheries from non-active accounts and how we get those to entrants into the fishery.

Another item that we looked at was the scamp and yellowmouth grouper, and that was the SEDAR 68 in 2021 report, and they were deemed to be not overfished or undergoing overfishing, but we have asked our SSC to look at a new spawning potential ratio of 40 percent for the entire shallow-water grouper complex, which that also includes our black grouper and our yellowfin grouper, and then, lastly, and I don't know if you've all been keeping up with this, and I know that we have different requirements on our charter/for-hire SEFHIER reporting, and one of the things that the council did move to do was to -- For the VMS, for the hailing-out, is that only if you are engaged in a fishing trip or any kind of chartered activity. Other activity, such as going to the fuel dock, bait, ice, that type of thing, they will no longer be required to hail-out. Again, if you have any

questions, I will be happy to answer them, but, a lot of these items that are on my report, you all will be touching on throughout your meeting this week. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Susan. Any questions at this point for Susan? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I already asked Susan, but she said to ask the NOAA folks, and what is an ecosystem-based red tide analysis?

DR. BELCHER: John Walter.

DR. WALTER: Hi, Laurilee. Good morning.

MS. THOMPSON: Hi, John.

DR. WALTER: In the Gulf of Mexico, we have these really nasty things called red tides that kill 40 percent of our groupers from time to time, as well as have a whole lot of other impacts on the whole system, from tourism to beaches to the entire ecosystem, and so one of the issues that the Gulf has been dealing with is how to deal with these in a fisheries management context, in terms of how can you set catch limits that might be precautionary in the face of those things, and then how you could try to mitigate around them and find ways for the fishery to operate better in the face of them.

One of the things that the Gulf is embarking upon, the Gulf Council, are these fisheries ecosystem initiatives, which are specific initiatives to address ecosystem factors, and that's going to be a collaborative series of projects that, once the council determines which ones they prioritize for the ecosystem technical team to move forward with, then those will be embarked upon and then bring management options to the council for what they can do, red tides being one of them, because it's one of the major episodic events that occur, and there may be a number of other ecosystem issues that rise to that FEI, or fisheries ecosystem, initiative, and so that's where that's from. We can talk more about it, but that's kind of the short answer to it.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, John. Other questions at this point? Okay. Moving on, it will be the Mid-Atlantic report-out. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. The Mid-Atlantic Council met in Dewey Beach, Delaware, October 4 through 6, and most of us were lucky to kind of get there, because we had a flooding event and different things like that around, and so the weather was not very conducive, but, at the meeting, we approved public comment for a draft amendment to modify species separation requirements in the Atlantic surf and ocean quahog fisheries, initiate an omnibus for an essential fish habitat amendment. The spiny dogfish specs included a 55 percent reduction compared to the 2022 quota.

We received updates on the private recreational tilefish permitting and discussed additional outreach needed to improve angler awareness and compliance. We received an update on the east coast scenario planning, and we met jointly with the SSC committee to discuss topics of mutual interest. We received a refresher on the surf and ocean quahog excessive shares amendment, and we also received a presentation and kind of like a three-hour workshop on Roberts Rules of the road and the proper way of doing things, and so it seems like a lot of us have been doing things

wrong, and so hopefully we'll do it right in the future. I did ask the question, to the lady, of how could I get all my motions passed by everybody, and she hasn't figured that answer out, but it was a good meeting.

We also agreed to send a letter, the Protected Resources Committee send a comment letter, on the proposed North Atlantic right whale vessel strike reduction rules, and we also presented Mr. Steve Heins, who is a citizen now of North Carolina, with the Ricks E. Savage Award for 2021, and he has worked for DNR, up in New York, for many years, and retired from there, and now he just fishes and hangs out, he says, now. Kerry was our liaison for that, and we also had a nice seafood social that we took part in, and so that's it. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Dewey. Does anybody have questions for Dewey at this point? Okay. Seeing none, we will move on to the state agency reports, and we'll start with North Carolina and work our way south.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess the first thing is our southern flounder, and we had our first southern flounder season under the new Amendment 3, which is quota-based management, and we had the recreational season open on September 1, and it ran through the 30th, with a one-fish bag limit, fifteen inches. For the commercial side of the fishery, we manage kind of both gear and area, and so we had a north and south area for mobile gears, which include gillnets, gigs, and hook-and-line, and then we had a northern/central/southern for pound nets, and we staggered the openings for pound nets.

We opened mobile gear, state-wide, on September 15, along with the northern pound nets, and we opened central and southern pound nets on October 1, and so the first thing that happened is we ended up closing our mobile gear in about a week, and that was gillnet, and we did reopen to gigs and hook-and-line, but not gillnets, with a fifty-pound limit, and our central pound net -- They closed in about a week, and then everything closed I think on October 28, and so it was kind of a quick, busy season for North Carolina.

Our commission met in November, and the Estuarine Striped Bass Fishery Management Plan, Amendment 2, was finalized, and it did different things. It incorporated harvest restrictions, some slot limits in different areas, and we maintained the gillnet closure in the upper Pamlico and Neuse River, and that was kind of contentious. We maintained the no possession in the Cape Fear River.

We also -- On striped mullet, we approved Supplement A, which set a commercial and recreational season closure for November 7 through December 3, and our striped mullet stock assessment had it overfished and overfishing occurring, and so this was an immediate action, and we are also in the process of moving forward with a striped mullet management plan, and so those goals and objectives have been approved, and the commission also received a benchmark spotted seatrout stock assessment, and the stock was found to not be overfished, but it was experiencing overfishing, and so there's plans to do scoping meetings for the upcoming management plan for that.

Last, but not least, the division also had a 200-year celebration kickoff last week. Basically, 200 years ago, December 30, 1822, North Carolina had the first law on the books for management of oysters, and so this gave us a kickoff date to celebrate 200 years of management.

The Governor proclaimed December as Marine Fisheries Management and Conservation Month in North Carolina, and, throughout the year, North Carolina is going to having blogs, and social media posts, of historical events, and we'll be having a lecture series, and, in June 10, in Morehead City, we're going to have a bicentennial jamboree, and that is where we'll have some educational booths and demonstrations and tours for the public to see, and so this is also part of our trying to really engage the public in fisheries management, and that's really all I have for North Carolina.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Trish. Any questions for Trish at this time? Okay. Seeing none, we'll move on to Mel.

MR. BELL: There's not much to really report from the federal side, and I think, when we count up everything, MARMAP and SEAMAP, we'll have had a good year, in terms of days-at-sea and all, and so it was a very productive year. We are -- Related to work done in support of reef fish work on the Lady Lisa, we are still working towards trying to replace the Lady Lisa, our forty-three-year-old wooden-hulled trawler, which is still afloat, the last time I saw it, but we're a little short financially on that, and we're trying to work some avenues, hopefully, to get some support in addition to what our general assembly has already provided us, but we're going to hopefully purchase a used vessel and then refurb it into something that we can hopefully have for the next twenty to forty years, and who knows, but we're looking at steel hull, rather than wood, this time, and we're going to a stern trawl, rather than a side trawl. That's the plan.

Under the heading of boats, we did have -- Recall we had minimal impact from Hurricane Ian, but we did have some damage done to one of our smaller research vessels, the Silver Crescent, and she's in the yard right now, and that's kind of put some of our inshore sampling, particularly for crustacean fisheries, a little behind, and they're having to try to find other available vessels of opportunity to get the work done.

We're still going through a conversion process for our licensing contractor, for both commercial and recreational licenses and permits. That's an ongoing process, and converting over to a new system always has some hiccups in it, but we're moving along with that.

We are spending a lot of time, right now, on blue crab, on the blue crab fishery. Our ability to regulate fisheries is directed through modifications to state code, through the general assembly, and so we're hoping to have a blue-crab-focused bill coming up in January, when our general assembly comes back into session, and so I suspect that we'll have blue crab on the menu this coming year. We've got some other things going on with the blue crab fishery, but there's a lot of focus on that for us right now, and that's, of course, a state-managed fishery.

Red drum are not exactly what we would hope to see, in terms of the recruitment to the fishery, and we're trying to figure out what's going on with red drum, and there is an upcoming stock assessment on red drum, I believe this spring, and so we'll see how that goes, but our red drum fishery is already a 90 to 95 percent catch-and-release fishery, and so, you know, regulatory adjustments on top of that are kind of hard to imagine.

Good news, and I think I had mentioned this before, but, just looking at fish that are in our waters, but that we manage federally, it looks like it might have been a good year for gag, and so we saw pretty good numbers of ingress and egress on small gag, and so, you know, maybe it was a good,

strong -- Maybe we'll have a good, strong year class for gag coming up, which would certainly be helpful, and I think that's really about all I have.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Mel. Any questions for Mel at this point in time? Okay. Moving on to Georgia, in Georgia, we're kind of -- It's nice to say we're light. Similar to Mel, red drum was on our agenda for some management. We've tabled it, based on the amount of comments we got. Jessica, I'm going to ask you to do this, and I'll come back.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Just to be clear, I'm doing Florida's update and not Georgia's update. For Florida, at our recent FWC Commission meeting that was last week, we -- The commission passed the first phase of our descending device and venting tool rule package, and we can certainly send around more information, if you're interested, but the rules that are in Gulf federal waters do not match the rules that are in South Atlantic federal waters, and so FWC is passing something, or moving through the process something, that is kind of a middle-of-the-road approach between the two federal waters, and so we can send around some information on that, including a table, if you're interested, but the commission is really excited to talk about descending devices and venting tools and get something in place, and so our plan would be to bring that for final action to the commission in February.

Also, there were a couple of storms since we met last, and so the State of Florida is still trying to work, in the Fort Myers/Pine Island, that area, following Hurricane Ian, and we have submitted a fishery disaster declaration request to the Secretary of Commerce, and then the other hurricane, and I believe it was Nicole, and there are so many, and I can barely keep up, but, at this point, we're not planning to submit a fishery disaster request for that hurricane, and so I'll pass it back to you, Madam Chair.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you. Apologies for that. We were looking at changes regulations for red drum, and this was an interesting change in how we've approached some of our management, and we used a satisfaction survey to help guide us, and then went out and did public comment, and we got a wide variety of comments behind that, and so we kind of pushed back a little bit, to come back at it and look at it from a different angle, because, actually, with what we were proposing, we had a lot of people who were actually in support of us being more conservative than we were, and we also had some folks that we're still feeling like we really didn't need to be making changes, and so we decided to kind of sit down and dig into it a little bit deeper before moving forward.

We were lucky with Ian and Nicole. Actually, what was surprising was Nicole pushed more water in on us than Ian did, and I felt bad for you all in South Carolina, because that first track kind of kept looking like it was going to hit those of us in the south pretty hard, and then it hooked-in and hit you guys to the north of us, but we were fortunate that way.

We're still, the same as you all, dealing with the right whales. We've been in discussions with our conservation management section, because of the entanglements as well with blue crab traps in the ocean waters, what to do as far as the weak links and all for those trap fisheries, so we can keep them going, and we're working really closely with drafting development of those letters, as well as for the vessel speed rules as well, and we're still waiting to hear on our 2018 disaster monies for relief to the shrimp fishery, and so maybe some day soon. Stay tuned, but, above that, that's really all that's been facing us.

Shrimp season has been rocking along, and we haven't heard too many complaints about that, and we'll be doing our assessment for determining if we're going to extend beyond the end of December or not here in a few weeks, and so are there questions for me? Okay. With that, I'm going to look to Myra, and we've got ten minutes until noon. Would you rather that we break ten minutes early for lunch and come at it full after lunch? So we're going to try to do our first agenda item there with the joint commercial electronic logbook amendment.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Carolyn. Good morning, everybody. This will be a short update on where we are in this amendment. For those of you that aren't familiar with what we're doing, this is a joint amendment with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and it addresses trying to move from a paper logbook for commercial vessels, those that are a part of the coastal logbook program, and move that to an electronic-based logbook.

Here is your purpose and need. There have been no changes. Both councils have looked at it, and I'm just bringing it up here for completion, to make sure that you all are still good with it, and, basically, what I just said kind of summarizes what's included in your purpose and need, and so there's nothing to do here at this time, and so, since September, which is the last time you guys saw this amendment, the IPT has been busy.

We met and agreed on an outline for the document, and we were able to flesh-out Chapter 1 of the document, and that is in Attachment 2a in your briefing book, and I'm not going to bring it up, but, if you're interested, I will just sort of walk you through what's included, as of today, in these various sections, and so we have begun work on the regulatory impact review, which is going to be Chapter 2 of the document. That is going to be the bulk of the document, and it's going to include detailed socioeconomic descriptions for the four FMPs that are being amended here, and so that's for Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, Coastal Migratory Pelagics, and Gulf Reef Fish.

We anticipate work being completed this winter, and the idea is to bring you some preliminary effects analysis in the spring, when both councils then would be in a better spot to approve this for public hearings, and so I will go over the timeline here in a little bit.

In the meantime, we've been busy bringing advisory panels together, and so four of them met this fall, two in the South Atlantic and two in the Gulf, and I will just go over their input here a little bit later, and so, going back to the document, here's what's in Chapter 1, and so we've included a history, a pretty detailed history, and thank you here to Lisa Hollensead at the Gulf Council and Rich Malinowski. They did a lot of work compiling the history of the logbook program, so that it would all be spelled-out in the document.

We have a section that considers what would happen, in terms of overlap and reporting, with other federal reporting programs in the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and so this is where we would talk about, okay, is this going to affect how the Gulf IFQ folks report, and is this going to affect -- You know, how is this going to mesh with how things are done in the Greater Atlantic Region, and how are vessels that are dually-permitted in other regions going to be affected, and so we still have to flesh-out some more information there.

Currently, eTRIPS is the electronic platform that we've been talking about relative to this amendment, and that is just one of the possible applications that can be used for fishers to submit their logbooks, but it is the one application that currently could support a one-stop reporting, and

so I will come back around to that in a little bit. We also included a list of the logbook and the economic data fields that were the ones that would be added, the ones that would be removed, and what those modifications are and the rationale for why those things are changing. That is also included in that spreadsheet that you all have seen before, and I'm not going to bring that one up, but it has more information, if you're interested, but we do have like a more concise little table in the document itself, so you can see what the changes are.

This slide, I was just -- I received this on Friday, and so this is not included in the presentation that's in your briefing book, and this is just basically the illustrate the level of overlap that we have among the various regions, and so, on the left, you have the GARFO and Southeast Region permits, and so there's 277 vessels. Those that have overlap between the Southeast Region and the HMS are 146 vessels. Between GARFO and HMS is 391, and so this last little column, on the far-right, is the ones that overlap for all three, and so GARFO, SERO, and HMS, and so that's 122 vessels.

This only shows the vessels that have an overlap, but, obviously, not the entire number of vessels that are permitted in those regions. For the Southeast Region, there were 4,549 unique vessels that were used for this particular analysis, and so roughly 7 percent of the vessels overlap with at least one other region, and so that's kind of to sort of give you a feel for what we're looking at, in terms of that overlap.

This is the revised timing, and it's slightly modified from what you saw in September, but it would still put you in late 2023, looking at a final rule being published, if everything goes as planned, so that regulations could potentially be effective as early as 2024, and so the reason, I guess, we are proposing this revised timeline is, as I mentioned a bit ago, the bulk of the work is putting together all this description information and looking at what the administrative effects are going to be, and we want to bring that back to you before you approve it for public hearings, and so we're looking at maybe public hearings in the spring, and we would suggest that you consider making those virtual, and the reason for that would be to be able to better demonstrate the application online, and also potentially have folks from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center being available remotely to help us answer those technical questions that might come up from the public.

Now I'm going to go into what the various APs said, and this is just a very quick summary. Generally, the advisory panels were very supportive of the proposed changes, and there was a willingness to test the currently-available application, eTRIPS. Folks that have been using it in GARFO said they like it, and there was, however, some skepticism about whether the electronic submissions would improve the permit renewal process, and, as you may have heard, there is some snags currently in the Permits Office, and the agency is going to be fixing that, and so there's a little bit of frustration among fishermen with that, and we're hoping, once this amendment moves along, and everything kind of dovetails, like it's supposed to be, then it will be a good thing, but, currently, I couldn't tell you how long that will take.

There were also some -- This last bullet here, it wasn't that there was a question about potentially improved compliance, but it was just an acknowledgement that electronic submission is probably going to make compliance easier, and they also pointed out that there's a discrepancy in the submission of the reports, because, in the Greater Atlantic Region, they are -- Vessels need to sort of submit an estimate of their catch ahead of time, and then, after offloading, they have to go back and do a -- Correct me if I'm wrong here, but this is how I understand it, and then they go back and amend their submission, and none of that is going to change with this amendment, and so those

timing little issues will be something that the councils can think about later, but just to acknowledge that that is there.

Fishermen wanted to know if there would be a time for overlap between paper and electronic submissions following the implementation, and the answer is yes, and the idea is that, hopefully, there will be a certain period of overlap, but, eventually, what ultimately is the goal is to have exclusively electronic reporting for these vessels.

There were some questions about the timeline for submission for the economic add-on survey, and so this surveys that only some vessels are selected to submit each year, and, apparently, there is a delay in how long those data take to be processed, and fishermen sometimes have to wait to be paid-out by the fish houses, but it sounded, to me, like that was something that is not anything the council can do anything about at this point, and it may be an issue that's more related to individual fish houses, but it's definitely something that the IPT will talk about and try to have an answer to those folks.

Then, finally, and I'm not sure if finally, and I think there's a couple more, but there were also some concerns about how the electronic reporting would affect mainly snapper grouper commercial vessels that have permits under separate corporations or that are leasing permits. Fishermen were just concerned about the complexity that electronic reporting might introduce for them, and, again, this is something that we'll try to provide as much guidance and information to the fishermen, but, for example, leasing of permits is not something that is recognized, and so there's no way to track those things through the Permits Office, and so there will be some complication for some folks.

That was basically what I had in terms of input from the advisory panels, and I think we still have to bring this in front of the Dolphin Wahoo AP, and so that will be in the spring, and we'll bring that feedback to you after they meet, and the economic description should be done in early 2023, and, like I said, we intend to bring you that preliminary effect in March, and keep in mind that this document is going to look a little differently than what you're used to seeing, our integrated documents that have the NEPA analysis. This is an amendment to four FMPs, but the actual NEPA portion of it is being done through a categorical exclusion, and so it's going to look a little bit different than what you're used to seeing, and so that's what I have for you, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Myra. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: It may be too early in the stages yet, but do you have an idea of -- When it comes time to roll this out, I would advise to look at the Mid-Atlantic Council, and they did a step-by-step -- If you could read it, you could figure out how to get onto what you need to do for the electronic monitoring, and there was a step-by-step, very articulated type of thing, and it was very helpful to a lot of folks, who didn't think they could do it, and they did, and so I would maybe just look at that.

Then, whatever application you're going to use, and there's probably going to be multiple ones, have a step-by-step, something that is tried out, so that it would help the different ones, with the different phones, or however, and I think that would be a big help, but I'm sure it's probably too early for that, but I just wanted to put it on your radar. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Dewey. Other comments or questions for Myra at this point? Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, and, Dewey, that just -- I guess I should clarify that, yes, there will likely be more than one vendor, and I imagine several. Once the Science Center comes up with technical specifications for building these applications, then those will allow us to provide the information, as you just suggested, but those technical specifications will have to be put together first.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Are there additional comments or questions for Myra? Okay. Myra, is there anything that you need from us? Okay. All right. At this point, we're at five after twelve, and I'm going to go ahead and break us for lunch, and we have an hour-and-a-half, and so we need to be back at 1:35, and then we will pick up with our next item, which is we'll be doing the presentation on Hudson Canyon, and so, at 1:35, be back here, please.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. PUGLIESE: LeAnn, go ahead.

MS. HOGAN: All right. Great. Well, hello everyone. Good afternoon. I really appreciate you having me. My name is LeAnn Hogan, and I work for the Eastern Region of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. The Eastern Region covers the sanctuaries in the Great Lakes, the Atlantic Ocean, and the Gulf of Mexico, but, today, I'm here to talk to you about the proposed designation of the Hudson Canyon National Marine Sanctuary.

Many of you may know about the program in general, but I will do a quick review of some program-level information, and then I will go into specifics about Hudson Canyon. This is a map of the sanctuary system, and there are fifteen sanctuaries, currently, and two marine national monuments.

Just quickly, for the program overall, the sanctuary management objectives, we are focused, in the program, on reducing threats to key species and marine habitats, interpreting marine maritime heritage resources, and promoting sustainable use and coastal resilience. We do also put a heavy focus on non-regulatory solutions, with community-based problem-solving at the forefront.

Just briefly, during the scoping process for Hudson Canyon, we got a lot of questions on the differences between monuments and sanctuaries, and I just want to quickly go through this. The sanctuaries, in our system, are designated under the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and the nomination process is community driven. The designation process is based on the requirements of NEPA, which incorporates multiple opportunities for public engagement and official public comment. A monument is designated through presidential proclamation under the Antiquities Act, and there is no public process that is required under the Antiquities Act before designation, and, many times, monuments are managed by multiple government agencies, such as sanctuaries and the Department of the Interior.

Sanctuary advisory councils, these are community-based advisory groups that are established to provide advice and recommendations to sanctuary superintendents on issues including

management, science, and stewardship. They usually represent diverse stakeholders, and, in the past, we've also, during designation, have done pre-designation sanctuary advisory councils.

Just quickly going over the path to getting an area added to our inventory, this all begins with the nomination that is submitted by a community-based process. Once the nomination is submitted to us, we do a thorough review, and we evaluate that nomination against our national significance criteria and our management considerations, and then, once we do that review, if it meets those criteria, then we accept it into the inventory. Those nominations can stay on the inventory, you know, indefinitely, and we do a five-review of the nominations, just to make sure that they have remained relevant, and then they can be on the inventory until they are chosen for designation.

The designation process takes between three to five years, and you're probably thinking, wow, that sounds like a long time, and part of the reason is because of the extensive public input and public process in the designation, and so we start with public scoping, and you all are familiar with the NEPA process through your council actions, and it's very similar here.

We have scoping, and that is the first point where the public engages, and then we develop our draft document. That is we are required to do environmental impact statements when we're going through our information, and we need to a draft management plan and a proposed rule. This is the second point where the public is asked to comment, and we usually do in-person or virtual meetings at this point as well, and then we get to the final stage, where we have our final EIS, management plan, and our final report.

Switching gears here, the Hudson Canyon, specifically the Hudson Canyon nomination, was submitted to NOAA in 2016 by the Wildlife Conservation Society. We evaluated it, and it met our criteria, and so it was placed on our inventory in 2017. As you can see on the slide, the nomination included several goals, and, also, I want to point out that the nomination was very clear that the fisheries in the Hudson Canyon area are well managed by the fishery management council and NMFS and that they should continue to be managed under those authorities.

Just a little bit about Hudson Canyon, and you all probably know that this area is about a hundred miles southeast of New York City, and it is the largest submarine canyon along the U.S. Atlantic coast, and one of the reasons that it was put forward for nomination is because of the nature of the area, the flux of nutrients, and the areas of upwelling in the canyon do make it an ecological hotspot. There are nationally-significant natural resources in the area, and, also, the robust biodiversity of the area directly supports the local economy and is a very important area for commercial and recreational fisheries, and, also there are indigenous communities in the coastal areas that have maintained practices tied to the ocean in this region.

This slide shows the NOAA goals for the designation, and the proposed sanctuary is based on Hudson Canyon's diverse qualities, and it is guided by the purposes and policies of the Sanctuaries Act, and one thing that I want to reiterate here is that, just in general, fishing occurs across the vast majority of the sanctuary system, and we have always seen well-managed fisheries as a very important part of a healthy national marine sanctuary, and so one of our goals is that we want to shine a bright light on Hudson Canyon. We want to bring awareness to the specialness of the area, and really to bring this place to the many people that don't even know that it exists. Another goal is to connect communities, through outreach and education, to this treasured place.

MR. PUGLIESE: Leann, can you turn off -- Maybe you have your sound on separately, because it's coming across right now.

MS. HOGAN: Can you say that again? Turn off my what.

MR. PUGLIESE: I don't know if you've got it on your computer, or maybe move further away from the mic, but it's coming across rough online right now.

MS. HOGAN: Okay. Let me see.

MR. PUGLIESE: That's better right there, by moving back, and I think that's all it is.

MS. HOGAN: Okay, and so that's better, if I move back?

MR. PUGLIESE: The mic needs to be away from the speakers.

MS. HOGAN: Okay. It's so funny, because I have an integrated webcam that's picking up my mic, and not my computer, and so that's probably -- Is this better? Sorry.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, it is.

MS. HOGAN: Good. Okay. So do you -- Let me -- Apologies for the bad sound quality. Let me -- The first step in this process, in the Hudson Canyon designation, was the public scoping process, and I mentioned that a couple of slides ago, and so, basically, from June to August, this past summer, we did our public scoping. We had virtual and in-person public meetings, and we received over 15,000 comments, and you will see, on the slide, some of the things that we heard during scoping. We generally received strong support for the designation, and we received some opposition, mainly due to fishery management authorities and general opposition to MPAs. We also heard, very loud and clear, that there was strong support for a pre-designation sanctuary advisory council.

One of the requirements, under the National Marine Sanctuary Act, we refer to as 304(a)(5) consultation, and, during designation, it requires us to provide the appropriate fishery management council, or fishery management authority, with the opportunity to prepare draft fishing regulations, as the council may deem necessary to implement the designation.

The councils, or NMFS, have three actions, under 304(a)(5), that they can take. They can recommend draft fishing regulations, or they can recommend that fishing regulations are not necessary to implement the designation, or they can choose not to act, and so, for Hudson Canyon, we sent letters to the New England, Mid-Atlantic, and South Atlantic Councils and the Atlantic HMS Division in NMFS, on July 7, to begin this process. Those responses are due to us in early February, and we will incorporate the South Atlantic Council's analysis and recommendations into the DEIS.

Next steps, we are going to go forward with a pre-designation sanctuary advisory council, and we are going to be publishing a Federal Register notice in a couple of weeks, and that notice will establish what we call -- We call it a SAC, for short, and we will establish the SAC, and, at the same time, we will solicit applications for the council seats. There will be fifteen voting seat

members, and from a diverse range of stakeholders that you see list there, and we have also invited the non-voting government seats from the list there, including the New England, Mid-Atlantic, and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils.

Right now, voting seat applications are due at the end of January. Depending on when this publishes, we may push that a little bit, and extend that into February, just to ensure that everyone has enough time to get applications in, and then, finally, we will begin drafting the DEIS, the proposed rule, and the draft management plan very soon, and we expect that should take about twelve to fourteen months.

Okay. That was a lot, and I apologize for the sound quality issues, and the Hudson Canyon website is at the top. We will be posting all of the sanctuary advisory council information, the charter, the applications, and all the information will be posted on the website. If anyone has questions, please don't hesitate to reach out to me. There's my email at the bottom, and I would be happy to take questions.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, LeAnn. Are there questions for LeAnn at this time from the council? Any discussion? Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Chairman, and thank you, LeAnn, for that presentation. I just wanted to clarify that there are two fisheries that you guys manage that would be -- That are in the area where the sanctuary is being proposed, your dolphin wahoo fishery and your coastal migratory pelagics fishery, and so the Mackerel Cobia AP is aware of this, and they were provided this presentation at their recent meeting, without the benefit of LeAnn presenting it to them, but it was included in the briefing materials. The Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel will have a chance to comment on it, and so, if you guys want to just coordinate with us for whatever comments you guys want included in that letter that we plan to send to the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries by February 1, let me know.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you for that, Myra. Any other questions or comments at this time on this item? Laurilee.

MS. LAURILEE: How long is it? It's seven-and-a-half miles wide, it says, but it didn't say how long it is.

DR. BELCHER: LeAnn, are you still with us?

MS. HOGAN: I am. I don't have the specifics on the total length, but we can get that information. It may say on the -- I just don't have it with me, but it may say on the website, but that information is probably on the website, but I just don't have it in front of me. Sorry about that.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions or comments? Okay. Well, thank you for your presentation, LeAnn. The next item, moving forward on the agenda, is the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary proposed rule comments. Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. Moving forward, we have a document that's been provided, and you have the background for the Florida Keys Sanctuary, and the initial request, as you all did, and you requested the extension for the proposed rule, which was granted through February 23 of 2023,

and so we began compiling the information from which to respond, building on the DEIS and to the proposed rule, and what was compiled are some points to consider for inclusion into the response, and I will walk through, quickly, the different components that are laid out.

In the initial part, Amendment 11 to spiny lobster and discussion on making sure that the areas that were implemented in Amendment 11, which were specific to the Acroporid coral conservation areas within the spiny lobster amendment are still effective, given some of the environmental conditions, including Hurricane Irma, and the intent is that we work with FWC and the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary to evaluate those and then, as time goes on, determine the appropriateness and move forward with whatever needs to be adjusted to make sure that they're still relevant.

The second part is some general discussion with regard to the management plan itself, and I think the biggest thing on that is the support for the bigger areas that are addressed under water quality, boater education, damage to habitats, increased law enforcement, and some increased opportunities to integrate artificial reefs into the system. Also, we pointed out some of the new areas, and so we added in to enhance some of those specific issues, like the Marine Sanctuary Explorer App, that provides some education capabilities and resource access, the use of navigation markers to promote responsible navigation, increase safety, and reduce damage to the habitats, and the proposed evaluation and placement of mooring buoys. Those are some of the areas -- There is extensive areas with regard to water quality and coordination, and I think that's some of the most important -- That was reiterated by a lot of our advisors, too.

The sanctuary preservation areas were identified, and the council supported the status quo designation for Key Largo, Dry Rocks, and Grecian Rocks SPAs. Sombrero Key SPA would be expanded slightly in the consideration, and the Tennessee Reef Conservation Area would be extended to the ninety-foot contour, and Alligator Reef SPA would be expanded to the ninety-foot contour, to include additional deep-reef habitat. The council, as stated earlier on, does not support prohibiting all fishing activity within SPAs and requests that the sanctuary consider allowing trolling in all SPAs, since prohibiting trolling is not necessary to protect corals.

That moves us on to the restoration areas, and this was addressed somewhat in the DEIS, and the council had supported, I think, about half of these, but they have been fine-tuned and expanded, and now it's both the nursery and the habitat restoration area, and what it includes is the Carysfort Reef, which is embedded in the larger area, in a discrete area, and these are all -- These first ones are all the areas that are active nursery grounds that are established and to protect those. The Elbow Nursery, that wasn't in the DEIS, but it has been added, and the Pickles Reef West Nursery, and, again, to protect the existing nursery components.

Marathon Key Nursery was proposed earlier on, and it was originally proposed as an SPA, and now it's being identified as a nursery area, and there are five additional nursery restoration areas proposed, the Middle Keys Nursery, Looe Key East Nursery, Looe Key West, Key West Nursery, and Sand Key Nursery. These provide additional protection to existing systems.

That leads us into the second component of the restoration, which are the habitat restoration areas, and, at Cheeca Rocks, we actually have active restoration ongoing in the area. Cheeca Rocks South, and we have Horseshoe Reef is also identified as a habitat restoration area, because of an iconic reef site that's within the existing SPA, and there are active and live restoration activities

ongoing. Pickles Reef East habitat includes large populations of elkhorn within that area. Cheeca Rocks East habitat is an active long-term restoration site.

That leads us on to the managed areas, and the council supports the proposal to maintain Key Largo and Looe Key existing managed area, with minor modifications, and just to rename them as Key Largo Management Area and Looe Key Management Area. With regard to the large, contiguous area protections that were in the original DEIS, it proposed three large, contiguous areas as SPAs, and the council supports the proposed elimination of the large, contiguous Carysfort Reef proposal, the Looe Key Tennessee Reef SPA, and the Tortugas spawning corridor SPA, since the benefits to the fisheries resulting from the original proposed restrictions in these areas are poorly understood.

That moves us on to the sanctuary boundary expansion. The council supports FWC's proposed modification to the boundary expansion of the sanctuary into the Tortugas, including the changes to the boundary in the Tortugas South Ecological Reserve.

Some of the individual areas identified within the proposed rule are baitfish permits, and the council supports the status quo for baitfish permits, and does not support the proposed two-year phase-out. It agrees with FWC's determination that the lampara net bait fishermen are able to fish within the SPAs without interacting with corals and people, because of the how the gear is used, and, also, the council views banning cast nets in SPAs as too restrictive.

That moves into the live rock aquaculture permits, and the council supports maintaining the current exemption for live rock aquaculture, as long as all the appropriate leases with the DEP, Agriculture and Consumer Services, or National Marine Fisheries Service aquacultured live rock permit continue. Also, it supports developing an MOA that would allow NOAA to ensure protection of sanctuary resources throughout interagency collaboration.

That moves us onto in derelict vessels, and the council supports the creation of a derelict vessel regulation outlined in the proposed rule, which protects the sanctuary by prohibiting deserting a vessel, anchoring, or mooring, or occupying a vessel that is at risk of becoming derelict.

That moves us into fish feeding, and the council supports the Keys Sanctuary proposal to prohibit all fish feeding from a vessel and while diving, which, however, allows for the use of chum and bait while fishing. Furthermore, FWC supports aligning the state and federal fish feeding regulations with the Keys Sanctuary in the future. The council, and many recreational advisors, are concerned with shark depredation and the possibility that the fish feeding essentially is teaching the sharks to associate humans with food.

The other areas are in the definition of traditional fishing, and the council is concerned about the definition of "traditional fishing" listed in the DEIS. This definition specifies fishing gear allowed in the Florida Keys Sanctuary, and the updated definition currently does not really allow lobster traps, and it would not allow new or innovative gears, such as lionfish traps.

Then it moves on into the emergency regulations changes. The council is concerned that the proposed changes to the emergency regulations would allow them to enact temporary regulations that affect fisheries and fishing-related businesses that operate in the council jurisdiction without really the council having the opportunity to comment, or weigh-in, on those measures, and they

request the sanctuary ensure the process for emergency rules preserves the reasonable opportunity for the council comment, and that leads to the protocol for cooperative fisheries management.

The current protocol was signed in 1997, and it describes the process and procedure for rulemaking that relates to the management of fishery resources. The council is working with FWC, National Marine Fisheries, and the Keys Sanctuary to review, revise, and update this agreement. That's the components of what we have included and coordinated to get that laid out, so it's pretty clear what we're moving forward with.

The council has engaged, and reached out, to our advisors, and all the advisory panels were notified of the opportunity to listen-in for the September 21 council meeting, where the presentations and discussion on the sanctuary were held, and, subsequently, the Snapper Grouper, Mackerel Cobia, and Habitat APs convened, in the fall, and had the opportunity to discuss. Mackerel Cobia did not have any specific comments. We also have scheduled a Shrimp AP, in January of 2023, to receive the same presentation, and I've coordinated with them, and so they're going to make that presentation to the Shrimp AP in January.

We did receive comments from the Snapper Grouper and Habitat APs, and the Snapper Grouper provided comments that the council's response should protect and enhance the fishing industry in that area. The AP members provided extensive comments on the potential effects of the proposed regulations and how current and past regulations in the Keys really affected fishing in the area, and they requested the council consider adding the transcript of the AP comments to the letter.

The council should recommend, and consider, what consideration would be given to equity between fishermen and divers and other harmful factors in the area, such as stormwater runoff, large amounts of population growth, including tourists and part-time residents, and development in the Keys, and a response to degradation other than limiting fishing areas.

The Habitat and Ecosystem AP provided a number of comments. Given the cascading adverse impacts the sanctuary is experiencing, the proposed rule seems to be a well-balanced approach and addresses the comments that the council submitted on the DEIS. It's important to emphasize the National Marine Sanctuary staff are actively engaged in the commenting on water quality impacts, and so there's some hands-on direct activity that is enhancing the activities relative to water quality, and that there is general support for the proposed rule, and so that's, in combination, what we've compiled as points for inclusion in the council's letter, and, as I said, we have until February 23 of 2023 to compile this, and we'll be getting one more AP input into this, and we'll move forward from there.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Roger, and so are there additional comments? Susan.

MS. BOGGS: Thank you, and so this is part of the report that I didn't read earlier, and you all have already addressed one of them, which is our Shrimp AP actually met on November 15, and saw a presentation, and one of the things -- They passed three motions, one of which was to ask this council to convene your AP, which it sounds like you have done, but part of that motion also says a link for this meeting would be emailed to the Shrimp AP members, so that they can listen and give public comment during the meeting, if they so desire, and so they would like to be notified of when your AP meets, so that they can listen-in and provide that comment.

Just, also, so that you're aware, they passed two other motions, and they're not specific to this council, but you might be interested, and that was to recommend that, prior to the approval of any proposed rule, the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary define the parameters of what constitutes an emergency for which emergency management actions and regulations can be taken.

The Shrimp AP opposes actions taken under emergency management being enacted for any more than six months, and then their third motion was to recommend that the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary create a new alternative in the DEIS which encompasses the actions in the proposed rule and provides a comprehensive analysis of that new alternative, prior to the approval of any proposed rule. Please understand that they met in November, and our council hasn't seen this, but I was asked to bring that information to your council, since you all would be meeting. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Susan. Are there additional comments from folks? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's a question to Roger or Jessica, but do you know the timing of the protocol, and how it's proceeding, and when the council, this council, would be seeing another draft?

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a great question, and so the protocol, of course, is back with the sanctuary. FWC and the councils met, and we passed it over to them, and so we're kind of waiting to hear back from them, and I think that they indicated that they would be reaching out to us in the first part of the year, to go back to looking at the document. Remember that there are twelve, or thirteen, agreements out there, and this is just one of those agreements that they're working on, and it's my understanding that they're probably at least eighteen months away from finalizing the plan, and their goal is to have all of those twelve or thirteen agreements ready to go before the plan is finalized, and so it's not like it needs to be done, you know, in the next thirty days or sixty days.

DR. BELCHER: Additional comments or questions? Roger, what else can we do to help support you, or is that pretty much it?

MR. PUGLIESE: I think that's pretty much it, and the only thing you still have -- When we convene the Shrimp AP, we can notify them, and we will reach out and make sure that we copy the Gulf, and, other than that, I think we should be good. Jessica, any other thoughts or comments?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I appreciate Roger for putting this letter together, draft letter together, and I'm excited to hear what our Shrimp AP has to say about it, and I guess I would just look to you guys. You know, FWC helped the council finalize the letter last time, and a lot of what's in this letter lines up with what we think is going to be in FWC's letter, and we have an extension until the end of February as well, and so, if you want me to continue to work with Roger, as FWC finalizes our positions, we certainly can.

DR. BELCHER: I think that would be great. Okay. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just a comment. Since the letter is going to be coming from the council, and I'm a voting member, I just want to express that I will be abstaining, essentially, from the

position on the letter, since NOS is a sister agency under NOAA, and we are working closely with them, through the Fisheries Service, directly, and so I just would acknowledge that. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Andy. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Will the Shrimp AP meeting be open to the public, because we have four potential new members for the Shrimp AP committee, and they have to figure out new applicant forms, and so they're not going to be available in January, and would they be allowed to sit in and listen?

MR. PUGLIESE: This will be a webinar, and it will be run like a regular webinar, and so it can be open to the public, and they can listen, and then they can submit comments separately or whatever, if they want to, through the NOAA mechanism, but definitely it's open, and so anybody can listen in.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions? All right. Thank you, Roger. I guess now we'll be moving on to a staff change, and Mike Schmidtke is going to come and talk to us about the Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rule Amendment. The council's actions for this amendment is reviewing the changes to the amendment since September of 2022, along with the draft rationale, and we're considering this for approval for formal review.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thanks, everyone, and so we are going through the Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rule Amendment, and you have the decision document, as well as the draft amendment, included in your briefing book, and there is also some draft codified text, which I will make a note to show you before we end on this topic, and so I'll be going through the decision document, taking a look at each of the actions and your selected preferreds, as well as your rationale for those preferreds, and getting all the steps for final approval done for this document.

As a reminder, some of the key components that are being changed about the ABC Control Rule -
- They include pieces of flexibility for the SSC, as well as the council being able to have more discretion in determining risk, and there's also actions included that would increase flexibility, by including carryovers and phase-ins in the ABC Control Rule for South Atlantic species. In the background information, you'll see pieces there that are describing the relationship between the overfishing limit, acceptable biological catch, and annual catch limit. We've gone through those in several of the previous meetings, and so I'm not going to dive deep into those, but, if there are questions, as we go through, then please let me know.

There are four actions that are included in the amendment. You see those there on your screen, and this amendment has been developing over quite some time. We're now at the last stage, where you all are considering final action for secretarial review.

The purpose and need statements were reviewed at the last meeting. There was one edit that got brought up in the later stages of the review process to change -- In the purpose, change "acceptable biological catch control rule" to "control rules", as there are three species being considered here, and so I would look to the council, if there is any disagreement with making that change.

DR. BELCHER: Anybody object? Seeing no heads shaking in the affirmative, we're good.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so that will be updated in the final copy that gets submitted, and now we'll be going into the actions and alternatives. I do want to note, just for kind of recordkeeping purposes, this amendment affects the Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and Golden Crab Fishery Management Plans, and so, in the number sequencing for those amendments, this would be considered Amendment 45 to the Snapper Grouper FMP, Amendment 11 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP, and Amendment 11 to the Golden Crab FMP.

Next, going into Action 1, this would modify the ABC Control Rule, and we've talked pretty extensively about all of these different alternatives, and so I'm really going to focus-in on your preferred alternative and make sure that that -- That the steps of that are explained, and, if there are any additional questions about the other alternatives, then please feel free to ask those. Preferred Alternative 2 would revise the control rule, and I will take you down to Table 2 of this document, just so you can see a visual of the categories that would be used, and so, instead of the current control rule that classifies according to different levels of information that are going in for a species, the assessed stocks would be categorized in three categories, and the SSC would be given some additional discretion in determining the appropriate levels of uncertainty to apply to those assessment results.

Right now, the SSC receives the results of a stock assessment, as well as the estimated uncertainty, and that is the information that they have to go on for recommending acceptable biological catch. Now, within these categories, the SSC would have the ability to adjust measures of uncertainty, or to develop measures of uncertainty, as they determine it's needed. For Category 4, unassessed stocks, there is no formal stock assessment, you all approved the inclusion of the SSC's recommended method for addressing these stocks, whereby they will have a workgroup that would go through them and would recommend the ABC changes, as they are needed, and they would not be limited in the methods that could be applied to determine the ABC recommendations.

Moving down into the council's part of this, the council will be responsible for final determination of the risk tolerance that is applied for these stocks, and so this P* level -- Remember that P* is the accepted risk of overfishing that the council would be taking on, and that P* level would be used when doing the acceptable biological catch projections, and so the basic premise of this Table 3 shows that, at higher biomass and at lower risk of a stock experiencing overfishing, the council would be, by default, taking on more risk. They would be willing to take on more risk for those stocks, and they would take on less risk for stocks that have a lower biomass or at a greater risk of experiencing overfishing.

The stock risk rating, we've talked through that in previous meetings, and that takes into account biological, human dimension, and environmental attributes, and that is developed through a process that involves both the SSC as well as the advisory panel, and they go through those different attributes, and they give recommendations to the council on how a given stock should be categorized, of low, medium, or high risk, and then the council considers those recommendations and determines what category it would fall in.

The biomass levels come out of a stock assessment, and so, to kind of think through a step-by-step form, there's a list there of the steps that are involved before an operational assessment, and it would have the process of the SSC and the AP providing their recommendations, the council's

review of those recommendations, and that would all happen before an operational assessment, and that could happen in concert with the fishery performance reviews that the AP conducts at their meetings ahead of each assessment.

Then, during the operational assessment, that P* level would be derived using the council's set risk rating, along with the biomass that's estimated by the stock assessment, and those projection analyses would then be run, and so we would then get stock risk ratings and ABC recommendations for unassessed stocks as well, and there would be a similar process of going through the unassessed stocks for risk ratings, and there are earlier levels that are included in an appendix to the amendment, and those have been reviewed by you all, and the general process for the SSC is, when they are conducting those unassessed stock ABC recommendations, they will try to define the overfishing limit, if possible, if they have enough information. If not, then they will define the ABC directly. If they are able to get OFL, then they will use that, along with the P* approach, to recommend ABC, based on that OFL level.

That is all that's included in your Preferred Alternative 2, and there is, included in your document -- We went through this in the last meeting, and it hasn't changed very much at all, because the alternatives haven't changed, and so there is a list there of just kind of direct comparisons of Alternative 1, Preferred Alternative 2, and Alternative 3, and, overall, summarizing some of the effects that have been described in the amendment.

None of the changes that are being described here would have immediate, direct effects on the stocks themselves, because they would still have to go through an assessment, and this is kind of setting a framework from here forward, and so, any future stock assessments, that's where we would see any effects, and they would be very much stock specific, and they wouldn't be unidirectional, in any type of form, and so the estimation is that there would be long-term benefits to the stocks, due to improved information, and this would apply in the biological, economic, and social aspects for all of these, but, as far as how they would be approached on a case-by-case basis, those may vary a bit, based on the stock.

Looking at the feedback from your advisors, we did have a meeting of representatives from the Dolphin Wahoo, Golden Crab, and Snapper Grouper Advisory Panels. They met, and their recommendation was for Preferred Alternative 2. This was not a full meeting of all of those APs, but there were representatives from each of those APs that were present on that meeting, and there's a more comprehensive summary of their comments in Chapter 5 of the draft amendment.

Then, from the SSC, their preferred recommendation was Preferred Alternative 2 as well, and they had pretty extensive comments, and they were involved in the development of these alternatives, particularly Alternative 2, and they provided comments on that over the course of this amendment's development.

There were a few public comments that were received, and these came along the wide time range that this amendment had been developing, but the most recent comments, from our public comment periods and public hearings, were in support of Preferred Alternative 2 and maximizing management flexibility for the council.

Draft rationale for this action has been written up, and it was included here, and so we would be looking to the council to review your draft conclusion, make any modifications, as needed, and let

us know of any changes, at this point, and, if there are any questions on Action 1, I can also address those right now.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Mike, and so questions for Mike at this point? Okay. Seeing none, I'm looking at the language, as drafted under the draft conclusion, and are there any edits that need to be made, or is it acceptable as currently written? No objections to the language. Okay, and so the draft conclusion is good as it stands.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right. Then we will continue going through to Action 2, which is looking at phase-ins of ABC changes, and this will be an added component to the ABC Control Rule, and so, just as a reminder, there was some guidance on National Standard 1, relating to phase-ins in this aspect, and it also covered carryovers, and we'll get to that a little bit later, but, as it applies to phase-ins, one of the aspects that was included there was that, if you are going to have phase-ins as part of your management, then it needs to be included in the FMP, and so that is what is being included here.

None of the preferred actions would require that phase-in happens at every opportunity, when a stock is eligible, and the council would still have the discretion to choose when it would use phase-ins for a given stock.

The preferred alternatives that you all have selected, first of all would be to allow phase-ins of increases at any ABC level and allow phase-ins of decreases if the new ABC is less than 80 percent of the existing ABC, and so there would need to be a 20 percent difference between the previous ABC and the newly-recommended one, and then, under Sub-Action 2.2, it specifies the time period that a phase-in can be executed, and it would have to happen, under your preferred selection, in no more than three years. The table numbering is a little bit off, just because we put it into a different document, but it's 2.2.1.1 in your draft amendment. Within the decision document, it's Table 5. This kind of sets forward the schedule by which phase-ins would occur and what the requirements would be in each of those years.

This table would apply for phase-ins of decreases. Under phase-ins of increases, you could still be phasing-in an increase in the catch, but it wouldn't have the same restrictions, because you can always set your ABC to be lower than the level recommended by the SSC, and so this is how phase-ins would be executed in that capacity.

Going through some of the effects, in general, if you are phasing-in a decrease, then there would be more opportunity for short-term harvest, less opportunity for long-term harvest, and there would potentially be greater negative biological effects on a given stock, because you're harvesting more in the short-term, as opposed to in the long-term, and there will be that lower amount of harvest. From an economic standpoint, there is some benefit to phasing-in decreases, because there wouldn't be such a large, dramatic drop in the catch levels in such a short amount of time, but the long-term amount of catch would be at a reduced level as well, and then, finally, from the social aspect, it's kind of similar to the economic, in the sense of the short-term kind of smoothing out that reduction, and it's perceived to be not as bad, not taken as bad socially, as making such dramatic drop all at once.

We went through an example, and it's included in the draft amendment, and I don't have it in the decision document, but you can refer to the draft amendment, and one of the things that was noticed

is that, if you have a very large decrease in your ABC, then there can be kind of a -- The effect of a phase-in can be kind of reduced, and it would be very small, relative to the large change that is required, and the reason for that is because, if you look at the requirements of Table 5, and what each year needs to fulfill, in year-one, which would be that first initial year, your modified ABC still can't exceed your overfishing limit, and, if you have a stock that has a very small buffer in between ABC and OFL, then you're still going to be taking a pretty large reduction in that first year, and so that's something to just kind of temper expectations on how smooth you can make that drop. There still could be a very dramatic drop in that first year.

There were comments from the AP and SSC related to these items, and the AP's recommended method was for Sub-Action 2.1, Sub-Alternative 3, that the stock not being overfished would be a criterion for being eligible for phase-in, and that is something that is included in -- Excuse me. That one is not included in the preferred alternatives, and then the AP also recommended Alternative 2 under Sub-Action 2.2, and that is the preferred item. I'm sorry, and I need to double-check something, because I may have mis -- No. I said it correctly. Okay. Sorry about that.

All right. Moving down to the draft conclusion, you all selected Preferred Alternative 2 and Preferred Sub-Alternative 2c under Sub-Action 2.1, and then Preferred Alternative 2 under Sub-Action 2.2. You have your draft rationale that's shown here on the screen, and I will zoom-out just a little bit, so you can see most of the full thing, and that's included in your decision document there, and so we would be looking to you all, if you have any edits to your rationale or your choice of preferred.

DR. BELCHER: Comments from the group on that? Any changes that need to be made at this point? Okay. Seeing none, Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right. Next, going to carryovers, if you remember, carryovers are addressed in two separate actions, and so Action 3 addresses the eligibility for a stock to have carryover applied, and Action 4 addresses the process by which carryover may be applied, and we have to include some actions there, so that it can happen under a faster process than management changes typically occur under usual circumstances.

Under Action 3, that addresses the eligibility, and your preferred alternative would state that carryover would be allowed for a stock if the stock status is known, the stock is neither overfished nor experiencing overfishing, and the overfishing limit has been defined. It's not undergoing a phase-in to an ABC decrease, and there are measures that restrict the annual landings to the ACL, as well as post-season accountability measures that would reduce the ACL in the following year, according to any landings overages for that stock and sector, and so there's a lot of kind of boxes that would need to be checked, in order for carryover to apply.

In thinking back to a previous meeting, we talked about -- I think there were three, maybe three, stocks under snapper grouper where carryover would actually potentially be able to apply, and that's out of all of the snapper grouper species, as well as dolphin wahoo and golden crab. Under dolphin wahoo and golden crab, we don't have any stock assessments for the species managed under those FMPs right now, and so that's something that doesn't check the box of stock status being known, as well as kind of the subsequent boxes of not overfished and not overfishing, and so that's something to keep in mind as you consider it, and we've talked about that.

Sub-Action 3.2 specifies how much of an unharvested portion of the ACL may be carried over from one year to increase the ACL in the next year, and so your preferred alternative would allow carryover. The ABC, and the total ACL, would be increased, and they may not exceed the overfishing limit, and so they can go up to the overfishing limit, but they cannot exceed the amount that's being carried over, and so it would be according to the underage that happened in the previous year.

Under this alternative, there can be carryover for multiple sectors within the same year. If the circumstance happens that both sectors are carrying over, and that total amount of eligible carryover would exceed the overfishing limit, then that carryover amount would be capped, and the total ACL still would not go over the overfishing limit, but it's just that extra carryover portion would be allocated according to the sector allocations in the FMP, regardless of the carryover amounts between the sectors.

Going through kind of some of the notes that we have included here in the discussion, one of the things that was brought up in the last council meeting was that there may be some desire from the council to add condition on a stock-by-stock basis for annual qualification for carryover, and we've included language to that effect in the draft amendment, as well as the discussion document. It's highlighted here, and so, for example, if you wanted to add that biomass was at a certain level for a stock to be eligible for carryover, then you could add that qualification here, or if you want to base it on some form of index, something like that, and then, as you set the ABC for that given stock, you would also add the additional criterion for carryover to be applied for that stock, and we'll talk through the actual process of setting forward an ABC with carryover in Action 4, and that's part of that step, and so this is just defining the eligibility and the amount.

In terms of effects, the general biological perspective on this is that, with additional harvest, there would be increased biological risk, and so carryover does present some biological risk, and not including it would be, from a biological perspective, the most potentially positive, but there is also some economic benefit to being able to carry over, as well as some social benefit, in the short-term, as well, as long as it's not reducing the status of the stock in the long-term.

The AP and the SSC discussed these actions, and the AP recommended that carryovers should not be included in the ABC Control Rule, and so this was Alternative 1, no action, and that would apply for both Actions 3 and 4, and they have a full list of comments that is provided, but some of those that were given by the AP included, if a stock is being underharvested, that there may be a biological reason why that stock is being underharvested, and carrying over that harvest could create market issues, and it also could create situations where overharvest, in a rapid fashion, could occur, and so those were some of their comments.

The SSC provided a lot of comments, as these alternatives were being developed, and just some of the ones that were highlighted here are they supported the use of carryovers, as long as they are applied to stocks that are neither overfished nor overfishing and have catch that is close to the ACL. If there is significant underharvest, kind of in similar form as the AP, there may be some larger biological reason why that is occurring. They also recommended having terms of reference in future assessment reviews, as well as ABC recommendations that would include a carryover designation for that stock, and that's something that's been included in Action 4, in that process that's defined.

They also commented that a simpler process than interannual carryover could be to have a buffer between the ABC and ACL, and then changes to the ACL could be made to accommodate times when you would need to increase that ACL. This is something that can be problematic, in terms of current council management, because, for many of our species, the ABC and the ACL are set to equal each other, and so that's something that was noted by the SSC, and so those were their comments.

Then, looking at the public comments, some of the more recent public comments stated opposition to allowing carryovers, noting the limited applicability for South Atlantic stocks, as well as limited ability for more timely assessment information that would be needed to really change the catch levels on a more frequent basis, and so the draft council conclusion is included, and it's a bit lengthier than the other ones, and so I'm not going to be able to show it entirely all on one screen, but it is included in your materials, and I would pause here, to see if there are any questions and if there are any edits to the council's draft rationale.

DR. BELCHER: Are there comments or questions or suggested edits? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just a question for Mike. Mike, when you use "interannual", do you mean within the year?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So "interannual" meaning from one year to the next, and we also have some stocks that have intra-annual carryover that's already in place, and that's the situation where we have seasonal allocations of an ACL, and you have Season 1, where not all of the Season 1 ACL is caught, and then that portion gets carried over into Season 2, and that's done for some of our commercial fisheries, and so that's what I alluded to with intra-annual, and this action would be addressing interannual.

DR. BELCHER: Additional comments or questions for Mike? Any needed changes for the language that's there under the draft conclusion from us? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I did want to touch on the AP recommendations, and I'm kind of surprised, because there is some additional flexibility, obviously, with carryover that they weren't supporting the carryover provisions, and so, I guess, from the council standpoint, it's somewhat unusual times to get an AP strongly, kind of consensus-based it sounds like, to make a recommendation like this, and I wanted to get, I guess, some discussion going from council members, if you have any further prospective thoughts on this.

DR. BELCHER: Mel and then Chester.

MR. BELL: If I recall the specific comments from the AP, that was -- We didn't really have a lot of AP members there, and it was kind of limited, but I was surprised by that too, but part of it, I thought, was they didn't quite understand the effects that we were trying to achieve, but, while that's what we captured, I wouldn't call it overwhelming support for not going that route, or opposition.

The other thing, and they've included some language in here, under the discussion, and we would note the AP's comments and all, but, again, what we said is that, you know, use this with discretion, and it's not automatic, and so it's a tool we have to provide us with some flexibility, and we intend,

as we stated here, to, you know, just be careful how we use that, and I think maybe that's what one or two individuals -- I think they kind of commented along those lines, and they might not have appreciated that we could do that.

DR. BELCHER: That was my understanding as well, but, Chester.

MR. BREWER: I wasn't at the AP meeting, and so I don't know exactly how many individuals were talking about it, but the concern that was expressed, in the paper that we're looking at right now, is that you may be having a carryover because of factors that you don't know about, and, in fact, you could be having a carryover on a species that's in trouble, and so you're not catching many of them, because they're not there, and then, the next year, you're saying, okay, well, we're going to boost the quota, and that gives me a lot of heartburn, and so thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica and then Tim.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm still supportive of it, because I feel like we've done a lot of work on this, and I feel like we have some parameters in there, and we're talking about defining more parameters of when this would be allowed, and so I am still supportive of moving forward with this.

DR. BELCHER: Tim and then Kerry.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, and I agree. I'm still supportive of it too, and I hear loud and clear what Chester is saying, but I also want to point out that, if it's a fishery that we're not catching all the quota, and it could be for a variety of reasons, and one of them could be because the stock is in trouble, even if you decide that it met the criteria, and you decide to carry it over, if you're not catching the quota, you're not going to catch the carryover either, and so you're really not doing any damage by carrying over, if that is the reason, in fact, and so I'm still supportive of this.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: My understanding was the same as Mel's, and, you know, just to remember, because I think we had this discussion for a long time at the last meeting, and, just because we have it in there, it doesn't mean that we have to use it. All this does is allow us to use it if we want to, and I'm not sure that the AP members -- I think they were also thinking of it as it's in there, and it's going to happen, and so we just weren't able to get that across, and it was just a few members, and so I would feel pretty strongly about not changing this.

DR. BELCHER: Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just providing some context, because we don't have the AP members present here, but at least my impression, from a staff perspective, of their comments was that they were resistant to the use of carryover, and use, versus ability to use, are two different things that are being discussed here, but their resistance, their word of caution, was towards using carryover, and that didn't necessarily always speak to the ability to have it.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: This is helpful, and I appreciate the additional perspective, because I wasn't able to listen into the AP meeting, and so, with that, I think there's lots of layers of precaution, in terms of how we would or wouldn't use carryover, and there is still additional steps in the process where the AP and this body are going to decide on it, and so I think that really does limit our ability to use it, but, where it's appropriate, it might be functionally usable at some point down the road, and so it's worth our including it.

The other comment I was going to make is, I think at the last council meeting, I publicly was more supportive of Alternative 3, kind of putting a 25 percent cap on carryover, but I think, really, kind of Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 are almost functionally equivalent, because, oftentimes, our ACL and OFLs are within 25 or 30 percent of one another anyway, but, with that said, a question for Mike. This says, essentially -- It doesn't provide a cap, and it just says you could allow for a carryover, with no specific cap, and could we, in a subsequent action, define how much we wanted to carry over, on a species-by-species basis?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes, and that's in line with kind of the language that was highlighted in the discussion, and we can maybe flesh that out a bit more, and not just the conditions to qualify, but also the amount, but I think that's in the spirit of what was discussed last time, that the council can put additional rules on carryover, on a stock-by-stock basis, and so, if that's something that you all would recommend to be updated, we can update that language, and it doesn't necessarily change the alternatives that are being selected, as far as I perceive.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. What's the pleasure of the group relative to that, with the addition of the added language, the highlighted stuff? Okay. Does anybody object to the modification that Mike has discussed, which is the yellow here? Seeing none, then everybody is good with the draft conclusion, and there are no modifications needed at this time. Other than that, moving on to your next item, when you're ready, Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Okay. Just noting that this is what Andy was talking about, and we'll make it more professional language, but this is the council -- You all can add conditions into the amount of carryover, as well as the qualification for carryover. All right.

Then, continuing down to Action 4, Action 4 -- This is addressing the process by which carryover would be conducted. Being that this is a year-to-year thing, it is not conducive to use the amendment process to do this, and so we're going through and amending the framework procedures for the Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and Golden Crab FMPs, so that we can have these types of changes be executed in a more timely fashion.

We have three sub-actions under Action 4, and they're the exact same language, but they're just addressing different FMPs. One is for Snapper Grouper, one is for Dolphin Wahoo, and one is for Golden Crab, and so, in that spirit, Preferred Alternative 2 -- I will go through it for Snapper Grouper, but it will apply the exact same way for Dolphin Wahoo and Golden Crab and carryover situations for those fisheries as well.

The language that's shown here on the screen, that single-season adjustments to carryover unused ACL would be able to be included in the framework procedures, and they would happen as follows, and this kind of just outlines a step-by-step of how these would be executed, and so, in this process, when you all are setting the ABC and ACL for a stock, and that's a very common thing to do,

typically after stock assessments, you all would set the ABC and ACL in place with or without the designation that that stock is eligible for carryover.

In accordance with the SSC's recommendation, there would be recommendations to go along with their recommendation for the ABC level, and they would also recommend on whether that stock should or should not be eligible for carryover, and so you will be able to consider that as well. In order for carryover to happen, to be included, you would have to fulfill the criteria that are included in Action 3. If all the boxes get checked, and so you all have said that ABC is set, carryover can happen, then, following the conclusion of each fishing year, staff will monitor the landings levels and will notify the council if there are any stocks, and sectors, that would potentially be eligible for carryover,

That would get brought up to you, in probably the meeting that follows the conclusion of that fishing year, noting that some of our fishing years are not calendar years, so it's not always going to be the March meeting for every stock, and it will be the conclusion of the fishing year, and so staff would bring up, to the council, if there's potentially for carryover there, and what that would be, using the preliminary landings estimates, just noting that, if the sector qualifies for carryover, according to the specifications of this rule, that NOAA Fisheries would enact the carryover of the eligible landings from the previous year.

If there is any type of deviation, then this quicker process would not be able to apply, and you all would have to go through the full amendment process, but, essentially, what this means is that, if you set an ABC, and you designate that ABC to have carryover along with it, then it's going to automatically carry over in every year when that stock qualifies, and so, every year there would be an underage for that stock that has carryover included, and it still maintains all of its other statuses, the carryover would automatically occur.

There is discretion from the council, but that discretion happens in setting the ABC, and it does not happen on a year-to-year, every-single-year basis, and so, if you want to change that, then you would need to change it through the setting of a new ABC that does not include carryover, and so that's how that process would be carried out, and that's how it could happen in the timeline that's needed.

What we would be doing this week, before you all take, I guess, final action on this, is we will send out the full framework procedures that's going to be included as an appendix to the document, and we've compiled those, and we're getting those reviewed right now, and we'll have them available via email, and probably tomorrow is when I'm estimating them, so that you can see where this fits within the framework language, but this is what the addition -- This is what the change to the framework language would be, and so we'll get that information to you.

The comments related to carryover we covered already in Action 3, and this is kind of an overlapping -- Those comments are kind of overlapping with both of these actions, and so that's what we would consider to be the comments from the public, as well as the AP and the SSC, and then, also, the summary of effects, and all of the effects are described in Action 3, and, really, the thing to note, for Action 4, is more of an administrative effect, and there would be some increase of administrative responsibilities for the SSC and AP, in evaluating what carryover status should be given to a stock, and there would be some additional staff responsibility, from the council staff, and probably the Regional Office staff as well, in monitoring the landings for stocks that have a

carryover potential designation, and then bringing that information to you all, as well as the potential for changing the catch levels, if carryover does actually occur.

That information is all included here, and you can see kind of the summary of comments there, and, finally, the draft conclusion, and you all's preferred for each of these was Preferred Alternative 2, that this addition would be made to each of the FMP framework procedures, and this is your draft conclusion, and I will ask for any changes that need to be made to that.

DR. BELCHER: Chester.

MR. BREWER: I have a question, and I hope that I misunderstood what was just said. We're saying that, when you set the ABC, you make a decision, at that time, whether there's going to be carryover for that particular species, and is that correct?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Given that it continues to check all the boxes, so to speak, that it maintains its status, because, if one of those boxes doesn't get checked, then it's no longer eligible for carryover.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Well, just, to me, that sort of flies in the face of this thing, that we can use it if we want to, or we don't have to use it, because you're saying criteria that may not even come into place for a year, or two years, whatever, and that you're trying to get to in the future, what that carryover -- Whether that carryover is going to take place or not, and that's -- That just gives me heartburn.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments to that? Mel.

MR. BELL: I think that just reinforces the importance of making that decision utilizing that discretion that you have upfront, when you make the decision to set the ABC, and really look at it carefully, and Chester is right. I mean, you can't predict, you know, three years into the future, but, you know, you can get a sense of what the fishery looks like, and, if you've got -- Then we have the discretion not to do that.

DR. BELCHER: Mike, is that something that we need to discuss? I mean, I'm just trying to -- If there's some clarification that's needed, I think we need to kind of put that on the record.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: What you're discussing is that the time when the council makes the decision on whether carryover would be used is when it sets the ABC, and, once it sets the ABC, then, if there is an underage, if that stock is steady and maintaining it's not overfished and not overfishing status, all of those things, if that is an underage that occurs, then carryover would be automatic in the following year.

The reason why it was brought about in this way is because of the timing aspect. If the council has to have discretion to evaluate a carryover in every year, then, when that happens, the council would have to have a meeting, and there would need to be a rulemaking process to change the ABC, and that would be akin to say an abbreviated framework-type of process, which can be done in a shorter timeframe, but it would cut off a large chunk of the year to when that increased harvest would be available, and so that's why it was determined that the discretion has to happen in setting the ABC and not on an annual year-to-year basis.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that, Mike. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Chester, I see what you're saying, and I see why you're saying it, but let's play it out. We have an assessment, and the assessment gives us a new ABC, and the council is going to be sitting around with the results of that assessment thinking about the state of this fishery anyway, right, and so I would presume that, most of the time, we wouldn't choose to do this, and we would have all the information that we needed at our disposal, and it would really take something coming out of the assessment of us going -- You know, what our vibe is, to use the technical, scientific term, for us to actually use it, and so I don't think it fundamentally changes where we were on it, but you're right that it does make me much more cautious about ever even bringing it up, which I think is fair. I would just hate the idea of like taking a tool and having no access to it at all, but you're very right that it should be used very rarely, right?

DR. BELCHER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I've had concerns about carryover, sort of philosophically, but I think we've done a lot to build in speedbumps and precautionary measures, to make sure that we don't force ourselves to take a risk-averse posture on stocks, and I think we've done a good job of building those checks-and-balances in there, and, really, I don't think we can complain about lack of flexibility and then turn around and not give ourselves flexibility, with reasonable boundaries, and I think we've found a place in there, and I think it's worth approving, and I think it's worth taking it forward and seeing if it works. I mean, nothing we do is forever, and we can always go back, and, if we learn something from it, we can make adjustments, as necessary.

DR. BELCHER: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I agree with Spud. I think it gives us some flexibility, and, in my mind, the times that we would really look at using this is if it happened to coincide with some outside influence on effort, whether that be a storm or a pandemic or something that really the stock is not in trouble, but the ability to put effort in the fishery was decreased to such an extent that it would be helpful to have a bigger fishery the following year, or to try to make up some of that.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Tim. Other comments? Okay, and so back to our actions. Is the group comfortable with the draft conclusion, as it's currently written? No modifications needed at this point in time? Okay. Seeing none, moving on, go ahead, Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: This is a Monica question. Given that we're going to be giving a full list of the framework procedures, should the council pause on approving the motion, or can they go ahead and do it, given that the changes are shown here and what we would be providing is just the summary of everything that's included in the framework procedures?

DR. BELCHER: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I guess I would wait until the council saw the appendix, as well as I believe you've got public comment scheduled this week too, and so you may want to wait for that as well, and so I would suggest that you wait until the next council session, which is probably Thursday afternoon.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Okay. Then we'll keep this draft motion on hold, and we'll put it in the Full Council Session I report, so that you all can review it later on in the week and decide whether you will approve, but, with that, that's the last I have for ABC Control Rule.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so any last-minute comments or questions for Mike, before we close this one up? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to say a huge thank-you to Mike and the many other people who have worked on this action. This is a complicated action, and a lot of brainpower went into this, and so great job. Well done, and I appreciate it.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Are we good to go? If folks are fine with it, I'm going to go ahead and say let's take a ten-minute break, and so say at 3:15 come back, and we'll go into the next, and so, at 3:15, we'll be back on-mic.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. PUGLIESE: I would like to introduce Jonathan Star with Scenario Insights, and Jonathan has been the foundation behind the efforts behind coordination with the partners throughout the entire east coast, with the New England and the Mid-Atlantic, the ASMFC, and National Marine Fisheries Service, to move forward with the East Coast Climate Scenario Initiative, the process that you all have been getting the updates over time, from the transition from scoping to leading into the different stages of building the information to develop narratives and then, ultimately, having the opportunity to have some initial discussions on creation of background for brainstorming on where we can go into the future on opportunities and understanding, as we move into a new world of climate change, and, today, we're going to dive into the application phase, hands-on for the first time with this with the people that kind of put their minds into the future of what you can think of and what the challenges may be, and this is the real opportunity to set the stage for how some of this can shape what goes into the summit of all the groups that is going to happen in February.

It's been an evolution in process, and it's been really important to get -- Jonathan was involved directly in all the work that was done in the Pacific, and that gave us a really good jump to be able to advance this in our region, and I think a real opportunity to work on the backend, which is really the application and how do we look, for short-term and long-term, all types of capabilities to plan for what we see is actually happening at this time already, and, with that, I will pass it over to Jonathan and move into the workshop today. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Folks, it may be helpful if you look at your overview for the agenda for today. There's a list of questions, under Item 6, that might help at least think about where we need to direct our thoughts.

MR. STAR: Roger, thanks very much, and good afternoon, everyone. I'm Jonathan Star, as Roger said, and I've been facilitating and guiding a core team from the organizations that you see on the right-hand side there, this collaborative effort to look, long-term, of the challenges of fisheries management in an era of climate change, and so thanks very much for giving me time on the agenda for this workshop discussion this afternoon.

Our task this afternoon is to look and to think ahead, and it's really to try and imagine what some of the challenges might be that we face, as fishery managers, as we enter the era of climate change, and now, obviously, we realize that there are many, many kind of pressing concerns, and our day-to-day business is what takes priority, justifiably, but it's also important, at times, to just take a step back and not only to think about where we are today, in 2022, going into 2023, but to imagine what will be the challenges that we, as fishery managers, that fishery managers that come after us, will experience, ten years down the line, twenty years down the line, and so our task today, and throughout this whole initiative, as Roger has described, is really to think about what are the challenges, and maybe the opportunities, that climate change brings for us as fishery managers.

Now, in thinking ahead, and thinking about the future, it would be great, and straightforward, if it wasn't for the fact that the future is unpredictable, and so we can't exactly know what the impacts of climate change, or the impacts of any kind of -- Whether it be physical conditions or biological conditions or social and economic factors will develop into the future.

What we do is we use a technique called scenario planning, and this is the kind of process, and the methodology, that we've been going through over the past year or so, and we'll be embracing that today, but, just quickly, in terms of definitions, because we can't predict the future, we can't exactly project what's going to happen, we create a set of scenarios, and these scenarios -- Let's think about them as stories, about the ways that the world might turn out tomorrow, and remember the word here is "might", and it's not "will", and we're not predicting, but we are suggesting that these are possibilities for how the future might look.

Then, by creating these scenarios, we use them, in scenario planning, by these provocative stories then help change the minds, and the actions, of a group of people, if indeed we feel that it's important to change some actions to be prepared for the future, and so we're using this technique of scenario planning in order then to say are there things that we need to do, as fishery managers, to make ourselves better prepared for a changing future?

More specifically, the objectives of this initiative are twofold, and the first one is one about exploration, and it's really to explore how east coast fishery governance and management, and so, therefore, across the whole east coast, will be affected by climate change in fisheries. Management is broad, and the governance is in terms of the kind of relationships between each of the different councils and commissions across the east coast, and then, once we've done that exploration, it's really then a case of saying, well, what are the sets of tools and processes that we think we need to be developing, advancing, as fishery managers, that continue then to promote fishery conservation and resilient fishery communities, and particularly addressing uncertainty in an era of climate change, and so it's both an exploration process of what might the future look like, but then, more importantly, it's about developing some ideas, some actions, some tools, and some capabilities to say we are as well prepared for the future as we can be.

We're looking at a number of steps that we've already take, and this initiative has been going for over a year, and, as Roger said, we're really at the business end of this now, and we're in the application stage. We've done a whole lot of research, and many of you have involved in a number of the webinars, or the workshops, and thank you very much for all the input.

Today, our job, and over the next few weeks, is to take these scenarios, which I will talk about in a moment or two, and say how do we use them? How do we use them to generate ideas, actions, and potential actions and recommendations, that we can then take forward to say this is how we might need to change what we do around fishery management?

This application phase really is made up of kind of three key stages, and we're at the middle stage of this right now. Back in September, back in the fall, we held a series of what we called managers meetings, where we created the scenarios, and then managers took those scenarios and generated a whole lot of different potential ideas for how we might pursue changes to fishery management and what needs to happen, in terms of challenges and opportunities. You've got a summary of those managers meetings in your briefing packet, and we'll be referring to some excerpts of that as we go through the afternoon.

The next pieces of work are really then these council and commission meetings, and we held a meeting with the commission back on November 8, and now we have this series of council meetings, the South Atlantic Council today, New England later on this week, and the Mid-Atlantic next week. All the input from the managers meetings and the council and commission meetings that are now happening will then be summarized and go forward into a summit meeting that we'll be holding with approximately fifty representatives, a total of fifty representatives, from those organizations, where we'll be reviewing the ideas and prioritizing possible actions that might emerge from that, and so think about what we're doing today as very much important input into the summit meeting that happens in February.

Specifically, our objectives today, I want to give everyone here a chance, an opportunity, to review the scenarios, these potential stories, in four different pictures of what 2042 might look like, or what it might be like, and so that's the first thing, and then I want to give you a chance to comment on the challenges and opportunities and potential actions that these managers generated in the earlier work, and let's see what you make of many of those ideas.

I want to really try and discuss the most important issues that you see for the South Atlantic Council, and what are the most important issues for you, as we prepare for climate change, and then as a result of that, identify what you see as some of the key discussion topics that we should be taking forward in that summit meeting, and so we have the material from the scenarios, and we have the managers summary, and we'll be going through that, and then we'll get into some conversations about what you see, as a council, as being some of the most important issues to take forward.

Let me just briefly talk about the scenario framework, and then I want to take a breath and see whether anyone has any questions about the work so far, and so many of you were involved, and, if you weren't involved, then hopefully you've had a chance to kind of take a look at the explanation of these scenarios, and, as I mentioned earlier, scenarios are built on the basis that we don't know what the future is going to hold.

Therefore, what we identified was two broad uncertainties that we felt, as climate change is happening, what is it that we're unsure about, and one of these broad uncertainties was around what we call the predictability of conditions, or the ability of science to assess, and so, in the future, over the course of the next twenty years, are we going to have a situation where conditions become increasingly unpredictable, really meaning that we have a low ability to assess and predict ocean

conditions, stock conditions, stock assessments, and so on, and is that going to be our future, or are we going to have a future where conditions are broadly a little more predictable, and, because of that, or because of technology advances, we have a high ability to assess and predict ocean conditions and stock assessments and so on.

That's one of the uncertainties that we're just not sure about with climate change, and the other uncertainty relates to stock production and stock productivity. Are we going to see a future where stocks are mostly maintained, in aggregate, and maybe some stocks will increase, and some stocks decrease, but, really, the same maintenance, or is climate change going to lead to a future where stocks are mostly declining, possibly because of deterioration in habitat conditions or something else that's going on, and so you put those two uncertainties together and you create these four spaces.

Just very, very briefly, you will see, from these quadrants, the top-left is a world where stocks are maintained, but it's hard to assess or locate where they are. In the bottom-left, stocks decline, and they are also hard to assess or locate, and you can see kind of the basic structure of what we've got going on in our scenario matrix.

As well as these four divergent scenarios, in thinking about the future, we also identified, the experts, as we kind of went through this research process over the last year, some of the things that we're more confident of, and so, under conditions of climate change, the chance are ocean temperatures are going to continue to warm, affecting marine species biology and distribution, and we can take that as a given.

We can also take, as a given, that there are differences in seasonal temperatures across regions, as there are with primary production changes, and so we're not basically assuming that there is a uniform change up and down the east coast. Sea levels are going to rise, and changing ocean uses are going to create more competition for fisheries, whether that be alternative energy, aquaculture, tourism, and it could be a number of different things, and we assume that's going to be the case, and the coastal population growing, and so, between the core scenario matrix and then these kind of common features, we then emerged with four scenarios, and I won't go into a huge amount of detail, because we're going to do that in a moment or two, but these are the four scenarios that hopefully you've had a chance to look at.

We tell four different stories about what the future facing fisheries might be like. Ocean pioneers is a world of unpredictable changes, but where stocks and habitat conditions are kind of mostly maintained, and so there's a lot of -- We call ocean pioneers a lot of kind of wild-west activity, with lots and lots of kind of new changes going on in the ocean and, really, people kind of fighting for their space.

Compound stress fractures is a very difficult scenario. There are unpredictable changes, and we can't really rely on the information, but we also see that, in our experience, there are declines in stocks and productivity and replacement. Sweet and sour, there are predictable changes, and so the science we can kind of rely on, and the trouble is the science is telling us bad news, and the chances are there are stocks that are mostly declining, and then, up in the top-right, predictable changes in those stocks we feel are mostly maintained, or indeed increasing, and so these are stories not to-date, but they're stories about 2042, and what could we imagine being the future.

By creating these stories, the reason why they're valuable is they put us in a slightly different position to imagine the challenges that fishery managers might face twenty years down the line, and so, for the next part of this conversation, I want to go into detail about each of these scenarios, getting your thoughts about them and about the ideas that emerged from the managers meetings, but, before I go there, let me take a break and see whether anyone has any questions about what I've talked about so far, the process that we've gone through or the kind of core scenarios that we're going to be working with today.

DR. BELCHER: Any questions from the group yet? Seeing none --

MR. STAR: Okay. Then we will dig in. Thank you. One final thing. When we held the managers meetings, and this is going to be relevant for later on, we identified the actions that came out of thinking about these scenarios in four different categories, and so some of those related to adaptability. If any of you were in the scenario creation session that we held back in June, flexibility and adaptability and resilience were very much core to those conversations, and we also heard a lot about data and science, alternative ocean uses, and then, critically, cross-jurisdictional governance and management, as you saw was one of the kind of key overall objectives, and so you'll see a number of actions here that jump into -- That fold into some of these categories.

I am going to start the discussion here on the top left, and this is ocean pioneers, and so, if you recall the matrix, here we are, and we imagine that climate change is creating a lot of surprises, a lot of unpredictability, so much so that we can't really rely too much on the science, or the traditional science, as we had it before, and let's imagine that world in twenty years, but, also, at the same time, we're not really seeing any evidence of stocks declining, or being depleted, or significant kind of dangers, let's say, to habitats.

As we tell that story, there are crazy ocean conditions, and there are lots of surprises that happen, maybe lots of storms and bad weather, that really do kind of start to affect things, but ocean stocks are resilient, and you don't see kind of the tipping points that are particularly damaging, with thresholds being met and so on.

What we do see is seasons and locations of traditional fisheries changing unpredictably, whether this be range shifts, range expansions, kind of the stocks disappearing for kind of periods of time. As a result, stock assessments, traditionally, are very much less reliable, and let's say there's a greater premium, and there's no reliance here, because it has to be on real-time data from vessels and users.

Oceans are busy, and fishing, aquaculture, offshore wind, and it gets dominated a lot by, you know, people kind of coming into this space, entrepreneurs, technology, pioneers, and, hence, the ocean pioneers, and winners are more imagined in those world as those with a lot of capital, those with deep pockets, and it's a bit of a wild west, and so there might be sharp elbows and new technology and a willingness to take risks. As we describe this world, maybe we want to think that there's a lot of uncertainty as to, okay, if we see stocks that are abundant today, how long can they kind of keep delivering?

As we talked to managers about this, under these scenarios, here are just kind of a few highlights, and there's plenty more in the discussion document, and so they talked here about kind of a wild west climate change, almost creating kind of turf wars here, in terms of governance.

Organizations, how do you compromise on kind of jurisdictional control? This is a world without, necessarily, accurate information, and we make decisions less based on quantitative information and more based on qualitative information. We imagine this world where we have to move to simpler harvest control rules, simply because we just don't have the data, in twenty years' time, compared to maybe what we have today, but then you might also see new opportunities, from vessels and other ocean users being able to kind of track, whether it be stocks or environmental data collection, and so let me open it up.

Do you -- Let's talk about ocean pioneers as a possibility for the next ten, or twenty, years, as we described that, and so you recognize the challenges? Do you recognize the opportunities? Do you recognize the possible actions that have been identified around this scenario, and maybe just talk about what else you feel is kind of important about this scenario that we've not yet covered, and what would you add, and remember, also, that there are a number of different ideas, management ideas, in the document that I didn't have the space to put in here, and so let's just talk about ocean pioneers for a while, and we're going to start our conversation around what you felt about this scenario. Did it resonate with you? Is there anything that you would kind of want to add or dig deeper into? Let me see what you think.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. Well, you know, I agree that the current stock assessment processes aren't very reliable into the future, and I say that with the caveat that we're already seeing that today. To me, all of this goes back to one of the big, fundamental problems that we have with all of our data collection right now, today, yesterday, the day before yesterday, and next year, and this is one of the problems that I think all of this is going to come down to, is funding.

Is this going to be something that increased funding is going to be able to take care of? Can the current level of funding get us through these climate change scenarios, and, to me, that's one of the overriding issues that we're going to have here, is you can have all the scenarios you want, and you can think of all the best ways to wrap your arms around these scenarios, but we can't afford to collect data right now, and I was just curious how -- Is any thought being put into how we overcome that portion of this problem?

MR. STAR: You mentioned that you see this as overriding. As we go through on the right, this is probably something that will emerge, whichever scenario we kind of talk about, and so we'll come on, a little bit later on, to talk about what you see as some of the priority actions, and there's questions about funding in there that we'll come to later. Thank you, but I want to focus on ocean pioneers, any actions to the description of a potential future there.

MS. THOMPSON: I think you're already seeing these turf wars taking place. I mean, a good example is the Hudson Canyon Sanctuary proposal, because, if you look at the website, it says that it could be protecting the area in the event of climate change, where cold-water creatures, because of its depth, would still be able to exist there, and they want to set up these protected areas to keep the wind and air people out of them, and so there are already turf wars. They're already happening.

MR. STAR: Thank you.

MR. BELL: I think some of that really is already going on. The turf wars -- All of this, if the animals are moving, either expanding the range, or changing the range, there is winners and losers, and so winners and losers is a turf war, but it certainly crosses jurisdictional lines, which we've

drawn, and so, you know, that's going on already, to some degree. In terms of the assessments being more difficult, Tim has got a point, and we have enough trouble, right now, in affording to do all the assessments we need to do, or affording the ability to collect the data we need now in a -- I'm going to call it static, but the imaginary static environment we have, which is not really static, as it turns out, and so that will just be more and more complicated, because, as things change, we'll have to respond to that.

Vessels and things, that's probably part of -- As things move, move into other regions, they prosecute the fishery differently, perhaps, or something, and so, I mean, those things are already going on and somewhat of a challenge right now, and you can just pick your particular fishery, and so it's not unrealistic.

MR. STAR: Okay.

DR. BELCHER: We had just talked about this a few weeks back, and it's the paradigm shift, too. It's getting away from single-species management and looking into ecosystem-based, or how do you integrate all of these different things that are going on, and we may be more responsible for watching -- As we saw with Alaska, you're looking at water temperature and its effects on recruitment and what it's doing for presence and absence of animals, and so it's thinking outside of the box and really getting people to start thinking about maybe we do have to step back, and maybe harvest control rules weren't ideal, but that's the best tool we've got, and we just might have to take it and branch it in a different direction.

MR. STAR: Thank you. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think this one is a little hard for me, because, to be honest, I don't see a world in which ocean stocks are resilient with no damaging climate tipping point, and so, whenever I have seen this, several times now, and, whenever I see that one, I kind of just like toss it out, because I don't see that happening, and so it's hard for me to imagine that.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thank you. Maybe some of the other scenarios might be to think about. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think one of the other things that is interesting about this is, you know, we talk about organizations will compromise on jurisdictional control, but, if you've got sort of a wild-west scenario, you will have new fisheries developing, quicker and more rapidly, than there is any governmental controls, period. I mean, we already see some of that, and, I mean, it takes how long now? If somebody started prosecuting the fishery on a new species, how long does it take us to actually get it under any sort of management control? That would be probably amplified in a scenario like this, where -- You know, basically the horse is out of the barn before you even know the horse was in the barn.

MR. BELL: To that, real quick, you could use -- For us, you could use cobia of an example of what we went through, remember, when the council managed the Atlantic cobia, before we started calling it Atlantic cobia, but we went through that process, and that seems like that started in -- That was a three-year or so process, just to effect some sort of regulatory adjustment, where we handed it over to the commission, and then the commission had to go through its process, and so it's not quick and easy, and, I mean, that kind of came on us -- It seemed like that came on us fairly quickly, but what brought it to our attention was the landings were getting kind of crazy, relatively

speaking, to what they were to the north, and that's because the fishery had started moving up into North Carolina and Virginia and Maryland, and, all of sudden, you're seeing fish where they weren't traditionally before, and so we've gone through an actual example of that, and it wasn't a quick fix.

MR. STAR: So, as you say, we've got some experience in that, but, Spud, to your point, multiply that, I guess, or just imagine, in a future like this, it's not one stock, and it could be multiple, and so we're having to deal with this maybe even more quickly.

MR. WOODWARD: What was interesting is, if we did not have an interstate commission, there would have been no mechanism to effect any sort of management controls on that fishery expanding into state waters, and so it sort of speaks to the fact that you've got to have better synergy between federal-waters management and state-waters management, to be adaptable to changes that might occur beyond anything we ever imagined. I mean, if it had been all fifteen east coast states trying to figure out, individually, what to do to deal with this, we would still be talking about it, and, I mean, it never would have happened.

MR. STAR: Yes. Thanks.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well, not to pick on cobia, but you've also got to look at the data that you had that Virginia was supposed to have caught thirty-three tractor trailers' worth of cobia in one year, and so you have to look at the data, and, also, you have at your disposal, I believe, emergency action that the council could do, in certain scenarios, if they think that the stock is being harmed, and there's like a criteria of three or four things, and I've seen the Mid-Atlantic Council experience that and do that for blueline tilefish, when it was unlimited harvest, and they did that until they could get something in place, or start the action to get it in place, and so there is a few things that could be done that's on the books that, if it's the will and intent, and something that is happening to that scenario.

I just feel like, in the future, looking at these, and I participated in the climate change scenario stuff, and it's really hard not to think about the present, instead of forty or twenty years from now or whatever like that, and, you know, it's kind of like building a house, and I don't know how many people has ever built a house, but they always have a set of plans to build a house, and we just didn't build that house. Very few people build a house just by only do this and this and this, and that's very similar to our stock assessments.

To do a stock assessment, it's almost like building a house, but, yet, we don't have the plans for a lot of the stock assessments, but, yet, we're going to come out of that stock assessment where we've got all the extra tools, whether it's the DLM Toolkit, the Delphi process, or all these other things to supplement zeroes to build that, and so, when you take this and use the climate scenarios on top of that, you're talking like a real cluster -- I mean a mess of stuff happening, you know, and as -- Sorry about that.

As you go into different species of fish, it's almost like you need to put a value on the fish, and then you've got to see how the value -- You've got to put a value on the fish, and just say spot costs a dollar a pound, or a dollar-fifty, and grouper is seven dollars a pound, and so you almost know what the value of your fisheries are by looking at how much fish you're allowed to catch on the ACL or something, for the commercial side, and we're still working -- You know, you've got

to know what you're catching in the ocean, and we haven't -- I don't know if we will ever master it, but get to the recreational side of things, because you can limit -- You can limit somebody going fishing for the season, and what they catch, but there is no limit of the access to go catch-and-release fishing.

We still haven't mastered all of these different things that you're going to need to build that stock assessment, to make it somewhere believable, but, yet, you've got climate change, and shifts moving, and stuff is happening, and I had somebody catch -- A buddy of mine caught a black sea bass in Currituck Sound the other day that was fourteen inches, in his crab pot, and we ain't never had a black sea bass fourteen inches in Currituck Sound, and so you have different things, scenarios, moving, and so, at the best rate, we can focus on the climate part, but we haven't even got the underlying stuff right.

MR. STAR: So there's new ingredients needed for stock assessments. As you said, already you've got -- Already, you have to supplement the kinds of traditional stock assessments with other information, and you can imagine, in a world like this, that there's just going to be more information needed one way or another.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: And also limited funds. Always limited funds, you know, and then you throw in different initiatives that different administrations put into it, and you've got a -- I mean, you've got -- It's different things going on nowadays, and so it's a real mess. I'm glad that I am coming down the backside of the hill, and somebody else can worry about it after a little while longer, but it's interesting.

MR. STAR: I'm not going to improve it any, because I am going to move on to the next scenario now. Okay, and so this is compound stress fractures, and so some of the features that we described in ocean pioneers, around the unpredictability and the fact that stock assessments are unreliable, and we need additional information, they're still around. Change in this world is now that we're foregoing the assumption that stocks are going to be maintained, that there isn't going to be any habitat deterioration, and so now we're in a world where we are going to see stocks declining.

We are going to see some problems in those terms, and so unpredictable conditions are still there, and now negative impacts to species, and maybe this is a world where more pollution could be affecting estuaries and nearshore habitat, and this, again, is where disease -- They are kind of very, very typical in a world like compound stress fractures.

There is a low abundance of traditional stocks, and costs rise, and harvest opportunities fall, and the changes are that this may well lead operators to shift to lower-trophic-level species here, and you're fishing kind of further down the chain. Science is unable to help, as we talked even for ocean pioneers, and stock assessments are relying on insufficient data, and, really, more than anything else -- We talked about turf wars and ocean pioneers, but this one could be like even lower levels of trust, because just the resources aren't there, and so this is a difficult scenario.

Maybe there might be some government involvement, stepping in to save a few domestic fisheries, if you play this one out, but then, also, you've got the other kind of dominant activities and taking more share, taking more control, and fishing is no longer the dominant activity in the ocean, and it's competing with other uses, other industries, for kind of space and attention, and so this one is

a really tough scenario, and I just would love to hear people's views. As you read this one, what did it make you think about?

In terms of the actions here, people started talking, the managers, of do you manage differently? Do you manage spatially? Do you manage by species? How do you ensure that there is maybe more flexibility here, and do you give specialized fishermen the opportunity to move up and down the coast, fixed fishermen to move from one species to another, and how do you build-in that flexibility? What do you do when previously-reliable indices are no longer reliable, and how do you maybe collaborate with other users for real-time monitoring, and so a number of the kind of ideas coming up from managers here that are more in the managers' report as well, and so what are your reviews on compound stress fractures? Tim wants to go first.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. This is where we are today. This is not in the future, and stock assessments are already relying on insufficient data. There already is a low level of trust. We are already competing with other industries, and we've got windfarms coming, and we've got all these different uses coming, but the reality is we are already here. We are already unable to build trust between our stakeholders, and we're already struggling with every single stock assessment we work with, every single one of them, and we have species that we can't even do a stock assessment on.

We're already looking at management strategy evaluations that are down the road, way down the road, but we need them today, and so, you know, I don't know that this is anything different than what we're experiencing right now. Everything we do today is on this page right here, and I don't know that -- I don't know that there's anything that is going to be available to us in the future that's not available to us right now that anybody can afford, and, to me, that's kind of where we are. We can look to the future, and we can realize that, yes, things are going to change, but they're not going to change any more than they're changing right now. They're already changing, and we need to be able to address this now, today, and not twenty years from now.

MR. STAR: Tim, thanks for that, and I will -- The one thing I will say is the very fact that we are, let's say, painting this picture, and, even though we're describing it twenty years into the future, this doesn't mean that we wait twenty years to deal with it, right, and so the whole process is you imagine this is going to be the future, or maybe it is today, and what do we start doing now to address it, and so let me just reiterate that at this stage. Other thoughts?

DR. BELCHER: Well, some of it, we have -- If you're looking at the top-three, you're looking at expanding your universe of people at the table. I mean, pollution and stuff like that -- I mean, those of us who are state reps, we can speak to some of it, but it really requires our environmental protection folks to be involved in that, and local municipalities, and Laurilee's soft spot with dealing with the Indian River Lagoon issues, and a lot of what she's asking for doesn't necessarily fall to a federal component to address, and it's coming from the state and water users and a lot of other things, and so you kind of have to expand beyond the bounds of the current realm that you're working in, and I think that's kind of where I see some of that.

Diseases, I mean, a lot of us know a sick fish when we see it, but we're not disease people, to know what do you do about it, and, if it's water-temperature-related, what are we going to do to address the issues, and so I think, again, it kind of expands beyond the boundaries of what we currently know.

MR. STAR: Okay, and so kind of the collaboration aspects there. Okay. Thank you. Other folks on compound stress fractures? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think we owe it to ourselves to be realistic about competing uses, because you're not going to see fishing win out in a turf war against wind development, when wind is providing energy for millions of people to maintain their quality of life, and for all these other industries, and, I mean, that just -- To put your head down and keep butting into it, thinking that you're going to win that war, is a waste of time, and it does nothing but generate unnecessary friction, and so I think you've got to do what we're trying to do, which is effect those decisions in a productive way, but not expect that you're going to turn that around and say, well, will you just go away and let us keep doing what we've always done, and I think that's where, you know, somebody has to take the lead of saying, you know, we're all going to be out here, and, you know, you can either work to effect a change, where as much positive can come out of this, or you're going to -- You're just going to end up being outside the room, and you won't even be part of the discussion anymore.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thank you very much. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks for being here, and so I was going to react to Tim, initially, by saying I disagree, but, after I read, in more detail, the compound stress fracture, I generally agree, and I think that the one that's missing here would be the full body cast, right, because I think part of the compound stress fractures that we're dealing with today are, in part, climate-driven, but they're also fishery management and regulatory-driven, right, and so the point here, obviously, is a climate scenario planning effort, and so the fractures are only going to grow worse, and be more substantial, obviously, going forward.

You know, this is, obviously, a scary situation for me to envision, and, you know, one of the last bullets, about the government stepping-in to save a few domestic fisheries, I was reminded of, you know, we're the government, and we're here to help you, right, that type of mantra, but I think that's -- You know, certainly, I think the challenge here is that, if we don't develop a more nimble management process, something that can be much more timely and reactive, despite the shortcomings of the data and stock assessments, right, and so I think the science also has to become more nimble, and this will be very much a reality, in the future, with growing climate change.

MR. STAR: Thank you. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Actually, I think Andy just stole a little bit of my thunder, and the biggest thing that I've been concerned about with all of this, and being involved in this, is our lack of ability to be adaptable. I mean, we have all these processes built-in for, you know, transparency, and making sure that everybody understands everything, but, at the same time, we are going to have to be more adaptable more quickly, but, you know, when we actually start looking outside of our box, to start looking at getting serious about EBFM-type stuff, build onto the process of -- You know, within our FMPs, maybe we can build some adaptability within those FMPs. If something happens, you know, if an abundance starts going down, have something already in place that we can immediately address it, but that -- You know, in science, I'm just concerned that the science is always going to be behind.

We end up -- Whenever we make lists of research priorities, the list gets longer, and, you know, that list is going to continue to get longer, and probably longer quicker here, and, you know, twenty years is not a long time, really, and, I mean, I've just experienced, living on the coast at home, you know, lots of changes just in the past five years, and so I just -- Adaptability, to me, is key, so that we can go fast.

MR. STAR: Thank you. Okay. I am going to move us onto the next two scenarios, and so just moving around the matrix here, and so, in this world, and Trish just mentioned that you can't envisage, or it's tough to envisage, a world where the science kind of does improve significantly, and this is what we're talking about here, and so stocks are still declining, and so the news is bad, but this is a world where either climate conditions, environmental conditions, stay relatively predictable or we improve -- And/or we improve the science.

In this world, we have got kind of declining productivity and abundance, and range shifts are happening, as they are in all of these species moving north and east, but maybe in a kind of relatively predictable fashion. In sweet and sour, partly because the productivity is declining, but we've got better information, and the science is a little more reliable here, and then also sweet and sour because you've got some places where challenges are being addressed, through improved forecasts and fishing community innovation, but then, in other regions, some are struggling to effect responses, and so you can see here that this is very much a good news/bad news situation. We also talked, in this world, about aquaculture becoming much more prevalent as a kind of mass source of seafood, and therefore, quite a significant player in ocean conditions here.

As you look at sweet and sour, and so this now a challenging set of circumstances for us to think about. There are declining stocks, but, also, there are advances in science, where we're getting better at knowing what's going on, and we're getting better at prediction. When you looked at this scenario, what did you think about it, and then the managers -- When we talked here about decisions maybe get a little more timely, because you know how things are going to play out a bit more, but is this a way of informally working through solutions, to determine the best approaches, before formalizing changes too quickly, and this is in kind of the management regimes.

You have to make deliberate, strategic choices around declining stocks, and think of the ecosystem and climate status reports being particularly important here, and then the aquaculture piece there, really prompting us to increase efforts to market wild-caught seafood, and so some ideas that the managers were thinking about, regarding sweet and sour, and what do you think about these ideas, or, indeed, anything about this scenario that struck you as worth talking about at this stage? Is this one plausible? Could you see it? Could you imagine the details of this one playing out? Let's go to Spud and then Tim. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think, actually, one of these is already playing out, and that's successful small-scale fishermen adapt to reduced catch limits in these stocks, and you hear the term "boutique fisheries", and that trip limits, small quotas, and things like that have forced fishermen already to seek out a different marketing and sales approach, and we've got two perfect examples of it sitting here at the table, the folks who -- You know, they're not out there competing in the world of imported, mass-produced seafood. They catch and provide to the consumer a premium product that, because of its limited ability, has a higher value, and so, I mean, that's already happening, and probably it will happen more, as stocks diminish in size.

You know, it's kind of like most of eat regular beef, but some people eat Wagyu beef, and it's worth it for people to produce Wagyu beef, because there are people out there to buy it, and so that, I think, is a forcing mechanism that is already happening, and it will happen more under this type of a future.

MR. STAR: Thank you.

MS. MARHEFKA: The opposite of that is that it also means then that there's an expansion, I think, of aquaculture, because not everyone can buy Wagyu fish, right, and it's really expensive, but I think Spud is right. I think, with the exception of the first bullet, everything is happening now, and so, for some of these, I think that's sort of what I'm coming from a lot of these arrows, is going, well, this isn't the future, and this is pretty much now, and I think the future is going to be, in my mind, very pessimistic, obviously, worse than any of the bullet points we've listed so far.

MR. STAR: Okay. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Spud said exactly what I was going to say. I mean, we already are, in the South Atlantic grouper snapper fishery, a boutique fishery, for the largest part, and we are already struggling with cheap imports, and everyone knows that the decline of our commercial fishing communities and infrastructure, and that can't get a lot worse than it is right now. If the infrastructure gets any worse than it is right now, it will not exist, and I think the biggest takeaway from this, that I see, is that, you know, it's really going to take everybody wrapping their arms around the fact that science needs to catch up with aquaculture technology, for us, and it needs to happen in a hurry.

We've worked with it, and we've great scientists right here in Wilmington working with black sea bass, and I think they've worked with flounder, but they've been doing it for years and years and years, and we still don't have an aquacultured black sea bass that could go to market. We can do stock supplementation with fingerlings, but we can't grow them to a size that, just like we do trout and catfish, that can supply food.

To me, we're already in this boutique fishery, in the South Atlantic, and that's not going to change, and it's only going to get to the point where it's probably going to decline to where, instead of the 500 guys we have doing it, there's going to be 300 guys doing it, and it's just going to be attrition, from people ageing-out and a lack of younger people going into it, and, to take up that, we're going to have to have aquaculture, and we're going to have to have a lot of it.

The rest of the world embraces aquaculture, and that's where all the seafood comes from, for the most part, and so I see that, going forward in the future, you know, we've got to embrace this aquaculture to supplement our wild-caught fish, and that's really the only thing, in the future, that's really different than what I already see on this page, because everything else is already happening, like Kerry said, with the exception of the very first bullet, and I don't see that changing. I don't see that happening in the future, and I don't see the science becoming what anybody would deem as good, and it all goes back to funding and how the process works.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: I kind of feel like the first two -- If you think about how management applies, I mean, the ideal thing is working through solutions to determine the best approaches, and that's kind of the proactive side, when you've got that ability, but, yet, the second one, deliberately making strategic choices around declining stocks, is more reactionary, and so you've got this juxtaposition of when should we be proactive, and when should we be reactionary, and how do you keep turning the speed up, and slowing it down, in appropriate measures, because you're always going to be judged as not jumping in at right time in the process, and I think that's kind of that hard part in it, too.

MR. STAR: Right, and I guess you can see how that could be a dilemma here, in a world where you feel as if the -- You've got decent information, and so there are times where you can be kind of confident about being proactive about it, but then, yes, maybe we'll be surprised as well. Okay. Let me move on to the fourth of the scenarios here, and so we've swung through three of them, and the fourth one -- Here, we're talking about a world where we imagine stocks being maintained, and, also, we have better information than maybe we do today, and so something has changed between now, if we believe that we're in some of the other scenarios right now, between now and twenty years' time.

Would these be predictable changes, or tolerable conditions, and would we see kind of better information, or maybe there are ways in which we started to address habitat issues, better pollution reduction, habitat protection, and restoration reversing some of those damages and losses, and, here, in this world, again, we can talk about likelihood, or probability, or plausibility, but science capacity is booming, and it's delivering more effective ocean monitoring and all the different kind of values from that.

Like with the others, the ocean is getting busier, and it leads to competition, whether it be through aquaculture, or maybe even it leads to collaboration. In a world where science capacity is booming, maybe fisheries science gets boosted here by being able to kind of -- To tap into wind energy installations, for tracking and so on.

The recreational sector may well be healthy in this scenario, but there is certainly concerns over accessibility looming quite large here, and so, when we put this scenario to the managers, some of the ideas that were emerging here are you would imagine that we would want to focus on access and participation from small-boat fleets. For low-income recreational fishermen, that would be a challenge, and is this a world where we're focusing much more on joint management of stocks, rather than switching, as stocks shift, from one management body to another.

Technology looms large here, and so there's more emphasis on that, and then really thinking about how new ocean users have seats at the table, and so, checks and balances, just looking at -- Hearing the comments so far, this might be a ways removed from our kind of current set of assumptions, but, as people read this one, any thoughts or reactions to it, in terms of twenty years' time? Is it plausible? What did it make you think of? What emerges from a conversation like this? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: When I read this one for the first time, I just felt that it should have a different name, like pipe dream.

MR. STAR: Does anyone see any reality in this one, rather than just being a pipe dream? Yes.

DR. WALTER: Jon, thanks for coming here today, and speaking to us, and, finally, it's becoming clear in my head what you're doing here, and you're basically the Ghost of Christmas Past, Present, and Future, and you are trying to tell us what the future could be like, and finally it's making sense in my mind that this is not -- Hopefully there are things that could be put in place now that could achieve the outcome of one of these four scenarios, and clearly there is a scenario that is quite positive, which would be this fourth one, and then there are ones of declining positivity, and the decisions that we could make today could hopefully get us on the path towards getting to that scenario, and so thanks for doing that, and it's now kind of becoming clear what this purpose was, and I think it will help us, as we move forward, in identifying what are those steps that are at least under this body's jurisdiction, and then, if there are other bodies that need to be brought into play, that's what the next slide is going to get to, and so I see it now. Thank you.

MR. STAR: Thank you, Mr. Scrooge. Yes, Dickens was a scenario planner. You're absolutely right, and, in some ways, it's not a new technique, and that's exactly what it's doing.

MR. BREWER: Thank you for the presentation. Sort of in line with A Christmas Carol, what we see happening right now are the bad sides of this graph, of these graphs, and that's what we're seeing, and it's a reality. It's just happening, and it's been happening for quite a long time, and it does need to change, and the way that we handle this needs to change, and, when you say pipe dream, right now, if we keep going the way we're going, it will never happen, but, to me, the emphasis should be on these are the things that we really can work towards, and what do we do, what actions do we take, to get to this right now, when it is in fact a pipe dream?

A lot of this is -- You know, aquaculture is going to take massive investment, massive, and it is the way to go, but it's going to take massive investment, which we have not seen. We've seen a lot of pilot programs, and we've seen a lot of different universities, and we've seen I think it was Texas A&M doing a lot of work along those lines, but to actually come in and put in place the infrastructure is going to be incredibly expensive, and it could work, and it has worked with other species, and we've seen it in some other countries, but, you know, I would much prefer the pipe dream to what is going on right now, and a lot of these different points that are raised I think are very, very valid.

One that particular strikes home for me is the idea that we need to take a really good, hard look at harvest control rules and how it is that we, at this point, try to manage these fisheries, which are going to tend to be data-poor, for the most part, and are we going to continue operating under what is really desperate times, and it really is, and the frustrations that come with that, or are we going to perhaps move towards different management techniques and ways of managing that do not require as much data and that are simpler, particularly from the recreational side?

I mean, I think about right now, and, if I'm going fishing, I've got to pull up a website and do a printout of what's allowed, because I can't remember, and I sit on the council, and so it's gotten harder, and it needs to be simplified. That needs to be simplified, and the way that we feel about managing the fisheries needs to be simplified, and, with that, I will be quiet. Thank you.

MR. STAR: Thank you. Spud, it looks like you have the last comment, and then I want to move us on to wrapping up the scenario portion, and then we'll go on to some of the common actions.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, at the risk of sounding like Pollyanna, and totally contrary to my inherent skeptical nature, I am going to -- I believe that there are some of these things, in this scenario, that I believe are already happening, and I think you've got, right now a public-private partnership to protect habitats, to reverse some of the damages that are being done on a scale that I don't think any of us ever saw.

Now, is it enough to prevent some of these other scenarios from taking place? Only time will tell, but I think you've got greater recognition of problems, and a greater willingness to try to address problems, than we've ever had, and so I do think that's -- We are moving, in some ways, in a positive direction, particularly I think in the habitat area. You know, scientific capacity, we're using citizen science, and we're using things that we didn't traditionally use, to try to augment the more traditional, and so there is some -- I think some of this has the potential to be a future reality.

MR. STAR: Okay. All right. Thanks, everyone, for the comments around these scenarios, and you've anticipated a little of where I want to go now, and some of you have kind of revealed some of your views on this, and I want to do a very quick straw poll, and this is not something that we're going to necessarily take on, but I would very interested just -- Everyone around the table here, I'm going to ask you two questions, and the first question is up on this one.

Which of these four scenarios is closest to describing the situation as you see it today? Now, many of you said that I see some elements of this, and this is already happening today, and, of the four, just choose one. Which one do you feel is closest to describing the situation, as you see it today, and so that's the first question, and I will ask you to kind of just jot down which one you would think of as answering that, and so what's closest to describing the situation as you see it today?

The second question is where do you think we're heading to? Which scenario do you believe is most likely to play out by 2042? Now, it doesn't necessarily mean that -- You can have the same answer for both of those questions, and you can think that we're in one world today, and I think we're moving to another, but whichever of those works for you, and so what I'm going to do is just give you twenty or thirty seconds just to think, okay, well, what would my answer be, and what's my kind of gut answer to answering one, and then answering two, and I'm just going to go kind of quickly, and I'm going to talk about -- I'm just going to name each scenario and see how many people are going to vote for one or the other. One vote for each question, please. This is actually going to be more important later on, as we go into something else, but we'll just make sure that we're maintaining kind of democratic integrity here, and so one vote for each question.

All right, and so the first question is which scenario is closest to describing the situation as you see it today? Who would vote for ocean pioneers as being the kind of closest as you see it today, and let me just check how many people. Eight hands for ocean pioneers. Compound stress fractures, and who sees today -- Compound stress fractures as the closest to today? One person, and so we've got one pessimist here. All right. Sweet and sour, and let's see sweet and sour. Okay, and so we have three. Three for sweet and sour. Anyone see checks and balances, or pipe dream, and, Tom, thank you for that addition. Does anyone see us in pipe dream right now? All right. No one there.

Okay. Question two is which scenario do you believe is most likely to play out by 2042? Where are we heading, if this matrix gives us an indication, and do you believe -- You first need to choose one here, and the future is going to be probably kind of a combination of a number of different

things, but it's just instructive. Okay. Who believes that we're heading to more of the ocean pioneers? Three. Okay. Who believes we're heading, in twenty years, to a world of compound stress fractures? Seven. Who believes we're moving to a world of sweet and sour? One for sweet and sour. Okay. Checks and balances, and that's what do you believe is most likely to play out. Thank you.

All right. Thanks everyone, for that, and that's helpful. We did this with the commission, and we'll do it with the other councils as well, and it's useful to kind of know what is happening there and roughly the kind of the balance there in the first question, and most were looking at ocean pioneers as being where we see the situation today, and then the majority then went towards compound stress fractures, which tells us something about, if you take the group as a whole, in aggregate, and, obviously, everyone is making their own individual decisions, we're kind of seeing that a movement from maintaining production and maintaining productivity into something where we've got habitat depletion, and probably into lower production, and so that seems to be the kind of main move. It's interesting then where people were seeing sweet and sour as being something that we're seeing today, and maybe less so in the future. All right. Thank you for that.

I am going to move on now, for the rest of this section, to -- We've spent our time looking at scenarios, and now what I want to do is talk about the actions that flow out of the four scenarios, and there's a way in which I want to think about this, in terms of kind of placing our bets across a matrix, and so imagine we have the two-by-two scenario matrix, and, in each of those scenarios, we're thinking about which of these ideas we saw emerging, and what options would work out well, or at least not hurt you too much, in any of the four scenarios, and so we're really focusing a lot on which are the robust options.

There are other ways in which you can kind of use scenarios to generate plans, or ideas, and you can hedge your bets and say we'll do some things in some scenarios and some in others, and we can look at the pipe dream and say, you know, our job is really to try and imagine us moving towards the top right-hand corner, and we're going to do everything we can to kind of achieve that, and you can set your strategy in that way, or sometimes you can kind of say our job is to really kind of prepare for or prevent a worst-case scenario, and these kind of combinations.

There are a number of ways in which you can use something like scenarios, and a scenario matrix, to determine how you then go forward with ideas, and, for the rest of this conversation this afternoon, I want to focus on these robust ideas that we've got in there, in the middle of this, and so, when we talked to the managers session, we looked at all of the ideas coming out of each of the different scenarios, and it basically created for us I think nine different overall themes that we think are worthy of further conversation at this stage.

These are, obviously, to further conversation for possible actions to deal with, saying we've got to prepare for climate change, and so you've got the challenges of the current cross-jurisdictional structure that seems to loom large in most, if not all, of them, of the scenarios. The mechanics of changing management responsibilities, making decisions with less clarity and certainty, and you can kind of go down the list, and, in the managers summary session, you will see that there is kind of a short paragraph on each of these that we're going to be focusing on.

I guess where I'm going to go with this, and I will kind of put these ideas back up in a moment or two, but do you agree with the nine kind of cross-cutting themes, or recurring issues, and do these

feel as if it's a list that is appropriate for saying, if we address, if not all, then some of these, then, yes, we're going to be in kind of a good position to be prepared for climate change, and then I also want you to think about what are the most important for the South Atlantic Council to address to be prepared for climate change over the decade ahead, and which of these do you think loom largest in our minds, because, sure, all of them may well be important, but, if you said we have limited attention, limited funds, which ones really rise to the top as being critically important to make sure that we are prepared for the future? Then we'll obviously talk a little about -- Maybe there are some things that aren't on this list that really need to be there.

I am going to go back to this list of nine and ask you, and are there any reactions to the list? Are there any reactions to kind of particular ones that you want to draw our attention to, or people's attention to, right now, and think about, for you, which ones loom largest? As we're thinking about how do we need to be prepared for climate change, which of these, from the perspective of yourself, from the perspective of the South Atlantic Council, which ones do we really need to pay attention to and make some changes around, from this list? Spud and then Tim.

MR. WOODWARD: I will go straight to suitable balance of funding and attention in data and science, because we have one Southeast Fisheries Science Center serving three councils, and so you've got three councils, spread over a pretty diverse area, that are trying to make well-informed decisions, and they are limited in what they can be provided, because of a lack of capacity, and it's not a reflection of the people that are there, but it's just there's not enough of them to go around.

MR. STAR: Okay. Let's go with Tim, and then we'll go to Mel. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. I will agree with Spud, and that's what I was going to say. You can't address stock assessment processes and methods without first addressing the balance of funding of data and science, and, you know, our whole process here is driven by a congressional act, a law, that is mandated that what we do is based in the best scientific information available, and that's it, period, and so the number-one thing we need is attention in data and funding, and, without that, we don't move forward with much of anything.

MR. STAR: Thank you. Mel, let's go to you next.

MR. BELL: I would agree with both of them, and that's definitely a big one, but I would also include challenges of current cross-jurisdictional structure. In our particular council, we've got a range of latitude that goes from the Florida Keys all the way up to Virginia, basically, and so we're kind of prone to see some of this stuff crossing state boundaries, federal and state, crossing from our jurisdiction into the next two councils, and so that one is, I think, in there as well, and I would include it in the top four.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thank you. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I will speak to several of them, and I guess, with the last bullet, I'm not necessarily fully understanding the second part of it, and I think I would disagree with the increased participation, because I think that's one of our challenges, is overcapitalization of our fisheries right now, and I certainly understand loss of shoreside infrastructure.

From my view, I think, you know, this body -- Obviously, ideally, funding and attention in data and science, which then leads to greater clarity and certainty in decision-making, but, to me, we're going to have to wrestle with making decisions with less certainty and clarity, which I know is not popular now, and certainly will become more challenging in the future. The current cross-jurisdictional structure, I know that NOAA Fisheries is working on guidance currently to that effect, to be shared with the CCC in the coming year, but I think that's really going to be important for the South Atlantic Council, as these fish move up the coast and shift jurisdictions from the South Atlantic to the Mid-Atlantic and New England, going forward.

Then the spatial planning and ocean zoning, and maybe not a top-four, but we're certainly seeing the benefits of that with wind energy in the Gulf of Mexico. We're a little late to the game for the South Atlantic, but I think there are some real opportunities here, when you're looking at the multiuse nature of ocean resources and the ability to better plan and zone for activities.

MR. STAR: Great. Thank you. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to add that I think the current stock assessment process methods -- I think, in the document, it was more about being adaptive, and I just think we need to be able to get our information sooner, so that we can act sooner, and so, again, I'm all about adaptability in all of this, that we can get some information quick and address it quick.

MR. STAR: I appreciate it, and I will have to go back, and I think that there may have been another version that it was kind of added to the assessment processes. Mel.

MR. BELL: I'm not sure if you've got the four yet, but --

MR. STAR: We're going to vote on them, and all I'm doing, at the moment, is let's say I am harvesting kind of comments from people, if you've got any kinds of questions or clarifications, and then I'm going to do a quick kind of straw poll of everyone.

MR. BELL: So, real quick, the collaboration one, and, obviously, there are a lot of different entities involved in this, across-the-board, and so, you know, we may know we all are, but trying to orchestrate all of the folks, the necessary folks together, in a productive manner, that collaboration is more and more complex, as you involve more and more participants, and so that's a challenge.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thank you. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I think maintaining shoreside access, and it's certainly a huge issue for the commercial industry right now, and, with the gentrification of the coastal areas, and tearing down docks and marinas and building condominiums, and I think it's becoming also a problem for the recreational fishermen, too. Also, the increased participation, and, if you are a boat manufacturer, or a motor manufacturer, and you sell trollers, these are large purchases that somebody is not going to keep trading in a boat and buying a new boat every two years, and so you're going to have to have increased participation in the fisheries for your business model to be successful and keep employees, and so I think the increased -- As much as we don't really want to see increased participation, for others, increased participation -- They live or die by it.

MR. STAR: Yes. Thank you. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: On the note of increased participation, I also look at in terms of maintaining participation, because a lot of what these scenarios show is that you can potentially have decreasing participation, right, due to lack of availability or lack of -- The fact of, just as you said, coastal gentrification. I mean, I know, in my community, our access is good, but it's getting more and more and more crowded, and more and more frustrating, and so I think that's, you know, an aspect that we have to consider there.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thanks for your comments around that, and I don't know if these are numbered, but let's through kind of 1 through 9 here, and so here's what I want to do and then see what the kind of wisdom of crowds is here between those around the table. You have three votes, and what we're going to be doing, through the commission and then through these council meetings, is determining which are the really kind of key areas for us to pay the most attention to, and I'm thinking particularly here and taking some of these things forward to discuss at the summit meeting in February.

We aren't going to be able to deal with all of these that are included on the list, but, if you were to say -- For me, if I had to choose three out of these nine for this meeting, to pay more attention to, to kind of push on a little more, to prioritize, because you think there's no way in which we are going to be successful, as a council, as a group of councils, as fishery managers, if we don't address the following, and so, out of those nine, would be your top three?

What I'm going to ask you to do is just kind of -- If you just kind of jot down which three would you vote for, basically on a piece of paper right in front of you now, and I'm also going to rely again on your honesty, in that you can only vote three times and not four or five or six, which I've seen. I've seen it.

MS. THOMPSON: Can I ask a question?

MR. STAR: Yes.

MS. THOMPSON: There is nothing pertaining to environmental conditions in these, and is that coming later, or --

MR. STAR: No, and --

MS. THOMPSON: There is nothing to do with the environmental condition in these nine choices, for dealing with environmental.

MR. STAR: In terms of what fishery -- The role of fishery managers in dealing with environmental conditions? Okay, and so what I would like to do is -- Let's talk about that, before we kind of maybe finalize this list, or what would you -- Tell me more about what you think would be important for us, as fishery managers, to include in either a list of actions or to just kind of consider as maybe a tenth or eleventh idea here.

MS. THOMPSON: The impacts from nutrients going into our estuaries and how that's impacting the nursery areas, nursery grounds, for our offshore species, and so you would have to be working,

as Carolyn said, with cities and counties and state jurisdictions that it's a problem in, and it's really -- It's impacting the offshore fisheries. Even though it's inshore stuff, a lot of these fish use the estuaries as a nursery ground, and, if we destroy their nursery grounds, how can we possibly expect them to do well out in the ocean?

MR. STAR: Okay. Is there -- Is the action there the kind of potential -- Let's say -- Probably the reason why it's not here is that it came up in some scenarios and probably not in others, and that is the reason why it didn't make the kind of top-nine or ten list, but it's good to kind of mention it now, because we'll be looking for things that might be kind of scenario specific, rather than kind of important and recurring, and so it's good to record it now, but it didn't make the list, because of the kind of cross-cutting nature of it.

Okay, and so, again, what I'm going to do is just go around, and I'm going to ask -- I'm going to identify -- I will just name kind of the first one of these, and then I'm just going to do a quick count around. If anyone has done these kind of things before, usually we might have a big board up, with some paper, and we've got like some sticky dots or whatever, and this one is actually a better voting system than that, because, if anyone has done the sticky-dot voting, you know you can game the system by going up last, and so that's usually what happens with these, but, of course, you've already made your choices, and I know that.

All right, and so, as you go through, you've got three, and you can only vote for three of these, of the nine that are there, and let's see. Who would put a top priority, one of your three, for addressing the challenges of the cross-jurisdictional structure? I think I've got ten there, or did I get eleven? Can I just ask again for that? Eleven. Thank you.

The mechanics of changing management responsibilities? Okay. Maybe people see that as a less-important issue, or it may be dealt with in other ways. Making decisions with less clarity and certainty. Nine. Thank you. Collaborations, addressing collaborations. Two. Thank you. Now the funding and attention for data and science. Fourteen. Thank you.

Then advancing the current stock assessment processes and methods. Three. Let's go again with stock assessment processes and methods. Four. Thank you. Sometimes you do get people saying, if you only want to vote for one thing, just put three hands up, or whatever. All right. Let's go to flexibility needs around permitting and landing. One on that. Spatial planning and ocean zoning. Maintaining access and increased participation, and who would vote there? Okay. One vote for that, and so zero for Number 8 and one for Number 9.

Okay, and so there is three that rise particularly to the top here, and so there is Number 5, around funding and attention to data and science, and the first one, the cross-jurisdictional structure, and then the third one is making decisions with less clarity and certainty, and they loomed the largest in here, and so what I want to do, for the time we've got left, is to think about the -- As now the South Atlantic Council, realizing that we've got these three kind of broad areas that we've identified, and remember these are the cross-jurisdictional governance, the issue around funding for science and data, and making decisions without clarity and certainty, I want you to think about can we be more specific about what you, as a council, think should be discussed at the summit meeting.

Do you want to put ideas into the mix, or do you want to kind of just provide a reminder and say, okay, when groups from this council get together with people from other councils, and we're thinking about what is it that we can take forward, in terms of potential actions to address the issues, what rises to the top, and I'm just going to go down the list here, in terms of the ones that are kind of in order here.

In terms of cross-jurisdictional structure, can we be more specific about what we think the conversation at the summit meeting should be about? What questions should they be asking, and what potential possible actions or proposals for cutting across the jurisdictional structure should we be addressing? Let's go to Mel first and then back to you. Mel.

MR. BELL: I think it's sort of what are the mechanisms we have to deal with that, and it can range from changing a law to just simply doing things kind of informally, like we're sort of doing right now, where we involve other councils in some of our fishery committees, and so, you know, it's identifying the mechanisms for dealing with that, and what's the full range of mechanisms involved.

MR. STAR: Thank you.

MR. BREWER: I may be off-base, but, anyway, I think what we're really talking about is we're seeing, and it's happening, but we're seeing the different fisheries move north, and it's been going on for a long time, and we're seeing questions about pressure on the fish, and so it goes on and on and on, but, as the different -- I am going to approach this from the standpoint of the councils, and, as the councils are trying to deal with these variables that are going to be happening, there's been some talk already about taking a look at National Standard 1 and the definitions contained therein and to give the councils a bit more flexibility, both from the standpoint of timing and from setting these quotas, et cetera, can you do this and can you do that, and, heretofore, it's been defined in a very, very -- What's the right word to use? Not limited, but restrictive manner.

There's been some talk, and I believe that Andy has touched on this, but there's been some talk, at NMFS, about perhaps taking a look at National Standard 1 and seeing if it perhaps some changes might be warranted there, and so, to me, that would be something that could be discussed at this summit meeting.

MR. STAR: Okay, and, as you say, the challenges of a cross-jurisdiction structure -- The challenge being that there's not a flexibility, and so the potential of the National Standards, and what is happening there, could well be something worthy of at least conversation.

MR. BREWER: Yes, but, with regard to this broad range of issues that we're talking about, that's just one that is really worth discussion.

MR. STAR: Okay. Anything else that people want to -- Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was going to say permitting, but I already see it up there in your list.

MR. STAR: Yes, and so permitting -- I have to go back to the votes, to see what's there. Okay. Anything else on that first one that we're talking about? As you have advocated, through your votes, that is talking about the challenges of the current cross-jurisdictional structure, thinking

about how climate change may well worsen that, or challenge it in various ways, is there anything else that we can be more specific about at this stage, to say, okay, when we go to the summit, when we have that summit conversation, here's really what we, as the South Atlantic, want to make sure is part of the discussion? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Instead of our current, you know, method of having one council member being a liaison to the other participating councils, would it be helpful if, every once in a while, to put us and the Mid-Atlantic, all the council members, in the same room at one time, just to have a massive meeting, because the one -- When we have one liaison, it's -- It's hard for them to represent the thoughts and desires of the entire council, and so I think putting the groups all together at one time, and maybe it would be a massive Zoom meeting, and I don't know, because it would be expensive to get everybody -- But maybe an occasional Zoom meeting with all of the council members might be kind of cool.

MR. STAR: All right, and thank you for that, and these are the kind of imagining options for how this might go and what would be the kind of pros and cons of it. Mel.

MR. BELL: Just to be clear at what I was getting at, so, right now, we have a system of governance in place, and there are all of these boundaries. There are boundaries between the councils, and there are boundaries between federal and state, and so, therefore, commission fisheries and state fisheries, and identify all the boundaries, and then things will move across various boundaries, but you have to have a mechanism in place to deal with it, when they cross particular boundaries, whether it's -- I mean, that's kind of -- Laurilee said get the whole group together and look at it, but that's what I was getting at, is establish what your current governance structure is, with the boundaries, and then deal with what happens when species cross, or fisheries move across, those different lines, and how do you deal with it.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thank you. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Really, the top two kind of go together, because what you've got is -- You know, to go back to the cobia example, there was a recognition that that population was shifting, or expanding, which is yet to be determined, into state waters, and then there was a process in place to allow the transfer of management authority to be predominantly interstate, through a commission, and, obviously, there is more joint commission/federal plans in the Mid-Atlantic than there are in the South Atlantic, and so how are those working, and what doesn't work about them, and how do we take those lessons that we've learned and apply them to making those processes better as we go forward, in anticipation of more of these kind of changes.

MR. STAR: Yes, and thanks for making a link there. Okay. I want to move on to just address the other two issues, before we wrap-up, and so there was also a lot of votes for the challenges, but also, you know, how can we make decisions with less clarity and certainty and the realization that this going to be our reality in the future.

If we want to address that at the summit meeting, any thoughts as to other options, and how would you kind of frame that, and are there kind of ideas that you would want to put into the mix as to, okay, we're trying to deal with, or we're trying to identify, potential ways to make decisions with less clarity and certainty, and what do you want as part of that discussion? Are there examples or options?

DR. BELCHER: I think some of it is in the context, because I think, if you're thinking how we currently do business, clarity -- The clarity and the amount of uncertainty is really what we're getting at, and so the idea is how do we do it with less, and we're going to have to take on new ideas and think outside the box, I think is where that comes from, and so what ideas are there besides our current paradigm of how we move forward in the process.

MR. STAR: Okay, and so really kind of challenging the -- Not challenging, but how do you supplement the current decision-making process, and what else would you need to have in place there. Okay. Thank you. Let's go to Spud and then to Andy.

MR. WOODWARD: That's what I struggle with, a little bit, because we just went through a discussion, that you had to painfully listen to, about ABC control rules, and don't ask any of us to explain it to you, but that's really dealing with risk, and how do you manage risk and uncertainty, and the interstate commission is doing the same thing, and it has a developing risk and uncertainty policy, and so I struggle with whether that's an issue that the summit can really illuminate much, because, you know, there's management uncertainty, and there's scientific uncertainty, but we kind of let the scientific uncertainty lead us into how much management uncertainty we're willing to accept, and so I kind of struggle with that, because I could see that bogging the summit down into something that you would never actually produce an output, except everybody would struggle with it, but I could be wrong.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thank you, Spud. That's a helpful comment. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: We struggle, obviously, with risk uncertainty, and especially stakeholder buy-in, when we have to build-in conservative management decisions, and so I think a key component to this is managing with even greater uncertainty and lack of clarity in the future, and how do we maintain, or build, stakeholder buy-in, in the face of climate change.

MR. STAR: Thank you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Sometimes I wonder if you're never going to get stakeholder buy-in, because they simply just don't want to buy in, and I look at the pelagic longline industry, and, in 1999, there was 300 vessels. Today, there's about 135 that are permitted, and there's only seventy, probably, that are active, from Maine to Texas, and we have cameras, and we've got vessel monitoring systems, and we have to check-in twelve hours after every set, to record a bluefin or not, and we might have to add another camera on the side of my vessel, or an arm, with this amendment that just passed, and I'm going to have to put a measuring board, or a type of platform, or a mat, on the back of my vessel, so that the camera can get a picture of the size of the fish that I'm going to catch.

I looked at it, and it's probably -- Over the years, I have very little patience for -- I am made to do this for my fishery. I'm made to do it, and so, when folks don't want to participate, and they don't want to buy in, or they're spoiled, then, you know, maybe they don't need to go fishing, and, looking at different things, I mean, that's a tough way to look about it, but I look at we have issues with bluefin tuna, and we now have a system that I hope that I don't never see another bluefin tuna, and so it's like we've been made to do these things to fix a problem for our industry, pelagic longline, and we decreased more.

You look at the snapper grouper resource, where, in 1999 or something, when they downsized, there was 2,500 snapper grouper permits, and they're down to five-hundred-and-some now, active, and so I don't know, and I just think that something is going to have to happen, either in the legal system, or NMFS is going to have to do something for the increase of buy-in, because I don't see the buy-in happening, in certain sectors, because they just don't want to, and that's why -- That's just, I guess, my two-cents' worth on buy-in, and I don't -- I see that, in the future, going forward, that it's critical for the buy-in, but I just don't see it happening. I don't see the buy-in, and I think the buy-in is going to have to be forced, because of just the crucialness of it, and we don't want to do it.

MR. STAR: All right. Thank you very much. Let me move on to the last short element of the conversation, and so we identified -- Just looking down this list, we identified cross-jurisdictional structure, and we talked about that, and we made a connection there with kind of the second one, changing management responsibilities, and we just talked about making decisions with less clarity and certainty, and there are interesting conversations there around buy-in and trust and Spud's comment about should we really be kind of pushing this in the summit, and it might bog us down, and, obviously, very, very helpful comments.

The element that got the most votes, as we kind of raised our hands here, was that funding and attention -- The suitable balance of funding and attention to data and science, and so a question there. As we think about addressing that, or talking about it in this summit, where we bring the councils together, and the commission and so on as well, how should we frame the challenge? What do we want to be talking about?

I mean, is this we need more, but let's think about what exactly -- How can we be more specific about saying, okay, this is something that needs to be addressed, and what's a helpful way for us to be thinking about it in ways that we can make a difference? Mel.

MR. BELL: I think the reason you got such a reaction on that one is that's the current reality for us. I mean, in the system we are, in the actual present world, that's where we are, and we don't have the -- I know, from our perspective, there's just not sufficient funding to do what we need to do now, and so then we start looking at any of the challenges, in any of these other worlds of the future, and, if we're already not able to do what we need to do, how in the world are we going to transition into something where we require more data, or more timely data, or different data? That's where -- I think that's what you're seeing, is a reaction to the here and now, and so how do we get from where we are now to be able to sufficiently support ourselves to operate in whichever world we go into.

MR. STAR: Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I mean, I know that the councils can't lobby Congress, and stuff like that, but it's clear that they don't have a problem giving money to other countries, and giving billions of dollars out and stuff like that, and they gave money to finance the red snapper count, and, you know, the amberjack and different things, and it's like we've got to reach out to the elected officials and say we've got to have more money for this type of stuff.

Either -- You know, something has got to change here, and so they give away plenty of money, and so it's just -- You know, it's up to the constituents to ask for more money for fisheries stuff, and the squeaky wheel gets the grease, and keep on keep on keeping on, because, if not, then something is going to happen where you can't go fishing, because of legal mandates, or something else that has happened, and so, if you had that money for a stock assessment, or a survey, then you might could go fishing, and so there's some way that we've got to get more money out of Congress, and they've got plenty of money that they give away, and do other things with it, and so, I mean, that's the only other -- That's where the money has got to come from.

MR. STAR: Right. You're right, and we kind of point out there the limitations there, absolutely. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I was going to touch on that too, but here's some of the dichotomy, and so, as a member of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, I am not limited, and I can sit down with my congressman, who serves on the Budget Committee, and talk to him about funding needs, and I have no restrictions, but on the -- I can say, you know, please give us money for the Atlantic Coastal Act to do this and that, but I can't talk to him, as a council member, about funding needs for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, or some of these other things, and so it's --

When we go to Capitol Hill, as commissioners, we're trying to make sure that the message is that we all need this, but, at the end of the day, we end up kind of competing against each other, which is unfortunate, because there's a limited pool of money out there, and we end up somewhat competing with each other, as much as we try to work in a rising tide lifts all boats approach, but it's just -- It creates an awkward environment for sort of comprehensive advocacy for better science, better data, and better decision-making.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thank you. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to build on that and agree, Spud, and I was going to mention something similar, and, I mean, the process is really haphazard. Some of us can lobby, and some of us can't, and there's not really a coordinated effort. Yes, we need funding, but we don't have it well described, in terms of exactly what those funding needs are for, right, and so I think the best approach would be discussing like a congressional budget strategy, right, with these limitations, and with the fact that there are multiple entities that potentially have the ability to go discuss these issues with Congress, but I know the agency is trying, internally, to be more organized, in terms of our programmatic needs and priorities, but that only goes so far, and, obviously, you, as key partners within the council process, are critical to, obviously, lobbying efforts and other things that would support funding.

MR. STAR: Okay. Thank you. Any final thoughts, as we wrap-up here? What I wanted to do, more than anything else, was give you a chance to review the scenarios and give your comments on how you see the challenges, both of today and indeed of the future, and then to identify, from this list, where you think we really should be kind of paying most attention, kind of coming out of the scenarios, and then moving into actions, and so this has been tremendously useful, as far as we're concerned, in terms of the core team, and we had reactions to this from the Atlantic States Commission, a month ago, and we're doing this one, and we've got New England later on this week, and then we've got the Mid-Atlantic next week.

Then, through all of that, we'll then be able to kind of determine what we feel is the right kind of agenda to push forward for the summit meeting, and also to kind of frame the issues in the kind of correct way, and so I've been talking about this, and I think you had some details of this, to just kind of outline -- As I said, we've got about fifty participants, and we'll plan to have them from the councils and the commission and NMFS.

We'll going to be reviewing the ideas and the findings from these discussions and then identifying potential actions then for further consideration. As you see there, we'll be talking about the jurisdictional issues, whether it be making decisions under situations of uncertainty, and there may be some other things there as well, in terms of funding and so on, and so you can see the kinds of areas and bullet points that we'll want to be talking about at the summit. Let me just check if there's anything else that people want to raise, at this stage, or feel as if we have now had the chance to discuss it.

When we think about climate change, when we think about the future, when we think about kind of the challenges for fisheries management, have we hit upon that, and are we discussing the issues that you would have expected? Do you think there is things that we should be aware of that we haven't quite really thought about too much in the last couple of hours?

MS. THOMPSON: Not to beat a dead horse, but I want to make sure that you guys are looking at recurring algae blooms, as the waters heat up, and seagrass loss and environmental impacts on the fisheries, and I just don't see it here.

MR. STAR: Okay. All right. I appreciate it, and, yes, we will definitely take that into account. Thank you. All right. Thanks, everyone, for your time and ideas this afternoon.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Jonathan. We appreciate the efforts on that, for sure, and it's a big project. It will be interesting to see where we end up with the summit here, before too long, and so thank you. Okay, and so we are at 5:05, and so not too bad. We actually were able to pick up our schedule and be on time, and so we're going to recess for today, and we'll pick up with Snapper Grouper in the morning, with Jessica, at 8:30, and so we are recessed for the evening, and we will see you in the morning.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on December 5, 2022.)

- - -

Certified By _____ Date _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
January 23, 2023

FULL COUNCIL - OPEN SESSION
MONDAY, 12/15/22

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS

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

✓ Trish Murphey, **Vice Chair**
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

No Present
✓ Robert Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
1050 N. Highland St. Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 22201
(703)842-0740
rbeal@asmfc.org

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

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

✓ Gary Borland
422 Highwater Court
Chapin, SC 29036
(561) 290-9274 (cell)
GborlandSAFMC@gmail.com

LT Cameron C. Box
Seventh Coast Guard District
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
(305) 415-6781(ph); (786)457--6419(c)
Cameron.C.Box@uscg.mil

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

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

✓ Tom Roller
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 32754
(321) 794-6866
thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com

Spud Woodward

Rich DeVictr
monica dmit -bunello
Frank ofelies

Presented
Le Ann Hogan
Jonathan Star

Jamal Ingram
Lt. Patricia O'Shaughnessy
Dr. John Walker
Dewey H. Emeligh *Susan Boggs*

FULL COUNCIL SESSION I
(OPEN)
MONDAY, 12/5/22

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net
843-302-8435

Deputy Director - Science

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net
843-302-8444

Deputy Director - Management

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net
843-302-8436

Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net
843-302-8439

Fishery Scientist

Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net
843-302-8433

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net
843-571-4370

Communication and Digital Media Specialist

Nicholas Smillie
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net
843-302-8443

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

Dr. Judd Curtis
judd.curtis@safmc.net
843-302-8441

Staff Accountant

Suzanna Thomas suzanna.thomas@safmc.net
843-571-4368

Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net
843-302-8432

Fishery Social Scientist

Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net
843-302-8437

Fishery Scientist

Allie Iberle
Allie.iberle@safmc.net
843-225-8135

Citizen Science Project Manager

Meg Withers
Meg.withers@safmc.net
843-725-7577

Public Information Officer Kim

Iverson kim.iverson@safmc.net
843-223-7258

SEDAR

SEDAR Program Manager

Dr. Julie Neer
julie.neer@safmc.net
843-302-8438

Administrative Officer Kelly Klasnick

kelly.klasnick@safmc.net
843-763-1050

SEDAR Coordinator

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net
843-725-7580

Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net
843-302-8434

SAFMC December Council

Attendee Report: Meeting (12/5/22 - 12/9/22)

Report Generated:

12/11/2022 10:12 AM EST

Webinar ID

338-488-243

Actual Start Date/Time

12/05/2022 07:45 AM EST

Duration

9 hours 22 minutes

Attendee Details

| Attended | Last Name | First Name |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Yes | Alhale | Sydney |
| Yes | Allen | Shanae |
| Yes | Bailey | Adam |
| Yes | Bell | 00 Mel |
| Yes | Bianchi | Alan |
| Yes | Borbely | Bernard |
| Yes | Box | Cameron |
| Yes | Brouwer | Myra |
| Yes | CARMICHAEL | 01 JOHN |
| Yes | Cermak | Bridget |
| Yes | Chaya | 01Cindy |
| Yes | Coleman | Nicholas |
| Yes | Cox | Derek |
| Yes | Dancy | Kiley |
| Yes | Dancy | Kiley |
| Yes | • DeVictor | Rick |
| Yes | Delaney | Joanne |
| Yes | Dieveney | Beth |
| Yes | Dixon | Michael |
| Yes | Dover | Miles |
| Yes | Dukes | Amy |
| Yes | Finch | Margaret |
| Yes | Flowers | Jared |
| Yes | Foss | Kristin |
| Yes | Freeman | Matt |
| Yes | Gentry | Lauren |
| Yes | Glazier | Ed |
| Yes | Gore | Karla |
| Yes | Guyas | Martha |
| Yes | • HEMILRIGHT | DEWEY |
| Yes | Hildreth | Delaine |
| Yes | Hogan | LeAnn |
| Yes | Hollensead | Lisa |

| | | |
|-----|------------------|-------------|
| Yes | Howington | Kathleen |
| Yes | Iverson | Kim |
| Yes | Kappos | Maria |
| Yes | Karnauskas | Mandy |
| Yes | Keppler | Blaik |
| Yes | Klasnick | 01Kelly |
| Yes | Kramer | Rob |
| Yes | LARKIN | Michael |
| Yes | LaRoche | Kelcie |
| Yes | Laks | Ira |
| Yes | Lazarre | Dominique |
| Yes | Levy | Mara |
| Yes | Long | Vivienne |
| Yes | Lucey | Sean |
| Yes | Malinowski | Rich |
| Yes | Masi | Michelle |
| Yes | Mata | Cheyene |
| Yes | Mehta | Nikhil |
| Yes | Morrison | Wendy |
| Yes | Mroch | Ray |
| Yes | Murphey | Trish |
| Yes | Neer | Julie |
| Yes | Newman | Thomas |
| Yes | Newman | Sondra |
| Yes | • O'Shaughnessy | Patrick |
| Yes | Patten | Willow |
| Yes | Poston | Will |
| Yes | Privoznik | Sarah |
| Yes | Pugliese | 01Roger |
| Yes | Ralston | Kellie |
| Yes | Ramsay | Chloe |
| Yes | Records | David |
| Yes | Reeder | Kelly |
| Yes | Reichert | Marcel |
| Yes | Riggs | Thomas |
| Yes | Roller | 00Tom |
| Yes | Sedberry | George |
| Yes | Seward | McLean |
| Yes | Smart | Tracey |
| Yes | Smillie | Nick |
| Yes | Spurgin | Kali |
| Yes | Stam | Geoff |
| Yes | Stemle | Adam |
| Yes | Stephen | Jessica |
| Yes | Sweetman | CJ |
| Yes | Takade-Heumacher | Helen |
| Yes | Thompson | 00 Laurilee |

Yes
Yes

Travis
Vecchio
Vinent
WHITTEN
Walia
• Walter
Walter
Wamer
Williams
Wolfe
Yopp
brewer
gloeckner
kittle
merino
moss
sandorf
thomas
thompson
vara

Michael
Julie
Daniel
MEREDITH
Matthew
John
Kate
David
Erik
Wes
Garland
00chester
david
christine
joy
david
scott
suz
laurilee
mary