

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION II

**Key West Marriott Beachside
Key West, Florida**

June 16-17, 2022

TRANSCRIPT

Council Members

Mel Bell, Chair
Chester Brewer
LT Robert Copeland
Judy Helmey
Jessica McCawley
Tom Roller
Laurilee Thompson

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Trish Murphey
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
Suzanna Thomas

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick DeVictor
Dewey Hemilright
Dr. Jack McGovern
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Monica Smit-Brunello

Shep Grimes
Jamal Ingram
Ashley Oliver
Dr. Clay Porch

Additional attendees and invited participants attached.

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Key West Marriott Beachside, Key West, Florida, on Thursday, June 16, 2022, and was called to order by Vice Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: We're going to push through for a little bit longer. At the max, John and I have talked about going to 5:30. We're just going to try to see if we can't catch up with what we had set up for today. We're going to start with Mel, while John is getting the computer set up, and Mel has a few words that he would like to say. Mel.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Carolyn. Welcome to Council Session II, everyone, Full Council. I just wanted to make sure that I recognized Chris Conklin, and I think you all probably realize that this is his last meeting with us, and Chris has served his three consecutive three-year terms, and he's termed out, but we'll be losing Chris, at least at the table, as part of the family, and it literally is like part of the family, and I've known him all these years now, and we're used to his presence there, and Chris is -- He's a great guy. He's also -- Keep in mind that he's second-generation in this.

His dad, Phil, was part of the council process for many years, and Chris has come along and kind of jumped in there and taken the business and all, but he's been a big help, a big contributor, and we're going to miss him. Gosh, I have watched Chris grow as a council member these years, and I've watched his family grow, and I've watched his business grow, and he's just a super guy, and we're going to miss him here at the table, but, you know, we hope to stay in close touch with him, as he's still part of the industry.

As you all know, I mean, Chris is -- He's a gentleman. He contributes in a way that -- He gets along with folks, and he works across the lines, and he tries to do things for the betterment of everyone, and for the betterment of the fisheries, and I think he really lives up to what is expected of a council member, and, from a South Carolina perspective, we really appreciate his service, and we wanted to make sure that we at least pointed that out. We're proud of him, and we're going to hate to see him go at the table, but, you know, and the other thing is, after nine years -- My hair has grown grayer, and Chris got a little less hair, and he's managed to survive this many years.

He has a good sense of humor, and he has a good spirit, and we're just really going to hate to see him go, but that's the system. I would encourage you all to shake his hand, give him a hug, and buy him a drink tonight. Don't everybody buy him a drink, because he's got to work tomorrow, but do express your thankfulness to him for being part of the family, and we're going to miss him, and I just wanted to say that, really quickly, as we start here, because we'll get busy tomorrow, and then everybody is out the door, but thank you so much, Chris.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Mel, and thank you again, Chris, for your service. We're going to go into the second session of the Full Council. The agenda, we're only doing a slight modification, as Charlie Phillips has something that he needs to handle at 5:00, and so we're going to go ahead and bump him to the top of the agenda item, or agenda list, and so, Charlie, if you're out there and ready.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I think Jenny is on, and I didn't know if she had a PowerPoint or anything that she wanted to share first, and then I would just kind of answer questions and tell you kind of a general overview of what I saw, and so did Jenny have anything that she wanted to bring up?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, and we think it's all you, Charlie. Take it away, and let us know what you feel.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Well, this is going to be pretty short, and I sat through, you know, the last workshops that lasted -- They were pretty long and entailed, and a lot of it had to do with trying to get vertical line reductions on things like gillnet gear, monkfish gear, and just you name it, and they were -- They already had discussions on lobster lines, and so they were just looking at other gear, and pretty much the bottom line is, if you took all of the other gear out of the water, except for say the lobsters and the snow crab and the stuff in Canada, it really would make very, very little difference.

We could do a lot of stuff, and it's not that they're not doing stuff. They are making changes, and there are -- You know, everybody is -- All of the stakeholders are really involved. You know, they're legitimately trying to make a difference, but sometimes -- We even looked at things like blue crab traps down in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, and we talked about how much of a risk they are, what could be done, could anything be done, how many are actually being fished that could make a difference, and, I mean, we -- You know, there were a lot of people on the call, a lot of stakeholders, and everybody is working and doing everything they can, but there's just not a lot.

There was talk about ropeless, and, as you know, we're working on black sea bass pot ropeless now, and we'll probably be doing something in the fall, and so there's -- When it came down to trying to get some risk reduction numbers, they -- The workshop actually had Mid-Atlantic and the regions north do the work on risk reduction, what they could do to get some risk reduction percentages, and there was -- Our risk reduction, even though we have, you know, calving down here, we don't have any fishing, really, where they're calving, and so there was really not anything we could do, other than just, you know, brainstorm and try to think of things that may help.

As far as the South Atlantic is concerned right now, I don't think there's going to be any changes, that I know of. Hopefully we can come up with some new gear, and new technology, like ropeless, that may work with the black sea bass, and maybe, and I'm not -- Maybe some other fisheries may see something that we're doing that they want to change, modify, that can help in some other fisheries, but the PBR is so very low. You know, we need to do everything we can, but there's not a whole lot we can do, and there's not a whole lot that they have really asked us to change, because we are such a low-risk area currently, and so does anybody have any questions?

DR. BELCHER: I don't see anybody, Charlie, around the table. I guess anything else you can think of of interest? I know that there has been some interest in hearing about vessel speeds, and was there any discussion about that?

MR. PHILLIPS: There was some talk about that, and I don't know that -- You know, I think there was -- At the workshop, I think the Coast Guard was trying to warn ships to slow down and stuff, and there was some talk about maybe changing the size of the boats, because I think there was a Sportfish or something that hit a whale, a couple of years ago, and so there was some discussion about changing, possibly changing, and what kind of enforcement they could have, other than just telling people this is what you should do.

There didn't seem to be a whole lot of teeth in that regulation right now, and so maybe there needs to be, at some point, some teeth in that regulation, but, yes, there was talk about ship speed, and other boats, for that matter, but I do remember -- I think it might have been Barb that mentioned that the whales are actually getting smaller, and the timeframe between calves is getting longer, which is -- Again, that's something else that is not helping, you know, the PBR numbers we need to shoot for, but it's pretty critical. I mean, we need to do everything we can do, but, with the whales moving north, it's not making things any easier.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Any other questions for Charlie? Okay. Seeing none, thank you, Charlie, for that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, all, for sneaking me all in. Now I've got to go plant some clams.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Charlie. We appreciate you covering this for us. Take care.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right, guys. Thanks.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Go digging.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's hot.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Carolyn, Jeff is on here as well, if you want to wrap up the SSC report, the bits that are left, for Jeff Buckel, if that works for you, Jeff.

DR. BUCKEL: All right, and I just have a few things that Judd asked me to touch on, and so thank you for the time. Our SSC is going to meet on August 4, this summer, by webinar, to review two stock assessments that you'll be hearing about in your September meeting. The first assessment is the yellowtail snapper interim analysis, and that was conducted by FWRI, and we just received that from Luiz Barbieri's shop today, and so the results of that interim analysis are going to be reviewed within a joint South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico SSC meeting, on August 4, and then, after we review the yellowtail assessment, the Gulf of Mexico SSC folks will drop off the webinar, and then our SSC will review the operational assessment for Spanish mackerel, and that's SEDAR 78, and that's on the SEDAR page, if folks want to get an early read on it. I will stop there, if anyone has any questions about that August 4 meeting.

DR. BELCHER: I don't see anything, Jeff.

DR. BUCKEL: All right, and then the second item that Judd asked me to hit on was the -- During our April meeting, we discussed what we would need to set an ABC for goliath grouper, as well as other unassessed stocks that don't have recent landings data, such as speckled hind and warsaw grouper, and so the SSC expressed concern that traditional stock assessment approaches are unlikely to produce management advice for goliath, and our ABC Control Rule doesn't accommodate stocks that have no recent catch time series, and so the SSC recommends the unassessed stocks working group that's going to be created -- That that working group be tasked with brainstorming new, and perhaps non-traditional, approaches to assess these stocks, and so goliath and any others that don't have recent catch time series.

That's going to be a joint working group, again with the Gulf of Mexico SSC, and so the current plan is to have five members from the South Atlantic SSC and then five members from the Gulf of Mexico SSC, and so that will be coming online at some point, and I'm not sure of the exact timing on that, but I just want to make your group aware of that, and I would be happy to take any questions on that as well.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Any questions for Jeff? I don't see any, and so thank you again, Jeff.

DR. BUCKEL: You're welcome, and I look forward to working with you all over the next couple of years.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you. We're going to circle back to the top of the list. I pretty much think I already know the answer to this, but I just want to check in Monica. Is there anything that you would like to put on the record relative to anything legal?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Not at this time. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thanks. The next item on the list -- We had already done the CCC report from John, and so we're now down to the council staff reports.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you very much, and so this is Attachment 2a, and you have it, and you can read it, and so I will just hit on a few value-added things. The staff update, Julia mentioned that we've hired the citizen science project person, with Meg Withers, and then our media and communication hire recently, since our last meeting, is Nick Smillie. Nick you know from our citizen science team, and he's now moved over and has become our web guru, and so he has been working tirelessly to get our new website into the amazing shape that it is, and it's gone really well. He's jumped right into that with both feet, and it's just going great, and so we're glad to have Nick onboard as a more permanent member of our staff.

Then I want to give you a reminder that we'll be asking you for your committee preferences and 2023 liaisons very soon. We expect that, sometime around I guess the end of the month, to get the new council member names, if there's any changes, et cetera. Once we get those, we put out the list to everyone, as you will recall, to check on committees for next year and line up liaisons for the Gulf and South Atlantic.

The other reminder that I want to add, which isn't on here, is the South Atlantic Awards of Excellence that we created back right before COVID started, and we intended to do it in 2020, but we put that off because of COVID, and we did put out the notice, earlier this year, that applications are due to me by June 30, and so I am very encouraged to report that we have received a few applications, which is always excellent when you're getting a new award going and trying to spread the word, and so, if you've got someone in mind that you think deserves recognition for their contributions to South Atlantic fisheries, please -- You have until the end of the month to get a package into me, and the information has been sent around, but, anytime you want a new copy of it, just give me a shout.

Then the next topic to move onto is the climate change scenario planning, and we've given you pretty brief updates on this all along, working with the two councils to our north. What I want to highlight is the things that will come up here pretty soon involving us, and so, at the September

council meeting, we're expecting to have a presentation from the team that's been working on this that's going to address the implications and options, and so to begin talking about what the scenarios look like and then what it may mean for us and how we may respond to them, and so they'll be going around to us, to the Mid-Atlantic, and to the New England Councils this fall, starting those initial conversations at the council level.

Then, probably the first quarter of 2023, it seems likely, there will be what's called the summit meeting, where we'll have representatives from all the councils coming together to start what's being called the synthesis of ideas, and so to try to put things into more of an outcomes and recommendations, et cetera, and so I think that's going to be an interesting meeting, and we'll be looking for folks to participate in the summit meeting, but that's about all we have for the details so far, and we'll keep you posted as that goes on.

Then, in the spring of 2023, after that meeting, it moves into the monitoring, and so we'll be starting to design a process and start evaluating the scenarios and trying to use it within the management process, and the Pacific Council has gone down this path, and so we're well aware, from their experience, that this phase can be really the toughest thing. With anything like this, it always gets really hard, when you try to make that rubber hit the road and use it within your system, and so we're well aware of that, at least in this iteration, and we can plan for it.

The next item that I want to hit on is the SAFE reports. We have been working on SAFE reports, as we have many times, and Chip has developed a web-based document, and so the link is there, and you can go and look at it. The initial focus here is on our overfished and overfishing stocks, to get information, and we're trying to make this something that can be easily updated and kept up-to-date, where folks can go and just get the kind of basic fisheries information that is often at the heart of your decisions, you know, things like landings and trends in surveys and where the limits have been, and so we're continuing to work on this, to make some real progress on the SAFE reports, and we expect to see more on this as it develops in the future.

On the SEDAR front, we have the Steering Committee that met on May 9, and you'll be getting a full report of that at the September meeting. I did want to highlight a few things about the schedule, and, I think, as mentioned earlier this week, we'll have the red snapper assessment starting in 2024, and we're also looking at a placeholder in there for dolphin in 2026, and so that potentially could be peer reviewing this strategy approach that we talked about earlier today.

Then what's coming up on the near horizon will be gray trigger, red grouper, and black sea bass in 2023, and so we look forward to a full discussion of SEDAR, looking at the schedule, and thinking about some of our next moves further down the road, when we meet in September.

On the outreach and communication front, we, of course, have the new website, which I can't say enough great things about that. It's so much easier to navigate, but we did a best practices event. There was a seminar held at Haddrell's Tackle Shop in Charleston, and a couple of local guides talked about bottom fishing and then asked our staff to come in and talk about best fishing practices, the SAFMC Release, and it was amazingly well attended.

The room was packed, standing room only, and the guides were, just in their own words and own experiences, very supportive of the use of the apps and the use of the descending devices, and that's just such an effective way to get through to people, and it was very encouraging to see how

that's gone, and so that's the types of events like that that we're really looking at doing as part of the core of our best fishing activities over the next year.

Ashley was out, I think, this week doing some of this, and so there's lots of tackle shop outreach that we're going to continue, and South Carolina, Florida Keys, Georgia, and North Carolina are really trying to get around to all the different states and start tapping into those tackle shops, where they're kind of catering to that bottom fishing crowd, and then the guides that are well known and respected, to help carry that message.

Then an exciting thing coming up will be a charter trip with the Miss Judy, to take a bunch of local writers and get them informed about best practices, the app, how these things work, because that's a proven way to get the message out with another trusted group of the local writers, and so we appreciate Miss Judy, and I'm sure the folks are going to have an absolutely incredible time hearing the things that Captain Judy says for an entire day.

Then we'll be at ICAST later on this summer, and, again, that's a great opportunity to work with and reach tackle shop owners and others that are there, and so that's what is going on in outreach and communication, and, if you have any questions, feel free to reach out to any of the staff for follow-up and continuing the conversation.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John. Any questions for John relative to the activities from staff? Okay. Seeing none, we'll move on to our next item, which is the Southeast Regional Office report. Rick, we've got you down for that, and I know we've also got Jennifer Lee on the list, and so however you need to proceed for that.

MR. DEVICTOR: Okay. Thank you. I will start off with a few things, and then Jenny -- Like you said, she's online, and she can give the Protected Resources report. Just two things to mention, and one thing is the closure of the Spanish mackerel fishery in the Northern Zone, and so the Northern Zone for Atlantic Spanish mackerel, and, of course, this includes water from North Carolina through New York, and the AM is an in-season closure. This is a March 1 fishery, and it begins on March 1, and so the Science Center has projected that we reach that ACL in the Northern Zone on June 21, and so you'll be seeing a Fishery Bulletin that's going to come out, probably tomorrow morning, and we'll put that out, announcing that closure, and so that's the first thing.

The second thing has to do with environmental justice, and John has talked about this too, about the CCC, when he gave his report, and they talked a lot about environmental justice, and I just wanted to point you to that SERO, and you may have seen it, put out a Fishery Bulletin, dated May 16, and it announced a draft strategy for advancing environmental justice nationwide and in the region, and so they put together -- Leadership at NOAA has put together a workgroup to improve coordination and information sharing on this topic, and this workgroup put together a report, and it's a draft report, and this is what it out for comment right now, and it's available on our website, and I can point you to that, if you have any questions or want to see that report, and I can also point you to a contact person in our office for this report.

It's important to note that this environmental justice is national in scope, this strategy report, and it's just the beginning. There will be more regional reports coming from this, and so it's a national report, and it doesn't attempt to include and cover all the various issues at the regional level itself,

and it's basically a framework, this report, and so the comment period on this -- Comments are due on August 19, and, from what I understand, the council is going to submit comment on this report, and they're working on it now.

There is also going to be a series of webinars on this strategy, and so the first was held on May 24, and there is three more that are scheduled. One is June 21, June 30, and then July 19. Then my final note on this is we did reach out to council staff about having a presentation here, and there just wasn't time on the schedule to have a presentation on this, because they are going to each council, to give a presentation on the draft report, and it -- The comment period is going to end before the September meeting, and so there is maybe time at September, but we'll see about having that, but just let us know if you want to receive a formal presentation on this strategy. That's it, and the comment period is open until August 19 on this.

DR. BELCHER: Does anybody have any questions for Rick? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Just real quick, on the Northern Zone Spanish mackerel closure, that's based off of projected landings, correct? We've shared some emails about this, and so --

MR. DEVICTOR: For the closure, yes. It's actually taken from landings that we do have, but a lot of those landings are from state waters, a good portion of those, just to point that out.

MR. ROLLER: Okay.

MS. MURPHEY: Just real quick, what day did you say the bulletin was coming out? Tomorrow? Is that what you said?

MR. DEVICTOR: Yes, tomorrow morning.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions for Rick? Okay. I guess next would be to have Jenny give the protected species report.

MS. LEE: Hi, everyone. I waited all day long for AAA to tow my car, and they just called to say that they're going to be there in five minutes, and so my apologies for the slight delay while I take that call and be flustered. Let's see. I hope you all have been having a great week in Key West, and I will update you on a few items we have going on.

The first item that I will review is the ESA actions related to listing and rulemaking. We have one new listing-related action, and that's a pending queen conch status review and listing determination, and so NOAA Fisheries is completing a status review of queen conch, to determine whether listing this species as endangered or threatened under the ESA is warranted. I likely shared news of this review with you initially way back actually in December of 2019, when we announced the initiation of the status review in the Federal Register, along with a public comment period that went through February 4 of 2020. I don't think you need to know this, or I think you already know this, but queen conch are found throughout the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, and also, of course, in your jurisdiction, in south Florida.

If, after considering the status review and ongoing conservation efforts, NOAA Fisheries determines that petition to request is not warranted, we would publish a negative twelve-month

finding in the Federal Register. If it is warranted, we would publish a twelve-month finding, but also a proposed rule, in the Federal Register, and we would request public comments on the proposal to list the species, and so that status review is currently under a status review and twelve-month listing, and the determination is currently under internal review, and so that's something just to look forward to in the relatively near future.

I don't have an update on the timing of determining critical habitat for threatened Caribbean corals, and so I'll skip right over that one. I do have a timing update on the five-year status review for seven threatened coral species, and it's just pushed a little. The status review is projected to be completed sometime this summer, and so, again, if a change in the status is recommended for any of the seven threatened coral species through that review process, there would be a separate rulemaking process with an opportunity for public comment.

I have nothing new to share regarding Nassau grouper critical habitat, but that does mean we are still on track to submit a proposed determination in the Federal Register by the end of this year. That pushes us down to ESA-Section-7-related actions, and I wish I had a lot to report on the status of ongoing consultations, particularly dolphin wahoo, but I really do not, or not too much anyway, and the SF and council staff have worked on the BA for dolphin wahoo, and they're waiting on me to help wrap that up, so we can move forward at your March meeting.

The coastal migratory pelagic resources consultation was added as a new item, and so that consultation is underway, and Protected Resources Division staff are still working and making progress on that, and it's an amendment, because, at least at this point, we are just working to address the oceanic whitetips and giant manta ray, and I probably want to point out -- I think, given that this is June, and your next meeting is not until September, this might be one where we find the timing unfortunate, and it could be finalized before your September meeting, and so I definitely just want to make sure you're aware that that is ongoing. I think that's about it there.

Moving on to Marine Mammal Protection Act actions, in other MMPA news, Charlie shared a little bit about his experience on the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team to review Phase 1, and that was essentially completed via a final rule in September, and that was dealing with the risk reduction from the Northeast lobster and Jonah crab trap and pot fisheries.

Now we are working on Phase 2, which is working to reduce risk associated from all the other Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team and coastwide fisheries, which you see listed in the brief there as gillnet, multispecies trap and pot, Mid-Atlantic lobster, a new risk reduction estimate dealing with population data, and I'm going to not get into detail there, because that will not be particularly helpful here, but, basically, there was a newly-held -- That was in Key West too, and that meeting was held May 9 through 13, and key outcomes will be available soon.

The Southeast measures discussed focused around precautionary measures about continuing to move forward with ropeless research with the black sea bass fishery and then also consolidating a single Southeast trap/pot area spanning from northeast Florida to North Carolina that would require weak rope, weak links, and single pots, and so some ideas being discussed, and a follow-up meeting will occur to discuss a final team recommendation, and then, from there, there is a Phase 3 as well, which would be then looking at the remaining risk from the Northeast lobster and Jonah crab, to hit that 90 percent estimated reduction needed to reduce mortalities and serious injuries in the U.S. commercial fisheries with respect to the potential biological removal level.

That takes us through the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction team news, and the next one is consideration of amendments to the North Atlantic Right Whale Vessel Strike Reduction Rule. This says no change, but I can let you know that we did submit a proposed rule to OMB, back on March 1, and we do anticipate releasing a proposed rule in the coming weeks, and, of course, I can't tell you exactly when, because we don't know, but that is -- There is progress there.

Right whale calving season, just an update, since the season ended since the last meeting, and we had, during the 2021 North Atlantic right whale calving season -- There were nineteen live calf whales that were identified, and I do not have an update, or anything new, on the North Atlantic right whale unusual mortality event, nor the pelagic longline take reduction plan proposed rule development, and we're still working to prepare a final rule.

The bottlenose dolphin take reduction plan, there isn't any information to share, and I did put on here just to keep an eye out for when this report comes out, but there is, in the works, a report to Congress regarding interactions between bottlenose dolphin and sharks and commercial, for-hire, and private recreational fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic, and I know that's certainly of interest, and so just a little heads-up there.

The next item I have, since you are in Key West, is I just put a little information on recent sperm whale strandings in the Florida Keys, and it seems like a nice time to remind you all that sperm whales are typically found in deep ocean waters far offshore, but that the greatest densities are in not just the central and northeast Gulf of Mexico, near Desoto Canyon, but there is an also an area near the Dry Tortugas, and there have been, again, a couple of recent strandings. There was a May 4 female sperm whale that had been reported swimming off of Key Largo, and a small whale ended up stranding along a tidal flat off the Pennekamp State Park, and so responders collected samples, and there was a necropsy performed. The results from that are pending.

There was also a forty-seven-year-old male sperm whale that stranded in the shallows of Mud Keys, which is a group of islands just north of where you are now, in Key West, and biologists found a mass of intertwined line, net pieces, and plastic-bag-type material in the whale's stomach, which likely interfered with the whale's ability to digest food and absorb nutrition, but, again, further diagnostics are needed, or are in the works, to confirm the cause leading to the stranding and death, and so that's still pending, in terms of the outcome there.

Then, moving on to our list of fisheries, just a note that our final 2022 list of fisheries published back on April 19, and there no major changes, but you can check that out, if you want. We just were part of a national deterrents meeting, and now it's important to share that the Alaska Regional Office hosted this national deterrent meeting, and they did open it up to all regions and fishermen on June 1 and June 2, and so we did participate, but, of course, because the dates weren't conducive to Southeast fishermen, obviously, related to red snapper, there was minimal Southeast fishermen participation, and so, again, this national workshop was a preliminary opportunity to hear from diverse fishing communities, but we, in the Southeast region will follow-up with a workshop specific to the Southeast region, and our intention is to better engage Southeast fishermen on the issue at a more convenient date, with ample notice, and so just kind of a rundown.

The last thing on here is I just know that you tend to be interested in offshore wind, and so I just thought that I would acknowledge the offshore wind projects in various stages in the South Atlantic

region, and just to let you know that, for the Kitty Hawk North and South projects, while EFH is covered in SERO, the ESA and MMPA action are going to be handled by our Office of Protected Resources in Silver Spring, and then the Southeast Region will handle aspects of the Carolina Long Bay project, and so just a little tidbit for you, and that concludes my report. Thank you very much.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Jenny. Does anybody have questions? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I am aware of the Kitty Hawk Wind Project, and I'm not sure if that's North, but I'm not aware of the Kitty Hawk Wind Project South, and is that one wind project, or is there two different wind projects that are named Kitty Hawk North and South?

MS. LEE: You know, I am -- It's probably one, but I am just speaking without a lot of knowledge on that, and so I don't know if anyone else -- If there's an EFH person that is present right now that would want to step in and say something, because maybe they will know more about it.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: My understanding is the Kitty Hawk lease, that whole lease, has been split into two areas, and it's Kitty Hawk North and Kitty Hawk South, and both are Avangrid, and the, for the Kitty Hawk North, they're talking about the cabling going up to Virginia, and then, for Kitty Hawk South, they're discussing how to cable down to North Carolina.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well, it's a good thing that I came to Key West to learn about it. Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: Well, I can tell you about it.

DR. BELCHER: Are there other questions for Jenny? I am not seeing any. Thank you again for your time, Jenny. I hope that all goes well with your car.

MS. LEE: Thank you very much.

DR. BELCHER: Actually, I've got Andy. Hold on a second.

MR. STRELCHECK: Good luck with your car, Jenny, but I just wanted to provide a few more Regional Office updates, and not to belabor the comments by SERO here, but sad news first to report, and so many of you, if you've been with the council process for a while, would have known Joe Kimmel, who served as our South Atlantic and Caribbean Branch Chief and then went on to serve as our Caribbean Branch Chief, and so he passed away on May 18 of pancreatic cancer. We had a celebration for his life just prior to coming here to Key West, but certainly I can provide contact information for his wife, and they're also accepting donations at Tampa Bay Watch in his honor, if anyone is interested in recognizing him, but he was a great man, a great person to work with, and fun to be around, and he will be missed.

Council appointments, we've already mentioned, obviously, Chris, unfortunately, leaving us and rolling off the council, and we will be announcing them within the next ten days, and your guess

is as good as mine, in terms of exactly when, but I believe June 27 is the final deadline for when they are announced, and so just heads-up there that that's getting close to announcement.

Aquaculture opportunity areas is not really something in your region to -- That it's so much focused on, but we just released a notice of intent to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement, and we have worked with the National Coastal Center for Ocean Services, NCCOS, and they have done a tremendous amount of marine spatial mapping to help deconflict where potential sites for aquaculture may be sited in the Gulf of Mexico, and so that programmatic environmental impact statement is essentially intended to give public comment and input and then narrow that range of sites that will ultimately be selected for offshore aquaculture.

Then the last thing to report is I had a good conversation with John and the Gulf Council, a week-and-a-half ago, and I shared with them the bad news, which is I was hoping for a good budget year, and it's ended up being a very difficult budget year for the Southeast Regional Office. In the budget this year, our Southeast For-Hire Electronic Reporting Program budget was cut by three-quarters-of-a-million dollars, and so the Southeast Region received one-and-a-half million dollars, which is down from \$2.25 million, and that's leading to a lot of tough choices that we're having to make, and we have to cut back on what we're working on, the contracts we have, and how we use that money to support the program, and so that means that there will be impacts, and we just cannot continue to run the program with the lower level of resources.

I don't have all the details, because we're kind of finalizing our budget execution, but I did want to let you know, obviously, that we are making those tough choices, and it will have some impacts to the SEFHIER Program, going forward. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Andy. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Could I have one more clarification on this Spanish mackerel? I am looking at the SERO quota monitoring website, and I know it's updated at different times, and you all have got to use projections, but, right now, it's showing 67.6 percent, and that was as of, I believe, June 13, and so are we to believe that, as of June 13, you have hard numbers that showed 67 percent, and, as of June 13, you have hard numbers?

Since that time of June 13, and it would be just a week, you're saying that 200,000 pounds -- You're saying 200,000 pounds is going to be caught, that you're projecting, in a week, when it's only North Carolina fishing, and a couple of boats in Virginia, and, if that's the case, how long will it take, if you're closing it, for all the numbers to add up? If there's a shortfall, how long does that take before you would open back up, if there was enough -- If there was 10 percent, or 15 percent, left? Just something ain't kosher here, and I know you've got to do projections, and a lot of stuff is state waters, but there's 200,000 pounds that you all are projecting to be caught in one week.

MR. STRELCHECK: Clay or Rick can weigh-in on this further, but we're not saying that we're going from 67 percent to 100 percent of landings reported in one week, right, and so that information that's on our website is what's been reported to us, and we have to project out what hasn't been reported to us and what we expect is going to be landed before the closure takes place.

As you point out, there are state-water landings for mackerel, and so the projections, which are based on, you know, work that we've done over a series of years, account for those reported and unreported landings.

In terms of how quickly we can turn around and say we've determined the quota hasn't been met and reopen the fishery, it really depends on how late those reports come in, and this is something we've talked with the council about before with other fisheries, and it makes our jobs challenging, in terms of really honing-in on exactly when we need to close the fishery, and so, the better the reporting, the more timely the reporting, the better our estimates are going to be, in terms of closing, and, with Spanish mackerel, there is obviously some uncertainty in the system, because of late reports and state-water landings.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: So is there some way to cause the State of North Carolina -- I believe they have to report dealers daily, and I just wonder about closing something right now, and I understand the late reporting, but is there any way to -- I guess the onus is on the state, with the late reporting, because it's not a federal fishery, even though it's managed that way, and it's all state waters, and so it's incumbent upon the State of North Carolina to deal with its late reporting, if that's the case, because it's either North Carolina and Virginia, and there might be one boat in Maryland, but I just -- Guys are having a tough time, and I just had to bring this up about it, because, when the dust settles -- You know, once it's closed, it's going to revert to 500 pounds, I think, with the things, and that's really tough, with the price of fuel, because I would just ask for somebody to look at this one more time, for the clarity of it, and, also, the State of North Carolina, to see if we're far apart, because it is from North Carolina north.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions for Andy? Okay. The last item that we're going to cover today is the NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center report from Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you. In lieu of the Center report, I thought I would end the day on some good news, and good news that hopefully will lead to some productive discussion here. As many of you know, for the past couple of years, the Science Center received -- In 2020, it was \$1.5 million, and, in 2021 and 2022, \$1.8 million to go to -- Could you pull up the spend plan on the screen, please?

Essentially go to the following language: NMFS is encouraged to leverage efficiencies learned through the Gulf of Mexico red snapper process to better the science and management of the South Atlantic red snapper and other reef fish. NMFS shall consider employing the independent and alternative stock assessment strategies used in the Gulf of Mexico to supplement NMFS assessments of reef fish in the South Atlantic.

What we ended up doing was funneling money over to Sea Grant, and Sea Grant ran a federal funding opportunity, which ultimately Will Patterson and his team were successful in applying for, and they have been applying a close-kin genetic tagging technique to try and figure out how many red snapper are out there, and so similar to what was done in the Gulf of Mexico, except they're using a very different technique, and it's essentially a genetic tagging technique.

The good news about that is they got a lot more samples easier than was anticipated, and we were able to give them a lot of samples from our trap survey, and they were able to get samples from the State of Florida's dockside intercepts, and also the hook-and-line survey that the State of

Florida has been running, and so they got thousands of samples there, and, just because the technology and genetics has been racing forward, the cost of processing genetic samples is getting cheaper and cheaper, and so the bottom line is they were able to complete, or at least complete all the sampling they need, and they expect to be able to get estimates of age-two-and-older red snapper in the South Atlantic with the money that they've already received from 2020 and 2021.

That means there is \$1.8 million that was appropriated for this year that could potentially be put towards other priority activities, and so the -- Will Patterson gave a presentation to the SSC, actually, not too long ago, and he did roll out some related projects that his group had interest in conducting, and some of them were actually along the lines of what is in some points in the South Atlantic Council's research plan, and we also identified some other priority activities that were in line with the South Atlantic research plan.

We talked with scientists from the State of Florida, from the State of South Carolina, Sea Grant, and, of course, our own staff, trying to figure out what's the best way, or some of the best ways, that we could use this money to fill in some of the gaps, and we came up with a short spend plan, and, again, this is something that I am asking the council to weigh-in on, and so there are basically four items that we had identified, at the time, in addition to the items that Dr. Patterson and his team had identified.

One of them was to expand the Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute hook-and-line survey, and that's the one that was involved in putting hooks out over a fairly broad range from north Florida down to Cape Canaveral, and we got a lot of samples from that, and we were able to use that to look at potential differences in selectivity between the trap survey and the video survey and what hooks are catching, but the problem is, again, it is only from north Florida, and it doesn't get all the fish that are now being found in southern Georgia and any expansion of range into below Cape Canaveral.

For a fairly modest sum, we could increase that spatial coverage, and we could also add stereo video cameras to that survey, which would help us estimate size selection of the gear even better, and they could use some funding to map and better characterize the reef habitat in that study area.

Another need that we identified is with South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, and they have a backlog of otoliths and reproductive samples that were obtained from MARMAP and SEAMAP, the trap survey and others, and it would be really great for the assessment to process that backlog. Sea Grant also requested some funding for their Extension program, where they would spend a lot of effort facilitating communication and outreach and delivery of fisheries research projects, and so that would actually go hand-in-hand with some of the discussions that we had earlier about outreach, in terms of descending devices and other ways to reduce discards.

Then, as I talked about earlier, we were recommending a reef fish discard estimation project, where we would expand observer coverage to get more -- Scott Leach mentioned that we could probably get, with some carryover funds that we had in that program, a one-year study that would get us about two-and-a-half percent coverage of the fishery. With some additional funds, maybe we could get closer to that 5 percent that he said would be more optimal, and so that's the gist of it, and I just wanted to get the council's thoughts on this proposal, and then, at some point, I will report back, actually to congressional appropriations staff, on what the council's thoughts were.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Clay. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Clay, and so I was just curious. Based on the discussions that we had this week, if maybe we could spend some of this money towards an independent project that would be focused on capturing better recreational discard estimates that could ultimately be validated, and maybe work on something in the area where we have these high discards, and so, if maybe some of the money could be spent on that, or better recreational intercept information, and is that a possibility, maybe, instead of say the commercial information, and so just a thought here.

DR. PORCH: I mean, that would be an excellent idea. That's, obviously, the biggest single source of discards, as far as we know, and is there some machinery in place already that we could kind of capitalize and make it happen? I mean, one of the things that the state has done, very well, is monitor vessels going in and out of passes for the very short season, and I wonder if there's something we could do like that, for a longer period of time, to get a better handle on the discards.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that idea, and I think maybe we would just have to work with you guys on what mechanism, like how to do that, and with who, and is it through FWC, or is it through a contractor, or is it through some other mechanism, and so, yes, I think that that's definitely a possibility.

DR. PORCH: I mean, that could be very powerful, if we can pull that off, and it would be definitely a very good use of these funds.

DR. BELCHER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I am curious too about -- So the Florida FWC hook-and-line work is being done with contracted for-hire vessels, and is that right? Is that how that was done before, because I understand they went out, and they were sampling the same areas that the trap deployments were in, right, and they were using, I guess, standard private recreational techniques, the same kind of gear, circle hooks, leader lengths, and so forth and so on, and so what I'm curious about is, is there any way to extract anything out of that that could be useful for looking at these discards, because, if you're going out, and you're fishing with the same techniques, and you could say, okay, for this unit of effort, we had this many encounters. If you're using the same gear that we assume -- I mean, there are some subtleties in there, but most people are using the same basic stuff, and so I'm kind of curious, and is there a way to maybe get some value-added information to help us with that?

DR. PORCH: You're right that they contract vessels, and they're working with fishermen. They are not fishing exactly the same way as say the recreational fishery is, but I think there is some more information that we can glean from that. It did overlap, in parts, with the southeast Florida -- Not the -- The Southeast Reef Fish Survey, which is SEFIS and all the MARMAP stuff all wrapped up, and so they did overlap there, but they also went to other areas, and so it's not exactly conducted in the exact same area, but the bottom line is you probably could use that information to look where there is higher numbers of red snapper in space and time, and, if you expanded that at a better map of the habitat, I think we could use it to pretty good effect, in a number of different ways, if that's what you're getting at.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, and just a follow-up, and, also, I can wholeheartedly support expanding that up into Georgia, and I think that would help our fishermen have a lot more confidence in what they're being told about densities and that sort of thing, and so just, if there is any way to build -- You know, get as much as we can, because I think this discard thing is going to continue to be vexing, and, with self-reported data that is all over the place, it would be nice to have something that we can kind of groundtruth it with.

DR. BELCHER: Mel.

MR. BELL: Thanks. Those are good ideas. From our perspective, South Carolina and MARMAP, yes, the samples have already been collected, as you mentioned, and it's just a backlog, and you can collect samples, but it does take some additional effort and funds to process, and this would be great, in terms of kind of catching up with the backlog of what we've already got, and so we certainly appreciate the opportunity to work on that.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions for Clay?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I'm just wondering if there are some thoughts that there might be otoliths from the longline survey that could be factored into it? Is that true? Are you aware that they're getting any red snapper or something that could be looked at?

DR. PORCH: Yes, they're definitely getting red snapper on our deepwater longline survey, and I would have to -- I thought we budgeted for processing them, but I guess I need to check into that and make sure we have enough funds to process all those samples.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I am just curious, and where might I find like the scope of work and methodology information on that Florida hook-and-line survey? I think we had something in the past, maybe, at one time, and so I might could dig that back up, and I think I might still have it, but I would like to just kind of see the particulars of it, because I think it would help us outreach to people in Georgia, saying, look, this is what they're doing, and this is how they're doing it.

DR. PORCH: There is a report on that, and I think you can find it in the materials for that topical working group for the last stock assessment on red snapper, and that was one of the things that they looked at, and I believe there is a document there, but I'm sure the state could get it to you pretty easily.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions for Clay? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I guess, to try and be clear on the council's recommendations, are you supportive of the first three, and then, as far as discard estimation, looking into the recreational fishery, as opposed to the commercial, on the grounds that you already do have some observer coverage in the commercial fishery, and we did hear, earlier, about some expansion of that that is already underway, and so you would rather direct this part to the private fishery, and possibly for-hire, I suppose, to some extent, where we don't have really any sort of validation information on discards?

DR. BELCHER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think the question there is, is can you spend that money in a meaningful way, to make a -- To produce something, I think, that's useful, or how do you turn those dollars into something useful? Is it a pilot study to figure out -- I mean, because we all know that putting observers on private recreational boats is just probably not going to be feasible, and so how do we use that money so that we advance our ability to figure out how to deal with discards?

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think some of what Clay is talking about is some of the things that FWC has done during the red snapper -- We'll call them mini-seasons, and expanding that, and so there were lots of different things, but a dockside sampling, as well as boat counts, and I think you could pair that with some other type of estimates, to try to get at the discards.

You could use the State Reef Fish Survey to try to get some additional information, and the State Reef Fish Survey is running alongside MRIP, but I think you could design something -- I don't have anything readymade right now, but we could work with Clay's folks and FWRI to try to figure out something to do this, and, if you kind of focused in an area, say Canaveral to the state line, you know the heart of this issue, just trying to get some additional information, so that we can make some better decisions here, and that seems to be the topic that we've been talking about all week.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Trish -- Or Clay, to that point, and then to Trish.

DR. PORCH: Just thinking about it, I mean, I think we'll need to have some internal conversations with my folks and the State of Florida, to figure out the best way to move forward, but I know that Dr. Patterson's team was talking about trying to get people on boats and get an idea of discarding and connecting with the tagging study, a conventional tagging study. I'm not sure that I'm as keen on the conventional tagging study part, given the kind of gaps that we have, but, if we could find a way that we get some people on recreational vessels, that is representative of the fishery, that could be really helpful, in tandem with Florida's approach to estimate effort during the mini-season, because that's --

There is two sides of the equation, what are they actually throwing back, which right now is just self-reported data, but then there is also what's the total effort that is going on out there, and, you know, expanding the Florida mini-season approach, where you're really counting all the vessels going through a pass, and then getting enough intercepts so you know what fraction of those vessels are actually offshore fishing, those two things, put together, could be really, really powerful.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to add that, way back -- I can't remember how long ago it was, and it was a while ago, but North Carolina kind of played around with a pilot, looking at using alternative platforms to observe recreational fishermen, and we could get some discard information, and I can't remember all the methodology, like whether they handed the fish to us and we measured them, or got them to measure discards or whatever, but we had a pretty good

methodology that -- Granted, that's an expense, because you've got, you know, additional boats out, and people out, but, in this mini-season, it might be worth checking out, and, in the meantime, I can see if I can find any reports that came out of that. It was small, and we only did it in Bogue Sound, and probably like one year, but just to throw that idea out as another way to maybe get, you know, on-the-water discards.

DR. BELCHER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I promise this is the last time we're going to talk about this, but I am particularly interested in how can we find methods that are durable and can be extended into time, because we're really going to need to be able to put something in place, and track things over time, if we want to make sure we're quantifying reductions, and so that's, I think -- Obviously, all of this is a challenge, but I think, as we look at things to invest in, things that we believe we can sustain and move forward in time and perpetuate, so that we can have something that we can depend on going forward to track this, because, as we know, effort is going to fluctuate, and whatever we can do, and so that's the last word, I promise you, Madam Vice Chair.

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: Just to follow-up on that, so what we're going to have is, from the Great South Atlantic Red Snapper Count, is a snapshot of the abundance for the period of around a year, and what I relayed to others that hold the purse strings is that that's only one side of the equation, right, and we need to know what we're extracting.

Landings, we can measure pretty well, but the discards are big uncertainty here, and so commercial discards is one, but maybe we can get defensible estimates with 2.5 percent coverage, but, you know, recreational discards, and, obviously, you've heard it from your own SSC and around the table, and that's a huge source of uncertainty, and so a snapshot there would be helpful, really helpful, for managers to go forward, but I agree with what Spud said, and what do we do five years from now, or ten years from now, when the Great Red Snapper Count is out-of-date, and the discard estimates would have been out-of-date, and so figuring out a way we can use this as a springboard to moving forward I think would be really, really helpful.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Clay. Other comments or questions for Clay on this? Okay. Seeing none, I would like to thank you all for persevering through a long day, and I do have another big ask for us for tomorrow, just to start at 8:00, and it's just because of the unfinished business we have with Snapper Grouper, to give us that time, and being respectful of everybody catching their flights, and so we're going to go ahead and recess for the evening, and we'll start back up at 8:00 in Full Council. Thanks.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on June 16, 2022.)

JUNE 17, 2022

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Key West Marriott Beachside, Key West, Florida, on Friday, June 17, 2022, and was called to order by Vice Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. We're going to go ahead and get started, if everybody could migrate back. We're back in Full Council, and we will be picking up with committee reports, and remember that we do have a couple of open items still in Snapper Grouper to revisit, and so that's, again, why we're starting early today, and I'm going to start it off with the reports from our closed session and then from our open session earlier.

The closed session, I'm going to need folks to make some motions for us, and this is our AP appointments, the background checks, and timing and tasks. The council reviewed applications for several APs, the Scientific and Statistical Committee and Socioeconomic Panel of the SSC, and the SMP Workgroup. Applicants for the open seats were advertised following the March 2022 council meeting, and both new and applicants on file were presented for consideration.

I have the following draft motion to address recommendations. Appoint the following individuals to council advisory panels, the Recreational Permitting and Reporting Technical Advisory Panel, the Socioeconomic Panel, and the Scientific and Statistical Committee. For ease of reading this into the record, and it's in the report, as far as who we've appointed, but the main thing was to have someone make the motion above and to vote on that. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Before we make the motion, I know I saw it happened up in North Carolina, where we reconsidered and changed our vote on one of the recommendations, and so I would like to try to see if I can do that this morning, and so I don't know if I need to make a motion, and then we have discussion, or whether I try to get it in my argument for the change, before we make a motion.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so, if there is a suggested change, now would be the time to do that, before we make the motion.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. My colleague from North Carolina, Trish, was -- She was supporting Casey Knight, and perhaps maybe didn't make a strong enough argument for Casey Knight, but I was, you know, interested in why she felt like Casey Knight would be a good choice, and so I went back, and I looked online, try to find as much information as I could about David Glenn and Casey Knight, and the only thing I could find about David Glenn is that he's like a TV weatherman, and he works for NOAA, and I couldn't find any papers that he had written or anything, and, if you look in the --

If you look in her application, and his reapplication, and look at all of the things that she's done, and all of the papers that she's written, and all the habitat things that she's involved in, and the only thing I could find about David Glenn was that he's a weatherman on TV and worked for NOAA as a weatherman, and so I just feel like perhaps Casey Knight -- I couldn't find a record of how long anybody had been on the AP either, and so I don't know how long David Glenn has been on the AP, but I feel like, for a Habitat AP committee, it would be better to have somebody that is working, you know, diligently and hard in habitat. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Laurilee. Is there other comment or discussion from the group? Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Well, I was just going to add that -- Nothing against David at all, but my thought was, with climate change coming on, I could see how he would be important on this, but Casey does bring to the table active research, and so does wear two hats, habitat and fisheries, which I think is important too, as far as she's involved in fisheries management for North Carolina, as well as one of the lead writers for the coastal habitat protection plan, and so I think she would be a very good asset. I guess what the group needs to determine, or decide, is if -- You know, is David good as well, you know, for the climate perspective or whatever, but I would be very supportive of adding Casey.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments? Myra.

MS. BROUWER: I was going to suggest that perhaps Roger give you a little bit more background, perhaps, of how David has performed on the AP, if that would help. Roger, I have unmuted you.

MR. PUGLIESE: Thank you. David has been participating with the council, and he was a more recent appointee, over the last two years, but has been in attendance. It's a little tough, because he came in basically right when we were going into remote and webinar activities, and so he has been attending and participating at the level that he can. He was brought in because of the expertise, and I think it was raised by Laurilee, relative to maybe some of the climate-related issues, and so, I mean, the reality is it's up to the council on what types of expertise they would like to have in that slot at that time, and Casey does bring that dual purpose in, with the fisheries and habitat activity, and you have kind of the other side, that David really, I think, brings some of the connections to maybe some of the more environmental or climate-related activities.

DR. BELCHER: So what's the pleasure of the group, as far as substituting or adding?

MS. THOMPSON: Can we add, or do we have to substitute? Is there a set number of people that has to be on Habitat and Ecosystem?

DR. BELCHER: John. I know we had talked about adding an extra person.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You always have the option of adding. The Habitat AP is fairly large, and we would probably wouldn't want to add more people to it, for that reason, and we've actually been discussing, through our habitat blueprint process, which we'll get back into this fall, potentially downsizing that, just because of the magnitude of it, and so, I think, at this time, it's probably better to consider substituting, and Mel had his hand up, too.

DR. BELCHER: Mel.

MR. BELL: Roger kind of hit the nail on the head, and it's really a matter of making sure you have the folks with the proper skillsets and backgrounds and all, and, if you want to do a substitute at this point, given that David's area of expertise is sort of limited, perhaps, to the weather stuff, if you get a better -- If you get more bang for your buck by substituting, we could certainly do that now, and I think that would be fine, in my opinion.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I did just remember, with Casey, that she did actually write the section on climate change and resiliency in the coastal habitat protection plan, and she has been participating on some of the Governor's E.O. 80, which was his Executive Order for North Carolina to begin addressing climate change, and so she has been involved with some climate change work in North Carolina as well.

DR. BELCHER: So how do we -- Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I just wanted to make a comment here that I can speak to Casey, and she's a very qualified individual, and North Carolina, NC DMF, is a leader in a lot of habitat research, our CHIP plan at the state is very extensive. I am hesitant, of course, to replace a participating AP member, but I do understand the need to bring in different perspectives, and so I will defer to everyone else here at the table.

DR. BELCHER: Again, I will put it back to the group. What's your pleasure, as far as substitution of these two people?

MS. THOMPSON: Let's put it to a vote.

DR. BELCHER: Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: I just was going to add that I am familiar with Casey, through coordination directly through Anne Deaton, as working on the CHIP program, and so a lot of interactions, again, in terms of coordination, especially bringing some of the different aspects of, early on, the climate discussion, and so there has been some even earlier interactions.

DR. BELCHER: I will call the question. John, before I call the question.

MR. CARMICHAEL: One option you can do, if you're not clear on the change, and there's not clear consensus, is you can approve all the rest of this, and then you can talk about that individual Habitat seat and make a similar motion for that seat, unless we feel like we're at a consensus to just modify this language.

DR. BELCHER: I was going to call the question, to see if anybody objected to substituting Casey for our current candidate. I don't see any objection, and so we can just do the direct substitution. Okay. All right. With that change, again, back to the draft motion that we have to appoint the following individuals to council advisory panels, Recreational Permitting and Reporting Technical Advisory Panel, Socioeconomic Panel, and the Scientific and Statistical Committee, and do we have anybody who is willing to make that motion? Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I will make a motion to appoint the following individuals to the council advisory panels, the Recreational Permitting and Reporting Technical Advisory Panel, the Socioeconomic Panel, and the SSC.

DR. BELCHER: It's seconded by Laurilee. Is there further discussion? **Any opposition to this motion? Okay. Seeing none, we'll move forward with that being approved.** The next item on the report, we have a motion to perform background checks for future SSC and SEP applicants, consistent with those conducted for AP applicants. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I am ready to make a motion.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, sir.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. **I move we perform background checks for future SSC and SEP applicants, consistent with those conducted for AP applicants.**

DR. BELCHER: Do I have a second? Second from Jessica. Any more discussion? Okay. **Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** The next one is our motion relative to timing and tasks, and do I have someone who is willing to make that motion? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Madam Chair, it's my pleasure. **Move the following timing and tasks: send notification letters to appointees and letters of thanks to those not selected by July 1; conduct an orientation of new AP members by the September 2022 SAFMC meeting; conduct an orientation of new SSC members prior to the August 2022 SSC meeting; conduct an orientation of new SEP members prior to December of 2022; convene a meeting of the Recreational Permitting and Reporting AP before the September 2022 SAFMC meeting; direct the AP to review the Mid-Atlantic recreational tilefish reporting program, with consideration of its applicability to the South Atlantic snapper grouper complex; present AP recommendations at the September 2022 SAFMC meeting.**

DR. BELCHER: Do I have a second? Okay. Chris. Any further discussion? **Anyone opposed to that motion? Okay. Seeing none, that motion has also passed.**

Our second report is going to be Full Council, the open session, which we had on the 13th. The council approved the agenda of the meeting and the transcripts from March 2022. Under the report, we had a NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, U.S. Coast Guard, state agencies, and council liaisons that provided their reports to the council.

Scott Crosson, with the Socioeconomic Panel, provided a summary of topics discussed during the April 2022 SEP meeting. Of note was the feedback on the Citizen Science Program's evaluation survey, Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 35, economics of the longline component of the commercial South Atlantic golden tilefish fishery, and the revised allocation decision tree, including the council's pending public input tool.

Council staff presented a public input tool designed to help gather information that would inform answers to some of the questions within the allocation decision tool. The online tool will allow members of the public to provide similar input to that of advisory panel members when conducting fishery performance reports.

The council had the following feedback: revise the name to be Fair Catch or Saltwater Conversations; ensure the input requested is not too personal in nature; note that the information gathered through this tool would be used broadly to help inform management decisions, not only

when discussing allocations. The council directed staff to work with NOAA GC to determine if the information gathered through the tool would require Paperwork Reduction Act approval, and the following motion was passed. The motion was made to approve the public gathering tool, as modified, which was approved by us.

The next item was the commercial electronic logbook amendment. The council staff presented an overview of the proposed action in the amendment. The amendment would move the paper-based commercial logbooks under the Coastal Logbook Program to an electronic platform. Staff provided background on the council's previous guidance and requested clarification on which fishery management plans would be amended. The council restated their intent to include amending the following FMPs: South Atlantic Snapper Grouper, Atlantic Dolphin Wahoo, Gulf and South Coastal Migratory Pelagics, and Gulf Reef Fish. South Atlantic Council staff will work jointly with the Gulf Council staff and SERO to develop the amendment as a categorical exclusion and finalize for submission by the end of 2022.

The SEFSC clarified that both the commercial discard logbook and the economic add-on survey were considered part of the coastal logbook data collection program and would also be transferred to an electronic platform.

The ABC Control Rule amendment, this amendment considers revisions to the Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rule for Dolphin Wahoo, Golden Crab, and Snapper Grouper FMPs, including the incorporation of phase-ins of ABC changes and carryovers of unused portions of annual catch limits. Staff presented the actions and alternatives. The council made the following motions and provided the following direction to staff.

The first motion was select Alternative 2 under Action 1 as the preferred alternative. This action modifies the Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rule. Preferred Alternative 2's language specifies an Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rule for the Dolphin Wahoo, Golden Crab, and Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plans. It categorizes stocks based on available information and scientific uncertainty. The evaluation incorporates the council's risk tolerance policy through an accepted probability of overfishing, which is known as P^* . The council will specify the P^* based on relative stock biomass and stock risk rating. When possible, the Scientific and Statistical Committee will determine the overfishing limit, characterize its uncertainty, based on primarily the stock assessment, or, secondarily, the Scientific and Statistical Committee's expert opinion.

The overfishing limit, and its uncertainty, would then be used to derive and recommend the acceptable biological catch, based on the risk tolerance specified by the council. Acceptable biological catch for unassessed stocks will be recommended by the Scientific and Statistical Committee, based on applicable data-limited methods.

Unassessed stocks will be assigned the moderate biomass level, unless there is a recommendation from the Scientific and Statistical Committee for a different level, in which case the SSC recommendation regarding the appropriate level will be used. For overfished stocks, the council will specify a stock rebuilding plan (usually T rebuild), considering recommendations from the SSC and fishery management plan advisory panel, which will determine the acceptable biological catch while the rebuilding plan is in effect. Per requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the probability of success for rebuilding plans is one minus P^* , which must be at least 50 percent. That was our approval.

The motion to approve the ABC Control Rule for public hearings was approved by the group and moved forward. Under this, we had direction to staff to conduct online hearings, ahead of the September council meeting, and an in-person hearing during the public comment session at the September council meeting.

Then the SEFSC presentation on progress towards meeting SAFMC research recommendations, Dr. Clay Porch presented an overview of research conducted in the region based on the 2021 SAFMC Research and Monitoring Plan. In the most recent version of the plan, the council included “provide annual progress reports, by the SEFSC at the June Council meeting, detailing efforts to implement the research recommendations noted in Council Research and Monitoring Plans.” That is the end of the report from our first council session, and so, moving on, our next report -- Myra, can you help me, because I just have too many tabs open, and I can’t find it.

MS. BROUWER: Next up is Snapper Grouper, and it’s up on the screen.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, ma’am. All right. The committee met earlier this week and approved the minutes from the March 2022 meeting and the agenda for the June meeting. Then the committee received a report on the status of amendments under formal review, and then we moved into the release mortality reduction and red snapper catch levels, which is Reg Amendment 35.

I don’t want to read everything, and let me try to summarize here. The committee received a report from the Snapper Grouper AP and the SSC on this topic, and there was a chair statement provided, and then staff presented a decision document that included information requested by the council to develop actions to reduce snapper grouper releases, and then the committee gave the following direction to staff, and so to develop Reg Amendment 35 with the following components.

The first component, red snapper catch levels, develop draft action and alternative language to change the South Atlantic red snapper OFL, ABC, OY, and ACLs, based on SEDAR 73 and the SSC’s most recent recommendations and include ACL alternatives for 90 to 100 percent of ABC. Then, gear modifications, develop draft action and alternative language for consideration of the following regulations: disallow the use of electric reels for the recreational sector while fishing for snapper grouper species and include appropriate language to accommodate individuals with physical disabilities and require single-hook rigs for the recreational sector while fishing for snapper grouper species.

Then outreach and education, and we have a new item added here, and I will point that out when we get down to it. For outreach and education, this effort will not require a formal action in Reg Amendment 35. However, expanded outreach and education efforts are expected to contribute to Regulatory Amendment 35’s goals of reduced dead releases and ending overfishing of red snapper.

Staff will summarize current and previous outreach and education efforts and provide some description of how future expanded efforts could reduce dead releases of snapper grouper species. Staff and the IPT should consider how to measure the success of changing behavior. Outreach efforts have gone on for several years. Most education campaigns have cumulative benefit, and

descending device use is already incorporated into assessment, but release information can be improved through ongoing data collection, such as through the SAFMC Release application.

The addition, which is in yellow there on your screen from staff, is the COVID effect. While the council has been conducting outreach efforts for years, in-person contact has been limited over the last two years, due to COVID-19. As in-person contact continues to increase, outreach efforts could become more effective.

Also, under outreach and education, there were suggestions of how to expand outreach and education include education and training on best fishing practices, especially those other than descending device use. While descending device use should continue to be encouraged when appropriate, other best fishing practices can also contribute to reducing dead releases, by reducing catch of species that cannot be retained. BFPs other than descending device use can also improve survival of released fish in situations when descending devices are not needed, such as during shallow-water fishing when there are no physical signs of barotrauma.

Education could occur through an online video training requirement to obtain state recreational fishing permits, particularly Florida. After a federal recreational permit is developed through Snapper Grouper Amendment 46, a similar training should be required to obtain this permit, and potential additional benefits beyond discard mortality reduction, such as better species identification.

Then the committee discussed time and area closures, or issues, and the council, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and SERO staff develop the analyses to inform discussion and consideration of time/area closures of the snapper grouper fishery at the September council Meeting. Consider alternative timing of the red snapper recreational season, consider a season with a recreational maximum depth limit, and consider wave closures of private recreational bottom fishing, possibly for hotspot areas only. We would need alternatives for which waves and areas. Consider closure to align with shallow-water grouper closure, which is January through April, Waves 1 and 2.

List of requested analyses: 1) commercial discards numbers for all stocks in the snapper grouper complex by wave for North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and north Florida, that being Cape Canaveral north, central Florida, which is Cape Canaveral to Jupiter, and south Florida, which is south of Jupiter, and this is for the years 2005 through 2021; 2) private recreational discards, in numbers, for all stocks in the snapper grouper complex by wave for North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, north Florida, central Florida, and south Florida for those same years of 2005 through 2021; 3) recreational charter discard numbers for all stocks in the snapper grouper complex by wave for North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and then north Florida, central Florida, south Florida for the same years; 4) headboat discards, in numbers, for all stocks in the snapper grouper complex by wave for the states and the three regions in Florida for the same years; the same for commercial landings numbers and pounds; and for private recreational landings; recreational charter landings, and that's also numbers and pounds; and headboat landings, numbers and pounds; and then discard-only projection with F landed equals zero and an ABC recommendation for red snapper. This projection would assume no landings occur and would give perspective on the minimum number of red snapper removals. In this case, all removals would be dead discards that must be reduced to end overfishing; analysis of discard hot spots as described by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center; the FWC State Reef Fish Survey discard estimates to

compare with MRIP discard estimates; and analyses and discussion of expected economic and social impacts resulting from reduced effort and catch of snapper grouper species.

The committee additionally discussed an aggregate snapper grouper bag limit, but did not direct it for inclusion in Regulatory Amendment 35, and the committee noted that revisions to sector allocations are not needed at this time for red snapper. While most other species are considering changes to allocation, due to the MRIP transition from the Coastal Household Telephone Survey to the Fishing Effort Survey, a large majority of the red snapper recreational landings estimates are from the Florida State Reef Fish Survey. Since the landings data did not change, the committee did not feel the need to consider reallocation through this amendment.

These were all the discussions that we had on this release mortality reduction of red snapper catch levels, or what we're calling the holistic amendment, and so I'm just going to pause here, to see if there's any additional discussions or concerns or anything else we want to talk about on this topic.

I will just, once again, note, for the record, that FWC is against closures, and I know that this is just the analyses, but time/area closures just aren't going to work here in Florida, and I know that this is just an analysis. I think Andy has his hand up.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Jessica. Three things. I noted, with the recreational data, the splitting of landings, or discard estimates, along the Florida coast into three areas -- I would want to check with the Science Center to confirm how that can be done, and I know we have post-stratification techniques for the MRIP data, and I guess you have, obviously, the State Reef Fish Survey data.

Keep in mind that, at least on the landings side, more recently, we've been using the State Reef Fish Survey, and so that will be, I think, easier to split into those areas, but, for MRIP, it might be difficult to do post-stratification, based on the areas described, and so we will take that under consideration, but we may have to bring back a little bit different analysis, based on what can or can't be done with post-stratification.

I wanted to add to this list, and I heard a lot of criticism and questioning of the discard estimates, and, you know, we have a stock assessment that's been approved by the SSC, and deemed as the best scientific information available, and I had mentioned, on a number of occasions, there is sensitivity runs related to that stock assessment, and I think it would be beneficial to have the Science Center, or at least someone from staff, talk about the stock assessment results and sensitivity, and maybe it's Clay, or whoever attends from the Science Center at the next meeting.

Then the third statement kind of relates to your comments that you just made about closures, Jessica, and so the council -- I want them to know that we had a really good discussion on Thursday, and it is certainly not my goal that we are, you know, wanting to create these massive socio and economic impacts, and I certainly recognize, and it's not my preference to have substantial large area or time closures, but also recognize that a huge part of the problem right now is we have fisheries that are going out and operating and fishing year-round and discarding a tremendous amount of fish, and so we have very inefficient, wasteful fisheries that are discarding fish, and we have to come up with solutions that are going to help us get those discards down,

whether it's red snapper or any of the other snapper grouper species, and so I'm pleased, obviously, to have the analysis moving forward, but I recognize that we need to continue to discuss what that range of alternatives will look like and what the potential benefits and impact would be of those alternatives. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. I look forward to continued thinking outside the box, to figure out how we can do that, and FWC will certainly work on that as well, and then I also wanted to point out some of the discussions that we had yesterday with Clay about some of the additional information, and it won't be ready between now and September, but additional information being gathered, which would be things like trying to get a better estimate of recreational discards.

I am trying to think of anything else. We also had some discussions about kind of doing outreach, say by council staff, at places like ICAST coming up, while there is a possible discussion of closures and just the challenges with that, and so I will just note that as well, as the council is going to be doing work on descending devices and some challenges, since this discussion is kind of on the table.

DR. BELCHER: Andy, did you have your hand raised again?

MR. STRELCHECK: No. Sorry.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more hands? Clay.

DR. PORCH: We will certainly, to Andy's point, look through the list and come back with what can actually be accomplished, because, as he mentioned, there are certain ways we can divide the data easily and other ways you would have to make a lot of assumptions, and we don't want to go around that route, and so we'll certainly look at that, but I will also mention that there is all sorts of flavors of time/area closures, and some might be more palatable than others, and we certainly wouldn't want to take that off the table, because that is the one thing we know would work.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Clay. Also, FWC will stand at the ready with the State Reef Fish Survey information and continue discussions with you guys about what we could bring back as well. Any more discussions on this? All right. I'm going to continue. We didn't make any motions, and so I'm going to continue going through the committee report. Then we moved into gag, which is Snapper Grouper Amendment 53, and we received an overview from the AP and then started going through a decision document, and the following motions were made.

Motion Number 1 is to select Alternative 4b as the preferred alternative for Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Then the committee made Motion Number 2 to select Alternative 3 as the preferred for Action 4a. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion is approved.

The committee then made Motion Number 3 to select Alternative 1, which is no action, as the preferred alternative for Action 4b and select Alternative 1, no action, as the preferred

alternative for Action 5b. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Then the committee made Motion Number 4, which is to remove Action 6 from Amendment 53. This is the accountability measures, commercial accountability measures. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. That motion stands approved.

Then the committee made Motion Number 5 to select Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative for Action 7. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. That motion is approved.

All right. Then there is a number of pieces of direction to staff, and let me go over those. In Action 4a, which was to reduce the commercial trip limit, direct the IPT to consider a commercial trip limit increase during the rebuilding plan and when such an increase would be optimal, given the preferred ACL and allocation alternatives. Include additional alternatives which incorporate a commercial trip limit increase, starting at 300 pounds gutted weight, increasing to 500 pounds, ending at 1,000 pounds gutted weight, throughout the rebuilding plan.

For Action 5a, which is to establish a recreational vessel limit, direct the IPT to consider a recreational vessel limit increase during the rebuilding plan, and when such an increase would be optimal, given the preferred ACL and allocation alternatives. Include additional alternatives which incorporate a vessel limit increase from two fish to four fish and six fish per vessel per day and include alternatives that would exclude charter or headboats from a vessel limit. Also, gather input from the public on excluding charter/for-hire and the establishment of a recreational vessel limit. Include the current black grouper bag limit into the alternative language for Action 5a and remove Alternative 5 from Action 7. Any discussion on that? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Just real quick, I want to make sure it's clear that, at least for the commercial industry, "optimal" is described as sort of the highest trip limit you can get without there being a seasonal closure.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you. I just wanted to ask for some clarification on this gathering of input from the public to exclude charter/for-hire. Do you intend for the IPT to add an alternative that would explore that, or how were you envisioning that we would gather this input from the public?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Great question. I'm looking to the committee. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: If you look up at the bullet above, it says, or to Action 5a, it says include alternatives that would exclude charter or headboats from a vessel limit, and so is that -- I guess that's going to be explored, and so I guess the purpose of that is to make sure we get full public input on the acceptance or rejection of that concept, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Spud. Myra is typing. Any more discussion on that? I don't see any additional hands. All right. That was the end of the discussion on gag. Then we moved into golden tilefish and blueline tilefish, which is Amendment 52, and we received an overview from

the Snapper Grouper AP and then started working through a decision document, and the committee made the following motions.

Motion Number 6 is to approve the purpose and need, as modified. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion is approved.

Then the committee made Motion Number 7, which was to select Alternative 3, Sub-Alternative 3a, as preferred for Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. That motion is approved.

The committee made Motion Number 8, which is to remove Action 4 from Amendment 52 to consider at a later time. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. That motion is approved.

The committee made Motion Number 9 to select Alternative 3 as preferred for Action 5. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. That motion stands approved.

Then the committee made Motion Number 10 to select Alternatives 2 and 4 as preferred for Action 6. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion stands approved.

The committee did not select a preferred alternative for Action 7, which is the blueline tilefish recreational season, and we said we were going to come back to this after we talked about snowy, and so you've heard some various points here, and you heard some discussion from Dewey, and you heard some discussion from Florida, and so, in Florida, we would love to line up snowy and blueline tilefish, but I don't know that that's going to work for North Carolina, and so I guess I'm looking around, to see what folks think about what we should do here. Just as a reminder, on snowy grouper, the season, the preferred, is May to June. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Are we okay going without a preferred at this point and just see what the public says?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess just -- I'm always -- I would rather pick a preferred, if we can, so we can get some reaction to it, so, if people really hate it, that they could tell us. Sometimes people don't react unless we've selected something, and they don't really give us a lot of feedback, and so I will just throw that out there, and so Trish and then Tom.

MS. MURPHEY: Well, if we -- To get reaction, maybe if we do select, what is it, the May through June, as the preferred, and I'm sure we'll get reaction, or at least from North Carolina, and we're still following up with matching snowy, like we discussed, and so I'm fine with that, because I'm sure it will drum up a reaction.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Would you -- Is that a motion, Trish?

MS. MURPHEY: Did Tom -- Did you want to say something first?

MR. ROLLER: Yes, if I could. Our discussion regarding blueline tilefish, and then, when we had the discussion in snowy, it was a little bit different, and I guess my question here was how important is that this aligns to an MRIP wave, because that was a lot of our discussion in snowy, right, and we wanted to start snowy on May 1, to align with those MRIP waves, though I don't recall us discussing it in the same capacity, and, I mean, just to be clear, I'm with Trish, and I don't think a May 1 start is going to work for the North Carolina fishermen, but, just to say it on the record, I would support that only to get feedback from the public.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I see Chip coming up here.

DR. COLLIER: It's very important to keep these aligned with a wave. If you do want to break it from a wave system, you can potentially get down to a month, and it is possibly to bracket it like that, but it is best at a wave, and this is your only data collection system for the recreational side.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: So, if we were aligning it with a wave, it would need to start on May 1 or July 1, and is that correct? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so, Trish, back to you for a motion.

MS. MURPHEY: **I will make a motion to select Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative.** Do I need to say anything else?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Under Action 7.

MS. MURPHEY: **Under Action 7.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Trish. Do we have a second? It's seconded by Chester. Any more discussion on that? I am certain that we're going to get a lot of feedback on this, and so I look forward to getting that and so I don't know that we need to have more discussion. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I also wonder if SERO could weigh-in here about the relevance of making, or allowing, the recreational industry to land their ACL for blueline tilefish, and that's also going to be probably in that discussion part, is how much does the council have to allow a sector to be able to harvest their quota, because, if you go a certain way here, there's a good chance they won't be afforded that opportunity where the biomass of bluelines are, but I think you're going to get some good discussion, but be prepared to be thinking about how this council is going to decipher on it when it comes back to making the hard -- Because it's going to have a difference.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Dewey. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I am actually speaking for Mel.

MR. BELL: She's channeling me. I will weigh-in a little late here, and I was -- I am fine with picking that, and you're going to get reaction, as Trish mentioned, and I didn't know if there was another one that you thought that we're going to get reaction, but maybe not quite as much, in a

negative sense, but just putting something down, like you said, Jessica, and letting them react to it is fine, and so I'm okay with this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Just thinking ahead, in case of a rare chance that somebody asks me where this might go, will we have the flexibility, within this amendment, to address a split season, to do some sort of regional approach? I mean, will we? I mean, that's, to me, a fundamental question here, is will we be able to do that, because I know what we're going to hear, and I think we pretty much know what we're going to hear, is will we be able to address that concern and render some sort of approach that addresses that concern.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that's my concern as well, and I'm looking across the table, and so I assume that the council can adopt two different seasons for different areas of the council's region. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So you're talking about a geographic split, like above a certain latitude it would be this amount, and -- Sure. That's within your -- You would build the record to support that, but that's within your discretion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so then, folks, be thinking about that, for when we come back at the next meeting, is how to split it, where to split it, et cetera. Okay. I see heads nodding yes. All right. Any more discussion? Mel.

MR. BELL: Sorry, and it sounds like we're okay with that, but I was just -- My concern was can we incorporate -- Are we at a point where we could actually incorporate that into this amendment, or are we locked in on a time track that it wouldn't fit, but it sounds like, from what you said, I guess we have that option, and so great.

MS. BROUWER: You could definitely direct staff to explore potential regional allocations, I guess, and I'm not sure exactly how to refer to it, but it's something that I think had been put on the list for this amendment already, and my understanding is the data are very limited for those kinds of approaches, and you've got, you know, a lot of the harvest of recreational for blueline is coming from that northern part of the range, and so, if the desire is to constrain that harvest, then you --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so just let me make sure I'm interpreting what you're saying, and so we could pass this motion, but we could also direct staff to come back with whatever information is available to help us determine how to make a regional season, if we wanted to do regionalized seasons, if we wanted to do that. Okay. Myra is nodding yes. All right. So I think that we want to do that, and Myra is capturing that. Any more discussion on this alternative, or this motion, to select Alternative 4 as the preferred? All right. **Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Then the committee made Motion Number 11, which was to select Alternative 3 as the preferred for Action 8. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. **That motion stands approved.** Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Sorry to interrupt, but just clarification on the direction to staff. I added it for blueline tilefish. I imagine the desire is to do it just for blueline, or did you want to consider this also for snowy?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't think so for snowy. I feel like snowy is in worse shape, and I think that it's more important to consider it for blueline, and that's just my thoughts, but I will look around and see if others have other thoughts. It looks like heads nodding yes. Okay. Thanks for that, Myra.

Then we have a draft motion that hasn't been made yet to approve Snapper Grouper Amendment 52 for golden tilefish and blueline tilefish for public hearings. Would someone like to make that motion? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I move the council approve Snapper Grouper Amendment 52, golden tilefish and blueline tilefish, for public hearings.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Spud and seconded by Chester. It's under discussion. **Any objections?** All right. **That motion is approved.** All right.

Then there was some additional direction to staff. For Action 1, to incorporate OFL in the action language. For Action 2, to include clarification for the difference in allocation percentages, due to MRIP transition from CHTS to FES, recalculate recreational ACLs using 5.6-pound average weight, which was from SEDAR 66. Action 5, clarify that Alternative 3 is not technically a post-season AM, and, for Action 8, clarify that the in-season AM would remain in place. Anything else on this amendment? All right.

Then we moved into snowy grouper, which is Amendment 51. The committee received an overview of the AP panel recommendations, and then staff reviewed the decision document, and the committee made the following motions.

Motion Number 12 is move Action 3 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee made Motion Number 13 to select Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative for Action 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. That motion is approved.

Motion Number 14 is select Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative for Action 5. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussions? Any objections? All right. That motion is approved.

The committee then made Motion Number 15, which was to approve Amendment 51 for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? All right. That motion is approved.

That was it for the snowy grouper amendment, and then the committee moved into greater amberjack, which is Amendment 49, and staff presented a decision document, and a public hearing

was held for this amendment during the council meeting public comment session this week, and so we still have some discussions that we wanted to talk about, following that hearing, and so I'll try to bring those up as we go through here.

The committee made Motion Number 16 to move Action 3 to Considered but Rejected. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussions? Any objections? All right. That motion is approved.

The committee made Motion Number 17 to select Alternative 2, which is the thirty-two-inch minimum size limit, as preferred for Action 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? I will put out there that also Motion Number 18 added an alternative to this action to consider a thirty-four-inch minimum size limit, and so the following motion, that we haven't made yet, is to add another size limit here, commercial minimum size limit, but, before we did that, we had already selected a preferred of thirty-two inches, and so, while this motion is under discussion, are we good with the commercial minimum size limit of thirty-two, or are we wanting to select that new-added alternative as the preferred, and so let me just throw that out there for discussion. I am hearing, over here, to keep it at thirty-two. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Personally, I'm comfortable keeping it at thirty-two. It strikes the balance of I think the needs that we're trying to juggle here with the size limit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Kerry. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I am channeling Andy now.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Carolyn. I had asked for it to be included, simply because this was an AP recommendation, and I wanted it as a viable alternative, in case we changed our minds between now and the next council meeting, and so, at this point, I'm fine with sticking with the preferred.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that discussion. **Any objections to Motion Number 17, which is the thirty-two-inch minimum size limit? All right. Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Then the committee made Motion Number 18, which is the one we also just discussed about adding an alternative that considers a thirty-four-inch minimum size limit for Action 4. Any additional discussion of that addition? Any objections? All right. Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Then we had some outstanding actions here for items that we wanted to revisit after the public comment session, and we had not selected a preferred for Action 5, which is the commercial trip limit, and so let me just throw that out there for discussion, and so are there thoughts on selecting a preferred for the commercial trip limit for amberjack? Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just a reminder, related to this item, the AP's recommendation was Alternative 1, to keep the current trip limits.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mike. Any thoughts here? Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I think it should be the same for both seasons, and I feel like 1,200 pounds would be a good viable option, and we saw some analysis, at the last meeting especially, that the higher trip limit -- We probably still wouldn't catch the quota, I think, and so 1,200 pounds is good, and it's sort of a slippery slope right now, with fishermen, to keep up with the 1,000, the 1,200, and the dates, and guys are getting -- I don't want to say in trouble, but in trouble for, you know -- Because we haven't had any continuity, and so at least the same limit, and I would recommend -- **I will make a motion to make it 1,200 pounds in both seasons, as the preferred.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so thank you for that motion. Do we have a second, and then we'll start discussing it. It's seconded by Kerry. I'm going to look over to Mike and Myra, and we don't actually have like a no action for the first season, but then an action for the second season, and I don't know how to fix that. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: The way that you would do it, with the way it's worded, is you would select, as your preferred, Alternative 3a, because that would only change Season 2, and there would be no change to Season 1, and so that would stay at the 1,200.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so, Chris -- We're getting this on the board here, but this would be to Select Alternative 3, Sub-Alternative 3a, as the preferred, because that only changes the second season, and the first one is already at 1,200, and so I'm looking -- It looks like, yes, that's the intent of your motion. I'm looking to the seconder. Yes. I see heads nodding yes. Is there more discussion on this particular selection of a preferred here? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** Next up, we also did not select a preferred alternative for Action 6, which was the April spawning closure, and so what are folks' thoughts on what to do about this April spawning closure? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: What was the AP's recommendation on this?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: They recommended Alternative 1, to keep the spawning closure as-is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tom, would you like to make a motion?

MR. ROLLER: I would. **I move that we accept, or approve, Alternative 1, no action, as our preferred.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Tom. Is there a second?

MS. THOMPSON: Second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Laurilee. It's under discussion. Mel.

MR. BELL: I am trying to remember the discussion on this, and I think maybe they were going that route because they were kind of less confident, perhaps, in the condition of the stock, maybe, or had a less-rosy picture, and I think that might have been it, but, you know, I could see where, going back to why it was established in the first place, you know, pre-stock assessments and all, I could argue that, unless there is a real biological need for it, I don't know that you need it, but I'm

fine with that, but I think that's what they were sort of thinking, but, you know, it's a matter of do you still need it or not need it, given the reasons under which it was established.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel. That's not exactly my recollection of the AP discussion, and Kerry is agreeing, and I'm afraid to even have this discussion, and so let me make sure that I understand what Alternative 1, no action, does, and so it keeps things as-is, and as-is is a -- Basically, it's no allowance for commercial sale during this time period, during this month of April, but it would allow recreational harvest, and so it's not matching up the season. My recollection, from the AP meeting, was that folks wanted to retain a recreational limit for personal consumption during this closure, but I'm going to look to Kerry, because she was at that meeting as well.

MS. MARHEFKA: I don't remember, and I think what you're saying is correct, but I also don't know if there was a fully-fleshed discussion about the fact that there's an option to not have it at all. It is really not a spawning closure, and there isn't really -- We want back, in I think it was December or something, and we looked back at Amendment 4, and looked at the rationale for this, and it had to do with some, you know, not knowing what was going on with diving and aggregations, and it's just things that really don't track anymore, and so, for that reason, I am not in support of making this our preferred. My preference would be to have no closure in April, but my second preference would be, if we're going to have a closure in April, it needs to be for both sectors, and so it's not -- It's not a spawning season closure, and I don't even think that matches with when their peak spawn is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry, and so let me interpret that. I think what you're saying is, if you were going to select a preferred, that your first choice would be Alternative 3, and then your second choice would be Alternative 2. Okay. All right. I just wanted to clarify. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just in reference to the timing of their spawning, their peak spawn is April to May, and so it doesn't cover the entire time period, but April is within their peak spawning.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mike. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Sometime, didn't we also discuss maybe leaving all the spawning closures and everything alone at this point, until we went to the MSE, and that would get incorporated, because there is so much overlap in everything, and I was thinking that we had kind of had that discussion, at least briefly, and so I'm just throwing that out there, and would want to maybe leave the spawning closures and everything alone, until we hit the MSE, and so I'm just throwing that out there for discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I would add that I think that some of these stocks are not in a shape that we can really do that. We don't know how long the MSE is going to take, but, if I think about things like snowy, and others, I just -- I am concerned with not addressing that now for some of these species. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thanks for that clarification on the peak spawn, because I was kind of under the impression that it was a true spawning closure, and, to that end, I have never really understood why, if we're going to protect a fish when it's spawning, why we would recreationally fish on it, and so, to me, I am with Kerry. If we're going to protect a fish, a species, during its spawn, then

it needs to be across-the-board. I mean, it doesn't make any sense to let the fish be taken recreationally while it's spawning.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and, while amberjack is doing better than some of the other species, I guess you've heard some concerns, and some concerns from the AP, and so then I don't know, and maybe you want to select Alternative 2 here. Kerry, would you like to make a substitute motion?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes. Thank you. **I have been schooled, informed, and that is a much better way to go, and so, if it's okay, I would make a substitute motion that we select Alternative 2 as our preferred for the spawning closure for amberjack.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Kerry. Is there a second? It's seconded by Spud. It's under discussion. Does everybody understand what we're doing here? Any more discussion? Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just putting out the AP's comment, kind of related to the closure, and one of the notes that they had in their report was that the charter and the for-hire component -- They expressed that it was important to keep greater amberjack open in April as a larger species that can be retained on a recreational trip.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mike. We could also move forward with this motion and get the feedback and then address it again at the next meeting, and I see heads nodding yes. All right. Is there more discussion on this substitute motion that would select Alternative 2 underneath Action 6? All right. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: My thoughts are with Trish on this one, but, moving forward, I'm okay with this motion, because we'll get some good public feedback for it, and, if it is important to aspects of the charter/for-hire industry, we'll hear from them, or we better anyway.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Tom. All right. Any more discussion? **Any objection to this substitute motion?** All right. **That motion passes, and now the substitute becomes the main motion, and we need to vote on that one more time.** Any more discussion? **Any objection?** Mel.

MR. BELL: Not objecting, but just to be sure -- Part of the problem is calling it a spawning closure, and Tim kind of hit on that, and so I think that's why we're doing this, and then we'll get some feedback and see where the tide goes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel. All right. **Any objection to what is now the main motion, to select Alternative 2 as the preferred?** All right. **I don't see any hands, and that motion is approved.** All right. We also have a draft motion here to approve all actions in Snapper Grouper Amendment 49. Would someone like to make that motion? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: **I move that we approve all actions in Snapper Grouper Amendment 49.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Motion by Kerry. It's seconded by Chris. Any more discussion on amberjack? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **That motion is approved.**

Then we got additional input from the Snapper Grouper AP that wasn't covered in previous agenda items. We also talked about the South Atlantic Reef Observer Coverage expansion, and we also discussed the exempted fishing permit, and then we moved into Other Business, where we discussed the federal recreational permit and discussions about the deepwater component.

Then we have a draft timing and tasks motion here, and I can read it. **This would direct staff to do the following: develop actions and analyses for Reg Amendment 35, which is the snapper grouper release mortality reduction and red snapper catch levels, for the committee's consideration at the September 2022 meeting; convene a meeting of the golden tilefish longline endorsement holders to discuss alternative ways to manage that fishery, and we need to talk about the timing of that, and do we need to do that before we pass this motion, Myra?**

MS. BROUWER: That would be clearer for us, yes. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you remind me of the timing of that golden/blueline amendment? The reason I'm asking is does this meeting need to occur before the September council meeting?

MS. BROUWER: I don't think it does. If your intent is to continue developing Amendment 52, to approve it at the end of the year, I guess we're assuming that whatever potential actions come out of the longline endorsement holders meeting would be put in a different amendment, and so you can convene them whenever you would like, but, for planning purposes, we just wanted to kind of get an idea for what you were thinking.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so that's helpful. It sounds like maybe it might be helpful to have a little bit of that information before this amendment is finalized, and so maybe the timing is between now and before the December council meeting. I am looking around, and I see heads nodding yes. All right. Myra is adding the timing to that.

Another item here in this draft motion is to conduct public comment for Amendment 51, which is snowy grouper, and Amendment 52, which is the golden tilefish and blueline tilefish amendment, via webinar before the September 2022 council meeting and during the public comment session at the September meeting. Then prepare Amendment 49, which is greater amberjack, for consideration of final approval at the September 2022 council meeting, and prepare Amendment 53, gag, for consideration of approval for public hearings at the September 2022 council meeting. Would someone like to make that motion that I just read?

MS. MARHEFKA: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's moved by Kerry. Do we have a second? Seconded by Spud. Any more discussion of this timing here? **Any objection to this timing and tasks motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion is approved.** That concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee report. Back to you, Madam Vice Chair.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Jessica. Next up is the Dolphin Wahoo report. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thank you. The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met on June 16, and that was yesterday? Oh my god. The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met on June 16, and the committee

approved the transcript from the March 2022 meeting and the agenda. We received an update on the status of amendments under formal review, which, of course, was Amendment 10, which went into effect on May 2, 2022.

Chris Burrows was also here to discuss the Dolphin Wahoo AP meeting, and they had met in April in Charleston, and they received updates on what we were working on with Amendment 3 and other topics, and they provided input to the fishery performance report. We got a presentation from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center on the development of empirical management measures, that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is planning to embark on a management strategy evaluation for the dolphin fishery. The goal of this project is to develop an index-based management procedure that may provide catch level and management advice and that will best achieve multiple operational management objectives of the fishery. The committee provided the following guidance and made the following motions.

The guidance is that the committee is interested in furthering considering the MSE approach for dolphin. Council staff is encouraged to assist with the stakeholder meetings. Council advisors may be involved in the MSE panel, as appropriate. The committee would like to receive updates as the MSE progresses.

The committee made Motion Number 1, which directs staff to move forward with the MSE for dolphin as priority over Reg Amendment 3, move forward with the MSE stakeholder meetings in the fall, and come back with summary information from the meetings, if available, and Reg Amendment 3 at the December 2022 council meeting. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on this motion? Any objection? Hearing none, the motion is approved. Andy, did you have a comment?

MR. STRELCHECK: I am supportive of the motion. The comment that I was going to make is, with the information that's going to be brought back to us in December, I was interested in hearing from the council -- You know, we're hearing a lot of information from constituents pointing to decreases in landings, changes in size, changes in catch rates, and would the council be interested in also receiving some of that kind of summary statistic data and information to help with discussions going forward with Reg Amendment 3, because, to me, I think it would be useful to see that data more clearly, in terms of what is happening in the fishery, as we make further decisions.

MS. MARHEFKA: I saw some head-nodding all around the table, including staff, and so that's a big thumbs-up.

MR. STRELCHECK: Great. Thanks.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry. I will make sure to look at Kelly next time. Then we moved into Regulatory Amendment 3, which is modifications to the minimum size limit, recreational retention limits, and for-hire captain and crew bag limits for dolphin. As we all know, measures in this amendment would extend the applicable geographic range of the minimum size limit, as well as modify recreational retention limits and remove captain and crew bag limits for dolphin. The committee reviewed an options paper on the amendment and provided the following guidance on the purpose and need statements, as well as the range of options considered in this amendment.

Under direction to staff, we discussed purpose and need. Consistency in retention limits for dolphin off of Florida may be incorporated into the need at a later date, but the committee would like to wait until after the scoping comments are received to make further changes to the purpose and need statement.

When we discussed modifying the applicable range of the minimum size limit for dolphin, that, right now, includes a range of options that would extend the applicable geographic range of the twenty-inch fork length minimum size limit for dolphin to cover the below options that we've had in there of North Carolina, North Carolina through New York, and North Carolina through Maine. This action is intended to apply to both the commercial and recreational sectors. Include sample sizes and PSEs for data used to create Figure 1 that shows the percentage of dolphin under twenty inches observed in the recreational catch.

Action Number 2, modify the daily recreational bag limit for dolphin, the committee instructed staff to include a range of options for a bag limit of two to ten dolphin per person, consider differing bag limits by mode, private, charter, and headboat vessel, remove options that would include a vessel limit or bag limit, whichever is greater, instead of whichever is more restrictive.

Under Action 3, to modify the recreational vessel limit for dolphin, we discussed including a range of options for a vessel limit of twelve to fifty-four dolphin per vessel, to include increments divisible by six, as well as a vessel limit of thirty dolphin. Consider different vessel limits by mode. Add a regional option for vessel limit changes, including off Florida only, and to be asking about potential regional vessel limits during scoping. To include an option that would remove vessel limits onboard charter vessels only. To bring back information to clarify the definition of a headboat, and we need to make sure that that's just clear language about what a headboat in fact is. To remove option that would include a vessel limit or bag limit, whichever is greater, instead of whichever is more restrictive, as we did in the previous action.

Then, in Action 4, modifying captain and crew recreational daily bag limits for dolphin onboard charter vessels, we want to include options for removing captain and crew bag limits for dolphin, consider a regional option only, and one to include off of Florida only. We had no other business in front of this committee.

We have a second motion that is to adopt the following timing and tasks: conduct scoping for Regulatory Amendment 3, with the intent of having the comments ready for review at the December 2022 meeting; and, secondly, to continue developing Reg Amendment 3 for review at the December 2022 meeting. Can I move that on behalf of the committee, or do I need someone else to make the motion? All right. **Well, on behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any objection? Hearing none, the motion is approved.** That concludes my report, Madam Chair.

DR. BELCHER: Don't run away yet. The next report up is Citizen Science, with Kerry again.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, what am I going to do when he's gone, because he's over here telling me what's going on next? Again, yesterday, on June 16, the Citizen Science Committee met, and we got a presentation by Rick Bonney on the program evaluation interview results, and it was a great presentation.

He provided an overview of key findings from the interviews conducted as part of the Citizen Science Program initial evaluation plan. The interviews provided insights from fishermen, scientists, and managers on their level of knowledge about confidence in and trust in the citizen science process of collecting data to inform fisheries resource management. The council found the interview findings informative and were supportive of the continuation of this work.

NOAA Fisheries and the council committed to providing funding to contribute to the survey component of this work, and it's not in the report, but I would like to add that his number-one favorite comment came from Jessica, and his number-three favorite comment came from Dewey, and so we'll have to find out more. You committed to sharing the tape with the council, right? Okay. I'm just making sure you all are awake this morning.

We then heard the highlights about FISHstory, and staff presented key findings and lessons learned from the FISHstory pilot project. The council is very supportive of the continuation of FISHstory. During the discussion, it was noted that the data collected through the project could be informative to assessments. The council supported staff pursuing additional funding for the project and exploring ways to identify and archive additional historic for-hire photos in the South Atlantic region.

Then Julia talked to us about the snowy project update. At the March 2022 meeting, the council provided guidance to work with the Citizen Science Program to explore development of a project working with dealers to gather supplemental commercial snowy grouper length data. Staff presented information summarizing the biological data available through the current data collection programs and things to consider if the council wants to pursue development of a citizen science project working with dealers to gather supplemental length data. Based on the commercial snowy grouper data available through the current data collection programs, and the resources available, the council did not support the continued development of the project idea at this time.

Finally, we heard a brief update on the Citizen Science Program, and time was limited, and Julia gave us a verbal update on the Citizen Science Program and project activities, highlighting work not covered in the other agenda items, and key activities noting were the hiring of a new Citizen Science Project Coordinator, Meg Withers, and the incorporation of red snapper into the SAFMC Release project. Just as a reminder, the citizen science update presentation, that we didn't see, is under Attachment 4 of that committee, and it provides more detailed information. No other business was brought before the committee, and we had no motions, and so, with that -- I'm sorry. Chris, please.

MR. CONKLIN: I have a question. Can we add a field, just to like the Release app, for dealers to be able to start measuring snowy grouper and submitting it into the Release app? Could you write a code and get it up there, so we can go ahead and start, like if we measure them on like a certified board and take pictures? I would be willing to do that, and I know plenty of others that would.

MS. BYRD: So what I will say, right now, is Release doesn't have snowy grouper in it right now, and it's focused on more of released fish. If the council wants to move forward on a project like this in the future, I will say that we're developing kind of the SciFish app to be customizable, where we can build new projects very quickly, and we are building the prototype of that kind of project builder right now, and so it won't be complete until -- The prototype should be done this

summer, and then we're going to move it into production the next calendar year, and so I would say, if the council is interested in us pursuing a project like this in the SciFish app, it would be easy to build a project, once this kind of project builder is complete next year.

MS. MARHEFKA: Any other comments or questions? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: You have dealers that are willing to take the time to try to verify the size of the snowies that are coming in, and is there some other way that we can submit that data, where it would be meaningful? I mean, I don't want to take the time to do it if it's not going to count, but, if there is some way -- Because we're seeing monster snowies, and our boat -- The fish are like twenty to thirty pounds, and we're not catching any little ones at all, and I think that's important, and, if there is a way that that information can be submitted, where it could be used in stock assessments, we would be willing to take the time to do it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I guess I just want to say, in response to Chris and Laurilee, is that, if the council thinks there is interest in a project that would look at recording lengths of kept fish, particularly to provide finer-scale type resolution on sizes and such, even beyond what's necessarily used in an assessment, because that's the whole region, then, you know, stating that would be pretty helpful, I believe, as far as support for SciFish.

You know, ACCSP is actually going to be looking into that, in a meeting coming up, and I always feel it's good, if anyone were to say, well, would this even be used, to say, well, the South Atlantic actually is looking on the horizon and is interested in being able to use that tool and design a specific project to look at say deepwater groupers and get finer-resolution data, and so, if you wanted to come out, Chris, and say that, yes, you support that as a project, I think it would be helpful, even knowing we can't do it today, but, a year from now, we probably can.

MR. CONKLIN: Well, I always have wanted to come out and support citizen science, and I sure would like to see this project come onboard in the next year.

MS. MARHEFKA: Clay.

DR. PORCH: Just to respond to Laurilee's comment, I mean, we do have size information in the assessment, and so, in principle, if the fishery is catching a proportionally larger fish than they used to, that should show up in the data. However, it's certainly worthwhile to get as many observations as we can through this initiative, and then we just look and see how representative those observations are and whether they could be used in the assessment or not, and so it is possible to incorporate it. As you heard during the presentation, there is lots of caveats, and we want to make sure that it's representative, but absolutely we would be interested in seeing it.

MS. MARHEFKA: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: So would you give us the process, or the parameters, that you need, and then we can submit it through email, or how would we get that information to you, where it could be used, because, you know, when they do the stock assessment, I don't know how they determine the size of the fish, but I would think that reporting from the dealers, as to the size of the fish, could be helpful.

DR. PORCH: We do have port samplers that are getting us size information, but the council has a process, and probably Julia is better positioned to answer how we would incorporate the citizen science, unless we were able to set up something where we actually intentionally did supplementary sampling, and, of course, that would require some funding to do that, and so, if it's just coming voluntarily from the dealers or the vessels, it's probably better to go through the system that the council has set up.

MS. MARHEFKA: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: On this discussion, the way I look at port samplers is they're not everywhere, and so your dealers are everywhere, and so, if you've got buy-in from the dealers, with a standardized system, on an app that, hey, this dealer here has got a star by it, and they've been certified, and they're doing these measurements, and they're all up and down the coast and different things, and this is what is coming in from their federal fishermen, to see how that has buy-in, because, as it moves forward with this stuff, there are some regional differences on the size of fish caught.

You know, where you've got larger fish, it seems like there might be less fishing pressure, and, where you've got the smaller fish, they've been picked over, and you probably can get some discernment of where two sectors are fishing, versus one sector, and so I see a utility of getting the dealers that are willing to participate, and maybe going the extra mile to say, hey, I'm certified here, with the protocol, and, if they're on an app, and do some measurements, or whatever needs to be done, and you look on their app and you say, oh, I've got two stars here, and we need to take their stuff down or whatever, or something like that, and that's just me thinking out loud, but there's got to be some other way that folks -- Because 200 pounds is the trip limit, and it ain't -- That is not very many fish, and you've got willing people to participate, that you don't have to worry about funding, and they just want to know the process that they can do this to help, and it would be standardized, or believable, or used.

MS. BYRD: What I was going to say is, you know, we're developing this SciFish app to make it easier for us to be able to develop projects at a lower cost, and so hopefully, again, that will be available next year, and I think one thing that's important to note, or to know, if we were to develop a project like this, is how you all would want the data to be used.

From having informal discussions with the analysts from the last snowy grouper assessment, supplemental length data may not be used in the assessment if there are still kind of enough ages. However, you guys having that data to make management decisions is kind of a different beast, and so I just want to make sure that we're clear about kind of how that data -- The intention for how that data would be used, because that will be really important, going into trying to design a project like this.

Just to speak a little bit, and I think we talked a little bit about it in March, but we have kind of a process set up, when we develop projects, to bring -- We want to bring kind of the scientists, or the people who may use the data, together with kind of fishermen, or dealers, in this case, to develop the project together, and so, you know, the scientists can help make sure that kind of the data will meet its intended use, and the dealers will kind of ground everything in reality, here's what I can do, and here's what I can't do, and so, if the council is interested in pursuing a project

like that in the future, we would kind of follow that process, to try to bring a group of people together to develop the project.

I know that, last time, when we talked in March too, it was very important to bring in state agency folks as well, because I think that the states collect -- A lot of states do TIP sampling, but they also do some other sampling too, and so we've just got to bring all the kind of partners and people we would want together from the start of developing the project.

MS. MARHEFKA: If I may, I think that what I'm hearing is that there is not -- Especially since, most likely, whatever we collect right now would not be used in an assessment, because that's not how they run the assessments, and so going -- Investing extra resources, with that in mind, is not productive right now, but, as we look forward, maybe to this MSE process, and we're looking at the fishery as a whole, and we may do some regional management, and that information may inform our risk, sort of, you know, we're allowed to make our own little determination of risk, and what's happening in North Carolina versus what's happening in -- That information could be helpful to us as a council.

Maybe we kind of put a -- Not necessarily a pin in it, but we let this slide down a little bit, with our next step for snapper grouper management, with the understanding that, for SciFish and looking for funding, the council certainly would support -- You know, in the future, it would be great to have the funding to do this, but with the reality so that everyone understands it, that sending the data -- It's not necessarily going to be used in the stock assessment. Does that sum up sort of the discussion we've had? Go ahead.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think that's true, and I think, as you kind of alluded to, it's important for the council to remember that the stock assessment is one product, and it has one usage. It represents the entire stock over its whole range, and you as a council may want to apply management with a finer-scale resolution, in which case then we're talking about a different data, best science, et cetera, determination.

You may decide that, yes, you need data on a finer resolution for this stock, from this component, that we can get through something like Cit Sci, and you can use it within your management evaluations and your risk determinations and everything that Kerry mentioned, even though it's not necessarily particularly beneficial as an added component of a stock assessment, which covers Florida to North Carolina, and so I think that's important to keep in mind. The stock assessment is kind of the starting point, and you have other needs, when you get into evaluating data for your management decisions and how you want to be more precise in your management than say a stock that's Florida to North Carolina.

MS. MARHEFKA: So, just before we wrap up this committee report, do you need any kind of differing statement from us, other than what we've put in here, in the report, or do you feel like we've had direction?

MS. BYRD: Do you want to get --

MR. CARMICHAEL: I don't think we need a motion.

MS. BYRD: I don't think we need a motion or anything like that. I mean, what I'm taking from this conversation is you guys are interested, potentially, in pursuing a project like this in the future, and so -- But not necessarily right now, just based on resources available and that sort of thing, and so I can kind of add an additional sentence into the report that reflects that.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thank you. Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you. I just didn't want to leave it too pessimistic, regarding how this sort of data could be used in the stock assessment, because it is possible, but it's just the bar is different for a stock assessment, and so Dewey made a great point that our port samplers can't be everywhere all the time, and we just don't have the resources to do that.

At the same time, they're trained to actually sample in a representative way, and so, if we could come up with a program where we were sure the fish houses were measuring all the fish, and not just selectively measuring the big fish, then, conceivably, that could actually be used in the stock assessment, to augment our sampling, and so, again, I just didn't want to leave it on a sour note that it could never be used, but it's just, again, the bar is a little different.

MS. THOMPSON: When you're only unloading 200 pounds of fish, you could just take a video with your cellphone, and make sure that every fish gets weighed, as it's coming off the boat, and it wouldn't be a very long video.

MS. MARHEFKA: All right. I believe that concludes my committee report, Madam Chair.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you, Kerry. At this point, it's 9:41. I'm going to give people fifteen minutes to go and check out, because I know that everybody is on a short timer. That way, we can close out with the plan for upcoming meetings. Be back just right at 10:00.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. BELCHER: Okay. If everybody would please come back to the table, it's 10:00. The good news is we are in the home stretch. We have the FMP workplan review and discussion on some upcoming meetings and then Other Business. With that, John and John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right, and so this is the part of the meeting where we look at our workplan for the coming meeting and give you an idea of how overloaded it is and think about how we prioritize the things that we want to work on, and so this is the updated, revised version, based on the progress that's been made here. Various timelines for the amendments have been adjusted to reflect what we think is most realistic, given where we stand and their progress.

If you look down the thing, we try to get to six projects, and we're at seven projects. We try to get to about eight here in the second one, and we're at twelve, and so we're looking at probably a little extra time than what we really would ideally want, but we do think some of these are possibly not going to take a whole lot of discussion, in some cases, and so, after the work on the agenda, with the Chair and Vice Chair, we believe we can likely get through most of these projects, and we'll probably have to start on Monday morning, early, 8:00 again, and we won't have the luxury of starting at say after lunch on Monday, but then we would plan to be done at lunchtime on Friday.

Some of this, of course, based on the various discussions and things added, will be contingent upon the workload of the staffs and what they can actually get evaluated and analyzed, et cetera, and so, you know, John, I know you went through this in detail, and so if you want to hit on -- Highlight some of the specific changes for them, it might be helpful.

MR. HADLEY: Thank you, John. Sure. I will just go through some of the changes, and I will mention this version is in recent documents, if you want to pull it up on your own screen. Overall, I added 2024, since we're starting to get into the workload that will extend into 2024, and so that's been added since the last time. Kind of moving down the list, we extended the timeline for Regulatory Amendment 35, because it looks like that may take a little bit longer, and I now have that wrapping up towards the end of 2023.

Then, scooting down, looking at Amendment 46, and so private recreational reporting, and I moved that from an orange to a yellow, and so indicating maybe a little bit less of a discussion, or a lengthy discussion, there, and I think the intent, at that meeting, is not to get into specific options, but focus on the AP's feedback, and then you've given them some guidance, and then also perhaps, you know -- Get them to meet again after the September meeting, to give more tailored guidance, based on what they can put together, and so that's going to be a little bit of a less, I think, lengthy discussion, or at least that's the idea for September.

I moved Regulatory Amendment 3 to come back in December, as we spoke about, which does alleviate some of the pressure for the September meeting. I added the dolphin MSE, to indicate that that work is kind of going on in the background, and not necessarily taking up council time, but that work is going on, and then, you know, towards the bottom there, we added the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, as the WECAFC presentation that will likely take place at a special meeting in August, and so that's something that sort of was taken off the council's regular meeting schedule, and it can be handled by a special meeting.

Then I will mention one of the kind of new additions to this, overall, was adding, sort of at that bottom list there, accounting for the typical standard meeting reports that you receive at every meeting, liaison reports, agency reports, staff reports, and accounting for that in your scheduling, as well as there was the addition of a scenario planning presentation in September, and so that's where some of the extra, so to speak, workload came from for September, but I think it's balanced out with some of the decisions that were made this week.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Carolyn, I think the bottom line is the items that are highlighted here, that we're going to plan to do in September, it looks like we can fit them on the agenda, with the limitations that we've discussed and the differences in the planned time on some of these topics. It will be a lot of individual topics for you, and it will be largely two-and-a-half days of snapper grouper discussion during the meeting, and so it will be a very heavy Snapper Grouper Committee meeting, but we're cautiously optimistic, as we like to say, that this will turn out to be a reasonable plan, without any significant additional changes. Also, keep in mind that we'll have a webinar meeting at some point in there to deal with a couple of these other topics too, and that's certainly helping a lot to be able to manage the workload.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John. Comments from the group on how the schedule looks? Okay. Thanks for laying all of that out.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You've got it, and so then the last thing to look ahead is notice in December, just a little bit farther, and we have a lot of As, and that's great. That's a lot of things that we're hoping to get to final approval and move on. If we can pull that off, then we will be in good shape for the new things that are coming on, such as the upcoming assessments, and we've got the yellowtail and Spanish that we're starting to dip our toes into here this year, but then we have black sea bass coming in, and scamp later in the year, and so we need to do the best we can to try to get those done and try to keep these existing projects on track, before we bite off too much in the way of new projects.

If we can do that, then I'm kind of optimistic that we have cleared this hurdle that was the result of the changes in MRIP numbers and doing lots of amendments to deal with allocation, and delays from COVID and everything else that really piled onto our workload for this year. If there's no further questions, I can go on to the meetings.

DR. BELCHER: I just have one, and it's just more of a reminder, because just the subtlety difference, and so the As with the question-marks -- We have two of those, and is that just for -- Can you explain that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Those are ones where we're not particularly clear, at this point, of the scope of the project and how long it may actually take for you to work on it, and it's not under a statutory deadline, which gives us a very hard A, in terms of getting done, and so like the ones that you see up here at the top, that are under statutory deadlines, these As are pretty firm, because we need to get those done, and then, these ones that are a little closer to completion, we feel like we've got enough of a handle on the scope and your plans and your timeline to getting it to that point that we're pretty confident in those.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that. Mel.

MR. BELL: Just a question. We're still redline there for September, but you mentioned the webinar and shifting some things to that mode, and does that then decrease those totals you've got, so we're actually not as red as we look right there?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We're still going to be in the red. Probably the bigger concern is just the number of topics that will be brought to you, because that increases your preparation time and your ability to shift gears from one discussion to the next during the meeting, and we think, as far as the time that we anticipate will be necessary for discussion, that we're okay overall, like I said, assuming that we will start on Monday morning, and so you'll need to travel on Sunday, which is certainly not ideal. The getting out of the red lets us get it down to where you don't have to travel on Sunday, but that just seems unavoidable. Mel, you're going to have to get to Charleston on Sunday.

MR. BELL: I will do my best, I promise, and the other thing to keep in mind, just stating the obvious, is we've got so much going on, and it really shows that we need to avoid any kind of last-minute, surprise, hey, can we add this, or can we add that sort of stuff, because we're already maxed-out as it is, just in trying to, as you say, travel on Sunday, and I don't think we want to travel, on the other end, on Saturday, but we're doing the best we can with the workload we have, and so this is just something to always be aware of, and simple additions are not necessarily simple.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that, Mel. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I appreciate the comments so far, and I am concerned that this seems like an extremely heavy schedule for the council, and I think the two things that come to mind, for me, and I think we need to continue working on, are commercial logbooks, but, with the Gulf Council, that might necessitate more time, and I don't think that necessarily comes off of September, but we need to kind of think carefully about that, and then, with wreckfish, I know that you're having a meeting with the wreckfish shareholders, but, if we need time on the council agenda for September, that, to me, is a lower priority than the other actions that are on this list at this point.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Andy. Other comments for John, for the Johns? Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The next item is the upcoming meetings, and I had a few things, and I just wanted to highlight a few late additions. This is our regular review of everything that's coming up. As you can see, there's a lot of stuff coming up this year, if you've looked ahead, in particularly the fall. There's a lot of AP meetings, and remember we're trying to make sure that all our AP meetings meet once a year, and some of these have not met in a while, and so I think that's time well spent, to get up with those, but I will also add that there will be the Rec Permitting and Reporting AP fit in for August, and I haven't scheduled that yet, but, based on your guidance, we will get on that right away.

Remember that the SSC is meeting on August 4, where they will look at the Spanish and yellowtail stock assessments, and so we've been awaiting that meeting for a long time, and we're glad to see that happening, and then October, as I mentioned, there's a lot going on in October, and it's going to be a busy month, and it turns out that November is going to be a pretty busy month as well, leading into our council meeting in Wrightsville Beach in early December. Then, down the list, you have the 2023 meeting locations and when and where we are going. Any questions about upcoming?

DR. BELCHER: Just for November, the reminder about the CMOD.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We do have a group that's going to the CMOD, and this is a training being hosted by the CCC, and they're going to be looking at ecosystem-based fisheries management.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Laurilee and then Monica.

MS. THOMPSON: I don't see the golden tilefish endorsement holders meeting, and have we ever picked a date for that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we just have created that, and so, no, we haven't set that up, but it's something that we would look at trying to fit in somewhere, starting with them and seeing when works for them, in terms of general timing.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you. Yes, they're looking forward to it.

DR. BELCHER: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: John, sorry if I missed this, but would you remind me what the EWE Workgroup stands for again?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's the Ecopath with Ecosim, and so we're wrapping up that project, hopefully. They did -- There were two specific questions they were addressing for the council, and they worked on one last year, and went to the SSC in the fall, and then they're working on the next step of that, and hopefully some things that will feed into the MSE analysis that we're doing from the Ecopath model.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Other questions on upcoming meetings? Okay. Seeing none, the last item on the agenda is Other Business. Does anybody have any other business to bring before the council at this point? Okay. Seeing none, I would like to thank everybody for your flexibility this week. Sorry. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Sorry, but did I miss it? Did we go through the ABC Control Rule already?

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm sorry. I have some motions that I would like to discuss with the ABC Control Rule, since we have a few minutes.

DR. BELCHER: Because it's getting close on Chris's last meeting, he just made the veto for no.

MR. STRELCHECK: Given the ABC Control Rule discussions, to me, it's really important that we talk through this and try to make some headway on it, and I apologize, and I must have stepped away when you talked about that. It's up to the council, obviously.

DR. BELCHER: I guess what's the -- I don't know how to ask the question, because I guess it's the can of worms. We've got -- Most folks are needing to be at the airport, leaving by noon, and so I'm just being sensitive on that time for folks, and so I guess that's to the group's decision, and I am going to leave it to you all, what you would like to try to do. I guess some of the -- The question I would have, Andy, is what would you like to discuss, in particular, and is it something that you feel -- Again, how far down do you think we have to dig to have the conversations?

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I mean, I have four motions teed-up for the four action and sub-alternative actions, and so, I mean, I can walk through it pretty quickly, but the question is, obviously, how much discussion are we going to have around it.

DR. BELCHER: Are folks amenable to that? I'm kind of seeing a little bit of concern, I think, about just re-revving back up again, and so would it be possible for us to hold it off until our potential scheduled meeting, and I guess that's the question, is I don't know what the plan was, as far as notice and all of that, for what we were talking about with the meeting between now and September, which was just going to be the sanctuary and the WECAFC thing, if staff would kind of help. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Just to remind the council, you have approved that amendment for public hearing, and so the intent -- We also are looking to schedule a meeting of the advisory panel chairs, and possibly the vice chairs, rather than, you know, explaining the amendment, which is very

technical, to the entire APs, and so that's coming up, probably in July, and then we'll have a webinar hearing ahead of your September meeting, and so I would not recommend that we bring this topic up during the webinar that we are now scheduling for the sanctuary, and that's likely going to take a couple of hours for that item, and then we also want to hear from, as John said, the WECAFC group, which will probably be another couple of hours, and so we're hoping that we can do half-a-day webinar for just those two topics. I'm afraid, if we bring this into that mix, it could end up being kind of disjointed and a much longer meeting.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Andy, am I interpreting this correctly, that your motions are just to select preferreds and not to make any changes in actions?

MR. STRELCHECK: Correct.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Right, and so, you know, I guess we've talked about how we don't have to go out to public hearings with preferreds, and so it wouldn't impact -- Whether you do this or not wouldn't impact that, and I think it means that it wouldn't make any changes in what you get for September, and I doubt that, if this were done during that special meeting, we could incorporate anything for September, and so it sounds like the best thing to do, maybe, is proceed, as you discussed earlier in the week, without selecting preferreds for most of these.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. I would like to follow that recommendation of staff, and then we can get back into it when -- Again, I just don't -- If the conversation does go, to where there's a good deal of discussion, I would really hate for us to feel like we're rushed, in an hour-and-a-half, to address this, and so I say let's hold off, knowing that we're not dealing with any hard deadlines on it. Maybe we can start, you know, when we go into the committee for the next time, and discussing the ABC Control Rule, we could start with these on the front, or help use it for guidance, as the conversation goes on.

Okay, and so any other business to come before the council at this point? Okay. Seeing none, again, I would like to thank everybody, and I know it's been a long week, and I appreciate your flexibility, but I'm glad that we were able to get through everything with the depth of discussion that we need to advance things, and hopefully we'll see -- I've got Mel, and so Mel is out in the ether too, and let me get him on here.

MR. BELL: I just wanted to thank you, Carolyn, for jumping in and doing such a great job of keeping things going, and you all are happy that I'm not there, because you didn't need to take a gift home with you, and so thanks, everybody, for a great, great meeting. You guys did great, and there was a lot of difficult things that we dealt with, and a lot of honest, open conversation, and I do appreciate it, and I just wanted to make sure that I thanked Carolyn publicly.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Mel. Again, we'll see everybody in September in Charleston. Safe travels home, and hopefully not everybody had cancelled flights. We're adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 17, 2022.)

- - -

Certified By _____ Date _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
July 18, 2022

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

✓ Laurilee Thompson
P.O. Box 307
Mims, FL 32754
(321) 794-6866
thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com

Monica Spirt-Brunello
Dr. Clay Porch
Rick Devictor
Dewey Hermitright

5

Shep Grimes
Dr. Jack McGovern
LT. Pat O'Shaughnessy
Ashley Oliver

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

✓ **Deputy Director - Science**

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

✓ **Deputy Director - Management**

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ **Citizen Science Program Manager**

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net

web ✓ **Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

✓ **Communication and Digital Media Specialist**

Nicholas Smillie
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net

✓ **Quantitative Fishery Scientist**

Dr. Judd Curtis
Judd.curthis@safmc.net

web ✓ **Staff Accountant**

Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator**

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Social Scientist**

Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Allie Iberle
Allie.iberle@safmc.net

SEDAR

web ✓ **Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

web ✓ **SEDAR Program Manager**

Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net

✓ **Administrative Officer**

Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

web ✓ **SEDAR Coordinator**

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

web ✓ **Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist**

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

SAFMC June Council

Attendee Report: Meeting (6/13/22 - 6/17/22)

Report Generated:

06/16/2022 08:28 PM EDT

Webinar ID
778-545-691

Actual Start Date/Time
06/16/2022 07:19 AM EDT

Duration
10 hours 18 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	Aukeman	Trip
Yes	BROUWER	MYRA
Yes	BYRD	01JULIA
Yes	Bell	00 Mel
Yes	Bellavance	00 - Rick
Yes	Berry	James "chip"
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Bonney	Rick
Yes	Bonura	Vincent
Yes	Brame	Richen
Yes	Bubley	Walter
Yes	Buckel	Jeff
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Chaya	Cindy
Yes	Cimo	Laura
Yes	Coggins	Lew
Yes	Collier	Chip
Yes	Conklin	00The Real Chris
Yes	Copeland	00 Bobby
Yes	Cox	Derek
Yes	Curtis	Judd
Yes	Darden	Tanya
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	Dover	Miles
Yes	Drury	Mark
Yes	Dukes	Amy
Yes	Flowers	Jared
Yes	Franco	Dawn
Yes	Franke	Emilie
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Glazier	Ed
Yes	Glazier	Ed
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Gray	Alisha

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

✓ Tom Roller •
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

• Monica Smit-Brunello

• Rick Detrick

• Dr. Jack McGovern

5 LT. Art O'Shaughnessy

• Dr. Clay Arch

• Jamal Ingram

• Steve Grimes

• Dewey Zentright

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

✓ Executive Director

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

✓ Deputy Director - Science

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

✓ Deputy Director - Management

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net

✓ Fishery Scientist

Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net

✓ Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Wes Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

✓ Communication and Digital Media Specialist

Nicholas Smillie
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net

✓ Quantitative Fishery Scientist

Dr. Judd Curtis
judd.curthis@safmc.net

✓ Staff Accountant

Wes Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

✓ Fishery Economist &
FMP Coordinator

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

✓ Fishery Social Scientist

Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

✓ Fishery Scientist

Allie Iberle
Allie.iberle@safmc.net

SEDAR

✓ Public Information Officer

Wes Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

✓ SEDAR Program Manager

Wes Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net

✓ Administrative Officer

Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

✓ SEDAR Coordinator

Wes Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

✓ Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist

Wes Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

SAFMC June Council

Attendee Report: Meeting (6/13/22 - 6/17/22)

Report Generated:

06/17/2022 11:51 AM EDT

Webinar ID

778-545-691

Actual Start Date/Time

06/17/2022 07:30 AM EDT

Duration

2 hours 52 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended

Yes

Last Name

BROUWER

First Name

MYRA

Yes

BYRD

01JULIA

Yes

Bailey

Adam

Yes

Bell

00 Mel

Yes

Berry

James "chip"

Yes

Bianchi

Alan

Yes

Bonura

Vincent

Yes

Calay

Shannon

Yes

Collier

Chip

Yes

Conklin

00The Real Chris

Yes

Copeland

00 Bobby

Yes

Cox

Derek

Yes

Cox

Jack

Yes

Curtis

Judd

Yes

DeVictor

Rick

Yes

Dunn

Tracy

Yes

Flowers

Jared

Yes

Franke

Emilie

Yes

Glazier

Ed

Yes

Gobble

Squat N

Yes

Gore

Karla

Yes

Gray

Alisha

Yes

Hadley

John

Yes

Harrison

Alana

Yes

Helies

Frank

Yes

Hemilright

Dewey

Yes

Howington

Kathleen

Yes

Iverson

Kim

Yes

Jacoski

Greg

Yes

Laks

Ira

Yes

MERRIFIELD

JEANNA

Yes

Malinowski

Rich

Yes

McGovern

Jack

Yes

Mehta

Nikhil

Yes

Murphey

Trish

Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Roller	00Tom
Yes	Schmidtke	01Michael
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Smillie	Nick
Yes	Stam	Geoff
Yes	Strelcheck	00-Andy
Yes	Thompson	00 Laurilee
Yes	Travis	Michael
Yes	Vecchio	Julie
Yes	Walia	Matthew
Yes	Whitaker	David
Yes	Wiegand	01Christina
Yes	Wolfe	Wes
Yes	blough	heather
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	sandorf	scott
Yes	vara	mary