

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **FULL COUNCIL SESSION II**

**Town and Country Inn  
Charleston, South Carolina**

**September 12-15, 2023**

### **Transcript**

#### **Council Members**

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Chair  
Trish Murphey, Vice Chair  
Mel Bell  
Gary Borland  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey  
Kerry Marhefka

Jessica McCawley  
Tom Roller  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Laurilee Thompson  
Spud Woodward

#### **Council Staff**

John Carmichael  
Dr. Chip Collier  
Myra Brouwer  
Julia Byrd  
Dr. Judd Curtis  
John Hadley  
Kathleen Howington  
Allie Iberle  
Kim Iverson

Ashley Oliver  
Roger Pugliese  
Michele Ritter  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
Nick Smillie  
Suzanna Thomas  
Christina Wiegand  
Meg Withers

#### **Attendees and Invited Participants**

Rick Devictor  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. John Walter  
Nikhil Mehta  
Jessica Stephen

Jeff Buckel  
Richard Cody  
Wes Townsend  
David Hugo  
Bob Gill

#### **Observers and Participants**

Other observers and participants attached.

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Town and Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: We're enough ahead that it's kind of causing a conundrum, because we don't have all the available folks or pieces of information ready to go, and so what we're going to do is we're going to jump out of order. We're going to go into Full Council Session II, and we're going to look at topics for the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel and topics for the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel, and so that should take us -- We'll cross the bridge when we get past that, but at least it helps us move things along that we can address. We're going to start with John Hadley talking about the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel, which is Attachment 2 from your Session II folder.

MR. HADLEY: Okay. Thank you, and so in front of you is an attachment, as mentioned, and this is a draft list of topics for the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel. The advisory panel is scheduled to meet for two back-to-back half-days, and so starting around 1:00 on November 6<sup>th</sup> and wrapping up around noon the 7<sup>th</sup>, and so looking at, you know, a day total, as far as meeting time.

What's proposed for the list of topics is in front of you. Included in that is a wahoo fishery performance report update, and so this was put together -- The original FPR for wahoo was put together several years ago, and we have new AP members, and we have an expanded range, geographically, of AP members, and so it would be good to get an update on that. We have an update on the dolphin MSE, management strategy evaluation, and a related discussion, a citizen science update, an update on projects, including the What it Means To Me project, which you will get more information on later on in this meeting, and potentially tying some of the AP members into that effort.

Then some general amendment updates, and so looking at an update on Amendment 3, where it stands, and essentially summarizing the council's discussion on that and intentions, as far as when to take that up again potentially, and then, also, just an update on the private recreational permit that will likely impact some of the AP members and related constituents involved also in the snapper grouper fishery, and so that was what was included, and I'm happy to get any input or add items, or should we take some off, and get your approval of this list of topics.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John, and so is there discussion from the group? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry, but I just had a question, and Tim was distracting me, and so, if you said this, I'm sorry, but the dolphin MSE evaluation update and discussion, is that sort of like what we get, when we get the update and discussion, or will they actually be speaking to the AP as people giving input into the MSE? Do you know what -- Am I making that clear?

MR. HADLEY: Yes, and that's a good question. It really could be whatever the council would like it to be, and I think, the way it's envisioned right now, the Science Center would be giving a presentation along the lines of what you received in June, as far as a summary of the initial workshops that were held and the input that was received and kind of the summary of input all along the coast. There's a report that's being developed that summarizes all of that, and it may be ready around that time, and so it would be a similar presentation to that. As far as any sort of input

that you would want specifically on the MSE, or how the council interacts with the MSE, we can certainly build that into that discussion as well.

DR. BELCHER: Anyone else have questions or discussion or additional topics that we should consider for the advisory panel? Okay. I don't see any further comments from folks, and so thanks, John, I guess. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I am not -- I don't know whether the Dolphin Wahoo AP has weighed-in on space, the closures, or if their fishery is being affected by the space stuff.

MR. HADLEY: We can add that. I don't think they have weighed-in, because we don't have representation from members that are specifically in that area. Now, that doesn't mean that they - - They may fish it from time to time, but we just didn't have members specifically geographically from the Kennedy Center, space center, area, and so that's why that wasn't on there, but we can certainly add it and see if any of them have fished there in the past, and they certainly fish up and down the coast, and so they may still fish in that area.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, I was going to bring up possibly getting an update on what happened at the WECAFC meeting, but I've been informed that, when they met, the dolphin and flyingfish subcommittee did not meet last time, but John, I think, sparked an idea, when he started talking about that.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. HADLEY: I'm not sure what the status will be on the U.S. delegation to WECAFC and how -- How prepared they would be to present to the AP at that time, and so my understanding anyway is that, at the next Dolphin and Flyingfish Working Group meeting, they're going to be discussing essentially how the U.S. delegation may approach it, and the idea now is for them to come to the council in December and provide an update to the council on those efforts and help get some feedback on how the council thinks they may need to proceed or help prepare for that meeting. The point being they were kind of on the December timeline, and I'm not sure if they will be available for the AP, but I could check and see, and, in that case, you could get feedback from the AP ahead of time.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I trust staff's judgment on whether or not they have anything of value to add at that meeting, and, if not, stick a pin in it for the next time the AP meets.

DR. BELCHER: Mel.

MR. BELL: Just a question, and so they're going to get an update and discussion of the MSE, and, this morning, you know, we talked about some things about the MSE, and things to maybe include, or consider, and one of them was changing patterns of fish, or climate-related stuff, and is that part of what -- Are the things that we've talked about that need to be kind of considered in the MSE, is that going to be part of their briefing and the discussion, or is that worth -- I am not

sure what the discussion, or the brief, the update, is going to involve, is all I'm saying, and we kind of had that little discussion this morning, about the importance of considering that, perhaps, and I didn't know if that was worth bringing up.

MR. HADLEY: I think we could certainly tie that in as a specific discussion question under that item, and get additional feedback for the council to consider, and that would be a great addition to the MSE. I mean, that's sort of a general, overarching topic, and so it can be what the council sort of envisions, and so I think that will be helpful discussion from the AP, and we can certainly add that in there.

DR. BELCHER: Anyone else have discussion? Clay.

DR. PORCH: I can imagine that, if it goes before the AP, the issue of stakeholder input would come up, and I'm just wondering, John, what your thoughts were, in terms of standing up that workgroup, that stakeholder workgroup, to inform the MSE and how that would play into this, and I'm still not quite figuring out where that is in the scheme of things.

MR. HADLEY: So that's something that, Clay, you alluded to earlier, at the end of the SEDAR discussion, and that's something that will come up at the December meeting, and so, essentially, as part of the MSE process, the intention, at least, as long as it's okay with the council, is to involve the council in appointing the stakeholder workgroup that essentially meets several times, maybe monthly or bimonthly, to help inform the MSE, as it's developed, and I guess the ask of the council would be to help select the participants for that.

Seeing as there is -- They're going to meet pretty frequently, and so the idea is to go beyond -- Dolphin Wahoo AP members would certainly be encouraged to apply to that, but the idea is to also incorporate others and make sure that they're onboard to essentially sign-on for that time obligation, and so the idea was to appoint, potentially appoint, that workgroup during closed session at the December meeting, when you're appointing your new SSC members and AP members, you know, that SSC and AP selection timeframe that we typically have at the beginning of the December meeting.

The point being is that that will be -- I guess the solicitation and application process for that will be likely completed, or need to be closed, before the Dolphin Wahoo AP meeting, and so the -- Clay, to your question, I think we could inform them of the process, but, as far as directly asking for their input on it, it may be a little late in the process to meet the briefing book deadline for the December meeting, and so it's kind of odd timing, I guess is my point, but we could certainly get their opinion and feedback on that stakeholder workgroup and how they think it could be structured, perhaps.

DR. BELCHER: Other discussion or suggestions? Okay. I don't see anybody else. Anything else that we can do for you, John?

MR. HADLEY: No, and I appreciate that input, and I think we have a pretty good structure to move forward with for the AP meeting this fall, and so thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, John. Okay. Kim, you're up next with talking about topics for the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel.

MS. IVERSON: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for the opportunity to review this agenda. The Outreach and Communications Advisory Panel is scheduled for October 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>, in this very hotel, and so we will be back here at the beginning of next month. I wanted to point out that I did come up with a little more detailed draft agenda, because we had to get a Federal Register notice out for this meeting, and so Spud was kind enough to, as the committee chair, review the agenda, and also Scott Baker, who is the advisory panel chair, from North Carolina, North Carolina Sea Grant, has reviewed it, and staff have provided input as well, and so it's a little more fleshed-out, because our briefing book will actually be posted next week for this meeting. Things are happening fast, and October is already here.

We'll have some welcome introductions, and our advisory panel members remain the same. We don't have anyone that's brand-new on this advisory panel, and the majority have indicated that they will be attending the meeting in-person, which is great. We always like to get together, and we have a few that are going to attend via webinar and a couple that had conflicts and won't be able to participate this go-round, but I have heard from all of our AP members in regard to their attendance.

We have an opportunity to share, at the beginning of the meeting week, or it's the meeting day, sorry, and we'll be meeting all day on the 4<sup>th</sup> and a half-day, or three-quarters-of-a-day, on the 5<sup>th</sup>, and so we've got a lot of information to cover within a short period of time.

I've been in contact with Shelly Krueger, who is with Florida Sea Grant, and, of course, we're all aware of the coral issues and the water temperatures and the issues that have been persistent this summer in the coral and the damage that's being done. Shelly Krueger has been involved with the outreach and communications team effort, and we chatted about this, and I think that our AP members would find that interesting, how they've been collaborating on this reef resilience program, and so Shelly has offered to review that program and share some of their experiences and lessons learned to this point.

I've also been talking with Andrew, Lieutenant Loeffler, and Andrew Loeffler is the chief at the Charleston Training Center for the U.S. Coast Guard, and they have been doing some pulse ops and some other things of interest, and, when I spoke with Lieutenant Loeffler, he asked if he could maybe have time to get some input from our Outreach and Communications Advisory Panel on how to better communicate and get that information out on their operations, and then also get some input from the AP members on timing and when certain events are happening in their areas, where the Coast Guard might want to do some sort of pulse operation, or focus with some of their patrol ops, and so Lieutenant Loeffler will be there as a member of the AP, and he'll get some input, I think, that will be helpful for them from our AP members.

Then, of course, Nicole Nichols, with Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission, will be there talking about the descending device outreach coordination team, and it's been very active, and we did a lot of work towards ICAST this year, and making that event a success, and so she's going to be providing some team updates, and we have a plan team, and a very larger network of communications people, ranging from the Gulf and the South Atlantic.

We'll also be talking about best fishing practices, some programmatic changes, and Christina will give an update to our AP members, and David Hugo, our Sea Grant Reef Fish Extension person,

will be providing updates and introducing himself to our AP members, and then some new projects that you will be hearing about later this week will be brought before the AP members and get their input.

Citizen science, Julia Byrd and Meg Withers will also provide some updates on the program and the projects, including FISHstory, and so I hope you brought some photos to be scanned this week, and Julia and team will be doing some scanning tomorrow, and I believe the intent is to have scanning done, completed, at all of these upcoming AP meetings. The Release project, again, Meg will be providing an update that you'll be getting this week on a participant recognition program that's proposed and then get input for their upcoming projects and program.

We've discussed the habitat blueprint, and I think Myra will be there to give the presentation and update to our AP members, as it relates to communications and the outreach needs as we move forward, and then the mackerel port meetings. Again, it's been discussed this week, and Christina will be updating our AP members and get input from them regarding the planned port meetings, including locations and recommendations from our AP.

On the second day, and that's a big load for the first day, and John Hadley, from our staff, will be talking about Snapper Grouper Amendment 46, which is the private recreational permitting amendment, and talking about the education component, and there are multiple actions currently in the amendment dealing with outreach and education, and so we want to get our AP members involved in that effort and get their recommendations, and, finally, last, but not least, Nick Smillie will be talking about the digital communications update and our website and some exciting things that are happening there, and we'll also get some input from the AP members on our newsletter, our e-newsletter, *The South Atlantic Bite*, and that was their recommendation, to go to that format, and take a look at the e-newsletter and how it's being utilized, and maybe get some recommendations from them. That's it, and that's going to be a busy day, or day-and-a-half, or day-and-three-quarters, and we plan to end by 3:00 on Thursday. Are there any questions? I ran through that fairly quickly.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Kim. Is there discussion for Kim, or suggestions? Obviously, they're working on getting this finalized quickly, since it's already almost distributional format, but does anybody have any insights or thoughts on anything? Any suggestions?

MS. IVERSON: I didn't mean to indicate that you couldn't add things, but it's just, you know, I've done the Federal Register notice, but I put in Other Business, and so, if there's something that you would like to see addressed, if you think about it later this week, please let us know, or let me know, and we'll be glad to address it. Thank you, all. I appreciate it.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you, Kim. All right, and so, I guess, at this point, we're on the wall, right, and there's not much else that we can move up on the agenda, and so we're ending twenty minutes early today, and so we're recessing for the day, and we'll be back at 8:30 tomorrow. Remember we're going to be starting out in closed session to discuss the appointments for the SEDAR committees, and then we'll continue.

UNIDENTIFIED: Unless you want to do that right now.

DR. BELCHER: I mean, that's up to the group, if you want to do it now.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We can do the closed session now.

DR. BELCHER: Let's pull the Band-Aid. Go ahead. What's the consensus of the group? In support? Is anybody opposed? Okay. Everybody is in support of it, and so let's go ahead and do the closed session today.

(Whereupon, the meeting went into closed session on September 12, 2023.)

- - -

SEPTEMBER 14, 2023

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Town and Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Thursday, September 14, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so we are going to pick up with the items that we had not hit on in Full Council Session II, and I know that Monica had asked for some time, relative to the litigation brief, and are you ready to talk about that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Sure, and there's a -- I can give you some summaries of a few cases that you might be interested in.

DR. BELCHER: That would be great.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Do you want me to do that now? Okay. Speaking of red snapper, you got a lawsuit, and I believe you all know, and I think I sent it to Kelly to send to you all, but there was a complaint filed on June 16 from five commercial fishers and dealers, and they filed in the District Court for the District of Columbia, and so D.C., and they challenged the 2023 temporary rule that allowed a limited harvest of red snapper in the South Atlantic this last July. They're also challenging Snapper Grouper Amendment 43, which established that current catch limit, annual catch limit. Remember that you took action, or, actually, Amendment 43 was implemented in 2018, and so they're trying to reach back and litigate that as well.

They're alleging that the Fisheries Service violated the Magnuson Act and the Administrative Procedure Act, by failing to establish an annual catch limit for red snapper that accounts for both landings and discards. The plaintiffs allege that overfishing continues to occur. Because of excessive discard mortality in the recreational sector, and failing to prevent and account for those discarded red snapper, it creates an illegal de facto reallocation from the commercial sector to the recreational sector.

We filed an answer to that on August 14, and we'll be briefing that, meaning we'll be filing our written legal arguments, starting, let's see, I think in October, and then with the last brief to be

filed in January, the beginning of January, and so I will update you on that as things go along, and, if there's anything that comes up between now and then that I think may be of interest in that case, I will send it to Kelly, and he can send it around to you all.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We have questions, Monica. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Monica, is there a link that we can follow along with your response, with the agency's response, your briefs and their briefs, so that we can kind of follow along? Is there a one-stop shop for that, or do we have to just try to piecemeal that together from you or from some kind of source?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, there is, and it's on something called Court Link, but I will send that to you. Let me make a note of that.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I will send you that, so you can follow along with the briefs. I think, that same day, there was a case -- So now I'm going to switch to the Gulf. The Gulf Council passed Reef Fish Amendment 54, which was for greater amberjack, and it established a new rebuilding plan, but it substantially reduced catch limits, in order to achieve the rebuilding plan, and it included reallocation of the catch between the commercial and recreational sectors. It increased the recreational allocation and decreased the commercial allocation. The fishery was also immediately closed with the final rule, because it had exceeded the new amount of catch that was in place, and so two lawsuits got filed on that, and I think you will find these interesting.

They were filed by certain commercial fishermen, fishers, whatever, and I will call them fishers, and the lawsuits, the two lawsuits, have been consolidated in the Federal District Court in the Southern District of Mississippi. Both lawsuits essentially allege that Amendment 54 is an illegal product of a fishery management system that violates the U.S. Constitution and that council members, and certain agency employees, are unconstitutionally appointed officers of the United States, in violation of the U.S. Constitution Appointments Clause.

One of those cases, and it's Arneson is a plaintiff, and the Arneson case -- Essentially, they allege that there is violations of the Appointments Clause, the Vesting Clause, and the Take-Care Clause of the U.S. Constitution and again that the council members, and certain agency employees, are unconstitutionally appointed officers of the United States, which has a special meaning under the Appointments Clause.

The other case, filed by Karen Bell, under AP Bell Fish Company and William Copeland, essentially also asserts really similar kinds of claims, that it violates the Appointments Clause and council members are unconstitutionally appointed officers.

Interestingly, in August, there was two other commercial entities, the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance and the Seafood Harvesters of America, that filed a motion to intervene in those cases on behalf of the Fisheries Service, the federal defendants. That motion hasn't been ruled on, and there has been at least one hearing, because the plaintiffs wanted a declaratory judgment, meaning they wanted it stopped immediately. The court heard that, and didn't rule on

it, and briefs are being filed, in I think kind of an expedited briefing schedule, to get this worked out. Those are interesting, and I think -- Jessica, were you named in one of those lawsuits?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I sure was.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I just found out yesterday that a new lawsuit, on similar grounds, was filed in the U.S. District Court of Maine, by another commercial entity, and they're challenging the New England Fishery Management Council and a groundfish action, and they're also alleging violations of the Appointments Clause, and so stayed tuned. This will be interesting, and we'll find out what happens.

If you remember, on another Gulf amendment that I talked to you about, which was Amendment 53 to the Gulf Reef Fish FMP, there was a challenge to the red grouper allocations, and the Fisheries Service prevailed at the District Court level. You know, they were alleging that there was a violation of National Standard 4 and National Standard 2, all kinds of national standards, and so they appealed that to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, and those briefs have been filed, and oral argument is set for September 27, and so we'll see what happens there.

My last case that I wanted to you about concerns a Freedom of Information Act case, or a FOIA, and that's our shorthand for FOIA, and so there was a decision issued in -- It's called Cause of Action versus NOAA, and there was a challenge to the adequacy of NOAA's search for documents that were responsive to the FOIA request. The original request sought, among other things, correspondence between and among members and staff of the New England Fishery Management Council about the final approval of a -- I will just call it the New England Industry-Funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment.

Anyway, and so a group filed, and maybe it was Cause of Action, was the name of the group, and I'm not sure, but they filed a FOIA request, and so documents were gathered together and given to them, and they didn't think that that was sufficient, and so they appealed that to the District Court. I believe you can take those directly to the District Court.

The court found on behalf of the plaintiffs, and the court said that council members rely on the correspondence they create outside of Full Council meetings and that they are, to some degree, compensated for their work, and that communications specifically mentioned by the court included personal email account correspondence regarding, quote, fishery management plan amendments or motions or some other kinds of things, and so the court said, no, we want those additional records produced.

Effectively, that means that the District Court decided for the plaintiffs, in the sense that now I think fishery management council members from New England are having to go look at their personal emails, and those sorts of things, to see whether they have any documents or emails, right, that comply with that kind of search. Before, I think the agency, and fishery management councils, had relied on a different interpretation of what an agency record is, and so it was if it involved I think an agency staff member, but this is a broader interpretation, and I don't know exactly what's going to happen with this.

I don't think the appeal time has expired, and so I'm not sure if it will be appealed, but I would also expect that the Fisheries Service -- Depending on what happens here, the Fisheries Service

would issue some additional direction to councils and council members, but I wanted you to be alert for that one, and so that's all I have for you today.

I've seen some interesting public comments that threaten litigation, and so there might be more litigation coming on certain amendments that you passed that are going through rulemaking, but I will certainly let you know if that happens.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: What topics were you -- What species were you hearing the threats of litigation on?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Snowy grouper.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then, back on the original lawsuit, or the first lawsuit that you talked about, the Atlantic red snapper, and so one thing has already been filed, and did you say that you guys are filing something else in October, and then a final filing in January, and is that what --

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: We filed the administrative record. We contacted John and Kelly, and they got documents together, and so we filed an administrative record, which, if you remember our discussions, is all the kinds of things that you decided and talked about, and then what the decisionmaker had before him or her to take final action, and so we got that all together, and I think it was at least 10,000 pages or so, and then we filed an answer to the complaint, and so someone files a complaint, and you file an answer, and there's a bit of a, you know, back-and-forth that happens, and I will let you know.

I think the plaintiff's first brief is due October 20, and then we'll file ours, and so I will send you the briefing schedule that the court approved. The final brief will be one that we file, and so they file a brief, and then we get a response, and they respond to our brief, and then we get a final brief, a shorter final brief, and I think our due date for that is something like January 5 or 12, something like that, but I will get you all that information, as well as a link that you can follow along on the arguments.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Monica. Other questions for Monica? Okay. Thank you again, Monica. Moving on down the list, we have Staff Reports from John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Carolyn, and so this is Attachment 1 for Full Council II, and I will, in the interests of time, hit a few highlights here. First, I want to start off with a rundown of the various personal changes that we've mentioned this week, and recall Roger is retiring, and we keep reminding him, but he's pretty excited about it, I think, having served his term and had a long and illustrious career, and we will miss him, but stepping up to take his place will be Kathleen, as we mentioned earlier, and then stepping up to fill in at SEDAR will be Meisha Key, who was here earlier this week and at the dinner on Tuesday, and I hope that folks got a chance to meet her.

Then the last one is Allie, who will be -- She has been promoted to Fisheries Scientist II, and so way to go, Allie. You know, you've seen a lot of Allie. She got some amendments that we thought weren't going to be too controversial, but it turns out they were, and she has really survived trial by fire over the last year, and so well done, Allie.

Just hitting some of the things that are coming, MREP is coming up and, Kerry, you're going, I believe, and so Kerry will be the council member there. Stakeholder meetings, we are working on those. If you remember, we talked about these earlier, and just think of this as another way that we're trying to push that snowball uphill, and dealing with outreach, and trying to find a better way to get communication with fishermen that isn't filled with all the controversies that go with our normal public hearing opportunities and to make sure we have good ways to talk to fishermen, face-to-face particularly, as we use more webinar-type approaches for public hearings, and so this is a work-in-progress, and we'll keep you posted on the development of that and when we want to do them, maybe late in 2024 or early in 2025.

You see there's a lot going on with citizen science. We had a scan night this week, and we're kind of off to a slow start, but there's a lot of optimism that folks are going to bring a bunch of pictures for the AP meetings that are coming up. They are also working on the evaluation of the program, and interviewing is continuing with folks, to get feedback on how that's going, and so we'll be excited to see that come to its conclusion and get some good feedback on how well this program has performed in meeting its objectives.

ICCAT occurred, which, again, is another one of our outreach things, and we really use that to reach tackle shop owners and stuff, who then expand the influence quite a bit, and it's been very successful in that regard, and then the comment was submitted on the advance notice of public rulemaking for National Standards 4, 8, and 9. That was due this week, and we sent it in. I sent you guys around a copy. Just a reminder of the process. If they decide to make rules, then there will be a rulemaking process that will be developing guidance, guidelines, for those National Standards, and we, the advisors, the SSC, et cetera, should have chances to comment on the actual guidelines themselves.

Then the piece I do probably need to spend a little bit of time on is the information on the IRA funding, and so remember this is the Inflation Reduction Act. There is quite a few pools of money that are allotted in this, and this graphic here that's in the report gives you a breakdown, and all those arrows zooming in there on the councils is \$20 million, and so there's \$20 million that is allotted to the councils that I will talk about, and there's also \$20 million allotted to red snapper, and that's Gulf red snapper, just to let you guys know, and that's not something that is likely to come over and have much impact for us, and there may be some indirects that we can feed off that, but, for the most part, that is Gulf red snapper earmarked funding.

There is \$20 million, as I said, that's going to the councils, and the CCC asked for the agency to give up the \$6 million allocated initially and equally to the councils, and the agency last told us that they will probably consider doing \$3 million, and so this will be the first disbursement, \$3 million equally to all eight councils, and each will get \$375,000. The agency would like to get that money to us by the end of Quarter 1 of 2024, which would be the end of this year. They have discussed us councils submitting the proposals of what we would do with this, goals and objectives, budget overview, milestones, by the end of September.

Since we haven't seen any grant proposal information, I don't know that that end of September deadline is going to be reached, but, at some point, they're going to come to us and say, okay, we're ready to go, and we need to know what you're going to do with the money, and then they will disperse that money to us.

The good news is it is over three years, and so we can potentially have this money over a three-year period, and there is also going to then be an additional \$17 million, once we first get out the \$3 million, and there is \$17 million left that will be available to all eight councils on a competitive basis, and so the councils will need to submit proposals that address the items there in those bullets to do projects that achieve those things and can be, you know, big projects or small projects or what have you, to go for a portion of that remaining \$17 million.

The agency would really like to get proposals for that early in 2024, and I think the reality is that none of the councils think that they can come up with, you know, collectively, \$17 million worth of projects and have it submitted by say the first quarter of the next calendar year, and so the good thing though is NMFS does have, for this money and how it's been allotted by Congress, and they do have through 2026 to actually disperse the funds, and so there will be additional time to work on proposals and submit proposals to get this funding, and that's important, because you will notice that one of the bullets in there deals with dealing with climate-related fisheries management planning, which is our scenario planning exercise really that we've been working on, and we may wish to enter into some agreements with the two councils to our north, perhaps, to make progress on those various priorities that I went over earlier in the week.

That would probably take some time to get, you know, three councils on the same page with a project, but I think there's a lot of opportunity that we can collaborate with those guys and keep the ball moving forward on that project, but the most important thing is we probably will not have a time to meet again before we get notice of sending in the proposal for what we'll do with the initial \$375,000, and so I wanted to give you guys some thought of what we have in mind, and talk with the council leadership on this as well.

I really think the first step that we would take would be to contract a temporary staffer, maybe for the duration of this project, depending on how funding goes, who would initially coordinate our scenario planning activities. They would help prepare information to address those various priorities, and they would also be available to help prepare grants to pursue other projects under that \$17 million in funding, and so they would be a bit of a point on contact on this, and just really get our ball rolling on that, because, you know, existing staff would struggle it in with all their priorities, writing new grants and managing new projects and that sort of thing.

The other part is, you know, none of this funding can be used to offset existing salaries or existing operations. This can only be used for new activities that we're doing relative to those bullets there about the things that are allowed, and existing staff could be funded through this, but only if their duties are shifted to do this kind of stuff, and so I can't pay for, you know, salary of one of the plan coordinators to do something under this money. We have to continue to do that within our regular budget. This has to be devoted toward new projects and new activities.

The other major challenge, probably, for us, and I think particularly for our region, is you will notice that these bullets include things like operationalizing fish climate vulnerability assessments, and we don't really have that kind of information, and operationalizing recommendations from climate scenario planning, and I'm not sure if we're ready to operationalize yet, and I hope that, in a few years maybe, that we are ready to operationalize some of that, but the last bullet, where we're starting to develop and advance, may be a precursor to actually operationalizing.

They also expect us to implement management changes to address climate vulnerability, and the timeline on that is that we should have management changes ready to go, implemented, or darned close to it, by 2027, and so there's a pretty strict timeline on this. They want us to get in, do these activities, and get out. Nothing that's done here should require additional funding beyond 2027, and so it's very much a short-term source of funding, directed at a number of climate-related projects, and we're going to do our best to come up with, you know, things that further the various objectives that we have through our research and monitoring planning, through discussions we had on the scenario planning, the identification of those projects.

So we spend some money on this initial staffer, and I think another project would be a data workshop that we talked about, with our SSC and others, to start getting a handle on current and historic ecosystem information, climate response information, and then the other part would be trying to begin to really understand the idea of dynamic reference points, and some of those alternative management measures that we talked about, by digging into the different analytical products that are available through the SSC, through the AP, and then ultimately making its way up into the council, and so that would -- That may result in a pretty good usage of the initial \$375,000, and possibly wash that out.

What we will do now, as far as priorities-wise, is going to depend on the timing. If there's a chance to run this by the Executive Committee, when they meet in late October, we will certainly do that. If we're on a tighter timeline, I'll probably work with the Executive Committee through email, and say here's what we've got, and here's what we're proposing to do with this funding, and then hopefully be able to have a lot more input coming from the council, as we figure out what we do and what we go after, in terms of projects under that other \$17 million.

That's essentially the IRA funding as we know it now, and I think some things are going to happen quickly between now and the end of the year, and we will try to keep you informed, and so, with that, I think, if there's any feedback on potential projects, or any thoughts on things you think would really be good for us to pursue, I would love to hear it.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John. Comments, questions, ideas for John? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: This is just more of a protocol question, but where are you looking -- Who are you looking at for ideas for projects? Is this to the council, the Executive Committee, or, I mean, what's on the table right now?

MR. CARMICHEAL: I think we're probably starting with staff, to get some ideas, and then definitely the Executive Committee, when we meet, and then I envision probably the council in December, and maybe we'll be talking more about this. I hope I know more about the timeline, particularly the \$17 million, and maybe we have an RFP for that, but I think the idea is -- Then also ideas from the SSC and the APs as well, and so anybody really within our family that we can get ideas from would be great.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions or comments or ideas for John? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: John, just because of time savings, maybe we can talk offline, and I mentioned, earlier in the week, that we had a really good discussion with the Gulf Council, and I

think there's some synergies there, and things we may want to take advantage of with what they're potentially going to propose.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions? Okay. Thanks, John. Moving on, we've got the Science Center report, or actually NMFS or Science Center, and first up was a briefing on ongoing system issues at the SERO Permits Office, and so, Andy, that was you.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, and so I think it was the last council meeting that there was a request to get updates on our permits online system. We don't have a presentation, and so I'm just going to walk through some notes that I have. First of all, I wanted to talk about the successes of the system, and so, several years ago, we had end-of-life software, and we had to transition over to a new system. We've done that, and it allows for full submission of permit applications online. We're no longer accepting paper-based applications, and so it's created some huge efficiencies, because it has eliminated the errors, the mailing back of permit information, and so, up until 2022, the longest we ever had without a backlog was one week.

We've had now thirteen months straight where we have a near-zero backlog, and so we are turning permits around very, very quickly. When we had a backlog, we were backlogged thirty to sixty days sometimes, and so a huge success, in terms of the frontend of the system.

What the issue is, it's when we migrated, and the system also connects to and operates other -- It helps with other databases, and so the IFQ program in the Gulf of Mexico is tied to it, and the logbook system is tied to it. We're collecting the data correctly, but the way that the data was structured, and kind of being pulled into the database, is not consistent with how we wanted it to be instituted, and so the systems themselves are not necessarily talking effectively with one another, and I think that's the best way I can put it.

We have taken a number of steps, over the last year-and-a-half or so, to resolve some of those issues, and we do have a few manual processes in place to kind of move data and ensure that data is being consistently input and connecting to those other systems, but where we're at right now is, earlier this year, we convened kind of a team of experts to really do kind of a deep dive and look at how we could restructure the backend database for this system.

They've provided their recommendations, and we've now put together a project team that includes a developer from the Science Center, a project manager from our Headquarters Office, and several staff from my office, and that project team is essentially working toward now implementing a project plan to correct, fix, the backend of the system, so that everything is talking with one another.

We recognize that it's been disruptive, but I did want to convey that, on the frontend, it's working correctly, and we are collecting the data in a manner that will ultimately be able to be used, but the system has not been communicating, connecting, to other databases in a proper fashion to allow us to kind of fully realize the benefits of the permits system, and so one other thing I will add is we're working on wreckfish, and we're working on commercial e-logs, and there's been questions with regard to, well, will this hold those projects up, and there certainly could be a potential that that happens, but my expectation, given the project team's work over the coming months, into early next year, is that we will be able to resolve this well before any sort of final action or

implementation of those amendments takes place, and so, with that, I will take any questions that people may have.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Tim and then Kerry.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for that, Andy. I just want to say, in this last go-round of renewing my permits, I thought the only system worked great. My issues were exactly what you described a little bit, with the logbook being interfaced in, and I just want to give a big shoutout, two thumbs-up, to Anna in the logbook and statistics office. She was great. She got me squared away in a matter of days, and it was unbelievable, and so thanks for that, and I was really impressed with the way the system worked this time, and I will say, also, that some of the issues that I encountered were of no fault of NOAA's, but they rested a little bit more with me. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I don't want to be repetitive, but, since I'm usually the one hammering you, I want to give positive feedback. I also just recently renewed our vessel permit, and, again, the issues were on my end. I wish that I had taken the name of the gentleman that I spoke to, but I did want to say that his customer service was excellent, and there was none of that sort of like condescension that you used to get, and everything worked great, and so I really, really appreciate you paying attention to this, and I appreciate you bringing this back to us, and I know that you listened to us bitch and moan about it, and so I think this might be the end of that journey. It's been a positive experience, and, on behalf of all the fishermen, thank you very, very much.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks to both of you for your kind words, and no one wants the system fixed on the backend more than I do, because we've been working on this challenge for quite some time, and Jessica over there, with our IFQ system, has been front-and-center in trying to help come up with some fixes, and so I will add one other thing.

You may not have noticed, but this does affect permit information that does go into our amendments, right, because of the way that the data is not being housed in the database correctly, right, and we have had now a couple of years where there's a lag, in terms of the information being updated, and so that's another goal, is that, obviously, once we get this fixed, we can update all that information and give you better information for amendments.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions for Andy on permitting? Okay. Seeing none, thank you, Andy. The next item under the NMFS reports is the Protected Resources Update and Biological Opinion Updates, which is Jennifer Lee.

MS. LEE: Good afternoon, everyone. I know it's late, and you guys have had a long day, but hopefully this will be a change of subject anyway. I'm Jennifer Lee, and I work in the Protected Resources Division of the Southeast Regional Office. I am your protected resources liaison, and I try to bring you protected resources issues that you need to know in order to manage your fisheries in the context of protected resources.

I'm here, and I was asked to present to you for the reinitiation of Section 7 consultation on the authorization of the Southeast U.S. shrimp fisheries in federal waters, specifically about giant manta ray and shrimp trawl interactions and some next steps. How I'm going to do that is, first, I'm just going to give you a little context, for those of you that aren't familiar with the 2021 biological opinion that we would be reinitiating, and then, from there, I'll give you some information about the giant manta ray, because I bet you don't know that much about them, maybe, specifically about the trawl effects and bycatch data, and a little bit about smalltooth sawfish, and then next steps and what you can do now.

Anyway, the 2021 shrimp biological opinion analyzed the effects of our ESA turtle excluder device, or TED, regs and the two FMPs, your FMP and the Gulf FMP in the shrimp fisheries under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which is generally called a proposed action. A biological opinion is just the end product of a formal Section 7 consultation process, if you're not familiar, and, if you need any background on Section 7, I'm going to be around today, and still tomorrow, and so I would love to talk to you, if you just have general questions and want some info.

This biological opinion determined the proposed actions not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of sea turtles, sturgeon, giant manta ray, and smalltooth sawfish, and so those are the species that we did anticipate adverse effects on, and we did issue an incidental take statement specifying the amount of incidental take, and I am highlighting here for you giant manta rays, and the biological opinion is good for ten years, and so, over that ten years, we anticipated the 16,780 non-lethal takes, and so averaging about 1,678 giant manta ray per year, but there were not giant manta ray mortalities, because we didn't have any lethal records, and it was, obviously -- Well, I shouldn't say obviously, but it was highly uncertain, based on -- Particularly, it was only really one year of data, and twelve interactions, that those initial bycatch estimates were on. That's because giant manta rays in the past -- Even though the fishery had observed, they weren't identified to species, and so you really didn't have that past information.

Now you know what the bi-op said, and why did we reinitiate it? There were a couple of factors, and, just so you know the basics, basically, we can reinitiate and have to redo a biological opinion if the amount or the extent of incidental take is exceeded, if there's new information revealing effects of the action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered. You know, like maybe you're impacting only one sub-population, or a new publication, but the identified action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to listed species or critical habitat that was not considered in the biological opinion, and so that's like you're changing the action, and it has some impact that we want to look at. Then the last one is the new listed species or designated critical habitat.

Why we reinitiated, we basically triggered a couple of -- There's a couple of reasons. First, again, since the 2021 shrimp biological opinion was completed, we actually have four giant manta ray mortalities that were observed in the observer program. I do want to point out, since you're the South Atlantic Council, those lethal takes that were observed were confirmed in the Gulf of Mexico, but, because we do have take records that are -- The disposition was unknown in the South Atlantic, and certainly the same impacts, in theory, would occur, and so we did reinitiate on both the South Atlantic and the Gulf, and the other reason is new information, and so another trigger.

One is the recent take data in itself, right, constitutes new information, because, you know, we originally thought that it was non-lethal, and now we're saying we actually have mortalities, and

then we also have a couple of new publications, which I will briefly touch on, and, again, it's just some new information that, you know, we need to consider for giant manta rays, and also for smalltooth sawfish, and so, again, no triggers on any other species at this time, and so we're not opening the door, in terms of our sea turtle bycatch estimates for example, and we're just limited, right now, to looking at those two species and their management under the Gulf and South Atlantic FMPs, implementing regulations. I know there are a bunch of proposed ESA rules, which I can touch on later, but, right now, we don't anticipate needing to reinitiate for those, in a formal way anyway.

I said I was going to give you a giant manta ray primer, and I am trying to be quick, because I know you guys are tired, but they're actually fascinating, and it's been really cool learning about them, personally, and so the average size is thirteen feet, and the largest -- They can grow actually up to twenty-nine feet, and so these are -- You know, obviously they make their name, but their sexual maturity is estimated at eight to ten years. They have a low fecundity. They only have one pup every two to three years, and so maybe five to fifteen in a lifetime.

We don't know a lot about their life history and specifics, but there are juvenile nursery areas at the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary and then in the shallow coastal waters along Florida's Atlantic coast. In your briefing book, those two papers, the Stewart et al. 2018 and the Pate et al. 2020, are there if you're interested.

In terms of population status, we did list them as threatened back in 2018, and so it's been about five years, and we -- The listing was primarily due to overfishing in foreign waters, and then also bycatch as the major threats contributing to their decline, and, again, the low reproductive output makes them very vulnerable to depletions, a low likelihood of recovery, and there are only three published regional total abundances in Mozambique, Raja Ampat, and Ecuador. Ecuador is believed to have the largest population of giant manta rays. We do have some preliminary information on the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico, and that's on the order say of about like 48,000 to maybe -- It's based on tagging and then looking at how much time they spend on the surface and accounting for that, and it is preliminary, but it is what we're using in our biological opinion, and so that's why I bring it up.

They are filter feeders, and they primarily consume organisms such as copepods, and they have really unique and super-cool feeding strategies, like barrel rolling and creating feeding chains. They aggregate in various locations and groups, usually ranging from 100 to 1,000, and so I'm trying to pull out just some of the things that might be of use to you in knowing and thinking about how you might interact with your fishery, and so, if you see one, maybe you're going to see a bunch.

These aggregation sites function as feeding sites, cleaning stations, sites where courtship interactions take place, and they exhibit a high degree of plasticity, in terms of the use of the depth and within its habitat, and so they feed at the surface and at night, with descents from 200 to 450 meters of depth, but they're also capable of diving to depths exceeding 1,000 meters.

They are distributed in tropical, subtropical, and temperate oceans. Again, they are commonly observed offshore in oceanic waters, but also in nearshore, highly-productive coastal areas, and so, in your particular region, the predicted highest nearshore occurrence is off of northeastern Florida during April, extending northward along the shelf edge, as temperatures warm, leading to

higher occurrences north, up to like Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, from June to October, and then south to Savannah, Georgia, from November to March, as temperatures cool, and we'll mention that paper later. Then, really, these movements are corresponding with zooplankton abundance and current circulation, seasonal upwelling, seawater temperature, and possibly maybe behavior, but we don't know too much about that.

That just gave you, you know, just kind of the highlights about the species a little bit, to get a feel for things, but, in terms of why they're susceptible, and what we're seeing as far as trawl effects, and so, kind of like some sharks, they are obligate ram-ventilators, and so they have to keep moving to breathe, basically, or aspirate, and so catch in trawls severely restricts that movement and respiration, resulting in asphyxiation, and so, you know, these are big animals, and they get into the trawl, and get down to kind of where the TED is, and there's nowhere to go, and that's kind of -- Then they kind of get compacted against the TED, and so injury and stress can directly influence the ability to survive, and, again, compacted against the netting. Post-release mortality is unknown, but, you know, similar species do have pretty high post-release mortality, and so, you know, that's something we'll be looking into.

Then this is the bycatch data, and so, you know, we only have less than 2 percent observer coverage, and I think it like hovers around 1.6 in the Atlantic, or South Atlantic, area, but, with that, you know, we have observed takes, again, and we started in 2019, when we started with identifying to species, and you can see we have a total of thirty-three now, over that time period, twenty-five in the Gulf of Mexico and eight in the South Atlantic, and, really, the South Atlantic number -- Given the abundance then in that sort of northeast area, that seems a little actually low for what we might expect, but, again, we have this problem, where we didn't assume mortality.

If you just look at the -- You know, just do the simple math, it's 12.1 immediate mortality rate, based on those four years of data, but, you know, obviously, as we get a new -- Either another mortality, or more take, you know, that's not -- It's going to change, based on as we continue to get more information, but that's what it is right now. Then, as far as I was saying, the spatial and temporal observations, and so you'll see in the next slide for the Gulf -- I left the Gulf information in, but just for FYI, but, obviously, we're not spending a lot of time on it.

Off of Louisiana is where the majority of interactions occur, and then Georgia and Florida is where we have the observed interactions in your area, with the most interactions during spring and fall. Something that is important to note is that multiple interactions are occurring on a single trip and at night, and so that's where I was trying to share how, you know, they aggregate, and then the majority of interactions are at depths of less than a hundred feet, and I think the ones in your jurisdiction were even less than fifty feet.

This is just FYI, and these are our Gulf records, and sort of where we've seen them, and the little Xs are the ones that were mortalities, and, if you want to just flip to the next one, you can see, in your region, we have the two individuals in the summer, and then four in the fall, up there off of Georgia, and then the other two are down off of northeast Florida, and so the nearshore area between St. Lucie Inlet and Boynton Beach Inlet in southeast Florida is that area that's been identified as a potential nursery habitat.

This is just to point out, and I'm not presenting the paper, but Farmer et al. did integrate siting and survey effort data, and predictive modeling, and the main point here is just that, actually, the paper

and our observer data are matching up, and so that does -- You know, it predicts, for the Gulf of Mexico, the highest occurrence around the Mississippi River delta from April to June and October to November, and then, off of Florida, it predicted the highest occurrence during April off of northeast Florida, and, again, you can just see that, again, there's that seasonality aspect on the slide that I mentioned, and so -- Yes, and so, really, it's just -- If you're interested, it's in your briefing book, and it just shows how it's kind of tracking our observer records.

That takes us -- I've been talking all about giant manta rays, and I did mention that we also have reinitiated for smalltooth sawfish, and so, if you're wondering why, this relates to a couple of new publications that we're attributing that new information, and so we do have Graham et al. 2022, again in your briefing book, if you're interested, and it highlights trawl threats, and that female sawfish are at higher risk for shrimp trawls, due to their greater overlap with areas of shrimp trawling effort, and that paper actually recommends a closure. Then the other two publications relate to what we know about individual females, and there is only 126 individual females that have contributed to the majority of the juveniles caught off of these sampled nurseries, and so we haven't sampled everyone, but these are the key nurseries that do have sampling.

Anyway, the point of this is, you know, we have presented this information I know to the Shrimp Gulf AP, and we have some next steps here too, as far as waiting for a population viability analysis to be completed, and I think I will just skip to next steps on the next slide.

What we're doing here is, when we do reinitiate a consultation, there's a lot of information that is needed for that consultation, and so we've actually developed a tentative schedule in SF, Sustainable Fisheries, with their action agency hat, you know, and we're working with our Science Center to develop the information necessary to formally initiate consultation, and, like I said, we have -- You know, we've acknowledged that we need to reinitiate, and we've reinitiated, but, in order to really move sort of past that, we do need a lot of information to make that consultation, to have everything we need to actually conduct the consultation.

We're collaborating with you and the Gulf Council, and some key steps are we need to revise -- We need to get some giant manta ray bycatch estimates, based on that recent observer data, and so we are targeting by the end of this year, and there's a smalltooth sawfish viability analysis that's in the works, and we should have that information maybe in early 2024, and then taking longer, or not as far along as the giant manta ray population viability analysis, and these are just documents that look at the potential likelihood of extinction based on current, you know, factors, and so you can kind of plug in things and say, oh well, we know bycatch is this, and what's it look like now, or in the future, if you change variables, is what those are about, basically.

We'll also consider any proposed Shrimp-FMP-driven actions and any shrimp actions of, you know, the Gulf or you take, in response to any data, and so, really, what we're trying to do is, rather than just say we reinitiated, and we'll let you know what it says when we get to it, we're working on really getting the information upfront, sharing with you as we go along, so you can, you know, really track this consultation.

This is a little broader than just shrimp, but, when we talked to the Gulf Council, we were asked sort of what they can do now, and so, you know, when we did that biological opinion on the shrimp fishery, we did send out guidelines on how to release giant manta ray, and all the shrimp fishers got our guidance, but it's also available on the web, and the website is here, and then we also have

guidance for hook-and-line fishermen and how to report commercial discards, and your supplementary discard logbook, for those who are selected, and you can report them there.

In addition to any and all bycatch data, you can report through our smalltooth sawfish line, and the phone number is on the slide, and then you can also talk to our coordinator, and Calusa Horn is our regional giant manta ray species coordinator, and so, as we work through to better understand, we welcome information on encounters and interactions, and that's it for this report that you asked for. I have, after this, I want to just highlight a couple of things that were in the briefing book for Protected Resources update, because it's very stale, due to just the timing.

What I wanted to just share is, one, I wanted to make sure you're aware that we do -- This was not stale in there, but, right now, there is an open public comment period for the green sea turtle critical habitat designation, and it's a proposed rule, and so just you might want to look at that. The public comment period closes on October 17, and there was one public hearing that has passed, but their critical habitat is proposed to occur -- It does overlap with some areas in the South Atlantic, and so there's a sargassum big area that covers basically the EEZ on the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and some of the other -- Related to other layers, or other units, relating to like breeding and things like that, and they also go out to twenty nautical meters -- It's not meters, but it's one of those, and sorry, but, either way, there is some overlap with your council area that you manage, and so just be aware that that's a proposed rule.

Then as another critical habitat is the designation of critical habitat for five threatened corals, Caribbean corals, and so that's in your briefing book. The link actually in the document is still -- Since that page was updated, you'll get the new information, but that's actually a final listing, and so that's a done deal, and there weren't that many changes from the proposed to the final critical habitat for your area, and they did back some of the -- I think, initially, the critical habitat went out to ninety meters, and then it was back down to forty meters, based on some comments from the Florida Keys Marine Sanctuary. That is, anyway, in effect now.

Then the last one that I wanted to just highlight for you is the pillar coral up-listing proposed rule, and that's -- We are proposing to list pillar coral as endangered. That public hearing hasn't passed, and it's September 26, and so I encourage you to join that, and, if you go on our website, it's real easy to just -- You can just search "pillar coral", and it will come up, and you will see how to participate in that, and that public comment period closes on October 30, and so that would be our first endangered coral, and so the different meaning, when corals are threatened, we have to do a special rule to make the take prohibited, and, once something is endangered, it automatically receives those prohibitions, and so that's a difference there that you might want to just check with, but you can talk to me offline about any of this stuff, and I know that you just want to get, probably, to the end of the day.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Jennifer. Questions for Jennifer regarding any of this? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: You included some takes for the manta rays, and did you have any numbers for the smalltooth sawfish?

MS. LEE: We haven't changed the biological opinion smalltooth sawfish estimates, and so those still stand, but we're reinitiating on the basis of this new information that, when we looked at the bi-op, we didn't consider that there might be a potential particular impact on females, as opposed

to just a uniform, you know, take being equal, and so the main reason why we're reinitiating is that not that -- We're not saying that we have exceeded our take, but we're saying that there's some new information out that we didn't consider that warrants further consideration, because it might be having this particular impact on the females, because, you know, our juveniles have been increasing, but they're not necessarily seeing the amount of increase in the juveniles in the adults, and so it's kind of trying to look at that a little more in-depth, and so, like I said, we'll be able to share more information as we get a little further along in getting that reinitiation package, but that's the basis of it, and so the short answer is the bi-op numbers on smalltooth sawfish still apply.

DR. BELCHER: Any other questions? Jessica.

MS. MCCAULEY: Does the green sea turtle designation extend into state waters of South Atlantic states?

MS. LEE: Yes, and I have a whole -- I can even just send it out as an FYI, and I have a presentation, actually, that I didn't give you, but that I have for it, and I would be happy to just share that, but, yes, and, in fact, most of it is -- A lot of it is state waters, but then there's that sargassum larger area, and then the other one is -- Like I said, it's twenty, and so I should just look it up, so I stop stumbling on twenty meters or not.

DR. BELCHER: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: Where are you primarily -- Thank you for the presentation, but where are you primarily seeing the sawfish? What areas?

MS. LEE: Southwest Florida is like the primary area, and they do extend up through Florida, but, yes, and it's sort of like the Everglades is what we always kind of saw as center, like, you know, the center, and core, of the population, and so it's definitely southwest Florida, and the Caloosahatchee River is, you know, a big area.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions for Jennifer? Thank you, ma'am. The next item on the agenda is the Science Center report from Clay.

DR. PORCH: I don't have a formal report today, but I did want to share some news, given that we're getting to the end of the year, and I will touch on IRA and touch on some developments with our budget. First, I want to say the good news in FY23 is we did get a \$1.6 million increase for the SEAMAP program, and that is allowing not only our partners to expand their surveys, but it's also allowing us to expand the video trap survey, certainly north, and maybe, to some extent, south. We've been doing some of the mapping to set that up, and so that's really good news, and our surveys will be improving. Now, that \$1.6 million that I mentioned is for Gulf and South Atlantic, but, yes, it is benefitting the South Atlantic, too.

We also got a \$1.9 million increase for -- I think it's \$1.9 million, but for offshore wind, and so we've been able to expand into that arena, and we've been very proactive in our marine spatial planning efforts, which you've heard some already, and it's definitely paying dividends there for us.

On the IRA front, we received funds that are going to enable us to purchase a roughly hundred-foot vessel and then retrofit it so that we can do our surveys. One of the big challenges we've had, which you probably heard some of, is that we've been unable to maintain all the days-at-sea for our surveys on the big white ships, just because they're getting older and having to go in for repairs, sometimes unexpectedly, and so we'll have an additional vessel that will help us keep those days-at-sea up and conduct all the surveys we need to do, including the video trap survey.

The other pots of IRA funds that are affecting the Southeast coast here, we are able to use some of the funds from red snapper to develop our automated image analysis, and some other camera work development, including acoustic cameras, which is going to allow us to process the video data much faster.

Right now, we have people sitting down and reading videos, which you can imagine is a very laborious task, and so we'll get computers to do it for us, and we've already trained our algorithms in the Gulf to recognize red snapper, I think 99 percent of the time accurately, and so that's already pretty close to being operational. Some of the other species are a little harder, and you can imagine that scamp and yellowmouth are tricky, and they're tricky for humans, and so they're, you know, hard for the computer too, but it's just a matter of getting enough photos and all that you can train the algorithm, but we're making really good progress there, and these IRA funds will help us.

That's only a small fraction of the red snapper IRA, and the bulk is going towards improving our processing of all the various state surveys, help -- Probably some of it will go to helping improve the individual surveys, and it will also go towards getting independent estimates of the discards and effort, but there will be a workshop. Again, this is mostly focused in the Gulf, but there will be some spillover effects for the South Atlantic, but there will be two workshops scheduled for later next year, and we'll develop spend plans for that, how can we best get estimates of discards, particularly for the private recreational fleet.

Some of the money that is funding the federal funding opportunity that Andy spoke to sooner, you guys saw the spend plan for that, that \$1.8 million that was appropriated, and we'll be working with our state partners to try and expand observer coverage on the for-hire fishery, and, as I mentioned earlier, we're looking into the possibility of study fleets and other ways to get a better handle on the discards, and so that's an exciting development.

I did also want to mention, and I alluded to it earlier, that we received permission and funding to hire four positions for the climate, ecosystem, and fisheries initiative, and one of those positions will help us move forward on ecosystem status reports for all the councils, and that would also include climate information, and so I expect, in the next couple of years, we'll make excellent progress there. That would also include helping us develop MSE-vetted harvest control rules that are robust to potential climate effects.

In terms of our base budget, we did get a little bit of an increase, of a little less than 2 percent, and that doesn't, obviously, cover inflation and pay raises and such, and so we are looking at what activities we can curtail, and I do expect, in FY24, fairly level funding, and we're in the process now, to our priority-based resource approach, to determine which activities we need to down-scale and which ones we will maintain, and, hopefully, with the IRA funding, and some other things that I will be able to tell you about later, we'll gain some efficiencies, using automated image analysis

and advanced tech, that will make up for at least some of the loss of manpower that we're expecting to have, and so that's my end-of-the-year report for the Southeast Center.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Clay. Questions for Clay? Okay. All right. We've played catch-up, and we are caught up through what have been -- Mel.

MR. BELL: I apologize that I'm not two or three seats down from you, Clay, and I had to run home real quick, and, given the list of things you went through relative to budget, is there any possibility that, in there somewhere, there could be some funding to help with the -- We definitely appreciate the \$1.6 million for SEAMAP and all, but we're still trying to come up with somewhere around \$1.4 million to finish the retrofits on the new vessel that will support SEAMAP for the next three decades, maybe, and is there any possibility of some at least partial support, or something in any of those categories, or anything you might have, or is that something we could talk to you about later?

DR. PORCH: Do you mean in terms of any of the pots of funding, and so, for instance, could SEAMAP conceivably contribute to that, and, I mean, that would part of the discussions that happen in SEAMAP, in the SEAMAP Committee, and so I would think that would be a possibility. I have my doubts whether we would use the IRA funds for things like that, since there's -- You know, if we went to all the states, there is many, many different needs, and the IRA funds would be exhausted pretty quickly.

The main point of that is to develop transformational technologies, but we did partition a few, obviously, or some of the money to get the Southeast Center set up to have that back-up vessel, because of the declining days-at-sea, but I don't think there is consideration right now for, out of IRA funds, for retrofitting state vessels, but, again, SEAMAP might be a possibility.

MR. BELL: Right, but those are SEAMAP operational funds, I would assume, right, and, I mean, they're designated.

DR. PORCH: Yes, and the way those funds are spent is dictated by the SEAMAP Steering Committee, and we don't -- We guide that process, but there's nothing, that I'm aware of, that says they couldn't use some of those funds to equip a vessel.

MR. BELL: Yes, and we're just looking for, you know, all or partial or anything, and the idea is -- You know, yes, it is indeed owned by the State of South Carolina, but it's a regional asset that supports work, a broad spectrum of work, from, you know, across the whole region, and so it benefits the region, and all the data feeds that come out of it, and so that's why we're -- Yes, we own it, but -- We've put \$1.6 million in it, I guess, already, but we're just looking for some help to try to get this regional asset up and running and in a condition where it will have the legs we need it to have, and the lifespan we'll need it to have, to, you know, carry that work into the next several decades, but, again, I get the IRA maybe not being a total fit, but we're just looking for any help we can, and that's why I just thought I would ask.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions for Clay? Okay. It is ten after five, and we've caught up to where we needed to be this evening. Tomorrow morning, we'll come back into Full Council, and we'll go through the committee and council reports, and we'll go over the workplan, and we'll talk about upcoming meetings, and there's some still open items that we have that will be related to the

committee reports, Snapper Grouper specifically, and so still 8:30 tomorrow, and we will wrap ourselves up then. We'll recess for the evening, and we'll see everybody at 8:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on September 14, 2023.)

- - -

SEPTEMBER 15, 2023

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Town and Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Friday, September 15, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to day five, which feels like day ten today, but, today, pretty much, our agenda is all surrounding our committee reports. For those of you who are committee chairs, the reports for each of the committees are posted online, and so we don't feel compelled to have to do a verbatim read, and it's already out there for consumption, and so you can just basically hit the highlights of what we covered and what the resulting actions or motions were for that committee, and so that will help us with a little bit of streamlining and still give us some time to talk about a few things that are hanging out there in the air.

I am going to start off with the report from Full Council, and we have a couple of items there that we still need to just check-off with the group on, and so we started on Monday, and we had our reports from the different groups within the council, and so OLE, the Coast Guard, state agencies, and the Gulf Council reported out.

We then discussed the commercial electronic logbook amendment, and we passed a motion to approve edits to Option 1 in the comprehensive amendment addressing electronic reporting for commercial vessels. Then we were discussing the codified text, which Monica was going to put some edits to, and Myra was going to go ahead and put that up for us to discuss. Tied to that review, there is a draft motion, and so, after you guys have had a chance to kind of look and see what's going on with the codified text, we can then talk about how we want to move forward, and so Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I just had a quick question about the codified text. I noticed that it always says the "owner and the operator", and, Monica, this is, I guess, for you, but, given that we don't have operator permits in the South Atlantic, I was just curious why the decision is made to always keep "operator" in there, because, at the end of the day, the only person who can really be held responsible for not reporting is the owner, and I can't think of a way that the operator could be dinged for not reporting.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I'm not sure. I think that's something that I could talk with the enforcement attorneys about, because I think they frequently cite owner and operator for a variety

of violations, and so I think this -- I can't tell you the history of why it is that way, but I can look into it.

DR. BELCHER: Other questions at this point? Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Just for the record, the edits that were made to the codified text was to clarify the language about the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP, and there was some language in there that was historic, that needed to be kind of modernized, and then the other thing that was done was to fix the criteria for what happens under a catastrophic condition, right, and so, on Monday, I had mentioned that NMFS would accept paper logbooks under that circumstance, but, in fact, the codified text now reads they may modify or waive reporting requirements under catastrophic conditions, and so those were the two changes that were made to the codified text.

DR. BELCHER: Any other questions or comments relative to the changes that are there? Okay. I'm assuming that everybody had a chance to look at that? All right. With that, Myra has posted a draft motion on the board. Do I have someone who is willing to make that? Kerry.

**MS. MARHEFKA: Approve the comprehensive amendment addressing -- I move that we approve the comprehensive amendment addressing electronic reporting for commercial vessels for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.**

DR. BELCHER: Do I have a second? Mel. Any further discussion on that? Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to clarify that this is a joint amendment, and so the Gulf Council is going to be looking at this at their meeting in October, and so the IPT is still making minor editorial revisions, and we also obtained -- We got the comments from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, a couple of days ago, and so we're going to be addressing those comments, and so I just wanted to make sure it was clear that there will be changes to the amendment in the interim, before the Gulf Council approves it in October.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Myra. Other discussion from the group on this? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just so the council knows, when you vote on this, there will be portions of the motion that -- Well, it's write there I guess, but it gives the staff editorial license, and so I want to make sure that, at least somewhere in the amendment, that it just mentions the catastrophic conditions and that kind of thing, but it will just reflect what you voted on, and so it won't be a big change.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that. Other discussion? Okay. Anyone opposed to the motion as it's currently presented? We'll do a roll call. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair, and so this will be a roll call vote. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Borland.

MR. BORLAND: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Helmey.

MS. HELMEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roller.

MR. ROLLER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Spottswood. Absent. Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: And Chair Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **The motion carries unanimous, with one member absent.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Robert, we've got you.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Yes. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: We can't hear you, Robert. You might have to unmute.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Can you hear me now?

DR. BELCHER: Unfortunately, we still can't hear you, Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I am trying to advise that I vote yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Let the record show that there was a relay, via the webinar, that Member Spottswood voted yes. Thank you, Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you, all.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **So the motion carries unanimously.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you for that. Moving on, we also discussed and received an update from Roger about the East Coast Climate Change Scenario Planning. He presented the different themes that seemed to evolve out of that, and we had a provided list of additional topics for consideration by the council that was presented to us, and so that one in particular is the council is interested in pursuing improved nimbleness, as described in the topic M4, and request a future presentation on management triggers. Permits are an ongoing issue that would require action by NMFS to resolve. Also, we highlighted standardizing data across regions to support shifting distributions, as necessary, and the council also indicated they are interested in pursuing alternative management options despite the lack of regional interest in the topic.

We moved on to the allocation review process, which John Hadley talked to us about the allocation review trigger policy, and, at the end, under general comments, John had a question relative to the allocation review being triggered, and so he has requested a little bit more clarification from the council. John.

MR. HADLEY: Thank you. If you recall, during the discussion, you mentioned that you wanted a feedback mechanism between an allocation review that would then trigger a fishery performance report, and so, since a fishery performance report could trigger an allocation review, it's sort of a circular feedback there, and I wasn't sure, as I captured it in my notes, whether you wanted that to be sort of an automatic trigger or maybe more at the council's discretion.

The reason I bring that up is because you are going to be -- Since all species are going to be reviewed, you're going to have species that are, you know, maybe not as significant, like saucereye porgy, tomate, misty grouper, some species that aren't landed very often, and you're going to be reviewing those allocations, because you have that time-based trigger, that seven-year time-based trigger, where all species come before you, and so I didn't know if you want that -- In that case, you know, if there's that automatic feedback loop, then you're going to be tasking your Snapper Grouper AP with a saucereye porgy fishery performance report, or a misty grouper fishery performance report, and so I just wanted clarification there, I guess, if that would be an automatic trigger, to say, yes, the AP needs to have a fishery performance report for that species, or if you

wanted to it be more at the council's discretion. If the council requests it, then they would create a fishery performance report for those, you know, lesser species, if you will.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, I don't want to make it be overly burdensome, but, in my mind, we've seen plenty of times where you go to the AP to talk about a species, and, all of a sudden, they're like, you know, we're catching a lot of these, and the price went up on this, or we're not seeing any of those, and so, you know, I don't know that you can do a full-blown fishery performance report for saucereye porgy, but some sort of consultation with the advisory panel about what they're seeing in that fishery. I don't know how we would make a decision on allocation without having -- I don't think all of us here have all the information about all the species, and that's why we rely on our advisory panel. Does that help at all? I mean --

MR. HADLEY: Yes, that helps, and maybe, more than sort of the full-blown fishery performance report that we have for the species before they get assessed, we could ask -- We could kind of come to the AP with sort of a modified version of that, a scaled-down version. That way, at least you get the feedback that some of those lesser species, that we think are lesser, they aren't, and, you know, they're important now, and keep up with those trends, and so maybe we can -- We will build that in for the next round. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Just to point out that I included some edits that allow that flexibility, and so, if an allocation review is triggered, the council may consider requesting that the appropriate AP -- I think that retains a little bit more flexibility there, if it's okay with you guys.

DR. BELCHER: Any other comments or suggestions from the council on that? Okay. Thanks, John. Okay. Moving down the report, we received updates on the SERFS and SEAMAP data from Dr. Tracey Smart, and we then spent a good amount of time talking about the Marine Recreational Information Program pilot study briefing, which Richard Cody came and talked to the council about, and we made a couple of motions under this action.

One motion that we made was, during the September council meeting, and prior to the discussion on each of our amendments that utilize the MRIP-FES data, the council will discuss the following: the amendment's dependency on MRIP-FES data; any MSE or federal deadlines required to complete the amendment; and, if the council is interested in moving forward with the amendment, the subsequent timeline or postponing further discussion until the MRIP bias evaluation study is complete. That motion was passed by the council.

The second motion under this topic was, during the SEDAR Committee, the council will discuss the ongoing and upcoming projects requested by the SAFMC, consider the dependency on MRIP-FES, and provide recommendations to be considered at the next SEDAR Steering Committee. The third motion was direct the Executive Committee, at their October 2023 meeting, to reevaluate and prioritize the workload in accordance with the council's actions during the September 2023 meeting to adjust FMP amendment timelines and SAFMC SEDAR priorities in light of the recent notification of possible bias in estimates provided by the MRIP-FES program, and that was also approved.

The next agenda item was the NMFS council governance procedural directive discussion, which Judd helped with the SSC comments for us, and then John helped walk us through current comments. We have a timing and tasks draft motion that's on the board right now that's related to this topic, and so do I have a someone who is willing to make that motion? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I will, but, before that, there's a question down on one of those bullets, and do we need to answer that question before I actually read it into the record? It's about the timing of the report related to the independent surveys.

DR. BELCHER: All right. Correct, and so, yes, the question that's there says, under the request an update from the Science Center on progress to address differences in fishery-independent surveys across regions, and so the -- Currently, differences in fishery-independent surveys across regions currently limit the use of survey information to evaluate climate impacts on fish stocks for the March 2024 meeting, and so when would the council want this? This is more of a timing thing. It more than likely won't be available for March, and so would we want a progress update in March, or what is actually the timing for that, and my apologies for lack of clarity.

MS. BROUWER: I guess what we would like is, Clay, is March of 2024 a reasonable timeline for the council to get that update?

DR. PORCH: The timeline is fine, but I'm just not sure exactly what they're asking for here, and is this something that the council wants to see or wants the SSC to take a look at? You know, first off, okay, fishery-independent surveys across regions, but what do you mean by a "region" here? It may mean one thing to me and a different thing to the council.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: As I recall it, the question had to do with the efforts to deal with the survey differences between the Southeast Region and the Greater Atlantic Region and the Southeast Center and the Northeast Center and the importance of that to the issue of species stock distributions changing and that there's supposedly efforts underway to address the current incompatibilities, because of different historical survey approaches.

My expectation was the council just wants to be kept up-to-date on efforts that are underway to resolve this. I think, at some point, there would be enough progress that there may be things to go to the SSC to comment on this, and it may be something that goes to our SSC, and the other SSCs, and maybe some kind of joint taskforce of the three SSCs could be in the works in the future, but, just for the time being, the council wants an update on this, and, if any council members want any more, I think now would be the time, but that was my understanding of it, just to keep tabs on how this process is going.

DR. PORCH: All right. I mean, that's not a hard thing to do, and, in fact, it's related to the second bullet there, you know, the Atlantic Science Coordination Workshop, and so it probably just could be one and the same presentation.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Right, and so, if that's the case, then it's something we could actually have in December, and do the two together.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Clay. I will let Myra catch up on that. With the modified draft motion, Spud, are you still willing to offer that motion?

MR. WOODWARD: I will be glad to, if I can read it here. **Prepare a presentation of -- I will move the following, to direct staff to do the following: prepare a presentation on management triggers to inform activities related to climate change response for the March 2024 council meeting; request a presentation from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center on status and outcomes from the 2020 Atlantic Science Coordination Workshop for the December 2023 council meeting; request an update from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center on progress to address differences in fishery-independent surveys across regions (Southeast and Northeast) that currently limit the use of survey information to evaluate climate impacts on fish stocks for the December 2023 meeting; finalize comment letter on governance procedural directive; submit a FOIA request to the U.S. Coast Guard to obtain information on the number, frequency, and duration of closures in the EEZ as a result of space-related activities over the past ten years; prepare a letter to support the states' position regarding shrimp imports and the effect they are having on the domestic shrimp industry.**

DR. BELCHER: Do I have a second for that? It's seconded by Laurilee. Further discussion? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Is this where we're going to talk about what we want to do about directing staff to bring back information about things we could with Amendment 35?

DR. BELCHER: That discussion will come up under Snapper Grouper. Is there other discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.** With that, that ends my report for Full Council. Next up is Tom Roller with the report for the Mackerel Cobia Committee.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair. On Tuesday, September 12, the Mackerel Cobia Committee convened, and we went through the following items on the agenda. The first thing is we discussed CMP Framework Amendment 13, and we had a -- We began with a pretty extensive conversation about the error, the potential bias, in the FES program.

The next order of business is we -- The staff presented us with an options paper with draft actions and alternatives, and the committee noted a few major items. There is a small buffer between the overfishing limit, the OFL, and the acceptable biological catch for Atlantic Spanish mackerel, and the committee felt that considering a buffer between ABC and ACL, in addition to setting the two values equal to one another, would be appropriate, and we provided the following direction to staff. It was to add alternatives that would include a buffer between ABC and ACL.

We also -- The committee was also comfortable continuing to utilize the current equation to calculate the recreational annual catch target, but we also request that staff gather input from stakeholders on the accountability measures. It's also important to note that this amendment will not include modifications to sector or regional allocations.

In further discussion, we had the following motions. **The first one was we passed a motion to approve the purpose and need statement.** Does anyone disagree with this motion? **On behalf**

**of the committee, I so move.** We also provided direction to staff to add alternatives that would include a buffer between ABC and ACL.

DR. BELCHER: Again, I'm rusty on these things too, but I think you moved on behalf of the committee right, and then you asked --

MR. ROLLER: Okay, and so on behalf of -- Let's go back to the first motion. **On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any objection? The motion passes.** Thank you. **The second motion was to approve the CMP Framework Amendment 13 for scoping, which was approved by the committee, and so, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

The next order of business was the mackerel port meetings, and we had an update, and a lot of that discussion was just regarding the plans of some of our fellow agencies, like the Gulf Council, as well as the ASMFC. We did provide some additional direction to staff to add EEJ as a discussion topic, to match the goals and objectives.

The next order of business was topics for the fall Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel meeting. I won't read over all of them, and they're available in the committee report, but we did -- We did add it, and one of the things we did add was a presentation on the What It Means to Me program. I should add, and it's important, that, in the mackerel port meetings, we're going to be asking the AP for recommendations on port meeting locations. We didn't have any other business, and so there is none listed, and the last item is I have a timing and tasks motion up there, if anybody would like to make that motion. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I am glad to. **I move that we adopt the following timing and tasks: 1) continue work on CMP Framework Amendment 13, bringing the amendment to the Mackerel Cobia AP for discussion and holding scoping hearings prior to the December 2023 meeting; 2) continue development of port meetings, discussing possible meeting structure and locations with the planning team and Mackerel Cobia AP. Planning team members have been requested from North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida state agencies. 3) convene an in-person meeting of the Mackerel Cobia AP this fall to discuss the topics listed above and note the importance of attendance.**

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Spud. Do we have a second to that motion? Kerry. **Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.** With that, I conclude my report.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure the council was aware, under CMP 13, that you had requested that the amendment include analysis to estimate whether the commercial and recreational sectors are anticipated to experience a closure to Atlantic mackerel under the new catch level recommendations, and the AP is meeting at the very beginning of November, and we may not be able to have those analyses ready for the AP, and so I just wanted you all to make sure that the -- That there weren't going to be expectations for the AP to have the full-blown analysis when they do meet in November.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. The next committee report is from the Habitat and Ecosystem Committee, which is Trish Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. The Habitat and Ecosystem Committee met on September 12, and the committee approved transcripts from the June 2023 meeting and the agenda. The committee also discussed the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council habitat blueprint, and so reviewed that, the job description, and the workplan. Direction was given to staff on approval of the workplan, and there was some direction there, and the following motions were approved.

**Motion Number 1 is approve the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council habitat blueprint.** It was approved by the committee. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? The motion passes.**

**The second motion was to approve the job description, as written. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? The motion passes.**

Next on the agenda, we discussed the Habitat and Ecosystem Advisory Report, which was presented by Stacie Crowe, the acting chair, and the following motions were approved. **The following motion was approved, to approve the revised 2023 beach renourishment and large-scale ocean engineering policy statement.** On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection? The motion passes.**

We also heard from Dr. Jeff Buckel, who is the SSC chair, and he provided a summary report of the SSC review of the deep-sea coral modeling product, and it was deemed adequate to inform management, and was consistent with BSIA, and we also discussed agenda items for the upcoming Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Advisory Panel, and there's a list of agenda items. We do have a draft motion, and, before I read that motion, I just want to throw out to the council if there was a need to have the offshore wind activities in the South Atlantic region on the list. The AP did hear that at the last meeting, and so I wanted to see if there was anybody that any thoughts on that before we went with the motion.

MS. MARHEFKA: You said they saw it at the last meeting? Is there any new information, any substantially new information?

MS. MURPHEY: Not really that I am aware of, and I don't know if Roger wants to add.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, I would say at the discretion of staff and deciding whether or not to include it.

MR. PUGLIESE: Trish, one thing we can do is just go ahead and drop the Carolina Long Bay, because Brian will be there, and he potentially can at least touch on what activities in the broader BOEM areas, if that's desirable, either that or -- It's up to you on what's going on, and I know that the intent is to bring the Long Bay discussion to the North Carolina meeting, but at least, there, he'll be able to touch on it. They will be discussing the policy statement at that meeting, and so at least Brian will be able to weigh-in on all that.

MS. MURPHEY: Any other discussion? So can we strike-through the offshore wind activities?

DR. BELCHER: Is anybody opposed to that? Okay.

MS. BROUWER: Did you mean to strike the entire agenda item or just the Long Bay update?

MS. MURPHEY: Why don't we just drop the Carolina Long Bay update, and just drop that, and is everyone okay with that? All right. Thank you, and so we have a draft motion to approve the list of -- I have a draft motion, if anyone is interested and would like to make that motion. Spud.

**MR. WOODWARD: Move to approve the list of agenda items for the November 2023 Habitat and Ecosystem Advisory Panel meeting.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? Laurilee seconds. Any discussion? **Any objection to this motion? The motion passes.** Then we have one more draft motion for timing and tasks, and so would anybody like to make this motion to adopt the following, the timing and tasks? Mel. Do I have a second?

**MR. BELL: I will read it. I move to adopt the following timing and tasks: Habitat and Ecosystem AP fall meeting planning incorporating approved agenda items; confirm and coordinate with presenters for the fall AP meeting; prepare habitat blueprint workplan for review in December of 2023; add discussion of Lake Okeechobee discharges to workplan for HEAP.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? Jessica seconds. Any discussion? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I know that Laurilee is passionate about Lake Okeechobee and discharges, and I guess I'm trying to figure out what we're going to accomplish by a discussion, right, and is it just more informational? The reason I say that is the Fisheries Service, Fish and Wildlife Service and others, are in consultation with the Army Corps over Lake Okeechobee, the system operating manual and discharges, and so we are -- We've concluded our essential fish habitat consultation, and we're in consulting right now and completing our Endangered Species Act consultation, and so a lot of this is, I guess, being handled within the government, and so, if there's information that could be brought forward, I think that's helpful, but I'm just not sure what the discussion would be for the AP.

MS. MURPHEY: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: My intent with that was impacts to the deepwater corals, to the Oculina reef, because the shrimpers believe that there's been major impacts to the Oculina reef, and we don't even shrimp on the south end anymore, because there isn't even any little animals, and starfish and stuff, that come up in our nets, and there is big -- I don't know if there is still, because they don't fish down there, but we started catching these really ugly -- It was almost like kelp, big, long, rubbery algae thing, and a diver told one of the shrimp boat captains that, oh yeah, we see that same algae around the sewage outfalls down around Fort Lauderdale, the same exact stuff, and so there's a concern, from our industry, that the discharges from Okeechobee have impacted the southern end of the reef, and that was the reason I wanted to put it in there, to see if any of your scientists have seen anything or know anything about it.

MS. MURPHEY: Any more discussion? I am going to call the question. **Does anybody object to this motion? Seeing no objection, the motion passes.** Thank you, and that ends the committee report for Habitat.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Trish. Now we'll move into the SEDAR Committee report, which is covering both the open session as well as the closed session. The SEDAR Committee met on September 12 of 2023. After approving the minutes and the agenda, we discussed the SEDAR Steering Committee report. We went through the SEDAR projects updates, and we covered the statements of work for 2026 projects.

**We produced the following motion, which was to approve statements of work for the 2026 SEDAR projects, as modified. This included snowy grouper and Spanish mackerel, which we asked to develop sensitivities to explore the potential impact of bias in the recreational landings. For dolphin, we asked that it include the following, to ensure the evaluation includes an exploration of the potential impact of the biased recreational landings, evaluate potential distributional shifts or impacts of climate on dolphin, and incorporate fleet dynamics for the commercial sector. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any further discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, this motion passes.**

We went on to the Scientific and Statistical Committee appointments to SEDAR projects, and so this was from our closed session, and we looked at new appointments needed for SEDAR 82, which is gray triggerfish, SEDAR 79, mutton snapper, and SEDAR 92.

**The committee passed the following motion to appoint Kai Lorenzen to the SEDAR 82 gray triggerfish review panel, appoint Steve Turner and Fred Serchuk to the SEDAR 79 mutton snapper benchmark assessment panel, and appoint Steve Turner and Kai Lorenzen to the SEDAR 92 blueline tilefish operational review panel. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any further discussion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

Then we went on to Other Business, and we talked about the red grouper operational assessment and how we received reports, which we'll talk about in Snapper Grouper, about how we were going to proceed forward with that assessment, and we had timing and tasks that came out of the other, and we had an additional motion for consideration. The draft motion was to adopt -- The motion is on the board, and does someone from the committee want to make this motion? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: **I move that we adopt the revised SEDAR projects schedule included in SEDAR project schedule recommended changes document (Figure 3), as the recommended schedule for South Atlantic projects.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Chip, would you be willing to put that table up, just so folks have the ability to look at it one last time? Do I have a second for that motion, to start? Okay. Jessica. We'll go into discussion on it.

DR. COLLIER: Just to let everybody know, you know, there was significant changes, and that's a pretty long document that was put together describing what changes were recommended, and so, from what was provided to you, I think yesterday, or maybe the day before, we did add yellowtail snapper in there, and Jessica had talked with staff at FWRI, and they had indicated that they would

be able to do an assessment for yellowtail and incorporate some of those FES, or State Reef Fish, numbers for yellowtail snapper, as opposed to using FES numbers, and so that was added in as an FWC assessment.

DR. BELCHER: Any discussion from the group? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't have a specific date, but, based on the discussion that we had during the Snapper Grouper Committee, when I believe it was Andy that indicated that, instead of putting it at the back of the line, behind black grouper, that maybe yellowtail can happen sooner, and so, yes, I believe it can happen soon, and that's why it's kind of overlapping mutton, but I don't have specific timelines yet, and that's TBD.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments from the group on the changes to the schedule? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It's more of a question, because I'm just trying to understand how everything happens. Obviously, we're working through gray triggerfish right now, and it will continue as planned, and we will get management advice out of that research track assessment? We will not? Okay. That's what I forgot, and I think you told me that the other day.

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and research track assessments do not provide management advice.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: A question for Clay, because I was asking him a little bit about the triggerfish assessment and having this large gap between the research track and operational assessment, and, if we moved up gray triggerfish to kind of late 2024, or mid-2025, my understanding is we would likely have a pretty solid, you know, preliminary, or maybe even final, results of the pilot study by that time, and we could work in, potentially, that landings data on the backend, and I'm just wondering if we should shorten the gap for gray triggerfish a little bit, but plan for incorporating any FES pilot study results sometime in 2025.

DR. PORCH: You could. It doesn't leave much buffer if it takes a little longer to get the final FES results, but, at this point, we could work around that, as long as it's not juggled around and like, in other words, if we say we're going to schedule it a little bit towards the end of 2025, and then, later, we find out that we don't get the results, and then we try and juggle it around, then it means all the schedules have to be recomputed, and so, once we make that decision, it needs to be pretty firm.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, and I'm partly suggesting it because of trying to keep the research track and operational assessment close together, but I was also looking at the assessment schedule for 2026, and it's extremely busy, and, when they lose an analyst, right, we tend to lose an assessment, and so I'm thinking maybe it would be beneficial to keep a gap in the schedule and move gray triggerfish up, and maybe we move it to more towards the end of 2025, to give a little bit more buffer.

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: Yes, and we definitely would -- You know, I didn't mention it, because 2026 and 2027, which is pretty packed, because, you know, presumably we would negotiate that later, at the SEDAR Steering Committee meeting, because we probably couldn't support the way it looks, but I didn't expect that -- I thought those would be more placeholders, and so maybe we need to make them blue or something like that, so that no one gets the impression that those are set in stone.

I would also mention, while I have the mic, that, presuming that the yellowtail snapper assessment is only just substituting the catch series, there wouldn't be requests for another year of data or something, in which case that could be problematic.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica, did you want to respond to that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just don't know yet, and so I need to work with Luiz, and I haven't had a chance to do that.

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: Yes, and, I mean, it's too late now to ask us to provide, you know, updated information, and, I mean, this is 2023, and so that's now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: 10-4.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. All right, and so back to the motion. Any other discussion on the motion, as currently read? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion passes.** The timing and tasks, I guess we don't really have anything formal, compared to our other ones, and so I guess it's just because, under timing and tasks, we're adding research track, operational, and benchmark assessments, along with management strategy evaluation, to the glossary, and so this is just basically a direction to staff. Okay, and, with that, that is the end of the SEDAR Committee report. Onward to Jessica and the Snapper Grouper Committee.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Madam Chair. The Snapper Grouper Committee met earlier this week, and, after approving the agenda and the minutes from the previous meeting, they went into wreckfish, and we looked at a presentation on the cost recovery program, addressed some questions to Jessica Stephen, and then ultimately deferred additional cost recovery discussions until after the wreckfish advisory group meets next week and provides additional input on the available options.

Then the committee moved into the private recreational permitting amendment, which is Amendment 46, and the committee received a presentation from Dr. Luiz Barbieri, who is the AP chair of this private recreational reporting working group, and then the committee made the following motions.

**Motion Number 1 is to accept the edits to the purpose and need statements. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 2 to remove Alternatives 3 and 6 in Action 2 to the Considered but Rejected section. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 3 to remove Action 3 to the Considered but Rejected Section. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 4, which is to remove Action 6 to the Considered but Rejected section and clarify, in Action 5, that the intent is for the education component to be mandatory. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**The committee then made Motion Number 5 to remove Alternative 2 in Action 8 to the Considered but Rejected section. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion carries.**

All right. Then there was direction to staff on both permit-related actions as well as on the education-component-related actions, and then, also, to ask the Outreach and Communications AP to provide input on developing the education requirement. I'm not going to read all those bullets. Then the committee went into scamp and yellowmouth grouper, which is Amendment 55. Sorry. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Before we moved on from the permits discussion, I think it's going to be extremely important for us, as we continue to make progress on this, and start making preferred alternatives, to bring in a survey design team, right, and to start actually seeing how this could be implemented. I know there was discussion as well, during public testimony, about possibly having some sort of advisory group, and then the logistics of just implementing this, right, from an opt-out standpoint.

I want to mention this now, and I don't think it's going to be ripe for December, but maybe, come March, we're going to want to really start more of the planning for what it would look like to be implemented and making sure we're engaging them. I think one of the shortcomings of the SEFHIER program is we started that process too late, and, ultimately, we were way down the path with council action, and so I just wanted to mention that, and we'll work, obviously, with the council staff, in order to bring that forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sounds good. Thank you for that. Anything else on that amendment? All right. Back to scamp and yellowmouth grouper. There was some direction to staff to add stock determination criteria language to the purpose and need, and there was direction to staff to add an alternative to Action 4 that would set the annual catch limit equal to 95 percent of the ABC, direction to staff to remove Alternative 3 from Action 6, direction to staff to remove Alternative 2 from Action 7, and then there was a few bullets here on direction to staff regarding the other South Atlantic shallow-water grouper complex, to add an action that modifies the complex for the remaining five species, direct the IPT to explore additional options on whether the ACL needs to be modified, have the IPT assess the effects of reducing the catch limit, and the need for management measures to avoid closures, as well as clarifying the retention and current size limit and recreational bag limit for scamp and yellowmouth grouper. Before I move to the next topic and species, any more discussion here? All right.

Seeing none, then the committee moved into yellowtail snapper and gave direction to staff on this amendment, and this is a joint amendment with the Gulf. The direction to staff was to ask the South Atlantic Council SSC to consider withdrawing the yellowtail snapper stock ABC and prioritize a new assessment for the stock, in light of the MRIP-FES pilot study and Florida State Reef Fish Survey. Because this is a joint amendment, also ask the Gulf Council to consider consulting with the Gulf SSC to take the same action. Any more discussion here? All right.

**Then we moved into black sea bass and talked about the stock assessment, and, also, we talked about the ropeless gear workshop that was held in late August and made Motion Number 6, which was to include black sea bass on-demand pot gear in the black and gag grouper framework amendment. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

There was some direction to staff to try to approve this for scoping at the December 2023 meeting, and addressing the management response to SEDAR 76 will be discussed by the council at the March meeting. All right. Then the committee received -- Sorry. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to note that the summary does not capture the extensive discussion we had about the potential for doing something in the interim, from the time we're working on now through the completion of the plan amendment, and that we did talk about possibly discussing that at the March council meeting, after we receive the results from the SSC.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Yes, and I was rereading that bullet, just to make sure it wasn't in there, and so maybe staff can add something to that bullet about consider interim actions, either at or following the March 2024 meeting. Okay. I see Andy nodding yes. Okay. Myra is getting that on the board. All right.

Then the committee received some updates on the System Management Plan Workgroup and best fishing practices outreach, including the details on What It Means to Me, which is a proposed outreach initiative, and the committee was very excited about the What It Means to Me project and provided a number of different points for input and directed staff to ask the Snapper Grouper AP for conversation topic suggestions.

**Then the committee made Motion Number 7 to approve the What It Means to Me project and begin filming at all AP meetings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion carries.**

The committee also received an update on the best fishing practices volunteer program, which is the MVP, and then the committee went into SEDAR 86, red grouper modifications. I am just scanning this paragraph here for anything that we need to talk about. The SSC Chair presented the SSC recommendations for the council to consider transitioning the red grouper assessment to a benchmark, rather than a research track, and this transition will require new terms of reference and new participant appointments. Then the committee discussed --

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Jessica, just a correction there, and it says that it's a research track assessment, and it should be an operational assessment currently, transitioned to a benchmark.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you for fixing that, and I think Myra can fix that. All right. Thank you for pointing that out. All right. The committee also approved a list of topics for the Snapper Grouper AP meeting that will meet in early October, and I'm not going to read all those bullets, and you guys can read them.

**Then the committee also went into Other Business, and so the committee discussed the gag and black grouper vessel limits defined in Amendment 53 and then made Motion Number 8, which is to initiate a framework action to modify the gag and black grouper vessel limit to two fish combined per vessel. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion carries.**

**Then the committee had a lengthy discussion about Amendment 35 and made Motion Number 9, which was to add a discussion of Regulatory Amendment 35 to the December 2023 agenda. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion on this motion? Just a reminder that we also need to talk about direction to staff on the materials that will come back on this topic to the December council meeting. Andy.**

MR. STRELCHECK: It seemed like people were going around and around, and some were changing their decisions, in terms of how to vote, and I would like to request a roll call vote for this motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I need to pass that over to John to do the roll call vote. Do you want me to clarify again what we're voting on here? All right, and so, just to clarify what the roll call vote is on, this is on Motion Number 9 in your document, and this would be, once again, to add a discussion of Regulatory Amendment 35, which hasn't been transmitted to the Secretary yet, to the December 2023 agenda. All right. I'm passing it to John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. Thank you very much. I will proceed with the roll call vote, in alphabetical order. Bell.

MR. BELL: No.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Borland.

MR. BORLAND: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Helmey.

MS. HELMEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: No.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roller.

MR. ROLLER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Spottswood.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: No.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: No.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: No.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **The motion carries eight to five.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, John, and so then now we need to get into the direction to staff on what materials they're going to bring back relative to this discussion, when this is talked about at the December meeting, and so I'm going to open up the floor here. Laurilee, you had actually put your hand up on another committee report, and do you want to start, because you said you had something on this topic.

MS. THOMPSON: Sure. Thank you. Yes, I would like to -- I would like to talk about time and area closures, rotating and not permanent MPAs, and I would like to see them located away from any inlets, so that people in the small boats aren't, you know, penalized, and the for-hire boats aren't penalized, and so they would have to be located away from the inlets, and I guess we need to decide whether -- We need to discuss whether they would be closed to just recreational fishing or to commercial fishing also, and what else? I guess that's it for right now, and we'll see what other people have to say.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee, is that off of all South Atlantic Council states?

MS. THOMPSON: Yes. Yes, that would be for all four states.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I'm on it, and so Robert Spottswood has his hand up. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to see whatever information we can put together before that meeting on what this might look like if we took discards to zero.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so let me repeat that, and so on what this would look like if discards were taken to zero.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Yes, meaning going to some -- You know, whether it's five fish or ten fish, and I'm not sure what that even looks like, but, you know, some boat limit, or per-person limit, and, once that limit is reached, you know, you're done fishing for the day.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so let me clarify that further, and so this was something that Robert talked about during the committee, and so what he's really talking about is what I would call the first fish, and so he was suggesting a first-fish limit on some component of the snapper grouper complex, and he said the first five or the first ten, and he said a possible per-person limit and a possible boat limit, and is that right, Robert?

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Yes, ma'am, and, not to over complicate it, but, you know, staff's suggestion in whether or not there needs to be some distinction in depth of fishing with regard to those rules.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so there are more hands going up here. Kerry and then Laurilee.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, let me say, first of all, on the surface, I love these ideas. I really, really do, and I think that some of these ways are where we're going to be heading. What I do not understand is where anything in this motion fits into our current timing plan. Would we do time/area closures instead of the 35 we currently have existing? Are we going to look at this one-fish thing out ahead of the MSE, which I know is something that we always thought was going to be encompassed, and like I'm confused. We had a solid plan, and granted it's been thrown a little off with this FES thing, but now I don't understand what our plan is at all.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I can -- Let me try to respond to that, and then I'll let Carolyn go, and so I agree with you that we had a short-term, mid-term, and long-term plan, and the MSE was the long-term plan, that would look at some of the things that we're putting up here on the board today, but I also took, from the discussion yesterday, that people were wanting to look at some information that we had looked at previously, or new items, in light of what they heard from the FES discussion, and so, based on what they know about FES, before the amendment is actually submitted, and, ultimately, the committee and council might decide, you know, to tell the Secretary to go ahead and submit this, but what I took from the discussion yesterday was people wanting to go back and look at some of that information, kind of rehash some of those things, make sure that that amendment was what they wanted to submit, or did they want to keep holding that back, if you will, considering the consequences, which we talked about some yesterday with Monica, and, instead, initiate a different short-term or mid-term action, and that's kind of what I took. Okay. I

see one head nodding yes. Kerry, do you want to ask another question, and then I will go to Carolyn to try to clarify more?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and to that point, just because I want to be really clear, and so what could happen is that almost -- Like you're saying, we rewind to where we were at the beginning of 35, where more of these items were included, and it's possible that one of those two options could be our short-term plan now?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess, but I guess someone like Monica would have to tell us how short really is the plan, and how much did we thoroughly discuss one of the previous options, and just some of the procedure for stepping forward, if we were to select something else, and if it was an item already discussed, and already analyzed, does that mean it's part of a short-term plan, or, if we pick something that's maybe a hybrid of something that we previously discussed, maybe we have to start a whole new amendment, and then maybe it's not really a short-term plan anymore. Let me go to Carolyn and then to Mike.

DR. BELCHER: I guess I'm still -- Where I'm still struggling with it, and, again, you can shut me down if this isn't a pertinent discussion point at this time, but back to where we went with this. If we had not heard anything about the FES bias, this amendment would be going through, yet we are trying to address the FES bias, but yet the approaches that we're taking aren't correcting for a bias, and so I'm not really sure -- It's almost like this is giving us the ability to go back into the amendment, to rethink things, because we're just not happy. Like the FES kind of gave us the crack to which we could go back in and pull it apart, and we're backing up, and this is where I'm struggling, is it's back to the three questions that we were working with initially, and we've kind of gotten away from what the FES impact really was doing to this amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me try to speak to that, and then go to Mike, and then go back to the hands list, and so I think we talked about this some yesterday, and I don't know who brought it up, but people, I think, were uncomfortable with the submission of Amendment 35, and so, in light of the new FES information, it sounds like people are saying, well, maybe, based -- You know, in light of that new information, maybe, know that I know that, I know that, I want to talk about this further, as a body again, and reassess the short-term, mid-term, long-term plan and rediscuss some of the items that we had already talked about.

I guess I agree with you that, if this is what you're saying, that we won't have all these new FES pieces, but, in light of this new information, I think, which is why I voted to reconsider it, that it does give us a chance to go back and look at this and think about this, and we had a step-wise plan, and is that still what we want to do? Do we want to change the timing of that? Do we want to look at some of these other pieces that we had previously looked at, and put them into a different bin, or change that up, and so I just see this as there is new information on the table, and we're kind of doing our due diligence to go back and discuss our game plan. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thank you. I just wanted to speak to some of the timing that's been discussed, wanting to highlight that you had actions that were selected when we went out for our public hearing process, and those are the actions that were in the final amendment, and so any type of additional action, regarding something like an area/time closure, something of that, that would need to go back out for public hearings again, if any of that were to be added, and like we would need time to develop it, you know, to develop it more fully, to the level that it would be able to be

in the amendment, and we would have to go out for public comment again, and so that's something to note when you're considering your timing for any changes that you would potentially be making.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that's what I was alluding to, but you said it better than I could, with more specifics, that, yes, if we decided to change the plan, then maybe the action isn't short-term, and now it's mid-term, because you've got to do all these other pieces, because the plan has changed. There were a number of hands. Chip and then Laurilee and then Spud and then Andy.

DR. COLLIER: One of the things I was wondering is could we get a sensitivity with different MRIP estimates for red snapper conducted. There was a sensitivity done in SEDAR 73 that looked at a 90 percent reduction in dead discards, and that resulted in overfishing not occurring. The stock was still overfished, but it did result in a different condition of the stock, and so maybe having a rerun of that sensitivity, just including a change in the discards throughout the entire time series, and then prior to 2010, and you would have a reduction in the recreational landings, and then explore that for the private vessels, to just see what the impacts might be, and that could give you guys a lot of information, I think, and it might not be that heavy of a lift.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that, and it looks like Myra is capturing that. Laurilee and then Spud and then Andy.

MS. THOMPSON: I don't want to use the word "MPAs" in the first bullet, because I think they're permanent, and so it would be rotating closed areas located away from any inlets.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chip is going to help Myra get that up there, and so it's in the first bullet, and she is wanting it edited. "MPA" should just be "closed areas". Okay. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Jessica. I want to wholeheartedly agree with what Chip just described, because I think, for us to have a meaningful discussion on this in December, we've got to have something like that to inform us, and then, ultimately, what is the role of the SSC in this, because the SSC has set an acceptable biological catch based on a set of catch estimates that we're now questioning, and we're not going to have the data in-hand to really understand how that bias may have made itself manifest in those estimates for a year, two years, three years, but, if we have these sensitivity runs --

At what point do we put this back to the SSC for them to reevaluate whether or not the contribution of discards to total fishing mortality was larger than it should have been, and, therefore, the ABC could either possibly stay where it's at, or be somewhere between where it's proposed to be and where it's at, because, as I understand it, the discard mortality is like 90 percent of the mortality, of the fishing mortality, and so obviously it has a very large, pronounced effect on the fishing mortality on the stock.

When do we make sure that what we know different than what we knew then is put in the hands of the SSC, to make sure that they can review it and give us, perhaps, a revised catch level, and I know we've got an assessment coming too, but all of this is sort of swirling around together, and so that's part of what I'm trying to understand, is how do we sequence all of this, to make sure we get the best information we can get to make a decision?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Spud. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: I think, if you get a rerun with a sensitivity analysis, that might lead you to different conclusions, and then you can remand it back to the SSC. You have additional information to say, hey, SSC please look at this again, and we requested this additional run that was not available to you, and so maybe that would encourage them to change their minds or revise some of their recommendations.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm going to go back to my list of hands. I have Andy and then Clay.

MR. STRELCHECK: We've talked about this fish way too much, and so I'm going to bring us back to the sensitivity run that was presented to this council about a year ago, and it was a sensitivity run, and we reduced discards by 50 percent, and we brought it and presented it to the council, and it concluded that the stock was undergoing overfishing and overfished.

Now we're wanting to come back, without definitive information, and we have a preliminary pilot study, and we don't know what the future conclusions of the full-scale pilot study are going to be, and we're kind of going to have to ask the Center, if they're going to run sensitivity runs, to provide a variety of percentages that, at some point, we'll know, after 2024, how close they are, but, at this stage, it will not give us any information, and it won't be based on the best available science, and so, ultimately, I'm not sure what purpose it serves, because I don't think the SSC will have anything to be able to change their recommendation based on that information, and it will just present us the uncertainty around the estimates.

The other concerns I have -- Carolyn made some excellent points, right, and I am struggling with why are we putting this list of activities up on the board if the issue surrounds FES, right, and I am going to say that I'm not willing to put a lot of staff time and effort, between now and December, to address those, given that I gave the council two-plus years of trying to discuss this and got shot down at every chance I was providing, right, and so it's really frustrating to me that you're trying to obligate staff time for a three-month period to bring this back to you for a decision that you're waffling on and trying to make.

Then the other point that I want to emphasize is I feel like we're picking and choosing what we want to ultimately reevaluate, and, yes, Reg 35 is the only one that you haven't submitted to the agency, but there's been no discussion about 49, 51, 52, 53, all of which are either before the agency, or recently made decisions from the agency, or pending decisions from the agency, right, and so we've focused on red snapper, just simply because you haven't submitted it, but the same issue exists for all of those other amendments that you've taken action on, and I haven't heard a whisper about those all meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, we did talk about black and gag, and that amendment is all the way through, and now we have a piece that's coming back, and we're considering another framework action, and so just saying that we have talked about other amendments this week that have been all the way through the process. Back to Chip, to that point, and then I have Clay, and then I have a question as well.

DR. COLLIER: The analysis that was provided to the council was a projection analysis, and it was not a rerun of the stock assessment, and it was looking at a reduction in forward projection of

discards, and it's very different than a historical rerun of the stock assessment. That was only through 2010, and it was not through the entire time series, and it was not changing the entire catch series for the recreational data. It was very limited in the analysis that was conducted, and it was not through the entire time set of the recreational data.

That's what we're talking about with the FES change, and so it's a big concern, and the reason that the council might not be bringing up all these other species is 90 percent of the F for red snapper is coming from dead discards from the recreational fishery. These other species are not having that kind of impact, and so it might not be as big of an issue for the other species as it is for red snapper. This stock assessment is highly sensitive to one of the least-known pieces of information in the stock assessment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Clay.

DR. PORCH: That's not consistent with my recollection, and my understanding is that they replaced the time series all the way through, and so I can double-check on that, but my understanding is they reduced discards throughout the entire time series. That was the point, and, when we had email discussions about that, that's what we were insisting on, and so I think Andy is right, and I can always check with staff to make sure that's what was done. That was the whole point, that, you know, when you have that constant ratio applied back in time, it just scales things up and down, and that's why stock status didn't change very much, and so that's one thing.

Two, I'm pretty sure that council staff won't be running that, and so probably we should change that to request the Science Center, because that's what they would be doing, and then we could discuss the details of how those projections would be done, since there is some disagreement on what was actually done, because it may be that we produced exactly -- In fact, I think it is that we produced exactly what's being requested here, although Chip did allude to some nuance, I think, that I didn't quite follow, but, again, we can talk about that offline. If we've already produced what is being requested, then there's no more work to be done. If there's some subtlety that we need to address, we can talk about how and when.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, and I'm glad that Andy brought up what he did, because, when the results of this pilot study were first announced, I immediately thought about this in three ways. There is what's pending, what's in the future, and what we have already done, and the fact that this bias could, and we won't know until the study is done, but could have created a situation where we made decisions in error in the past, and, you know, I think we're going to have to think about what do we do about that.

I mean, those are done, and they're sort of in the process, in the queue, but, if we do find out that there was a bias in the way various aspects of the stock status determination and subsequent management decisions and allocations were made, then how are we going to address that going into the future? I think we need to put some thought, and, I mean, that's not a part of what we're going to talk about in December, but I think it's part of what we've got to contemplate.

I mean, are we looking at having to go back and undo, or alter, things we've done in the past, because we realize -- Or is that just write that off as history, and you forge ahead? You know, it's

a very real part of my concerns about what this FES bias could, and we don't know yet, and, I mean, I will be the first one to admit that, and we don't know yet, and, until this is dissected down, we won't, but I think we've got to contemplate that there may be an effect on things we've done in the past that will force us to have to revisit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So, first, I will admit that I did not do a deep dive, but I did look back to actions that we had done back to 2018, and the blessing and curse of us not doing a lot of assessments on a lot of species is what has been done in the past is in the process of coming up in the schedule right now, and so it's not as simple -- You know, it's not as complex as something that we set down and we're not going to look at it for ten or fifteen years. It's species that are in the list that we're talking about, black sea bass, red porgy, blueline tile, and, I mean, so we're in the process of bringing these things back to the front, and so we're not that far off.

Again, it's not something that we're really going to have to fight to bring something out of the past, and we're in the process of bringing them back, and so there is at least that subtle benefit to what do we do about past actions.

I struggle with it, because I don't think that there's a -- The solution is going to be not accepted either way that we go with it, and with, like I said, 35, my general feeling was we recognized that it wasn't ideal, but it was getting at something, and the good news was -- Again, I think where some of the semantics too was like, well, we were talking back and forth yesterday, and we were saying that effort needs to be reduced, and so effort, to the average person, means number of trips, number of anglers, and we're reducing that number.

It's not that the F rate is changing, and that's not what we're focusing on, or what the average person is focusing on, and they just know that their number of trips is going down, right, and so we know, somehow, if we're biased -- Again, I'm just going to throw a number out there other than 40, because I'm not resting on that, but 25 percent, and so effort is 25 percent higher than we think it is, and so that says, to me, technically, number of trips is actually 25 percent lower than what we've projected, and so is that not a reduction in effort?

The rate, I get that the rate doesn't change, because, relative to what the values are, all we're doing is scaling them up or down, but, in terms of numbers, that is, again, back to trips and anglers, and that's what we're focusing on. I think 35, for as much as we had the debate over the fact that it doesn't quite get to where we need it to be, is at least making a good-faith gesture, going forward, that we're doing our damndest, and we understand that there's things that we're doing in the interim.

The MSE -- Because, again, I have a feeling, with time/area closures, if you get very species-centric on that, and you're going to start impacting other things, because pressures are going to go away from red snapper, and they're going to go to some other species, which we have no idea what that squeeze is going to be. This is probably one of the few amendments that, again, I can see the pros and cons of both directions, but I don't see what waiting until December is going to get us, based on really the reason we opened it up was because of FES numbers and not to address the other direction, but, again, back in time, a lot of time, a lot of these species are coming to the forefront again, and so I don't think that there's as much peril on those past actions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think that we voted, and, you know, we're going to revisit this in December, and the question is what do we do in December, what kind of information do we have available to us to make a definitive decision about yes or no, go forward or don't go forward, and that's what I think this whole discussion is supposed to be doing, and, as Carolyn has already said, I mean, and Andy said, this is about the FES influence. You know, bringing in all these other things -- Yes, I mean, it may be good to have some kind of general discussion, but that's not going to help us really decide, I think, the fate of 35, but we've made a decision, and so we'll do this again in December and see what happens.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay.

DR. PORCH: I just wanted to come back and kind of bring this back into perspective. This adjustment to FES isn't going to result in the sea change that I think some folks are expressing. We've done many, many sensitivity runs, on many different occasions with assessments, where we just changed the scaling of the catch, and stock status usually does not change much, and the management advice does not usually change much.

The ABC goes down, but the currency you're monitoring in is also going down by the same proportion, and so, in effect, there's just not that much of a change, and so I think we're making a little more of it than we need to, and we certainly can do some sensitivity runs during assessments, just to demonstrate that.

You will recall that we did a lot of alternative assessment runs when we went from CHTS to FES, and that was a much bigger change, and, not only that, but it was not a constant adjustment back in time, and it was an adjustment that attenuated back in time, and so that did have some impacts, but this is a smaller change, and it's a constant change in time, and there will not be as big of an impact as some of you may be thinking. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, and so I see that people are getting up and leaving the room, and let's take a bathroom break in the middle of this discussion, and so let's take a fifteen-minute break, and we'll come back and finish this discussion and finish this committee report.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so I'm hoping that Myra can pull that back up. All right. Just to talk a little bit about where we are, about this direction to staff and discussion and kind of what's going to happen in December, I feel like we're a little bit rehashing everything that we talked about yesterday, which, while that's an exciting discussion, that's really the discussion maybe that happens in December, when this is actually on the agenda, but I want to go to John Carmichael, because I believe he can maybe succinctly summarize what some of the options are for December and possible next steps, and then we can kind of react to that, and so I'm going to go to John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Jessica. You know, I'm just trying to figure out how we best deal with this situation. You have a motion that you want to talk about this amendment more in

December, and, at that point, the gist of the conversation is do you go ahead and submit it or do you begin to make some changes.

Where it would get into some concern is if we start getting into, you know, new information, and a request to bring it in December and that sort of thing, and then, you know, this is a topic that was new business, and we're kind of getting to look like, well, you know, you're saying that you're having this discussion in December, but you're asking for all this new stuff, which kind of looks like maybe you've already -- It's a foregone conclusion that you're going to say that you're not going to submit this amendment, and so you're asking for this. I think it's really going to be more transparent, and better for the public, if we just, at this meeting, leave it at this action, that you're going to reconsider this in December.

In December, there's a couple of ways to go. You could say, you know what, we need to just submit this amendment, in which case we carry on, and you could say, you know, we're not comfortable submitting this amendment, for X, Y, and Z, in which case then it's on you to say, okay, what do you do alternatively, because we have a fishing level recommendation that we need to respond to, and we have an overfishing stock that we need to address, and so there's actions that need to be taken. You need to have a plan for taking those actions, and so that would be one option.

Your other option could be, you know, as part of that, you say, well, we're going to submit Amendment 35, you know, with fewer actions than we're already submitting it with, and so, you know -- Then, at that time, as part of that plan, we can get into what do you want to do, how do you want to respond, and is there more information that you would like, and is there analyses that you would like to have done, and is there things that you want to ask more information from the SSC on, but then at least we're doing it in a meeting, where we said we're going to talk about this topic, and we're having an opportunity to bring this up.

We can also provide you all of the analysis that covers a lot of the issues that we're talking about here that were done as, you know, a couple of years there, where we worked on Amendment 35, and so, you know, in part of the briefing book, and we don't have to put all of that analysis back in there, because it's a lot, and all of those documents, but we can provide, you know, say links in the overview to each amendment, so that, each meeting where it was discussed, and potentially SSC reports and AP, et cetera, so then you can go, you know, and dig into that and find the information that you're really looking for.

It seems a lot better to do it that way, in my mind, than to get into these new topics here and all of that, because no one really was expecting this, and it just maybe doesn't look particularly transparent. We first need to decide what are we even doing with this amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I see heads nodding yes around the table, and I saw, if you are on the webinar or can see the screen, while that discussion was occurring from John, Myra was editing some of the document up there, particularly the part right under the council vote about what the council's intent is and what staff would provide, and so then let me try to do a for-example here.

Then the bullet below, about the time/area closures, that was in one of the previous documents, and so there would be a link to the previous document, and I think that's what John is suggesting, and the only thing that I don't think has been explored in a previous document is the first fish, and

I don't think there's a detailed analysis on that, but, as what John is saying, and let me try to play that out.

So then, first, you would make a decision, at the December meeting, about whether you're submitting 35, or pieces of 35, or you're not submitting it, and then you're going to take a different action, and the action could be to send something back to the SSC, and it could be to request an analysis on X, Y, and Z, including the first fish, but you would make those types of decisions at the December meeting, after you figure out what you're going to do with 35, and does that articulate this? Okay. I'm looking around the table, just to make sure, because I feel like we were getting the cart in front of the horse a little bit, and people were thinking about what they might want to do if we don't do 35, but maybe that's a little premature, because we haven't made the decision on 35, because we couldn't, because it wasn't on the agenda. All right. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I'm just wondering in the report, and should we maybe just be silent on this piece below "Information", because, you know, if we don't get into covering all the stuff that was looked at before, and then, again, if we start getting into new information, and we should -- We've had some ideas here, but I think those would be better served if we actually bring those up in December.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree, and so I guess you could say new ideas, and, I mean, I guess, also, depending on what gets submitted for the RFP that's on the street, or if there's EFPs out there, you might have new information about new ideas about ways to manage differently, but it's premature for that at this point, and we wouldn't know any of that. We might know a little bit about it in December. Okay. Are we good with where we are? All right. I see heads nodding yes, and I see thumbs-up. Anything else that people want to say on this discussion before we leave this topic? I don't want people to feel like they have something burning to say and they couldn't get it out. All right. Judd.

DR. CURTIS: I just wanted to remind the council that the SSC will be receiving a pretty extended review of the MRIP-FES changes that Richard Cody presented to the council earlier this week, and so he's going to be on the agenda first thing in our October meeting, and so you'll get some additional guidance and recommendations coming from the SSC that should be available for your December meeting, probably on a broader kind of level, but, you know, after that, there's more specific species amendments and assessments that, as discussed today for 35, and that could be discussed at a later SSC data as well too, but just to let you all know.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thank you for that. That was helpful, and so I think we're good with this discussion. I appreciate the discussion, and, if we're good to move on, then the next order of business is the timing and tasks motion, if someone would like to make the timing and tasks motion. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, Madam Chair. I would be happy to. **I move to direct staff to do the following: continue to develop Amendment 48, including bringing together the WAG and the WSC to discuss cost recovery, monitoring, participation, and eligibility and provide the committee with an update on the WAG and WSC meetings at the December 2023 council meeting; prepare an Amendment 46 public hearing document for approval at the December 2023 council meeting; continue to develop the BFP MVP and What It Means to Me program and identify possible participants for What It Means to Me during the fall 2023 AP meetings;**

**begin development of a framework amendment that will address the gag and black grouper vessel limit and black sea bass commercial on-demand gear to approve for scoping in December 2023; request the SSC withdraw the stock ABC for yellowtail snapper, in light of the MRIP-FES and SRFS data; request the FWC consider prioritizing the yellowtail snapper assessment to include SRFS data.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The motion has been made, but it looked like Myra edited it a little bit for readability. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Yes, and the second-to-the-last bullet, I have inserted requesting that the SSC withdraw their stock ABC and consider including the SRFS data, and I believe that was the intent, but please let me know if that needs to be edited further.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know that you would need it, because the following motion is about how we're going to rerun the stock assessment with the SRFS data, and so it's not really the SSC, maybe that -- But maybe it's in light of the MRIP-FES data, and, I don't know, and knowledge of SRFS data, and I don't know what to add there. Okay. Data issue, and that we have State Reef Fish Survey data for this species, or something like that. Are we okay with that? Do you want me to reread that bullet?

**Okay, and so the bullet that was edited in the timing and tasks motion was the next-to-last bullet, and it now says to request the SSC withdraw the stock ABC for yellowtail snapper, in light of the MRIP-FES data issue and the availability of SRFS data for the species.** All right. The motion has been made, and do we have a second? It's seconded by Mel. It's under discussion. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just a point of clarity. Will the South Atlantic Council staff be coordinating with the Gulf Council staff in making this recommendation to them, so that it can be withdrawn from the Gulf SSC's ABC recommendation as well?

MS. BROUWER: Yes, and I would look to Judd for that, and I assumed that we would be establishing communication between the two SSCs to do just that.

DR. CURTIS: Yes, and that was a question I had, actually, is, because this is jointly managed, and a joint stock ABC with the Gulf, and it was set in a joint meeting framework, does this need to be rescinded in a joint meeting framework as well between the Gulf SSC and the South Atlantic SSC, or can we just ask -- Can the South Atlantic Council ask the South Atlantic SSC to pull back on that ABC catch limit recommendation on the Gulf, and do the same thing for their SSC, or does it need to be done in a joint format?

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a great question, and I don't know what the answer is, whether it needs to be at a joint SSC meeting or not, and I don't know who would give us that answer. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It seems, to me, that each council has its own SSC, and each council could ask its own SSC to do that. If one decides yes, and the other no, then maybe we can talk about some sort of joint process, but I think this is fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that discussion. Any other discussion on the timing and tasks motion, or any questions or anything here? All right. **Any objection to the timing and tasks motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Is there any other business to come before we end this committee report on Snapper Grouper? All right. Thank goodness the answer was no. All right. Back to Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you, Jessica, and so that completes all of the committee reports. At this point, we're looking at the council workplan with John Hadley. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Jessica slammed the gavel before I could get in, but I just wanted to make mention, again, of the recommendation we got about sort of a private angler advisory group regarding Amendment 46, and maybe can we maybe get staff to start working on a plan of how we would put that group together, and maybe define what our expectations of them are, and I know we had originally kind of talked about, well, we could use the Snapper Grouper AP, but, really, when you look at the composition of that group, it's only I think seven members that sort of represent PR, and so it might be better to have sort of an ad hoc group, and Andy mentioned this earlier, but just how do we move forward with that?

DR. BELCHER: Is that something we could possibly wait until December to talk about, or do we need to do that now? John.

MR. HADLEY: If I could, I think that's a good segue into the workplan. You're going to be discussing -- In December, as with every December, at the beginning of the meeting, you have the closed session where you appoint different workgroups and new AP members, new SSC members, and that may be a good time. If you want to move forward with this group, we could, in the meantime, start working -- Getting a -- Basically soliciting applications and come back to you in December to further discuss that, and, if you want to move forward, go ahead and populate that workgroup at that time, since you do have that morning blocked off to have sort of discussions and appointing various workgroups and APs and that sort of discussion.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Is that the pleasure of the group? Is that okay? Spud is giving a thumbs-up on that.

MR. WOODWARD: That certainly sounds good to me, and it keeps us moving forward.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. John, it's all you.

MR. HADLEY: What I'm bringing up is a revised version of your workplan, and this has been uploaded to the website. I know it's kind of tough to look at the screen here sometimes, because there's a lot of moving parts to it, and so, if you want to follow along on your own device, you can bring it up, and just click on the live agenda towards the bottom, and this revised workplan should come up.

Essentially, what has been done here, and I'm going to go down the list of the various changes and the few items that could use some guidance, particularly since we're looking fairly full for December, and the idea here, I think for this discussion, is to at least get through December, or get through the planning for December, and I think, some of the items down the road, you could sort of perhaps task the Executive Committee with discussing and then coming back in December,

where you typically have your more long-term planning, and come up with a plan there, but I've taken off the September items, and some of the items that are not going to be going on beyond September were removed, to sort of clean up the worksheet a little bit.

I will go down the list here, just to note some of the kind of highlights that have been made. Up top, as you can see, the black sea bass assessment response, that was bumped, and that discussion was bumped to March, and so it does clear up a little bit of time, and that's pending SSC discussion. Moving down, you have your wreckfish ITQ, or wreckfish ITQ modernization amendment, and so Amendment 48. That one is scheduled for June approval, and it may need to slide a little bit more, depending on how much progress the council can make, but just noting that.

You have your private recreational permitting and reporting that will be coming back to you with a public hearing document in December, and then we'll come back to this, but I think we'll need some guidance on perhaps moving the yellowtail snapper assessment, and so Snapper Grouper Amendment 44. I think, if you did want to move that, pending the discussion on the revised and updated stock assessment, that would likely come back to the council in June of 2024, and so that's probably how that would move.

Moving down the list, you do have the addition of a vermilion snapper interim assessment that will be coming to you, and this is part of the SEDAR discussion, which is the reason that was added, and that assessment response will be coming to you in December, and that's another item, if you did want to move it perhaps to March, where there's a little bit more room, and that's something that could perhaps be moved to March, and so basically push that whole timeline back a meeting, and then also added at this meeting was the Regulatory Amendment 36, and so that's that amendment that captures the discussion on gag grouper and black grouper and the recreational vessel limit topic, as well as black sea bass pot ropeless gear.

One thing I will note, and this may be something that would probably a better topic, just because it will take some in-depth discussion to move things around, but there's a few items in here where some of your upcoming stock assessments were added, and so you have the mutton snapper assessment response, golden tilefish assessment response, the unassessed stocks ABC, which isn't really an assessment response, and it's a catch level recommendation review, but that's sort of a block that comes up all at once, and that's tough for the council, and it's tough for council staff, to have really more than two major items, either assessment responses or final approval, in one meeting. It's certainly a lot for the council to go through, and it's a lot for the council chair to review on the approval side, and so I just noted that that's in there, and that's some of the shifting around that maybe could happen between now and December, but I did want to note that that's the way things have sort of stacked up, and that's on there.

Then that covers your fishery-management-plan-related items for December. Moving down the list, we have several of the sort of other topics that will be discussed in December, and you can see that there's a lot of items on there. You have your agency, liaison, and staff reports, and you have your AP and SSC selection, and so that was the topic that I just mentioned, and, within that, you'll be discussing appointments to new SSC members, potentially, and new AP members. Additionally, within that discussion would be planned, and it was mentioned earlier this week, is appointments to the dolphin MSE workgroup, and that's something that has been requested that the council assist the Science Center on, in populating that workgroup, to make sure that you're comfortable with how that has been appointed, both geographically and sector-wise, and so that

would be held during closed session at the very beginning. Also, perhaps that would be where the discussion of populating the ad hoc group of private anglers to discuss the recreational permit in Amendment 46.

Then, moving down, we did add a Habitat Committee, and we basically shifted that from March to December, as noted during the Habitat Committee discussion, and there are several follow-up items that need to be addressed during that committee in December, but it was moved from -- It essentially moved up a meeting, from March to December.

There is the wind energy presentation that has been added, as well as, at the very bottom there, a probably half-day discussion on Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 35, and that certainly seems like a topic that is really a notable topic that takes a lot of time to get through, and really get through that full discussion that's necessary to come to a conclusion, and so that's been added on there.

At the very bottom here, we do have a pretty full, really overly full, workload. The target, again, is eight, and we have been around 8.5, and so, as John mentioned at the last meeting, that's usually your Monday morning, and so start at 8:30, instead of around noon, or 1:00, and so, again, it's a little full at this time.

As far as the pieces that could be moved, and to bring that down, I think that yellowtail snapper piece -- Assuming you want to move forward with the developing the amendment with what would be new catch level recommendations from an updated stock assessment, that could be moved, again, to June 2024, and so we could slide that down, and that frees up one, and that brings it down to 8.5. Seeing as that's fairly full, you could also move the vermilion snapper interim assessment response back to March, and that would bring it down to eight, and that certainly brings it in quite a bit, and really into that target of eight overall.

Some other items that are on there that could be moved, you do have your dolphin MSE progress report update, but we do have -- We do have that on the schedule, and on the agenda, but that's something that is really at the council's discretion, but that's something that you did want to see, per the guidance at the June 2023 meeting, and sort of getting updates on that, on the dolphin MSE, as that moves forward. With that, I will turn it over, and we're really looking for guidance on how to address the December meeting and some of those items that you would be comfortable with moving perhaps to March, where you have a little bit more space on the agenda.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Comments on the workplan? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So I agree that yellowtail -- That all of that can be pushed back, and I still don't have a firm timeline on when, and I think that the vermilion interim could be pushed back, and then I'm also fine on the dolphin MSE, getting an update in March, and so that's just my two-cents, and then isn't the ExCom going to look at this also, at their meeting, and also considering the budget and everything? Okay. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: Others? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm in agreement with Jessica's comments. I guess the two other things I will add is, depending on the outcome of the interim assessment for vermilion, you know, we may

be able to have a shorter schedule for any sort of response to that. The other thing I will note, and unless there was a decision made for the five-year review for wreckfish that it be every five years, and, after you do the first review, it can be a seven-year time period, and so you actually have more time, and so you wouldn't necessarily have to start it this coming year.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments on the workplan? Okay. John, do you have --

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I think this is good guidance for us to prepare this, with these three options, and take that to the ExCom. The idea then is the ExCom looks a little more closely at all of 2024, and into 2025, and try to come up with a good, balanced load, and so I think, you know, we'll see how yellowtail plays out, and also the vermilion response, and we don't know what the SSC is going to do with an interim, if they're going to feel that justifies changing catch levels, and so we may have to sort of play that one by ear, until we get some feedback from them.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just one more question. I know we had a discussion maybe yesterday, and it's all kind of running together, on the ExCom looking at possible projects for the IRA money, and I think we talked about that some yesterday, and is that still on the list for the ExCom meeting?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That is, and, if anybody had any other thoughts overnight, you know, bring them up today, and that would be great.

DR. BELCHER: Any other comments or considerations? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Just a question, and so where will the Amendment 35 discussion that we're going to have -- All right. It's down there. Okay.

DR. BELCHER: Judy, did you have something? You flashed your hand a little bit ago. Okay. Anyone else? Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Just to make sure I'm with the changes that Jessica suggested, does that drop the numbers down to eight? Is eight still high?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's about what we need.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. I was just checking on that. Thanks.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Any other further discussion on that, or suggestions? Okay. Seeing none, we will move down to the next agenda item, which is upcoming meetings. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It fits on a page, and that's good, and so the last bit is just a look ahead. We're in September of 2023, and we have the wreckfish group coming up next week, and then, in October and November, you see we are in our AP run, with most all of our APs meeting over the next few months, into October and November. There is a CCC meeting in October, and we're still waiting to hear the hotel location. The FRN was due Tuesday, and it hasn't been sent in, to my knowledge, and we're having a lot of hotel contract. NMFS organizes this meeting, and it's really been lagging, and so we're still waiting on knowing where we're going to go when we go to that

meeting, and it's also -- Just for some of these other meetings that are coming up, there is a lot of talk about federal travel limitations.

There's two things in play, and one is there's a shift in the grants system that's got them already saying that only essential travel during October, and then there's also the idea of the potential for government shutdowns, which always rears its head during this time of year, and some people seem to think it's likely, and other places we haven't heard so much, and so we really don't know how all of that will play out, but just, as usual this time of year, keep your ear to the ground, and it may affect some of the activities with our federal partners.

Then, at the end of October, we have the SSC, and I would just point out that we're planning FISHstory scan nights during the various APs, and we're hoping to get folks to bring out a bunch of pictures for those, which would be pretty cool. The NRCC that's noted there on November 7, that will be the first meeting of that east coast scenario planning working group, I think, or our coordination group, is the higher level, and so that will be the first meeting. I will be there, and I think Andy is planning to be there, and I hear that even Clay is possibly planning to be there, and so that will be pretty nice, to have a good Southeast team there to deal with our scenario planning plans, as we move forward.

Then, in December, we'll be in Beaufort, North Carolina. Then, if you look ahead to the council meeting weeks coming up, and mark your calendars, and we have dates and locations for that. Any questions about any meetings that are coming up? As always, these are webinars, and registrations are available on the website, and all the briefing materials are available on the website, and, if you're a council member really interested in an AP or an SSC meeting, just reach out to Carolyn and I.

DR. BELCHER: Any questions for John? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: For the APs that we signed up, you know I guess to be a liaison or whatever, and so, for example, the citizen's science meeting that's coming up in October, are we supposed to attend those in-person, or can attend them on a webinar, or what are the rules?

MR. CARMICHAEL: So you can always attend them on webinar. Normally, to the various APs, it's the AP chair, or, I mean, it's the committee chair over that AP that's always preapproved, essentially, to travel. If other members want to go, for some reason or another, that's where you can just reach out and ask.

MS. THOMPSON: But it's okay if we attend by webinar?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, absolutely, and anybody can attend by webinar. All of our meetings are open and transparent, and you, as a council member, absolutely may attend any of these meetings by webinar.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: APs, the SSC, anything else that's going on, as can anybody else that's just interested in the business, and they're all open to everyone, and there is one other meeting that wasn't settled when this was done, and it just wanted to highlight it, and it's the ExCom meeting

that we've talked about a few times, and that's going to be on October 24, and that's actually going to overlap with the SSC a bit. The fall is pretty busy, with ExCom members and everything else, and that's unfortunate, but it's the best that we could do to get that meeting scheduled, and so that will be via webinar, and occur on the afternoon of October 24, and we should get the details of that going up on the website next week.

DR. BELCHER: Any other questions for John about the schedule? Okay. Seeing none, we've got Other Business left, and I had a couple of requests, one from Tim and one from Kerry, and the other is Chip wanted to at least talk with us about asking the council what our thought was relative to the Shrimp AP, to talk about protected species interactions, and so I will start with Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. One of the things I've been struggling with is, as we move through amendments, I always revert back to the ACL monitoring page, because it helps me get a feel for, you know, where a sector is in their catch levels, but what I struggle with is the fact that the majority of the species are still in the old currency on the ACL monitoring page, and I was hoping that we could request maybe the Science Center to start -- The numbers come in in FES numbers, right, and so the waves are all coming in in FES, and the way they're doing it now is they're converting the FES backwards, back to CHTS, so that it matches up with the existing ABC, and then it is monitored that way.

What I would like to do is to keep the waves in the FES number and convert the old ABC to FES, so that, when I look at that page, I'm looking at everything in FES, and I can apply the -- I know exactly where we are, and the percentages make sense, and I was hoping that we could request them to do that, and it's just -- It seems odd that we're collecting data and then we're converting it backwards. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Chip.

DR. COLLIER: That's why we've been prioritizing the unassessed ABCs. That way, we can get a lot of them changed over from CHTS, and, even worse, some are still in MRFSS, and so it would be great to get all of these changed over to the appropriate currency and make sure we're moving forward with it, but it's going to take a little while to do it. It's not as straightforward as just multiplying to get to the ABC, because you do have the commercial sector that has been stable, and it hasn't changed, and so it will take some time, but we are working on it.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am sorry, and I think I missed the opportunity during Snapper Grouper to address this, but it's a timing issue. As we move forward with Reg Amendment 36 for the black sea bass ropeless gear, and then potentially whatever we add in the full amendment that we're going to be doing with the black sea bass assessment response, I think it's going to be important to get more participation from the pot participants.

Right now, currently, I believe the only person we have on the advisory panel that participates in that fishery is Jimmy Hull, down in Florida, and I know there's a bunch of people, at least in North Carolina, and so we do AP selection in December, and I double-checked with Kim, and it sounded

like, if we either wanted to create additional seats that are targeted towards those participants, or potentially a different sub-panel, and I don't have a preference, and whatever we all think is best is fine with me, but now would be the time to do it, so that then they could meet in April, as we move forward with these.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It sounds like this is something that could be a temporary need tied to this amendment, and maybe we create another of those ad hoc groups that we've created to provide input on a specific part of this specific amendment.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and, I mean, it's a distinct fishery, for sure, and I hate to add -- I mean, I feel like I've created like five new things since I've been a council member, and I'm self-conscious of that, but, if that's what you all -- I would defer to staff, or if anyone else feels strongly about it, but --

MR. CARMICHAEL: I mean, yes, we have created a number of these, but I think that just reflects the nature of our snapper grouper fishery now, where there are some specialized components, and you just don't necessarily get enough voice when you have, you know, a broad AP that represents commercial and recreational and private and for-hire and the entire coast and all the different things that go on. It's good for that big-picture view, but, you know, I think, as far as creating something that's on a temporary basis, that maybe meets once and gives that good input, I think it's very manageable, and I think it, you know, goes a long way toward getting more input on these plans, which is something we're really struggling to do, and so I'm not too bothered by another, you know, temporary special group.

DR. BELCHER: Anyone else on that, weighing-in? Okay. What direction do you need, John? Anything?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I mean, if there's no objection to us creating this type of ad hoc group, to get black sea bass potters to give input on this amendment, I think we'll just add it into the mix of things to be addressed in December.

DR. BELCHER: Is everyone okay with that idea? I see heads nodding. Okay. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: There's discussion about whether the seats should be advertised or we should just appoint people, which, if you recall, in wreckfish, I think we just appointed people, because it's a limited group, and this is also a limited group, and so --

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we could reach out to the potters and ask who is interested.

DR. BELCHER: All right. Thanks for that, Kerry and John. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Jenny Lee gave a presentation yesterday about -- During the Protected Resources update on the bi-op for the shrimp fishery. Last time the bi-op was going on for the shrimp fishery, I felt like it was very helpful to have our advisory panel be briefed on the bi-op, and so I think it would be a good thing to have occur for the Shrimp Advisory Panel as well, is to have the bi-op come to them and them be aware of what's going on and any potential changes, and just be able to discuss it as a group.

DR. BELCHER: Anyone opposed to that idea? Okay. All right. I think that's a good thing too, especially since that group hasn't been together in a bit, and so I think it would be good for them to have an opportunity to have something to talk about, whether it's a webinar or in-person. Is there any other business that we need to bring before the council at this time? Okay.

Well, I would like to thank everybody for your time and engagement this week, and, obviously, it was a very productive and whirlwind meeting, for sure, and I still don't know what day of the week we're on, other than we're wrapping up, and so it must be Friday, and so we will see each other again in December, up in Trish's backyard there in Beaufort, and so, with that, unless anybody has anything else we need to address, I am going to adjourn the September council meeting

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 15, 2023.)

- - -

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

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
November 1, 2023

FULL COUNCIL ROLL CALL VOTE 2023-2024

DATE:

9/15

LOCATION:

Chas

MOTION:

comp ELB comm

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bell	X		
Borland	X		
Griner	X		
Helmey	X		
Marhefka	X		
McCawley	X		
Murphey	X		
Roller	X		
Spottswood	X		
Strelcheck	X		
Thompson	X		
Woodward	X		
Belcher (Chair)	X		

~~ABSENT~~  
 VOTE VIA  
 WEBINAR

FULL COUNCIL ROLL CALL VOTE 2023-2024

DATE: 9/15/2023 LOCATION: Charleston

MOTION: SB motion 9: RS amend discuss in December 2023

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Bell		X	
Borland	X		
Griner	X		
Helmey	X		
Marhefka	X		
McCawley	X		
Murphey		X	
Roller	X		
Spottswood	X		
Strelcheck		X	
Thompson	X		
Woodward		X	
Belcher (Chair)		X	

8

5

Motion Carries



## Attendee Report: SAFMC September 2023 Council Meeting (9/11/23 - 9/15/23)

Report Generated:

09/18/2023 09:03 AM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered	# Attended	Clicked Registration Link
284-120-835	09/14/2023 06:45 AM EDT	10 hours 27 minutes	229	138	426

### Staff Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Role
Yes	Not applicable for staff	Council	South Atlantic	administrator@safmc.net	Organizer

### Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Registration Date/Time
Yes	52	Aines	Alex	aaines@oceana.org	09/08/2023 11:02 AM EDT
Yes	36	Allen	Shanae	shanae.allen@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 09:53 AM EDT
Yes	43	Anderson	Stacey	stacey.anderson@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:39 PM EDT
Yes	56	Anderson	Dustin	dustin.deepeatfoods@gmail.com	09/11/2023 05:21 PM EDT
Yes	90	Anderson	Christopher	chrisanderson996@gmail.com	09/13/2023 11:57 AM EDT
Yes	33	Appelman	Max	max.appelman@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 10:54 AM EDT
Yes	69	Atkinson	Seth	seth@quillbackconsulting.com	09/14/2023 02:15 PM EDT
Yes	52	Aukeman	Trip	taukeman@ccaflorida.org	09/12/2023 11:38 AM EDT
Yes	46	Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	39	Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu	09/11/2023 02:27 PM EDT
Yes	61	Barbieri	Luiz	luiz.barbieri@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	82	Batsavage	Chris	chris.batsavage@deq.nc.gov	09/06/2023 10:13 AM EDT
Yes	69	Bell	00Mel	BellM@dnr.sc.gov	09/05/2023 05:23 PM EDT
Yes	52	Bianchi	Akan	alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:04 PM EDT
Yes	90	Binion-Rock	Samantha	samantha.binion-rock@noaa.gov	08/31/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	41	Bradshaw	Christopher	christopher.bradshaw@myfwc.com	09/10/2023 09:04 PM EDT
Yes	38	Brantley	William	william.brantley@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 08:24 AM EDT
Yes	46	Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 01:25 PM EDT
Yes	49	Brogan (Oceana)	Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org	09/13/2023 02:31 PM EDT
Yes	44	Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net	08/18/2023 10:33 AM EDT
Yes	43	Bruger	Catherine	cbruger@oceanconservancy.org	09/14/2023 01:26 PM EDT
Yes	40	Bublew	Walter	bublew@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 09:26 AM EDT
Yes	43	Bunting	Matthew	matthew.bunting@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	44	Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	09/08/2023 09:36 AM EDT
Yes	36	Calay	Shannon	Shannon.Calay@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
Yes	38	Clinton	Haley	haley.clinton@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:05 AM EDT
Yes	70	Coggins	Lew	lewis.coggins@NOAA.gov	09/07/2023 05:03 PM EDT
Yes	90	Coleman	Heather	heather.coleman@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 11:54 AM EDT
Yes	90	Cox	Jack	dayboat1965@gmail.com	09/14/2023 03:06 PM EDT
Yes	43	Crosson	Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 03:29 PM EDT
Yes	62	Curtis	Judd	judd.curtis@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	42	DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:37 AM EDT
Yes	37	Dukes	Amy	Dukes@dnr.sc.gov	09/12/2023 09:08 AM EDT
Yes	92	Dunn	Tracy	TADunn76@gmail.com	09/12/2023 09:56 AM EDT
Yes	39	Dyar	Ben	dyarb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:51 PM EDT
Yes	47	Finch	Margaret	walkermf@dnr.sc.gov	09/01/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	37	Flowers	Jared	jared.flowers@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 09:48 AM EDT
Yes	40	Foss	Kristin	Kristin.foss@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	32	Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 11:55 AM EDT
Yes	33	Froeschke	John	john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org	09/13/2023 10:54 AM EDT
Yes	35	Gahm	Meghan	meghan.gahm@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 02:42 PM EDT
Yes	50	Gentner	BRAD	brad@gentnergrouop.com	09/14/2023 08:29 AM EDT
Yes	90	Gentry	Lauren	lauren.gentry@myfwc.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
Yes	47	Gill	Bob	flosprey1@gmail.com	09/12/2023 02:16 PM EDT
Yes	51	Glazier	Edward	Edward.Glazier@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 03:18 PM EDT
Yes	93	Gloekner	David	david.gloekner@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:07 AM EDT
Yes	44	Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	38	Gray	Alisha	alisha.gray@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 09:01 AM EDT
Yes	36	Griffin	Aimee	aimee.griffin@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:42 PM EDT
Yes	47	Guyas	Martha	mguyas@asafishing.org	09/10/2023 08:24 PM EDT
Yes	36	HILDRETH	DELAINE	DELAINE.HILDRETH@DNR.GA.GOV	09/12/2023 02:00 PM EDT
Yes	94	Harrison	Alana	alanaharrison22@gmail.com	09/12/2023 08:59 AM EDT
Yes	32	Heffernan	Katie	katie.heffernan@mail.house.gov	09/05/2023 04:41 PM EDT
Yes	42	Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	82	Helmey	Judy	judyhelmey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	36	Hollensead	Lisa	lisa.hollensead@gulfcouncil.org	09/14/2023 01:34 PM EDT
Yes	35	Horn	Calusa	Calusa.horn@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:54 PM EDT
Yes	34	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.con	09/13/2023 01:05 PM EDT
Yes	45	Hugo	David	david.hugo@safmc.net	09/11/2023 09:39 AM EDT
Yes	39	Iverson	Kim	Kim.Iverson@safmc.net	08/28/2023 12:29 PM EDT
Yes	47	Juliano	Jocelyn	jocelyn.juliano@scseagrant.org	09/11/2023 08:40 AM EDT

Yes	91	KELLY	BILL	fkcf1@hotmail.com	09/13/2023 07:17 AM EDT
Yes	32	Karnauskas	Mandy	mandy.karnauskas@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:49 AM EDT
Yes	35	Keppler	Blaik	kepplerb@dnr.sc.gov	09/13/2023 09:56 AM EDT
Yes	32	Kershaw	Francine	fkershaw@nrdc.org	09/14/2023 09:09 AM EDT
Yes	91	Kersting	Anne	anne.kersting@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:17 AM EDT
Yes	90	Key	Meisha	meisha.key@safmc.net	09/11/2023 01:52 PM EDT
Yes	99	Klasnick	01Kelly	kelly.klasnick@safmc.net	08/30/2023 12:18 PM EDT
Yes	92	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org	09/14/2023 01:41 PM EDT
Yes	69	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 08:26 AM EDT
Yes	52	LaRoche	Kelcie	kelcie.laroche@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	97	Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net	09/11/2023 11:46 AM EDT
Yes	90	Laney	Reid Wilson	rallaneys@gmail.com	09/13/2023 03:04 PM EDT
Yes	38	Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:32 PM EDT
Yes	40	Lazarre	Dominique	Dominique.Lazarre@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:48 AM EDT
Yes	37	Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 04:26 PM EDT
Yes	53	Lind	Michael	michael.lind@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:15 AM EDT
Yes	93	Locke	Charles	obxlocke@aol.com	09/12/2023 09:10 AM EDT
Yes	37	Long	Stephen	longs@dnr.sc.gov	09/14/2023 09:50 AM EDT
Yes	91	Lorenzen	Kai	klorenzen@ufl.edu	09/11/2023 02:45 PM EDT
Yes	89	M Borland	Gary	gborlandsafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	36	Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:37 AM EDT
Yes	84	Marhefka	00Kerry	kerryomarhefka@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	91	Marinko	Jeff	putridinnards@hotmail.com	09/13/2023 06:32 AM EDT
Yes	90	Maroney	Bradley	captainbradleymaroney@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:31 AM EDT
Yes	50	McCoy	Sherylanne	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 09:51 AM EDT
Yes	61	McGovern	Jack	John.McGovern@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	92	McWhorter	Will	wdmcwhorter@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:30 PM EDT
Yes	67	Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 12:55 PM EDT
Yes	43	Moore	Jeff	Jeffrey.N.Moore@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:53 PM EDT
Yes	86	Murphey	Trish	trish.murphey@deq.nc.gov	08/28/2023 11:26 AM EDT
Yes	99	Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:47 AM EDT
Yes	92	Newman	Thomas	thomas.newman03@gmail.com	09/06/2023 09:27 PM EDT
Yes	93	O'Malley	Rachel	rachel.o'malley@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 09:43 PM EDT
Yes	61	Oliver	Ashley	ashley.oliver@safmc.net	09/06/2023 08:39 AM EDT
Yes	32	Package-Ward	Christina	christina.package-ward@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 11:01 AM EDT
Yes	47	Porch	Clay	clay.porch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:32 AM EDT
Yes	33	Privoznik	Sarah	sarah.privoznik@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 02:44 PM EDT
Yes	43	Rainey	Dan	rainmand63@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:48 PM EDT
Yes	36	Ramsay	Chloe	chloe.ramsay@myfwc.com	09/04/2023 09:12 AM EDT
Yes	56	Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:31 PM EDT
Yes	100	Ritter	Michele	michele.ritter@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:45 AM EDT
Yes	41	Robicheaux	Emily	Emily.Robicheaux@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 11:16 AM EDT
Yes	66	Roller	00Tom	tomrollersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	41	Sauls	Beverly	bevsauls1@gmail.com	08/31/2023 09:42 AM EDT
Yes	55	Shervanick	Kara	kshervanick@gmail.com	09/13/2023 02:00 PM EDT
Yes	74	Sinkus	Wiley	sinkusw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
Yes	41	Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 08:55 AM EDT
Yes	56	Smit-Brunello	00Monica	monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:36 PM EDT
Yes	38	Somerset	Carly	carly.somerset@gulfcouncil.org	09/14/2023 09:43 AM EDT
Yes	49	Spurgin	Kali	Kali.Spurgin@MyFWC.com	09/11/2023 08:03 AM EDT
Yes	37	Stemle	Adam	adam.stemle@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 11:24 AM EDT
Yes	41	Strelcheck	00-Andy	andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 08:32 AM EDT
Yes	54	Sweetman	CJ	Christopher.Sweetman@MyFWC.com	09/06/2023 08:29 AM EDT
Yes	61	Thompson	00Laurilee	thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	92	Townsend	Wes	pakafish1@yahoo.com	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	39	Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov	08/30/2023 12:23 PM EDT
Yes	45	Vara	Mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:23 AM EDT
Yes	59	Vecchio	Julie	vecchioj@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 10:51 AM EDT
Yes	90	Vega	Andrea	aavega2@outlook.com	09/14/2023 09:30 AM EDT
Yes	59	Walsh	Jason	jason.walsh@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 04:22 PM EDT
Yes	36	Walter	John	john.f.walter@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	35	Wescoat	Lauren	lauren.wescoat@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 09:13 AM EDT
Yes	49	White	Geoff	geoff.white@accsp.org	09/11/2023 09:54 AM EDT
Yes	95	White	Shelby	shelby.white@deq.nc.gov	09/07/2023 10:59 AM EDT
Yes	34	Wilber	Pace	pace.wilber@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 08:23 AM EDT
Yes	31	Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	36	Willis	Michelle	willisc@dnr.sc.gov	09/13/2023 04:13 PM EDT
Yes	45	Withers	Meg	meg.withers@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:34 AM EDT
Yes	41	collier	chip	chip.collier@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:20 AM EDT
Yes	97	griner	tim	timgrinersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	64	moss	david	david.moss@tnc.org	09/13/2023 09:31 AM EDT
Yes	33	murphy	allison	allison.murphy@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 09:52 AM EDT
Yes	94	oden	jeff	slshcrkwtwrks@aol.com	09/14/2023 01:26 PM EDT
Yes	39	sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT

Yes	38	stephen	jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	97	thomas	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:08 AM EDT
Yes	80	thompson	laurilee	00thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/14/2023 11:25 AM EDT
No	0	Anderson	Christopher	chris.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:25 PM EDT
No	0	Baker	Marion	marion19@ufl.edu	09/10/2023 04:40 PM EDT
No	0	Barger	Jeff	jbarger@oceanconservancy.org	09/13/2023 09:28 AM EDT
No	0	Beaty	Julia	jbeaty@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:33 PM EDT
No	0	Benevento	Tony	43tonyb@gmail.com	09/07/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	Berry	James "chip"	chip@chipberry.com	09/05/2023 06:11 PM EDT
No	0	Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:40 AM EDT
No	0	Blosser	Brooke	brookeb@scccl.org	09/11/2023 02:21 PM EDT
No	0	Bogdan	Jennifer	jennifer.bogdan@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 12:59 PM EDT
No	0	Box	Cameron	cameron.c.box@uscg.mil	09/13/2023 08:28 AM EDT
No	0	Box	Cameron	boxcameron06@gmail.com	09/06/2023 07:05 AM EDT
No	0	Buckel	Jeff	jabuckel@ncsu.edu	09/12/2023 10:45 AM EDT
No	0	Buckson	Bruce	bcbuckson@aol.com	09/07/2023 08:59 AM EDT
No	0	Cimo	Laura	laura.cimo@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 05:06 AM EDT
No	0	Cody	Richard	richard.cody@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:12 PM EDT
No	0	Corbett	Ellie	Ellie.Corbett@MYFWC.com	09/06/2023 11:14 AM EDT
No	0	Cox	Derek	decox@sfwmd.gov	09/07/2023 09:51 AM EDT
No	0	Cross	Tiffanie	tiffanie.cross@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:13 PM EDT
No	0	Crowe	Stacie	crowes@dnr.sc.gov	09/10/2023 08:13 AM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kileyjd@gmail.com	09/11/2023 04:37 PM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kdancy@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	DeJohn	Frank	frank.dejohn@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:15 PM EDT
No	0	Dunn	Russell	Russell.Dunn@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:14 AM EDT
No	0	E Brown	Julie	julie.e.brown@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Farnell	Paula	paula.farnell@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:25 AM EDT
No	0	Friedrich	Tony	tony@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/13/2023 08:36 AM EDT
No	0	GREENE	Karen	karen.e.greene@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:47 AM EDT
No	0	Gietzmann-Sanders	Marcel	marcelsanders96@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:42 PM EDT
No	0	Govoni	Beth	beth.govoni@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
No	0	Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:38 AM EDT
No	0	Haymans	Doug	doug.haymans@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Huber	Jeanette	jeanette.huber@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 10:01 AM EDT
No	0	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.com	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
No	0	Iberle	Allie	allie.iberle@safmc.net	09/13/2023 09:45 AM EDT
No	0	Kalinowsky	Chris	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 12:02 PM EDT
No	0	Kappos	Maria	maria.kappos@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 03:32 PM EDT
No	0	Kean	Samantha	samantha.kean@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:18 PM EDT
No	0	Kittle	Christine	christine.kittle@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:11 PM EDT
No	0	Kumar Ghosh	Bijoy	bkgghoshbuet7@gmail.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
No	0	Lee	Max	maxlee@mote.org	09/07/2023 11:43 AM EDT
No	0	Mackesey	Brendan	brendan.mackesey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:38 PM EDT
No	0	Masi	Michelle	michelle.masi@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:38 AM EDT
No	0	Meehan	Sean	sean.meehan@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 03:42 PM EDT
No	0	Menegolo	Jean Paul	jpmenegolo@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:15 PM EDT
No	0	Menendez	Hayden	hayden.menendez@myfwc.com	09/13/2023 10:34 AM EDT
No	0	Menzel	Terri	terri.menzel@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 03:49 PM EDT
No	0	Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
No	0	Muffley	Brandon	bmuffley@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:44 AM EDT
No	0	Olsen	Edward	butchnett@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:19 PM EDT
No	0	Owens	Marina	marina.owens@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 08:15 AM EDT
No	0	Pierce	Brett	Brett.pierce@bluefindata.com	09/11/2023 11:04 AM EDT
No	0	Pikula	Kyle	bkpikula@yahoo.com	09/11/2023 01:23 PM EDT
No	0	Ralston	Kellie	kellie@bonefishtarpontrust.org	09/11/2023 10:06 AM EDT
No	0	Rathke	David	execdir@resiliencyflorida.org	09/10/2023 12:22 PM EDT
No	0	Reding	Brandon	redingb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 02:04 PM EDT
No	0	Reichert	Marcel	mreichert2022@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Rinaldi	Mike	mike.rinaldi@accsp.org	09/12/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Sabo	Mary	msabo@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:59 PM EDT
No	0	Salmon	Brandi	brandi.salmon@deq.nc.gov	08/31/2023 08:34 AM EDT
No	0	Sartwell	Tim	tim.sartwell@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 02:58 PM EDT
No	0	Schmidtke	Michael	Mike.Schmidtke@safmc.net	09/13/2023 01:57 PM EDT
No	0	Schwaab	Alexandra	aschwaab@fishwildlife.org	09/06/2023 09:02 AM EDT
No	0	Seramur	Mark	mark.seramur@saltwaterinc.com	09/11/2023 01:41 PM EDT
No	0	Seward	McClean	mclean.seward@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 12:25 PM EDT
No	0	Simmons	Carrie	carrie.simmons@gulfcouncil.org	09/13/2023 01:35 PM EDT
No	0	Smillie	Nick	Nick.smillie@safmc.net	09/13/2023 03:23 PM EDT
No	0	Soss	Alison	alison.soss@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 10:10 AM EDT
No	0	Spanik	Kevin	spanikk@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:07 PM EDT
No	0	Sramek	Mark	Mark.Sramek@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 07:23 AM EDT
No	0	Stam	Geoff	grstam@att.net	08/31/2023 09:20 AM EDT
No	0	Stewart	Mark	mstewart@gmail.com	08/31/2023 10:22 AM EDT

No	0	Sweeney Tookes	Jennifer	jtookes@georgiasouthern.edu	09/11/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Takade-Heumacher	Helen	helen.takade-heumacher@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 12:17 PM EDT
No	0	Tuohy	Chelsea	ctuohy@asmfc.org	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
No	0	Turner	Steve	scturner160@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Uchino	Pepper	pepper@fsbpa.com	09/12/2023 10:00 AM EDT
No	0	Vega	Andrea	vega.andrea.a@gmail.com	09/13/2023 09:31 AM EDT
No	0	Wagner	Warren	whwagner@southernco.com	09/01/2023 08:31 AM EDT
No	0	Waine	Mike	mwaine@asafishing.org	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Walia	Matt	matthew.walia@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	shelby.white@nc.deq.gov	09/06/2023 09:58 AM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	sbwhite6762@gmail.com	09/13/2023 02:01 PM EDT
No	0	kramer	rob	rkramer@wildoceans.org	09/12/2023 09:52 AM EDT
No	0	mroch	ray	ray.mroch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:21 AM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	bpilula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 11:23 AM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	bkoikula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 04:45 PM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	kpikula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 04:45 PM EDT
No	0	pikula	Kyle	kbikula@gmail.com	09/13/2023 01:02 PM EDT
No	0	poston	will	will@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/11/2023 03:52 PM EDT
No	0	rettig	adam	adam.rettig@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:18 AM EDT
No	0	white	geoff	Geoff.Kir.white@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:13 PM EDT



## Attendee Report: SAFMC September 2023 Council Meeting (9/11/23 - 9/15/23)

Report Generated:

09/18/2023 09:05 AM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered	# Attended	Clicked Registration Link
284-120-835	09/15/2023 07:59 AM EDT	3 hours 3 minutes	231	78	449

### Staff Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Role
Yes	Not applicable for staff	Council	South Atlantic	administrator@safmc.net	Organizer

### Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Registration Date/Time
Yes	47	Anderson	Stacey	stacey.anderson@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:39 PM EDT
Yes	40	Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	42	Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu	09/11/2023 02:27 PM EDT
Yes	61	Bell	00Mel	BellM@dnr.sc.gov	09/05/2023 05:23 PM EDT
Yes	40	Bianchi	Akan	alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:04 PM EDT
Yes	77	Bradshaw	Christopher	christopher.bradshaw@myfwc.com	09/10/2023 09:04 PM EDT
Yes	38	Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 01:25 PM EDT
Yes	36	Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net	08/18/2023 10:33 AM EDT
Yes	35	Bruger	Catherine	cbrugger@oceanconservancy.org	09/14/2023 01:26 PM EDT
Yes	39	Bunting	Matthew	matthew.bunting@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	40	Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	09/08/2023 09:36 AM EDT
Yes	38	Clinton	Haley	haley.clinton@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:05 AM EDT
Yes	33	Coggins	Lew	lewis.coggins@NOAA.gov	09/07/2023 05:03 PM EDT
Yes	46	Crosson	Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 03:29 PM EDT
Yes	67	Curtis	Judd	judd.curtis@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	57	DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:37 AM EDT
Yes	43	Finch	Margaret	walkermf@dnr.sc.gov	09/01/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	38	Flowers	Jared	jared.flowers@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 09:48 AM EDT
Yes	39	Foss	Kristin	Kristin.foss@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	39	Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 11:55 AM EDT
Yes	61	Gentry	Lauren	lauren.gentry@myfwc.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
Yes	48	Gill	Bob	flosprey1@gmail.com	09/12/2023 02:16 PM EDT
Yes	83	Glazier	Edward	Edward.Glazier@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 03:18 PM EDT
Yes	39	Gloeckner	David	david.gloeckner@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:07 AM EDT
Yes	72	Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	57	Guyas	Martha	mguyas@asafishing.org	09/10/2023 08:24 PM EDT
Yes	94	Harrison	Alana	alanaharrison22@gmail.com	09/12/2023 08:59 AM EDT
Yes	42	Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	82	Helmey	Judy	judyhelmey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	50	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.con	09/13/2023 01:05 PM EDT
Yes	40	Iverson	Kim	Kim.Iverson@safmc.net	08/28/2023 12:29 PM EDT
Yes	91	KELLY	BILL	fkca1@hotmail.com	09/13/2023 07:17 AM EDT
Yes	92	Kersting	Anne	anne.kersting@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:17 AM EDT
Yes	100	Klasnick	01Kelly	kelly.klasnick@safmc.net	08/30/2023 12:18 PM EDT
Yes	98	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org	09/14/2023 01:41 PM EDT
Yes	39	LaRoche	Kelcie	kelcie.laroche@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	98	Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net	09/11/2023 11:46 AM EDT
Yes	38	Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:32 PM EDT
Yes	41	Lazarre	Dominique	Dominique.Lazarre@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:48 AM EDT
Yes	95	Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 04:26 PM EDT
Yes	53	Lind	Michael	michael.lind@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:15 AM EDT
Yes	91	M Borland	Gary	gborlandsafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	90	Marhefka	00Kerry	kerryomarhefka@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	49	McCoy	Sherylanne	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 09:51 AM EDT
Yes	84	McGovern	Jack	John.McGovern@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	77	Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 12:55 PM EDT
Yes	86	Murphey	Trish	trish.murphey@deq.nc.gov	08/28/2023 11:26 AM EDT
Yes	39	Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:47 AM EDT
Yes	98	Newman	Thomas	thomas.newman03@gmail.com	09/06/2023 09:27 PM EDT
Yes	75	Porch	Clay	clay.porch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:32 AM EDT
Yes	75	Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:31 PM EDT
Yes	100	Ritter	Michele	michele.ritter@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:45 AM EDT
Yes	37	Robicheaux	Emily	Emily.Robicheaux@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 11:16 AM EDT
Yes	73	Roller	00Tom	tomrollersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	39	Sauls	Beverly	bevsauls1@gmail.com	08/31/2023 09:42 AM EDT
Yes	54	Smit-Brunello	00Monica	monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:36 PM EDT
Yes	98	Spottswood	00Robert	Robert@brightwild.com	09/15/2023 08:21 AM EDT
Yes	85	Spurgin	Kali	Kali.Spurgin@MyFWC.com	09/11/2023 08:03 AM EDT
Yes	45	Stam	Geoff	grstam@att.net	08/31/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	44	Stemle	Adam	adam.stemle@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 11:24 AM EDT
Yes	61	Strelcheck	00-Andy	andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 08:32 AM EDT

Yes	69	Sweetman	CJ	Christopher.Sweetman@MyFWC.com	09/06/2023 08:29 AM EDT
Yes	49	Takade-Heumacher	Helen	helen.takade-heumacher@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 12:17 PM EDT
Yes	91	Thompson	00Laurilee	thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	41	Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov	08/30/2023 12:23 PM EDT
Yes	50	Vara	Mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:23 AM EDT
Yes	48	Walsh	Jason	jason.walsh@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 04:22 PM EDT
Yes	94	Walter	John	john.f.walter@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	98	White	Shelby	shelby.white@deq.nc.gov	09/07/2023 10:59 AM EDT
Yes	41	White	Geoff	geoff.white@accsp.org	09/11/2023 09:54 AM EDT
Yes	38	Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	40	Withers	Meg	meg.withers@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:34 AM EDT
Yes	70	collier	chip	chip.collier@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:20 AM EDT
Yes	98	griner	tim	timgrinersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	79	moss	david	david.moss@tnc.org	09/13/2023 09:31 AM EDT
Yes	93	oden	jeff	slshcrkwrwks@aol.com	09/14/2023 01:26 PM EDT
Yes	45	stephen	jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	99	thomas	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:08 AM EDT
No	0	Aines	Alex	aaines@oceana.org	09/08/2023 11:02 AM EDT
No	0	Allen	Shanae	shanae.allen@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 09:53 AM EDT
No	0	Anderson	Christopher	chris.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:25 PM EDT
No	0	Anderson	Dustin	dustin.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/11/2023 05:21 PM EDT
No	0	Anderson	Christopher	chrisanderson996@gmail.com	09/13/2023 11:57 AM EDT
No	0	Appelman	Max	max.appelman@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 10:54 AM EDT
No	0	Atkinson	Seth	seth@quillbackconsulting.com	09/14/2023 02:15 PM EDT
No	0	Aukeman	Trip	taukeman@ccaflorida.org	09/12/2023 11:38 AM EDT
No	0	Baker	Marion	marion19@ufl.edu	09/10/2023 04:40 PM EDT
No	0	Barbieri	Luiz	luiz.barbieri@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
No	0	Barger	Jeff	jbarger@oceanconservancy.org	09/13/2023 09:28 AM EDT
No	0	Batsavage	Chris	chris.batsavage@deq.nc.gov	09/06/2023 10:13 AM EDT
No	0	Beaty	Julia	jbeaty@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:33 PM EDT
No	0	Benevento	Tony	43tonyb@gmail.com	09/07/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	Berry	James "chip"	chip@chipberry.com	09/05/2023 06:11 PM EDT
No	0	Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:40 AM EDT
No	0	Binion-Rock	Samantha	samantha.binion-rock@noaa.gov	08/31/2023 08:07 AM EDT
No	0	Blosser	Brooke	brookeb@sccl.org	09/11/2023 02:21 PM EDT
No	0	Bogdan	Jennifer	jennifer.bogdan@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 12:59 PM EDT
No	0	Box	Cameron	cameron.c.box@uscg.mil	09/13/2023 08:28 AM EDT
No	0	Box	Cameron	boxcameron06@gmail.com	09/06/2023 07:05 AM EDT
No	0	Brantley	William	william.brantley@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 08:24 AM EDT
No	0	Brogan (Oceana)	Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org	09/13/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Bubley	Walter	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 09:26 AM EDT
No	0	Buckel	Jeff	jabuckel@ncsu.edu	09/12/2023 10:45 AM EDT
No	0	Buckson	Bruce	bcbuckson@aol.com	09/07/2023 08:59 AM EDT
No	0	Calay	Shannon	Shannon.Calay@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
No	0	Cimo	Laura	laura.cimo@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 05:06 AM EDT
No	0	Cody	Richard	richard.cody@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:12 PM EDT
No	0	Coleman	Heather	heather.coleman@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 11:54 AM EDT
No	0	Corbett	Ellie	Ellie.Corbett@MYFWC.com	09/06/2023 11:14 AM EDT
No	0	Cox	Derek	decox@sfwmd.gov	09/07/2023 09:51 AM EDT
No	0	Cox	Jack	dayboat1965@gmail.com	09/14/2023 03:06 PM EDT
No	0	Cross	Tiffanie	tiffanie.cross@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:13 PM EDT
No	0	Crowe	Stacie	crowes@dnr.sc.gov	09/10/2023 08:13 AM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kdancy@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kileyjd@gmail.com	09/11/2023 04:37 PM EDT
No	0	DeJohn	Frank	frank.dejohn@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:15 PM EDT
No	0	Dukes	Amy	Dukesa@dnr.sc.gov	09/12/2023 09:08 AM EDT
No	0	Dunn	Tracy	TADunn76@gmail.com	09/12/2023 09:56 AM EDT
No	0	Dunn	Russell	Russell.Dunn@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:14 AM EDT
No	0	Dyar	Ben	dyarb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:51 PM EDT
No	0	E Brown	Julie	julie.e.brown@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Farnell	Paula	paula.farnell@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:25 AM EDT
No	0	Friedrich	Tony	tony@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/13/2023 08:36 AM EDT
No	0	Froeschke	John	john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org	09/13/2023 10:54 AM EDT
No	0	GREENE	Karen	karen.e.greene@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:47 AM EDT
No	0	Gahm	Meghan	meghan.gahm@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Gentner	BRAD	brad@gentnergroupp.com	09/14/2023 08:29 AM EDT
No	0	Gietzmann-Sanders	Marcel	marcelsanders96@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:42 PM EDT
No	0	Govoni	Beth	beth.govoni@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
No	0	Gray	Alisha	alisha.gray@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 09:01 AM EDT
No	0	Griffin	Aimee	aimee.griffin@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:42 PM EDT
No	0	HILDRETH	DELAINE	DELAINE.HILDRETH@DNR.GA.GOV	09/12/2023 02:00 PM EDT
No	0	Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:38 AM EDT
No	0	Haymans	Doug	doug.haymans@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Heffernan	Katie	katie.heffernan@mail.house.gov	09/05/2023 04:41 PM EDT

No	0	Hollensead	Lisa	lisa.hollensead@gulfcouncil.org	09/14/2023 01:34 PM EDT
No	0	Horn	Calusa	Calusa.horn@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:54 PM EDT
No	0	Huber	Jeanette	jeanette.huber@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 10:01 AM EDT
No	0	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.com	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
No	0	Hugo	David	david.hugo@safmc.net	09/11/2023 09:39 AM EDT
No	0	Iberle	Allie	allie.iberle@safmc.net	09/13/2023 09:45 AM EDT
No	0	Juliano	Jocelyn	jocelyn.juliano@scseagrant.org	09/11/2023 08:40 AM EDT
No	0	Kalinowsky	Chris	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 12:02 PM EDT
No	0	Kappos	Maria	maria.kappos@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 03:32 PM EDT
No	0	Karnauskas	Mandy	mandy.karnauskas@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:49 AM EDT
No	0	Kean	Samantha	samantha.kean@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:18 PM EDT
No	0	Keppler	Blaik	kepplerb@dnr.sc.gov	09/13/2023 09:56 AM EDT
No	0	Kershaw	Francine	fkershaw@nrdc.org	09/14/2023 09:09 AM EDT
No	0	Key	Meisha	meisha.key@safmc.net	09/11/2023 01:52 PM EDT
No	0	Kittle	Christine	christine.kittle@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:11 PM EDT
No	0	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 08:26 AM EDT
No	0	Kumar Ghosh	Bijoy	bkghoshbuet7@gmail.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
No	0	Laney	Reid Wilson	rallaneys@gmail.com	09/13/2023 03:04 PM EDT
No	0	Lee	Max	maxlee@mote.org	09/07/2023 11:43 AM EDT
No	0	Locke	Charles	obxlocke@aol.com	09/12/2023 09:10 AM EDT
No	0	Long	Stephen	longs@dnr.sc.gov	09/14/2023 09:50 AM EDT
No	0	Lorenzen	Kai	klorenzen@ufl.edu	09/11/2023 02:45 PM EDT
No	0	Mackesey	Brendan	brendan.mackesey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:38 PM EDT
No	0	Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:37 AM EDT
No	0	Marinko	Jeff	putridinnards@hotmail.com	09/13/2023 06:32 AM EDT
No	0	Maroney	Bradley	captainbradleymaroney@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:31 AM EDT
No	0	Masi	Michelle	michelle.masi@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:38 AM EDT
No	0	McWhorter	Will	wdmcwhorter@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:30 PM EDT
No	0	Meehan	Sean	sean.meehan@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 03:42 PM EDT
No	0	Menegolo	Jean Paul	jpmenegolo@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:15 PM EDT
No	0	Menendez	Hayden	hayden.menendez@myfwc.com	09/13/2023 10:34 AM EDT
No	0	Menzel	Terri	terri.menzel@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 03:49 PM EDT
No	0	Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
No	0	Moore	Jeff	Jeffrey.N.Moore@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:53 PM EDT
No	0	Muffley	Brandon	bmuffley@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:44 AM EDT
No	0	O'Malley	Rachel	rachel.o'malley@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 09:43 PM EDT
No	0	Oliver	Ashley	ashley.oliver@safmc.net	09/06/2023 08:39 AM EDT
No	0	Olsen	Edward	butchnett@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:19 PM EDT
No	0	Owens	Marina	marina.owens@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 08:15 AM EDT
No	0	Package-Ward	Christina	christina.package-ward@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 11:01 AM EDT
No	0	Pierce	Brett	Brett.pierce@bluefindata.com	09/11/2023 11:04 AM EDT
No	0	Pikula	Kyle	bkpikula@yahoo.com	09/11/2023 01:23 PM EDT
No	0	Privoznik	Sarah	sarah.privoznik@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 02:44 PM EDT
No	0	Rainey	Dan	rainmand63@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:48 PM EDT
No	0	Ralston	Kellie	kellie@bonefishtarpontrust.org	09/11/2023 10:06 AM EDT
No	0	Ramsay	Chloe	chloe.ramsay@myfwc.com	09/04/2023 09:12 AM EDT
No	0	Rathke	David	execdir@resiliencyflorida.org	09/10/2023 12:22 PM EDT
No	0	Reding	Brandon	redingb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 02:04 PM EDT
No	0	Reichert	Marcel	mreichert2022@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Rinaldi	Mike	mike.rinaldi@accsp.org	09/12/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Sabo	Mary	msabo@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:59 PM EDT
No	0	Salmon	Brandi	brandi.salmon@deq.nc.gov	08/31/2023 08:34 AM EDT
No	0	Sartwell	Tim	tim.sartwell@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 02:58 PM EDT
No	0	Schmidtke	Michael	Mike.Schmidtke@safmc.net	09/13/2023 01:57 PM EDT
No	0	Schmidtke	Michael	mike.schmidtke@safmc@gmail.com	09/14/2023 05:57 PM EDT
No	0	Schwaab	Alexandra	aschwaab@fishwildlife.org	09/06/2023 09:02 AM EDT
No	0	Seramur	Mark	mark.seramur@saltwaterinc.com	09/11/2023 01:41 PM EDT
No	0	Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 12:25 PM EDT
No	0	Shervanick	Kara	kshervanick@gmail.com	09/13/2023 02:00 PM EDT
No	0	Simmons	Carrie	carrie.simmons@gulfcouncil.org	09/13/2023 01:35 PM EDT
No	0	Sinkus	Wiley	sinkusw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
No	0	Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 08:55 AM EDT
No	0	Smillie	Nick	Nick.smillie@safmc.net	09/13/2023 03:23 PM EDT
No	0	Somersset	Carly	carly.somersset@gulfcouncil.org	09/14/2023 09:43 AM EDT
No	0	Soss	Alison	alison.soss@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 10:10 AM EDT
No	0	Spanik	Kevin	spanikk@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:07 PM EDT
No	0	Sramek	Mark	Mark.Sramek@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 07:23 AM EDT
No	0	Stewart	Mark	mstewar@gmail.com	08/31/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	Sweeney Tookes	Jennifer	jtookes@georgiasouthern.edu	09/11/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Townsend	Wes	pakafish1@yahoo.com	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
No	0	Tuohy	Chelsea	ctuohy@asmfc.org	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
No	0	Turner	Steve	scturner160@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Uchino	Pepper	pepper@fsbpa.com	09/12/2023 10:00 AM EDT
No	0	Vecchio	Julie	vecchioj@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 10:51 AM EDT

No	0	Vega	Andrea	vega.andrea.a@gmail.com	09/13/2023 09:31 AM EDT
No	0	Vega	Andrea	aavega2@outlook.com	09/14/2023 09:30 AM EDT
No	0	Wagner	Warren	whwagner@southernco.com	09/01/2023 08:31 AM EDT
No	0	Waine	Mike	mwaine@asafishing.org	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Walia	Matt	matthew.walia@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	Wescoat	Lauren	lauren.wescoat@myfwc.com	09/14/2023 09:13 AM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	shelby.white@nc.deq.gov	09/06/2023 09:58 AM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	sbwhite6762@gmail.com	09/13/2023 02:01 PM EDT
No	0	Wilber	Pace	pace.wilber@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 08:23 AM EDT
No	0	Willis	Michelle	willisc@dnr.sc.gov	09/13/2023 04:13 PM EDT
No	0	kramer	rob	rkramer@wildoceans.org	09/12/2023 09:52 AM EDT
No	0	mroch	ray	ray.mroch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:21 AM EDT
No	0	murphy	allison	allison.murphy@noaa.gov	09/14/2023 09:52 AM EDT
No	0	pikula	Kyle	kbpikula@gmail.com	09/13/2023 01:02 PM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	kpikula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 04:45 PM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	bkoikula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 04:45 PM EDT
No	0	pikula	kyle	bpilula@yahoo.com	09/13/2023 11:23 AM EDT
No	0	poston	will	will@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/11/2023 03:52 PM EDT
No	0	rettig	adam	adam.rettig@noaa.gov	09/13/2023 09:18 AM EDT
No	0	sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
No	0	thompson	laurilee	00thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/14/2023 11:25 AM EDT
No	0	white	geoff	Geoff.Kir.white@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:13 PM EDT