

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

COUNCIL SESSION II

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

September 19, 2024

Transcript

Council

Dr. Carolyn Belcher , Chair
Trish Murphey, Vice Chair
Charlie Phillips
Kerry Marhefka
Amy Dukes
Gary Borland
Jessica McCawley

Tim Griner
Tom Roller
Robert Spotswood, Jr.
Andy Strelcheck
James G. Hull, Jr.
Judy Helmey

Council Staff

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

Kelly Klasnick
Rachael Silvas
Suzanna Thomas
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Christina Wiegand
Meg Withers
Kim Iverson

Attendees and Invited Participants

Dr. Jack McGovern
Monica Smit-Burnello
Shepherd Grimes
Rick DeVictor
Sonny Gwin
Beth Dieveney
Evan Howell

Dr. Clay Porch
Kristin Foss
Kathy Knowlton
Billy Broussard
Katherine Papacostas
Sarah Lazo
Geoff White

Observers and Participants

Other observers and participants attached.

The Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at The Town & Country Inn and Suites, Charleston, South Carolina, on Thursday, September 19, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. If everybody would please make their way to the table. Okay. For folks in the audience, where we are in the agenda is we are moving what would have been Friday morning's schedule for the Full Council Session II to this morning, to start out with, and then our afternoon schedule will hold as it currently sits, with the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary activities report and the Marine Recreational Information Program Revisioning discussion, and so what we'll start out with this morning -- First of all, for those of you in the audience, we gave our third South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Award of Excellence Award the other night, at our social, and, for those of you who were there, obviously, you saw a very surprised recipient.

Mel Bell, who had been a council member for a number of years, as well as had been long involved in council activities, because of his work with artificial reefs, was the recipient this year. I know we've been grateful for the amount of time that Mel put in, and all of us who have had that chance to work with him really greatly appreciate all that he brought to the council. Our next item on the agenda is handing off to John Carmichael for our chair and vice chair election.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you, Carolyn. I think Mel said, yesterday, he had forty years of fisheries, and thirty years in the Navy, and so he's not like a hundred years old, but he actually spent a lot of time in the Navy Reserves that overlapped with that time, and so sometimes you do the math of his career, and you're like, man, Mel, you look pretty good for a hundred years old, but, yes, he had quite a career, and it was quite an honor, and it was great to see him get that, and we're glad that he was able to be here yesterday.

Just a reminder, and so we change over chairs this time of year. Our chairs traditionally serve two-year terms, and our vice chair two-year terms, and we rotate through the different states, as we've done it, as you can kind of see, and it's just been the process of the council for quite a while, to rotate amongst our different states and to have just kind of a standard process for doing it. Each council is quite different. Some council's chairs can serve for eight or ten years sometimes, it seems, because nobody else is really stepping up and wanting to do it, and other councils have a lot of upheaval in chairs and vice chairs from year-to-year, and so it's just councils all have their own ways of doing business, and this is how we operate here.

Thank you, Carolyn, for this, and, with this, I will go ahead and open it up. The first step is to elect a vice chair, and then I will hand it off to whoever that is to handle the election. I mean, first we'll elect a chair, and then I'll hand it off for election of the vice chair, and so are there any nominations for chair? I see Tom.

MR. ROLLER: It is my honor and pleasure to nominate our vice chair, Trish Murphey, for the position of Chair of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Tom. Are there any other nominations? Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thank you, John. I will second that nomination from Tom, and I move the floor be closed for nominations for chair and that Trish Murphey be appointed by acclamation.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Amy. Are there any objections to this motion? All right. Thank you. Hearing none, Trish Murphey is elected chair, and so congratulations, Trish. Welcome to the chair. (*Applause*) So, Trish, go ahead, and the floor is yours to handle the vice chair.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, John, and thank you, everybody. I just want to say that I will do my best with this new position, and I just want to reiterate what Mel said yesterday, is that, you know, we have a hard job to manage fisheries, but what's great about this council is we are a team, and I really look forward to working with everybody, because this is the best council ever, and so I will go ahead and handle the election of the vice chair, and so are there any nominations? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you, Madam Chair. It is my honor and pleasure to nominate Jessica McCawley for the position of Vice Chair of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Robert. Are there any other nominations? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I will second that nomination, and I move that the floor be closed to nominations for vice chair and that Jessica McCawley be appointed by acclamation.

MS. MURPHEY: Are there any objections to that motion? All right. If none, Jessica McCawley is elected vice chair. (*Applause*) Go ahead, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: As many of you know, I sit on three fishery management councils, and so I see this process handled very differently from one council to the next, and certainly I'm excited to have, you know, Trish, you as chair, and, Jessica, you as the vice chair, and you provide great leadership. You know, one of the things I feel like is important though is that we consider participation of non-state directors going forward in the chairmanship and vice chairmanship process. I think that adds value to the process, and so I don't want to take anything away from the two of you, because I think you will do a phenomenal job for us, but, ultimately, at the end of the day, I think we owe it to also the constituent stakeholders to consider non-government employees as well as part of the leadership of the council, and so I just offer that as a suggestion, and a comment, going forward in the coming years, as we move forward with our chairmanships.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Andy. Charlie.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair. As somebody that's been a chair, I agree that we can't ask for anybody any better than Jessica, or anybody that works any harder, but, yes, the information that gets crosspollinated at the CCC meetings and things -- I think it's something that just helps everybody, but part of the problem is we've got so many good people, and so how do you deal with it, but, yes, to Andy's point, and I was privileged to -- Like I said, when I termed-out, I was chair, and it was just -- Just the people that you meet, and how you figure out how other councils do stuff, and how they prosecute their fisheries, it was very enlightening, and then you can share it. Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I just want to say, in my twenty-plus years with the council, this has been interestingly cyclical, in terms of who has been chair. When I was first on the council, and on the SSC, it tended to be more of the state people, and then there was probably a ten or twelve-year run

where it was primarily the fishery representatives that were doing it, and then, more recently, it's kind of come back, in the last eight years or so, and it's been the agency folks, and I think it's just really turned out that way, I think is the nature of, you know, who is in the state, and what their other responsibilities are, and things of that nature, but certainly there is no --

There is certainly nothing that I think anyone at the table expects that it would always be state director people that are doing it, because, like Charlie said, Charlie has been chair, and he was in a line of, I think -- I feel like four or five, you know, cycles, where the chair was actually from -- You know, not from the state agency representation, and so, yes, I think it's just how it sort of turns out, at times.

MS. MURPHEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, and thank you, Andy, for bringing that up, and Charlie as well, and I want to just thank them for bringing that up, because I feel the same way, and, you know, I was on the council when Charlie was the chair, and, you know, he did a great job, and, you know, I think one of the big things that, you know, I've always felt like -- One thing that, you know, I lend myself to thinking that the state people were really good at is, you know, they are able to dedicate the time away from what they're normally doing to prepare themselves.

It's a big lift to prepare yourself in the manner that the chairman has to, but, at the same time, you know, guys like Charlie are the people that can certainly do that, and they do bring a different way of conducting the meeting, a little bit different than just, you know, a state person would do it, and so I do think that's something we ought to keep in mind going forward. Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: Anyone else? All right. Well, thank you for that input, and, you know, as John said, I think it's just kind of rotated historically that way, but I don't think I've ever had the sense that commercial nor recreational representatives were excluded, but so, yes, we hear you, and we totally understand, and I support that as well. Myra, is it time to turn it over to you? Okay. Thanks. So we'll start with the committee reports, and I think the first report are the open and closed sessions of the Council I, and I will turn that over to Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Madam Chair. The first report of discussion will be from the closed session that we had on Monday. The reports will be published on the website, so folks can see the full verbiage, and I'm just going to kind of give the highlights. We received a litigation brief from Monica, relative to highlights of what's going on with red snapper. She reported-out to us again at the Snapper Grouper Committee on that as well, and so there will be two different instances talking about the litigation brief.

For-Hire Reporting Advisory Panel, we did selections for the seats on the new ad hoc AP, which was advertised following the June 2024 council meeting. Only applicants from North Carolina and Florida were received, and the council recommended appointing seats from the available pool of applicants and re-advertising to fill the remaining seats during its December 2024 meeting. The following draft motions are presented as recommendations for the council's consideration.

In essence of saving some time, since I'm no longer chair, I'm going to go ahead and make the motion. **I make the motion to appoint Ron Whitaker and Chris Kimrey to the For-Hire Reporting Advisory Panel.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? I've got Robert as a second. Should we discuss? Seeing no discussion, the motion passes. **Any objections? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay. **I would like to make the next motion to appoint Bob Zales and Haley Stephens to the For-Hire Reporting Advisory Panel.**

MS. MURPHEY: I have a second from Robert. Any discussion? **Any objections? The motion passes.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay. We also provided the following direction to staff, which is to readvertise remaining seats on the For-Hire Reporting Advisory Panel for review in December. We're going to reach out to existing AP members to ask who might be a good participant.

Snapper Grouper AP seat for the Georgia representative, an open seat on the Snapper Grouper AP, for the Georgia representative, it was readvertised following the June 2024 council meeting, and seats on the Snapper Grouper AP are state-specific, but not sector-specific. **I would like to make the following motion to appoint Oscar Navarrete to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? I think I saw Charlie. Any discussion? **Any objections? The motion passes.**

DR. BELCHER: Next, we discussed the Citizen Science Operations Committee appointments. The Citizen Science Program has three advisory groups, the Operations Committee, the Projects Advisory Committee, and the ad hoc committees. Participants on these advisory panels must be members of the Citizen Science Pool and/or be a member of another council advisory panel. An open seat was advertised for the council's Citizen Science Operations Committee, along with other advisory panels, via news release and newsletter. **I would like to make the following motion to appoint all applicants that were in Table 1, Attachment 2b, to the Citizen Science Pool.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? Charlie. Any discussion? All right. The motion passes. **Any objection? Sorry. The motion passes.** I will get this right soon.

DR. BELCHER: **The next motion I would like to put forward is to appoint Bob Zales to the Citizen Science Operations Committee.**

MS. DUKES: I will second that motion.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. Any discussion? **Any objections? The motion passes.**

DR. BELCHER: The next item on the list was the Shrimp AP and Deepwater Shrimp AP structure. During the June 2024 council meeting, we discussed the merits of combining the Shrimp AP and Deepwater Shrimp AP and requested staff to provide a list of pros and cons for doing so. Council staff provided a discussion document, including the list and additional items for the council to consider. The council also considered adding representation from Virginia and Maryland on the Shrimp AP, in recognition of developing fisheries in these areas.

The council discussed the benefits of having joint discussion on shared issues by a combined AP, versus focused discussion on fishery-specific issues by the existing separate APs. We also discussed, again, combining the APs, while indicating the joint meetings could be considered when beneficial to address shared issues. Potential future impacts of developing fisheries north of the current shrimp fishery management unit were also considered, and the council recommended creating non-voting liaison seats on the Shrimp AP for Virginia and Maryland.

Liaisons will participate in AP deliberations and receive travel support from the council. Representatives will be recommended by the marine fisheries agency of each state and appointed by the council. **I would like to offer the following motion to establish Maryland and Virginia liaison seats on the Shrimp Advisory Panel.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? Kerry. Any discussion? **Any objections? The motion passes.**

DR. BELCHER: Under Other Business, council staff noted the recent addition of the following persons filling agency seats on the Coral Advisory Panel: Angela Delaney from Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth in Fort Lauderdale; Laura Eldredge from the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources from Miami, and Wade Lehmann from EP in Atlanta, Georgia. Madam Chairman, that ends my report for the closed session.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Carolyn. Would you like to move into the open session?

DR. BELCHER: Yes. I just need one second.

MS. MURPHEY: We're just giving Carolyn a little bit of time to find the --

DR. BELCHER: I had three reports to open, and I apparently only opened two, and so hold on a second.

MS. MURPHEY: Ready, Carolyn?

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MS. MURPHEY: She's got it now. Okay.

DR. BELCHER: Apologies. Okay, and so this is the Full Council open session report, a continuation on Monday, or Tuesday, and we received reports from our representatives with the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, the U.S. Coast Guard, liaisons from the Gulf of Mexico and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils, as well as our state representatives. We also received staff reports on the update on stakeholder engagement meetings and the revised SSC workgroup approach.

Council staff briefed the council on activities since the June 2024 meeting, including planning for stakeholder engagements scheduled in North Carolina and Georgia for early 2025 and revisions to the workgroup approach used by the SSC. The council approved the following motion, which was to approve the revised SSC workshop approach.

Shrimp Advisory Panel restructuring, the council staff provided the outcome of the discussions from the council's closed session regarding the potential restructuring of the advisory panels. The council recommended retaining separate Shrimp and Deepwater APs, due to the fundamental differences between the fisheries and anticipated future actions. The council also discussed adding the seats, as we just talked about from the results of the closed session, for Maryland and Virginia.

We received an update on the Hudson Canyon National Marine Sanctuary from LeAnn Hogan, an update on the East Coast Climate Scenario Planning Initiative, and so scenario planning is a tool that helps people and organizations prepare for uncertain futures. In late 2020, east coast fishery management organizations initiated a scenario planning exercise to explore jurisdictional and governance issues related to climate change and shifting fisheries stocks along the Atlantic coast.

The scenario planning work occurred through a structured, multistep process, over a two-year period, concluding with a summit workshop in February of 2023. Council staff provided a summary of the progress since the summit, addressing the creation of two standing groups to manage implementation activities and identification and prioritization of action items.

We received the NOAA Fisheries reports. Andy Strelcheck, Regional Administrator, provided the following from SERO, reporting out on the gag fishery, which closed with landings that were 98 percent of the commercial ACL and 101 percent of the rec ACL. The recreational golden tilefish fishery closed with 70 percent landed. They're considering reopening the fishery, to allow for additional harvest, and the council asked whether the underage could be carried over into the next year. It cannot, as carryover provisions were only recently added to the ABC control rule and have not yet been addressed for golden tile.

Work continues to resolve the data issues on the permits system, and SERO is working with a contractor to create a snapshot database to provide data to managers. The database is expected to be available soon, and then Andy shared with us the upcoming retirements, including Dr. Jack McGovern, Dr. Mike Travis, and Ginny Croom.

Dr. Clay Porch provided the update for the Science Center, noting that Dr. Trika Gerard was recently hired as the Deputy Director for Science and Operations, that the South Atlantic Deepwater Longline Survey, or SADLS, will continue as planned, despite a delay in funding, and that they have a new data application, SEAFish, that is being developed to serve all fishery-independent survey data.

We received an update on the Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission Flyingfish and Dolphinfish Workgroup. We discussed the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting (SEFHIER) program improvement amendment. At the June 2024 meeting, the council received feedback from NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center that data being collected through the SEFHIER program and the for-hire logbook cannot be used for management, due to low compliance and lack of validation. The letter included a list of recommendations to render the data collected through SEFHIER useful for management. The council directed staff to initiate work on an amendment to address the shortcomings, focusing on incorporating actions that can be taken in the near-term, without an amendment, and considering actions and alternatives being explored by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

Council staff provided background on for-hire reporting in the South Atlantic, a draft purpose and need for the amendment, and a list of potential actions and alternatives for the council to consider. Council members offered the following questions and comments, which included that -- It was noted that the agency cannot validate the logbook until reporting compliance is improved. A question came to the group of what level of reporting compliance would be needed to begin validation, start the comparison of logbook data with MRIP estimates, and use the logbook data in management.

Several council members noted the need for increased effort towards education, outreach, and customer support. A more boots-on-the-ground approach would be needed to help educate some fishermen, and then there was a question regarding the one-stop reporting guidelines that the agency is using.

Purpose and need, the council reviewed the draft purpose and need statements and provided the following edit to the purpose statement. The purpose of the amendment is to make modifications to the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting program to improve the accuracy, precision, and timeliness of landings, discards, with a strikeout, and, to continue the list, fishing effort, and include economic data, for the for-hire component of the recreational sector of the snapper grouper and coastal migratory pelagics and dolphin wahoo fisheries.

We discussed the Draft Action 1, which would modify reporting frequency for for-hire trips for for-hire vessels. Consideration of required reporting within an hour, and so, basically, it was just scoping, within the group, what we thought were the appropriate timeframes for the completion of the trip to report. Require trip notification for for-hire vessels, task the IPT to clarify the intent of the action and that Alternatives 2 and 3 would apply to dually-permitted vessels. We also asked to provide information on what would happen if a for-hire trip changed to a commercial trip.

Draft Action 3 looks at establishing approved landing location for for-hire vessels, and so we're looking for additional information on the approval process for landing locations, and we're also looking to how it was done in the Gulf of Mexico, how would private landing locations would be approved, and other questions related to that, again, through different regions. The other question that was kind of important was how important is this action in relation to validation.

Draft Action 4 is require participation in a validation survey. For Alternative 2, clarify that all permit holders would be required to participate in a validation survey. There was a request to provide an example of how validation surveys would be administered, what percentage of permitted vessels would need to be sampled, information on how validation was completed previously in the Gulf of Mexico, and another question related to that was who a valid -- Would a valid survey be the responsibility of the boat owner or the permit holder.

Other items included did-not-fish reports, looking for additional information on the existing South Atlantic did-not-fish reporting requirements and whether they need to be modified, gather information on why the Southeast Region feels that did-not-fish reports are necessary, but the Greater Atlantic Region does not recommend DNF reports, and so why the inconsistencies in the regions, and examine what other did-not-fish requirements are in place, or are going into place, so the requirements can be aligned.

Discussion about the economic component, whether the sampling approach is adequate, should it be census, and that was kind of the bulk of that conversation, and looking to the spatial data, and it would be beneficial to improve spatial data for the for-hire fleet and collect it in higher resolution than is currently collected through the logbook.

It was noted that SERO is developing a new reporting platform that is intended to eventually allow one-stop reporting. Data collected through this application would continue to be funneled through ACCSP. SERO intends to beta test the application with fishermen and conduct outreach. Another project involves creation of a permit registry. Both projects intend to ease the burden on stakeholders as well as the agency. Council members requested to be kept informed regarding the agency's outreach and education plans.

We reviewed the allocations for species meeting the time-based criteria in the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council allocation review trigger policy. At the December 2023 meeting, the council approved their allocation review guidelines and updated their allocation review trigger policy. The guidelines specify how the council's sector allocations will be reviewed and documented, while the policy specifies when allocation reviews will occur. One of the criteria the council chose to trigger an allocation review is time-based, noting that each species will have its sector allocations reviewed at least once every seven years.

Several of the allocations for species that the council manages currently meet the time-based criteria for review. As such, the council will work to review allocations for these species over several meetings. For this meeting, the council reviewed the current sector allocations and other relevant information for Atlantic spadefish and the three species that make up the jacks complex, which is almaco jack, lesser amberjack, and banded rudderfish.

The council offered the following comments and guidance. Generally, the council noted the existing sector allocations for the four species are sufficient in relation to the current fishery. Allocations should be reexamined when the annual catch limits are revised and the Fishing Effort Survey is integrated into the catch level recommendations, and that's the FES, and so transitioning from CHTS to FES.

The council noted the desire to potentially modify accountability measures for Atlantic spadefish and the jacks complex and tasked the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel to complete a fishery performance report for the jacks complex. In accordance with the guidelines, a summary allocation review report will be developed, based on the council's discussion, and presented to the council for approval at the December 2024 meeting.

I would like to offer the following as a timing and tasks motion for us, and we would like to direct staff to do the following: request that SERO staff present to the council at the December 2024 meeting on the level of reporting compliance that would be needed to begin validation, start the comparison of logbook data with MRIP estimates, and use logbook data in management; the mechanics of how a hail-in and hail-out requirement would work for for-hire vessels; the approval process for landing locations and how was it previously carried out in the Gulf of Mexico, how would private landing locations be approved, how would this approval process operate with permitted vessels in the GARFO region, how important are approved landing locations in relation to validation, and why are they necessary, and how are they useful; an example of how a validation survey would be administered and what

percentage of permitted vessels would be needed to be sampled and information on how validation was completed previously in the Gulf of Mexico. Additionally, prepare a summary allocation review report for the Atlantic spadefish and the jacks complex for approval at the December 2024 meeting. That so ends my motion.

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

MR. STRELCHECK: I have a comment, and so, if you can go back up to the comment about the GARFO region, I just want to note, right, so, yes, that's accurate, in terms of kind of out of the Southeast Region, but keep in mind that the council is specifying these requirements as a condition of the permit, right, and so it's your permit, and so, if you wanted to do something different in an area say north of North Carolina, you could, and you would have to have the justification and what are the limitations and shortcomings of doing that, but keep in mind that the requirements right now are tied to reporting based on the permit, and so there's a lot of criticism coming in about why am I required to do this, and the Northeast doesn't require it, and other areas don't require it.

The reality is they're required to do it because they decided to get a permit from our region, in order to fish those species, right, and so, if we wanted to alter that, we would want to look at the benefits and tradeoffs of that and make sure it's clear, obviously, as to why we are or aren't requiring those specifications in this region. That's just one example of, obviously, a whole host of things that are tied to the permit requirements.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So you're saying the council could have, within say the dolphin wahoo permit, different requirements if you're operating outside of the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction than if you're operating inside of it?

MR. STRELCHECK: We have to, I think, determine if that's fair and equitable, right, and the justification for why we would be doing that, right, and, as Monica would say, we would need to build the record, if we did that, and what that would look like, and so I'm not suggesting that we should, or can, at this point, but just the fact that we could explore it, if, you know, that continues to be an issue.

I keep hearing, you know, concerns outside of kind of the region in which our fishermen are, obviously, largely operating, and I just wanted to correct the fact that the reason that is is because they have opted to get that permit, and so they're now having to abide by our permitting requirements.

MS. MURPHEY: Any other comments? I still need a second on this motion. I've got Jimmy. Any discussion? **Objections? The motion passes.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay. That, Madam Chair, ends my Full Council report.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Carolyn, and I think you're up again for the SEDAR Committee.

DR. BELCHER: The SEDAR Committee met on Tuesday afternoon, and we approved the minutes from the March 2024 meeting and the agenda for the September 2024 meeting. We

received a Steering Committee update. Council staff provided the update on discussions from the March, July, and August -- I think that's supposed to be 2024 SEDAR Steering Committees, which centered on revising the SEDAR process by eliminating the research track and operational assessments nomenclature.

If the new approach is approved by the SEDAR Steering Committee, assessments would be structured around project components such as data workshops, topical working groups, assessment workgroups, or review workgroups, each of which has the potential to impact the assessment timeline.

SEDAR process changes and identifying key stocks, council staff presented on past and future potential changes to the SEDAR process and the number of stock assessments that could be completed. The committee discussed the idea of key stocks, acknowledging the limited number of assessments that can be completed in a year. A proposed Southeast Fisheries Science Center schedule included fourteen stocks being assessed every six years, with an update model completed around year-three.

The council expressed the following considerations for the revised process: having a fixed schedule of assessments would be beneficial; need the flexibility to address emerging issues; include gray triggerfish as a potential key stock, given their recent importance; consider longer intervals between assessments, and possibly alternate assessment approaches, for stable stocks; consider switching some stocks with age-based assessments to a more rapid assessment type; allow flexibility to change key stocks as importance evolves. The SEDAR Committee will further discuss SEDAR process changes and priorities in December, after the SSC has reviewed the proposed process and developed their recommendations.

We reviewed the 2026 stock assessment schedule for the South Atlantic region. Staff presented on the 2026 stock assessments for species managed by the council. Gag and red grouper will begin in 2026, and then red snapper will continue, with two time slots. King mackerel and snowy grouper, originally slated for 2026, will be rescheduled for 2027. Similarly, black sea bass, initially under consideration for 2026, was also postponed to 2027. The council did not propose any modifications to the assessment schedule for 2027 and 2028.

Other business, council staff were notified by Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission that SEDAR 95 for the Atlantic stock of cobia has been delayed, due to the lead analyst leaving National Marine Fisheries. ASMFC staff indicated that ASMFC would like to have the assessment be completed as quickly as possible, and South Atlantic Fishery Management Council staff indicated that a delay in the assessment would result in downstream impacts on South Atlantic assessments. The Science Center indicated the assessment cannot be completed within the current timeframe. As I still chair this committee, I cannot make the following motion, which is timing and tasks, and so, Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Would someone like to take this and make this motion? I've got Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I make the motion to direct the staff to do the following: provide information on life history, to help determine which stocks should be considered key stocks; request that the SSC review the proposed SEDAR process changes and provide input on the proposed changes, key stocks, and intervals between assessments for committee

consideration in December 2024; request that the SSC provide guidance on stocks that could be adequately managed using alternatives to intensive age-based stock assessments. The SSC should consider both assessed and unassessed stocks and may consider this as part of the unassessed stocks effort and may consider a working group to address this request. That's everything, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? I've got Charlie. Any discussion? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I would be interested in hearing, maybe from John and Clay on this, and so I brought up, during the SEDAR Committee discussion, about, you know, the key stocks versus, you know, simplified assessments, and not necessarily being defined simply based on life history and other factors, stock status, and that it's also a throughput issue, and it's a capacity issue, and it's willingness to, obviously, simplify the process, and so my comment is really -- I think it goes beyond kind of how we've summarized this motion, in terms of how we need to look at key versus non-key stocks, and I think the center intends to do that, but, John, or Clay, do you have any further thoughts?

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, Clay.

DR. PORCH: Yes, and we've actually been working pretty closely with council staff on this, and we just provided some information that is along the lines of that first bullet there, looking at what kind of data is available, and various aspects of the stocks, and I think a lot of this is already in process now.

MS. MURPHEY: Great. Thank you, Clay. Go ahead, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and that was my expectation as well, which is always good to have some things underway. Yes, I really think there is two considerations, I guess, within the key stocks, and there is the idea of which ones can be assessed by other methods, which is more of the technical scientific question of which one does the SSC have comfort, and be willing to give us ABC recommendations, using different methods, particularly when we're considering stocks that already have pretty intensive, robust assessments, and then the other part is, once you have that universe, which ones does the council maybe bring in other considerations that it decides, okay, you know, I will go ahead and do that on this number of these stocks, so that I can increase the frequency of this other tier of stocks, because of the other considerations.

You know, I see this as sort of playing out along two tracks, and so the first part being, you know, we do need to hear, from the SSC, which one of these are you going to be comfortable giving us an ABC on, and which ones are you going to, you know, really -- Is that going to cause a lot of issues and, you know, fall out here at this table, and so, yes, I think we consider all of those things, and just go along in different paths, and that's one reason why that third bullet is a bit detailed.

I think we want to make it clear to the SSC that the council really is looking for feedback on this, the technical aspects, and it's not necessarily an easy job, and I think the other thing to make sure is conveyed is, if you make a decision today, it doesn't stand forever. We always say that, and nothing we do ever does stand forever, but it does seem sometimes, when you talk about something like that, people tend to think, well, it will be that way forever. It won't, and key stocks will change, as we discussed, and as our needs change and evolve.

MS. MURPHEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I agree with all that, and I guess the last thing I will add is I do think, right, that we're giving a lot of deference, right now, to the Science Center, and the SSC, to provide input here, but the council plays a role in this, right, and so it's really critical, I think, that, once we get that input and advice, we consider, and weigh-in, and maybe we disagree, in terms of what needs to be age-based, versus a more simplified assessment, based on our management needs, and what we kind of foresee, at least in the near-term and long-term, but that is, obviously, kind of an iterative discussion that we'll need to have as this comes forward.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, Clay.

DR. PORCH: Just following up on that, I mean, what we really need is what the council perceives as their greatest priorities, in terms of key stocks, and getting back at something John said, and then we can look at -- Knowing that you absolutely want to have these stocks assessed on a fairly regular basis, what kind of assessment techniques are best suited for it, and is there room to scale things down, and have that discussion with the SSC, and so there are two things we need to know from you. Which stocks are the most critical, and how often do you absolutely need them assessed, and then we can work with the approaches that we would use to make that happen.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Clay. Any further discussion? Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for that, Clay, and so when do we, as a council, have that discussion of --

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I hope December.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Any other discussion? Thanks for the comments. The motion passes, or I'm sorry. **Any objections? With no objections, the motion passes.**

DR. BELCHER: Okay. With that, Madam Chair, my report is concluded.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. Thank you, Carolyn. All right, and so I guess it's my turn to go through the Habitat & Ecosystem Committee report. The committee approved the minutes from the June 2024 meeting and the agenda for this meeting.

During the June 2024 council meeting, staff were directed to bring four potential approaches to the IPT for establishing a shrimp fishery access area along the northern extension of the Oculina Coral Habitat Area of Particular Concern to allow access to the rock shrimp fishery. Those four potential approaches are -- Number 1 was to address the shortcomings listed in the disapproval letter and resubmit Coral 10 in its current form. The second one was an alternative to Coral 10 that would increase the buffer between the known coral pinnacles and the western boundary of the proposed shrimp fishery access area. The third one was to modify the coral habitat area of

particular concern boundary through a Coral FMP framework amendment, and the last one was to develop a joint Shrimp and Coral FMP amendment to establish a shrimp fishery access area.

The IPT discussed those approaches and what the benefits would be to move forward with the Approach 4, versus Approach 1, and it was stated that the council may have taken the wrong path initially with Coral Amendment 10, and the greatest chance of success, at this point, is Approach Number 4. The proposed shrimp fishing access area is small, but historically important. There has allegedly been no coral in the area for a long time, and the council intended to establish the shrimp fishery access area immediately after the Coral Amendment 8 submission in 2013. The proposed joint amendment will need to address the goals and objectives for both the Shrimp FMP and the Coral FMP.

The motion was to move forward with an amendment to both the Coral and Shrimp FMPs to establish a shrimp fishery access area. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Do we have a second? I've got Jimmy. Any discussion? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I was -- Just for discussion, I was wondering, Myra, if you could repeat -- You and I had an off-record conversation about there was a time, in CE-BA, I believe, and that's the acronym for whatever that document was, where there was precedent, and we had established a shrimp fishery access area, and can you explain that better than I just did?

MS. BROUWER: Sure. I will try, and so the council did an amendment that we called the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 1, and there were two of them, and that first amendment amended several FMPs. The Coral FMP was amended to establish the deepwater coral habitat areas of particular concern, and so there were like I think six of them, and they were very large areas.

Through that process, at the same time, the footprint of the historical fisheries that had occurred in those areas was kind of frozen, and then those little areas were -- I don't want to say little, because they're not all little, but they were -- Access continued to be allowed to those fisheries that had been established in those areas already, and so, process-wise, both of those things were done at the same time. We said, okay, all of this coral is here, and we're going to protect it all, but there's these little chunks that have been fished for some time, and we're going to allow fishing to continue there.

What we're doing now is a little bit different. It's the Coral HAPC has already been established, and now we're carving out a little sliver of it and saying, oh, never mind, and this doesn't contain any coral, and we have no evidence of any coral being there, and it's an area that's been fished historically, and so we want to either redraw the boundary, to carve out that little area, or establish what we are now calling a shrimp fishery access area, which is the same process that we used in CE-BA 1. Does that help? Okay.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you for that explanation. Any other discussion? **Do we have any objections? The motion passes.** The council also reviewed the draft purpose and need for Approach Number 4 and determined that the second sentence in the purpose was unnecessary, and so this is direction for staff.

It's to move forward with the draft purpose and need, as modified, and that was the purpose of this amendment, is to create a shrimp fishery access area along the eastern edge of the Northern Oculina Coral Habitat Area of Particular Concern boundary in an area where the rock shrimp fishery operated historically, while minimizing impact to deepwater coral, and then the second line was struck out. Then the need is for this amendment to allow the rock shrimp fishery to obtain optimum yield, while minimizing negative impacts to deepwater coral in the council's jurisdiction. We have a timing and tasks motion, and would someone like to make that motion? Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I would like to put forward the following motion to adopt the following timing and tasks: add the Shrimp 12/Coral 11 joint amendment to the council workplan and prepare for review for scoping at the December meeting.

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? Charlie. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you. I just wanted to kind of go over -- The Coral Amendment 10 took a long time to put together, and we did a lot of -- There were a lot of opportunities for the public to comment on that, and so we don't necessarily have to take this out, back out, to scoping, and that will depend on you all, and so I'm just putting it out there for you guys to think about it, because, in December, you know, the IPT will have met, and we will bring to you a more fleshed-out kind of outline of this plan, and you can decide if you want to include another alternative besides the ones that went in with Coral 10, and so that's why we have this potentially for review for scoping in December.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Myra. Any discussion? Seeing none -- Does anybody have any further discussion? Go ahead, Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Myra, I guess, if we were going to add any alternatives, which I have not heard the desire to do so, that would have to be done now, correct, for scoping in December, or you're saying that other alternatives would come out of scoping?

MS. BROUWER: No, and I was -- Well, in June, I believe, there was an additional alternative that was proposed, and I believe Andy brought that to you all, and so the IPT will get together and flesh those out, and, in December, you will have an opportunity to say, yes, we want to take all these alternatives for scoping, or no, or we don't want to scope it any more, because we feel that we've scoped it enough, and so all of those are possibilities.

MS. MURPHEY: Are you good, Kerry? Okay. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just a more general comment, because I've heard this come up several times throughout council meetings, about scoping, and the way that I view scoping is we don't have to have a detailed list of alternatives to share with the public. Obviously, it's helpful for them to react to and comment on that, right, but the whole idea of scoping is to say here's our purpose and need, and here's what we're trying to accomplish, and here's some ideas that we're exploring, and we would love to get your input, and feedback, right, and so, obviously, we appreciate that sometimes it's better to then give them kind of more details, so that they can react to it, but I often hear that, you know, we need to get -- You know, we hold off on scoping until we have these alternatives, and I don't think that's truly the case. We can go out to scoping before we have alternatives fleshed out.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Andy. I've got Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Just to that, I guess I was always under the impression not that we had to have everything fleshed out, but that we had to have the bounds fleshed out, and is that -- That came up, obviously, in a different discussion about red snapper yesterday, but that's sort of what I was always taught, and is that not correct?

MR. STRELCHECK: Certainly Shep and Monica can weigh-in, and, you know, sometimes I don't think we've thought of everything by the time we go out to scoping, and so I think it's more at the public hearing stage, right, that you want to have the bounds established, because, once you get past the public hearing, if you're making any changes, and you haven't allowed the public to comment, right, then you're essentially taking away opportunities for them to provide that input that could change, obviously, your preference for preferred alternatives. Shep, or Monica, anything else? Do you agree? Okay.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Andy, for clarifying all of that. Any further discussion? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Obviously, I was gone for part of this, but, unless we're really going to have some new, you know, alternatives in there, and we're still going to have public comment, I don't really see a need for scoping, unless something comes up in December that I don't know about.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Charlie. Any more discussion? Is everybody good? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, if we're going with what Charlie said, I think we need a substitute motion, don't we, because you said -- The motion right now is to prepare for scoping at the December meeting.

MS. MURPHEY: Well, I'm thinking, and tell me if I'm wrong, but we would still have further conversations in December about going out to scoping, and so is everybody in agreement with that, or am I misinterpreting?

UNIDENTIFIED: (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. MURPHEY: Okay, and so everybody is still good with this motion? Any further discussion? **Any objections to this motion?** Okay. **The motion passes.** Thank you, everyone. I think, last, but not least, we have Jessica, with Snapper Grouper.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Madam Chair. The Snapper Grouper Committee met earlier this week and approved the minutes from the June 2024 meeting and the agenda for the September 2024 meeting, with a slight modification to allow for a litigation briefing, and the committee received updates about amendments currently under review, red snapper litigation, an upcoming secretarial amendment, and the red snapper research projects being conducted in Florida under exempted fishing permits.

Three red snapper cases are currently under litigation. The latest one alleges that NMFS violated MSA and APA, because it failed to address overfishing of red snapper. The settlement agreement was approved on August 22, and it includes NMFS agreeing to complete and submit a secretarial amendment. The final rule needs to be submitted to the Federal Register by June 6, 2025, and the council can prepare regulations to end overfishing, but would need to submit these to NMFS by June 6, 2025. The council will be able to comment on the secretarial amendment, and there will be opportunities for public comment prior to implementation, and the notice of intent is expected to be published next month.

Then the committee moved into the gag and black grouper recreational vessel limits and on-demand gear for black sea bass. This is Regulatory Amendment 36, and this amendment considers revising gag and black grouper recreational vessel limits and revising transit and stowage requirements for commercial black sea bass pots equipped with on-demand gear.

Council staff presented the draft amendment using a decision document that outlines actions, alternatives, public comments, and draft rationale for each action, and the committee provided the following direction to staff to revise the draft codified text for gag and black grouper bag limits to be similar to previous language and to be consistent with other bag limit text, meaning the Amendment 55 pertaining to scamp and yellowmouth grouper, and then add the following information to the background discussion in the amendment to describe misidentification issues between gag and black grouper, similar to information in Amendment 53, and note the council's intent to revisit black grouper management after completion of the ongoing black grouper management strategy evaluation being conducted by Florida FWC. Then there is a draft motion there, that hasn't been made yet, if someone would be willing to make that motion. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I move to approve the Regulatory Amendment 36 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region 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.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there a second? All right. It's seconded by Jimmy. It's under discussion. Any more discussion on this? Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Can you scroll back up, for just a hot second, where we talk about the misidentification? Can we put some boundaries on that misidentification, more so than perhaps the limited conversations we had at the table about this yesterday? I think, from the perspective of my state in particular, the misidentification is typically to the recreational sector only, and we don't see that many black grouper, and so I think that's where most of that misidentification comes from. From a positive species identification area, our dockside intercept sampling, our trip interview program, and even our commercial trip tickets, specifically from electronic from 2011 to current, are usually dead-on with their species identification.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I would just add that I feel like the bounds are captured in the Amendment 53 document, but I'm looking to Mike, to make sure you think it's already captured in that amendment. He's coming to the table. Go ahead, Robert, while Mike is coming up here.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I mean, are we going to specify just to a specific state? I would say the opposite, and I don't think we have any recreational misidentification issues down in south Florida, and so I don't know that that's going to be helpful, having that statement in here, and I don't know we're directing it at the recreational sector, unless there's some real data to support that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so that's why I thought that the reference to the information that was already in Amendment 53, which we spent a lot of time on, and we had a lot of these discussions, and I thought that was adequate, but maybe Mike could speak to that.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I mean, we can look back through Amendment 53, and see, I guess, the level of explanation that was included there, because I don't have that fresh in my mind at the moment. I guess, do we need to be incredibly detailed about it, or is it simply a mention that this -- Because, as I interpret it, the reason why this is being mentioned is because this is the connection between gag and black grouper management, is because there have been misidentification issues in parts of the region, and we can, you know, make note of that "in parts of the region", or "in parts of the fishery", and it's not a universal, unanimous thing throughout the region, and there may be -- You know, like Robert comments on, there may be regions that are very good at identifying one versus the other, and so it's sections of the fishery.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Amy.

MS. DUKES: I'm fine then with removing that. I'm just not familiar with what information was provided in Amendment 53, as you indicated, and so, as long as it's generic in nature, then I'm good.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead, Allie.

MS. IBERLE: I just looked through it, and so we mentioned it in the summary, and then it's included in Chapter 2, which is where you set up your alternatives, in the comparison of alternatives, and then it's also included in Chapter 4, and so it's a quick Control-F for "misidentification", and you're seeing it in multiple chapters of the amendment, specifically tied to the bag and vessel limit actions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Any more discussion? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Procedurally, I guess a question for John. How do the minutes from those discussions get incorporated, if at all, into that record? I didn't get a change to go back and read it, Allie, and thanks for that, but are there any captures from the discussion, in addition to what's in Amendment 53? That's it? Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion? All right. This is a roll call vote. I'm sorry. Tim.

MR. GRINER: When we're done with that, I wanted to scroll back up to something else.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Got it. I'm going to pass it over to John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. Thank you. Yes, this is an approval, and so it's a roll call vote. We will call alphabetically, and so, for a change in the last few years, we're going to start with, alphabetically, Dr. Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Borland.

MR. BORLAND: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Dukes.

MS. DUKES: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Helmey.

MS. HELMEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Hull.

MR. HULL: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roller.

MR. ROLLER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Spottswood.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Chair Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. **It passes unanimously.** Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim, did you have something you wanted to go back to?

MR. GRINER: Yes, and could we scroll back up to the lawsuit paragraph, the paragraph about the lawsuit for red snapper? There was a sentence in here that says the council can prepare regulations to end overfishing, but would need to submit these to NMFS by June 6, 2025, and that's confusing to me. I don't think that's what the settlement says. I think the settlement says that NMFS has to have it recorded in the Federal Register by June 6, and, Monica, is that not correct, but that -- If the council were to prepare something, it would have to go to NMFS way before June 6.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Tim is correct. It would have to be submitted to the Federal Register, and so it would need to be approved by the Fisheries Service and then submitted to the Federal Register by June 6.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Myra is changing that on the screen, if you want to look at it now.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and that "submit to the Federal Register" means that the comment period has to be over as well, and that is for recordation in the register.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Would you ask me that question again?

MR. GRINER: I said "the submit to the Federal Register" is for recordation in the register, and that means that all the comment periods, and the last sixty-day period, is over.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, right, and that means that you would have already received public comment on whatever proposed rule, and this is the final rule would need to be submitted to the Federal Register by June 6.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do you feel good about the language there, Tim?

MR. GRINER: Yes. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm going to continue going back through the committee report. All right, and so then the committee moved into black sea bass, which is Snapper Grouper Amendment 56. I'm sorry. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So it's not -- Would you scroll back up, since we're on that paragraph, and let's make it completely accurate. NMFS needs to approve -- So the final rule must be

submitted to the Federal Register, and not published in the Federal Register, and so the way this works is the Fisheries Service, when we're going to implement some sort of action by the council, or, in this case, a secretarial amendment, we submit those to the Federal Register for publication, and sometimes it takes several days between the date you submit it and the date it's published, and so, just to be clear, it must be submitted to the Federal Register by June 6.

While we're on that paragraph, the second sentence says "the latest one alleges that NMFS violated the MSA and APA", and that's not the latest lawsuit. The latest lawsuit is the one on the interim rule, and so maybe we just want to say that "one lawsuit alleges that NMFS violated the MSA and APA". That's fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Monica. All right. Back to black sea bass. Okay. Amendment 56 responds to the SEDAR 76 stock assessment of black sea bass, which indicates the stock is depleted. In June of 2024, the council requested additional catch projections that incorporated management changes beyond changes to the annual catch limit to be developed by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and reviewed by the SSC at their August 2024 meeting.

The SSC met via webinar in August and discussed the additional projections with the analyst, clarifying the assumptions for the requested projections. The SSC is expected to review results of the projections at their October 2024 meeting, and an SSC representative presented the SSC's comments from the August 2024 meeting.

The committee discussed the current list of potential management actions and expected changes to fishing behavior in response to management actions being incorporated in the requested catch projections. The committee discussed addressing black sea bass changes incrementally, and, first, the committee would address new catch limits, once provided, and new reference points. Secondly, once the new stock reference points have been adopted, the council will address the rebuilding plan.

The committee also provided the following direction to staff to explore federal snapper grouper recreational trip data to determine whether past closures of black sea bass (2010 to 2013) or other snapper grouper species provide insight as to whether changes in recreational catch (landings and releases) or trips could be expected if a January through April recreational black sea bass retention closure were to be implemented. If notable changes can be expected, coordinate with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to discuss how expected effort changes can be incorporated into the applicable catch projections. Work further with the SSC and Science Center to develop a method to allocate projected removals and subtract discards of black sea bass for presentation at the December 2024 council meeting. Conduct scoping after the December 2024 council meeting. I'm just looking to see if there are any more black sea bass comments here. Okay.

Next, the committee moved into scamp/yellowmouth grouper, which is Snapper Grouper Amendment 55. Snapper Grouper Amendment 55 is being developed to reorganize the other shallow-water grouper complex and establish the new scamp and yellowmouth grouper complex and establish a rebuilding plan, catch levels, allocations, and accountability measures for this new complex.

The committee provided feedback on the codified text, to ensure the text is written similarly to other bag limits. The committee passed the following motions and provided the following

direction to staff. **The committee made Motion Number 2 to select Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative for Subaction 2d. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection?** All right. **Motion 2 carries.**

Then the committee made Motion Number 3 to move Actions 6 and 7b to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection?** Okay. **The motion carries.** Then there is a draft motion there, Draft Motion Number 4, if someone would like to make that motion. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: **I would like to move that we approve Snapper Grouper Amendment 55, scamp and yellowmouth grouper, 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 to re-deem the codified text.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Do we have a second? It's seconded by Kerry. It's under discussion. Any discussion? All right. This is a roll call vote, and I'm going to pass it to John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Jessica. We will run alphabetically again. Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Borland.

MR. BORLAND: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Dukes.

MS. DUKES: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Helmey.

MS. HELMEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Hull.

MR. HULL: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roller.

MR. ROLLER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Spottswood.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **It passes unanimously.** Thank you

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Then the committee moved into the topics for the fall 2024 AP meeting. The Snapper Grouper AP is scheduled to convene on October 15 through 17. The committee directed staff to include the following topics in the AP's agenda: red snapper and yellowtail snapper fishery performance reports; ABC control rule risk scoring for golden tilefish, blueline tilefish, mutton snapper, red snapper, and yellowtail snapper; management strategy evaluation update and discussion; SERFS presentation; stakeholder engagement meetings discussion; Amendment 56, and this is the black sea bass amendment, and ask about expected fishing behavior response to the considered management actions; amendment updates for Amendment 46, which is recreational permitting, SEFHIER update, and recruitment for the for-hire AP; and other updates on best fishing practices, citizen science, SEDAR, red snapper EFP projects. The committee also requested an FPR, fishery performance report, to be completed for the jacks complex at a future AP meeting.

All right, and then the committee moved into Other Business, and there was a discussion of the black grouper management strategy evaluation. At their August 2024 meeting, the SSC reviewed a presentation from Nature Analytics on a proposed foundation for designing management procedure options for black grouper fisheries in the U.S. Southeast region, and the SSC representative provided the SSC's comments on the MSE. All right, and then we have a timing and tasks there, and would someone like to make the timing and tasks motion? Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I would like to move that we direct staff to do the following: prepare Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 36, which is gag and black grouper recreational vessel limits and black sea bass on-demand pots, and Amendment 55, which is the scamp and yellowmouth grouper complex, for transmittal to the Secretary of Commerce, with

additional direction to review and revise the codified text, as needed. Additionally, develop outreach materials/media for stakeholders about Regulatory Amendment 36 and Amendment 55 regulations; investigate black sea bass effort data and work with the Science Center to update assumptions for catch projections; convene the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel in October of 2024; conduct scoping webinars for Amendment 56, again the black sea bass assessment response, after the December meeting; and convene the commercial snapper grouper management subcommittee between the September and December 2024 council meetings, and we would be reviewing the membership at Full Council.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there a second? It's seconded by Kerry. Any discussion on that timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to the timing and tasks motion?** All right. **The motion carries.** I am going to pass it back to you, Madam Chair.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Jessica. I think that concludes all of our committee reports, and so would everyone like -- Go ahead, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: All right, and so we put this little note in here to remind us to ask you guys if you want to review the membership for this commercial subcommittee at this time.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay.

MS. BROUWER: I don't remember who signed up for it, and so Amy, Kerry, Jessica, Trish, Jimmy, Tim, and Charlie. Okay. Did you get that, Mike?

MS. MURPHEY: Is that right?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I thought that Andy wanted to be on there.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm on the fence about it, because I have so many things that I'm involved with right now. Can I say maybe? I would love to be on it, but I'm not sure I have the capacity and time to be on it, and that's the challenge.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Include him in the correspondence.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Is everybody good with that list? Then I guess we'll be getting together sometime between now and Christmas, or December? Okay. Before the December meeting. Okay. Great. Thanks. Now does anybody have anything else? Then we'll go ahead and conclude our committee reports, and I think it's a good time to have a break, and maybe just come back at -- Is 10:30 too late? Okay. Come back at 10:30. Thanks, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MURPHEY: All right, everyone. We are going back to our agenda, which, basically, we're following the Friday morning agenda. We've got John Hadley, who is going to go over the council workplan, and so I'll go ahead and turn it over to John.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you very much. In front of you is a slightly revised workplan, and this has also been uploaded to the meeting webpage, and so, if you want to follow along on

your own laptop, you can click on that from the meeting webpage, and this should come up as an Excel file, but there were a couple of things we moved around, but not much, and so not much needed to be shifted around for this week, in relation to the discussion, and so I'll run down and highlight a few items.

Of course, Snapper Grouper Amendment 55 and Reg 36 will be coming off of there, and we have those two approvals, and so that will kind of condense the workplan a bit. Then, moving down, you know, really, what the focus is for this meeting is the December meeting, or for this discussion is the December meeting, and then, as you'll call, in December, usually the council has a little bit more of a long-term planning discussion for your workplan, and so there's a few items coming up, but, you know, I think, for December, it's looking pretty full overall, but okay to fit into the meeting week.

Moving down the workplan, you can see what will be coming in front of you, and, you know, a few items on there, black sea bass, Amendment 55, and the recreational permitting and education requirement amendment will be coming back to you. Then, to go along with that, the for-hire limited entry, potentially, and so that's -- Again, that's kind of a TBD, depending on the availability of new permit data, and so that -- You know, we'll see that where that information stands, if we can provide that information to you, and then we'll be bringing that back to you. If not, that may slide, but it sounds like there may be some headway that has been made to gather the more recent permit information for you to review.

For Coral 10, that timeline, and it will be Shrimp as well, and that timeline has essentially been extended a bit. I think we'll get with staff, a little bit, to maybe flesh-out that exact timeline a little bit more, but we added a few more meetings, and so we're tentatively looking at final approval sometime in the latter half of next year. Also coming back to you will be the SEFHIER revisions, as, you know, a further-fleshed-out document from what we discussed this week.

Then, moving down the workplan here, as you can see, there are several upcoming assessment response amendments coming up for next year, and these may be -- You know, maybe perhaps a discussion for December, after you start to get some of the assessment reports, but, you know, this may be able to be condensed a little bit, if you want to say combine the blueline and golden tilefish amendments, assessment response amendments, and, you know, that's an option, but that will be coming up next year.

The unassessed species amendment, that timeline will probably continue to slide, as we discussed during the allocation review discussion, and, you know, that timeline is sort of to be determined, and it's likely to slide further back, but we can come back with additional information for that.

Moving down in the workplan, to the sort of other activities, outside of the FMP amendments, we did add a SEDAR Selection Committee, and so that will come back to you in December, kind of a follow-up to the discussion that you had earlier this week, and you'll have a Citizen Science Committee meeting, to review several items, and you'll have the snapper grouper commercial discussion, in relation to that subcommittee meeting, sort of a report-out, and the direction that that subcommittee would like to go.

You had requested some headboat information, and so we'll go into that, and you will have the snapper grouper MSE results, and so that will likely be a very lengthy discussion, probably, you

know, a half day of your agenda, and so something to look forward to, and then, also, of note is sort of a greater dolphin discussion, and so you'll have a discussion of the dolphin MSE, and progress that has been made on that front, and then, also, per previous council guidance, you will discuss how you would like to generally move forward with Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 3. As you may recall, that's come up several times, and you've noted, kind of as a time certain, you did want to have that discussion at the December 2024 meeting, and we'll be bringing back some information for you to further go over that in December.

Then the allocation review, and, per the guidelines, you'll be reviewing the summary report of your discussion earlier this week, and approving that for the jacks complex and Atlantic spadefish. One other thing I wanted to note, just something new that was added for this week, was, you know, to capture some of those items that come up during the council's various discussions, and we wanted to capture that at least somewhere on the workplan, and so we added updating the jacks complex accountability measures, and so that topic that was discussed, and we put that other under activities, and then modifying recreational black grouper regulations, and so, you know, that's something that the council noted that you wanted to discuss at a future meeting, or at a future time, and so that's at least captured on there, and it will stay on the workplan until it either moves up into the workplan or you want us to remove it, and so that was captured.

With that, I'm happy to answer any questions, or any comments, and I will note, you know, the kind of last line there, and it's a nine, and it will be -- So that will be a fairly full week, and so, again, if you go above eight, or 8.5, or the nine range, you're looking at an early Monday morning start, and sort of a full week, likely going all the way until around noon on Friday. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, John. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I've got a couple of things. A couple of them might be just because I can't find it, because there's a lot of items on here, and so the commercial visioning discussion -- Was that on here? Was there a line for that? I couldn't -- I didn't see it. Okay. The other thing is I think that yellowtail and mutton can be combined, and it looks like they're both going to come to the December meeting, and, assuming that we take action on that, I'm hoping that that reduces a slot, because then a yellowtail and mutton amendment, following the assessment, could be combined. I wasn't here earlier this week, but what about the HMS reporting, and what they're doing, and I didn't see that there on there either, and were we wanting a presentation on that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Jessica, to that, we do have, in the draft agenda, to have a request that HMS come and report on that, and that popped up quicker than this, and then the other thing is there will be a Habitat Committee meeting in December, and so it will be a pretty full load, and so being able to combine some of those FMPs, as you suggested, could be pretty helpful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, John. John.

MR. HADLEY: On the HMS-related note, the plan is to have a presentation from HMS staff on that, and comments are due on their proposed rule in January, and so the idea would be to have the presentation and gather comments from the council, perhaps to provide your written comments to HMS.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I didn't see the -- Don't we review the budget at the December meeting? I don't know that I saw that on there.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and we'll review that at the Executive Committee meeting in detail, and then we'll report out, and so I have a note, for the agenda, to remind us that we'll have an Executive Committee report, when we do the committee reports.

MS. MURPHEY: Thanks, Jessica. Does anyone else have any comments, or questions, on the workplan? Go ahead, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks. A couple of comments. With the SEFHIER revisions, I guess I'm struck by the fact that we're looking at 2026 for final action, and that just seems like a long development timeframe, and I would think that this could maybe move forward faster than that, and that it wouldn't take an entire year, especially given we've already drafted, largely, the range of alternatives for the amendment.

Then, setting expectations, at least from now until March, my team, obviously, is being pulled into developing the secretarial action, and so I will have to work with the council staff, with regard to how much time, effort, you know, my team is going to be able to contribute to some of these amendments, but that certainly could be a limitation to what we can accomplish between now and March.

Then the third comment is, given that we will be discussing the secretarial action sometime, I will say, in the January to March window, whether it's a special council meeting or at the March council meeting, you know, we -- I see the MSE kind of colliding with that effort, and is that going to be helpful or, you know, complicate matters, and is there a way to potentially have, you know, a discussion of the secretarial action that won't be clouded by the MSE discussions or not?

MS. MURPHEY: John, do you want to answer that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I guess possibly. I think it's all going to come down to when we get the secretarial amendment to look at, and maybe what's in it, and so, yes, I agree with that concern, and I'm not sure how we manage it at this point.

MS. MURPHEY: Anything else? John.

MR. HADLEY: Just in response to the comment on the SEFHIER revision amendment, we can - - We'll task the IPT to take a look at that, and just come up with a more -- I guess potentially a revised timeline for that.

MS. MURPHEY: Thanks, John. Is that okay, Andy?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and, just in quick response to that, you know, especially because the Gulf Council is working on their action, it would be good to, obviously, see kind of how quickly, or slowly, they're going to be building theirs and how much we could line that effort up and take action around the same time.

MS. MURPHEY: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I know we haven't gotten to the sanctuary presentation yet, but assuming that they're going to have a draft of the fisheries protocol ready, does that need to take up a period of time on the December agenda?

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I'm thinking it possibly could, if we get it, and it may be something we do in Full Council, sort of under staff reports or something.

MS. MURPHEY: So it seems that things are loading up on December. Is there anything we need to move around, John, that might -- John Hadley, that might help soften that score, or if anybody has any thoughts on what maybe can be moved around to -- John is looking through this, and I assume that nine has already changed.

MR. HADLEY: So we'll have to update it a little bit, but we can go ahead and just slide the unassessed stocks amendment further down, and that's unlikely to be at the December meeting, and so that would free up a little bit on the agenda, or on the workplan for December, and there is -- I'm just thinking of items that -- I mean, there's the dolphin discussion, but you have noted that you did want to discuss that in December, and there's the headboat vessel limit, if you wanted to move that back one meeting, and that's one that could possibly move, but, you know, that's something that we are prepared to come back to you in December with, and so maybe a little further discussion, and think about it over lunch, and just make sure -- You know, I think we can fit it all in, but just kind of we'll discuss it a little bit more, if there's anything that we need to come back to you with after lunch, and we can certainly do that, if that's okay with you, Chair.

MS. MURPHEY: Well, I was wondering, and does anybody have any feel for pushing that headboat discussion further? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: If we pushed it out, I would just point out that we had really good attendance on that at the Jekyll Island meeting, as well as in the Florida meeting, and so, if it was pushed out to March or June, we might get an ample discussion there from some of those stakeholders that raised it, if they wanted to attend.

MS. MURPHEY: Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Thank you, ma'am. I would not like to push it out. I would like to handle it in December.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I agree with Jimmy. I would like to get moving on it.

MS. MURPHEY: Any other thoughts on that? So we'll just leave it in December. Well, I guess we'll just fill it out a little bit more, and Myra might have some suggestions.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We could possibly move, Myra is saying, the Habitat Committee to March. That might be something we should consider doing, and so let's put that into our pocket as something to consider. Habitat, AP report, and the coral and shrimp amendment could wait until March before you see it again.

MS. MURPHEY: Any thoughts on that? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that's a great idea.

MS. MURPHEY: Kathleen seems to think that will be very helpful, and I kind of think it will be too, and I think kind of a lot of stuff has to come together, especially the permit information, and so, if no one objects to that, let's bump Habitat to March, and, actually, I'm good too, and so will that --

MR. HADLEY: Certainly moving that to March doesn't mean that work isn't going to be completed in the meantime, and that gives -- It certainly gives staff some more time to do some writing, and the IPT to meet, and so, you know, work will be progressing on that, and it just adds a little bit more time to get that work done.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Considering what Andy said about his staff working on the secretarial amendment may affect some of the things that get done for these amendments, and so some items may have a little less discussion, because there's not as much progress on them, and so I think, with what guidance we've gotten here, we can probably work this out into a feasible agenda plan for December.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Any other comments on the workplan? I am seeing none, and I guess we will call that, and so I think the next agenda item is upcoming meetings, and so we'll send that to John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You have your document here that summarizes the meetings that are coming up. I do want to highlight one thing, and there's a November Snapper Grouper Private Angler AP to be determined, and that won't happen, because we will make additional appointments for that in December, but, otherwise, as you notice, there are a lot of things going on in October, as is always the case, and note the port meetings that are scheduled in there, and then there's the SSC meetings, and there is the AP meetings that occur, and the SEP meeting, John, you said will be on the 7th?

Yes, it will be on the 7th, and not the 8th, of October, but it's a very busy time in October, as it always is, and then, also, a thing to definitely note is the December meeting is early December, and starting on the 2nd, and so we're going to start on Monday morning, and that's the week right after Thanksgiving, I believe, and so just be forewarned that we're back into that cycle of the calendar, unfortunately, for a few years.

Jessica mentioned, you know, giving the budget update when we go in December, and the other thing that I will just mention on that is our current grant that we do, our administrative grant, is ending this year, and we're going to go into a new grant cycle for next year. In the future, they're going to be on four base years, with one year allowed for continuation work, and so it will be the

2025, 2026, 2027, and 2028 period that will be covered, and one of the things that I intend to include in that, for December, is the workplan extended out through 2028.

As it turned out, this workplan that we had, with what's on there now, as well as coordinating that with the assessment schedule, and what's planned, made it really easy to figure out what it is that we're going to be working on between now and 2028, and so the reality is, between the assessment schedule and what's on that thing now, we have a really good idea of what's coming up, and we can look at that and get a sense of, you know, where you maybe have some opportunities to bring in new ideas, and projects, that haven't even been thought of yet, and so, you know, we'll give you a little -- It will be a little bit simplified, but it will really focus on that 2025 to 2028 period, so you can get a good long-term view of what we intend to accomplish under the next admin grant.

MS. MURPHEY: Any questions for John? Go ahead, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: No questions, but I just wanted to mention a couple of other things, for awareness, and so we are hosting the Marine Resource Education Program the week of October 21st, and it's always valuable to have South Atlantic staff participate in that. That will be in St. Petersburg.

Then, not related to South Atlantic Council work, but, for those that may be interested, on October 29 and 30, the Gulf Council will be starting their first workgroup for the private recreational initiative, and so this is an effort by the Gulf Council to look at goals and objectives of the recreational fishing industry, to look at some innovative new management strategies, kind of what are the problems, challenges, issues facing the recreational industry, and then have the workgroup offer solutions, and recommendations, going forward.

Then, kind of parallel to that process, there's also some efforts that will be getting underway with regard to look at data statistics, ways we actually monitor and manage the fishery, and how that could help with recreational fisheries management, and so I just wanted to mention that, because I know that's a big issue over here, and, for those that may want to participate, I expect a lot of virtual options.

MS. MURPHEY: Any questions for Andy on that? Tim.

MR. GRINER: Andy, what were those dates again, please?

MR. STRELCHECK: I believe it's October 29 and 30.

MS. MURPHEY: Andy, is it possible that you could share that meeting information with council staff, so that can go out to all of the council members? That would be great.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, I will try to remember to do that, when I receive it, and, also, John, just feel free to reach out to Carrie Simmons when that's scheduled.

MS. MURPHEY: Thanks, Andy. Anything else? So we are up to the end of our Friday morning, even though it's Thursday morning. Other Business, is there anything that anyone would like to bring up under Other Business, thoughts or comments? The floor is open. All right. Seeing none -- Go ahead, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So, Trish, I reached out to Sarah from the Florida Keys Sanctuary, and we were scheduled to come in after lunch at 1:30, and she said they would be available at 1:00, and so we can come back earlier from lunch, if you would like to do that.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. I think it sounds like a plan. We'll adjourn the morning session here, and everybody be back at one o'clock.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Well, I guess we'll go ahead and get started. It's 1:02, and I hope that everyone had a nice early lunch. One thing I need to let you guys know is, after we're done with the revisioning, we will have to jump back into a short closed session. Closed session. I don't know what -- We'll have to jump into a short closed session, and then, afterwards, after that discussion, will jump back into our open session, and so hopefully it should not take very long, but I just wanted to give you all a heads-up that that is happening.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The open session will just be to discuss any changes that might come from the closed session and to adjourn the meeting officially.

MS. MURPHEY: What he said. So I guess we will go ahead and move into the Florida Keys Marine Sanctuary activities, and do we have Beth Dieveney online?

MS. DEVENEY: You do, and you also have Sarah Fangman.

DR. COLLIER: We hear you, Sarah.

MS. FANGMAN: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with all of you this afternoon, with a quick update on where things stand with the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary's restoration blueprint. This is something that probably many of you are quite familiar with, and so this is an opportunity to just let you know that we are nearing the finish line on this, if you can believe that, after a very long process, and so, if I can ask for the next slide, which refers to that long process and the steps that have been contained within it.

What you can see on this slide is a lot of checkmarks. Starting back in 2011, when a condition report, basically a status and trends report, of the resources in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary was released, and it referenced a concerning status with regard to a number of the natural resources in the sanctuary that kicked off this whole process back in 2011.

What you can see, on this slide, is there have been a number of steps in this process involving public content released, and invited for comments, and we have received a tremendous amount of that throughout this process, and then, as you can also see, we have been engaging with the councils, at different stages, through the National Marine Sanctuary Act Section 304(a)(5) process, consultations with other agencies that have jurisdiction and authority in the Florida Keys, using that information to refine our proposals, and inform them, and then put them back out for public comment, and once again refine, and so where we are is a step, like I said, quite near the end, where we are preparing our -- Well, we have prepared a final EIS, and that will be followed by a final rule.

Just this morning, we were briefing our federal colleagues, through the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, or ORIA, for those of you that know that acronym, and so some of you will know that that is one of the last steps that goes on, for a process like this, before a final set of documents can be released.

Then, importantly, that last very last box, I want to highlight that, once this is published, there will be a forty-five-day congressional and governor and cabinet review. The Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary is co-managed, in state waters, with the State of Florida, and that translates to about 60 percent of the sanctuary is in state waters, and so the governor of Florida, and the cabinet, review that and can make objections to parts of it, if so needed, and those can be addressed through not moving forward, potentially, with an item that is not supported by the states, whereas other things happening in the federal waters could potentially go forward.

As I noted, this has been a very lengthy and collaborative process. You can see, on this slide, the logos for a lot of the different agencies that we have been coordinating throughout this entire process, and, obviously, including the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, but also the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and a number of other federal and state agencies and, as I noted, state agencies, in light of the fact that 60 percent of the sanctuary is in state waters.

We have also taken a lot of comments from the public on this effort. As you can see, over the course of a decade, and you can also read some of the statistics there, with regard to the number of meetings we have held, the number of recommendations that I have received from our advisory council, as well as from the public, and it has been a well-considered, well-discussed, and well-debated set of proposals, and that is a reflection, in my view, of the fact that this is, obviously, a large and complex set of proposals, and it is also extraordinarily important. These resources are critical to the community, and to the economy here in the Florida Keys, and, therefore, it matters. It matters to a lot of people.

I will say that we have really worked hard to try to take into account those comments, the input, the feedback, the concerns of our partners, and our community, and reflect that in where we are today. That said, of course, it is impossible to come up with a suite of proposals, especially when you're dealing with something this large and complex, that is going to be to everyone's liking. That's just not possible, in this day and age, and with a project of this size and complexity, and so we have done our best to try to stay true to the input we have received, the scientific and socioeconomic data that has informed these decisions, and put forward a suite of recommendations that reflect that, as well as are aligned with NOAA's mission, recognizing that our mission is not the same as every other entity that has a voice in this, and what we are putting forward reflects input, data, and our mission.

I think, for most of you, this is review, and, just after lunch, it's nice to have an easy review presentation, but what is contained in this final step of this process is, again, a combination of the information, and the proposals, that we put out and the information that we received through different states of this process. In 2019, that was a draft environmental impact statement, and then, a couple of years later, a revised notice of proposed rule that reflected the input we heard.

In sort of big, broad terms, what we're talking about is proposed boundary expansions, and so changing the boundaries of the sanctuary to reflect potential additional threats, and we are also

proposing changes to sanctuary-wide regulations, and, in some cases, those are really technical revisions and updates, either to align and be more consistent with our own federal -- The rest of the sanctuary systems, just small updates, and then we are also proposing a few regulatory actions that would apply in the entire Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, for example our temporary -- Our emergency regulations, extending those from sixty days to 180 days, which, in fact, aligns with how NOAA Fisheries handles such actions.

Then, lastly, a large portion of what's in the final preferred alternative pertains to zoning. Zoning is a tool that the sanctuary has used since 1997, and we are making modifications to our zoning, based on, again, concerns and data that has been a part of this process. I will say that, in some cases, we are in fact proposing to eliminate zones, and I know that's something that oftentimes people think that, once a protection is put in place, it is never changed, and the restriction will always be in place, but, in fact, in this case, in some instances, where appropriate, we have examined whether or not it makes sense to eliminate certain zones, and so there's a lot of details pertaining to that in this document, but those are kind of the big picture.

Then I will say, associated with this whole thing, and so this is the regulatory side of our activities, and we are also, and have, worked very hard on a management plan, and that's essentially a strategic plan that speaks to the business of the staff, and what we do on a day-to-day basis to support the work of the regulatory side of the house, and so that's things like education and outreach, our science programs, our mooring buoy program, and we also are updating that as a part of this, but that is a non-regulatory component of the restoration blueprint sort of umbrella of activities.

Another activity that is happening in parallel with the restoration blueprint is updating our agreements that are associated with it. Again, I noted our co-management with the State of Florida, and we have a number of agreements, with the state, pertaining to how we work together, and I wanted to shine a light specifically on the protocol for cooperative fisheries management. This is something that we, in light of our efforts to sort of update how we do business in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, both on the regulatory side and on our strategic plan, we are also updating these documents, and it is long overdue, because the document that we are working on now is from 1997, and that is an agreement between NOAA Fisheries, the National Ocean Service, the fisheries management councils, and the states.

This is a document that recognizes the different jurisdictions and tries to address how we work together, and hopefully provide some collaboration, coordination, and flexible management, in terms of how we all implement and coordinate, in light of the fact that, as you see on this map, and it's a very pretty and colorful map, and it's colorful because it has a lot of different jurisdictions, adjacent and overlapping, which makes for some complex activities when we need to handle certain issues, and so this cooperative fisheries management document is meant to help guide and inform that and how we implement and coordinate together. It is a management agreement that we have the need to really update.

Just high-level on that document, it is a document that is draft, and we've been working with our colleagues at the state, and, to some degree, the other signatories, and I will get to that in a minute, but some of the things that we need to update are just basic, like including the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission instead of the Florida Marine Fisheries Commission. The old version refers to the agency in its previous form, and so clearly we need to make sure that we're

talking about the right state organization, but, again, we're also working to really describe and clearly outline the different authorities and jurisdictions that we all have, and that we bring to the table, and then describe that process for how we undertake coordinated rulemaking among these different entities and who takes the lead on what type of activities, et cetera.

We are including, in this document, a new section on traditional fishing, and it will clarify what that means, what that term is, and then, importantly, because that just marks a moment in time, we also want to articulate what is the process whereby, if and when we need to make any changes, like there's a fishery, there's a new tool that needs to be included, and how do we go about doing that, and so this document is not a regulatory document, but it is extraordinarily important, in light of all the different agencies, all the voices, all the jurisdictions that are here in the Florida Keys.

The next slide, and this is my last one, is, with regard to that document, what is the status, and what are the next steps, and so we are currently working on a draft that reflects FWC and FKNMS, the sanctuary, discussions, and so it's largely been -- This version has largely just been passed back and forth between those two entities, and it's still being refined, in I think fairly small ways, and I think we're nearly there, but it's largely been between the two entities. However, as I noted, this document is one that is signed by not just those two entities that have worked on this current draft, and so we also have NOAA Fisheries and the South Atlantic and Gulf Council input that is needed.

That is going to be the next step, is to bring in our colleagues in this part of this process, to get their input and fingerprints on this document, so that we can all come to agreement and hopefully finalize it, and so, once we're done with our FWC and FKNMS discussions, then we'll have a clean version that we can share, and so my question to you all today is what the South Atlantic Council's wish is with regard to starting to provide that input.

I will offer that we were imagining that we would work at the staff level, to begin with, on those discussions, and then, once the staff felt the time was appropriate, they would provide guidance, and direction, with regard to how we bring the wider council into discussions to inform and finalize the protocol for cooperative fisheries management, and so, with that, that completes my presentation, and I invite any questions, or discussion, if there is any.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you. Does anybody have any questions for Beth? I see Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Thanks for the presentation, Sarah. A couple of things. Back on the timeline slide, towards the very beginning, the time for the governor to review the plan -- Yes, right there. Thank you. So I know that forty-five days was for the original designation process, and I think a forty-five-day time period is fine for the governor and cabinet to review this, but, in the sanctuary, the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, document, it just said forty-five days, and, in the National Marine Sanctuary Act, it says forty-five days of consecutive congress, and so I'm seeking clarification on this forty-five-day time period. Is it forty-five days of consecutive congress, because that's what I would recommend.

MS. FANGMAN: Thank you, Jessica. I will let Beth speak to that, because she may be able to be more precise than I, but what I will say is you're not going to see a lot that you haven't seen already, and so I would imagine you're hoping for the scenario where the maximum amount of time is given, and I will assure you that there's really not much in there that you haven't already

seen, and so you might not need as much time, is all I'm trying to say, and so, Beth, do you want to answer Jessica's question directly?

MS. DIEVENEY: Yes. Thank you, and, Jessica, yes, my understanding is that the period of time that the governor has to review is the same as the continuous forty-five days of congress.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to continue down that line of questioning, just because FWC has seen it before, it requires coordination with the governor and cabinet, and they have not been as intimately involved as FWC or DEP has in this process, and so I'm just trying to get some clarification on the timeframe there, so that we could, you know, let them know to get ready, and let them know specifically how many days that we have.

I had another question, Madam Chair, and so, to speak to the question that Sarah brought up about the protocol and, you know, when the council is going to get involved, and how, we had a discussion, earlier today, about the council's workplan, and I think that we were envisioning the protocol, a draft of the protocol, coming to the council's December meeting, so that the council can review it. I think it's fine to coordinate with council staff, you know, ahead of that timeline, but I still think that the Full Council needs to see that protocol, or have the ability to see that protocol, and comment on it.

MS. MURPHEY: Sarah or Beth, do you want to respond?

MS. FANGMAN: Well, at least as I understood it, I think that's really a question for you all, and is it not, Jessica? Your process is -- We will not prescribe, right, because you're asking what the council wants to do, correct, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm just making sure that what the council wants to do is okay with you guys, and so we're suggesting that the council's intent, as the discussion we had this morning, is to review that protocol document, a draft of that document, before it's finalized at the South Atlantic Council's December meeting, and so I'm just letting you know that that's the plan.

MS. FANGMAN: Understood. Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: Will you all be able to have that protocol document, or at least some sort of draft, for December?

MS. FANGMAN: Well, I mean, we are working diligently with FWC, and so we will be -- As I said, I think we're very close to being to the point where we can bring in other voices on this document who are involved in it, and who are signatories to it, and so I -- Since it's not just our decision as to its progress, I can say that the sanctuary will be ready, and able, to continue to move it forward as quickly as possible.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. That would be great, and I guess just stay in touch with council staff, as far as coordinating the opportunity for the council to review it. Thank you.

MS. FANGMAN: Yes.

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have any other comments or questions? Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, I would like to see a list, or bullet points listed, of successes that have occurred from this sanctuary designation, from the inception of it over thirty years ago, and see what's been accomplished to restore the reef and the ecosystem there, and is there any type of slide, or document, on that available?

MS. FANGMAN: We can certainly provide information about that, yes. It would probably take more than one slide.

MR. HULL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Sarah and Beth. Does anybody else have any comments or questions? All right. Seeing none, I guess we will move on. Thank you so much, Beth and Sarah, and please, again, if you can stay in touch with our council staff, and be able to coordinate, with the possibility of seeing the draft protocol in December, that would really be good.

MS. FANGMAN: You bet. Thanks so much. We appreciate it. Have a good afternoon.

MS. DIEVENY: Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: All right, and so our next-to-last thing is our Marine Recreational Information Program Revisioning, and this is going to be Evan Howell, Sarah Lazo, and Katherine Papacostas. Do you all need a little bit of time to set up or anything, or are you good? We'll give you -- We'll just give you five minutes. Five minutes, you guys.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Is everyone ready to go? Okay. I think the plan is you guys are going to give a presentation, and, as we get into discussions, and answering questions, I think John and Carolyn will be facilitating that, but I'll go ahead and let you guys go ahead and do your presentation.

DR. PAPACOSTAS: Okay. Well, thanks, everybody, for having us, and so there's a couple of people that you're going to hear from in our three-hour session, and so I'm Katherine Papacostas. I work in the NOAA Fisheries Office of Science and Technology, in the Fisheries Statistics Division, and I do program management aspects of the Marine Recreational Information Program. I'm here with Evan Howell, who is our Office Director, and we also have Sarah Lazo, who is our MRIP communications lead, and she'll be coming in at the end, during the listening session component, and then we also have Geoff White here, from ACCSP, who is going to talk a little bit as well.

For our presentation, we really have two major updates to talk to you about, one being an ongoing study to investigate potential improvements to the Fishing Effort Survey, and I will be covering that, and then I think it might make sense to pause for questions, maybe at the end of that section, and then, the second component, I'll turn it over to Evan to talk about the collaborative initiative that's underway to really evaluate the rec fishing data collection partnership more broadly and to

work together to try to identify and make further improvements, and then we'll hope to get feedback from you and have a good discussion during the listening session.

Going into the Fishing Effort Survey, just basic 101 on the Fishing Effort Survey, just to make sure everyone is on the same page, it's a self-administered mail survey of residential households, implemented from Maine to Mississippi, and also in Hawaii. It collects trip information for each resident of a responding household for specified time periods, and it's used to estimate shore and private boat fishing effort for MRIP.

As you all are likely aware, the agency is currently conducting a large-scale follow-up study for the Fishing Effort Survey, based on the results of some previous studies that we announced last year, to gain a clearer understanding of the differences in effort estimates between the current survey design and a revised design that changes both the FES question order, and so it specifically switches the -- It has two-month and twelve-month fishing activity questions, and switching the order of those, and, also, as part of this follow-up study, we're increasing the frequency of sampling from every two months, as it's administered currently, to monthly.

The goal of all of this is to ultimately work to improve response and recall accuracy, and then also allow for the flexibility for more frequent production of estimates, which has been expressed as a priority across the Atlantic and Gulf from our partner community.

The follow-up study has been -- We're about halfway through the study, and we have preliminary data through July. The design that's being tested is producing improved data quality, in alignment with the prior pilot studies. We continue to see a large reduction in reporting errors and illogical responses, illogical responses meaning respondents have been less likely, with the revision to the question order, to indicate more trips for the two-month fishing reference period than for the twelve-month fishing reference period.

We do have a lot of data still to collect and analyze, and so we have preliminary data through July. We haven't analyzed all of that yet, and so we're not at a point where we can make really fully-informed comparisons yet between the current survey and the revised design, and so we kind of want to wait until we have more data, and are close to the end of the study, before making definitive statements about the magnitude of the difference between the estimates.

We worked closely, S&T has worked closely, within the agency, with the Office of Sustainable Fisheries and some stock assessment scientists at the Northeast and Southeast Fisheries Science Centers, to put together some interim guidance that's been distributed to all of the councils that use FES data in the partner community. That guidance recommends that fishery managers, and stock assessors, who use FES data currently continue to use that data until we have this complete follow-up study and the new design has been peer-reviewed, and, if needed, the historical estimates have been calibrated.

This slide just shows the timeline. We have communicated about this a little bit already in various capacities, but, generally, we remain on track. We plan to conclude our study at the end of 2024, the calendar year. This year and next, we plan to work with state and regional partners on preliminary planning for a potential transition to this revised FES design.

We're beginning calibration model development, for calibration being a statistical process that accounts for variation that can lead to differences among estimates, and that's -- You know, in fisheries applications, that's -- For anyone who isn't aware, it's really important for, you know, basing -- Because stock assessments, and management, base their work on, you know, continuous and uninterrupted time series of fisheries statistics, and so it's just kind of adjusting the scaling of the estimates, and so that the calibration stage.

In the spring of 2025, and so this upcoming spring, we plan to produce final 2024 estimates, produce a study report shortly following that, outlining the findings, and the estimates, and kind of comparing the differences, and so getting into more details about, you know, magnitude of differences. We also will initiate a peer review of both the revised FES design and calibration methods, and then, pending favorable results from those reviews, we would then plan to implement a new design, or a revised design, starting in 2026, with a revised time series ready for use in assessments, and in management, in the spring of 2026.

I think that's the main update that I have for the FES. If it works for the room, we'll pause, and talk about the FES, and take questions on that, before we kind of shift gears into the re-envisioning component of this.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you. Does anyone have questions on the FES? Okay. Seeing none, I guess you guys can move on.

DR. HOWELL: Thank you, Katherine, and I just wanted to say thank you for John, and the rest of the council staff, for having us, Madam Chair, and so it's great for us. We've, you know, individually, or as a group, been going to a lot of the councils, through this process, and we'll describe some of this, and what the impetus was for it, but we appreciate you asking us to come down and giving us some time on your busy schedule.

In terms of re-envisioning the recreational fishing data partnership, this is something that we really came up with, you know, as we were going through some of the FES redesign, and seeing some of those results, and talking with some of the state partners.

We really felt, in the agency, like we wanted to initiate something that really, you know, takes advantage of some of the challenges that are happening. We have, you know, more states that are becoming more active, and we've got the Atlantic, that's very vibrant, and we've got issues in our fisheries, and how do we continue to work together to really make a strong partnership that allows us to get the best available data, from whatever sources we can, and bring it together to get that data into then the best science, and then the best management decisions, knowing that we're going to need as much data as we can to make the best decisions we can in a dynamic sense, meaning that we can make decisions one day, and we might not necessarily have years before we have the ability to make another one, and so this was some of the impetus there.

For the first part of this, we really wanted to do a little bit of this roadshow, to listen to people, and to try to get ideas, you know, for how we can reevaluate our partnership, these approaches, and transition to something that is new and collaborative, a vision that we built together, and so I've been in this position for four years, and, in the four years, you know, MRIP has been probably my daily bread, for a lot of this, and in a great way. I've learned a lot, and there's still a lot that I don't know, as much as the people that work it every day, in the stats, and really the usage, but what I

saw, in terms of like if I had to define a problem statement, it really was that I felt that trust and credibility -- You know, we needed to really work to advance that, and that partnership really didn't seem to be across-the-board something that everybody believed in. It wasn't something with pride, that people said I collect this data, and it's part of this partnership, and so that was really something that we wanted to focus on in this.

Again, we've done these four virtual briefings so far, and they were for everybody, and now we've been going council-by-council, to really talk and hold these listening sessions, but some key takeaways for today that I wanted you to have were that we're really looking to build, or rebuild, trust and credibility across-the-board, to really acknowledge and seek the regional data collection flexibility, where necessary, and, again, where desired. We call this a national coherent, but regionally specific, process, where we know that not every region is the same, and, in fact, from the South Atlantic, I think we heard, specifically, please don't have us the same as the Gulf, and we are a very separate region, and so there are things that are happening in the Gulf that may or may not work for the South Atlantic, and so we've really tried to focus, council-by-council, in a way, at this point, to get these regional outputs in here.

We want to ensure stability, and consistency, for the aspects of the program that work. There are things, hopefully, such as the transition team's transition planning, the process that gets to estimation, that hopefully we can either keep as-is or improve upon. If there are things that we feel are not working, and that can come out in the listening session, we can either work to revamp those, or possibly remove them, but we want to really focus on the foundation of what works for us, and we want to help develop these adaptive management frameworks that better consider the data uncertainty and limitations.

Again, a big concern that I've seen over the years has been the percent standard error and the way that the data is being used in MRIP, and so that was a big concern, and so, again, we want to continue to work to improve our recreational fishing effort estimates and consider novel technologies to track or compare effort estimates, where possible.

Where we are, in terms of this timeline, again, we've spent -- The summer and fall of this year, we've devoted towards these one-on-one or group information-gathering sessions with key partners, and so Katherine and Sarah have done a tremendous amount of individual interviews, and group interviews, as well as gone to almost every council, at this point, to have one of these listening sessions, and so, in the winter, we're going to use this information to compile a report, with major themes and findings, and this is going to do a few things.

It's going to inform what we're putting together for 2025 workshop agendas. To me, this is just the beginning. It is more of a federally-driven part of this process, but my internal clock is already going off that we need to have this federal and state, at least, partnership, and that's these 2025 workshops. This is where we start to really identify what did we hear in the listening sessions, and what are we looking to change, and what are we looking to adapt, and to improve, through these workshops, and then identify these regionally-based working groups, where we have that regional specificity that we can build-out, and then begin to propose immediate and long-term improvements.

If you look at the timeline, we've got something, again, that goes into 2026, but, for me, there are things that we can identify along the way, and I fully expect that we'll find changes that we'll put

into place as we go through this process, and really be thinking about this early 2026 as when we finish this process of improving this partnership and making these changes, and not when we've decided we have enough information to start talking about that change.

Again, we can form these working groups as necessary, and have them be not just federal, but federal and state, as well as other key partners that are needed. We'll host these visioning workshops, and identify how we build this shared vision together for partnership, build the action plans, start to make changes, but bring this out for public review, make this a very open and transparent process, and announce and transition to this re-envisioned partnership. Again, this sort of being an endpoint by 2026, hopefully, and not really the beginning of what we choose to change.

The continued improvement, some of the things that we've already seen, in terms of examples, has been trying to strengthen the state partner review of preliminary catch and effort estimates, and so leveraging the regional knowledge. In different councils, we've seen there is effort and estimates, at times, that come out where there might be spikes, or things that are anomalous, and being able to more of a partnered review of those, before they're released for final usage, allows us to get that best data that's available into that preliminary to a final estimate that we can then use for science and management.

We're also looking at supporting the development of these regionally-consistent for-hire logbook frameworks, where we can partner there, and we've commissioned an independent review of our national survey and data standards. This is something that the program put together, and it was also something that, if you looked at that bill that came out, and we call it the Graves Bill, one of the things that was in that Graves Bill was this independent review by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. We have also believed that that's important, to have that peer review of the standards, and so we've commissioned that independently, to be able to meet that goal on our own.

We're also reevaluating the MRIP team structures, and the composition, through the regional feedback, trying to figure out, for the teams that we have in place, do we have the right people, do we have the right scope and tenor, and so that's something that we're already doing, and we're also looking at revising policy, and procedures, for updating our surveys, or transitioning to new surveys, based on partner feedback, and so, in some ways, we have this transition process. No matter who collects the information, we want to make sure that it's got the same scientific rigor, and transparency, so that, through this partnership, again, no matter who collects it, we trust the data, and it's credible, and we understand where it's been, how we got the estimates, and how we can use it.

We're also investigating improvements to the recreational fishery discard and release data, and that was through these Inflation Reduction Act workshops that we've held, and we've already held two, one for independent techniques to estimate effort, through advanced technology, such as camera-based systems or other location-based systems, but also how to get improvements in estimating discards, and so we're doing that through the IRA workshops. Again, those are focused mainly in the Gulf, due to the red snapper composition, but those are things that we can also do in other areas that have red snapper, and, of course, anything that we learn from the technology, we can apply that to any other region.

I was kind of joking with Sarah and Katherine, and they've been on the road a lot, and I probably should make some tour shirts for them, to talk about this public information tour that they've gone through, both in the Atlantic and the Gulf, and I won't read through the list, but we've got -- Again, we're in, right now, in September, the South Atlantic, but we've got others that we're still doing through the year, and so we're a little bit more than halfway through this public engagement timeline.

They both just came back from Hawaii, and the Western Pacific Council, on Sunday, and so they've really been trying to get as much as they can in-person, to hear things firsthand. We believe, really strongly, that this public engagement is important and that we also do it in-person. It would be hard for all of us to go to all of these, and so we're really trying to divide and succeed as well, as we go through these.

Then, again, kind of looking through where we were, if you were at any of the public listening sessions we held in the beginning, this working goal, as you will see, has changed, based on feedback that we've got already, and so we've got this working goal of a state-federal data collection system for marine and estuarine recreational fisheries, and it goes through the detail there, and we have already been changing the language, adapting and adopting this as we go, to make this working goal more of what we feel is a shared goal.

Again, we've got these objectives on the right, but we really are trying to identify the roles and responsibilities for this partnership, where people have empowerment, where people see that they have a place, where the teams are already working, where we can expand upon those, and, obviously, improve the data where we can, enhance the precision, the accuracy, and the timeliness of our estimates, where we can, adhere to the data collection standards that we've set forward, and do this all in a very transparent, consistent, and centralized way, and we've got a couple of ideas for this.

We want to improve our estimate review process. In a way, I think some of the way it's been described is to get back to the monthly wave review, estimate reviews, that we've had in the past, and we think that was a lot of power, and I think that maybe some of this might have been broken down through COVID, or other things, and we're really trying to work our way back to some of the things that we might have thought had been working in the past, and also try to get this data stream connectivity and effective integration.

Where we have data streams, again, whether it's state partners, or federal partners, we've got an ability to get all the information into the same data stream as fast as we can, and, ultimately, if we can enhance the partner, whether it's federal or state, and the angler collaboration and participation, and we talked about this at lunch with a few of you today, but how are we going to get the best data that we need, in the most effective way, and really be able to use that effectively, and so that's the goal right now. We have the systems in place, and we're focused on the partnership together, but it really is about how do we get the right data, at the right time, to the right people. Then, with that, I think we're going to be turning over to Geoff White to go through one slide.

MR. WHITE: Perfect. Thank you, Evan, for including me in this, and the council for having us here. My role is really to highlight the existing partnerships that are already taking place via the state conduct of MRIP APAIS, the for-hire telephone survey, and even the submission of the NSAR, the National Saltwater Angler Registry, data that's been going on for over a decade now,

and so there is an existing process to gather, identify, and prioritize regional data needs. That was set up by MRIP back in 2015, and the ACCSP was selected as kind of the regional implementation team for the Atlantic, and so to get feedback from the states, the commissions, and the councils.

The ACCSP Coordinating Council really serves as that team lead, from Maine through Florida, and we also utilize the recreational technical committee, to get another perspective on these things, and so that team was established in 2015, and we're on our second version of the regional priorities, which are listed as the six bullets, in priority order, in the middle of the slide, and so, with that, the plans are updated about every five years. It's a great forum to allow for feedback and information about what is most important up and down the Atlantic coast, be that for the South Atlantic states, Mid-Atlantic, and New England, and so that's been a good forum, and it continues to be an option.

I do want to certainly note, as this re-envisioning process occurs, to invite you all to include ACCSP, myself and/or the coordinating council, in your feedback to NOAA Fisheries. That way, that keeps us aligned with your priorities, your interests, in where we go moving forward, and so, with that, I do want to also kind of note that NOAA Fisheries has been really open to supporting changes that have been brought through this process, and so increased precision, through the Modern Fish Act, the increased APAIS sampling, better funding to the states, to be able to get those more APAIS assignments completed, and they've been supportive of kind of a discards project that ACCSP is trying to get funded to put in the field in 2025, as well as responsive to our submission of the for-hire logbook methodology for certification.

That's an iterative process, and we are still in the middle of that, but I've had a really good experience with them, over the last five to eight years, of, where things are important to several states, then we raise that up to the MRIP team, and we find ways to get those changes in place, and implemented, and working, and so I'm glad to see the openness to these new ideas, expanding and re-envisioning the partnerships, but thank you so much for having me here.

DR. HOWELL: All right. Thank you, Geoff. At this point, I'm going to transition, and I'm going to ask Sarah to come up, but, again, you know, even if we just had this presentation right now, and I'm going to hope that, during the listening sessions, any questions, comments, concerns, you know, that you speak openly, but really to share awareness of what we're doing, and why, so that you have an understanding of why we would go through this, and why we feel it's important, especially as we go region-by-region, and so, with that, Sarah, I'm going to turn it over to you.

MS. LAZO: Before get into the feedback session, I just wanted to provide some brief, overarching instructions to you all, and so we've broken out the questions by three key themes, and so data collection, assessment and management, and partnership and communication, and so we request that feedback pertain to any of the questions presented on the slide at that time, and so, just quickly, I will kind of show you -- Apologies for the misnumbering here on the slides, but so we'll go through these three slides, just to let you know what's coming.

We're going to start with taking feedback from the council members on all of these topics first, and then we're going to open it up to the audience, attending both in-person and virtually, and please note that this isn't necessarily meant to be a Q-and-A session, but primarily just getting an open forum to obtain the most amount of feedback that we can, and so, in addition to this session, please feel free to also email us with any feedback you have, at fisheries.mrip@noaa.gov, and so that's fisheries.mrip@noaa.gov.

With the timing, the council will have about thirty minutes on each topic or slide, prior to opening the floor to the audience, and so we request that those who would like to speak in-person to come up to an open microphone when called upon, and, for those who would like to provide feedback virtually, following the council discussion, we request that you use the raise-hand button, to be called on in turn. We will not read aloud the written feedback submitted via chat, but we will document it, and so feel free to also submit comment that way. We request that, prior to providing any additional feedback, you wait until others have had a chance to speak, and, Madam Chair, I will now turn it back to you to start the facilitation.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Sarah, and I think the plan really will be for Carolyn and John to facilitate this, and so I will let them recognize everybody, when hands are raised, and so I'll turn it over to them.

DR. BELCHER: So who would like to start? We've got the questions in front of us. I have one question, moving forward. When you're talking about your top three to five priorities, is that initially looking at the list that you provided at the bottom of the previous slide, because you had indicated that there were six priorities there, identified by the team for 2023 to 2027, and the ordering, and that was back to Geoff, I guess, and is that --

MR. WHITE: Those were the previously-identified priorities, but I believe the intent, for today, is to really just speak up of what your current priorities are. That was developed, you know, a couple of years ago, and they may be flexible, but what's most important today?

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and those were the ones that came out of the regional team for the Atlantic, right, that were routed through ACCSP and the commission, et cetera, right?

MR. WHITE: That's correct. They were actually developed through several workshops and forums and then ranked by all of the state and council and commission partners that had availability to that, and so we merged both the coordinating council and some of the priorities that they ranked, where they fell out up and down the coast.

DR. BELCHER: So, for me, when I look to that next slide where the questions start then, rather than hitting it cold with three to five, I would look at those six priorities and at least see if they're still relevant in how we would order them, and maybe that at least gives us some good talking points to move forward with right now, and so comments from the group on that, or thoughts?

My point was the first question is what are the top three to five priorities/absolute needs in your region, right, and Geoff's question, at the bottom of his slide that was in front of that, was are these priorities representative of this region, and there were six that were identified through ACCSP, and the question was are they representative of our region, and, if not, how do we improve regional planning, and so there's six there. Are they pertinent to us? You know, are there three to five of those that we think are important, and let's talk about those, or are there other things that aren't there, or wipe everything and start new, and that was kind of -- I didn't want everybody feeling like they were getting a cold call on what would be a priority to start with. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you, Chair. We had a chance, over lunch, to speak a little bit about this, and so, as I look at these six priorities, I keep coming back to I think the information that we continue to need, and to struggle with, is what's being landed, what's being kept, and what's being discarded, and, you know, that's Number 3 in this list of six, and I'm surprised it's not Number 1.

The rest of this information I think is nice to have, and it's not need to have, at least for the decisions we've been struggling with, and I'll go back to, you know, red snapper. This is the core piece of information that we've not been able to say we absolutely understand what's being kept and what's being thrown back.

DR. BELCHER: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Robert. I just wanted to echo what Robert said. You know, our number-one priority right now, in my opinion, should be the recreational discards. That should be the number-one thing we're focusing on right now, and how do we get a better method of collecting data for these discards, but, you know, I think -- I think that is much more important, right now, than the catch estimates. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: I had Tom and then John.

MR. ROLLER: So I concur with the previous statements that discard estimates are really important, but I do think it's really -- I do think the precision of MRIP catch estimates needs to be looked at in a particular way, and I'm going to give you some examples, as a North Carolina fisherman and manager, as I sit in my regulatory body in my state, as well as this council.

You know, in a lot of our fisheries, effort is increasing, and our available fish are decreasing, and we're seeing a lot of fisheries, that are very popular, and some are that -- You know, like red snapper is an example here, where you have these very short seasons, and we may not be capturing it, particularly in a state like North Carolina, through MRIP as well, but, also, in our state fisheries, we have fisheries like southern flounder, which are going to very, very short seasons, and it's really taxing the use of MRIP, and so it's my opinion that we need to look at improving the precision of some of these catches, particularly these popular fisheries, which are being put into very, very small segmented windows.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you for that, Tom, because I think that's an important point that I was going to echo here a little bit too, is, you know, we have estimates of discards. What we struggle with is the fact that we're often concerned that they're not reliable enough, and I think that's why just getting improved precision across-the-board of the catch estimates, and so catch is, you know, fish could be landed, or they could be discarded, and so that's pretty -- At least in this language that we use here, that's pretty comprehensive, and so the idea is just trying to get better precision, and accuracy, so that we can have confidence in those estimates, and that's why that one rose to the top, but I think definitely those first three from that, down to improve discard and release data, are, certainly from everything I've heard around this table for years, are top priorities of the council.

DR. BELCHER: Charlie, then Trish, and then Tim again.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Talking about precision of the catch estimates, I'm -- I keep thinking about black sea bass on the shore, and where on shore, and what -- You know, exactly where -- You know, where can we figure out how to manage this stuff that's not in our jurisdiction, and so that's -- That's important, to me.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Actually, I was on Question 1 on the other, and so, if everybody wants to go on with -- I agree with what folks have been saying about the listed priorities here for 2023 through 2027, and so, when we get to the Question 1 on the next one, I will go there, but, yes, I agree with that, especially -- That was one of the things, is, of course, our discard information, and, you know, we need that, as well as being able to verify that discard information.

DR. BELCHER: Tim, back to you, and Robert.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, and I'm glad that Tom made that distinction, because that's what I envisioned when it said "improve", you know, improve the accuracy, and improve the precision, and black sea bass is a perfect example. I cannot, for the life of me, imagine three-and-a-half million individual fish were released in the waterway, and that just -- You know, that just defies logic, and so, when I said moving that up -- It's the improvement part, and it's the precision part, and it's the accuracy, some numbers that actually make sense.

DR. BELCHER: Robert, to you, and then Tom.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I just wanted to go back and thank you for bringing up the shore fishing stuff, because I think at least my comment was really focused on dead discards, right, and recognizing there is a significant difference between, you know, a deeper-water fishery, where we're actually dealing with barotrauma, versus some of the inshore stuff, which has different types of issues, you know, hook size, gut -- Other types of dead discard issues.

Then the second thing is, you know, I come back to this improved precision of MRIP catch estimates, and I think we need improved precision of actual catches, right, and I don't know if I'm mincing words there, but I feel like we're not getting to the core of it, and part of the discussion here may be how do you do that without a mandatory reporting requirement, which also I think is a piece of this puzzle that at some point is going to have to be tackled.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Other comments from folks? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: If we want to do anything about in-season management, that just doesn't -- MRIP doesn't seem to be able to respond quick enough for us to do any type of in-season management.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that, Jessica. Judy, and then Tom.

MS. HELMEY: I pretty much agree with what everybody is saying, but we do need better data on the dead discards, and I agree with Tim. Three-and-a-half million black sea bass released inshore is really crazy.

DR. BELCHER: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Kind of adjusting my comment here, and so many people have brought up some really good stuff. Thank you for the in-season mode, and I think that comes down to improved precision too, because, again, as we have shortened seasons on these fisheries on the state and federal side, we need to be able to react better.

Second of all, I'm really glad that people brought up the shore mode aspect, because we've seen some really wonky shore mode estimates in several of our fisheries, and not just black sea bass, but Spanish mackerel as well, and so I think we need a little bit better grasp on some of that, some of those effort estimates, and I just want to bring up -- Let's not forget about the for-hire reporting, which we're working on now, and that should be a priority too, and not just because it's a low-hanging fruit, but my hope is that better estimates of recreational catches, through that program, could also help us look at the general recreational fishery at-large.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: It looks like we're kind of moving into Question 1 anyway, and so I need to echo about the in-season monitoring. As you know, North Carolina has a mandated mandatory monitoring program now, and that stemmed from management of our flounder and our inability to be able to even, you know, do some -- You know, to monitor that fishery quick enough to close quick enough, and so that's how we are now in the place of having this mandated reporting.

The other thing, and this is speaking for North Carolina, and I did speak with our MRIP folks, and a couple of things that they wanted me to add was that field staffing has been a problem. It's a tough job, and it doesn't pay well, and where everyone has to live along these coastal communities, which are -- You know, they have a high cost-of-living, and so that probably needs to be taken into account, and, also, how do we focus some effort on combating misinformation with MRIP, and, I mean, there's groups, and social media, that kind of put all this crazy stuff -- You know, all those stuff out there that -- They're misinformed, and it's getting out, and so I think that's something else to, you know, think about, as far as some priorities, and so thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so we've got, it looks like, three, or four, priorities, and is there any other ones that we need to consider under that first bulleted question? Amy, and then Andy.

MS. DUKES: I would just like to see a little bit, perhaps, more language associated with the for-hire reporting system, and it's not so much just improved, but it's comprehensive and cohesive in nature, and I want to make sure that we're thinking outside of not only focusing our efforts here in our region, but making sure that we are applicable with other regions, since a lot of our fishermen overlap amongst regions with their fishing and reporting requirements.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Maybe just more a question, for especially the state directors, and, you know, Trish, and others, kind of got me thinking about it, but, you know, I think a lot of these priorities align with both federal and state needs, right, but is there anything unique, based on state-

managed fisheries, right, that MRIP is not providing you, beyond kind of what we're talking about here?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we might get to some of that in the next couple of questions, but there are some things about what are we not collecting that you might need, and so people should think about that pretty good, and it sounds like we're maybe -- Certainly the council agrees with the priorities that were established through the Atlantic regional implementation team, pretty strongly. I mean, everything I've heard here seems to echo what's there, and the priorities don't -- The priority order doesn't seem to be too far out of line from what the council seems to think.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that, John, and so other comments to that first bullet question about priorities? All right. The next question was what changes are you seeing in angling/fisheries behavior that could impact catch and effort estimates? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I'm seeing people consolidate their effort into shorter periods of time. In particular, we have shorter seasons, right, more expensive gas, and so people are -- They may go three times in an early period of June, right, when gag grouper is still open, and that makes me wonder what that does to the overall estimates, if maybe people are doing more effort in a shorter period of time, while seasons are open, versus maybe spreading it out over the course of the year, and it just may look a little different, but, obviously, I'm not a statistician.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think there's also -- We've talked about kind of the lack of trust in the process, and I think that that's causing anglers, oftentimes, at the dock, to run from samplers, or say I don't want me fish sampled. We had some specific issues in the Gulf, with some reef fish, where the people that wanted their catch sampled had really large red snapper, but maybe some of the people that didn't do as well didn't want to be sampled, and I would say we hear, from fishing clubs on the Atlantic coast, where people are like I don't want to answer questions, and I don't want to talk to the samplers, and I feel like the data is going to be used against me if I give the information.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments from folks on that? Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: So one thing we're seeing, up in North Carolina, is we are -- Similar to Jessica, we are seeing an increase in the refusal by anglers to be interviewed. A lot of it, I think, is because of regulatory change. I think, in North Carolina's case, it's been over flounder, and, you know, I think there's a need for more outreach, or some sort of campaign to explain how important it is to do these interviews. You know, it's for better data, so we can manage better, so we have sustainable fish, so they can fish.

You know, in the long-term, a suggestion was that you may need to identify other ways to access effort and catch, if we continue to have limited participation, or folks just don't want to be interviewed. Another thing to add is the surveys are long, and maybe -- Is there a way -- You know, think about ways to streamline them, and then can you arrange questions, and this is trying also to get at people just don't want to be interviewed, but can you streamline these questions, and also put maybe the more personal questions towards the end, because I guess -- Now, this is my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, but I guess there are some personal questions, near

the end of the interview, that they won't answer, and that kills the interview, and, I mean, all the data are gone, and, you know, it may be just because they don't want to give you their zip code, or their address, but you got some good catch and biological information, and it's a shame to lose that just because they didn't want to give, you know, where they lived or something, and so that was something that our folks wanted to see. I think the big thing is just these interviews are too long, and people are tired, and they're ready to go home, and, you know, so that's some input from North Carolina.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I wanted to echo the comments that Jessica made, because I'm hearing a lot of that as well, in terms of people just wanting to not provide input to the survey, simply because they feel it's going to be used against them, or misused, and the other thing that I guess I would mention is, you know, diversification of fishing activities, right, and so I'm hearing this throughout the Southeast, in terms of, you know, when fisheries are closed, instead of going for shallow-water grouper, or, you know, snapper, they're going to go deep-dropping, right, and so they're moving around to different aspects of the fishery, and the technology, the boat motors and everything, has, obviously, helped make them more effective, and efficient, at targeting those species.

DR. BELCHER: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Andy brought up my next point, is the general efficiency of anglers is unimaginable, and it's changing faster than we can even grasp it, with all the new boat technologies and trolling motor technology and stuff that we see in our fisheries specifically.

DR. BELCHER: I know, and I'm looking to Kathy, and I will come to Jessica, but one of the things that we noted with our survey, and we did a satisfaction survey, is effort is shifting more and more to the inshore, and so there's chances now that federal fisheries are going to start getting more and more to be harder to hit, because the bigger boats, or the private dock boats, and not necessarily the inshore boat ramp folks, and so there's a little bit of that shift going on. I mean, it's not dramatic, but it is noticeable, and so that's what we're seeing in Georgia, is that near to inshore shift. I've got Jessica, and then back to Tom.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree with everything that's been said, but I was going to bring up -- So we had some interactions with the Jacksonville Offshore Fishing Club, and so some of those folks were at the June council meeting, plus we were meeting with them about the EFPs, and they were bringing up -- So a bunch of that club had stopped doing all the surveys, and they kind of told their club to please stop answering the questions, and part of it stemmed from, A, they didn't understand how the data would be used, but, also, they thought that some of the questions, like the questions themselves, indicated that the people using the data didn't really understand how fishermen actually fish, and so there were some questions about area fished, and other things like that, that they kept trying to explain to me, and to Kristin, when we went to go talk to them, and they said, since my choices, or my only possible answers, were this, this, and this, it means that they don't understand how fishermen actually fish, and so we stopped during the surveys, and we told the club to stop doing the surveys.

I'm wondering if there's a way that Evan, or others, could go talk to some of these fishing clubs, and maybe kind of -- Especially these ones that have become reluctant to answer the questions,

and to hear from them, because they certainly gave us an earful. That wasn't even what we were there for, but they gave us an earful about this, and there was a lot of discussion between the State Reef Fish Survey and the MRIP data, and kind of how those things were being used, what the difference was, a lot of that, and so it might be helpful if you went and talked to -- We could give you some of these clubs, but they were -- I mean, they followed us out to the parking lot to talk to us about, you know, the area, and some of the other questions, like how can we even trust this, when some of the questions were this, this, and this, and that doesn't even make logical sense, and so they don't know what's going on, and we told our club not to answer questions.

DR. BELCHER: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: So, Carolyn, I think you articulated what I was trying to say earlier a little bit better, and I want to expand on that. That was what I meant. I think that people are compartmentalizing their fishing, a little bit, around seasons, right, and so, also, people's boats are a lot more versatile than they were twenty years ago, and so you see a lot of these very -- Let's call them these huge like offshore bay boats, but they effectively fish inshore, and offshore a little bit, particularly whether they're for for-hire or guides.

Like if we're seeing our federal fishing activity consolidated in shorter periods of time, maybe it's not being captured well enough in these surveys. Also, at the same time, with inshore fisheries, if they're consolidating kind of around those other seasons, it may be captured differently as well, but I'm definitely seeing increased activity that looks like that, like people just focusing on -- They're kind of making their own seasons around some of these seasonal fisheries and whatnot.

DR. BELCHER: Judy, and then Amy.

MS. HELMEY: I'm in the charter boat business, and we have a lot of customers who used to want to answer the questions, when they would come for the surveys, and I always suggested they do, but now they say the surveys are too long, and there is too many personal questions, and so we might -- If we could downsize some of the surveys, I think it might be a little bit better, and I don't know what you use that other information for anyway, but maybe if you just got the information about the fish. They want to talk about the fish, but the rest they don't want to answer.

DR. BELCHER: That's part of that next question, but Amy. Okay. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We're seeing increased discarding across-the-board, and, you know, catch-and-release fishing has become more prominent, certainly than back when MRIP was started, but then also the regulatory discards that we deal with a lot of times in fisheries, where people really want to keep their fish, but, you know, from a survey estimation perspective, that means a greater percentage of the fish are not fish that anyone can actually see who is doing the sampling, and I think that adds to the uncertainty in the overall catch.

MR. WHITE: I don't want to speak out of turn, but, yesterday, there was discussion about Wave 1 for black sea bass, and some other fisheries, and so maybe one of the items is matching the survey timelines to the fishing timelines, now that more fishing is occurring at different months of the year.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think some of the personal questions, getting into some of the if there's economic-type information, like how much did you spend on whatever, and I think that that kind of sets people off, but, also, I know, in the Gulf -- I think that there's been this extrapolation issue, and so Gulf gag, and then the one fish that was caught on Skyway, and we've had some similar issues, I think, about hogfish.

A few years ago, there was one trip that went out of Biscayne National Park, and they were spearfishing, and so the spearfishing components -- Everybody on that boat limited out, and that was extrapolated, and it basically shut down the hogfish fishery, and so it's -- Sometimes, to me, it's kind of the weights that MRIP is estimating, versus like the State Reef Fish Survey, because maybe only the people that had a really good day, that they agreed to be sampled, but, also, what ends up becoming more of like a rare intercept, and how that gets extrapolated.

I think that that causes anglers, and managers, to be frustrated with the data, with how those numbers get extrapolated, especially when it closes a fishery down, but Gulf gag too, and like it seemed like, on the Skyway, that that one gag grouper was extrapolated into, I don't know, and I'm looking at Andy, but like 300,000 shoreline catches of Gulf gag, whereas, when we used the State Reef Fish Survey numbers, it didn't show anything like that, and so there's something in the way that this extrapolation is happening that makes managers frustrated with the numbers. They don't seem realistic, and then the public, when they hear these things that don't seem to make common sense, that that causes them to be more frustrated, not just with the data, but the whole management process in general.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Other comments to this question about the fisheries angling behavior? Okay, and so the next question, and, just for clarification, the "you/anglers" in this question, what are you/anglers most willing to report, and how, what is the focus of "you"? Is it as in the state most willing to report and how? I mean, I don't know that we have a non-willingness to report whatever is needed, and so that's why I'm curious who the "you" is here.

MS. LAZO: I think that this question might be a little bit more targeted to the fishing public in the audience, and so we could -- Unless the council wants to weigh-in on what do you feel that anglers are most willing to report, and how, and then we can talk about that.

DR. BELCHER: I was going to say that I think you've kind of captured some of that, as people have talked about the personal information, and, obviously, economics is always sensitive, whether it's commercial or recreational, but does anybody have any others? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: A general comment that I hear is that they don't want to give information that is not going to actually be used, and so I know that's kind of a general statement, right, but, if there was some way of saying like, hey, we're looking for this information, and, when we get reports, if we get this information, then this happens, and, if we get this information, this happens, and I know it's kind of looking down the road, but I think, to some extent, that's what people are looking for, and that's why I keep coming back to it's easy to explain to people why we need information on what was harvested, and what was discarded, or dead discarded, because that's fundamental to our decision-making process and how we make fisheries management decisions.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Other thoughts? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: So, you know, this question -- I always scratch my head at it, because, in the outdoor world, people don't seem to have any problem reporting big game species in hunting, right, and that's accepted, and it's, you know, taken at ease, and people don't really complain about it. For some reason, it changes in fisheries, but I do have to point out that, you know, the State of North Carolina -- Our legislature has been very reticent to ever weigh-in on fisheries very much.

Now, this last year, we got a bill where we're going to have required recreational reporting for most of our most common inshore species. Recreational anglers will be required to report the harvest of every red drum, speckled trout, southern flounder, striped bass, and weakfish, and we received a lot of public comments, and they are not positive. There are not many people in favor of it.

DR. BELCHER: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: I was -- If you could break the survey down a little bit, and, if you do the survey, and they don't answer all the questions, does that make the survey null and void?

MS. LAZO: No, and the personal information that's -- Geoff may be able to answer this as well, and so the personal information that's collected in the interviews -- All that's used for is to -- I believe it's things like phone numbers, and all that is used for is to validate that the interviewer was there when they said they were, and so it's like a QC kind of thing, and it's not used for anything else, and the interviewers are instructed to make that clear, that this is confidential, and this isn't -- You know, NOAA is not going to be calling you about this, and it's going to come from -- Yes, if it's -- It depends on what questions they don't answer, and it would just be item nonresponse, and it would be treated as a missing value.

MS. HELMEY: But you could still use the information that you got, right? Okay. Great.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess, the way I'm thinking of this, it's almost -- I feel like it's an area of research, right, and I think, from a social standpoint, you know, are anglers that are more familiar with regulations, and the council process, or state, are, you know, willing to report more or less, right, and are you willing to report your catch if you had a good day, versus a bad day, or if you had a big fish to show off, versus a small fish to show off, and, I mean, I think there's a lot of dynamics here that really probably interplay with willingness to report, and then there's just people that, if you're asked, you're going to provide the information, and, other people, if you're asked, you never want to provide the information.

DR. BELCHER: Trish, and then Amy.

MS. MURPHEY: This is a follow-up, and this is another question as follow-up to Judy, because, when I was talking to our folks, there seemed to be some questions that were -- They called them kill questions, and so -- It sounded like it was really more on that personal economic-type questions, and that was what they were concerned about, you know, is don't kill the whole interview because of that, and so if you can clarify that.

MS. LAZO: Yes, and so the economic questions are -- It's a separate survey that is administered through APAIS, and so there's -- It's like the Economics Division in Science and Technology adds on questions, and I think it's every five years, and so it's not every year, every interview, and it's like an add-on to APAIS, and those are -- People don't like answering those questions. The economics team -- I would have to have them kind of speak to why those questions are worded the way they are, but they use that information for separate analyses.

UNIDENTIFIED: (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. LAZO: No.

DR. BELCHER: Amy.

MS. DUKES: I was just going to build upon Andy's comment. We're actually also seeing demographic changes, and so, if you get a younger angler, they're a little bit more eager to participate. They think it's actually kind of cool to be interviewed at the dock, and then you kind of have your old guard that are like I'm not going to talk, and so I'm actually -- We're seeing that really come to life, and it's almost like a little bit of FOMO, and some folks that maybe are boats getting pulled out, and we didn't get to them, are coming back and asking questions, and so I think that that's a good sign that maybe we're going to have some shifting here soon, too.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts on willingness to report certain types of data and how? I guess the how also gets into the follow-up on that, with what do you think are the pros and cons related to the use of self-reported apps, angler permits, and additional modes of data collection. I know the one thing, for me, is the struggle with the fact that it's a voluntary survey, and we know that people opt-out, and we know that using self-reported apps is basically the same thing, and I know the difficulties, as we all know, with surveys, right, and, if you've got certain ones -- Strong personalities, one way or the other, will tend to want to make sure that their points are getting made across, and other people aren't so invested in it, and so I do think that there's kind of that struggle with the voluntary opt-in. Other thoughts from folks? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I mean, as a general matter, I think everybody in the world is doing just about everything they're doing through an app at this point, including Instagram and taking photos and all that, and so, from that perspective, I think that's exactly where we need to go, in terms of pushing people to.

I think, you know, again, back to kind of -- You have two options, right, to get people to do this, and, one, it either becomes mandatory, or there's some incentive for using this app, and is it possible to have a different bag limit if you hail-out and agree to self-report on the way out, a bonus fish or something, and I don't know, but we've got to feel our way through that.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: On one hand, mandatory -- Well, kind of living that -- Well, I won't say hell, but living that anyway, and, you know, it could, you know, make things better, but I guess that's just -- That's down the road, and, you know, don't throw that out, but I think that's probably going to be a hard sell, or at least so far for us it's been, but I think, with apps, the verification is going to be real important, and I guess you can build in verifications with pictures, or GPS locations, you

know, and is there a way to compare those self-reporting apps with the MRIP intercepts, to kind of get -- I don't know if there's a way to validate that way, and the other thing about apps is there's so many out there, and, you know, they need standardization, and the other thing is just consistent use.

I mean, I kind of get to the point where I've got different little apps, and I will be religious on one, and then I'm like, yeah, no, and so, you know, I think consistent use of an app is going to be important, and then I think folks will need to realize that, just as you're trying to get any kind of data stream going, it takes some time, and so folks are going to have to realize that, you know, you may be putting data in for three or four years, but you're probably going to need at least five years of good data for it to start being useful, and so I think people -- When you do go to apps, they need to realize that it's still going to take some time before their data are used, and it's not, you know, they plug it in for this fall, and they're looking for it to be used next year, and that's probably not going to happen yet, and so those are just some other thoughts.

DR. BELCHER: Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thanks, Trish. I completely agree with you, with the continual use and the standardization, but I think the idea about an app can be used for a specialized utility is still a very important point, and, a lot of times, when an app is put out, if it doesn't showcase what that utility is on the front side, I think that gets a little lost too, because they're like you just want to track what my fishing has been, just because you want to know, and it's not. It actually has a utility, and so I think pushing, on that front side, the utility of how that could be used is going to be really important to sell it.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments from folks? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I know apps are in, but there's a lot of older fishermen that just -- They're just not going to do it. They're not even going to be on Facebook, like me, and so I could, but I just - I don't need to, and so you've still got to keep -- I know you do, but I just want to remind you that you're going to have a lot of folks that are just not going to want to do apps, and I don't know how you're going to get them, because it's not going to be easy, but I'm telling you something that you already know.

DR. BELCHER: Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Just to Trish's point of the number of years, I mean, just a general comment. As we think through this, I really think we need to figure out a way to create a stream of information, and data, that can be verified quickly and put to use much quicker than five years. I think, you know, if it takes five years for us to get a program started and to utilize this data -- I mean, we're already way behind, and so I think that needs to be a core consideration of building this, is what information are we asking, how quickly can we get the information, and verify it, whether it's through dockside intercepts or other, and get a quick comfort level that this information is reliable, and accurate, and I think removing variables gives us a better chance of getting there.

DR. BELCHER: I think the hard part, with a lot of what we talk about is, Robert, as you indicated, is the problem becomes the resources, and the resource availability, because it's one thing to put

an app out there, and like we try to do pilots, to get a good understanding of what's going to work well, and you try to do that within a year or two, but, as we know with the SEFHIER process, compliance is huge, and so, if you're still not getting enough of that information back, and you don't have the resources to go out and, again, do the matchups and all of that, we're still stuck in that same burn-in mode, as they call it. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I hear you loud and clear, and we talk a lot about resources, but I think we should at least put together the program, leaving aside what resources it takes to get it done, that we think is necessary, and then, if we can't get Congress to give us the resources we need, well, that's a different issue, but I think we need to outline specifically what we want to accomplish, what we need, and what the budget is to do that, and let somebody else tell us that we're not going to get the resource that we need.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Let me just -- I will go to what I meant, as far as taking five years, and I just -- I know that you need to start seeing trends in data, and so that was my point, and then I do know that -- I guess the rule of thumb, for stock assessments, is they want at least five years' worth of data, and so that was kind of where I was coming from, as far as use, and so just to clarify that.

DR. BELCHER: Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: That's perfectly fair, and I think our experience tells us that's kind of where we are. I'm just -- We've got to try and break free from that. I mean, you know, red snapper is an example that I will go back to again. Had we had resources, five years ago, to start getting the assessments and the information we need, we wouldn't be in the quandary we're in today. It's simply a lack of resources. We didn't have the information, and I think that's a message that really needs to be sent to Congress, in whatever form and who needs to carry that where, but, every time I ask, we're just not getting the resources we need from Congress, and so we're doing the best we can with what we've got, and that's not an acceptable place to be with our federal fisheries, in my opinion.

DR. BELCHER: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair, and, you know, I'm glad that Robert brought that up, because he's absolutely right that you've got to start somewhere, and, you know, at least get the tool, so that you have a tool. Should it take five years before you can use the data? I'm looking at the data right now from MRIP, for the State of North Carolina for black sea bass, and every one of them has a "no" beside it, almost, and says it doesn't even meet MRIP standards, yet we're using that in our assessments, and so to think that we've got wait five years to have usable data from the app -- I can't buy into that. You know, we're spending resources right now, using a data collection method that, by its own standards, should not be used, but it is being used.

These data, the PSEs are too high to even use, and that's no different than starting out with a new app, and you don't have to wait five years, but you're absolutely right that you've got to start somewhere, and I'm a firm believer that there will be a lot of buy-in to an app. There will be a lot more buy-in to an app than there will be a dockside interview, as we move forward, and Charlie is right that there's a lot of us older guys that -- You know, I don't use a lot of apps, or put new apps,

because my antiquated phone and technology, doesn't have the storage capacity to even put any more apps on, and it doesn't work, and so, yes, I hear you loud and clear, but, you know, Robert makes a very good point. You've got to at least get the tool ready. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: You know, and, again, I'm thinking outside of the box, and you have already thought of it, I'm sure, but it talked about additional modes of data collection, and, you know, if you had a self-addressed envelope and a one-sheet survey that they could pick up at a bait store, or in a dry box at the boat ramp, so they could -- If they wanted to fill something out, they could just fill it out when they come in, and mail it in, and, for the people that don't want to use, you know, an app, or they can't use an app, that might be a way for you to reach some people that you are not going to reach internet-wise. That's just a thought.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Just some broad thoughts on, you know, self-reported, whether it's an app or fill in the comment card at the tackle shop, you know, with voluntary-type stuff, the challenge you face is the avidity and the success bias. Avid anglers often -- Some want to do it, and some don't, but success though is a big thing. People like to report when they had a great trip, and they don't like to report when they feel like they were a failure as an angler that day, and I think we've all probably felt that way, if the sampler walks up to you on the day you didn't catch anything.

The pros of it though is, you know, I really think that you can get specialized, rare info quickly. Apps do allow you to get things really quickly, and, if you focus on specialized information of a certain fishery, or something you're not getting otherwise, then maybe the timeline isn't such an issue, and that's certainly much more -- Having many years is much more of an issue if you're trying to say generate an estimate that represents a much larger picture than what you're sampling, and so there are pros and cons to that, and it certainly seems like there's a place for this, within an overall comprehensive program, to, you know, fill in some holes, and gaps, in a data collection system.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so, coming back around on this, are there other things that we need to talk about, pros and cons-wise, relative to data collection approaches? I know we didn't really touch angler permits, and I don't know whether that's by design or not, and I know that was something that we had been talking about, within Georgia, as we were trying to kick down what are the best ways to help hone this in, and, I mean, it does -- The pros are it does refine your universe to a more applicable set of folks.

I mean, federal offshore fishers are a lot smaller percentage of the overall anglers in the state, and so hitting them directly with particular questions, and you will get a little bit better resolution on what's out there, but you've got the issues of is it going to be a state permit, a federal permit, a free permit, a paid-for permit, and there is different leverages. We've all been there. Every state agency that's dealt with licenses has been there, and so I think that's part of the pros and cons on how you go about doing that. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I'm going to circle back to the app thing, because I think, in order for this to work, we've got to be able to confirm, to validate, this information, right, and, at least from my perspective, one of the real benefits you get of an app, and I would even talk about taking pictures and logging, is you get time stamps when you get stuff in, and then we're able to randomly do

dockside intercepts to confirm the accuracy of this information. Then it becomes really usable, and I would challenge do we need five years of it.

If we really can say, look, we've done 3,000 stops, and, 98 percent of those, the information we find is exactly what they're reporting in the app, that would give me a lot more confidence in landings, and dead discards, than some of the information we're seeing today, and I get it. I totally get it, right, but we went from VMS to GPS, I mean Loran to GPS to other advancements, and this is one that I think we're going to have to just help those people, and so, if there's folks that need training -- We've got to think outside of the tablet, and not just the box.

We're going to have to get, you know, people to buy into this, and everybody is going to have to do the same thing, because, as soon as somebody can say that I'm going to come in, and I'm going to go fill this out in the next day or two -- One, the information recollection is disconnected, and our ability to validate and have a real, you know, secure system that this information is accurate will be eroded, and I think that's something that -- If we don't build something that we can really, really rely on, and it has all the protocols to create, you know, accuracy, we're just going to find ourselves back here again in five years talking about the same thing.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so, relative to this section, do you all feel like you have good information from us? Is there anybody who wants to add anything else to any of these questions that we've just discussed on data collection? Okay. Seeing none, is everybody good to move on? We don't need a biological break for -- I wouldn't go any more than five minutes, and so -- Five minutes? Okay. Let's go ahead and take a five-minute break, and I will say until quarter of, and so, at 2:45, come back.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. BELCHER: If everyone can come back to the table, please. Okay. I am turning it back over to Evan and crew.

DR. HOWELL: We were going to move on. Thank you for all of that. I mean, I personally agree with everything that I heard. I really like the comments about the trust and credibility, about, you know, people -- I don't see a future where we don't have people really self-reporting in a rapid fashion, but they have to believe in the data that I'm giving you is going somewhere that is actually helpful, and I think that's something we've got to continue to work with, but we're ready to move on, to sort of talk about data gaps in the next slide, and so we were just going to turn it back to you, or whoever, to run the moderation on the comments, but we appreciate everything we've heard so far.

DR. BELCHER: I didn't know if you all wanted to go into that. Sorry, and so your next slide is -- My computer froze.

DR. HOWELL: Data gaps.

DR. BELCHER: So we're going to focus on assessment and management. The first question is what data gaps are making assessments and management challenging, and the sub-question to that is what data aren't we collecting that is needed? Does anyone care to take a first jump on this? Amy, and then I've got Trish.

MS. DUKES: I'm kind of hesitant to talk about what data is missing, when we're actually sitting here talking about trying to get rid of data fields, and I'm also sitting here struggling between what -- You know, I'm thinking more, instead of data gaps, more data deficiencies, and I'm trying to get my mind there.

DR. BELCHER: 10-4. Okay. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. So, again, I talked to my MRIP folks at DMF, and I think we've already hit on some of it, discards, you know, all the discard information, and let me go ahead and clarify, or verify, discards, and so effort from private access. I mean, we've -- You know, if you just get a GIS picture of all the private docks, and those are all missed, and rare-event species, data for in-season management, which we already hit on, you know, for example our flounder and red snapper, and this is kind of a question, but shore mode, and wasn't, a while back, shore mode was kind of broken into three pieces, like piers and beach and, I don't know, manmade, but I thought that it was broken out into separate pieces, and now it's all been conglomerated into one, and I wonder if it might be better to convert that back, because I think -- You know, thinking about the Spanish mackerel assessment, they had a huge number coming from shore, but maybe that was really piers, and so, you know, I think that might be something to reconsider, changing those back to what it was a while back, and so, yes, that's what I've got for you.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Effort from private access, and, Trish, what does that data look like? Is that the number of boats that are able to access the fishery, or is that -- What exactly are we getting at that, and without -- You know, sorry for the redundancy, but I think this is the same kind of question we've talked about along the line, which is we need to understand what's being harvested, and what's being discarded, but still like, you know, effort from private access is what I think leads to all these extraneous questions, and burden, on these surveys that -- I think talking about limiting the number of boats that are allowed to go out on the ocean is going to be a really, really hard discussion to have, at any level, and probably has some larger implications, and so I would just caution us from continuing down that path and collecting more information.

MS. MURPHEY: Let me clarify that. What I meant by private access was your private dock, and so that's actually what I meant, you know, and, granted, that's probably more state. That's more of a state thing than a federal thing, but that's something that North Carolina is lacking. We don't have a way to -- You know, we don't go knock on doors and ask how many fish did you catch off your private dock, and so that's what I was getting at.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Tom, and then I saw another hand. Tom, and then John.

MR. ROLLER: I just want to agree with Trish there. It's definitely an issue for our state, increasing like effort from private locations, that we just aren't adequately capturing. As our coasts grow, our boat ramps, and access points, get more crowded and crowded and crowded, and marinas are becoming more expensive, and so people are leaving from really creative places, and we just need to figure out how to get a better grasp on that. It's definitely an issue in North Carolina.

DR. BELCHER: I think one thing Robert just explained is it's the APAIS part of it. We can get the effort part through the survey, but, when it comes to actual sampling those boats, we can't get to those properties, to get the catch from them, because that's not captured through APAIS, through the intercepts, the dockside intercepts. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and something that has long been talked about that's needed, and I recognize that it's not easy to get, would be biological samples from recreational fisheries, especially down here, where some fisheries are so dominated by the recreational harvest, and then, for the discards, it would just really be nice to be able to actually observe and validate and verify some of those discards, as well as having information, more detailed information, on the depth that they were released at, hooking location, and usage of any sort of descending treatment, any sort of best fishing practices, because all of those things are important to letting us know what's really important in the assessment, is how many of the discarded fish actually died.

You know, MRIP focuses on estimating the number that are caught and released, and then a lot of work goes into figuring out how many of those died, and one of the big impediments is, while we know the factors that affect whether or not the fish die, we have very little information on how those factors play out in the actual fishery itself and for all of the fish that we estimate. Again, I recognize that this is really hard to get into, but I do think it's an important need.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John. Other thoughts on this? Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I'm not sure if this falls in this spot or not, but our staff was also interested in having more attention given to the assessment of site pressures. It sounds like they don't get a whole lot of direction there, but it's, I think, a very important piece of the sampling, and I guess that's the APAIS sampling.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments from folks on this, other suggested data points or elements? Okay. Moving down the list, next is how can disruption to assessment and management be minimized when revised surveys are implemented and historical estimates rescaled/calibrated to their revised design? That's a big question.

MS. LAZO: Sorry. Can I go back to the notes here, the site pressure assignments, and can you reiterate what the concern was?

UNIDENTIFIED: Assessment.

MS. LAZO: Assessing site pressures? Okay.

DR. BELCHER: Any thoughts on this? Evan.

DR. HOWELL: Not a thought, but, I mean, I'm tying it into what I heard Robert saying earlier, and then Tim verified, which is, you know, when we had this FES issue, the councils were noticing a concern, and understandably so, and I started thinking about climate impacts, and species movement, and all these things, and how we're going to need to make much faster decisions, and it gets to that comment about taking new information, and we can't wait, and so I see that in sort of the same line, is how are we going to rapidly assimilate new information, or new methods, into the process.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, this one is really tough. I think we certainly know that it's completely needed, and I reflect on something I've heard Richard Cody say at one point, that, you know, changes in MRIP may not so much be the exception, like they were for the first thirty years, but they actually become more the norm, and more regular as you go forward, that, you know, the program could be more in flux as it continues to get better, which means this kind of stuff could come up more often.

How to avoid it is really hard, and I'm not sure what we can add there, and certainly survey and assessment experts going to be able to provide more information there, but, you know, perhaps this is a place where getting apps, and getting more rapid information coming in, that maybe isn't the final, and as validated as you might like, could help you bridge these kind of gaps, and they occur, just more of a willingness to, okay, this is maybe not final, but it's the best that we know right now, and it's better to use that, and try to transition into this new program, than have to wait a lot of years before we can turn around and start using the new information, because it does leave people, I think, frustrated, when they feel like there's an issue, and they have to wait a number of years for it to be resolved and changed, which I think is kind of where we are now.

DR. BELCHER: I mean, I think one thing that comes to mind, for me, and it's -- Florida is the example that we pretty much have with the State Reef Fish Survey, is at least there is -- I mean, we can't afford duplicity, and, I mean, that's the hard part of that, right, is we really can't, but that supplemental -- Not supplanting, but supplemental to the fact that there's at least a bridge that kind of overlaps with that, that would kind of help, is a tuning between them, or something to that effect, and it may be a way for that, but I, obviously, don't see that as being in everybody's toolbox to be available, but that may be one way to do it. Other thoughts from folks?

MS. LAZO: I certainly want to hear from the council, but, just to maybe spur thoughts, some of the things -- We've asked these questions internally, at all the regional offices and science centers, at our internal interviews, and one thought that has come up, that I would be interested to hear your take on, is trying to either figure out some way to align survey changes with priority assessment cycles or just saying, you know, MRIP is going to now do survey changes on this year cycle, and everyone know that change is coming, and we build a body of research, and make a change every X years, but I think we would want to make sure that that was at a frequency -- We would want input on what that frequency should be, to help kind of mitigate the disruptive nature of this, and so those are just kind of some thoughts that came up, in the internal discussions, as potential ways to mitigate, you know, the disruptive of constant change.

DR. BELCHER: I think, in my head, I like that idea, but I just think about what we just went through with our SEDAR scheduling, and how we're on this rotation as-is, and updated measures, and unassessed stocks, and then is somebody going to jump to the front of the line, because of an urgency thing, and, I mean, it would be fantastic if there was some way to get everything in sync, and I just don't know if that's as easy a lift as one would think. That one is definitely going to take a lot of head scratching, I think. Okay, and so everybody else is where I'm at with that. Next on the list is, in the absence of additional resources or reductions in survey scope, what are alternative viable options for management? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: At least my interpretation of part of the reason why we struggle so hard with surveying is because of the complexity of our management practices, size limits, seasons, gear, a lot of different variables that are floating around I think that make this somewhat difficult, and so I will tie this back to, you know, I think maybe some adjustments to our fisheries management approaches, whether that be through aggregate bag limits or some of the other things that we've tested, I think it ultimately might help simplify some of the data collection components of this, and make this a lot easier, and so I think, to some extent, we need to be thinking about what's coming down the pipe, and, you know, the discussions that Andy is having, and what's going to come from the Secretary here.

I think we should be thinking about, you know, what that looks like, and how we're catering our data collection to try to make sure that we're creating as much efficiencies, but, you know, at the core of it, I think part of the struggle we have is, is it really even possible to survey, and to get the information that we're looking for, with all of these different variables in our fisheries management plans we have today.

DR. BELCHER: Some other thoughts from folks? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Short of a universal license, where everybody is in the pool, whether it be mandatory or they're selected through drawing, or however, I don't know another way to get there from here.

DR. BELCHER: I mean, some of me -- Some of my thought, with the way that my training had been when I was younger, is thinking about, you know, the approaches to survey design, and looking -- Again, it takes a lot of deep diving, like you all have done in the past, with working with the group from Colorado, and what are some of the things that you can gain, and it's like are we overfocused on certain species, to the point that we could shift some effort in a different direction, and a different weighting, and a different time, and it's a bigger scope of question, but I think sometimes those are the only way.

If you're kind of stuck, what's the best efficiency you can get with what you have? I mean, that's -- When our first questions were coming up at the office, the way that my supervisor was approaching the question was, first of all, can we fix it with more money, and, you then, okay, well, if money is not the thing, is it more sampling?

Then so it was all of the tradeoffs with those types of situations, and I guess it just comes down to the core of what your goals are, and are there ways that somehow you can adapt that, knowing that you can't add more in, but can you shift it, and like you guys pretty much put all that effort into the redo on the effort survey, you know, with the APAIS part of it, but how you went out and did the intercepts, and get the focus where it really needed to be, and, you know, that was the whole conversation that we got into with red snapper, and it was like more money, more sampling, and I'm like, there's more to it than that, Doug.

There's a seasonality, and there's boat types, and there's these things that we may not be able to account for that's going to take something that is more focused within, and can we reallocate and not hurt all the other things that we need that continued resolution on. I don't know if those are the ways to do that or not, and, again, it's a bigger lift, and you guys know that, because you've been dealing with it for many years. Other thoughts from folks? Okay.

With that, I guess we can move on to the next slide, partnership and communication, and so the first question on this slide is what elements of the federal/state/regional partnership in the South Atlantic are working or not working? Amy.

MS. DUKES: I think what's working really well right now is that, from Maine to Florida, all the states are conducting the APAIS survey, and the buy-in from the anglers in our states, when we show up to the docks, has really been a valuable component of this process, and it would be nice if we had the resources to expand our coverage, so that we can bring more staff, and we can do more intercepts, but I definitely think that working directly with the states, and the states implementing the surveys, has been a huge push to make this a whole lot better of a program.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments from folks? Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I agree with Amy. I think, for the most part -- I know North Carolina has a great relationship with MRIP, and one thing that they felt maybe some communication and transparency might need some improvement -- An example is when the FES pilot was rolled out, and I think, if they had been given -- If they had been kept in the loop with you guys working on this, and, you know, working together to kind of -- On the roll-out, then I don't think that states would have been left so much as having to pick up the pieces for that, and so I think that -- You know, that's probably a lesson learned already, but just to kind of pass that on anyway.

DR. BELCHER: Amy.

MS. DUKES: Can I add to my statement, too? I also think that the evolution to start working more closely with ACCSP, with the state partners, was also a huge component of this. We're already -- All of the states are already program partners with ACCSP, and we're really big into standardizing our data, and ensuring we're all doing the same thing, and so I think that's been a really big plug as well. It also helps to transfer the monies a little easier, too.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think I would echo that a bit. I think, from the Atlantic perspective, the coordination role of ACCSP is really working well. You know, I just think look to our first discussion on the priorities, and we're very much in line with the priorities coordinated through ACCSP and the Atlantic team, and so, you know, I think that makes things work really well on the Atlantic coast, in a lot of ways, and, you know, the states, and their staffs, spend a lot of time working together and dealing with shared issues.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I forgot one more thing. My folks suggested that the tech manual be rewritten, because I guess it's kind of cumbersome, because I know they were talking about he was doing something based off of page 28, and then something kind of fell in a pile, and he had to go to page ninety-something to finish it, and so there is a request, from our staff, if you could do a tech manual rewrite.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Other thoughts on the partnership and what's working and not working? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: In the Gulf, you know, we kind of had a mixed reaction, I think, with the work with the state surveys, and I think we're on track, and really the partnership is working well, with a lot of the transition work we're doing, but I did want to look to Jessica, in particular, with regard to SRFS, and the Florida survey, and I know we're integrating it into several stock assessments, and we've been calibrating it for the South Atlantic, and, you know, are things working well there? Is that something that has been improved, kind of as part of the transition process?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes and no. I think that, in the Gulf, the way that we've coordinated on some of the challenges, like when we were looking at tracking say the Gulf red snapper season, and I gave some examples earlier on Gulf gag, and, when we see a difference, a drastic difference, in the data, trying to get to the bottom of it, but it's -- I like the coordination. I wish that there was more coordination, when these differences were seen, but I guess the frustration is that it just seems like there's this inability of MRIP to --

If there's a season for a fishery that's kind of a short wave, and I'm not talking Atlantic red snapper short, but I'm talking about some of these other short waves in the Gulf, and it's just not sampling it well, and there ends up being this big discrepancy between the MRIP data and the State Reef Fish Survey data, and lots of back-and-forth between NOAA folks and our staff at the Research Institute about why, and then trying to dive down into the data, to figure out what the issue is, whether it's weight estimation or what, but it just seems that, when the season is short, and maybe it ends within a single wave, or it's like one-and-a-half waves, that the MRIP data doesn't estimate it well, is the best way I can explain it.

If there was a way to get to the bottom of why it's not being estimated well, and make those improvements, but I do like how, at the current time, when these inconsistencies were found, that there is some coordination on that.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just following-up, I guess what I was asking, more specifically though, is with like yellowtail, mutton, you know, the calibration process, the fact that we're moving from MRIP now to the State Reef Fish Survey, and how has that process worked? Do you feel like there's been a good partnership there? Are we building on what we've kind of learned in the Gulf now, and expanding it to, you know, those assessments in the South Atlantic?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that maybe it's just a little slow, but the part that I've seen is how the data is coming through the stock assessment for mutton and yellowtail. If there have been other, you know, state-specific meetings, it's probably with FWRI, and so my only experience with it is through the assessment process, and, other than being slow, I don't know that I have complaints about it.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Other comments? Amy.

MS. DUKES: Just another is the expansion to our electronic data collection for the dockside sampling. I think that that was a really -- Again, it was a big change, to the positive, for our state partnership, and I think, also, just getting the folks that are actually boots-on-the-ground, doing the

surveys, in the same room, at the same time, to discuss a lot of what works and what doesn't work, exchanging ideas to make the actual intercepts go better, the lessons learned, has also been very valuable for this tool as well.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Amy. Other comments? Okay. The next question is what does a successful, credible recreational data collection program look like, one that you would contribute to, advocate for, and trust? I'm going to -- One thing that I thought was interesting, for us, when we did our June meeting, was Geoff came and talked to us about what ACCSP is trying to do to help what I call put the umbrella over, so that, if a state wants to do a survey, they're making sure that you're meeting all the goals and objectives of the MRIP, because the worst thing that happens is a state puts a lot of time, effort, love, blood, sweat, and tears into a survey, to find out that that survey is not going to be used.

The fact that ACCSP is trying to give that, I think is very positive, because now we're within the boundaries that we know are being set up for success, and resources are being put forward in a good way. We're out there doing the boots-on-the-ground, trying to sell the product to the fishermen, and then it's not a lot of frontend work to be told that, yes, we didn't get to use it, because then that erodes not only the trust in the federal system, but also the state system, because you promised us something, and now it's not happening, and so that's kind of what I see is probably a good one, is to be able to do that. Other thoughts? Amy.

MS. DUKES: I think it goes back to my flumbering a minute ago, with data gaps versus inaccuracies, or what have you, and it's just that, whatever the survey looks like, make sure it's short and sweet and to the point. Make sure you're collecting just what you have to collect. Don't collect what you need, or I'm sorry. Don't collect what you want. Collect what you need. I know we need to have some built-in thought process about how we could use it in the future, but I think we're overwhelming these folks a little bit, and, as we continue to overwhelm, they start to fade away a little bit, and so, if you need it, ask it, if you're going to use it specifically.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts from the group? Jimmy.

MR. HULL: I think one point would be the data and the results -- That they represent reality as to what the average fisherman sees with their own eyes on the water and what they're experiencing.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I will add to what Jimmy was saying. This, obviously, is caveated based on kind of the current program, but a lot of the criticism that I often hear is, you know, those outlier data points, those anomalies, those estimates that are generated from the program, and it's not a criticism necessarily of S&T then, and it's how we use that data, and kind of the flexibility in how we interpret, and utilize, data that might have high error rates, or less precision, and so I think, you know, to me, a more credible system also looks like, you know, something that we can take that information, and data, and make it more adaptable to kind of the reality of what might have occurred, how that estimate was generated, and how it can be used for management purposes or not.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think something that is flexible in a way that's not just applying the same method to every species, because there are some fisheries that are unique, and special, and need a different approach, and it needs to reflect that, but there also needs to be sort of core consistency, particularly along the Atlantic coast, as we prepare to be climate resilient and deal with species shifts and such. You know, you need to have that baked into the system as well, and I think, ultimately, the program needs to give data with acceptable precision, but also some indication of accuracy, because it's very easy to be precisely very wrong, and we don't want to do that.

Then I think, also, considering some of the earlier discussions, you know, truly, from an angler's perspective, to be successful and credible, you need to -- Anglers need to feel like they have a voice in the program, and that they're listened to, and so it may need to accommodate various ways of giving input, as we've already talked about.

You know, there's lots of ways, and everybody is kind of different, and I think the public today, you know, looks at what is going on, in technology and everything else, and just expects multiple ways of giving input and things, and feels it's very antiquated if you're like, well, this is it, and this is how we're taking your input. I mean, look at us as a council, and we've evolved to take input, during our council meetings, from writing to in-person to, you know, over webinars virtually, you know, because people have come to demand those kind of things over time, and so I think all that needs to be factored into the program.

One of the things I feel like I've heard, probably more than anything throughout, hearing about MRIP, is the people would, you know, stand up and go, I don't believe it, because you never asked me, and you never intercepted me, and so your data is no good, and that's just them saying you haven't talked to me, and so I don't have a voice in this program, and so I have no reason to believe it, and, you know, we know it's hard to get self-reported data and fit it into a statistically-designed program, and there is lots of biases with that, but people have different ways they want to give their voice, and, to really get there, to successful and credible, we've got to find some way that that can be accommodated in the bigger picture.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John. Other comments? Okay. The next question is where do NGOs and the recreational and commercial fishing communities best fit into the re-envisioned partnership? Outreach and education. I mean, I know that they get frustrated with a lot of the product, but we do have good things in there, and I think the understanding is selling that, when we do try, we do our best, and there's things out there that are workable, but everything is always a process, but I think it would be good if they could help at least advocate for what is being done right, and not just what's being done wrong. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: When we say "communities", are we thinking a bit there of not just individual fishermen, but more like clubs and such, as playing a role, or are we actually thinking individual fishermen as well?

DR. HOWELL: I would say both. I mean, yes, I wouldn't limit it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: With that, you know, I think certainly fishermen, recreational communities, play a huge role, because it's the data about their activities, and you can't collect it without them taking part, but then I think various advocacy organizations, and clubs and such, can definitely play a role in the outreach and education, and, as we mentioned earlier -- You know, Jessica was

mentioning about clubs that are, you know, engaging in whether or not people should participate, and so looping them in to collect information, and maybe providing a venue to find out that we have a special need in this area, in your fishery, and would you provide it.

You know, we hear a lot about like offshore fishing clubs and stuff, and they're taking part in an activity that we know is a rare event, and a specialized thing within the world of MRIP, and so maybe groups like that would be willing to say, yes, we'll give you more detailed information for a period of time, or about our fishing activities, or, you know, something where, for a month, they give you really detailed information for some of their fishing activities, by some of their members, or from tournaments or that sort of thing, and they could serve as supplements to fill in the general survey that is certainly, you know, in my mind, always going on, and underway all the time, and these other pieces come in and try to improve the trouble spots, and the noisy spots, where it's not doing so well.

DR. BELCHER: Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thinking as individuals and not NGOs, the NGOs that represent the commercial and recreational communities is what I assume we're talking about there, and, you know, I think that this will really work when you have fishermen advocating to other fishermen to participate, right, and like, once you have, you know, peer-to-peer, people saying, hey, you need to get in, and you need to do this, and you need to help, and an example, right, and maybe this will or will not happen, but, as we look to red snapper, and how we're going to address this, if some of the information that came out of the EFPs in the State of Florida could be used to help give a little more access than people are anticipating, I think that would be probably the first time that fishermen, at least that I'm aware of, would say, darn, my information was used to give us more access, and maybe create a time that creates an opportunity for us to have a lot more trust, in a newly-rolled-out system, and program, and get people to say something has changed, and they're looking at this a little differently, and we gave this information, through this app, and now the feds are using it to give us a little more fishing access, and it may change people's attitudes, or opinions, a little bit.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts on that? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: From the NGO perspective, you know, I mean, they can move more nimbly than the government can, and a partnership, with particularly some of these industry-focused groups, is a great way to test new data collection methods, right, and like I've been participating in some scientific gathering, and app work, that's done through some NGOs, and so, if there is a new -- I hate to use the word "cutting edge", but, if there's new things that we can do, whether it's collecting scientific data, or collecting data, that's a great way to field test stuff, and do it quickly, and do it with other sort of funding as well.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments from folks? Okay. The next question is what would make you feel engaged in this process and in the partnership more generally? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: You know, if somebody asks me something, a set of questions, and I'm going to stop and take my time to answer them, obviously, I want to know that they're going to be used for something constructive, and, if they can give some feedback back to me, and say, all right, later, or say we used this type of information last year, or the year before, and it helped us make these

management decisions that affects you, especially if they can show it can help, then it makes people much more likely to share, and then, also, talk to their peers, and encourage their peers to share, and so some feedback on how it's really affecting them, but that would be my first thought.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts from folks on that particular question? Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: This is just short, and I think everybody just wants to make sure they've been heard, and so -- Which I think you all are trying very hard to do.

DR. BELCHER: Amy.

MS. DUKES: Heard and seen. I think this sort of interaction right here, face-to-face, is probably going to be really beneficial, if it can be worked into some of your working groups, and I know John just mentioned working with fishing clubs, and advocacy groups, and I think that's a great way for those boots-on-the-ground, and webinars are great, but I think more face-to-face interactions, with larger constituent groups, would really be helpful. You're going to gain so much more from the folks that you really want to hear from.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think the outreach and education is a big part of that, to making people feel engaged, and I'll go back to something that I've mentioned before to others. When -- I don't remember what change it was, and maybe it was the APAIS, or something, but -- Was the guy named Forbes Darby, that went down on the docks, and did the videos, and did a lot of that outreach, and that stuff was really effective, and there was a lot of positive feedback from people with that effort, and those videos, because it was, you know, going down and talking to the fishermen, and saying, hey, let me answer your questions and explain to you how this works.

You know, certainly one of the things that we've learned, in our outreach efforts, is that's how it happens. It doesn't happen with newsletters, and it doesn't happen with throwing stuff out into the cloud and hoping that somebody looks at it on the internet, et cetera. It happens by going down and talking to people one-on-one. We've had the most success with our outreach folks, and best practices and citizen science, going to docks, and going to fishing clubs, and going to tackle shops and spreading the word, and I think that's really a part, because then that's how people do start to feel like they have that voice, and they are really being seen, and I think that probably sums it up right there, that, you know, people have got to know they have a voice, and that they're being seen, and then they're going to feel like they're part of it, and then they've got to see some positive benefits, which is always going to be -- You know, it can only get you so far at first.

If they don't start seeing positive benefits, they turn around soured again, unfortunately, and we know what positive benefits are in the eyes of a fisherman, and it's -- A lot of times, it's hard to get there, because of other constraints, but we do have to recognize that's just the reality. They do want to see some sort of feedback and payback.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts from folks? Okay. The last question for us is how can the re-envisioning effort be efficiently organized to ensure participation, moving forward, for example, a national steering committee, regional workshops, leveraging/restructuring existing MRIP teams? Thoughts from folks? I think it's keeping engaged. I mean, again, not meeting to have meetings,

as everybody dreads that in a general work sense, but to keep that momentum going, as you kind of -- Everybody starts thinking about, hey, where are we in the process, and so quarterly check-ins, half-year check-ins, something along that line. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Then, just to add to that, seeing things implemented after all this. I mean, to actively implement it, because you get a lot of talking, but sometimes things just don't get implemented, and so I think the follow-through would be really good.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts from folks? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Keep it moving and progress sufficiently, to me, is leveraging existing groups, you know, like the councils are doing now, but, you know, in particular, ACCSP and the Atlantic Implementation Team. That's really important, because that's a way to get in touch with everybody without them having to agree to serve on another group and go to another meeting.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts from folks on that? Okay. Before we move over to get public input, I thought I would go ahead and see if anybody wanted to touch on anything from the slides earlier, now that they've had time to think about it, and ruminate on it, and is there anything that you want to go back to, or is everybody pretty much good for right now with comments? Thumbs-up? Amy.

MS. DUKES: I was trying to find my notes, but I was curious if you could go into a little bit more detail about your current thoughts, and I know this is still working through the process, but those informative 2025 workshop agendas -- Again, are these going to be in-person, or are they going to be throughout the region, just to try to understand your timeline a little bit more, as far as the effort that's going into it, and that would be helpful. Thanks.

DR. HOWELL: No problem, and so, I mean, at this point, and, if you have any detail, Katherine or Sarah, but we're looking to do like -- You know, having a contract, and so a national contract or a regional contract, to have somebody come in and professionally facilitate a face-to-face gathering of the people that are involved in this process, to really start putting things into practical action. This listening session really helps us tune to like what's important, out of everything we're doing, and I think it was Robert that was saying that it's like what are the variables that we actually need, and so I think, if we were to take this, and we're going to synthesize it, and then we're going to use that to work with a facilitator, to say we've got to build a workshop to bring people together, but definitely in-person, and definitely regional, is the way we're structuring it. Did you want to add anything?

DR. PAPACOSTAS: No, I think you covered it. I mean, we're still in the early stages of trying to plan what those workshops are going to look like, and how they're going to be run, and we are planning on getting a facilitator, or someone to be able to help coordinate that. One thought that we've had is, given how difficult it can be to get the right people in the room together at once, given everyone's busy schedules, is trying to figure out certain meetings, regionally, that we could add on, you know, a short workshop at the end, to try to just leverage, you know, existing gatherings, and existing travel, and so that's just one thing that we're starting to think about, but we would certainly welcome input on, you know, how these should work, in your view.

DR. HOWELL: We're looking at one per region.

DR. PAPACOSTAS: Yes, and we have yet to decide if we should do it by like commission region, or by council region, and so that's something that we're considering also, is whether we should do it through like the Atlantic States Commission, and have, you know, meetings associated with that, or do it, you know, council-by-council.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so other thoughts? Again, wrapping up, does anybody want to revisit a comment that they've had time to think about, or is everybody pretty much good with the comments to the questions? Okay. I'm assuming everybody is good. All right. Thank you for all that. I think that was some really good information, and, Evan, I hope that helps you all.

DR. HOWELL: Absolutely. I mean, this has been really informative, and I really appreciate everybody's candid comments. I think that, you know, we'll go through the synthesis, but one of the major things I've taken from this is the feedback, and so, when we do the synthesis and come back, we'll let you know what we've reviewed.

DR. BELCHER: I appreciate that. Okay, and so we're going to move to the audience. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to provide comments for Evan and his group, besides Martha?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think Martha is first up.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Martha and Kristin. Anyone else? Okay.

MS. GUYAS: Hi, guys. It's one of my favorite topics. I think this was a really good conversation, and, again, I'm really glad to finally have you all here. I think I've been asking Evan to do this for like -- Since before I had this job, and so this is good, to finally have some folks here in the South Atlantic.

I agree with a lot of what was said around the table, and so I'll just try to like hit on, I guess, big themes, and so I think -- I guess one thing to emphasize, in terms of thinking about how to prioritize and, you know, what to do, just things to keep in mind, I mean, the diversity of recreational fishing. I mean, I think a lot of what we talked about, or you all talked about at the table, was in the context more of private recreational anglers, but I feel like there's also opportunities here right now, because, you know, at least here in the Southeast, we're having conversations about how do we improve, you know, charter and headboat reporting as well, and so I feel like there's an opportunity there, potentially, and I feel like, you know, just -- Certainly we need to think about MRIP, and how to improve that, and how to improve the private angler side, but there may be some synergies there, and efficiencies, that can be gained by looking at those kind of as a whole, and so that's one thing.

I guess, you know, thinking more about things to keep in mind with the diversity of recreational fishing, I mean, the data needs, I feel like, are very different depending on specific geographies, the seasonality, changes in fishing practices, just between states, just between parts of states. In Florida, I feel like each region does things very differently, fishes for different things, and they've got shorter or longer runs to get to fishing grounds, target species, and just, you know, from an angler perspective, the values, what they're after, and are they doing a catch-and-release trip, or are they doing a meat trip, or is it kind of a mix of those things, and I mean --

So it's hard, I guess, to encompass all of those things with one single survey, and so Carmichael hit the nail on the head, at least in my opinion, is that I feel like there certainly needs to be common standards, however we move forward with recreational data collection, but I do think there needs to be flexibility for meeting some of those regional differences, and regional needs, because, you know, just thinking about northeast Florida versus southeast Florida, and, I mean, when people are fishing for different species, and the suite of species, is so, so, so different, and the conditions are so, so different, you know, let alone, you know, you go further north, just to Georgia and North Carolina and on up. This is a big task, and I really appreciate you taking this on.

I took a lot of notes, and so I'm just trying to go through them, so that I don't just repeat everything that you all just said. Let me see here. One thing, and I think it was the second question about, you know, changes in angling, and how to account for those things, and I feel like it's not just changes in angling, and I feel like, to some degree, the changes in distributions of fisheries also could be captured here, because we're seeing a lot of those, and, on the for-hire side, the for-hire part of MRIP, I feel like there's been a lot of changes in the regulatory environment that we have here.

I feel like a lot of businesses have adapted their practices, and changed what they do, and, you know, they may have picked up commercial fishing, and they may have a job that's not on the water anymore, as part of their business practice, and so like -- I think red snapper is like the most drastic example, right, when we went from a 365-day season to now -- To what we have now, a one-day season, right, and, if red snapper was that vessel's bread-and-butter before, they're certainly not red snapper fishing all the time, most likely, and they may have shifted to some other species, but they probably have picked up other things on the side, and it's difficult to capture all those things, but I think important to keep in mind.

Another thing is changing demographics, and this is definitely a Florida one. We have a lot of people that speak different languages, and I don't know how that's currently really captured in a lot of the surveys, and so a lot of Spanish, Haitian creole, stuff like that, but the people that are out fishing are definitely changing.

To the question about what anglers are willing to report and how, just big picture, and I think this all came out of the conversation, but I will reiterate it, and, you know, anglers need to trust, you know, who they're reporting to, and what it's going to be used for, and they need to understand the benefits that they get, and the value, and those are really, really important, and then I think Amy brought this up, and it needs to be really easy, quick, and painless to get good data, and not just participation. What else?

To the extent that you can fast-track data improvements, I think that's a good thing, so that people can see that value quickly, because I think it is frustrating to people, and people just lose the momentum of wanting to fill out surveys, reports, what have you, if they're doing it, and it takes five to ten years for it actually to get integrated into the process, where they see results, and I know that's tough, because we have a very slow process, and we need to QA/QC things, but, the sooner people can see the benefits, I think that just helps amplify and get buy-in from more people.

Then, like in terms of apps, if those are used, and I'll just talk about me. I don't use apps if I don't like them or they make my life easier, and that's it. One data gap that I thought about, that I don't

think was brought up, and it's not necessarily an MRIP problem, but MRIP adjacent, I would say, is economic information on recreational fishing, particularly on the private side. Having sat in you all's shoes before, you know, one of the things that we're supposed to look at, and maybe it's not the driving decision, but is having -- Is the economic impacts of these decisions, and usually that part of that document was blank, and that's kind of a problem, I think, and so I'm not necessarily saying put that in MRIP, but that's something that needs to be tackled at some point, and there was a whole workshop about that last year, I think.

I don't know what that means. Let's see. I think that's mostly it, and I feel like a lot of it was ditto, and I will say that definitely keep it moving, keep the communication clear and open about where we are and what's coming next, as the updates are coming, and then, you know, to the extent that you can involve the recreational fishing community in some of these meetings moving forward, I think that's a good thing. It's better to have people at the table, and feeling like they're part of the decisions, rather than just being like, hey, this is what we did for you guys, and so thanks. I really appreciate you all being here.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Martha. Okay. Kristin.

MS. FOSS: Hi, everyone. I appreciate the fruitful conversation today, and the opportunity to provide some comments, on behalf of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Over the years, FWC has raised concerns about the use of MRIP-FES, since the switch, and we've written a number of letters over the years, and the magnitude of differences in the catch estimates generated from FES, compared to those from CHTS, as well as fisheries observations, have made us in Florida question the accuracy of these MRIP estimates, and, additionally, independent surveys, like Florida's State Reef Fish Survey, consistently generate substantially lower estimates of effort and catch than those generated by FES, and MRIP is also drastically overestimating the number of trips in Florida as well.

Moving forward, we support looking at this regional data collection needs and priorities, as it may vary by region, especially within, you know, Florida alone, and I really want to highlight the two priorities that were kind of identified today of improving precision of catch estimates for high-priority species as well as improving discard and release data, and so, moving forward, I just wanted to emphasize the need to continue to rebuild the trust and engagement with stakeholders for data collection, as a way to improve the overall fisheries management process, and then, lastly, I just recommend that this program adopts a more collaborative approach to improving recreational data collection, by working with state agencies like FWC throughout the process. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Kristin. Anyone else in attendance in the room who would like to make a comment? Okay. Seeing none, Charlie, you had something you wanted to say before I go to the online folks?

MR. PHILLIPS: (Mr. Phillips' comment is not audible on the recording.)

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you for that. So, online, do we have anyone who would like to make a comment? I'm not sure if -- If you would raise your hands, and we'll get your name on the list.

DR. COLLIER: Just some quick instructions on how to raise your hand. There should be an icon panel on the right side of your screen, or the left side of your screen. You can click on the one that it looks like a hand-drawn hand, and some people say it looks like a turkey. If that is currently green, that means your hand is down. If you click on it, it turns red, and that means your hand is raised. Then, as staff recognize you, you will hear the webinar say “you’ve been unmuted”. You will need to click on the red microphone, and, once that turns green, that means we can hear you.

DR. BELCHER: All right. John Hadley, let us know. All right, and so we have no one in the virtual audience that would like to make comments, and the comments that have provided will be passed on to you all. Okay, and so, Charlie, back to you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you. You know, I’m thinking about the value of the numbers, and I have seen a lot of assessments, and a lot of the values came out with confidence errors, or PSEs, and, you know, obviously, when you have rare intercepts, you’ve probably got much higher error bars than you’re going to have when you’ve got a species that you encounter a lot, and so, if we could get those error bars, so it would help us understand just how -- I don’t want to use the term “accurate”, but just how close to those numbers that we need to try to get in our management, and I think that would help us, and then, the more you can get those, you know, error bars tighter, then it's just going to give more confidence to the public, and the fishermen, on how these -- You know, how we’re going to use these numbers, and why we can use the numbers, because we’re getting the confidence errors closer, and so just a thought.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thank you, Charlie. Anyone else at this point, because we will wrap up with that. Okay. Again, thank you, everybody. If you have additional comments, Evan and them have provided their email, at the end of the presentation that’s in the briefing book, and so feel free to reach out to them at any time, I guess, and, with that, we appreciate you all coming and talking with us, and, with that, we’re ready to go into closed session. Did you want to take a break?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, just to transition.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so, to transition, we’re going to go ahead and give a fifteen-minute break, and so come back at four o’clock for the closed session. Then it’s back to Trish.

(Whereupon, the meeting went into closed session.)

MS. MURPHEY: All right. I will call to order the open session, and we’ve come out of closed session, and, basically, after further consideration, there was a motion to rescind the appointment of Oscar Navarette, and there was a second motion to readvertise for the Georgia commercial seat on the Snapper Grouper AP. Any other business? Okay. We are adjourned, a day early.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 19, 2024.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
October 28, 2024

2024 COUNCIL MEMBERS

Thur 9/19

Voting

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

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

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

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

Amy W. Dukes
SCDNR-Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
217 Ft. Johnson Road
Charleston, SC 29422
(843)953-9365
DukesA@dnr.sc.gov

Charlie Phillips
1418 Sapelo Avenue N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
(912)832-4423
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

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

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

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

Robert Spottswood, Jr.
robert@spottswood.com
(305) 294-6100
Assistant:
Carina Primus-Gomez
Cprimus-gomez@spottswood.com

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

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

James G. Hull, Jr.
111 West Granada Blvd
Ormond Beach, FL 32174
(386)547-1254
hullsseafood@aol.com

Geoff White

Katherine Papacostas

Rick DeVictor

Clay Parch

Jack McGovern

Kristen Foss

Kathy Knowlton

Sarah Faugman

Billy Brussard

~~Gregory~~

Step Grimes

Monica Smith-Burnello

Sonny Gwin
Beth Dieveney
Evan Howell
Sarah Lazu

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2024 COUNCIL MEMBERS (continued)

Full Council II
Thur 9/19

Non-Voting

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

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

Full Council II
Thur 9/19

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

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

Deputy Director - Science

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

Deputy Director - Management

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

Citizen Science Program Manager

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

BFP Outreach Specialist

Ashley Oliver Ashley.Oliver@safmc.net
843-225-8135

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

✍ Rachael Silvas
Rachael.silvas@safmc.net
843-571-4370

✓ **Fishery Scientist II**

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

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

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

Communication and Digital Media Specialist

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

Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator

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

✓ **Staff Accountant**

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

Habitat and Ecosystem Scientist

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

✓ **Fishery Social Scientist**

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

Fishery Scientist I

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

web

Citizen Science Project Manager

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

Public Information Officer

web Kim Iverson kim.iverson@safmc.net
843-224-7258

SEDAR

SEDAR Program Manager

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

Administrative Officer

web Kelly Klasnick kelly.klasnick@safmc.net
843-763-1050

SEDAR Coordinator

Emily Ott
Emily.Ott@safmc.net

FULL COUNCIL ROLL CALL VOTE 2024-2025

DATE: 9/19/24 LOCATION: Charleston

MOTION: approve 8camp SB 55

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Belcher	✓		
Borland	✓		
Dukes	✓		
Griner	✓		
Helmey	✓		
Hull	✓		
Marhefka	✓		
McCawley	✓		
Phillips	✓		
Roller	✓		
Spottswood	✓		
Strelcheck	✓		
Murphey (Chair)	✓		

FULL COUNCIL ROLL CALL VOTE 2024-2025

DATE: 9/19 LOCATION: Charles
MOTION: Reg 30 approval

NAME	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Belcher	✓		
Borland	✓		
Dukes	✓		
Griner	✓		
Helmey	✓		
Hull	✓		
Marhefka	✓		
McCawley	✓		
Phillips	✓		
Roller	✓		
Spottswood	✓		
Strelcheck	✓		
Murphey (Chair)	✓		

SAFMC Sept. 2024 Council Meeting

Attendee Report: (9/19/24)

Report Generated:

09/20/2024 10:13 AM EDT

Webinar ID

504-848-323

Actual Start Date/Time

09/19/2024 08:06 AM EDT

Staff Details

Attended

Yes

Interest Rating

Not applicable for staff

Attendee Details

Last Name

First Name

Adam

Bailey

Baker

Scott

Bard

Dave

Barile

Peter

Barrows

Katline

Berry

Chip

Bianchi

Alan

Bradshaw

Christopher

Brouwer

Myra

Buntin

Jesse

Bunting

Matthew

Byrd

Julia

Cermak

Bridget

Clarke

Lora

Cox

Jack

Crosson

Scott

Curtis

Judd

Darden

Tanya

DeVictor

Rick

DiJohnson

Alex

Dieveney

Beth

Dukes

Amy

Emory

Meaghan

Foss

Kristin

Garrett

Allison

Gentner

BRAD

Glazier

Edward

Glazier

Edward

Gore	Karla
Gray	Alisha
Guyas	Martha
Gwin	Earl
Hadley	John
Helies	Frank
Helmey	Judy
Hollensead	Lisa
Horton	Christopher
Hull	Jimmy
Iberle	Allie
KLASNICK	KELLY
Knowlton	Kathy
Larkin	Michael
Lazarre	Dominique
Lee	Max
Levy	Mara
Luers	Daniel
M Borland	Gary
Malinowski	Richard
Marhefka	00Kerry
McGill	Maria
McGovern	Jack
Meehan	Sean
Mehta	Nikhil
Moore	Jeff
Muehlstein	Emily
Murphey	Trish
Neer	Julie
Newman	Thomas
Oliver	Ashley
Ott	Emily
Package-Ward	Christina
Patterson	Nicholas
Phillips	Charlie
Ramsay	Chloe
Records	David
Roller	00Tom
Rule	Erica
SCHLICK	CJ
Salmon	Brandi
Schmidtke	Michael
Seward	McLean
Silvas	Rachael

Simmons	Carrie
Sinkus	Wiley
Smart	Tracey
Smit-Brunello	Monica
Spurgin	Kali
Stein	Sarah
Stemle	Adam
Stephen	Jessica
Sweetman	CJ
Travis	Michael
Waldo	Jennifer
Walsh	Mick
Walsh	Jason
Westcott	Lauren
White	Geoff
Wiegand	Christina
Withers	Meg
Zales	Bob
broussard	billy
colby	barrett
collier	chip
fangman	sarah
gloeckner	david
griner	tim
iverson	Kim
l	i
moss	david
oden	jeff
sandorf	scott
thomas	suz
vecchio	Julie
Addis	Dustin
Adisa	Sylvia
Alger	Brett
Appelman	Max
Bissette	Jesse
Brewer	Nell
Brown	Sydney
Caraballo	Leysha
Cardenas	Roberto
Cheshire	Rob
Christmas-Svajdlenka	Anna-Mai
Cimo	Laura
Clinton	Haley

Clinton	Haley
Coleman	Heather
Cross	Tiffanie
Dancy	Kiley
Degan	Jacqui
Delaney	Angela
Delrosario	Leeanne
Doolittle	Cedric
Finch	Margaret
Flowers	Jared
Franco	Crystal
Franke	Emilie
Gentry	Lauren
Goode	Savannah
Gooding	Elizabeth
Gravitz	Michael
Green	Matthew
Grist	Joseph
Grundy	Benjamin
Harrison	Alana
Harvey	Claire
Hayden	Andrew
Hogan	LeAnn
Iverson	Kim
Ives	Nora
Joyner	Woody
Keppler	Blaik
Kerns	Toni
Kittle	Christine
Klibansky	Lara
Lorenzen	Kai
M	Charlotte
M	Charlotte
M	Charlotte
Masi	Michelle
Mason	Gina
Matter	Vivian
Mendez Ferrer	Natasha
Ostroff	Jenny
Pease	Thomas
Perry	Simona
Porch	Clay
Potter	Caroline
Puglise	Kimberly

Reed	John
Reilly	Greg
Reinhardt	James
Rojas	Pearl
Scott	Rebecca
Sedberry	George
Shervanick	Kara
Sramek	Mark
Stephens	Haley
Stewart	Mark
Thompson	00Laurilee
Thompson	Laurilee
Voss	Joshua
Walia	Matt
Walsh	Jason
Walter	John
Wamer III	David
Wesner	Taylor
Wheeler	Kevin
Whitten	Meredith
Wilber	Pace
Williams	Erik
Williams	John
Willis	Michelle
Wolfe	Jordan
carmichael	01 john
carvalho	avelino
eldredge	laura
marinko	Jeff
vara	mary

SAFMC Sept. 2024 Council Meeting

Attendee Report: (9/16/24 - 9/20/24)

Report Generated:

09/20/2024 10:26 AM EDT

Webinar ID

504-848-323

Actual Start Date/Time

09/19/2024 04:34 PM EDT

Staff Details

Attended

Yes

Interest Rating

Not applicable for staff

Attendee Details

Last Name

First Name

Helmey	Judy
Mehta	Nikhil
Sweetman	CJ
Waldo	Jennifer
Adam	Bailey
Addis	Dustin
Adisa	Sylvia
Alger	Brett
Appelman	Max
Baker	Scott
Bard	Dave
Barile	Peter
Barrows	Katline
Berry	Chip
Bianchi	Alan
Bissette	Jesse
Bradshaw	Christopher
Brewer	Nell
Brouwer	Myra
Brown	Sydney
Buntin	Jesse
Bunting	Matthew
Byrd	Julia
Caraballo	Leysha
Cardenas	Roberto
Cermak	Bridget
Cheshire	Rob
Christmas-Svajdlenka	Anna-Mai

Cimo	Laura
Clarke	Lora
Clinton	Haley
Clinton	Haley
Coleman	Heather
Cox	Jack
Cross	Tiffanie
Crosson	Scott
Curtis	Judd
Dancy	Kiley
Darden	Tanya
DeVictor	Rick
Degan	Jacqui
Delaney	Angela
Delrosario	Leeanne
DiJohnson	Alex
Dieveney	Beth
Doolittle	Cedric
Dukes	Amy
Emory	Meaghan
Finch	Margaret
Flowers	Jared
Foss	Kristin
Franco	Crystal
Franke	Emilie
Garrett	Allison
Gentner	BRAD
Gentry	Lauren
Glazier	Edward
Glazier	Edward
Goode	Savannah
Gooding	Elizabeth
Gore	Karla
Gravitz	Michael
Gray	Alisha
Green	Matthew
Grist	Joseph
Grundy	Benjamin
Guyas	Martha
Gwin	Earl
Hadley	John
Harrison	Alana
Harvey	Claire
Hayden	Andrew

Helies	Frank
Hogan	LeAnn
Hollensead	Lisa
Horton	Christopher
Hull	Jimmy
Iberle	Allie
Iverson	Kim
Ives	Nora
Joyner	Woody
KLASNICK	KELLY
Keppler	Blaik
Kerns	Toni
Kittle	Christine
Klibansky	Lara
Knowlton	Kathy
Larkin	Michael
Lazarre	Dominique
Lee	Max
Levy	Mara
Lorenzen	Kai
Luers	Daniel
M	Charlotte
M	Charlotte
M	Charlotte
M Borland	Gary
Malinowski	Richard
Marhefka	00Kerry
Masi	Michelle
Mason	Gina
Matter	Vivian
McGirl	Maria
McGovern	Jack
Meehan	Sean
Mendez Ferrer	Natasha
Moore	Jeff
Muehlstein	Emily
Murphey	Trish
Neer	Julie
Newman	Thomas
Oliver	Ashley
Ostroff	Jenny
Ott	Emily
Package-Ward	Christina
Patterson	Nicholas

Pease	Thomas
Perry	Simona
Phillips	Charlie
Porch	Clay
Potter	Caroline
Puglise	Kimberly
Ramsay	Chloe
Records	David
Reed	John
Reilly	Greg
Reinhardt	James
Rojas	Pearl
Roller	00Tom
Rule	Erica
SCHLICK	CJ
Salmon	Brandi
Schmidtke	Michael
Scott	Rebecca
Sedberry	George
Seward	McLean
Shervanick	Kara
Silvas	Rachael
Simmons	Carrie
Sinkus	Wiley
Smart	Tracey
Smit-Brunello	Monica
Spurgin	Kali
Sramek	Mark
Stein	Sarah
Stemle	Adam
Stephen	Jessica
Stephens	Haley
Stewart	Mark
Thompson	00Laurilee
Thompson	Laurilee
Travis	Michael
Voss	Joshua
Walia	Matt
Walsh	Jason
Walsh	Jason
Walsh	Mick
Walter	John
Wamer III	David
Wesner	Taylor

Westcott
Wheeler
White
Whitten
Wiegand
Wilber
Williams
Williams
Willis
Withers
Wolfe
Zales
broussard
carmichael
carvalho
colby
collier
eldredge
fangman
gloeckner
griner
iverson
l
marinko
moss
oden
sandorf
thomas
vara
vecchio

Lauren
Kevin
Geoff
Meredith
Christina
Pace
Erik
John
Michelle
Meg
Jordan
Bob
billy
01 john
avelino
barrett
chip
laura
sarah
david
tim
Kim
i
Jeff
david
jeff
scott
suz
mary
Julie

Duration
3 minutes

Registered
190

Last Name
Council

First Name
South Atlantic