

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

**Marina Inn at Grande Dunes
Myrtle Beach, SC**

September 15-16, 2016

Council Members:

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Ben Hartig
Dr. Wilson Laney
LTJG Amy Hockenberry

Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley

Council Staff:

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Chevront
Chip Collier
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Amber Von Harten

John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Mike Collins
John Hadley
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Roger Pugliese

Participants/Observers:

Leann Bosarge
Rick Devictor
Nik Mehta
Monica Smit-Brunello
ASAC Jeff Radonski

Dewey Hemilright
Erika Burgess
Dr. Jack McGovern
Jocelyn D'Ambrosio

Other Observers Attached

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Marina Inn at Grande Dunes, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, Thursday morning, September 15, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I would now like to convene the council session, and so all members of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council are eligible to vote during this session. We would need a member of the South Atlantic Council to make the draft motion that is up on the screen to approve this framework amendment for secretarial review.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move we approve the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 4, as modified, for secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate and 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.**

MR. HARTIG: Second by Zack. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection to this?

MR. WAUGH: This has to be a roll call vote.

MR. HARTIG: I'm sorry.

MR. WAUGH: It's a final action to the Secretary, and so it has to be a roll call vote. Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

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

DR. DUVAL: Okay. We are now going to recess the council session and we will now continue discussions as the Mackerel Cobia Committee, and I turn it back over to Chairman Hartig.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on September 15, 2016.)

- - -

SEPTEMBER 16, 2016

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Marina Inn at Grande Dunes, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, Friday morning, September 16, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I would like to go ahead and call the council session to order. The first item on our agenda is Adoption of the Agenda. Are there any modifications to the agenda? I know we have just a couple of items under Other Business. Seeing no changes to the agenda, the agenda stands approved.

The next item is Approval of our June 2016 Minutes. Are there any modifications to the minutes? Seeing none, those minutes stand approved. We have already sworn in our new and returning council members, and so we can dispense with that agenda item. Now we come to the Election of Chair and Vice Chair, and I'm going to turn things over to Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. As you all know, our Chair and Vice Chair serve two-year terms, but we do have to elect them annually, and so are there any nominations for Chair?

MS. BECKWITH: It would be my honor and pleasure to re-nominate our fearless leader, Dr. Michelle Duval, for one more year.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. Are there any other nominations?

MR. GRINER: I will second the nomination. I move that the floor be closed to nominations and that our fearless leader, Dr. Michelle Duval, be appointed by acclamation.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. Is there any objection to that motion? Hearing none, Dr. Duval, you are elected for another term as Chair. Congratulations.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, and I am now full of fear. All right. We have now come to the Election of Vice Chair. Are there any nominations for Vice Chair?

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, it would be my honor and pleasure to nominate our current fearful Vice Chair, Charlie Phillips, to serve another term as Vice Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Any other nominations?

MR. BOWEN: I would second that nomination and move that the floor be closed for nominations and our fearful, Charlie Phillips, be appointed by acclamation.

DR. DUVAL: All right. Is there any objection to that motion? Hearing none, Mr. Fearful Charlie Phillips, you are elected for another term as our Vice Chair. Congratulations. More running of rabbit. The next item on our agenda is actually the Snapper Grouper Committee Report, and so we're going to move right into this. The committee reports have been posted online, in the Committee Reports Folder, and so I just want to make sure that folks have accessed them.

The Snapper Grouper Committee met on September 13 and 14, 2016 in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. We received updates from the Southeast Regional Office staff on the status of commercial landings for snapper grouper species as well as an update on the status of snapper grouper amendments under review and recently implemented.

We then moved into Amendment 37, which is hogfish, and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was filed with the EPA on June 10 and the comment period ended on August 1, 2016, and so we received a summary from the Regional Office staff of the public comments received during that comment period. We reviewed the actions in the amendment and answered questions. The committee made the following motions.

The first motion was to specify the total ACL for the Georgia-North Carolina stock of hogfish in pounds whole weight. Specify the ABC and total ACL for the Florida Keys/East Florida Stock of hogfish in numbers of fish. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to revise titles of Actions 4 and 6 in Amendment 37 to include specification of optimum yield. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve Snapper Grouper Amendment 37 for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessarily editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text. On behalf of the committee, I so move. This is a roll call vote.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **The motion passes unanimously.**

DR. DUVAL: Thank you. The next item was Amendment 41, which is mutton snapper, and the committee received a summary of public comments received during the August public hearings, made editorial modifications to actions and alternatives, reviewed the analyses, and modified selection of preferred alternatives for some actions. The committee approved the following motions.

Motion Number 4 is approve suggested edits to Alternative 2 under Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion Number 5 was to specify the ABC and total ACL for mutton snapper in numbers of fish. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion Number 6 was to approve the suggested edits to Alternative 2 under Action 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion Number 7 was to approve the suggested edits to Alternatives 1 through 5 under Action 5. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. Next, we have a draft motion that needs to be made to approve the suggested edits to the title of Action 6, and so I would entertain a motion from the committee at this time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we approve the suggested edits to the title of Action 6.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Jessica. Is there a second? Second by Anna. Is there discussion on the motion? **Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** We also need another motion from the committee to approved suggested edits to Preferred Alternative 2 sub-alternatives under Action 8.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we approve the suggested edits to Preferred Alternative 2 sub-alternatives under Action 8.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Jessica. Is there a second? Second by Ben. Any discussion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. Motion Number 9 was to select Sub-Alternative 4c as preferred and de-select Sub-Alternative 4b under Action 7. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Motion Number 11 is to select Sub-Alternative 2c as preferred and de-select Sub-Alternative 2a under Action 8. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Motion Number 12 was to add a sub-alternative under Alternative 3 of five fish per person per day and select as preferred and de-select Sub-Alternative 3b under Action 8. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Before we move on to Amendment 43, I just want to note that we did have some discussion about recalculating the sector allocations with the latest and greatest numbers that had gone into the assessment. Staff went back and worked on that, and those changes are very, very small, and so I think it's Florida's preference that, rather than tackling that now and potentially creating additional confusion, given that we're going to have to update numbers once the new MRIP recalibrations begin occurring, which will be like next year, that they would prefer to just tackle all those changes at once, and so I apologize for having wasted the committee's time with that discussion.

The next item on our agenda was Amendment 43, red snapper, and we had a presentation by Dr. Kate Siegfried regarding reasons why SEDAR 24 and SEDAR 41 estimated such different productivity levels for red snapper. She reviewed selectivity changes and shifts in age composition, which were cited as contributing factors. Then we had an overview from council staff regarding options for possibly allowing harvest of red snapper while continuing to rebuild the stock. We discussed a number of options and provided guidance, which you can see in all of those bullets. I am not going to read all of those into the record. They will be included as part of the committee report.

The next item on our agenda was the Vision Blueprint Recreational Amendment, dealing with fisheries seasonality and retention. We reviewed an options paper containing possible actions to modify recreational bag limits and the annual four-month closure for shallow-water groupers. The committee provided the guidance below that you see in the bullets and requested that a revised options paper be prepared for the December 2016 meeting, to approve for scoping in early 2017. You can see all of those bullets there. Again, I am not going to read those into the record. They will become part of the committee report.

MS. BECKWITH: Do we need to talk about my request to John Carmichael about the aggregate bag limit analysis?

DR. DUVAL: Anna had a suggestion for a way to possibly try to look at aggregate bag limits slightly differently, and so we will tackle that in the timing and tasks motion. Next, we discussed golden tilefish items.

Back in June of 2016, after we discussed the update to the stock assessment for golden tilefish, we had requested additional information on the methodology used in the Mid-Atlantic and Northeast Region, and John Carmichael gave us a review of the approach used there and noted that similar issues exist in the Mid-Atlantic and New England with regard to recruitment uncertainty. We also noted the use of market grades in the Northeast dataset, and our Mid-Atlantic Council liaison noted that golden tilefish in the Mid-Atlantic are managed under an ITQ program, which may impact fishermen behavior.

We also reviewed some of the specific requests we made of our SSC in June, and they are scheduled to address those requests at their upcoming October meeting. In addition to that, we asked that the SSC discuss the possible use of market grade categories to detect year-class strength in the South Atlantic fishery.

The other golden tilefish items came about during public hearings for Amendment 35. Stakeholders had requested that the council consider making a vessel's catch history of golden tilefish transferable with the longline endorsement, and we had a brief review from staff regarding the council's rationale for maintaining landings from both black sea bass and golden tilefish endorsements with the permit rather than with the endorsement, and so we didn't entertain making any changes, but just requested that the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel have some discussion on this issue at their upcoming meeting, to ensure that their recommendation to maintain landings history with the permit was still appropriate.

We also asked the advisory panel to have some discussion regarding exploring a different fishing year start date for the golden tilefish commercial hook-and-line sector, and so we will get input from the advisory committee and then come back and tackle that in December.

The next item on our agenda was Modifications to Black Sea Bass Pots, and we had an outstanding motion from the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel from their April 2016 meeting, recommending consideration of a two-and-a-quarter-inch mesh size, based on the results of that study. The SSC is scheduled to review that during their upcoming October meeting and provide a recommendation to the council, and so we elected to hold off on further discussion until December. The item that we did not get to was the Red Grouper SAFE Report, and so I would like to turn it over to Mike Errigo to walk us through that quickly. The SAFE Report is actually Attachment 8 under your snapper grouper tab, which is Tab 7.

DR. ERRIGO: Hopefully everyone got the updated version, which has discard estimates for the commercial sector through 2015. That's the only change in the updated version. I am just going to go through this fairly quickly and focus on the graphics that are most interesting or important to perhaps the discussions. This is just the actual SAFE Report.

This first table is just all the amendments pertaining to changes in regulations for red grouper, when they happened and what was changed, what might affect fishing for red grouper. This talks about accountability measures and different commercial and recreational regulations, like closures and size limits and bag limits.

This section is the fisheries sampling, which is an interesting one. First, we're looking at the TIP samples, and so that's the commercial samples, and we have the number of lengths collected by year, the number of otoliths or ages collected by year, and the number of trips sampled that had red grouper on them. These zeroes for otoliths is because they weren't collecting otoliths until 1992.

There is graphics. It's much easier to see it in graphic form, and then I also have the recreational sampling, both MRIP and the headboat survey, and we have the number of trips sampled that had red grouper onboard, the number of fish sampled, which roughly corresponds to the number of lengths and weights that were taken, and the number of ages, which is only from the headboat survey. MRIP does not collect otoliths or ages.

Here it is in graphic format. It's much easier to see what's going on. This is TIP sampling, and so this is commercial. Blue is the number of lengths and green are the number of trips with red grouper on them and red are the number of otoliths collected. You can see the trends. Up until 2008, there was an increasing trend in the number of red grouper collected and the number of trips that had red grouper on them. Since this big spike in 2008, there has been a decrease in the number of red grouper sampled and the number of trips sampled that had red grouper onboard.

I don't have the effort for this sampling program, and so I don't know if there was any change in sampling effort during this time period, and this is recreational. The recreational really has been dropping off since the late 1990s. The blue is the number of fish sampled and green are the number of trips. Red is the number of ages, and I think that's just gone up because we really started collecting ages later on. Then we really ramped up the number of ages collected recently, and so I think that's more of a sampling effort issue there.

In terms of the sampling, biological sampling, there's a drop-off there. This is number of fish sampled per trip, both commercial and recreational. Recreational, it didn't really change. The number of fish sampled per trip is kind of the same, and so this is getting at the effort kind of thing, but, in the commercial sector, it has dropped off, pretty much since the beginning of the time series.

There is a bunch in here about stock status based on the last SEDAR and a bunch about what happened in the last assessment, how it was run and what the SSC determined and all of that. These are the parameters that came out of the last assessment, and then there is a lot here about the biology of the fish, the biological attributes and ecosystem attributes, where it occurs and what depths and where it's caught.

This current outlook is my take on what the data is showing, and they're really just indications. This is not an assessment or anything like that. It's just this graph indicates that and these data indicate that, and I will go through the -- These are landings, and I will go through what everything is. I will go through the graphs. The tables are not very useful in a presentation.

This is from the last assessment. The blue is the fishing mortality over MSY and red is the spawning stock biomass over spawning stock biomass at MSY. You see that the SSB over MSY goes up towards the end, and it kind of levels off, and then there is also a spike in fishing mortality at the end of the time series. We were overfishing, and this is 2008, the last year here. The terminal year is a bit old currently.

These are the landings of red grouper to 2015. The black line is the ACL and the blue is the total landings. Then these are the sector landings. Red is for higher. The teal is private sector landings and the green is commercial, and all of them have pretty much dropped off since 2008, which was the terminal year of the assessment. You will see that right before that there was a ramp-up, and so that might indicate why the assessment was showing increases and also that spike in fishing mortality. You see the landings go way up higher than ever was seen. Then, after that, there's a very steep decline, which the assessment, of course, couldn't have seen.

These are the discards of red grouper. Red is the recreational, and they are very variable, but you can kind of see this downward trend. The recreational sector is discarding less red grouper. They're also catching less red grouper. The commercial sector was seeing a very steep decline in discards up until 2012. Then, for some reason, they had a very big jump in their discards. Now, their landings are still very low in 2013, 2014, and 2015, some of the lowest of the time series, but their discards went way up, and so does this mean that maybe there are a lot of small red grouper out there, like a year class? We have no idea. We don't have lengths, and we don't have size information for the discards, and so we don't know.

Also, remember that discard information is very highly variable and uncertain, and so there are very wide error bars. I don't have the error associated with it, but they typically are -- There is typically a lot of error, but there is obviously a big jump, and so maybe there is a year class coming through. It's very, very hard to tell. I have one more graph to show, and that's the MARMAP trap index, the chevron trap index, and it is currently at the lowest it's ever been, in 2015, and it's been low for a while, dropping off since 2003. Of course, that's also highly variable, but there's a lot less variation in the recent years. That's it. That's the whole report.

DR. DUVAL: Are there questions?

MR. CONKLIN: In reference to the information you were saying about we don't know if the fish were small or if it was out of season or whatever on the second-to-last slide for the commercial discards, but, for the southeastern logbooks for the commercial, there is a column on there that says the discard reason, and we're supposed to put whether it's undersized or out of season. I didn't know if you looked at that.

DR. ERRIGO: I don't have any of the discard data. The discarded numbers were sent to me from the Science Center, and they do a lot of -- They don't just count up what the logbooks say. They do a lot of calculation based on effort and -- They have to expand, because only a small portion of people are reporting discards, and so I don't know what that data shows.

MR. BROWN: I've actually been bringing this up for quite a while, even before I was on the council, that I had seen a definite decline in these, and we have never really caught a lot of them off of Charleston. You just catch a sporadic one, but they seem to always be larger fish, but I never saw any small fish, like back inshore or anywhere, and then one of the fellas that I do business

with in North Carolina said they had a big pot of them up off of the coast of like Morehead or somewhere like that, and down the coast there was a lot of fish, and so somehow we missed them aggregating in our area, where they were just scattered, but we would see an occasional big fish, maybe migrating that way or something, and I don't know.

DR. DUVAL: Concern about red grouper has been around for a couple of years now, and I know that fishermen in North Carolina have called me, and they're concerned about red grouper, and scamp as well, and it's mostly been centered around when those fish are have roe and kind of the misalignment of our four-month spawning closure for when they're seeing red grouper and scamp with roe. It would be interesting if we could get information on those discards, as to whether or not they were undersized fish. I think something else I have heard from fishermen is they felt like they just kind of missed -- There's been a couple of year classes that have just been missing that they just didn't see.

MR. HARTIG: To Chris's point, there is also in the logbook a size. You write down the size of your discards, the average size, and so there is a way to go back into those logbooks and see if those were small fish or not.

DR. ERRIGO: There might be a way to get at why there is such a large jump in red grouper discards, but my guess, based on this steep decline in discards over time and then the sudden jump is that they're undersized. I don't think a regulation went in during 2013 that would have caused people to stop landing red grouper, when the landings didn't change really in 2013 very much, but that's only a guess.

DR. DUVAL: One of the questions I had, in looking through this, is there were uncertainties that were discussed from the previous assessment, and I wanted to know if those were being addressed in the standard that we have going on right now. It was discontinuous distribution between North Carolina and Florida and the possibility of a two-stock structure and differences in catchability and release mortality estimates, et cetera, et cetera. I was just curious if any of those were being addressed in the standard.

DR. ERRIGO: I have, inadvertently, not been a part of the earlier calls and webinars for red grouper, but I will be starting now, but it is still in the very early stages of that assessment, that standard, and it's been mostly webinars and calls. There haven't been any in-person meetings yet. I assume they will try to tackle those as best they can, but I don't know if any studies have been done to bridge that gap.

DR. DUVAL: That is supposed to go to the SSC in April, and so then we would see it in June. Are there other questions for Mike about the SAFE Report? What is your pleasure? I mean we do have a couple of visioning amendments that will likely go out for some scoping that include consideration of the four-month spawning closure, which seemed to be the big thing that fishermen were bringing up.

We're always in this quandary of waiting for an assessment versus starting to consider some action, and so I kind of feel like we can use those two amendments to take out to the public come consideration of modification of the spawning closure, and I think we could be more informed about any further action, once the assessment comes through, but I would like to get a sense from

the committee. I am seeing some nods around the table about consideration of modification to the spawning closure, through the two visioning amendments.

MR. BOWEN: Given the testimony we've been hearing for several years, I think we need to be as proactive as we can be.

MR. BELL: I share Zack's concerns, and I know Jack and I have been worried about this one for a while, and so I would like to see us provide some options in there. Can I ask a quick question related to the fishery? Are they sort of targeted specifically in specific areas and like one of the options might be to just to extend the closure for them, and then you could stay off of them? Are they kind of just mixed in with everything else? I think if you had a special closure that you could extend the closure, just to allow it to extend for red grouper, and is that -- That's getting into the weeds, I guess.

DR. DUVAL: I think we will see those two documents that we would approve for scoping in December, and so I think inclusion of that as a possibility for scoping is definitely -- Yes, that could be included.

MR. PHILLIPS: If we can go ahead and put out some of our general what we would do if, so people could go ahead and be looking at it and thinking about it, and we might get ahead of the ball on it.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, and so that might be something we could add to the timing and tasks motion, in terms of inclusion or specifically noting, with regard to modifications of the spawning season closure, concerns about red grouper and should it be extended just for red grouper, some of the things like Mel was talking about, both commercial and recreational.

MR. HARTIG: I think it's interesting that Mark doesn't see many red groupers in South Carolina. There aren't a lot in South Florida as well, and there aren't a lot on the whole shelf until you get to North Carolina, and so it's really an interesting thing that happens. It probably happens with a couple other fish as well, but I mean, going forward, we may be able to extend that red grouper spawning season in North Carolina without a lot of impacts on other groupers, probably for both scamp and red, when we get there, but it's interesting.

DR. DUVAL: It is interesting, and it used to be quite a big fishery for us, but it really just -- The bottom dropped out of it pretty much the year after the assessment was completed.

MR. CONKLIN: I would like to dig another layer into the commercial discards and request the information from the Science Center to see what's really going on.

DR. DUVAL: Can we add that to the timing and tasks as well, Myra? Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: I would add one thing, that I looked at these landings a while back. I looked at the hurricanes that actually push large numbers of red grouper out of the Gulf, and Hurricane Charlie was in 2004. If you look at that, and it may just be serendipitous that they go together, but we see amazing numbers of red grouper come through, and they don't stay but a couple of weeks and they're gone. Now, which way they're going, I don't know, but I know a number of our fish

do go to the north over time, and so that could be something we could look at. Do we know the genetics of those yet, of the --

DR. DUVAL: No, and that was one of the things that I was noting that's in the SAFE Report that was -- It says of particular notice was the issue of red grouper's discontinuous distribution between North Carolina and Florida, indicating the possibility of a two-stock structure and the SSC suggested a possible two-stock scenario for the next red grouper assessment, but I don't know if we have genetic information on it.

DR. MCGOVERN: I know when I was at the South Carolina DNR that Bob Chapman did some genetics work on red grouper. It was a MARFIN proposal.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, and so we've got a couple of additions to the timing and tasks motion with regard to red grouper. Is there any other discussion before we get to the timing and tasks motion? Okay. We have exceeded a screen there, but hopefully folks have had a chance to read those tasks. They will be included as part of the record. I am not going to read through each one of them, but I would entertain a motion from the committee to adopt the timing and tasks motion as shown.

MS. BECKWITH: Again, do I need to add anything about the additional analysis I wanted?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and so Anna had suggested an update to a presentation that I think John Carmichael had put together a few years ago regarding sort of the rankings of our species with regard to landings and how that might help inform discussion of looking at aggregate bag limits, and so I'm going to let John speak to that a bit.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think what we want is a hierarchal list of species caught in the recreational fishery, for-hire and private separate, based on landings for recent years. We said since like the last ten, or since 2008 or 2009 until present. Yes, 2009 until present, a hierarchal list of species, based on recreational landings by private and for-hire from 2009 through 2015.

MS. BECKWITH: We can even probably do the last five years, because we know that in 2009 there was barely any recreational fishing, and so I would probably keep it to just the last five. It's likely more realistic.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So 2011 through 2015, because 2016 is still in prep. Do you want for-hire combined or do you want charter and headboat separate?

MS. BECKWITH: It would be interesting to see it all separate, if it's not too much more trouble.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay, and so private and then private, charter, and headboat.

DR. DUVAL: The intent there is this would help inform our discussion of looking at aggregate bag limits in the recreational visioning amendment. Thank you for that reminder. I think that might fill out our timing and tasks list.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we approve the timing and tasks motion.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Jessica and seconded by Anna. Is there further discussion on the motion? **Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

That concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee Report. The next report is the Mackerel Cobia Committee. Before I turn it over to Ben to go through the report, Kim has reminded me that we need to update our group photo for the website, and so I think, Ben, we will see how the Mackerel Cobia Committee goes, but maybe we will take a quick break in between there and take the picture and let people check out, if they need to get anything else out of their rooms, something like that. Would that be okay with folks? Okay. Then I am going to turn things over to Chairman Hartig to run us through the Mackerel Cobia Committee.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Chairman Duval. The first item of business, the committee received an update on commercial landings for Atlantic king mackerel, Spanish mackerel and cobia from Southeast Regional Office staff. The committee also received an update on Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 26, which was transmitted for formal review on July 7, 2016, and is currently under review at the Southeast Regional Office.

The next presentation, SERO staff presented on the process for landings information to go to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and then to SERO, and then made available to the public. Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff provided a presentation on the 2015 commercial overage for Atlantic cobia.

Council staff then reported on the June and August 2016 Gulf Council meetings and Louis Daniel reported on recent decisions related to cobia by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Rob O'Reilly from the Mid- Atlantic Council briefed the committee on motions approved at the recent Mid-Atlantic Council meeting, which included a request that the Mackerel Cobia Committee meet as a committee of the whole when discussing cobia. At that time, the Council Chair convened the Mackerel Cobia Committee as a committee of the whole.

Next, we had a presentation by Mike Denson from South Carolina DNR, which provided ongoing work on ongoing genetic research for cobia. After that, the committee of the whole went into Framework Amendment 4 for Atlantic cobia.

We have a number of motions that went through there. There are nine motions. They have all been already approved by the council and we do not need to go back and revisit any of these options, and it has already been approved to go for secretarial review, and so we do not need to go through any of those motions.

The next item of business was Framework Amendment 5, revise permit restrictions. **The first motion to come before you was to approve the modified purpose and need statements. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The next motion was to approve the IPT recommendations for the language in the alternatives. I missed that one, Kari, somewhere. Is it Motion 11?

DR. MACLAUHLIN: It's just the language in the alternatives.

MR. HARTIG: In the alternatives. Okay. Sorry. I will read that one again. **The motion was to approve the IPT recommendations for the language in the alternatives. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The next motion was to select Alternative 2 and 3 under Action 1 as the South Atlantic preferreds. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

The next motion was to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 5 for 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. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?

DR. DUVAL: It's a roll call vote.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **The motion passes unanimously.**

MR. HARTIG: Thank you. The next item of business was Amendment 29, Gulf king mackerel allocations. **The motions that came up under that amendment, the first one was to approve the modified purpose and need statements. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The next motion was to approve Alternatives 1 through 3 in Action 1. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The next motion was to approve Alternatives 1 through 3 in Action 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

That, if I'm not mistaken, takes us to timing and tasks. We would need a motion to approve the timing and tasks motion to finalize Framework Amendment 4 for formal review; prepare Framework Amendment 5, Amendment 29, and Amendment 30 (formerly Action 2 in Framework Amendment 4) for the Gulf Council meeting in October.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we adopt the timing and tasks motion.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Jessica and second by Zack. Is there any discussion on this motion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** That concludes the Mackerel Committee Report, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Ben. Very nice and efficient. I am actually going to suggest we go through the HMS Committee Report and then we can break. I have a feeling that the mega-joint Dolphin Wahoo/Snapper Grouper/Mackerel Committee Report might take a little bit longer, and so let's go ahead, and I am going to turn things over to Chairman Beckwith for the HMS Committee Report. John, has this been posted in the committee folder on the website, because I don't see it.

MS. BECKWITH: The Highly Migratory Species Committee met September 15, 2016, and completed the following activities. We reviewed a presentation on the proposed rule to modify the commercial retention limit for blacknose and non-blacknose small coastal sharks in the Atlantic Region, and we received a presentation on Draft Amendment 10 to the 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan on Essential Fish Habitat.

The Highly Migratory Species Committee approved the following motion as a recommendation to the council. **The motion was to send a letter of support to HMS for blacknose shark retention limits. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** We do not really have a timing and tasks motion, but do we need a motion for that timing and task? I don't think so.

DR. DUVAL: I don't think so. I think I can just work with John to develop that letter and get it out before the comment period ends on the 20th.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. With that, I conclude my report, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you very much, Anna. Let's go ahead and take about a fifteen-minute break. We will let folks check out if they haven't checked out, and then we will gather for a group photo. Thanks.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. DUVAL: We will continue with committee reports, and I'm going to turn things over to Chairman Beckwith for the Joint Dolphin Wahoo/Snapper Grouper/Mackerel Cobia Committee.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. The Joint Dolphin Wahoo/Snapper Grouper/Mackerel Cobia Committee met September 14, 2016, and completed the following actions. We received updates on the status of commercial landings for dolphin and wahoo. We received an update on the status of Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 1, and we discussed the development of Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10/Snapper Grouper Amendment 44.

The committee was unable to complete all of its business in its time allotted, and we will be taking up a few issues at this full council. One is a discussion of the National Marine Fisheries Service and the CCC allocation procedural directives, and the second will be the For-Hire Limited Entry Options Paper.

The Committee voted on the following motions as recommendations to the council. Under Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10/Snapper Grouper Amendment 44, the following motions were made. **Motion 1 was to direct staff to develop an action in the allocation amendment to revise the definition of OY and look at the long-term average catch in the recreational sector for**

dolphin, so that OY will be the long-term average catch, which is not designed to exceed the ACL, and will fall between the ACL and the ACT. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?

DR. CHEUVRONT: That's not exactly the motion that's in the report.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Do you want me to reread it?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and, if you need to change it, then I need to change that's in the report, but --

MS. BECKWITH: To me, the wording would make a little bit more sense the way I read it, but we can -- What is the --

DR. CHEUVRONT: I think the intent is the same, but the wording is different. It's not exactly what was passed by the committee. That's the point I'm trying to make.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so I will reread the motion as passed by the committee. **Direct staff to develop an action in the allocation amendment that will look at the long-term average catch in the recreational sector for dolphin, so that OY will be the long-term average catch, which is not designated to exceed the ACL, and will fall between the ACL and the ACT. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

Under Action 1, we had a motion to move Action 1 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Motion 3 was to move Action 2 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix, but that motion failed. **Motion 4 was to move Alternative 3 in Action 2 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Motion 5 was to move Alternative 6 in Action 2 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Motion 6 was to replace Alternative 7 with Alternative X language, with the additional considerations discussed. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Under Action 3, the motion was to remove Alternatives 6 and 7 and add Alternative X with the discussed modifications. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

There was an additional motion to add an action that would reconsider management of the recreational dolphin sector by ACT, using a range of 50 percent and 85 percent of the sector ACL. That motion failed for lack of a second.

We have a motion to direct staff to develop an action that would address authorized gear aboard a vessel on which dolphin and wahoo are onboard. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Then there was quite a bit of direction to staff that will be included in the committee report. Then we did have a timing and tasks motion specific to Amendment 44, but would we like to wait on the timing and tasks motion? Okay. The next agenda item would be a Discussion on the National Marine Fisheries Service and CCC Allocation Directives, which I will pass over to Chairman Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Anna. I think Attachments 5, 6, and 7 deal with the National Marine Fisheries Service Allocation Policy and the Council Coordinating Committee guidance document with regard to setting triggers for allocation review. I was part of the CCC working group that developed the guidance document for consideration of allocation review triggers, and we finalized that work at our May meeting last year, and so these two documents are kind of designed to work together.

The CCC document really just addresses what are the different types of trigger criteria that councils could consider in determining when they would review an allocation, and this is meant to apply to any kind of allocation and not just a commercial or recreational sector allocation, but gear sector allocations and any allocation that might come before a council for consideration. We divided things into three different types of triggers that folks could consider.

There were public interest-based triggers and there were time-based triggers and then what we called indicator-based triggers. Public interest-based triggers are sort of how a lot of councils do things now. They can be sort of bottom-up type of constituent concerns about a particular allocation, and that decision to review an allocation could occur at any time. A council could specifically solicit public comment on a particular allocation or a council could establish like a formal petition process. Those are sort of the three examples that the CCC laid out in terms of public interest-based criteria.

You could also have time-based criteria and just say we are going to review all of our allocations on a specific time, and then the indicator-based criteria, we're looking at development of social, economic, or ecological criteria or objectives that councils may be trying to meet, and so your trigger as to whether or not an allocation review would occur would be based on the establishment of those social, economic, or ecological criteria, and you could use a combination of these different suites of triggers.

You could use a combination of a time-based and an indicator-based approach. Perhaps you have set a social or economic parameter that you want to meet within a time certain. At that time certain, your trigger is looking at that particular social or economic objective you might have set for a particular fishery, and so there's different ways to set up allocation triggers, and I want to be very clear about the CCC document. That's not -- It's a trigger for review of an allocation. Whether or not a change to an allocation occurs, that's the next step. The CCC was dealing with the very first step in the process, which was how councils could consider setting up those triggers for review.

If a review is warranted, then that review would occur and, based on the output of that review, that would determine whether or not an allocation, quote, unquote, action would occur, whether or not you actually needed to reconsider those allocations, and so this is just setting up the triggers for allocation review, and there is actually a great chart in that document that sort of walks you through timing, decision criteria, what the outcome is, the source of the guidance, and how this document works with the National Marine Fisheries Service allocation policy, which lays out a whole set of factors for consideration when councils are establishing allocations.

If you come to a point where you have an allocation review that's been triggered, you go through the review process, and perhaps you find that an allocation action is warranted. Then you kind of move over to the NMFS document, which says here is all the different suite of factors that councils may want to consider as they're thinking about an allocation action, and so, when we discussed this and approved it back in June of last year, it was with the understanding that once this was finalized and had worked its way through the policy approval process that councils would have -- It was a recommendation that councils establish their allocation review triggers within three years of the effective date of the policy, and so we have a few years to discuss and set up those triggers, and so this isn't an immediate urgency, and I think it's going to take some considerable discussion to decide on what type of approach we want to consider here, if we want to look at what those allocation triggers should be on a fishery-management-plan-by-fishery-management-plan basis, if we wanted to establish just a more comprehensive approach that would apply to all of our managed species, and so those types of discussions need to occur down the road.

I think we're in the middle of this amendment here, this joint amendment for Dolphin Wahoo and Snapper Grouper, that's looking at tools for non-permanent allocation sharing, and it would just be my recommendation that once we complete that document that we hold off on any other allocation-type of actions until we get our own allocation policy in place that would set up these triggers for review, et cetera, et cetera, just so that we can -- I mean the idea is that you are trying to be very clear to the public what is your process for a review of your allocations.

I guess I will stop there and see if people have any questions about things. I don't know if folks have really had a chance to dig through those documents. I would encourage you to read them. There is a big emphasis with regard to setting up allocation triggers. There is a lot of discussion about adaptive management and ensuring that the goals and objectives of your fishery management plans are contemporary and relevant. Those are also things that need to be considered when you're talking about setting up allocation review triggers.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that, and I will be frank that I did not have the time to go through all of those yet, and I will. I appreciate all the work that's been done by all the groups to do that, but I'm just thinking that if we -- As we're moving through the way we're shifting allocations for partial allocations back and forth, and we get a council decision of this is how we're going to do it, is that enough? Would that be enough to say this is how -- We have reviewed the allocations and this is how we want to go ahead with it in the future, and would that be enough to satisfy the mandates of looking at allocations?

DR. DUVAL: I think that's a discussion we could have. I sort of see these as two different things, two slightly different things, because the document that we've been working on and that we discussed earlier this week was really temporary allocation shifts, and so I think that is a component that would be included in an allocation policy that the council would develop, but I see

it as being slightly different than considering triggers for review of any existing allocations that we might have.

Ben, there was a lot of discussion after the Comprehensive ACL Amendment went through in April of 2012, which basically set most of the existing commercial/recreational sector allocations that we have today, and, as we lived with that and applied that landings-based formula for setting our allocations, there was some dissatisfaction with that, based on the MRIP data that were available at the time.

I mean, I see these two documents as addressing more decisions like that and when those would need to be reviewed, but I think Chester was right when he said yesterday that it's going to require a good bit of conversation to establish that policy, and so that's why I am not suggesting that we get into a long, protracted discussion today, but that we schedule time for those discussions when we've had a little bit more time to digest -- Folks who haven't been stuck working on those documents, like I have, when they've had a little bit more time to digest them and we can determine which type of approach we would like to take or combination of approaches.

MS. BECKWITH: Any other comments? Okay. Talking about protracted discussions, before we get into the for-hire permit limited entry discussion, Madam Chair, how long would you like me to permit this discussion to go on for?

DR. DUVAL: I think we're doing pretty well on time right now. I would say why don't you move forward. The next committee report is, according to the agenda, not scheduled until 10:30. It's just before 10:00 right now, and so why don't we let the discussion happen and we can sort of check in at 10:30. My sense is some of these reports are going to be pretty darned short, and so I think we would make up any time, and so go ahead.

MS. BECKWITH: The next portion of our agenda is the Discussion on the For-Hire Permit Limited Entry, and I would like to take this in three parts. I would like to discuss first how we got here and then go through a bit of a discussion on defining the problems and both of those prior to us actually considering the possible solutions and the options paper. I am going to turn it over to Brian for a moment to go through some of the comments that we received through our visioning process and some of the requests from our APs and just to give us a sense of how this topic actually arrived to this table.

DR. CHEUVRONT: What I can tell you, because I did review that, is Amber prepared -- She went through all of the visioning statements, both the port meetings and then when we took the statement, the visioning blueprint, out again. We had a total of fifteen comments between those two types of sessions. There were some in North Carolina and then there were some also in Florida.

There were none from South Carolina or Georgia, and all of the comments, except for one, were in favor, at some level, of doing some kind of limited entry in the for-hire permits. Now, understand that some of the comments were very, very specific and said there needs to be some kind of cap on for-hire permits. Some comments were a little more tangential, but they were related to this, but, out of those fifteen comments, only one of them was don't do this and keep it open access. That's in a nutshell. I can go pull that document up and put it up there if you want to see it, but that's, in a nutshell, what was in it.

MS. BECKWITH: Let me see if maybe Amber or Mike can send that one around for folks to take a look at. I have it pulled up, and so I can go through a bit of it more specifically. In North Carolina, we did have the meeting in Shallotte, which seemed to be where more of the comments came from. They did feel that there was a need to consider limited entry and had offered some solutions. From the 2014 port meetings, we did not have comments from our North Carolina Morehead City, Hatteras, Raleigh, Sneads Ferry, or Southport meetings.

In South Carolina, in 2014, we had meetings in Charleston, Murrells Inlet, Bluffton, and Shem Creek, and there were no comments for or against limited entry at any of those meetings. In Georgia, we had meetings in Brunswick, Savannah, Shellman Bluff, and St. Simons Island, and there were no comments for or against in any of those.

Then, when we got to Florida, the Keys did have some comments in consideration of that the charter fishing was open access and that a solution might be a cap of some type. There was also one comment in Lake Park, but there were no comments in Key Largo, Marathon, St. Augustine, or Titusville.

During the 2015 visioning input, we had additional meetings in Wanchese, and they were not supportive of limited entry. We did not have any additional comments in Morehead or Wilmington. In South Carolina, there were no comments at the Mount Pleasant or Murrells Inlet. In Georgia, there were no comments at the Brunswick or Shellman Bluff. Then, again, we got to Florida for the last of the meetings and there were some comments in the Stuart meeting, but none at the St. Augustine, Titusville, and Marathon meeting.

I also wanted to go through the Snapper Grouper AP folks, the different times that they provided input for consideration of either a moratorium or moving to limited entry, and I'm trying to find that. Do you have that, Brian?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Amber is putting that up on the drop-box with that full document from which you're talking about, and so everybody can look at it. She's putting it up on the website so everybody can look at it.

DR. DUVAL: I do have that there was a motion from October of 2012 from the Snapper Grouper AP that said the council should consider a moratorium on all snapper grouper permit holders in the for-hire sector in the South Atlantic. The intent was to stop issuing new permits, and that was approved with one opposed and six in favor. There was another motion in April of 2013 that the council should consider a moratorium on all for-hire snapper grouper permits in the South Atlantic, to be consistent with the moratorium for the for-hire vessels in the Gulf. There were eight in favor and three opposed.

In October of 2014, there was a motion to recommend that the council consider implementing a limited entry program for the for-hire sector. There's no vote count, but just approved by the AP. Then, in April of 2016, there was a motion that the AP recommends that the council consider limited entry for the for-hire sector. It passed with one opposed and two abstentions.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Then, of course, we, through our council discussions at the visioning process, through the visioning process, this did come out as one of the hot topics. It

didn't come out as one of our priorities, but it did come out as the number one hot topic under our management grouping, and so I just wanted to put that out there as this is how we got here and these were the comments from the AP and where it fell out in our own visioning process and the comments that we got through the stakeholders. Are there any comments to that specifically?

MR. BOWEN: I was present at the 2015 advisory panel meeting, and that was vote was unanimous in favor of limited entry. I feel like we probably as a whole, as a body here, should really take what the advisory panel says. That's a room full of fishermen that are our constituents, and I think their voice should carry a lot of weight, because, again, they are part of the fishery, but yet they're our constituents as well, and so it was a unanimous vote in 2015. I remember that specifically.

Also, Madam Chair, if you will, when you were going over your notes, you said Wanchese, at that meeting, and I wrote it down here that you said that they were against. I would like for you to clarify. We know who is for. It seems like we have some advocating for it, but, when you say they were against, it kind of left me wondering who was they.

MS. BECKWITH: The note is that the Wanchese stakeholder meeting, the individuals at the meeting, were not for limited entry, which is not a surprise, coming from that area of North Carolina.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you. Just, for the record, I think when we -- We've been hearing some public testimony this week about everybody advocating against limited entry, and I'm not sure that that was a totally correct statement. Just because somebody is not in favor or doesn't speak for it, I don't think we should assume that they're against it.

MS. BECKWITH: I wasn't suggesting that. I was simply going through where we had actually received comments through our stakeholder meeting.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, ma'am. No disrespect, and I didn't mean you. I just meant our constituents. Just because they don't speak for it, it doesn't necessarily mean they're against it. I wasn't meaning you at all.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Specific to what we are currently talking about.

MR. BREWER: I believe the AP motion was that we would consider limited entry, and that's what we're doing. We are following the recommendation of the AP. There were other comments that have not been mentioned here yet. There are written comments from the Coastal Conservation Association and there are written comments from the National Association of Charter Boat Operators, which is the largest charter boat operator organization in the United States. You also had, and I don't know if it was written, but you've had verbal comment from the ASA.

All of those comments were very much against limited entry. With NACO, I think you're talking in the neighborhood of -- I forget, but I know it's way more than 1,000 members. Bob Zales wrote a very strong letter that's in the record. CCA right now is about 140,000 members, not all of whom are located, admittedly, in our area, but it was actually a condemnation of limited entry. The ASA, as I said, has spoken against it, and so to say that public comment has been in favor of limited entry, I can't go there.

DR. DUVAL: Just with regard to the port meetings and the summary from both the 2014 visioning port meetings as well as the 2015 public input on the draft vision blueprint, I just want to -- In terms of the 2014 port meetings, I just wanted to remind folks that we had tried to structure those port meetings in certain areas so that we were perhaps having a port meeting in a location where we could capture input from private recreational anglers and then we had other locations where we were trying to get input from commercial industry representatives and other locations where we were trying to target for-hire operators. When you look through the summaries and you see that there were no comments on for-hire limited entry, in some of those cases, it's because there weren't necessarily representatives of those different stakeholder groups there, and so that's just kind of a reminder of how we had set up those port meetings in the past. Thanks.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, and another point to consider is that all of these comments, of course, happened through the Snapper Grouper AP and the snapper grouper visioning, and so we actually have no feedback from our Cobia Mackerel and our Dolphin Wahoo Committees. They have never given us a motion to consider limited entry, to my knowledge. I may be wrong, but certainly this could be an opportunity for them to weigh in on if they consider that to be an appropriate step forward.

MR. BOWEN: The last mackerel meeting that I attended, which I think was the last one that was held, in Florida, the Mackerel Advisory Panel voted in favor of limited entry. I was at that one as well.

MS. BECKWITH: I see Kari shaking her head no, and so we would have to get that clarified.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: The Mackerel AP, when they met in Cocoa Beach, it was a really short meeting, and remember we ran over into public hearing time, and so there were some items that they wanted to bring up. In particular, the Mackerel AP Chair wanted to talk about this, but they didn't have time.

MR. BOWEN: I stand corrected. Maybe I am remembering him telling me he was in favor and wanted to bring it up and didn't have time, but it was mentioned at the Mackerel AP, and I am sorry for misspeaking.

MR. BROWN: I just want to clarify something. I was at the Snapper Grouper AP meeting in the spring, and it was not a unanimous decision. There was one opposed and two abstentions on the record, but it did pass. Also, I wanted to state that the port meeting that was held on Shem Creek was at the Geechie Dock, which is normally a commercial dock, and I think that Mark Marhefka and a couple of commercial guys were there, but there was basically no turnout of any for-hire or charter people. We struggle here in Charleston, for some reason, getting people to come to our meetings, but I don't know why we didn't get anybody to come to that one.

MR. BELL: Are you limiting discussion right now to just public comments or perception or can I ask a general question? I am only asking a general question, and I apologize for not being at the June meeting, and so I'm kind of out of what the collective thinking was, but my general question would be what was the rationale for application of this tool, if you will, and what was the driving necessity or the problem we were trying to fix with it, or what was the chief problem we were trying to fix in kind of moving forward on application of this approach?

MS. BECKWITH: That's exactly the next discussion we're going to move into, if we're done with this portion of the discussion. I'm going to let Tim speak, and then we're going to go back and we're going to start defining some problems.

MR. GRINER: I was at both the Shallotte and Sneads Ferry port meetings, and it was mentioned at the Shallotte meeting, but almost as a sidebar. There were one or two quick comments. Overall, it wasn't a big topic of discussion at either one of them.

DR. DUVAL: I was at that Shallotte meeting too, and that's not my recollection. I mean, there was a good bit of discussion about why some of those captains wanted limited entry, and their goal in wanting limited entry was that they had built a business. They wanted to be able to maintain the value of that business and they were concerned about things like if the council is setting a maximum -- If we're only going to have so many fish that can be caught in our snapper grouper fishery in setting a total ACL, then it made sense to them to limit entry, and so I guess I felt like there was a good bit of discussion about that, but we can agree to disagree on that.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. For this next portion of the conversation, I am going to be very strict with my instructions. We are going to define the problems. I would like to have a discussion with the council where we define the problem and how limited entry, or limiting access, will specifically address that problem. For example, and I'm going to have Brian, as we talk, if he doesn't mind, type out sort of notes on this.

My first example would be I would identify compliance with the logbook as a problem. A limited-entry-associated fix might be considered increasing accountability and stabilizing the total universe of participants. There's a problem and there is a possible way that limited entry would fix it.

Another example would be maybe a problem might be lack of flexibility or need for stability for business planning. A limited-entry-associated fix would be considered limited entry, possibly paired with sector separation, and that could lead to different seasons, bag limits, accountability measures, or other regulations that might assist the charter fleet in managing their business practices, and so those are two examples. That is specifically what I'm looking for, is let's have a discussion on what we consider the problems and how limited access might assist in addressing those problems. Who would like to start?

DR. CRABTREE: I think a key part of this is do we have more charter boats than we really need? Is the fishery over capacity? Just to start it off, I can tell you that, in the Gulf, we have around 1,400 charter reef fish permits. In the South Atlantic, we have around 1,700 snapper grouper for-hire permits, and so you've got more permits than the Gulf of Mexico does, and I looked at the landings from the snapper grouper fishery for the last five years and the Gulf reef fish fishery for the last five years, and our average is in the neighborhood of a little over six-million pounds and theirs is seventeen-million pounds. They're catching three times as many fish, and they've got fewer vessels, charter vessels, than we do, and we know we've got fisheries closing and we're hitting ACLs, and no one likes the closures.

We clearly have a lot of charter boats, in the snapper grouper fishery at least, and I think that's something to really think about, but that seems, to me, to be a fundamental question here. If you have more vessels than you need, they're not going to be profitable and you're going to have

derbies and early closures and all kinds of things, and so I think that's part of this. The other things you mentioned, like reporting compliance and professionalizing the fishery, are all important too, but I think the issue of overcapacity is fundamental to it as well.

MR. BOWEN: To Roy's point, I was going to be a little more specific, and I was glad he was broad with that statement, and I agree 100 percent with it, but we're just now getting into Amendment 43 with red snapper and the amount of discards, the amount of effort, the amount of hooks in the water. That's a driving force of Amendment 43, and so that would be another reason, in my mind.

MS. BECKWITH: Zack, what I'm hearing you say is that you see that there is a resource concern with red snapper specifically?

MR. BOWEN: Well, I think there is multiple resource concerns with red snapper and cobia. We just talked about red grouper this morning. There are multiple resource concerns, yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Anyone else?

DR. DUVAL: One concern that I have, and I think it's probably -- It would apply to all three permits, but I think most specifically to snapper grouper, and that is folks who are operating illegally in federal waters. We know that there are folks who some proportion of their business plan is fishing in federal fisheries, maybe not very far offshore.

It may only comprise 25 or 30 percent of their business plan, but my concern is that you have folks who are operating without permits, whether it's intentionally out of just laziness or they simply don't know that they need to get one, which I find a little bit difficult to believe, given that these species have been under federal management for some time. I think that puts the folks who are operating legally and are maintaining their permits at a disadvantage if folks are going to continue to be operating illegally, and so I could see limited entry as being a tool that would level that playing field, in terms of legal versus illegal operation.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and I sort of see that partly as an enforcement issue as well, and so you did clarify at the end that you consider the limited entry solution a leveling of the playing field, because I think, if we go to limited entry, we certainly might exacerbate that illegal fishing that might occur because those permits would not be available, and so there is some balance to consider on that one.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: When Roy talked about the seventeen-hundred-and-some permits that are there, what is the number of permits that are as of the control date? Of those 1,700 or so, how many are actively reporting right now?

MS. BECKWITH: We don't have current reporting requirements for our charter guys. They fall under the charter survey for MRIP, and so we would not be able to answer that question.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: So you don't know what your universe is? You said you had seventeen-hundred-and-some permits.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, but there's just not a reporting requirement for them, but there is a permit reporting requirement, and it varies from year to year, but, in 2016, there were 1,786 charter/headboat permits for snapper grouper. There were 1,794 for mackerel and 1,945 for dolphin wahoo. Let me clarify, Dewey, that only the headboats in the Beaufort Headboat Survey are required to report, of those vessels.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I understand that, but I was just -- When you talk about logbook compliance, you don't have to have logbook compliance to be a charter/headboat. There is no compliance for that, is there?

DR. CRABTREE: But we're looking at an amendment that would establish a charter boat reporting requirement.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: From what I saw yesterday, there is still no teeth in your requirements, because there is no way to go back and see if -- You could send in a no-fishing report the whole time, and there is no way to put teeth into that, looking at it, but, talking back with your logbook compliance, so when you put a control date in effect of last year, you probably still have, and I'm just guessing, 1,700 permits that were there, and I don't think that -- Prior to your control date, there is probably still 1,750 permits or something, and so I guess, when you look at this going down in the future, you're going to have to figure out some way of choosing -- How do you know if they even fished? I don't understand how you're going to look at logbook compliance when there is none.

DR. CRABTREE: We aren't. You can't.

MS. BECKWITH: When I talked about the logbook reporting compliance, it was a problem with -- I am identifying that as a possible problem because we are moving to a logbook, and so lack of reporting, future reporting, might be a concern that we will take into consideration during development of a limited-entry program, and so hold that thought. Again, we are still in the defining problems discussion. We are not debating other people's problems. Right now, I want to hear from the committee what you consider a problem and how you think limited entry is a possible solution. That's the box we're in.

MR. HAYMANS: I've been silent, because I didn't think you were allowing rebuttals. I thought it was only the problem, and so I wasn't going to say anything. However, I would like to address Dr. Crabtree and his numbers, because you're looking at something other than what's available on the website, obviously, because what I'm pulling up, as of the day before yesterday, was 1,566 pelagics and 1,542 snapper grouper and 1,678 dolphin wahoo, and I can't imagine that it's jumped over 400 in a day, and so I don't know what different table we're looking at.

DR. CRABTREE: When you look at these, it's complicated. What you're looking at, I suspect, is valid permits, meaning non-expired permits, but there are a lot of these permits that may only be expired for a month and are expected to be renewed. When you look at it that way, the number goes up.

MR. HARTIG: Accountability is one of the things we're trying to get out of this, and then, under accountability, would be to reduce uncertainty for the for-hire catch estimates and then eventually -- Number two would be eventually move the for-hire vessels out of MRIP.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I didn't catch the last part that you said, Ben.

MR. HARTIG: The last one was to eventually move for-hire vessels out of MRIP.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester, do you have a problem that we can fix through limited entry that you would like to share? We are not rebutting now, and so I'm going to move on to Mark. Do you have a problem that we can fix through limited entry, Mark? We are looking for problems, as you see them in the fishery, that might be fixed through limited entry. Do you have one to share?

MR. BROWN: I would like to defer that, temporarily.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. We are back to Zack. Do you have another problem that you would like to share?

MR. BOWEN: I have a lot of problems, but I'm going to withhold that for right now. Thank you for calling on me, but I am going to move on.

MS. BECKWITH: Dewey, do you have a problem in the for-hire industry that could be fixed through limited entry that you would like to share?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: It would be more fish for the recreational industry to catch and possibly commercial.

MS. BECKWITH: Sorry, but I don't understand. Can you try that one again?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: If it's limited access, then that would probably be more fish for the commercial and the possibility of also for the recreational industry to catch, because you would have less charter boats out there fishing for them.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so anybody else that would like to add a problem that they see on the table that might be able to be fixed through limited entry? Is this a comprehensive list? Okay. Then the next question we're going to sort through is do these problems -- Are all these problems the same for all of our permits or are there some of these issues that are not currently a problem for some of our permits? Let's go back to the top of the list, Brian, please.

We have three for-hire permits that are up for discussion right now for limited entry. For example, potential logbook reporting compliance, is that something that we should consider for all three permits?

MR. BELL: You switched gears there a little bit, but you might -- Well, I lost it. The way it just says that a problem is logbook reporting compliance, we don't have logbook reporting, but a problem would be data, quality of data. That's just a comment.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so we can add to that "future logbook" and then sort of with data quality.

MR. BELL: I was just saying the real problem with that is you've got crappy data, and so you can get better data, but you don't have a current requirement for logbook reporting. That's a solution for kind of a specific problem that doesn't exist yet, because the requirement doesn't exist, but it could certainly help improve the data, and we know the data are a problem. We've been told the data are a problem.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so let's go back up to the top of that list. Are there any of these that we don't consider issues for say the mackerel cobia permit? Do we really believe there is a resource concern right now for the cobia mackerel permit?

MR. BOWEN: We're under a current closure, recreationally, for cobia, and so I would definitely say that's a concern.

MS. BECKWITH: The for-hire guys do need to have a CMP to fish for cobia? There's not a commercial permit, but they do have -- Yes. Okay. How about dolphin wahoo? Is there a resource concern for the dolphin wahoo permit?

MR. BOWEN: I don't feel like there's a resource concern for dolphin and wahoo at this time. If the council decides to move forward with the electronic for-hire reporting, it would add teeth to compliance for dolphin and wahoo, but, as far as a resource concern, I don't think there is.

MS. BECKWITH: Are there any -- Ben, did you have a comment?

MR. HARTIG: Just because there's not a resource concern, it doesn't mean you can't improve your data, in the long-term, to get better accountability. I think that's a critical -- From my perspective, that's one of the critical reasons for doing this in the first place.

MR. BREWER: I have forgotten what the exact motion is, but, the way you've set this up, you're only taking pro for limited entry and you're not taking con.

MS. BECKWITH: We're not there yet.

MR. BREWER: Okay.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Madam Chair, it's 10:30. Can I have another thirty minutes?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think we can go another thirty minutes. I mean your intent is to move forward and do con and kind of bring this to some resolution?

MS. BECKWITH: Correct. My next question would be can all of these issues be fixed only through limited entry or are there other methods for fixing some of these issues?

MR. HAYMANS: We had a discussion during one of the committees that dealt with are there other areas within the business practices of the National Marine Fisheries Service that can address penalties for non-reporting, and we don't know that answer yet, but there are potential fixes to non-reporting, simply through correction of business practices.

MR. BOWEN: I feel like mandatory logbooks may address some of these concerns, but we are only 25 percent there in the South Atlantic for logbooks, state logbooks, and I know Georgia has no intentions of mandating logbooks, and I don't feel like, and you probably could answer this a lot more accurately, but I don't feel like North Carolina has any intentions of implementing logbooks, because of the feedback you got from your constituents, if my memory serves me correctly, and I don't feel like Florida has any intentions of mandating logbooks. If that was the case, if that was different, that might be something to look at, but, again, I don't think there's any intentions from the other three states besides South Carolina.

MR. BROWN: We discussed this before too, about the access permit and being able to use the fishery with some type of stamp or access and having mandatory reporting, and we still haven't gotten that far yet. I would like to see us be able to get to where people that are going offshore have a stamp or a permit or something that are accessing the fishery and also reporting, not only private, but charter and for-hire, making sure everybody is on the same page.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Are there any other comments to add to that question? If there's not, now let's look at some detriments to potential limited entry. We're going to take this for a few minutes, and so Doug and I assume Chester and Jessica might have a few things to add. Now, what would be some of the concerns that we would have with moving forward to limited entry?

MR. HAYMANS: I would look at the potential conflicts between users, particularly the average recreational angler and for-hire that may ensue from limited entry, the concerns between participants who are in or out of the industry, and then, if I look back at the fixes, we have already addressed number one. Number three, the overcapacity issue, during visioning, I had Brian do sort of a back-of-the-envelope what would the landings actually support, and I'm going to just say that it was in the hundreds and nowhere near the thousands, and so the potential conflict between those who you would have to boot out in order to get down to some carrying capacity, I think the bloodletting would be unbearable, and so that's certainly a conflict between those that are in and out.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there anyone else who would like to discuss some reasons why not limited entry?

MR. GRINER: When you discuss overcapacity, the flip side of that is going to be undercapacity. If you look at the landings right now, it's clearly not a resource issue, but what is growing are the number of tourists that are coming, and so, if you've cut this off, who is going to take these guys fishing? Now, all of a sudden, you've got not enough capacity, and what are you going to do then? Then you've kind of shot your business model in the foot, because you can't grow anymore.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, guys. We are not rebutting. We are just doing negative potential consequences to moving towards limited entry. Do you have a potential negative, Zack?

MR. BOWEN: Whether it's pros or cons, when we go through this list, I think they need to be accurate, and I think undercapacity is not an accurate statement of a con for limited entry. I don't think there's a charter boat operator in the South Atlantic that says they're not booked enough, that says they can't carry any more trips.

MS. BECKWITH: I doubt we can speak for all of our charter boat captains in the entire region, and so we will let that happen through scoping when we get there. Who else had a comment?

MR. BELL: It's kind of specific to what's going on now or how we're doing this, but a problem right now, I can see, is we have this for-hire or the charter boat logbook amendment that we're trying to bring the community into working on, and, at this point, the discussion of this tool is perhaps somewhat -- Although we see it as a good thing related eventually to compliance, it kind of is more change on top of what we're already trying to bring onboard, and so there's a specific time-related issue, I think, related to being right on top of what we're trying to achieve through that.

Then, also, related to timing specifically, and I realize control dates can change and what we published is what we published, but I think there is some specific issues with the specific control date at this point, and then that sort of feeds into other concerns. It's just a lot of stuff going on in the community right now, when you consider about we're asking them to do something they've never done before, which is help us get better data for the reporting, electronic reporting, and so that's a very specific time-related concern, but it's still a concern.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I'm going to take two more comments and then we're going to move on to discussion of the options paper.

MR. BROWN: In regards to the control date, it would actually be something that I would want to see changed too, just simply because I am in a situation to where I have a permit that came in after the control date, and so I would like to see it moved further forward, but I also have talked to quite a few different for-hire fishermen that are inshore guides.

Our jetties extend pretty far offshore here in Charleston. A lot of people are fishing right on the boundary of the demarcation line, and so there's a lot of guys that are now looking at the fact that maybe they do need to go ahead and get their permit now, because they are boundary fishing, and so, just to get the data added to what we're already doing and trying to get into a position to where we are getting better data to go ahead and have the control date further ahead, so that people that are either transferring from one fishery, like from commercial to recreational, or downsizing or something to a smaller boat, has the opportunity to go ahead and get their permit.

MS. BECKWITH: To me, that sort of falls under the problem or issue of the potential illegal fishing, but that's not quite where we are right now. Right now, we're at sort of concerns for moving forward with limited entry, which I guess you're saying there's sort of people out there that probably want to be in the fishery and won't be able to get in there, potentially.

MR. BREWER: You've got it. I will give an example, and then I will state the con. When we were talking about specifically the number of guys and charter boat permits that we have in the South Atlantic for snapper grouper, the most recent data that we have, and I understand that Dr. Crabtree may have some updated stuff, is that it's 1,469. Of those, 886 are in the State of Florida, and I forgot to mention a little while ago that the Florida Guides Association, at our last meeting, in public comment, their Past President and their President came in and they gave very, very strong opposition to limited entry.

I bring that up because this is going to be a very, very controversial item, and I see us spending an inordinate amount of time on this, and then what is sure to follow, and Ben has already said it, is sector separation. He didn't state sector separation, but he made the statement about getting them out from under MRIP. The only way you can do that is through sector separation.

We have got several wars that are going to be going on, and I looked at sort of the timeline that Brian put in front of us yesterday, and six of your time units are devoted to this issue alone. I think that there is, in fact, very little public support. I think there is a lot of public opposition to this procedure.

The issue of better reporting, at the last meeting we had, that was the reason, that we were going to get better reporting. Well, we saw, from the study from the Gulf, that that's simply not the case. Remember that the study from the Gulf was on folks that were already on a limited entry program, and they were required to report. The reporting was so abysmal that they could not reach consensus, and they gave several recommendations, which are being followed by the Gulf. As we learned yesterday, the business practices that are within I guess it's SERO's Permit Office are the same for closed as they are for open, and a far more, I think, efficient and less controversial method of achieving better compliance, and particularly timely reporting, and that would be to work with that office.

As we go forward with our reporting amendment, to work with the SERO Permit Office on how to administratively enforce the timeliness of reporting. I am really, really concerned that we are going to get, for the next two years, wrapped around the axle on this issue and the issues that are sure to follow, and I think it's very -- I don't think it's the way for this council to go.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I want to give one last opportunity to anyone who hasn't spoken. Jessica, you haven't said anything. You're good? Okay. I want to wrap up the conversation. We have gone through defining the problems, we've gone through how limited entry might fix it, and some of the concerns. Clearly there is some opposing viewpoints on the other end of the table.

I just want folks to sort of frame the discussion that we're having as we move into consideration of the options that Brian is going to present to us. Then, when we go through that, we can talk about what public scoping document we would like the council to develop for us for consideration at our December meeting, where we can continue this conversation, because we're going to have lots of conversations on this as we move forward.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, that presumes that this council wants to continue with this process, and I would prefer that we determine whether the council does want to continue beyond today.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Fair enough. Can we have the options paper presented to us first? Okay. Brian, go ahead.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay, Madam Chair. This document appeared in your briefing book, and I think it's Document 8, Attachment 8. At the last council meeting, staff were directed to bring an options paper to this meeting to establish things that the council might consider if they decide to go ahead with a limited entry system for the three for-hire permits.

The council has considered limited entry permits in the past for the king mackerel and snapper grouper fisheries. It may not be necessarily in the for-hire sector, and so what I did was, just in a nutshell, is I went through all of the FMPs that the council was involved in through the past where I could find discussions of limited entry. Because the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP is a joint FMP, I pulled in those things from the Gulf that the council had seen before.

I don't want to spend all of your time going through all of the individual details of each of these amendments, but this is a good document that we can use as a reference in the future, when we talk about things that the council had done in the past, if you decide to go further ahead with this.

Just to let you know that there are for-hire limited access permits in the CMP fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. There was a for-hire vessel permit moratorium amendment, and then there was the king mackerel limited entry permit. Then, of course, we have our own Snapper Grouper Amendment 8 from 1997 that made the commercial permits limited access and created the two levels of permits, the full access and the 225-pound permits.

One of the things that, if you do decide that you want to go ahead and look at further development of a limited-entry permit, we have put together three possible ways that you can look at this for the future. If you do decide to go ahead with this, we recommend that your next step would be officially to go out to scoping. We would bring you a document in December that would have some things put together for you, hopefully something that might look like a scoping document, if you give us enough direction at this meeting that you would want that.

Basically, what we looked at here is there is a Level 1 that you could look at, which would be if you wanted to just consider limited entry for the snapper grouper fishery. You have got some issues there that could be addressed biologically through some limited-entry or for-hire permits, and there is some rationale for that, primarily for interaction with red snapper. There are some other things that you are facing in management that you could reduce pressure on the red snapper fishery and other snapper grouper species by having a for-hire permit moratorium or limited entry on this.

You could also consider mackerel cobia. You could add some economic and social benefits for the participants by adding mackerel cobia, but there also may be some issues related to cobia, that if you reduced the for-hire participation under the mackerel cobia permit that you might address some biological issues there.

Then dolphin wahoo, if you add in dolphin wahoo, that means now you're starting to add in -- Your jurisdiction goes much further, because the Mid-Atlantic and the New England Fishery Management Councils would also be involved, but there would be social and economic things as well. If you add the mackerel cobia permit in, it would also include the Gulf Council.

We kind of proposed that one of the decisions that, if you decide to go ahead, is you would need to decide which of those three permits or all of them or whatever that you would want to have included in here, but part of what we're thinking about is thinking ahead, and you have given some ideas already today of ideas for a purpose and need for the amendment. That was one of the things leaving the June meeting, is that we have to have some real reasons for doing this, and so you gave some reasons and stuff today, but that would be fleshed out later, in a purpose need.

The bottom line of what I did was I looked at all of those amendments and looked at the criteria for why they decided to go ahead and do this and what are the things that they did, and so I have given you some bullet statements here, towards the end of the document. Now, I am going to tell you that I forgot to mention that these other things, these three levels, that was added in discussions that Gregg and I had last week, after you all got your briefing book. We thought that that might help you. We just didn't send out the new document, thinking that you're bombarded enough already, and then other things came up as well, but we will make this available to you all if you want to have a copy of this document. That won't be a problem.

Some things that you would need to probably consider if you decide to go ahead with this, and these things could be turned potentially into actions or some could be combined together or some could be just tossed out altogether, because you don't think they're relevant, but I wanted to give you some ideas.

Will you all be creating new permits or are you going to somehow modify the current existing permits? What would be the criteria for getting a limited-entry permit? For example, things that were used in the past are how many years did a vessel have an open-access permit, what years did a vessel need to have as an open-access permit, and potentially landings criteria. That comes largely from commercial applications.

Will there be permits that won't be transferable, like we have with the snapper grouper 225-pound permit? That was made as a non-transferable permit to keep some historical participants in there thinking that those permits would eventually go away, and, surprisingly, they haven't gone away at the rate that people thought that they would, but nonetheless.

Will the limited-entry permits be transferable? The other issue to really think about is if a permit is transferred, can the number of allowable passengers on the vessel be modified at the time of transfer of the permit? Will there be any endorsements that would be associated with this? Will vessels have to be required to be marked in a certain way, to show that they have one of these permits? Will a permit be permanently revoked if they are not renewed, meaning that if somebody doesn't renew their permit, the actual number of permits then starts to go down?

You will need to think about an appeals process for those that are not selected to get one of these permits, and one thing that was added that was not in the original list that Anna brought up was would the council want to consider some sort of a permit moratorium in the meantime, while they're working on such an amendment?

The council needs to give direction to staff. I think the big thing that Doug brought up is the council just needs to decide if you want to move forward with an amendment to even look at these things right now, but, if you do decide to, I gave you these ideas of some things that you might want to consider that could end up going into a scoping document or something that we would bring back to you. In writing this document, I was thinking about it in terms of, in December, the timing on this would be we would come back to you with some kind of a draft document that would be either the scoping document or something very similar to that. It could be modified after the December meeting, but give you an idea of the kinds of topics and ideas that we would discuss with the public in scoping, which would be then in January or February of next year, and, Madam Chair, that's all I have for the options paper.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I had something from Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just a quick note that I expect that the control date notice that you all took action on and that was subsequently sent to the Service will publish perhaps even next week, but in that is a thirty-day comment period, and so the Fisheries Service invites public comment on the actual notice from members of the public. I wasn't sure if you were aware of that.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Now I'm going to open up discussion about how you guys would like to move forward as the next step. Brian gave us some options, some different levels, if we want to consider moving forward with this for snapper grouper or multiple permits or all the permits. Doug brought up that that presumes that we're moving forward at all, and so I think now I'm going to permit open discussion on what this council would like to see happen next.

MR. BOWEN: Brian, I appreciate that presentation and the questions and all. As you were going through it, I was kind of outlining it in my mind, and I appreciate that. This is just a scoping document, ladies and gentlemen. **This is not a decision document, and so I'm going to go ahead and make a motion that the council move forward and look for a scoping document at the December meeting, if I can get a second.**

MS. BECKWITH: There is a motion. It's seconded by Ben. Is there discussion?

MR. BREWER: This is much different, and so it is a substitute motion.

MS. BECKWITH: That is certainly your right. Give us a moment to let Brian get the original motion up on the board. Okay. Chester, go ahead.

MR. BREWER: **I move that we postpone indefinitely any discussion of or work on limited-entry permits for the South Atlantic for-hire industry.** When I say "industry", I am speaking of both charter for-hire and headboats.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester has made a substitute motion. Brian will finish typing it up and allow us to try and read it. The substitute motion is on the board. I would need a second to that motion. Jessica seconds. Is there discussion on this motion?

MR. HAYMANS: Chester, the word "indefinitely" is the part that really I have got trouble with. Would you consider removing "indefinitely"?

MR. BREWER: I am going for my green card here. When you postpone something indefinitely, it means you're not setting a time for it to come back. It can be brought back at any time by motion, and that motion would only have to carry by a majority, and so this doesn't kill this, but it's saying we're not going to deal with it right now. If it's an issue that becomes important and we find out that there's huge overcapacity, then it could be brought back up. The issue of limited-entry permits can be brought back up. It's just brought back up by motion. The motion to bring it back up only needs a majority vote.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you for that clarification.

DR. CRABTREE: The problem is, Chester, how are we going to figure out if there's overcapacity or any other issues there if we postpone it and don't look at it? It seems to me that's part of what we would do now in developing a scoping document, is to take some look at it and try to get some indication of how many trips are being taken and get some gauge of that. To just postpone it means that we're not going to do anything with it, and so I don't know how we will ever come to the answers of those questions.

MR. BROWN: I would like to make a second substitute motion. I learned this one in the Gulf. **I would like to adjust the control date for any future limited-entry to be January 1 of 2017.**

MS. BECKWITH: That is out of order, because it's not pertaining to our current discussion.

MR. BROWN: Madam Chair, it would directly impact my consideration on any voting, and so I am making this motion so that I can feel more comfortable about the direction that I would vote.

MS. BECKWITH: Is there a second? Tim seconds. Is there discussion?

DR. CRABTREE: You understand, Mark, that if the council does go forward with limited entry that they don't have to stand by the control date and they can in fact move it forward. You create a bit of a problem when you ask for a particular control date, and then, before we even get it published, you're wanting to change it.

MR. BROWN: I understand.

DR. DUVAL: I wouldn't support this motion. Given what Monica said, I think it would be wise to get the public comment that we would have on the control date that you all decided to establish at the last council meeting and then, considering that public comment, the council could come back and make any adjustments that they wanted to to the control date down the road, and that would be my advice.

MR. HARTIG: Ditto.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was just commenting that when you did the dolphin wahoo amendment, when it came out of the committee here, you said to wait like eighteen months to do something else. You're just going out to the for-hire, which I think is kind of great, for electronic monitoring and electronic logbooks, and now you're going to tell them that, hey, you probably won't be able to fish or may not and we're developing this. Back to what Mel was saying, and it's like you've already done one thing. Somehow, you've got to have a cooling-off period or something going on before you can do the next thing. I mean you can probably do whatever you want, because it's the votes of the council that kind of goes with the rationale, but you're just asking the for-hire to do electronic monitoring, and now you're going to go tell them that there's a possibility that you ain't going fishing.

MR. BOWEN: Dewey, to your point, I don't think that's really accurate, but we can save that debate for later. I would ask the council to keep in mind that, as Chester mentioned earlier, when we were going over the council staff and their workload, I guess, and Gregg or Brian yesterday, one of them, said that they had full enough time to do what we were asking. Like Chester said, we had six blocks donated to this. We have the staff to do it, and I think now is the time.

MR. CONKLIN: It just seems to me like the problem with a lot of the public comments, and I know we already had a prior conversation, was people were angry because they felt like they were sidelined, and that if they were going to buy another boat that they couldn't for sure stay in the fishery, if they were growing their business right now. I don't think we should support changing the control date just because we haven't had time to have it published, but we have a lot of people paying attention to this right now. It's put a lot of people on notice. The control date has done what it's supposed to do and will do what it's supposed to do.

At this point, I think it's going to be up to guys, if they want to get in the fishery or even have an idea about it, that they need to get the permits, still apply for them, because it's still open. If we need to circle back around and take care of a motion like this at a later date to accommodate the individuals that really had the reservations with this, then we could do that at a later time, and so I couldn't vote for this right now.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would like to hear from scoping, providing we go that way, and, to Roy's point, we're moving way too fast in moving control dates around.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. We're going to vote. The motion that we are voting on is the substitute substitute motion to adjust the control date for any future limited entry to be January 1 of 2017. **All those in favor, please raise your hands, two in favor; all opposed, nine opposed. The motion fails.**

Now we're going to jump back up to the substitute motion, and we are going to vote on the substitute motion. If this passes, then it would become the main motion. We are going to open up discussion, because we didn't have much discussion on this motion. Go ahead.

MR. BREWER: I watched what went on in the Gulf. I watched it for I guess going on three years now, and where this leads is not even finished yet, because Monica tells me that the Amendment 40 in the Gulf lawsuit is set for oral argument in the 11th Circuit on October 1. They are still in litigation over it. I bring that up only to point out that this is extremely, extremely controversial, and where it leads is even more controversial.

At least to my mind, if you do a cost/benefit analysis on going down this road, the cost is very high, not only of the council's time, but staff's time and, in all probability, legal staff's time. What are the benefits? Maybe we will get more timely data or maybe we'll get better compliance with a reporting amendment that we don't even have in place yet that we will somehow or another fix an overcapacity problem that we heard about. At least me, the first time I heard that was today, and it's not even -- We had some raw figures that were put forth, but there's been no study that there's an overcapacity problem in the South Atlantic. What I really want to take -- My thinking is, again, cost/benefit. What's the cost and what are you going to get out of it? The costs far, far outweigh the benefit.

DR. CRABTREE: I want to respond to some of what Chester just brought up. What's going on in the Gulf has nothing to do with this. Sector separation wasn't a logical outcome of going to limited entry. Sector separation arose because many of the Gulf states, now all of them, simply opened up their state waters to these extremely long seasons and, because I guess all of the states

now have a nine-mile jurisdiction, that threw the whole management of red snapper into a pretty chaotic state. We don't have any of that over here, and so that's completely different.

Then the business about the litigation, all of the litigation in the Gulf has nothing to do with limited entry in the for-hire sector. It is all based on Section 407(d) of the Magnuson Act, which specifically only applies to Gulf red snapper and has nothing to do with us, and so that's a completely unrelated issue.

As for the overcapacity, Chester, we have no analysis to tell us if we have overcapacity or not, and you're just speculating about a cost/benefit result, because there's been no cost/benefit analysis done. If we postpone all of this, we won't know how either of those come out, and so I just wanted to make those points.

MR. BOWEN: To combat Chester's argument about the cost/benefit, the benefit is the fishery. That's what we're here to serve and manage. The benefit is the fishery, and that's what we really need to be thinking about. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: If this motion was to fail, I am guessing that your bullet points of pros and cons would go out as part of the scoping, so that, when we got comment back, the public could kind of see a larger picture of the pluses and minuses of what may happen, and I would feel a little more confident, should it go to scoping, if it was explained, and I know the staff is going to explain it as much as they can, but I kind of like the pros and cons, if we end up going to scoping. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: I don't think I can support this motion, and really what I can't support about it is the "postpone indefinitely", and I understand what Chester said about bringing something back up again, but it seems to really put us in a bit of a box. I could understand if you wanted to postpone consideration of an amendment until a particular step had occurred or something like that, but I can't support postponing indefinitely any discussion of or work on limited entry permits.

I understand that it can be brought back up, but I am more with Charlie. It is a very controversial issue. I am not denying that. I think what I've heard from folks in North Carolina is they're pretty divided. There are pockets of people who support it and there are pockets of folks who are split 50/50 on it. Yes, it surfaced during the port meetings for snapper grouper, and I think I would prefer to probably take something to scoping, so that we could make a more informed decision. If the feedback we get back is overwhelming, then we might want to reconsider it, but I will not support this motion. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: That's one of the things about this motion too that I was kind of wondering about, is the fact that we don't have the for-hire reporting requirements in place for all the different states. If that was in place, it would make a lot of difference too, and I tend to wonder whether or not we're putting the cart before the horse before we do that.

MS. BECKWITH: Last word, Chester.

MR. BREWER: I don't have any objection to taking the word "indefinitely" out of there. I used that word because that is the terminology that is used in Roberts Rules of Order. If we say "postpone", simply say "postpone", I have no objection to making that change, and I will look to my seconder over there to see if Doug has any --

MS. BECKWITH: The seconder doesn't matter. It's just consent of the council. Is there consent to take out the "indefinitely"? Okay. How does that work? Somebody help me out. It's a motion to amend, which requires a second, right? Help me.

DR. CRABTREE: Just from a practical standpoint, you can't tie the council's hands into the future, and so whether you have "indefinitely" in there or you don't, it's the same thing. You are postponing this until someone on this council makes a motion to bring it back up. That's the case, whether it says "indefinitely" or not, and so it really doesn't make any difference.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Our Council Chair suggests we simply vote on this, and so we'll go with that. **All those in favor of the motion, which is postpone indefinitely any discussion of or work on limited-entry permits for the South Atlantic for-hire industry, charter/headboat, please raise your hands, three in favor; opposed, nine opposed. The motion fails.**

Let's go back to the first motion, which is direct staff to develop a scoping document for the December 2016 council meeting. Essentially, this is actually the same thing. We either have staff create the scoping document or, if this motion fails, then we wouldn't develop a scoping document for the December 2016 meeting, and so that's my understanding of it.

DR. DUVAL: Just as part of the discussion, directing staff to develop a scoping document for the December 2016 council meeting, that means that there would be a document before us at the December council meeting to consider. There would need to be a motion by the council to send that scoping document out for public comment in December, and so we wouldn't be sending anything out to scoping today, and my understanding for how we've been conducting our scoping meetings is via webinar, correct?

DR. CHEUVRONT: That's what we've been doing on a lot of things, but this one is pretty controversial, and we've talked about maybe going out and doing scoping in-person, when we do the regular public hearings, because I think we're going to catch an earful.

MS. BECKWITH: Are we still in discussion?

MR. BELL: I was just going to say that I share some of Chester's concerns, but, to Roy's point, I would like to learn more, and so I don't want to stifle our ability to learn a little more here, and if a scoping -- That's what scoping is about, is kind of getting -- It's like Chris said. The issue is out there. We're going to get an earful one way or the other, but that's the value I see in scoping at this point, is simply to help us further consider it, but I do share concerns related to -- Specifically, we're about to engage this same community in a let's work together and get better data, and I really don't want to see this kind of sour things for that, and that's a personal, perhaps, issue.

MS. BECKWITH: Good points.

MR. BROWN: I voice the same opinion as Mel. Also, I agree with Brian that I think that it should go out in-person. Anyway, I think that it is controversial enough that we will need to engage the stakeholders in-person and just get some good feedback. That way, we can make a good, decisive decision.

DR. DUVAL: I think, based on the concerns that Mel has expressed and Mark has expressed, I think you could include in the scoping document as one of those questions you want to ask the public, in terms of timing of these types of actions, and ask for some public input on establishing the charter electronic reporting first and then taking a look at limited entry afterwards. I mean that's something that you could get some public comment on, and I guess I would also remind folks that this is why you scope things. You want to get public input on issues. Then you can make a decision as to how and whether to move forward.

MR. BELL: Can the scoping also -- Can we really try to hone in on the for-hire community, to get specific -- I want to make sure we hear from them.

MR. HAYMANS: I personally don't believe that a scoping document is necessary to inform this council of some of the decisions that we need to start with. We've got some information on logbook compliance from the logbook studies that are out there. We could get better information on capacity without having to go to scoping. We could get some idea of illegal operations from LE from what's been -- We can get some information on the business practices first, before we take this out to public scoping, before we stir everything up.

All of those things may help inform our decision on whether to go out, but we're planning on taking something to the December meeting that may or may not have all of that information in it. I doubt that Brian would have an opportunity to do a capacity or overcapitalization paper between now and then or Chip or John or whoever the person may be. To me, we don't need a scoping document to answer some of those questions now.

MS. BECKWITH: What I am hearing Doug say is if we don't move this to scoping, then you would still like to see a discussion occur at the December meeting just to further continue discussion on limited entry. Is that what you are suggesting?

MR. HAYMANS: It could be inferred, yes. I said on the record last time that I'm not opposed to limited entry, in concept, but there is an awful lot of issues that this council, to me, needs to beat through first, before we stir the pot. Dewey brought it up, and Mel has brought it up and several others, but for-hire topped by limited entry, I know I'm not ready to go there.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I think we're ready to vote. The motion is direct staff to develop a scoping document for the December 2016 council meeting. **All those in favor, please raise your hands, eight in favor; all those opposed, four opposed. The motion passes.**

MR. BOWEN: I would like to make a motion that we ask staff to contact the federal permit holders and ask their opinion of limited entry. It's like Mel said. We need to hear from the people that actually are involved in the business. Maybe that's not the right way to word it, but they need to be asked.

MS. BECKWITH: The motion dies for lack of a second. Is there any other business to come before this ginormous committee?

DR. DUVAL: Just to this issue, I think we've heard from Mel and from Doug about additional information that they would like to see, and so staff has made notes of this additional information,

and I think that, in the direction to staff, whatever they can accomplish between now and the December council meeting, include in that document that we would see.

Putting things in documents is how we get information, and so if we're not satisfied with the information that's in that document in December, then we don't have to approve it to scoping, if there is additional information that we would like to see. I just want to assure everybody that we're trying to get the information we need in as deliberative a manner as possible, and so I am very sensitive to those concerns, and I am sensitive that this, thus far, has been something of a divided issue. Is everyone okay with that?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I would just make note that if you guys can take into consideration timing needs for some of these discussions at the December meeting, when we schedule the Dolphin Committee.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, we know we need a lot of time for this.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I would love to not have to ride the crowd quite so diligently. Mark, last word and then we are done.

MR. BROWN: I will be quick. I have a question for Gregg. I would have seconded Zack's motion if I had known whether or not that you could send a mail-out or something to the permit holders and ask their opinion on this.

MR. WAUGH: That's a bit of a divided opinion now. We have certain leeway that we as a council can conduct certain inquiries of the public, but it's a fine line we have to walk with doing any sort of official surveys, and I'm sure that Monica would like to weigh in on that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just very quickly, Gregg is right. There is some legal issues involved with the hoops you have to go through to conduct surveys. Maybe what you want to do is, when the Federal Register notice comes out, blast that to all permit holders, because that asks for a -- It requests public comment, but that's one thing that you can think about, doing something like that, and then you're not going through the legal road, and it's very windy, on what you have to do to conduct a survey.

MR. BROWN: Do we need a motion to do that or can you just do that?

MR. WAUGH: We can just do that, and my understanding would be, if the decision is to go out to scoping, that we would then send the scoping document to all permit holders, and we can certainly do that, yes.

MR. BELL: That was my concern. I just wanted to make sure that they knew about it, because I was getting the sense that it was like what's going on? I realize the word is going to get around, but I wanted to make sure they knew what was going on, and that's a good way to do that.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. If there is no other business, then I conclude the mega joint committee.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Anna. Well done. Next, we are going to move to the Protected Resources Committee Report and Dr. Laney and Mr. Collier.

DR. LANEY: The Protected Resources Committee met on September 15 and had an extremely efficient meeting, thanks to Jennifer Lee and Chip Collier and Bob Beal, who all gave updates on various and sundry topics. The NMFS updates related to the electric ray and request to list. NMFS found the request did not meet listing requirements. Jenny also reported to us on the proposed rule DEIS to require turtle excluder devices in skimmer trawls, which will publish by December 15.

The 2017 MMPA List of Fisheries is coming out, and NMFS is proposing to add the Florida Keys stock of bottlenose dolphins to that list. The critical habitat designation for Atlantic sturgeon will potentially be completed late May or early June 2017. In the Gulf, the Alabama shad should have a twelve-month listing finding completed in January 2017.

The snapper grouper biological opinion is in review and should be finalized in the next two to three weeks. Nassau grouper were listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, due to decline in the population abundance, and in part because of targeting the species at spawning aggregations outside of U.S. waters and also due to limited enforcement in some foreign countries. The next steps include determining whether and where critical habitat should be designated and if a 4(d) rule is needed.

Mr. Beal gave us an update on the Atlantic Sturgeon Update. The bottom line there is the assessment is on schedule and should be completed in 2017, and we're all pretty excited about the fact that they're working on a new model. Actually, Dr. Jared Flowers of the North Carolina DMF staff is working on that. That uses acoustic tagging data to assess Atlantic sturgeon. The model also is going to include assessment at three different population levels, those being coast-wide, at the DPS level, and also within specific river systems, where data permit.

Finally, I gave an update on the red knot critical habitat. The bottom line there is it's scheduled to be completed in September of 2017, although that schedule could change if some potential litigates follow through with their notices of intent. The committee did not vote on any motions, and there are no actions or recommendations to the council. Consequently, there are no directions to staff. Madam Chairman, that concludes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Wilson. I appreciate that. The next report is Advisory Panel Selection. We will turn things over to Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Advisory Panel Selection Committee met on September 13, 2016, in closed session. The committee reviewed applications for seats on the following advisory panels: Dolphin Wahoo, Information & Education, Law Enforcement, Mackerel Cobia, SEDAR Pool, and Snapper Grouper. They also provided recommendations for appointments to the council.

The committee discussed the need to have representation on the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel to specifically address cobia management issues and provided recommendations for creating a Cobia Sub-panel of the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel and members to serve on the sub-panel. The committee provided guidance to staff of the intent to allow members of the sub-panel to also remain eligible to serve on the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel if appointed. Madam Chair, I will not call, obviously, for seconds with regard to any of these motions. We've got sixteen of them.

I will read out the different motions and call for discussion, if necessary, and then see if there is consensus or any objections. If necessary, we will have a vote by hand.

Motion Number 1 is reappoint Chris Burrows to the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection? That motion is approved.**

Appoint Jon Reynolds to the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Next, appoint Kenny Moore to the Information & Education Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Motion Number 4 is appoint Cinthia Sandoval to the commercial seat on the Information & Education Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion passes or is approved.**

Appoint Felton Jenkins to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Motion Number 6 is re-advertise the commercial seat on the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Next is create a Cobia Sub-Panel for the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel and include one representative from each South Atlantic state and Virginia. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection?**

MR. BROWN: I had a little bit of discussion. I just wanted to clarify again that the five members that are going to be added to this sub-panel that they will be members of the Mackerel Committee and have voting rights on that committee as well, and is that clear? The Mackerel AP.

MR. BREWER: Cobia Mackerel, and my understanding is that yes, they will be able to vote. Now, it may be that they're not going to -- The sub-panel that's being created is cobia specific, and they may not choose or whatever to attend full mackerel cobia meetings, but it's my understanding that yes, they are voting members.

MR. BROWN: Will they be engaged in the conversation? Will they be able to access the AP meeting at the same time and engage with the AP members, just as if they were there?

MR. BREWER: My understanding is, yes, if they choose to attend.

MR. BROWN: I just want to make sure that -- Each one of the representatives from each state is a purely recreational fisherman. Would that make the mix of commercial and recreational or charter for-hire very skewed on this AP now?

MR. BREWER: I don't remember right now what the mix was between recreational and commercial on the sub-panel. I don't remember. I am not able to answer your question, and I'm sorry.

DR. DUVAL: I think more of the members of the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel, as a whole, are commercial representatives, and so I think we were trying to address the fact that we have this pretty big, important recreational fishery in providing a means by which people could engage in those discussions, and so I think that's why all the folks who were recommended for appointment are recreational representatives on that sub-panel, and I think, as we discussed yesterday during Executive Finance, I think if we feel like, down the road, that the finances allow for it, that sub-panel could simply be merged with the full Mackerel Cobia AP.

Those are full members of the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel, and I think the thinking was that if we wanted to be able to have the opportunity to convene this sub-panel specifically just to address cobia issues, such as when the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission public information document comes out of their -- When the draft fishery management plan comes out, that would be an ideal way to do so without having to convene an entire Mackerel Cobia AP meeting, but I would expect that those recommendations or votes coming from that sub-panel would go forward to the full advisory panel.

MR. WAUGH: If you look at the Draft Executive Finance Committee Report, there is some wording in there too that clarifies how this group is going to work, and we can certainly, as Michelle has said, fine-tune this over time, but the intent was to work with them more intensively over the next couple of years, given that we're going to have a lot going on with cobia.

MR. BREWER: Any further questions or discussion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

Next, Motion 8 is appoint Wes Blow to the Virginia seat on the Cobia Sub-Panel. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

Motion Number 9 is appoint Bill Gorham to the North Carolina seat on the Cobia Sub-Panel. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

Motion Number 10 is appoint Howard Ellis, Jr. to the South Carolina seat on the Cobia Sub-Panel. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

Motion Number 11 is appoint Bill Weeks to the Georgia seat on the Cobia Sub-Panel. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

Motion 12 is re-advertise the Florida seat for the Cobia Sub-Panel. Any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

Motion 13 is appoint Stephen Donalson to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

Motion 14 is re-advertise the NGO seat and two open seats on the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? **Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

Motion 15 is appoint Steve Shelley, Wiley Coppersmith, Michael Schmidtke, and Captain Aaron Kelly to the SEDAR Pool. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion passes.

Motion 16 is re-advertise for the North Carolina open seat on the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any objection?

MR. BOWEN: I object.

MR. BREWER: You object? Okay. Then we have to have a vote. Given that there is an objection, is there any further discussion? **Could I please see a show of hands of those in favor of Motion 16, which is to re-advertise for the North Carolina open seat on the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel, ten in favor; those opposed, one. The motion carries.** The directions to staff were simply, for those seats that are to be re-advertised, that they please go ahead and re-advertise those seats. Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Chester. The next committee is SSC Selection Committee. We will turn things over to Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, thank you. The SSC Selection Committee met on September 13. The SSC Selection Committee considered SSC appointments. The motions are as follows. Motion 1 is move to make the term of the additional seat for this initial appointment. On behalf of the committee, I so move.

MR. WAUGH: Charlie, you need to read the motion itself exactly how it is, please.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. **Motion 1 is move to make the term of the additional seat one year for this initial appointment. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, the motion is approved.**

Motion 2 is move to appoint Peter Barile to the SSC for a one-year term. The motion failed in committee. **Motion 3 is move to re-advertise the SSC vacancy once a conflict of interest policy is developed and reconsider the appointment at the June meeting. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion?

MR. HAYMANS: Just a question regarding Motion 1 as it relates to Motion 3. Whoever we appoint after the re-advertisement, that position is going to be for one year, and is that correct?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Based on that motion though, I suppose you could change your mind at a later meeting.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any other discussion? Then I will note that I guess we could change that if we want to at the December meeting, should the committee so desire. **Seeing no further discussion, do I have any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion is approved and adopted.** Madam Chair, that's our committee.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Charlie. The next committee report is the SEDAR Committee. The SEDAR Committee received updates on SEDAR projects and considered guidance for the next

SEDAR Steering Committee meeting. The committee was informed that the recent age workshop for blueline tilefish as part of SEDAR 50 concluded that reliable ages could not be assigned to structures at this time. The project will proceed as scheduled, with a January 2017 Data Workshop and SSC review in October 2017.

We received a presentation from Erik Williams on the research track proposal, via webinar. The committee supported moving ahead with that pilot plan for the 2018 scamp assessment. Efforts to increase assessment productivity are supported and encouraged, as long as opportunities for public involvement and data evaluation are retained. The committee supported the assessment priorities approved at the prior meeting and requested conducting the next assessment of tilefish sooner if an opening arises earlier in 2019. There were no motions were made by the committee.

MS. BECKWITH: I would like to make a motion to change in the stock assessment schedule -- I would like to flip-flop cobia and white grunt. If I can get a second, I will give my reasoning.

DR. DUVAL: Second by Zack.

MS. BECKWITH: My concerns, I have stated them earlier, but I am concerned that we have had multiple changes in management, or will be having multiple changes in management, and now we're looking at a change, potentially, to the start date of the fishing year, and I just feel that, given all of the rosy assessments that we have recently received, that moving into an assessment with all those changes and one year of exceptionally high landings and just the high level of uncertainty, as well as some research that is being done now by Dr. John Graves from VIMS -- He has seven satellite tags out, that he put out this August, that he will have some information on in six months. Then he intends on putting another ten out next August that will give us some additional information that I think would be helpful for the next assessment.

For all those reasons, I just feel like we can wait a bit, recognizing that we will be having a stock assessment workshop and that might influence it, but we have the ability to make changes to management through our framework amendment if we feel the need, based on some of that, while we wait for a future assessment, just like we're about to do with red grouper.

MR. HAYMANS: Just to clarify, since I don't have the table in front of me, your motion would move white grunt ahead of cobia?

MS. BECKWITH: Right. The slot that white grunt is right now is in 2020, and our slot for cobia in in 2018, and so I would just be flip-flopping them in the schedule.

MR. HAYMANS: I would just note, on behalf of the poor old white grunt, that that is the first time I have ever seen it moved forward in the schedule.

DR. DUVAL: Any other discussion on this motion? I would like to just ask John to kind of review how this chart that you see in front of you kind of moves through the SEDAR Steering Committee process. I mean our recommendations are not always what ends up happening.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That is true, and this is a request, and it hasn't been reviewed by the Steering Committee. Most important, we haven't heard back from the Science Center with regard to what they really think about any of those things in the red and whether or not they can

accommodate them. The cobia, being in 2018, will use data through 2017, at the most recent, and so it's most likely that scheduling it in 2018, as it is, would not include recent management actions that you guys are taking that may take effect sometime in 2018 or mid-2017 somewhere.

If you moved it back, you would have a chance to use some of that, and there is also work being done by Florida to try and better define the movements within that area of northern Florida, in the southern zone of what we consider the northern portion of the stock now, that they hope to have done for this assessment.

I guess there is a little bit of uncertainty as to the white grunt. Moving that up might cause some concerns with the Science Center. Again, we haven't heard, but really with the workload, because we're planning the research track experiment of scamp there, and white grunt is already known to have two or maybe three stocks. We know there is a stock ID issue there, and so just to let you guys know that it may be one of those things where if white grunt moves up, if that takes more resources, there might be more consequences than simply the impact of cobia. Those are just the kinds of things that will be discussed at the Steering Committee when we get to this.

MR. BELL: John, if we did this, is there a chance -- If it could be accommodated, is there a chance that you would get kind of a better informed cobia assessment, assuming things go into place and it has sort of had a year or so to stabilize? Could you see that being useful to getting kind of a decent cobia assessment out of it?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Perhaps. I tend to not put a whole lot of stock in what single terminal year is going to do. In most cases, we feel like you need a couple of years to really understand what impact a management action might have. There can always be weather and other species and a myriad of other issues that always come up when we try to understand how a regulation affects a fishery. Whether or not one year is going to really tell us all that much, it's really kind of too soon to tell.

MR. BELL: 2017 was the terminal year now, and if you flipped it to 2020, the terminal year would only go to 2018 and it wouldn't be 2019?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It would probably go to 2019, and so you would pick up two years.

MR. BELL: So it would pick up two years, you're assuming? Okay.

MR. BOWEN: That was my question. If this came down to it, and it was just asked and answered, but, if cobia went to 2020, what would the terminal year be?

MR. PHILLIPS: When does the Steering Committee meet that would talk about the ramifications of this?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Tuesday and Wednesday of next week.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am thinking that we might want to tentatively schedule a swap, depending on what the Steering Committee tells us, and then we make the decision in December.

DR. DUVAL: I think there's going to be lots of feedback that we'll need to get from the Science Center. We have expressed our priorities before, and those may or may not be able to be accommodated. I think my concern in potentially bumping cobia all the way back to 2020 is that we have a lot of constituents that are very concerned about what they see as a pretty small annual catch limit and they would like to see reconsideration of this stock assessment, and so I just throw that out there for folks to consider and just the knowledge that you might not end up with the timing that you ask for.

MR. CONKLIN: I wasn't going to bring this up, but, with the Steering Committee meeting quickly approaching, with the species ID with white grunt that John had mentioned and coming through other assessments with a species ID historically on other species, would it behoove us to request that the grunts be assessed all together as grunts instead of white grunt? This may not be the place to bring it up, but I wanted to put it on the record if we're going to have that meeting next week.

MR. CARMICHAEL: As in you would like to see them attempt to assess all of the grunts, however many species there are?

MR. CONKLIN: On our commercial trip reports, there is a section that says "grunts" that runs vertical on the page, and then there's three or four different types. With the species ID, and I've even seen fisheries observers that have to go in their book when they see a grunt and they say, well, this is a bluestripe or this is a French or this is a white, and they call the white a bluestripe. Stuff like that, which I can really see us running into some problems, and something like that could be an even bigger problem on down the road, and I just wanted to bring that up.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Assessing them all as a unit would not fly in peer review, in today's world, really. That was something that was commonly done in the sharks, because of species ID concerns, the same reasons. Under SEDAR and a more rigorous peer review, every one of those shark complex assessments has been soundly rejected, because each individual species might be contributing differently to the productivity and within a single year, and all you get is this generalized smearing. You really don't feel like you get any sort of information on productivity when you try to combine a whole bunch of species together and so, yes, right now, where things stand, we don't have methods that sort of allow you to do that. The single species methods end up not working together when they're all just aggregated.

MS. BECKWITH: My interest is seeing cobia in that 2020 slot, but if there is another species that the Steering Committee would deem appropriate, I am not tied to white grunt, but I just simply want to see cobia backed up a little bit, for all the reasons expressed before.

DR. DUVAL: I think we can talk to the folks on the Steering Committee and talk to the Science Center to say there are these research projects that are going on and we would like to be able to incorporate this information and here's when we think this is going to be tied up and how could we time it to incorporate that information, and that might be a better question.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I would ask what are your real priorities, because, presumably, our assumption is that the Science Center has looked at this request that we put forth in June and has already given some thought to how workload would be managed and how lead assessment folks would be managed. Now, you don't want to -- You want those people who worked on cobia last

time to be the people working on cobia this time, and the same for like greater amberjack and red porgy and all these other standards that we've had requested.

I think what would be best would be to say if you want to consider delaying cobia, what really are your priorities that you would like to see done in 2018? It doesn't have to be a white grunt benchmark. Are you more interested in Spanish mackerel or tilefish? We already mentioned about moving tilefish up. Would you rather see that one elevated or would you rather see gag or would you rather see some of these stocks that are scheduled as updates a little bit later, and so I think you may have actually other priorities that you have in mind that you would really like to be done, and it would be more helpful to know what those may be.

MR. HARTIG: In tilefish, the 2012 year class was the one, and we need six years to get that one into the assessment, and so that's going to be critical, that we go in at least six years after 2012, to be able to see that year class, because we didn't get any information on it in the last assessment, and we need it in this one.

MR. DUVAL: That would put that at more like 2019.

MR. BROWN: John, how far out is scamp?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Scamp is going to be done in 2018 as the research track pilot, and we're looking at Gulf and South Atlantic scamp together. That's this assessment here.

DR. DUVAL: We have a motion on the floor.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Did you get a second?

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: Zack seconded it, yes. It might be better to ask if cobia could be backed up, in order to accommodate additional research that is ongoing, and that might provide a little bit more flexibility.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I'm fine with that. Again, the intent is just to see cobia hopefully, potentially, just a little bit later and allow some of the recent fisheries to stabilize, to allow some of this effort control that we've put into place to take hold and certainly to allow some of the research that's ongoing to be fully vetted.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Are there any that you would like to identify as priorities for 2019 or 2018?

MR. PHILLIPS: I am guessing that what we'll do is get a report back from the Steering Committee in December and with some input from them on what could be moved up, so they get the right scientists working on the right projects. I don't want to definitely say delay it until I hear from the Steering Committee to tell me what makes sense. Do you know what I'm saying? I don't know how to vote for this.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The challenge is the Steering Committee really needs to finalize the 2018 schedule here in the fall of 2016, because these things get started six months or so more in advance.

You guys have to approve terms of reference schedules and make participants and we have to find hotel spaces and all of that stuff. It gets very, very difficult if we're trying to figure out in March for an April or May Steering Committee meeting exactly what it is that we're going to do in 2018. Most likely, we sort of lose the first half of 2018, in that scenario, and we look at something being done in later 2018.

That's why if you guys have any of those other stocks that you think are more important, going to the Steering Committee next week and saying this is the stock that we would like to do, we have a good chance of getting that through, and it also gives us a chance to let the Steering Committee folks know that, hey, this is what the council would like to see done alternatively to cobia. They can come to the Steering Committee really working to do that, and I think we've had instances in the past where we're made changes late in the game. As a result, we've kind of lost some productivity. We've lost the slots.

The other thing we have to remember is these are age-based assessments. People have to read age structures, and that's another reason we have to get out of this. If you go in and we tell folks that we want to do one of those other stocks that maybe the age people aren't looking ahead to, then we cut six months off of their time to get the ages done and they may not be able to catch up.

DR. DUVAL: I think a motion to delay until a date certain concerns me a little bit, because I think it might be better to put forward a request to examine the feasibility of delaying cobia by a year and perhaps -- I am looking at gag in the 2019 slot right now, a standard assessment for gag, and it might be more appropriate to ask the Science Center what's the feasibility of moving up a gag standard and moving back the cobia benchmark and get a response to that. I think delaying until a date certain doesn't necessarily mean that you're going to get what you want.

MR. BELL: I would just say that part of that too is there is the mechanics of all of this and what works or what makes sense, priority-wise, but then part of my assumption too is that 2015 was a rather odd year and, in 2016, states incorporated changes. In 2017, we may incorporate changes, and so a better quality product might result from waiting until -- If they could maybe comment on that. That's my assumption. That's my reason for kind of thinking this is a good idea. If that's not the case --

MR. CARMICHAEL: If you could do something and say you want to have it done so it includes data through 2019, so that it bridges the various data changes, then that might mean it's 2020 or 2021, whenever it gets scheduled, or maybe really late in 2019, depending on the data situation, but if you set a terminal year by which you would like to have the data, based on the various management changes that have happened and you foresee happening, at least it gives some reason as to why you are doing this change, because you know it was about -- Certainly from March through June, we heard an awful lot of cries for a new cobia assessment, and I think you guys may hear more about that, let's just say.

MS. BECKWITH: I like that idea. I do like the idea of the terminal year information for 2019. I think that would encompass most of the studies that we've heard about, and I understand that the stakeholders are concerned and they want a new stock assessment, but we understand the process better than the majority of the public, and we understand the concerns that some of our assessments have brought to us recently and what we have to work with, and, if we have some more information, we may get a better product out of it and maybe, if we don't and we just let this move

on -- People are frustrated by our current ACL, but I would assume that they would be more frustrated if the assessment comes back with an overfished or overfishing status, which, of course, we have no idea, but we can certainly see that that might -- That could be a concern, and so a little bit more data and a slightly later terminal year might better inform the actual status of the stock.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am going to go on the assumption, which is scary, that if the Steering Committee says we can't really practically do this, that we can't move the gag up or whatever, that it doesn't practically fit in the schedule, that we just won't do it. I am guessing that's the way this works. This is a request, if it works. If it doesn't really work and the Steering Committee says there is too many things that is already set in motion, then we just won't do that. Is that the way this will work?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and deletions are pretty absolute. There is no reason for the Science Center to say, no, we're really going to do that assessment when you say we don't want it done yet. I would say, by this motion, what would happen is cobia would be delayed, and I don't think the Steering Committee would debate that with much detail, and they would then look at other things that they have going on and evaluate if gag could come in and move in its slot, and so that would be the remaining uncertainty, whether or not gag could go in or whether or not maybe something else slips up, based on what the collective knowledge of the Steering Committee reps is.

MR. PHILLIPS: I guess that gets to the other point that you made. We don't want to lose any slots. We don't want to lose any of our -- I mean we're so far behind on assessments anyway, and we don't want to lose any. I am very sensitive to what Anna says. The assessments that we've been getting lately have not been helpful, but it's a tradeoff. Do we possibly lose spots or do we possibly get an assessment that we don't think we're going to like, and I would rather not lose the spots, personally.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I don't think you will lose the spots. It just would be up to primarily Gregg and Michelle to negotiate with the Science Center, based on what can be brought into that spot. It may be something where, with this involving one council, as long as it sticks to something that only involves the South Atlantic, perhaps Bonnie could look -- It may be necessary for them to look into that after the Steering Committee, if there is a couple of alternatives, evaluate life history, data, people's workloads, availability of personnel, and it may come down to a couple of stocks, and she could report back in December as to which one they think is the best, most practical one to put in that slot, but we won't lose the capacity.

DR. DUVAL: It's not about loss of capacity. It's more about mechanistically what might be able to be shifted and do you throw a monkey-wrench in certain things. We have heard before that the more we change our minds the more it messes up that process, when they're already starting down the road of things.

MR. BELL: I just wanted to be really clear, because of the sensitivity of this, and I understand folks' desire for an assessment, but I think the folks that are really focused on that have perhaps a preconceived outcome in mind. If that outcome doesn't occur that way in the assessment, then they can go back and say 2015 was weird and 2016 we did things and 2017 we did things. They might not be happy with the results, and then we find ourselves having the assessment called into question. That's why I just want to make sure we have the data and we do the best possible

assessment we can, given the things that are going on, and then that would perhaps have a result that -- It will take some of that argument against some of those other things if they don't like the outcome. That's my only reason for wanting to delay, is to get the best possible assessment, I think.

MR. HARTIG: The last cobia assessment just barely passed muster with the amount of data that we used in that assessment. Do we have any idea if we are collecting more data, from the landings data, more lengths and ages and weights? Do we know anything about that from the last assessment timeframe?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We probably have a pretty good handle that we're not collecting a whole bunch of data right now, because of the closure. That's always an issue, and, as far as what we did last year and the first half of this year, I am not exactly sure.

MR. BOWEN: Ben, to your point, we are collecting data, and it may not be as much as we probably should be, but even now we are collecting data. I am in the process of still collecting fin clips. Of course, they're released alive, but we are gathering fin clips when we catch them, and we still are catching them. I caught one the day before I came up here.

DR. DUVAL: I think what Ben is referring to is the data that are used for indices of abundance, and so the data that you're collecting helps inform the life history parameters and stock ID and movement of those fish. Ben is talking about the indices of abundance that were used in the assessment, which were fishery-dependent. Virginia is no longer open. North Carolina is open for another couple of weeks. There is still some recreational sampling occurring, and so that's what he's referring to.

DR. LANEY: Pursuant to our discussion the other day about the genetics, and this is a question for John, I guess. If at some subsequent date it was to be determined that we definitely have a separate stock in South Carolina and a separate stock in Chesapeake Bay and a separate offshore stock, based on the genetic determination, does that mean that then you would have to assess each of those separately, in order to maintain the genetic integrity of the population as a whole?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Certainly that would be ideal. One of the challenges you get into with that is can you parse your landings out into those units, and that is sort of one of the concerns there. There was some indication of those stocks, but it wasn't clear how well they were distinguished, I suppose, and they really didn't feel that they could divide the landings out into each of those individual units. Maybe you could, if you had good area data during the time when they're all together, but then, in those periods when they're sort of moving about and mixing up, then it gets much more difficult.

DR. LANEY: I guess my concern would be that, inadvertently, we somehow wind up in a situation like they did in New England, where you had all those localized spawning cod stocks, and they didn't realize that until it was too late, in that case.

DR. DUVAL: All right. The motion reads: Move to delay cobia until 2019 data can be included, and prioritize gag for 2018. Is there any more discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** That concludes the SEDAR Report.

MR. WAUGH: The statement at the end of the committee report says that request to conduct the next assessment of tilefish sooner if an opening arises earlier than 2019, but what Ben was saying was that there was a strong year class in 2012 and that we need six years, and so that argues for not really moving that up. Given that we're going to be at the SEDAR Committee meeting next week, do we want to move tilefish up or do we want to leave it where it is, so that you can get the benefit of that 2018 data?

MR. HARTIG: What we saw -- I don't know how old the fish were in 2012. That's the problem. I am not even going to venture a guess, but we do not know how old they were.

MR. CARMICHAEL: If they were ones, and assume they weren't just newborns. If they were ones, then they would be six in 2017. You would have two years of data for them, if you did it late enough in 2019 to use the 2018 data, and so that's the sense that I got out of it, that you would like to at least try to include through the 2018 data, so we have a good chance of seeing those fish reflected. It certainly seems like that gives you enough time that, if they were ones or twos, that you should have some information on them.

DR. DUVAL: Any other business to come before the SEDAR Committee? That concludes the report, and we will move on to Data Collection, and I will turn it over to Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Data Collection Committee met on September 15. The committee discussed bycatch monitoring, commercial electronic logbooks, the for-hire electronic reporting amendment, and citizen science. The final rule for bycatch reporting has not published in the Federal Register. Further discussion is planned for the December 2016 meeting. The committee supported changing the name of CE-BA 3 to the Bycatch Reporting Amendment.

David Gloeckner provided presentations via webinar on costs associated with electronic commercial logbook reporting and progress on voluntary electronic commercial logbook reports. A fully-functional system for submitting these reports through ACCSP should be online in early 2018.

The for-hire electronic logbook reporting amendment will be considered for final approval at the December 2016 meeting. Comments on the current draft should be provided to staff for inclusion in the final version. There was discussion on the importance of ensuring compliance with reporting requirements and the role of law enforcement and administrative provisions in ensuring compliance.

We had one motion. **Motion 1 was to move to change the name of CE-BA 3 to Bycatch Reporting Amendment. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion of that motion? **Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

Then I guess this needs to be a motion, under timing and tasks, which would be to move to direct staff to prepare the for-hire electronic reporting amendment for final approval in December. If someone could read that as a motion.

MR. HARTIG: **I would move to direct staff to prepare the for-hire electronic reporting amendment for final approval in December 2016.**

MR. BELL: Seconded by Doug. Any discussion of that? **Any opposition? Seeing none, then that passes.** Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mel. The next report is Habitat and Ecosystem Committee, and we will let Roger and Doug get ready.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, the committee met on September 12, 2016, and addressed the following items. First was Report on the May 11 and 12, 2016 Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Advisory Panel Meeting. Next was Summaries of the FEP II Sections on South Atlantic Food Web and Connectivity and South Atlantic Climate Variability and Fisheries, Summaries of policy considerations related to FEP II Sections on the South Atlantic Food Web and Connectivity and South Atlantic Climate Variability and Fisheries Sections, and Update on habitat and ecosystem tools and modeling.

Chairman Duval, who served as member of the Advisory Panel for the Lenfest Fisheries Ecosystem Task Force, updated the committee on the pending completion of the task force report, which is anticipated to provide a practical blueprint that managers can use to make ecosystem-based fisheries management operational. Launch is expected in mid-November. There were no motions were made by the committee. We do have three items under the timing and tasks motion presented in front of you, and I would appreciate a motion to accept those.

DR. DUVAL: **I move that we adopt the timing and tasks motion.**

MR. HAYMANS: Charlie seconds. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, the timing and tasks motion is approved.** Madam Chairman, that concludes my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mr. Haymans. We did not have the Law Enforcement Committee meet, and we will take care of the motion from them under Other Business. Next up is Information & Education, and we will give Amber and Mark the opportunity to get set up here first.

MR. BROWN: The I&E Committee met on September 12. The committee received a summary of the recent council communications survey that was conducted in July of this year. The summary included an overview of how stakeholders are using existing outreach and communication products, how stakeholders are using existing outreach and communication products/programs from other agencies/organizations, feedback on the current use and possible improvements to the council's mobile app, and seeking feedback on potential new outreach strategies, and other recommendations for improving council communications.

Staff led a discussion to receive guidance on the following items: further identifying stakeholders that prefer to receive printed/mailed communication and also further review of communication preferences by sector. We are seeking some guidance on that. A future survey about the use of the council website and development of prioritized new outreach approaches. Some of those were comments on the station model and YouTube videos. The committee also discussed the importance of sustaining outreach efforts with the region, so that annual visits are made to certain areas within the region, whether by festival events or types of outreach visits. Convening the council's I&E Advisory Panel to review the survey results and provide recommendations on the communication strategies and development of a communications plan. No motions were made during this committee, and that's the end of my report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mark, and thank you, Amber. The next report is Executive Finance. The Executive Finance Committee met on September 15 in Myrtle Beach. We adopted the agenda and the minutes of the June 2016 meeting. We reviewed our Council Year 2016 Budget Expenditures.

Dr. Brian Cheuvront, Deputy Executive Director for Management, gave the committee an overview of the Council Follow-Up and the 2016 Priorities. These are updated after every council meeting. We are going to be adjusting the 2016 priorities to address Snapper Grouper Amendment 38, a Wreckfish ITQ Review, Allocation Policy, and a number of other items. We discussed those priorities and provided guidance on changes and directed staff to bring some revisions to the Full Council today. I think Gregg maybe has the spreadsheet that -- Perhaps we can review that once we get through the committee report.

We reviewed Standards and Procedures for Public Comments and provided some input on that. We will be reconsidering Standards and Procedures for Webinar Meetings at our December 2016 meeting, due to time. Next, we reviewed the Council/NMFS/NOAA Regional Operations Agreement, and Gregg Waugh presented an overview of that and thanked the Regional Office staff and Science Center staff for their help and input on that, and so this outlines the responsibilities of each of those organizations in developing fishery management plans and amendments. 1

Then, under Other Business, we had a discussion about issues related to MRIP and non-factual information surfacing at public hearings and requested guidance from the committee on how to respond to that, and so we had a pretty robust discussion and provided some guidance to staff to draft a letter for review at our December meeting.

We also discussed the proposal to establish a Cobia Sub-Panel on the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. Given the high level of interest in cobia, the AP Selection Committee wanted to involve more fishermen than we had open spots on the AP, and so this is why the cobia sub-panel was proposed, to allow for that involvement while preserving the current king and Spanish mackerel expertise.

There was some concern that the sub-panel was not equal in function to the advisory panel, but the committee discussed it, and it was noted that the members proposed for the Cobia Sub-Panel were equal to members of the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. In fact, the Cobia Sub-Panel will be very active over the next two years, as results from the stock ID workshop and pending assessments become available. The Cobia Sub-Panel will meet via webinar and can also meet in person, as needed, and there may be times that the council has the Mackerel Cobia AP and the Cobia Sub-Panel meet together. Should this occur, the Cobia Sub-Panel members will participate and vote as full AP members.

We had several motions. **The first motion was to approve the standards and procedures for public comments. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to approve the regional operating agreement. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was that the council write an open letter to NOAA outlining the cumulative impact of species-specific estimates of unusually large/small MRIP landings and the impacts on the council process. The intent there is to bring that back in December for review. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there discussion?

MR. HARTIG: Just as long as there is discards in there. I did not put discards in that. I had just landings, and it should be landings and discards.

DR. DUVAL: So perhaps a clarification that this includes landings and discards.

DR. MCGOVERN: It's come to my attention that there's a review of MRIP, and that review should be available in December, and that would probably help inform your letter. I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Jack. I agree that that NRC review would certainly be very helpful, and so this might be something that -- I don't want to say drags out, but drags out over a couple of council meetings. Next, we had our timing and tasks motion. Sorry. That was discussion, and so we still need to approve Motion Number 3. Is there any more discussion on that motion? **Is there any opposition to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The timing and tasks motion was to direct staff to address the revised 2016 priorities, revise and distribute the approved public comment guidelines, prepare the webinar meeting guidelines for review at the December 2016 meeting, and prepare a draft letter for review at the December 2016 meeting. I would need someone to make that timing and tasks motion.

MR. PHILLIPS: **Madam Chair, I move that we accept the draft timing and tasks motion as written.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie and is there a second? Second by Ben. Any discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Gregg, in terms of the Excel spreadsheet that you all use to outline the council's priorities, is that something that has been posted and is on the briefing book website or can it be emailed around to council members? I don't know if folks really have -- I am suggesting that we don't need to review that right here right now.

MR. WAUGH: That's fine. I think it was posted to the website, and I will follow up with Brian to make sure that happens.

DR. DUVAL: Next, we get into our reports from the Regional Office and Dr. McGovern.

DR. MCGOVERN: Madam Chair, I have one item. Last Friday, Roy sent out a request for input from our key partners, which includes the councils, commissions, states, federal agencies, and the Marine Mammal Commission, on a draft list of our priority science needs, and one of the goals in our strategic plan is to improve management by acquiring and applying the best available science.

To advance this goal, we worked with the Science Center to identify and prioritize key science activities required to inform management decisions, and so this is out for comment, and we are requesting comments through October 8. The draft science priorities are summarized on our website, and there is a link to an online comment form and a comprehensive list of the science needs. This list of science needs was informed by the South Atlantic Council and SEDAR recommendations derived from FMPs, assessments, SSC report, and other related documents, and so it's on our website for folks to see.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Jack, and I definitely got the email and appreciate that going out. Are there any questions for Jack?

MR. WAUGH: Just one comment. We will be looking at that at the staff level and putting together some draft comments or response, but, as Jack indicated, it's based on a lot of our needs already, but we will have that letter for Michelle to look at and get in.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. We have no EFP requests. The next item was an update from the Science Center, and Dr. Ponwith isn't here. There is an attachment. It's a one-page attachment in your briefing book, under the Full Council Tab, that includes a bulleted list of items that folks can take a look at. I don't think there is anyone on the webinar who is slated to provide any updates on behalf of the Science Center, and so I would just encourage folks to look at that. It includes some information on the Saltonstall-Kennedy and MARFIN RFPs and then some information on regional action plans.

Next, we come to our other agency liaison reports and additional information, and so, unfortunately, our Gulf and Mid-Atlantic liaisons had to leave, but we'll go around the horn and get liaison reports from others, and so I will turn it over to Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to report out on two things that the commission did at their meeting last week. They approved the recreational bag limit increase for black sea bass as well as the buoy marking requirements, so they would be consistent in state waters.

On the Atlantic gray triggerfish we discussed at the last meeting, the stock assessment was rejected, and we were talking about what are we going to do about management changes, because FWC had put in a temporary rule that lowered the size limit back down to twelve inches, but also implemented a ten-fish bag limit.

After the stock assessment was rejected, at the meeting last week, FWC put in a permanent rule, because we don't know how many years it's going to take to get another gray triggerfish stock assessment and then make a decision then, and so we had a temporary rule that was set to expire on October 31, and so we went ahead and made that rule permanent, which is dropping the size limit back to twelve, implementing a ten-fish bag limit at that twelve-inch size limit, and then we will reconsider that after another stock assessment comes out and the council considers additional management actions. That's all I have to report.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Jessica. Are there any questions for Jessica? If not, we will move on to our Coast Guard liaison, Lieutenant Hockenberry. Welcome. It's been great to have you here this week, and so it sounds like you've had a good time learning about our process here.

LT. HOCKENBERRY: Absolutely. I've been waiting all week to take the mic, and so I promise you that I won't be too long, but those of you who are not aware, I am the XO at the Southeast Regional Fisheries Training Center. I have over ten years of Coast Guard experience, and so not only do I serve there as the XO, but I serve there in the capacity of an instructor and subject matter expert in the Caribbean and South Atlantic, and so special thanks to Madam Chair and council members, along with Lieutenant Prey, for allowing me to be a part of the council this week. I appreciate the sidebar conversations, especially with Dewey, and the knowledge shared with me to help bring me up to speed. I now feel more comfortable with the formalities and the processes of this council. I look forward to being more engaged in the near future.

In addition, I will be attending more AP meetings when they are in Charleston, South Carolina. I have noticed quite a few up and coming, and I see no reason why I can't stop in when these are in my backyard. My hope is to speak to Captain Gordon and Lieutenant Prey in District 7 to see if I can be a part of this committee in the future. There is no point of having a Coast Guard rep on the council who is not involved with LMR, either through direct operations and/or training. You won't have the confidence or knowledge to speak on topics being discussed unless you are actively involved in the planning and/or training in this complex, vital mission, both of which I am involved in day in and day out.

Although not all Coast Guard LMR boardings are captured below in my numbers, the larger operations in the South Atlantic AOR will be reviewed. Operations Summary, a five-day operation in Sector North Carolina AOR, with the white marlin open, the station monitored participating vessels for boating safety and ensured illegal fish handling was minimized. Over twenty boardings were conducted.

Sector Key West and Sector Miami participated in two separate operations and a joint operation for the lobster mini-season, resulting in over 203 boardings and over 2,000 lobsters checked. Three major cutters participated in LMR operations during August. There is no data to report at this meeting, but it will be available for your December meeting.

Sector Charleston, along with a patrol boat, NOAA, and AUXAIR conducted a joint LMR operation, resulting in forty-seven boardings. Station Fort Myers Beach was very active in LMR. There were five fishing vessels cited to be in violation for insufficient turtle mitigation gear. A District 5 patrol boat spent two weeks conducting LMR off the north coast. There is no data to report at this meeting. When I was onboard for ten hours, we conducted over seventeen LMR boardings.

A current operation in Charleston AOR we are working on involves a joint operation with over fifty personnel. I can't discuss anything further at this time, due to operation security. District 7 had five significant LMR violations to report in July. This concludes my LMR operations snapshot.

Just to bring something to your attention, we have a field advisor program that I've very passionate about, and so we talked about that there's a human performance technology triangle that the Coast Guard follows. You have your training realm, which is going to be, for instance, my curriculum. Then what I do is I test the LMR BO's. Then what do I do with them? I send them out, and I just hope that they succeed? It's only a five-day course, folks. That's all I have to teach these LMR

BO's, and so we have the field advisor program that we started in my unit. We just, in general, overall, have conducted a total of five since it's been implemented in just one month.

There are interesting results, and I will just keep it that way, but it's definitely a missing component in my training realm that is now in full steam ahead, and so I'm now going out there and following up with these LMR BO's that passed my course and I am now evaluating them on how they are doing LMR BO missions, and so, from that perspective, I follow up with their CO, OIC, and conduct hands-on training and follow-through, and it goes all the way up to a flag level, and so it's definitely getting a little bit more awareness from an enforcement perspective, and so I don't want to take up too much of your time. I can go into more detail about that in the future. Are there any questions for me?

DR. DUVAL: Are there questions?

MR. HAYMANS: First, what is the Coast Guard equivalent of ooh rah? Excellent report. Thank you. I do look forward to your continued involvement. We have Coast Guard Station Brunswick that shares a campus with us, and we have minimal involvement. I mean literally I can hit every window in their building with a baseball from my office. Perhaps there is a way, in the future, that -- I don't know how many other folks are next door to their Coast Guard offices, but we can have some interaction to help with that continued training. In other words, we can provide biologists to help with let's call it a continuing education program with at least Coast Guard Station Brunswick.

LT. HOCKENBERRY: Absolutely. It's a good idea, and that's one reason why I think it's important to have someone like me on the committee sitting here, because I mean education and outreach is the utmost importance, and so I went ahead and made a note there, and we will follow up with that.

MR. BROWN: You mentioned forty-seven boardings off of Charleston, but you didn't say anything about any citations or anything written. Was there anything that was encountered?

LT. HOCKENBERRY: That's a good question. Right now, just because when we go through our missile program and tracking, I can't report that until District releases that, but I can follow up with you at the next meeting. Good question.

MR. HARTIG: Not really a question, but just a kind of tie-in to your Fort Myers boardings and your turtle equipment violations. Charlie Bergman came through our area last week, and I met with him, and he said advise your fishermen who have snapper grouper permits, both for-hire and commercial, that they are now enforcing those regulations, and you have to have not only the gear, but you have to have the placards and the regulations, and so that's part of the offense. If you don't have it all, you can get a significant fine for not having it all, and so that's just to make sure everybody is apprised of that.

MR. BOWEN: I just wanted to add that I was one of those forty-seven boardings. I really was.

LT. HOCKENBERRY: How did they do?

MR. BOWEN: They boarded me in the proposed SMZ, Georgetown Hole. The officers were very professional and very courteous and very nice. Thank you, and I did not get a citation.

LT. HOCKENBERRY: Even better, Zack. Thank you.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, but I was sweating it.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you very much, Lieutenant, and we will definitely look forward to hearing more about this new component of your program. I definitely agree that it's very valuable, and so thank you very much.

LT. HOCKENBERRY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Dr. Laney. Well, I guess I should mention something. Gosh, what's going on in North Carolina? What's not going on in North Carolina? I don't really have anything to report from the perspective of federal fisheries at this point. I think a lot of our staff has been pretty heavily involved in the upgrade of our trip ticket and licensing system. That's been a huge ongoing project for the last couple of years, and so we're wrapping that up, and I think everyone is going to be very excited when it's finally over.

Then, as a result of some of the management changes that we've had at the division and within the department, and I think most folks know that we have one director for two divisions right now, Coastal Management and Marine Fisheries, and there is an ongoing study looking at trying to gain efficiencies between those two agencies, and so it's yet to be determined what might result from that, whether we still maintain two separate divisions or merge, but that's it from me. Now I will move on to Dr. Laney.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I will just mention three things. One that I'm very excited about is the Department of Energy, working through the Northwest Pacific Laboratory, has developed a tiny new acoustic tag that can be used on American eels. This thing can be injected through a nine-gauge hypodermic needle, and so it's little teeny. They have contacted Dominion Generation, and they're planning to do a pilot study at Roanoke Rapids Dam, looking at some of the eels that we've been moving over the dam for the past eleven years or so, I think, or maybe even a little bit longer.

They're hoping to basically outfit the dam with a whole bunch of acoustic receivers to help us understand how the silver eels that we hope are going to result from all of those eels that we've been moving over the dam will out-migrate and can be detected, and we can hopefully develop safe, timely, and effective passage for them, and so stay tuned on that. That pilot study is supposed to take place in 2017 and possibly on into 2018. Of course, the only issue there is catching the silver eels before they out-migrate, which so far has proven somewhat problematic.

The second thing I was going to mention is I think some of you are aware, particularly those of you who are administrative representatives for the states, that we have a new Assistant Director in the Wildlife and Sportfish Restoration Program, and that's Paul Rauch. I asked Sam if they were related, since their last names are spelled the same, and he wasn't sure. I forwarded him that information. He doesn't know, and he's going to check, I think.

Then, lastly, I will mention, and I think most of you have probably heard, that the President announced yesterday that there is a new Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National

Monument designated yesterday off the coast of New England, pretty far out, and it will be jointly administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wildlife Refuge Program, and the Department of Commerce. That's about all I know about it at this point in time, and so, if I learn more, I will certainly share that information with the council. I do have a map, if everybody would like for me to distribute the map, and I can do that, at least.

DR. DUVAL: I think there's a lot of electronic scuttlebutt going around about that right now, definitely. Doug, I was going to move on to you for your liaison report, and I didn't know if you had a question specifically for Wilson.

MR. HAYMANS: Just a quick question, Wilson. Wilson, what was that last national monument that the President --

DR. LANEY: You are going and make me pronounce that name, aren't you? The only person I know who can do that without even thinking about it is Dr. Radar. He's got it memorized, but I can't pronounce it. It's the one off the northwest Hawaiian Islands.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I'm sorry for those occasional funnies, but, anyway, I have two things for the listening audience, if anyone is still out there. October 1 is CoastFest at Coastal Regional Headquarters, and 9,000 people. It's one of the things I bring up every September. If you happen to be out our way, stop in for the day.

Something on a more serious note though, and I probably should have brought this up during Protected Resources, and I apologize for not doing that, but we're running headlong into our nationwide permit for artificial reef deployment with a NMFS Protected Resource Office requirement, through the U.S. Corps of Engineers. Basically, they don't want us to deploy during critical calving season in the area.

We, as a state, have developed what we think is going to be our response to that, but I think I would like to hear a report from Protected Resources at the December meeting regarding interactions that have occurred or the potential for interactions to occur during reef deployments during the calving season. After that, I think I would like to consider the council submitting a letter to Protected Resources regarding that, and I have briefly spoken to Mel and Jessica, and I don't recall, Michelle, whether you and I have talked about it or not at this meeting, but all of us are going to have to get our permits renewed at some point or another, and, anyway, that's the report, and I would like to see if we could.

DR. DUVAL: I see Gregg writing it down, and, just to be clear, it's a nationwide permit that allows you to deploy artificial reef resources out in -- Is it state waters or the EEZ?

MR. HAYMANS: It's federal waters, and we have twenty-two permitted reefs off of the coast, with a combined 180 or so deployments across those twenty-two reefs, and it's a normal practice, and we've never had an encounter with a right whale or seen a right whale while actually putting the materials out. Anyway, it's an issue, and we think we know how we can address it, but maybe if some of the other states would come alongside, it would be great.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Doug. We will definitely get that put on the agenda for I think Protected Resources in December. Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: I won't belabor that last point from Doug, but we're experiencing that issue as well, and so we will be glad to work with folks to help work through that. Of interest might be, since we do have a shrimp plan, that we're having a bumper crop this year. That's probably mostly due to the warm winter temperatures, and this council has been very helpful in us managing cold winters, but, when warm winters occur, we tend to have really good years, and this year was a banner year, as far as our roe season, and we're looking forward to a really good fall crop. We do have an issue with blackgill, like Georgia is well aware of, but hopefully we will have a really good overall shrimp season, and so buy local shrimp.

I sent, via Mike, a snapshot taken from one of the ROV videos out on the Charleston Deep Artificial Reef MPA from the June cruise. If you get that, that's just an excerpt. I have video I can show you if anybody wants to see it at some point, but, as far as I know, the final cruise report hasn't been issued, and so it's NOAA's data, and we're sensitive about passing out NOAA's data. At some point, we will have some video snippets to look at, but I would report that, after two years of materials on the bottom out there, it's very promising looking. There are a lot of warsaw grouper and misty. There's lots of snowy and gag and scamp and lots of almaco and amberjack. It's good species diversity. It's what we were expecting to see, and that's only going to get better with time. We need Amendment 36 to kick in at some point so we're covered out there as far as protection.

We've got some state issues going on. We're dealing with a number of things at the state level with red drum and flounder. I mentioned the other day that the flounder -- We call it the flounder jubilee that we had along the Grand Strand here, where, due to water conditions and low DO, flounder were kind of driven into the surf zone and then they're caught by the fishing piers.

We almost had a case where our creel clerk was going to show up on one of those fishing piers on a day where the normal flounder catch might be five flounder and we were getting 300 or 400 flounder a day on these piers, and so imagine what the creel clerk and coming together with that would have done to the MRIP data. Everybody understands how that works. Really, that's all I have. We may be dealing, as I mentioned, with some stuff with red drum and flounder in the next legislative session. That's it, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: All right. Are there any questions for Mel?

MR. BELL: Sorry, but I remembered one thing, big news. You may be aware that the R/V Palmetto is our research vessel. It's a 110-foot vessel that supports MARMAP, and she was in for a very extended, long yard period. We were able to actually get one of the experimental research vessels from the sanctuaries program to help this summer, to keep MARMAP data going, but the Palmetto is back in action, after a million-dollar investment, with new engines, a new generator, new screws. She can now do eleven knots, which is screaming compared to what she used to do at eight knots max, and so the Palmetto is up and running, and we are extremely pleased about that, and so that's good news for MARMAP.

DR. DUVAL: I think there is a lot of folks out there who go on those cruises who are very happy that the Palmetto is back in service. There are a couple of quick items under Other Business before we review Upcoming Meetings. The first one I just want to make everyone aware of is that Chip has worked on a draft letter for my signature to U.S. Coast Guard Miami that is considering -- They are relocating their anchoring area outside of the port, and this would actually be a good

thing, because it would move it out beyond where there might be potential impacts to corals, and so we were going to send a letter of support for that effort, and so I think everyone will get a copy of that. I have reviewed the letter, and it looks great. It's very non-threatening, and so I just wanted to let everyone know about that.

Then the second thing that we agreed to take up under Other Business, and I'm going to go to Mel for this, as Chair of the Law Enforcement Committee, was the Joint Law Enforcement Committee and Advisory Panel had one motion that they just wanted to move forward, and so Gregg has got that up on the screen. Mel, if you would like to move that forward.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and this was the one thing that -- Recall that the MPAs that went into existence back a number of years ago, the original MPAs, are not on the NOAA nautical charts. That can be problematic from a standpoint of, one, the fishermen knowing where they are, and, two, it can be problematic for law enforcement in encounters with fishermen on these areas, because it's very easy for them to say, well, I didn't know and it's not on the electronic charts and not on the paper charts and how am I supposed to know where it is, although people are supposed to know where they are.

Anyway, we had some initial discussions with NOAA about getting the MPAs on the charts. In this process, and this came up at the Law Enforcement AP and Committee meeting, we realized that NOAA has an actual process for doing this. What this motion basically does is it would allow us to move forward and start the actual process of officially requesting that NOAA include these MPAs on the nautical charts. I know, from the Law Enforcement AP and Committee perspective, everyone felt this was a really good thing. What we were going to do is -- I was hoping to adopt this at the committee level, but we can just adopt it at full council, but, procedurally, how would we make that motion?

DR. DUVAL: I think you can go ahead and make the motion. It was made in committee, which means it already had a second.

MR. BELL: No, because the committee didn't meet.

DR. DUVAL: Then go ahead and just make the motion and we'll get a second.

MR. BELL: Okay. **Madam Chair, I would move that the council send a letter to NOAA Fisheries Service requesting that the Service make the necessary request within NOAA to have the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council managed areas, deepwater MPAs and coral HAPCs, included on NOAA nautical charts.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Mel and seconded by Mark. Is there any discussion on this motion?

MR. BELL: Keep in mind the spawning SMZs are not on there, because they don't technically exist at this point. If we want to bring those in additionally, we will deal with that after Amendment 36 is finally signed off on, and I might say that the larger MPAs will have a better shot, because one of their criteria is kind of a size sort of thing, and we may run into a minimum size problem, but we will deal with that when the time comes.

DR. DUVAL: Any other discussion on the motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** If there is no other business --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just one quick thing that I forgot to mention earlier. It's been brought to my attention that the National Parks Service is working on some type of nationwide fisheries policy. It was supposed to be brought up this week at the AFWA meeting. I am trying to get more information about it. I have reached out to the individual from the Parks Service that's in charge of this, and I asked him if there was a way that he could come to the councils or if he was planning on engaging the councils. At this point, I'm just trying to get more information, but I wanted to bring it to the council's attention.

DR. DUVAL: Wow. Great. Thanks, Jessica. If there is no other business, just a quick review of upcoming meetings, and I will turn it over to Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. We've got the SEDAR Steering Committee on the 20th and 21st of this month and we've got MREP meeting, that management workshop, in Tampa during the week of the 3rd of October. Then our SSC meets the 18th through the 20th. Then, starting October 31, we've got our Snapper Grouper AP meeting for a couple of days and we've got our I&E AP meeting for a day-and-a-half after that. In between, we're going to have a monitoring workshop for doing work out in Devil's Hole.

DR. DUVAL: The Snapper Grouper AP, does that actually start on the 31st? That's a Monday.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, it's starting on the 31st.

DR. DUVAL: Okay.

MR. WAUGH: Then we finish up the year with our December council meeting on the 5th through the 9th in Atlantic Beach, North Carolina.

DR. DUVAL: Anna was asking me when our December council meeting will start on that Monday, whether it will start in the morning or in the afternoon, and we'll just have to take a look at the agenda. I suspect that we will probably need some extra time at that meeting, and so you might want to plan for a Monday morning start. Okay. Is there any other business to come before the council? Seeing none, we will adjourn. Thank you all very much for your hard work this week. It was much appreciated.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned on September 16, 2016.)

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
September 2016

Signature: _____ Date: _____

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: September 16, 2016

Meeting Location: Myrtle Beach, SC

Issue: CMP Framework 5 (MODIFY PERMIT RESTRICTIONS)

| | YES | NO | ABSTAIN |
|--------------|-----|----|---------|
| MR. HARTIG | ✓ | | |
| MR. PHILLIPS | ✓ | | |
| MS. BECKWITH | ✓ | | |
| MR. BELL | ✓ | | |
| MR. BOWEN | ✓ | | |
| MR. BREWER | ✓ | | |
| MR. BROWN | ✓ | | |
| MR. CONKLIN | ✓ | | |
| MR. GRINER | ✓ | | |
| DR. CRABTREE | ✓ | | |
| MR. HAYMANS | ✓ | | |
| MS. MCCAWLEY | ✓ | | |
| DR. DUVAL | ✓ | | |

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: September 16, 2016

Meeting Location: Myrtle Beach, SC

Issue: SG Am 37 (HOGFISH)

| | YES | NO | ABSTAIN |
|--------------|-----|----|---------|
| MR. HARTIG | ✓ | | |
| MR. PHILLIPS | ✓ | | |
| MS. BECKWITH | ✓ | | |
| MR. BELL | ✓ | | |
| MR. BOWEN | ✓ | | |
| MR. BREWER | ✓ | | |
| MR. BROWN | ✓ | | |
| MR. CONKLIN | ✓ | | |
| MR. GRINER | ✓ | | |
| DR. CRABTREE | ✓ | | |
| MR. HAYMANS | ✓ | | |
| MS. MCCAWLEY | ✓ | | |
| DR. DUVAL | ✓ | | |

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: September ¹⁵16, 2016

Meeting Location: Myrtle Beach, SC

Issue: CMP FRAMEWORK 4 (ATLANTIC COBIA)

| | YES | NO | ABSTAIN |
|--------------|-----|----|---------|
| MR. HARTIG | ✓ | | |
| MR. PHILLIPS | ✓ | | |
| MS. BECKWITH | ✓ | | |
| MR. BELL | ✓ | | |
| MR. BOWEN | ✓ | | |
| MR. BREWER | ✓ | | |
| MR. BROWN | ✓ | | |
| MR. CONKLIN | ✓ | | |
| MR. GRINER | ✓ | | |
| DR. CRABTREE | ✓ | | |
| MR. HAYMANS | ✓ | | |
| MS. MCCAWLEY | ✓ | | |
| DR. DUVAL | ✓ | | |

Red Snapper Considerations:

Before any further regulations are considered or discussed or placed into law the following measures HAVE to be discussed and put into place..

1. Who is going to enforce any of these new important regulations and what will the penalties be if violations are discovered..????
2. Will State DNR officers be considered the prime source of enforcement and how many officers are there on the water ? Will USCG participate ???
3. Presently , I have not seen an inspection DNR officer inspecting or boarding ANY vessel in YEARS..Not even on the docks..They are not even considered a threat anymore so everyone can skirt the laws and do whatever their conscience may dictate..
4. Is the U.S. Coast Guard going to participate in these fish regulations on-water fish catch inspections as they once used to ?? Offshore and in-shore boarding officers presently are non-existent with State Wildlife.
5. What is the purpose of making serious important laws if there is no follow-up or inspections to be had ??? As of now it appears to be a total waste of time.
6. Are the fishermen , both commercial and recreational, going to take seriously the federal SAFMC regulations of circle hook use if there is no inspections or consequences for continuing use of J-hooks.. NO RECREATIONAL BOATER IN OUR AREA USES CIRCLE HOOKS FOR THE SNAPPER -GROUPER COMPLEX FISHERY..THESE ANGLERS DO NOT EVEN OWN CIRCLE HOOKS.. This continued use of J-Hooks is illegal but very realistic facts...Who is inspecting and even looking when almost ALL these boaters do not even know that is the LAW.. And what are the penalties for continued use of J-Hooks.. Once again , no officials are looking or even appearing occasionally on the water or even appearing on our docks. There is not even a threat of this happening occasionally..

IN CONCLUSION:

ISN'T IT A WASTE OF TIME TO DEVELOP NEW LAWS AND REGULATIONS THAT WILL CONTINUE TO BE IGNORED AND NEVER ENFORCED AND PENALTIES NOT EVEN ANNOUNCED THAT COULD MAYBE DETER FISHERMEN FROM BREAKING THE FEDERAL LAWS ???

I would compare what SAFMC is doing is like hiring architects and builders and sending out bids to construct a new building or facility and the land is not even purchased yet.. It's simply putting the cart before the horse..

The present no-fish ban on Red Snapper and the lack of inspection officials have made some good law abiding fishermen skirt the law and become bad guys..The majority of these red snapper brought up from deep waters are already dead and their revival survival rate is almost zero.. Bringing home hidden snapper filets is almost becoming commonplace.

The slogan "Filet and Release" is not funny anymore..Heidenseek released six 24 inch red snapper this week that floated away bellyup ..We boated 16 Genuine Red Snapper on that trip. Acting this moment on all of the above and Amendment #43 is probably already too late.

SOOO:

-Train and develop more Federal and State officers to enforce our laws and maybe our fisheries will be better sustained without any further major legislation or changes.

-Consider major cash rewards for any anonymous tips that would lead to arrest and convictions of violators. We already have a program in place that is non effective and not even known called "Stop A Thief" .. This project needs to be promoted with posters . billboards etc.. Rewards are important and let the anglers patrol themselves.. We can never have enough officers and this program is already in place. Don't ever forget that "Money Talks"..Develop a Hot Line Fone.

-Better utilize the State fishing clubs that could be the leaders in this effort as well as the "eyes and ears" on the water.. Maybe consider making ALL fishing club members deputies to give more clout in this effort..We need to educate the fishing public..

-Newspaper and television programs need to be better utilized to get all this information out to the public so everyone will know the consequences of failing to abide by our present and new regulations..

ONCE THESE EFFORTS ARE PUT INTO PLACE , THEN AND ONLY THEN , SHOULD WE CONTINUE DEVELOPING AMENDMENT 43 AND OTHER NEW REGULATIONS THAT ARE SO DESPARATELY NEEDED...

Captain Eric Heiden

U.S.C.G. Certified -"Heidenseek Charters"-

Eagle Claw Pro Staff—Florence Bluewater Fishing Club-

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

✓ Dr. Michelle Duval
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street
(PO Box 769)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/808-8011 (ph);
252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

VICE-CHAIR

✓ Charlie Phillips
Phillips Seafood/Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

Robert E. Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
703/842-0740 (ph); 703/842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

✓ Anna Beckwith
1907 Paulette Road
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/671-3474 (ph)
AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com

✓ Mel Bell
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

✓ Zack Bowen
P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

✓ W. Chester Brewer
250 Australian Ave. South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
561/655-4777 (ph)
WCBLAW@aol.com

✓ Mark Brown
3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)
capt.markbrown@comcast.net

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

✓ Dr. Roy Crabtree
Regional Administrator
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
727/824-5301 (ph); 727/824-5320 (f)
roy.crabtree@noaa.gov

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

✓ Ben Hartig
9277 Sharon Street
Hobe Sound, FL 33455
772/546-1541 (ph)
mackattackben@att.net

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

✓ Doug Haymans
Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
doughaymans@gmail.com

✓ Dr. Wilson Laney
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617
(110 Brooks Ave
237 David Clark Laboratories,
NCSU Campus
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617)
919/515-5019 (ph)
919/515-4415 (f)
Wilson_Laney@fws.gov

✓ Jessica McCawley
Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E.,
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847 (f)
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

✓ ~~LT Tara Pray~~ LTJG Amy Hockenberry
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
305/415-6765 (ph)
tara.c.pray@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 (ph); 202/736-7350 (f)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

LEANN BOSARGE
DEWEY HEMILRIGHT
RICK DEVICTOR
ERIKA BURGESS
NIK MEHTA
DR. JACK MCGOVERN
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO
ASAC JEFF RADONSKI

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

✓ Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Deputy Director – Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

✓ Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
Julie.Odell@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Julia Byrd - julia.byrd@safmc.net

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

FRIDAY 9/16/16

| Last Name | First Name | Email Address |
|------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Aukeman | Trip | taukeman@ccaflorida.org |
| Bailey | Adam | adam.bailey@noaa.gov |
| Bianchi | Alan | Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov |
| Binns | Holly | hbinns@pewtrusts.org |
| Blow | Wes | wesamy2000@cox.net |
| Bonura | Vincent | SailRaiser25C@aol.com |
| Brennan | Ken | kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov |
| Brouwer | Myra | myra.brouwer@safmc.net |
| Clarke | Lora | lclarke@pewtrusts.org |
| D'Ambrosio | Jocelyn | jocelyn.dambrosio@noaa.gov |
| Daniel | Louis | sciaenops1@gmail.com |
| DeVictor | Rick | rick.devictor@noaa.gov |
| DuBeck | Guy | guy.dubeck@noaa.gov |
| Dunmire | Leda | ldunmire@pewtrusts.org |
| Erwin | Gwen | gwen.erwin@myfwc.com |
| Foster | Dean | dfoster@pewtrusts.org |
| Gerhart | Susan | susan.gerhart@noaa.gov |
| Gore | Karla | karla.gore@noaa.gov |
| Guyas | Martha | martha.guyas@myfwc.com |
| Hartig | Ben | mackattackben@att.net |
| Helies | Frank | fchelies@verizon.net |
| Hemilright | Dewey | fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com |
| Hockenberry | Amy | amy.n.hockenberry@uscg.mil |
| Laks | Ira | captainira@att.net |
| Levy | Mara | mara.levy@noaa.gov |
| Mehta | Nikhil | nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov |
| Records | David | david.records@noaa.gov |
| Sartwell | Tim | tim.sartwell@noaa.gov |
| Shipley | Krista | krista.shipley@myfwc.com |
| Shipman | Susan | susanshipman@att.net |
| Siegfried | Kate | kate.siegfried@noaa.gov |
| Swatzel | Tom | tom@swatzel.com |
| Takade-Heumacher | Helen | htakade@edf.org |
| Williams | Erik | erik.williams@noaa.gov |
| brewer | william | wcblaw@aol.com |
| holiman | stephen | stephen.holiman@noaa.gov |
| malinowski | rich | rich.malinowski@noaa.gov |
| pugliese | roger | roger.pugliese@safmc.net |
| sandorf | scott | scott.sandorf@noaa.gov |
| vara | mary | mary.vara@noaa.gov |

| Timestamp | Full Name | Email | Mailing Address (If your address is already on file, just type "on file") | How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply) |
|-------------------|--------------|------------------------|---|---|
| 9/16/2016 8:25:05 | Lora Clarke | lclarke@pewtrusts.org | on file | Non-Governmental Organization |
| 9/16/2016 8:42:01 | Leda Dunmire | ldunmire@pewtrusts.org | on file | Non-Governmental Organization |
| 9/16/2016 8:50:29 | david bush | davidbush@ncfish.org | on file | NCFEA |
| 9/16/2016 9:36:32 | Dean Foster | dfoster@pewtrusts.org | on file | Non-Governmental Organization |