

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

**Hilton Garden Inn/Outer Banks
Kitty Hawk, North Carolina**

December 6-7, 2018

Summary Minutes

Council Members

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Dr. Kyle Christiansen
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
LCDR Jeremy Montes
Art Sapp
Spud Woodward

Mel Bell, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Dr. Wilson Laney
Stephen Poland
David Whitaker

Council Staff

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Dr. Chip Collier
John Hadley
Kim Iverson
Roger Pugliese
Amber Von Harten
Julia Byrd

John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kathleen Howington
Kelly Klasnick
Cameron Rhodes
Christian Wiegand
Mike Collins

Observers and Participants

Rick DeVictor
Shep Grimes
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Clay Porch
Tony Dilernia
Charlie Phillips
Brett Pierce
Heather Coleman

Nik Mehte
Erika Burgess
Monica Smith-Brunello
Dr. Erik Williams
Dale Diaz
Michael Larkin
Vivian Matter
Kelley Elliott

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Hilton Garden Inn/Outer Banks, Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, on Thursday afternoon, December 6, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We are going to move into Full Council. We need to go around the table and do voice identification, and we'll start over there with Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Spud Woodward.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Kyle Christiansen.

MR. HAYMANS: Doug Haymans, Georgia.

MR. SAPP: Art Sapp.

MR. BREWER: Chester Brewer, Florida.

MR. WHITAKER: David Whitaker, South Carolina.

MR. BELL: Mel Bell, South Carolina.

MR. CONKLIN: Christopher Conklin, South Carolina.

DR. LANEY: Wilson Laney, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. WAUGH: Gregg Waugh, council staff.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jessica McCawley, Florida.

MR. DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

MR. DILERNIA: Tony DiLernia, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MS. BECKWITH: Anna Beckwith, great state of North Carolina.

MR. POLAND: Stephen Poland, North Carolina.

MR. GRINER: Tim Griner, North Carolina.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We don't want to keep going around the table here?

DR. WILLIAMS: Erik Williams, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

DR. PORCH: Clay Porch, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Monica Smit-Brunello, NOAA General Counsel.

DR. CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.

DR. MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.

LT. MONTES: Jeremy Montes, Coast Guard.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, everyone. We would like to welcome our new council member, David Whitaker, to his first meeting. Also, as you heard, we have Dale, our Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council liaison, and Tony, the Mid-Atlantic Council liaison, and we also have Clay, our Southeast Fisheries Science Center Director, and Jeremy Montes, our Coast Guard rep, with us today.

Our first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any changes or additions to the agenda? Any objections to approval of the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved. The next order of business is Approval of the Minutes. Any modifications to the minutes from the last meeting? Any objection to approval of the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes stands approved.

We don't necessarily have any awards at this particular meeting, but we would like to thank Steve for the hospitality on Tuesday night, and, also, I want to recognize Mike Collins. This is his last meeting, after thirteen years of service to the council, and we are certainly going to miss him. He leaves some big shoes for Kelly to fill, and we recognized Mike earlier this week, but I just wanted to also recognize him at the end of this week as well. Thank you so much, Mike, for all that you've done for the council over the thirteen years. (*Applause*) We will be coming to visit you at the Villages. Next up, we're going to go into the Council Staff Reports, and we're going to start with Gregg on the Executive Director's Report.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. My report is included as Attachment 1, and it's short. We have covered the stuff under Executive Finance. As everybody has experienced, it's been a very busy end to the year, since our council meeting got postponed due to the hurricane. We've been looking, and it was just a two-week delay, but it certainly seems to have snowballed, because we just feel like we've been playing catch-up the entire rest of the year.

We've got a new council member from the State of South Carolina, and we did David's orientation with him, and, as the Chair just indicated, Mike is headed off. Kelly is doing a super job. Kimberly Cole also is leaving to pursue another opportunity, after working with us for two years, and we'll miss her, and we wish her well in her new endeavor, and we've already hired someone that you will meet at the next meeting to serve in that role, and her name is also Kim, and so it makes it easy on us in the office. Thank you, Madam Chair. That's it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Gregg. Next up on our list, we have our MyFishCount Update, and I think Chip is going to give us that.

DR. COLLIER: We continue to work with MyFishCount, and we are providing an update on the number of users. As of the writing of this report, there are 821 users, and they have reported 866 trips. Looking in that trips number, I believe that does actually include some of the test trips. Looking at the promotions, we are continuing to promote it. We are doing some webinars, and we've had some success with getting people in those, and they have all indicated that it was very useful to have those trainings, and so we're going to likely continue those trainings.

We have been working on a Shiny app, which is just a web program, or a web portal, in order to look at some of the data, and I can show you what it looks like right now, and so I will pull that up, if you give me just one second, and I have two different versions of this. I have a test version, and then also a live version, and so what I'm going to show you right now is what is currently out on the web, and then it's not updated, because I haven't checked the most recent data, but this was through 9/26.

In addition to that, while the computer is thinking about it, we are continuing to clean the data and to check for errors and also make it more streamlined. Then, finally, one of the biggest things that we're trying to do with this reporting app is actually make it available so that several different systems could report into ACCSP, and, right now, the API is being developed, and we are able to submit some data through that process.

Here is what we're calling our Shiny app, and it welcomes you to the first page. It indicates the number of users and the number of trips. If you look at this through 9/26, and it gives you exactly what day it's based up to, and then you can go into some of the information that's been reported for the last two weeks, and this, once again, was 9/26 was the last two weeks, updated for this page.

You can see the most common species that were reported, and there is no numbers associated with this. We're just giving the rankings, and, also, some of the fish with the highest number reported. Within there, you can go into different pieces of information, and you can look at November, if you want to see some information from that, and so that was November of last year, is what that data was indicating. We don't have November in there yet.

What we're thinking with this catch information is fishermen would find it useful when they're designing their trips, and so what fish are typically caught in the South Atlantic region during this time period, and so the next piece of information, the next tab over, is MyFishCount fish, and this is information on the length distribution for fish that were kept and discarded. We have several different species here, black sea bass, gag, gray triggerfish, red snapper, vermilion snapper, and you can see the percent of fish by length distribution, depending on whichever species you pick, and then you can scroll further down and actually look at the reason for release, and so this focuses just on the released fish and whether or not it was over the bag limit, too small, other reasons, and you can scroll through the different species.

Some of the species we don't have that great information on, and red snapper is obviously one that we have been getting a lot of information on that species, and you can see the length distribution of fish that were caught, or kept, and then length distribution of fish that were released. Then you can go in there, and you can look at additional information for the releases. You can look at release treatment, and you can also look at reason for release in a different format.

Then, finally, we go into some of the life history information for some of these higher-profile species, and so we have some information that I pulled from the Ecospecies database as well as the most recent SEDARs, and it focuses on the distribution, the spawning, reproduction, movement. We try to put an interesting fact for each species as well as age and stock status, and so, within that, we have these normal von Bertalanffy curves. They're actually in inches and ages

and pounds, trying to make it legible for fishermen and what they would be using, and so we have a length-at-age plot, and we have a size and weight plot as well as a maturity plot.

These information can be combined, if you click on this life history data, with MyFishCount reports, and, if you scroll down, we have changed this to look at the length of fish. Then, for each age, what is the portion of the fish that were reported within MyFishCount, and so a ten-inch fish that is being displayed here for black sea bass is somewhere between a one-year-old fish and a four or five-year-old fish, and that accounts for about 24 percent of the fish that were reported through MyFishCount. We also have the length-weight distribution, and you can compare how the fish reported in MyFishCount match up to the most recent SEDARs, and then, once again, this is the proportion mature.

The fish that we have the best information, once again, is red snapper, and you can look at that for red snapper, and you can see the overall catch distribution within these age blocks, and then, once again, the size distribution, which matches up very well with the most recent SEDAR, as reported through MyFishCount.

That's what we're working on to display some of the information that's being reported through MyFishCount. If you guys have any questions on that, please let me know. If you want to see any other piece of information, we can try to provide that in there for you. One thing you will note that MyFishCount -- We're not trying to actually provide numbers of fish. What we're trying to do is describe the fishery better for you guys through the management process.

DR. LANEY: Chip, as far as QA/QC goes, have you got just some standard error routines that you run on the data and things like that?

DR. COLLIER: We're working on those, yes. Where this comes from is I looked at the age distribution within the most recent SEDARs. Looking at the von Bertalanffy curves, they provide actual ages for each species, and I looked at the ages that had samples in there, and so, if you look at the largest size there for red snapper, that age distribution went from eight years old all the way up to forty-five years old. It doesn't mean that necessarily that fish was forty-five or anything like that, but that's the potential ages that that size fish was.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions for Chip? All right. Thank you so much, Chip. Next up, we have Hurricane Impacts from Cameron.

MS. RHODES: Hi, everybody. I don't really have much to report since the last time I came to the table for you in the September/October meeting. We had a few additional comments from folks on the Snapper Grouper AP, when we recirculated the form, and, just to refresh your memory, we sent out basically a public comment form structure to our advisory panels, to get an idea of how they were affected by Hurricane Florence, and that was distributed to them. It was not distributed to the public. We were just trying to get a feel for primarily how North Carolina was impacted by the hurricane.

Most of those comments -- We had a range, but I would say most of the comments were from folks in North Carolina, and they did offer some suggestions for if we wanted to pursue further information and where we could go to do so. At this point, I think we're really just looking for any kind of council guidance on what you would like us to do with this information. For the last

hurricane, for Hurricane Irma, we were asked to provide that information to NOAA Fisheries. We haven't been asked for that this time, but, if you would like us to redistribute the form, we're happy to do that. We're just looking for additional guidance on how you guys would like us to continue to collect information.

I know that the North Carolina governor has already moved forward with a couple of steps, and I'm sure that Steve can elaborate on that better than I can, but I just wanted to see if you guys had any notes for us on how you would like us to do this, if you would like us to continue to do this when hurricanes come through, if you have any suggestions for how to make them better, and I know that you've seen the forms. You've seen the reports in the past, and it's exactly like the public comment forms that send out to people, and so, any suggestions you guys might have, we're totally open to them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Are there questions or comments or ideas? I like that you guys do this, and I would appreciate you continuing to do it in the future if we have other storms. I think it's been helpful. Steve, I don't know if you want to add anything.

MR. POLAND: Yes, and so the North Carolina legislature has earmarked some money for hurricane relief for the commercial fishery in the state. I think we got a little over a million dollars. There's been some discussions about more, and I know our legislature went back into short session a week or two ago, and I think they're tossing around some numbers, on the order of the \$8 to \$10 million range, and that money has come to us, to the Division, to disperse to the fishermen, and it's really not something that we have a lot of experience with, and so that's something that we're working out, but I do have a question, or I guess two questions. First, how many respondents did you have, and, two, has anybody reached out to you via a private entity or a federal agency, like FEMA or anything, inquiring about that information?

MS. RHODES: We have not been contacted by another agency. We've had conversations with folks from different agencies, just casually, asking them for suggestions and things like that. Sea Grant folks from North Carolina did weigh-in on the form, before we distributed it, but no one has asked for the results of the form.

We had twelve respondents, and, just going based on a guesstimate here, I would say probably 75 percent of them were from North Carolina, and we did have people who responded and said that I was not impacted by the storm, and I like that people are putting that information in there, too. It's helpful for us to gauge where exactly the targeted impacts are, but one of the things that I think we've been unclear on is, for Hurricane Irma, we kept it, so that it was just focused on our advisory panels, but, when advisory panels provided additional information on other people, particularly in the spiny lobster fishery in south Florida, we put that information into the form, with their permission, and so it wasn't limited to just advisory panel members at that point.

We didn't reach out really to other folks for additional info, but I'm not really sure of the legalities of this, and it might have to turn to Monica, since we don't want to take a survey approach to this, and this is really more of an in-house thing, but I'm not sure if that's something we want to look into pursuing, like us contacting particular tackle shops that don't necessarily have a connection to the council, but other council folks have told us to reach out to them and they can provide you with more information, and so that's kind of a -- I don't know if that's something we can do,

Monica, but that's something that has come up amongst staff during our conversations about how to better get a feel for what's going on.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm sure you could do it. It just is how you go about doing it, and so why don't you and I talk offline? If that's something the council wants you to pursue, then we can figure out how to do that.

MR. DIAZ: This is a quick comment for Steve. After Hurricane Katrina, there was a tremendous amount of money that came into the Gulf. I believe all five Gulf states had some type of program to either work fishermen or pay fishermen. The money flowed from Congress to NOAA to Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, and they administered all of it, and they've got all five state plans right there.

With one call, or one email, they could send all those plans to you, and you could look at how all five states did it, and I guarantee that you will come out with some good ideas. Whether you use them or not, I don't know, but it will give you plenty to think about. There's a lot of work that's been done, and you might not have to reinvent the wheel, for some things anyway, and so I'm sure that would be helpful to you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The same thing for Irma, Hurricane Irma, last year, and Congress appropriated \$44.6 million to Florida, and we're in the process of finalizing our spend plan for that, and so we can send you some information as well.

MR. POLAND: I would really appreciate that, because it's something that nobody at the division is -- We're not insurance adjusters or economists or anything like that, and so it's really something that we're just kind of -- We're really just trying to feel our way through.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's talk offline.

MR. DILERNIA: Steve, also, after Sandy hit the New York metropolitan area, the feds gave New York and New Jersey money, federal assistance money, and it went directly to the states. The states accepted it, and, in New York State, it was the Department of Environmental Conservation, and, in New Jersey, their division was responsible for distributing the money. The money in New York and New Jersey went to both for-hire vessels as well as commercial vessels and the businesses that were dependent upon fishing, and so it wasn't just -- Tackle shops got some money, and bait stations got some money. It took about three years to get the money, but the money was distributed, and so, again, you may want to speak to your counterparts in New York State and ask them how they distributed the money.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Cameron, are you wanting more direction from us? One thing I can tell you is, at least the way it has worked for Florida, is our executive office, in this case being the governor, made requests following Irma and Hurricane Michael for a fisheries disaster.

Once that was declared, NOAA Fisheries comes in and does a rapid assessment. They are required to do it, and it gets at more of what you're talking about, and so I'm wondering if the utility of what you're doing is more the earlier stages of following the storm in the couple of weeks afterwards, kind of trying to get an early assessment of what the impacts are. That might be of more utility, since, in many of these cases, I think NOAA Fisheries is going to come in later and

do this more specific analysis and assessment of the damages that includes tackle store owners and wholesale dealers and all of the above. Those are kind of my initial thoughts here. I don't know if anybody else has anything to add.

MS. RHODES: So that would be direction to keep it in-house and keep it solely with our advisory panel members at this point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure. If other people report, like you said with the lobster, I think it's fine to accept that information. I just don't think that I would spend too terribly much time, unless you get some kind of request for, hey, what are the early numbers that you're getting and what are the early reports, which I think we got some of that information from you guys following Irma, and that was helpful, but I am thinking that, in many cases, NOAA Fisheries is going to come in behind both what you all are doing and what the states are doing to get some more specific numbers. All right. Thank you, Cameron. Next up, I think we have the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team Report, and it looks like that's going to be Christina and Charlie Phillips.

MS. WIEGAND: I am going to update you guys on everyone's second favorite protected resource, large whales. If you will remember, back in October, you appointed Charlie as your representative to the Take Reduction Team, and so I'm going to give you just sort of a bare-bones refresher on what take reduction plans and teams are, and then Charlie is on the webinar, and I will let him fill you in on what they talked about at the October meeting.

Take reduction plans are only developed for certain marine mammal stocks, and these are stocks that are listed as endangered, declining, threatened, or likely to be listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act or are listed as depleted under the Marine Mammal Protection Act or are experiencing human-caused mortality that is exceeding the potential biological removal, and this is the amount of human-caused mortality that the stock can withstand and still be at a sustainable population level.

For Atlantic large whales, this was originally -- The take reduction plan was developed in 1997 to reduce the serious injury and mortality of right whales, humpback whales, and fin whales, and the plan contains both formal regulations, like gear modifications, area closures, time closures, as well as programs that are aimed at expanding research and monitoring and outreach efforts. The Take Reduction Team serves as sort of an advisory panel that provides consensus recommendation on needed modifications or improvements to the plan to NMFS for implementation.

All of this information is here. I did just want to note a few links, in particular. The Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan and Team coordinators do a really great job of keeping their webpage updated, and they provide these gear guides for trap and pot gear and gillnet gear in the Southeast, as well as black sea bass guides for each state. I looked these over, and they are up-to-date, to the best of my knowledge, and are a really great resource, if you've ever got fishermen reaching out to you that are confused about different large whale regulations. I will turn it over to Charlie to let him talk to you about what they discussed at the October meeting.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Christina. It's nice to hear you all again, Madam Chair and council members. I just got what they call the near-final report for the meeting, and so I'm just going to kind of scan over a few things. If you've got a question, stop me and ask me. It was like a twenty-one-page report, and I guess they will still tweak it a little bit, but it was October 9 through 12.

There were forty-four members of a fifty-nine-person team there, and Sam Rauch was there, along with some other -- The Regional Administrator and some other folks. The team is supposed to work on consensus, and so you all can imagine how getting consensus for forty-four people plus, versus a smaller meeting. They do not make motions, and everybody is there, from the Humane Society right on up to industry and state reps and NGOs. They cover a lot of people.

One of the things that I noticed, when I started scanning through the report, was they estimated 481 whales in 2010, and now they are estimating just over 400 whales, as of 2018, and the three core points they have for this change is ecosystem shifts appear to be impacting the right whales' core food supply, the copepods, and so they are not where they used to be, and they are spending more time and energy and traveling greater distances to find food, and, basically, a lot of the whales are going to Canada, and so they're ending up in the St. Lawrence Seaway, and they are having more encounter rates with shipping, and then those folks, up until recently -- You know, they've got snow crab pots up there, and I think Doug found one down here, a snow crab pot on one down here, a couple of years, down off of Cumberland, and so whales are going places that they've never really been before, or not in great numbers, and so it's just changing the interaction rates.

Some of the -- They say, third, the behavior of fisheries in historical whale habitat uses have changed. There is, obviously, a lot of discussion with the lobster folks up there, and so some of the lobster fishery have started -- They have got trawls, but they have started using more traps on a trawl, trying to reduce some of the vertical lines, and so you reduce vertical lines, but some of them, I think, may have put some stronger bottom lines in, because of the longer trawls, and so there's an awful lot of talk about rope strength.

The magic number that seems to be talked about the most is 1,700 pounds, which, in some areas, the fishermen say it's okay, and some other areas, especially deep water, they have concerns if it's strong enough, and then they've got concerns about wear and knots in it and splices in it and all those kind of things that change the rope strength a lot.

Going along, they had -- A lot of the whale entanglements have been in Canada lately, in 2017 in particular, and they're finding snow crab pot gear on up there and unknown gear, and so the potential biological removal, because we're losing a lot more whales than we have been in the past, and then, to compound the problem, we're not getting any calves.

The calving rates have gotten really low, and I think it was zero last year, and so they're looking at all kinds of options, and obviously, since the only thing they can control is what fishermen do, the fishermen are going to bear the brunt of the new regulations and/or closures, rolling closures, line strength changes, and they've even went so far as to look at maybe having them make the lines red, hoping the whales can see them a little bit better and maybe dodge the lines.

There is a lot going on, and there is going to be some regulations, because that's all they can do, if the whale rates don't go up or they don't figure out a way to not interact with the whales. I saw somewhere else that, in the last -- I think it said since 2010 that they've had like 400-plus either mortalities or significant injuries, and that seems like an awful lot of -- To me, it just seems like an awful high interaction rate when you've only got a little over 400 whales, and so the team is really looking and working with the stakeholders. They had breakout groups of mixed stakeholders, and it was really good.

They have got twenty members who have offered to serve on a rope-less best practices workgroup, and there is almost nothing that's not on the table, but probably the best thing that can happen would be to start to have some calving events down south, and, without getting into the weeds, I think I will stop there.

MR. BELL: Charlie, thanks. A quick question. I guess there's been no indication of encounters with black sea bass pots. I mean, you recall what all we went through recently with the black sea bass fishery, and I guess nothing there, right?

MR. PHILLIPS: Unless it falls into one of those unknown gear categories, no, and I think they would be able to -- If there was any black sea bass pot, the way our gear is marked, I would have thought that they would have been able to identify that, and so, no, nobody said anything about any black sea bass pots.

MR. BELL: Okay, that's good, and so is there any indication that any of the fisheries that we deal with or anything else needs to be done, or I guess we're in good shape right now?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I would say we're in good shape, but, because the number of the whales that are coming out of the population is at such a high rate, I -- It looks like everything is on the table, and I wouldn't say we're free and clear, because, if something happens anywhere -- You know, they've seen these whales, I think, as far as the Gulf of Mexico, and so the lobster fishermen and the snow crab guys, and even the shipping, is going to have additional regulations on them, rolling closures and ship speed changes. Canada has started doing a lot in the last couple of years, and it seems to be helping, but, if you don't have any calves coming in -- It's just hard to get ahead if you don't have any calves you can add to the population.

MR. BELL: Was there any discussion of the great white shark populations increasing?

MR. PHILLIPS: Actually, I think there was. I think they talked to Clay George about that, and he was there, and he's from Georgia. There was some conversation about it, but there is no -- Nobody can prove and definitely say that, yes, it's doing this, or, no, it's not, but it was talked about. I mean, they literally -- I don't think they left a rock unturned.

MR. BELL: Real quick, I'm not sure where the red line thing was coming from, but, ten feet down, red is not red, and I am sure they know that, but --

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I know that and you know that, because we both dive, but, supposedly -- I mean, that's literally how desperate, and I'm going to use the word "desperate", that the group is on trying to do anything to lower interactions, and they had some what they call cross-cutting discussions, and some of the main things were vertical line reductions, closed areas, rolling closed areas, experiment with rope-less fishing gear, and they also wanted more surveys, so they could try to get a handle on what's where.

A lot of lobster fishermen say that, where they fish, they have never seen a whale, and so they feel like they're going to get regulations for stuff that they've never seen, kind of like some of the stuff we have to go through sometimes. One thing that they did all agree on was they wanted a ban on

aquaculture in closed areas. They don't want to add any more ropes to the water, especially for new fisheries.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Charlie, we have a couple more questions, but I had a question building on what Mel is asking. If there are new regulations that come out of this that do affect us, what do you think the timing is of those new regulations?

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think anything is going to come out until after we see what the calving season looks like, and the calving season is probably going to have a lot to do with what they feel like they need to do. That's my gut feeling.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you.

DR. LANEY: Charlie, is there anything unusual in terms of mortalities going on with the other large whale species? I know they look at at least three other species, right, humpbacks and minke and, what, fins, and so anything weird going on there, or it's just Northern right whales?

MR. PHILLIPS: No, they're looking at all of it, and I looked at -- They had what they call unusual interactions for some of those whales, but, because they are in much better shape biologically than the right whales -- They mentioned it, but I didn't really go into it that much, because I don't think that's going to be what's going to drive the regulations. It's going to be right whales, but there are some interactions with gear with those other whales.

MR. CONKLIN: Are the folks that are on the Take Reduction Team, are they the same folks that go following these things around and count them?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, they're trying to count them, as best they can, but, again, the whales are not where they are usually at. They are finding a lot of whales up in St. Lawrence, and the best they can tell is they are looking for food. They are chasing their food, which would be normal, and the water temperatures are changing up there, especially in the Gulf of Maine. They are having some of the more radical water temperature changes versus other places. Their water is heating up quicker than other places, for some reason, and they're not really sure why. I forgot what the first part of the question was now.

MR. CONKLIN: You answered it. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay.

MR. SAPP: Charlie, you might want to tell them to take a peek in the Gulf Stream in late summer. We're seeing a lot of them down there.

MR. PHILLIPS: That was the other thing I was going to say. I think they spotted -- When they were doing their surveys, I think they found about 300 of the whales, while they were looking, but there is still a lot of the whales that they think we have, but they haven't been able to -- They didn't locate them last year, if I read the report properly, but, yes, if you think you know where some are, they would be glad to hear from you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: More questions from anybody?

MS. WIEGAND: I just wanted to note a few other things. I went to the North Atlantic Right Whale Recovery Plan Implementation Team meeting last week, and we got a ton of presentations, and I wanted to note that Amy Knowlton, who is up at the New England Aquarium, gave a presentation on research she had done looking at entanglements that could be attributed to the southeastern United States, and, through her work, she found that there were really only about twenty instances since between like 1980 and 2016 where they could sort of attributed those entanglements to gear from the southeastern United States, and so they do -- Whales do get entangled down here, but certainly not at a rate like they do in New England and Canada.

I do not believe a specific fishery was mentioned, but I could find that presentation for you guys, and this council also got a lot of compliments for the work that you guys have done through the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan to reduce interactions with right whales, and Charlie also got a nice shout-out and compliments for his work on rope-less gear technology and work with the Take Reduction Team, and so they're aware that you guys are doing good work trying to protect the whales.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's great news. Any more questions for Christina or Charlie? All right. Thank you both for your report on the whales.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, all. Have a good meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Next up, we have some presentations from the SERO office, and I think that Rick DeVictor is going to do some of these, and then we will follow it up with Jenny Lee with the Protected Resources Update. First up, I think we have the Status of Recreational and Commercial Catches Versus ACLS for species that we haven't already covered.

MR. DEVICTOR: Thank you. The species that we haven't gone over are the CMP species, and we'll do the same thing. I will go through the commercial, and Dr. Larkin will go through the recreational ones. This is Tab 4, Attachment 4a in your briefing materials for Full Council. What we have on the screen is our updated landings as of December 4, and so, starting off with king mackerel, preliminary landings of king mackerel, from the Southeast Science Center quota monitoring system, it's shown in the table.

Again, the fishing year begins on March 1, to remind you, and the ACL is 5.2 million pounds. If you look at the table, you can see the current year landings, 2018/2019, for king mackerel. For the Northern Zone, it's 18 percent. The Southern Zone Season 1, which begins March 1 and goes through September 30, is at about 60 percent. The Southern is 6.92 percent, and the cumulative total is 33.9 percent, and so those are preliminary landings of king mackerel.

Moving on down to Spanish mackerel, this ACL for 2018/2019 is just over 3.3 million pounds. You can see what the northern quota and the southern quota are on that. The northern quota, we're currently at 105 percent on that. We did close that down on November 4, 2018, and you can see, in the notes, that we closed down relatively the same time last year, November 7, 2017, and we did have that transfer last year, but not this year. Then you can see where we're at with the Southern Zone, 31.9, and the total of 46.4.

Lastly, I want to touch upon Atlantic cobia. You can see the Atlantic group quota is 50,000 pounds on that, and then we are at 50.6 percent, and we did close commercial harvest of Atlantic cobia on September 5, and, again, I will talk about Amendment 31 and where we're at in that process for Atlantic cobia, and I think Dr. Larkin is on the line to handle recreational landings.

DR. LARKIN: I will do the recreational landings, and I will begin with king and Spanish mackerel. It's the same format as before, and this will look very familiar to the information that I gave on Tuesday. Landings are summarized using MRIP, and the 2017 landings are final, and the 2018 landings are preliminary, and we're doing what we call poststratification, which basically means we're looking at certain regions to equal how the ACL is monitored, and so, for example, like cobia from New York to Georgia, we look at that region to match how the assessments are done and how the ACLs were set. Then these landings for 2018 are from January 1 through August 31, and so Waves 1 through 4, and all the landings include the MRIP and also the headboat landings as well.

These are the 2016/2017 landings, although I added cobia here, and they have a calendar year of January through December, but just to keep them all on the same table, and so you see cobia north of Georgia and then cobia east Florida and then king mackerel and Spanish, and king and Spanish have the March to February fishing year. Then you can see, in these cases, they are below the ACL.

Recently, we recently got the Waves 3 and 4, and, for cobia for 2018, and so we did exceed the ACL. There was a spike in landings in Waves 3 and 4, and so that May/June and also that July through August, and there is some high landings in North Carolina and Virginia, as we've certainly seen in past years. The AM for cobia is to monitor the stock or close it the following year, as well as the council is in the process of giving cobia to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, but, anyway, currently, right now, they're at 96 percent over the ACL, but the other ones are below the ACL.

Then the same format as before. The gray is when it was monitored in MRFSS, and then the non-shaded is when it switches over to MRIP, and these are the landings by fishing year, broken up by mode, the charter, headboat, private, shore, and then the total. Then the same format here. We've got the year down on the X-axis and then the landings over on the Y-axis to the left, and then the overall effort for MRIP and headboat are over to the right. Then the dashed lines are the ACL, and so you can see that, in this case, they're all well below the ACL.

Then, for Spanish mackerel, you see it switches over to MRFSS/MRIP in 2014/2015, and then these are the landings broken up by mode, and then the same setup here. You can look at which modes contributed most to the landings, and you can visualize it here and then look at the landings relative to those dashes, those black dashes, again being the ACL.

Then cobia. Again, the landings switch over from MRFSS to MRIP in 2016, and then you see that highlighting in 2015, 2016, and 2017, in the last ten years, and then there you see we actually had a dip in the landings in 2017, but then we seem to have come back with high landings in 2018. Not as high as 2015 and 2016, but we still had high landings in 2018. That's it, and I would be happy to take any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any questions on either one of those presentations?

MR. POLAND: Two questions about cobia. First, are these landings -- These were back-calculated to the Coastal Household Telephone Survey effort, right, and then put back in the same currency?

DR. TRAVIS: Yes, and I'm sorry that I didn't mention that, but you're right. Yes, these are to match the telephone survey and so how the ACL was determined, and so yes. Sorry I didn't mention that, but yes.

MR. POLAND: Then the second question is I know there was a lot of discussion at the ASMFC level about Virginia using their average weights from their carcass collection program as a stand-in for the weights intercepted from MRIP, and so did these landings include those average weights from Virginia, or did you all use the MRIP average weights, the expansion process?

DR. TRAVIS: They're more the Science Center's average weights. They make sure they have a sample size of thirty or greater when they determine, but it's not from Virginia carcass sampling. It's from the MRIP surveys, where they made sure they had a sample size of thirty or more, and so it's not from the Virginia carcass samples, if that helps.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any other questions? Mel, do you have questions?

MR. BELL: I just want to make sure I'm -- That's 2018, and that's where we were 196 percent, or whatever it was?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

DR. TRAVIS: Yes, and so we're still in 2018, but the landings are real spiky. They take place mostly in the summer, and so I don't expect a lot more landings in future waves, just based on what I've seen of historical landings.

MR. POLAND: I don't want to spend too much more time on cobia, because I know we're about to divorce ourselves, but 147,000 pounds from the shore mode, can you explain that a little bit? What's going on there?

DR. TRAVIS: I cannot, but I can look into it. I can certainly get back to you. You want to know exactly like where they took place, right?

MR. POLAND: Yes, and we can do this offline.

DR. TRAVIS: I can certainly look and see how many intercepts and see where those come from. If you hang in there, I can look that up and get back to you with the shore mode landings and how did they get those.

MR. WAUGH: Steve, I believe, how MRIP is done now, piers are included in the shore mode, and so those could be pier catches, but, again, it's high.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. More questions?

MS. BECKWITH: I think that's exactly the point that we're trying to make, is, because these are being caught off the piers, that we consider this expansion inappropriate to have that pier effort expanded out to all the shore effort, and so, for anyone out there who is listening, remember that - I think there is some need to have that pier separated from the actual shore effort. This is an example of why this is not going to work well.

MR. SAPP: Pier effort or boat effort, it would surprise me if -- I mean, even calling it a twenty-five-pound average fish is a pretty decent cobia, and that's 6,000 cobia. I mean, shore, boat, pier, everybody combined, it would surprise me if that was a real number.

MR. HAYMANS: I believe piers have always been included in shore. It's not something new to 2018 or new to the new survey.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Right.

MR. POLAND: In North Carolina, we used to separate our shore mode into pier and beach/bank mode, and that was something that was collapsed back down with the new MRIP estimates.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more questions? All right. Thank you, both. I think we're going to continue on with status of amendments under formal review, and I believe that's you, Rick.

MR. DEVICTOR: Thank you. Starting off, we've been talking about CMP Amendment 31, Atlantic cobia, and, of course, this rule would remove Atlantic cobia from federal management under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and, at the same time, would implement comparable regulations under the Atlantic Coastal Act to replace the existing Magnuson-Stevens Act based regulations in federal waters. The NOA published on October 11. The proposed rule published on November 9, and both comment periods end on the same day, December 10, and we're working on a final rule package now, and, of course, the final rule will announce the implementation date of CMP 31.

Next on the list is CMP Framework Amendment 6, and this is one that the council took final action at the last meeting, and it modifies the commercial trip limits for Atlantic king mackerel in the Atlantic Southern Zone in Season 1, and we're working on that proposed rule package now. Then there is Spiny Lobster Amendment 13, and this was the bully net amendment and other actions, and we are working on the proposed rule package now on that one. Then, if I jump down to the for-hire amendment, of course, that was approved, and we've been talking about that for a while, and we are working on a final rule package now.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I wanted to just bring up something with the for-hire final rule. As you know, that amendment has been approved, and we're working on the final rule, and there is a lot of pieces kind of to the puzzle to be properly put together so that we can collect the information from the charter vessel owners and operators, because they are going to need to report.

Just there are approximately about 2,138 South Atlantic for-hire permits. Of those, 373 fishers hold a Gulf permit and a South Atlantic permit. The Gulf also has done a similar kind of reporting

amendment, and that amendment has been approved, and their proposed rule is currently out for public comment, and so recall that one of your goals was to also eliminate duplicate reporting, such that you didn't want to make a South Atlantic fisher who had another permit under another reporting system have to report under that other reporting system and also under the South Atlantic reporting system if the other reporting system was more restrictive, more stringent, and so, in other words, for the Gulf reporting program, they require a GPS-like device, and they require a number of things, and, in the amendment and in the rules, we have discussed that for these roughly 373 dually-permitted holders.

Once the Gulf permit requirements come online, they're going to have to report under the Gulf system, and that will satisfy the South Atlantic reporting requirements as well. What we have right now is that the South Atlantic's rulemaking for final rule is ahead of the Gulf's final rule. The Gulf, I think we anticipate probably getting the final rule out in the late spring, in late March or mid-April, and so, if we go ahead right now with the South Atlantic final rule, what you can have is these 373 dual-permit holders first having to learn how to report under the South Atlantic system, and remember this is all new, a new reporting system for these folks, and then, in the matter of a couple of months later, switching over to then reporting under the Gulf's reporting system.

It appears to me that making them learn one reporting system and then switching to another really could create some unnecessary confusion and complications and frustration for these fishermen, and we did not mention, in the proposed rule, any kind of delay for these fishermen, potentially, to have to report, and so this is why I'm coming to you with a couple of potential solutions.

I think we have two options. One is to delay the effective date for these specific fishermen, these 373 dually-permitted fishermen, to not have to report until the Gulf's system comes online, or we could delay the publishing the South Atlantic's final rule and publish it at the same time, pretty much, that the Gulf's final rule goes out, and so you would have both final reporting requirements going out at the same time, and that would make these 373 fishers just go ahead and have to report under the Gulf system.

One other piece of information is that these guys will be reporting to the ACCSP. I think that's the -- I think, as Bonnie Ponwith used to say, that's the catcher's mitt. That's who is going to be receiving the information, and Mike Cahall from the ACCSP has said that, by February 15, they would be able to have an app developed for a smartphone, such that people would be able to report on their smartphone instead of having to buy, as we talked about in the proposed rule and the NOA, the people could use computers, tablets, or smartphones, and so, anyway, some sort of delay for these folks could benefit them, if they have smartphones, and then they could use the app to report.

Hopefully I haven't confused you too much, but I just wanted to get a little bit of discussion from you all on those two options I put out, which is, one, delay the effective date for these 373 fishers, so they wouldn't have to report until the Gulf's final rule goes into effect, or just wait, since we're pretty close anyway, and that would be my, really, advice to you, is to just wait until the Gulf's final rule is published. Again, that is probably going to be in mid-March, or maybe early April, and then that would allow the ACCSP folks time to get this smartphone app in place, so that it would save people money and they could use their smartphone, if they have one, to report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Monica. I can tell you that, at FWC, we have been writing commenting letters and wanting them to both go in place at the same time, and so it's

simultaneously, not to pull out the 373 separate, but just both the South Atlantic and the Gulf going into place at the same time. Other folks around the table?

MR. WAUGH: We have talked with Monica and Rick and with ACCSP as well, Mike Cahall, and the training we're doing, and Kathleen is doing a session tonight, you get down in Florida and those people -- Their temperature is a little bit higher, and so, if we can do something to keep them a little cooler, I think it's worth it, and I think, the bulk of the area, there is not a lot of fishing, charter fishing, until you start getting into April or May, and so I think, as long as it doesn't drag on beyond mid-April, I don't think we'll see anything negative.

There's a lot of fishing in Florida in the first part of the year, but we can still go forward with the training, and people can start learning, and I think we can point out to the fishermen what we're doing to try to minimize impacts to them, is delaying the effective date so that those dual-permitted vessels don't have to learn two systems, and something to me that I think is a lot more important to them is you won't have to then go out and buy a tablet. You can just start using your smartphone, and so it helps ease that transition, and I think it will be a lot more effective.

MR. BELL: I would agree. Probably, the less painful we make this, it would be a smoother approach, and we would get, perhaps, better cooperation and buy-in when we get there, and so I think it makes sense, Monica's recommendation in terms of the best approach, and that makes sense to me.

MR. CONKLIN: Do we need that in the form of a motion or can we just go with some general consensus?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, I don't think you do. I've got what I think is -- I understand what the council would like to do, and that's sufficient, and I don't think you need a motion. I do want to say it's been very eye-opening and interesting to see how much work has been put into developing the system to collect this information, and the Fisheries Service has been devoting a lot of person-power and time, along with some ACCSP folks and those other folks, and there's just been so many pieces, from security requirements to developing the system and all of that, and so it's taken a while, but I think that it will be well worth the wait.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you.

DR. CRABTREE: So we're absolutely not going to require people to start reporting once and then switch, and we did get a little delay in the Gulf program, because of Hurricane Michael, and we had requests from Panama -- That was right in the middle of the comment period, and we had requests to extend the comment period, and so we did that, but I really think, right now, the key is to try and have a successful rollout, and whether that occurs much later or not, I'm more interested in having it go smoothly. The first year is largely going to be an education experience and get the equipment on the boat and get this thing going anyways, and so it seems to me, right now, having both programs go in place simultaneously is the smoothest way to do it, and so I agree with that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Anything else on that topic? All right, and so we're at five o'clock, and I would like to go a little bit longer. I want to get to Jenny Lee, who I assume is on the phone, and then I want to get to Tony and Dale's presentation as well.

MS. WIEGAND: I actually think Rick is going to give Jenny's presentation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Rick.

MR. DEVICTOR: Okay. Jenny Lee was not able to make the meeting today, and so the report is in the briefing material for Full Council, and so you can read it there, and she did provide a couple of bullets for me to read into the record, and she said, of course, contact her if there's any additional questions.

NOAA Fisheries published a proposed rule two years ago that, if implemented, would require all shrimp trawlers using skimmer trawls, pusher-head trawls, and wing nets to use TEDs designed to exclude small turtles in their nets. When the council met last time in September, SERO was working on the final rule for that action, and that final rule is now under review in Headquarters.

Then there is two new items under the MMPA, Marine Mammal Protection Act, and they're as follows, and so there is the 2019 proposed list of fisheries comment period, which was open when Protected Resources prepared the briefing material in the Full Council folder, and so that comment period closed on November 23, and there were no proposed category changes to Southeast Region fisheries.

Finally, Jenny Lee shared information on how a recent publication confirmed that the endangered North Atlantic right whale population has been declining since 2010, and you all just talked about that, and so there was a report that showed that 160 females in the population could drop to fewer than fifty females within the next fifty years, and, of course, as you talked about, the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team met in October of 2018. The team provided feedback for NMFS to look at prior to the next time that they're going to meet, which is March of 2019. That is basically what Jenny shared with me to share with you all, and, again, that report is in the briefing materials.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Rick. Any questions for Rick?

DR. LANEY: Just one, Rick. In looking over Jenny's report, and referencing my earlier question, it does note, in the written report, that, since January of 2016, elevated humpback whale mortalities have occurred, and, since January of 2017, elevated minke whale mortalities have occurred along the Atlantic coast, and so it makes you kind of wonder if there is some common factor between those three large whale species that are causing some elevated mortality event, and that's kind of unusual to see three different species all showing a similar trend.

MR. CONKLIN: Maybe we should let those folks know that it's probably sharks that are eating those whales. Like Mel said, it could be the megalodon coming back.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more questions? We're going to go into the two other presentations from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, the Commercial Electronic Logbook Program and the status of the MRIP Conversions, and I'm going to turn it over to Clay.

DR. PORCH: We have two presenters listening in on the webinar, Brett Pierce and Vivian Matter, and so, if you can unmute them, they can make the presentation.

MR. PIERCE: Hi, everyone. This is Brett. Briefly, I just want to give you an update on the progress that we've made on the electronic logbook program here since the last update that we gave you. We anticipate having the infrastructure to accept southeast electronic logbooks for the commercial sector in place by January of 2019.

There will be some additional time needed for ACCSP and any third-party vendor to develop the software that will accommodate that, but, for the most part, I think that we'll be able to get the infrastructure in place by January of next year. As you can see, most of the work has been completed to do this. There are a few minor things that still need to be done, as far as the infrastructure goes, and we are still waiting for the ACCSP to complete the database, the building aspect of it, and then to reconcile the API that goes with that, but, from my understanding, the majority of the API has been completed, so much so that we've been able to pass a lot of that API on to third-party vendors, the ones that participated in the pilot program with us a few years ago.

There has been progress, and there is progress being made from our third-party vendors that will kind of cut down on some of that time needed, once we get the infrastructure in place, to develop the software that will be able to put data into that, and so I'm not seeing the presentation on the webinar, and is that up?

MR. WAUGH: There isn't one. We were told it was just going to be verbal.

MR. PIERCE: Okay. Well, I can make it even quicker now, and so one of the other things that we are still waiting on is we do have a few things that we need to coordinate with ACCSP with, and we need to be able to create the way to pass information from SERO, permit information, to ACCSP, and we're going to do that by generating an ident variable, which is kind of a unique variable that uses information from both account information and from the permit information with SERO to be able to link up those that have already produced accounts with ACCSP and to match those to the permits that we have on file with SERO.

We have been given permission to pass that information on to ACCSP, and I expect that that will happen first thing next week and that we'll be able to pass that information on sometime next week to ACCSP. Then it's just a matter of working together and getting the final parts of the infrastructure in place, specifically how we're going to bring the data in from ACCSP and put it into our current database and also how we track compliance with that as well.

One thing, and one final thing I want to mention, is that we do have -- We have launched an application that will allow fishers to submit their electronic no-fishing reports electronically, and we kind of soft-launched that last time that we gave this presentation, and I can report now that it's been fully launched and that next week we are sending out our logbook packets to fishermen that we do every December. Inside that packet will be information for all fishermen inside Southeast and HMS fisheries that have permits currently to register to be able to submit their no-fishing reports electronically, and so that information will be provided to the entire fleet beginning next week.

The last thing from there is we just need to make sure that we work with ACCSP to get the data that's submitted into the database into our system to track compliance, and I expect that to take a couple more months, but, for the most part, the infrastructure will be completed next month, and so are there any questions?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't see any hands in the room. I really appreciate your presentation. Thank you.

MR. PIERCE: No problem.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so next up is Status of MRIP Conversions.

MS. MATTER: This is Vivian Matter, and I was just going to give a quick update on where we're at with the MRIP data, and we have Wave 4 2018 data sent to SERO for the presentation that Mike just presented, and so those, like Mike explained, were in the Coastal Household Telephone Survey units. We had to redo a couple of those. There was an issue at S&T with their server, and so we had to redo Wave 4 at the beginning of November, and so we sent that out as quick as possible.

As for the FES estimates, again, just the FES and APAIS adjustments were done at S&T. Down here at the Science Center, we did the charter mode calibration, which is accounting for the change in the for-hire survey, and so that was updated in October. We also, at that point, completed the HMS SAFE Reports, and so that included the FES data for HMS species, and that was completed in early November.

As far as the domain estimation for the new data, we had to update those in the middle of November, and there was an issue with some of the weighting variables that were communicated to us that we were supposed to be using from S&T, and so we found some issues, and so we kind of got back to them, back and forth, and, in mid-November, they gave us some new direction, and so we went ahead and applied that, and so we were able to complete all the domain estimation in mid-November. At that point, we were able to send out the Gulf red grouper estimates, and, also, we completed the SAFE Report that had the FES, APAIS, and for-hire survey estimates, and that was complete at the end of November. We are working along, and we're making a lot of progress, and up next are the rest of the South Atlantic assessments and gray triggerfish in the Gulf.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any questions? All right. Thank you for that presentation. Thanks for hanging in there with us, and I know it's late in the day.

MS. MATTER: No problem.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We have one more item that I think we want to get through today, and so the final item that we're going to try to cover today before we have the workshop tonight is the presentation on the Okeanos Explorer.

DR. COLLIER: We're going to be having a presentation from the Okeanos Explorer, and they've been doing a lot of work in the Southeast Region for the past year or two years, and they're going to continue work for the next hopefully year or two, and so we're going to get a lot more information.

We're going to get a presentation by Kelley Elliott with OER as well as Heather Coleman. Heather works with the Deep-Sea Coral Research and Technology Program, which they really coordinate well with the South Atlantic Council, as well as academic partners in NOAA, to make sure we're

getting information that's relevant for the South Atlantic Council to make decisions on deep-sea coral and sponges. With that, Heather, if you want to do the introduction for Kelley.

MS. COLEMAN: Yes, absolutely. Thank you for the introduction, and thank you also for having us at the council meeting. I'm sorry, and I will rush a little bit, since I know you're trying to get out of there. Like Chip said, I coordinate the Deep-Sea Coral Research and Technology Program, and we work with NOAA scientists in each region to support deep-sea coral discovery and research. We also work with all of the councils, to learn their science and exploration priorities and then to deliver information acquired after expeditions and data analysis are complete.

I'm just going to try to take up as little time as possible, but I just wanted to set the stage for Kelley Elliott, who is there in person, introducing one of our program's regional initiatives, and she has worked with the council over the past few years to identify many of the priorities that have been addressed during the Okeanos expedition that Kelley will talk about more today.

About a month ago, Casey, who is also from Kelley's office, met with the Habitat AP, and that was the longer version of this presentation, and so, if you have any questions, you can refer to that, or also you can get a briefing from the Habitat AP.

Just briefly, the Deep-Sea Coral Research and Technology Program mission is sound science and to conserve and manage vulnerable deep-water ecosystems. It's a congressionally-mandated program, and it's developed and maintained in consultation with all of the fishery management councils, and the Magnuson-Stevens reauthorization in 2007 gave the councils a number of authorities to protect deep-sea corals from fishing impacts.

Really, we operate through mutual initiatives, for the most part, and that's what I am showing on the screen right here, are the Southeast deep-sea coral initiatives. It kicked off in 2016, and it's got this 2019 large, dedicated amount of funding, and then it will wrap up in 2020, and so our priorities really come from the councils, in addition to researchers and sanctuaries and some other places, and so we brief the councils and committees whenever requested, but this time is a little unique, because our partners from Ocean Exploration Research are here to brief you, and that's exciting, and, if we want more instances of that, I would love to work with Chip and Roger to make that kind of thing happen more often.

Basically, what you can see on this screen is just input received from management and research priorities, and many of these came from the councils, from the South Atlantic Council itself, including the map up in the corner.

This image is from workshops that the Southeast Deep-Sea Coral Initiative held in 2015 and 2016 and the science plan that came out of the workshop. The map just shows the main priorities of the council and from researchers in the region, and particularly areas of interest to the council has been golden crab fishing off the southern coast of South Carolina and the southeast coast of Florida, and the other areas you can see here is -- The great thing about this map is that Kelley will show you that both of these areas were really reached by the Okeanos mission, and, so far, the regional initiative has produced a lot of data from ROVs and cruises, like Okeanos, from AUV missions, and even from an Alvin cruise, a human-occupied vehicle.

We have cruise reports and characterization reports and species guides and a geodatabase and lots of outreach student projects and presentations and predictive habitat modeling that's ongoing now, and scientific publications as well, and so all of these products really rely on our partnership with parts of NOAA and the researchers, but particularly Ocean Exploration Research and Okeanos expeditions.

We really value this partnership, and so I'm happy that Kelley is at the council meeting to talk about this particular expedition. With that, I will just introduce Kelley as the senior expedition manager for OER's Telepresence-Enabled Exploration Program. She's been planning, coordinating, and managing expeditions conducted by Okeanos Explorer since 2009, which is impressive. With that, Kelley, take it away.

MS. ELLIOTT: Thanks so much, Heather, and I really appreciate you setting the stage by sharing some background on the Southeast Deep-Sea Coral Initiative. This was certainly a major driver and identified quite a few of the priorities that were addressed during our Windows to the Deep 2018 Expedition.

Okeanos Explorer cruises are what are called community driven, and that means that we don't have principal investigators onboard conducting hypothesis-driven cruises. Instead, we conduct mission-driven cruises, and I will tell you a little bit more about that, that seek to address priorities that have been identified by the broad science and management community, and I will be happy to answer more specific questions, if folks have them, about how that's done at the end of the presentation, if folks are interested.

The Office of Ocean Exploration and Research is the only federal organization that is dedicated to exploring the ocean for the purpose of discovery and the advancement of knowledge, and we satisfy this mission requirement in several ways. One is through an annual federal funding opportunity, where we make one to several million dollars of funding available to principal investigators through grants to conduct ocean exploration work.

Another root is through projects with partners to combine capabilities and resources and meet common or complementary interests, and one way that we do this might be through providing the platform to test and advance technology in a new area and acquire data in a poorly-explored region or through a multiyear interagency collaboration, like the one that's occurring right now in the Southeast between NOAA, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to conduct baseline characterization in advance of potential offshore energy development.

We also accomplish this mission through dedicated ships of exploration, in particular the NOAA Ship Okeanos Explorer, and she's the nation's first and only federal vessel with a mandate to explore the ocean for the purpose of discovery and the advancement of knowledge, and we conduct two primary types of cruises with the Okeanos.

More than half of our cruises each year are just dedicated mapping cruises. We have a suite of four different types of deepwater sonars, and we literally go out to priority areas identified by the management community and mow the lawn and collect high-resolution seafloor bathymetry as well as water column data, and then we also conduct about four to six cruises each year that are what we call telepresence-enabled ROV expeditions, and so we do have a dedicated two-body

remotely-operated vehicle, and so you're seeing the main body of that vehicle, the Deep Discover, up on the screen right now, and it's being imaged by the camera platform.

During these cruises, we seek to conduct an ROV dive every day, and those dives are started just after breakfast, and they are typically recovered after dinner, and then we conduct overnight mapping operations, and the ship is also telepresence-enabled, and so we're an exploration ship. We're going to places we haven't been, and we can't plan in advance to have the right expertise on the ship, and so we don't. Instead, we stream up to three high-definition video feeds to shore throughout the course of the expedition, and scientists located anywhere within an internet connection can watch those live video feeds and dial into a teleconference line to talk to each other, as well as scientists located around the country, and also use a suite of online collaboration tools to view the live video feeds and share their input and observations into the dive and into the exploration in real-time.

As you see, we use a variety of tools and leverage partnerships with other offices within NOAA and other federal agencies to accomplish our mission, and, in 2018, NOAA sponsored three field efforts in the Southeast Region. The first is the Deep Search Project, and so this is the joint partnership between NOAA, BOEM, and the U.S. Geological Survey, and they conducted two cruises this year.

The first was a combined mapping and submersible cruise onboard the Research Vessel Atlantis, and the second was another one that was focused on equipment deployment, CTDs, and coring operations, and, combined, these cruises conducted twenty-three days of work in the region, and, if you're interested in learning more, the PIs for that cruise are Erik Cordes with Temple University and Amanda Demopoulos with the U.S. Geological Survey.

The Windows to the Deep Expedition was conducted on NOAA Ship Okeanos Explorer, and it was comprised of two cruises. The first was a dedicated mapping cruise, and the second was a combined mapping and ROV cruise focused on the Southeast continental margin, and these cruises, combined, totaled thirty-six days of work in the region, and, additionally, we have two more cruises that will comprise about another fourteen days of work in the region. One was already conducted earlier this year, and it focused on mapping an area south of the Blake Ridge, and the other cruise is currently underway. The ship is in the Bahamas, presently, and, as it wraps up its work and makes its way back to port in Charleston, we are planning to stop at the Stetson-Miami Terrace Deepwater Coral HAPC and spend a couple of days mapping there.

As you can see, by taking a regional approach to ocean exploration, we're able to apply multiple capabilities and leverage opportunities, such as transits, to acquire data in priority regions. If you look at this map that is currently located on the right side here, it shows all of the new bathymetry data that was acquired during these 2018 cruises. All of the Okeanos Explorer data is, or will soon be, publicly available, and the Deep Search data will also be made publicly available after our proprietary period.

The primary objectives for the Windows to the Deep Expedition were driven by community input, the needs of resource managers, including in particular this council, as well as regional data gaps, and the specific objectives of the expedition included acquiring data to support priority science and management needs, investigating biogeographic patterns and connectivity across the Southeast Region, identifying mapping, and exploring the diversity and distribution of deep-sea

benthic habitats, and collecting high-resolution bathymetry in areas with no or low-quality data, as well as collecting data to better understand the characteristics of the water column and the fauna that live there.

In total, we mapped 29,600 square kilometers of seafloor during these two cruises, and that is an area that is larger than the State of Maryland. We conducted seventeen remotely-operated vehicle dives, and we actually observed deep-sea corals and sponges during sixteen of these dives, and note that the one dive where we did not observe deep-sea corals and sponges was a dive that was focused on exploring and characterizing a seep habitat.

We collected 175 biological and thirty-eight geological specimens. Much like the digital data that we strive to make publicly available, we also seek to make all of the samples that we collect accessible by the science community, and so all of these biological specimens can be accessed through the Smithsonian repository, and the geological specimens will be available through Oregon State University's marine geology repository, for anyone who is interested.

During the course of these two cruises, we had more than 140 scientists, students, and managers participate, both at-sea and onshore, and this is the highest number of participants that we've ever had in an expedition, and I think it really speaks to the tremendous level of interest in the Southeast Region, and it's particularly notable that we had several members of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council participating during the course of this expedition.

During the rest of my presentation, I am going to share some of the main highlights and findings from the expedition, focused on priority topics or areas that were identified by the fishery management council.

Today, we're going to start at one of the priority areas that we mapped at the Stetson-Miami Terrace Deep-Sea Coral HAPC. The first phase of ocean exploration is seafloor and water column mapping, which we accomplish using a suite of deepwater sonars. Our primary sonar is our Kongsberg EM 302 multibeam, and it provides the data for us to create high-resolution maps of the seafloor. The expedition included a dedicated mapping cruise, both to reveal the seafloor environment and features as well as to help identify dive targets for the follow-on ROV cruise, and so, if you're looking at this image, the gray background that you see is the level of knowledge that we had about the seafloor bathymetry here from satellite altimetry data prior to the mapping effort, and the brightly-colored terrain is the multibeam data that we collected.

This multibeam revealed detailed seafloor features and habitats of the area and previously unknown features, including, and I am going to zoom in on this area right here, potential iceberg scours, and these are particularly large and deep for the region. This one here is four kilometers, and this one is six-and-a-half, and they are twenty-five meters deep, and these scours help inform what we know about this region, also, by improving our understanding of the past.

The ROV observations during the cruise really helped improve our knowledge and understanding of the life history of deep-sea animals. There are actually a very limited number of observations in the deep sea, and these limited observations contributes to our poor understanding of the life history of many deep-sea animals. Thus, documenting these events really increases that understanding, and it provides new information on areas such as species interactions and animals' ecological niche and general knowledge about the deep sea.

During the expedition, several rarely-observed predation events were documented. A fun example of that is actually the upper-right-hand image. During one of the dives, the scientists were coming across a lot of brittle stars that had been ripped apart and partially eaten, and they didn't know what was eating them, and, eventually, we came across this king crab, while it proceeded to rip apart and eat a brittle star while we filmed it. We have really great video footage of this available, and, if you look at the image, that little white strip hanging out of the king crab's mouth is indeed a brittle star leg, and that provided new information to scientists.

We also documented commercially-important species of red and golden Chaceon crabs in new areas and observed juvenile crabs and mating pairs of crabs, such as this pair of Chaceon golden crabs in the lower-right here, and, finally, we documented range extensions and new records of other species, including deep-water corals, the deepest observation to date of Atlantic midshipman fish, as well as sponges that were previously only known to occur in the eastern Atlantic.

One of the dives that we did was planned to the Cape Fear Lophelia Banks Coral HAPC, and originally targeted what we believed to be another lophelia mound, based on the satellite altimetry data, and we mapped this area overnight, the night before the dive, and the mapping data instead revealed a nearly completely flat area that contained no such structure, and so, instead, we re-routed the ship early in the morning and dove on a flank of the coral HAPC, and, although most of the dive surveyed dead lophelia, we did document a few live colonies.

Most of the lophelia skeletons have been colonized by other corals, and many thousands upon thousands of anemones, and so that's actually the image that you're seeing in the lower-right there. The sort of mottled gray area are the dead lophelia skeletons, and those bright sort of pink-coral-colored animals are all of those anemones. One of the surprises of the dive here were observations of wreckfish. We did observe about a dozen of these during the course of the dive.

We also conducted a dive to the Blake Escarpment on an area requested for exploration by the council, and the red spike that you're seeing on this map is the location where the dive was conducted, and that red spike is going to persist through the next couple of images, for reference, and so the area was originally predicted to be a flat, gentle slope, based on the satellite data, but, as you can see after we mapped it, it actually revealed that there were inner slope terraces in the area, and then we conducted an ROV dive to further characterize this area, and that dive revealed that the slopes were composed of smaller, steep, terraced features, containing a high density and a high diversity of deep-sea corals.

Now, what's really notable about this area is that, previously, there wasn't enough data in this area to support habitat suitability modeling, and so the mapping data we acquired and the coral records from this dive will support efforts to build out the model along the Blake Escarpment. Notably, there is also not a lot of data about low-slope continental margin areas around the world, and this data can really help shape our understanding of these types of areas.

Now we're back at the Stetson-Miami Terrace HAPC that was mapped during our first cruise, and, again, this gray area shows the really low level of detail available in the satellite altimetry data, and the high-resolution bathymetry data shown is the data acquired by Okeanos Explorer this year, and we shared our data and information and collaborated with the Deep Search team, and they conducted a cruise on the Atlantis this year that conducted mapping and submersible dives, and

their mapping efforts built out the mapping coverage in this area, and they also conducted dives here using the Alvin submersible and discovered a giant lophelia reef that extended for more than eighty-five miles, and you have probably all heard about this in the news. It received a tremendous amount of coverage.

Similar to the Blake Plateau, previously, there wasn't enough data in this area to support habitat suitability modeling, and, thus, the mapping data and the coral observations that they captured will help support efforts to build out the model in the Stetson-Miami Terrace HAPC area.

This map shows the Million Mounds area, and it was first mapped by Okeanos Explorer in 2014, at the request of the council, and this area is believed to be one of the largest deep-sea coral reef habitats discovered in U.S. waters to date. During our expedition, we were able to investigate five of these mounds, and we discovered lophelia, and we confirmed that the mounds are indeed biogenic and host a high density of corals, and we added evidence that this region hosts extensive coral habitat.

For reference, this image shows the Deep Discover ROV, and so this our vehicle, with extensive lophelia below it, and so all of these little white patches are live lophelia colonies, and this image is actually pretty indicative of this site and the others that were explored in the Million Mounds area. The bioherm from this image has grown to about fifty meters off the seafloor, and the mounds in the region are between twenty and 120 meters tall, averaging around fifty to eighty meters.

As we look to the future, there are several projects upcoming with field work and further explorations planned in the region. I have already mentioned the current cruise that we have underway. On our way back to Charleston, we're planning to spend three to five days mapping the Miami Terrace HAPC.

The Deep Search Project has another cruise next year, in April, and they are planning to use the NOAA Ship Ron Brown to conduct mapping work and use the ROV Jason to do additional dives in the region, and we also have another telepresence-enabled ROV and mapping cruise with the Okeanos Explorer this coming May, and we'll be conducting mapping and ROV dives, and we certainly plan to reach back out to the council for any refined priorities and input, to help inform our planning efforts for that cruise.

Notably, we're also currently planning and working on our draft field season schedule for 2020, and this may also include additional opportunities to collaborate and conduct work in the region, and so I do just want to reiterate that all of the data and information that we collect from these Okeanos expeditions are publicly available within a few months of cruise completion, and so, if you're interested in accessing the data, or you just want to learn more about what types of datasets are available, please don't hesitate to reach out. We would be happy to go over that with you. I don't know if there is sound on this computer, but I did have a highlight video that I was going to play, if there is time for any questions. I know it's late, and right now I'm probably standing between you and a beer.

Just, in closing, on behalf of OER, I wanted to emphasize that we really appreciate all of the input and support that we have received from the council, and we hope that you will continue to invest your time and your input in our expedition planning and continue to participate in our explorations. We are a community-driven program, and your input and participation really are critical, or a

critical part, to our success, and so, with that, I will open it up for questions. I know we still have Heather Coleman on the line, and I actually was not part of this expedition, and so I will do my best to answer them, and, if there's anything I can't answer, I will get an answer and bring it back to you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Kelley and Heather. Great presentation, and that's really exciting stuff. With respect to the Cape Fear Lophelia CHAPC, you said there was a lot of dead lophelia that you all observed, and did that observe to have been caused by past fishing practices, or was that natural mortality? Could you tell?

MS. ELLIOTT: I have not heard anything from the folks in my office to suggest that it was anything other than natural. I would also ask -- I don't know, Chip or Roger, if you're in the room, and you participated, if you have a sense of that, or Heather, who is also on the line.

DR. COLLIER: I don't think they observed many effects from fishing, but they did observe a lot of marine debris out there, and so it's not necessarily fishing activities in general, but oceanic activities and human activities, and there was definitely evidence of that.

MR. BELL: You mentioned that I guess you do your mapping at night, I think you said, and you run all night, and so how much area can you map in a night for a particular --

MS. ELLIOTT: The answer to that really depends on the depth, and so I don't know. Over the course of one cruise, I think we typically map, during our ROV cruises that are three weeks, 8,000 to 10,000 square kilometers, total, and I don't know the coverage overnight.

MR. BELL: So beam width is dependent upon depth.

MS. ELLIOTT: Yes, the beam width is dependent on depth, and the other thing to note is that, during our ROV cruises overnight, our priorities are generally getting from one dive site to the next, and so a lot of that time can be spend just doing underway transit, and we do still map while we're doing that underway transit, but, if we have two dives that are close together, in a HAPC, for example, then we can certainly build out coverage overnight, if they're nearby.

MR. HAYMANS: I probably gave myself away a minute ago, and I went to the site to see some of the video, and there is some great stuff on the site, but none of the HAPC that we were interested in, and so I was just hoping that maybe you all could post some of that cruise online so that we could get to it, and I'm also looking at the atlas, and it's pretty neat. It shows the ship tracks and what you saw below the tracks, and it's very good, but I would love to see some of the video from the HAPC we're interested in.

MS. ELLIOTT: Okay. Which HAPC?

MR. HAYMANS: Miami Terrace.

MR. PUGLIESE: Just a quick comment. While you weren't on this cruise, I appreciate the work to get them -- I think we coordinated on the original cruise, in our collaboration with Okeanos,

when the Million Mounds was discovered back in the original time, because the only thing that was done there was the mapping, and the uncertainty on that was what are we looking at, and so, the first time I saw that, that was pretty amazing. It's absolutely phenomenal to see the validation and really identifying the extensive nature of the corals within those systems.

I think all I wanted to do was make a quick comment that we really appreciate Heather and Kelley's involvement with the Habitat and Ecosystem presentations, and there was a very detailed elaboration on that, and, also, part of our effort there was to expand exactly what was stated before, is the integration of this information directly into the spatial presentation to the council's own site, including video, and the more we can do, and, actually, there is a live link in one of the partners to your ongoing activities right now, and so it has evolved from what -- The Million Mound cruise was literally just an in-between them cruising into the Gulf of Mexico and doing that phenomenal work to a very focused -- Using the highest technologies to advance this information for multiple levels of understanding and documentation of what is protected in our region and will continue to evolve and expand beyond this, and so I'm looking forward to refining the collaboration and adding that connection into the council's systems and sites supporting the management and providing additional priorities, which I think everybody wants to see keep ongoing, and so that evolution from just the transit and to where we are now has been pretty amazing, and it will only support management in even a better way.

MS. ELLIOTT: Yes, and your response to our call for input in 2014, when we were just heading from the Atlantic into the Gulf of Mexico, really stuck with us, and that, combined of course with the Southeast Deep-Sea Coral Initiative, was not something that we forgot, and so, now that we're back in the Atlantic, we're really focusing on building our knowledge in this area.

With regarding to ensuring that the data and information makes its way through your system, that's really something that we work most closely with the Deep-Sea Coral Program to ensure that happens, and, if there's anything that's being missed, I would be happy to work with them or you to make sure that you're receiving it in the ways that you need.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more questions? Thank you so much, Kelley and Heather. That was a super-cool presentation, and I can't wait to go to the website that Doug is talking about. All right. I think that's all that we're going to cover for today. Just a reminder that there is a workshop tonight at six o'clock in this room. Otherwise, we will start at 8:30 in the morning. With no exempted fishing permits, we're going to go to the presentations by Dale and Tony in the morning. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on December 6, 2018.)

- - -

December 7, 2018

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Hilton Garden Inn/Outer Banks, Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, on Friday morning, December 7, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We did not have any exempted fishing permits this time, and I also mentioned that we're going to start with the reports from Dale and Tony, and I'm going to start with Dale to give the Gulf Council report.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just have a couple of quick things that I want to mention that didn't come up during the course of the meeting. In an effort to be proactive, the Gulf Council took final action to increase the cobia minimum size limits to thirty-six-inches fork length, and that's for both commercial and recreational.

Over the course of this year, we've had a lot of people give us public comments that cobia just are not in very high numbers, and it's a little bit more prevalent in the eastern Gulf than it is in the western Gulf. We are scheduled to have a stock assessment on cobia in 2019, but, rather than wait, we decided to take some action, and so that action for that size limit would basically reduce the landings for commercial by 10.3 percent and for the recreational by 26.1 percent.

The other thing that I just wanted to mention is, for a number of years, we had to deal with really short seasons for recreational red snapper, and so, for 2018, it's the first year of a two-year exempted fishing permit, where the states -- NOAA has delegated the responsibility to the states to manage recreational red snapper for this two-year period, and so 2018 was the first year, and it's been, in my opinion, very successful, and so the thinking was is, while the exempted fishing permit was going on, that the council would start working on amendment that we could potentially go ahead and do this on a permanent basis and delegate the responsibility for managing recreational red snapper to the states.

The reason I want to mention this now is because we're pretty much coming to a point where we have to get this approved very soon, if we're going to have it in place to where it can seamlessly take over in 2020, whenever the EFP runs out at the end of next year, and the biggest issues that we have with that right now really is still settling the allocation, and there is still a little bit of issue about how to handle charter boats, although, right now, the preferred alternatives has the charter boats completely out of this, and the allocations, as the preferred alternative, are the allocations that we're actually using in the EFP, but there are some people that I think have a difference in opinion about how to handle both of those things, and so January is a pretty important meeting for this amendment, to see where we go with it.

I think some people feel like we could maybe even go to the following meeting and take final action. I hope we don't push it that far and drive it to the very last minute, but we will keep you all abreast of how this works, and we can let you all know at your March meeting how it turns out, and, Madam Chair, other than wishing everybody a Merry Christmas, that was all that I wanted to brief everybody on. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Dale. Any questions for Dale?

MR. HAYMANS: That's not a permanent fishing exemption. That's a fishery management plan tailored after the fishery exemption, right? I want that.

DR. CRABTREE: Let me just say, my friend, be careful what you ask for. How many times has Chester warned us about the evils of the Gulf and the contention?

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more questions for Dale? All right. I'm going to move over to Tony to give his report.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Just to Dale's last point, in the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Fisheries Management Act, which really empowers ASMFC, there was a provision in there that says, in the absence of a federal fishery management plan, the provisions of an ASMFC plan can be extended out into the EEZ, and so there is a mechanism by which federal management can, at least in the Mid-Atlantic, federal management can I guess be overturned or skipped and turned over to the commission.

Anyway, regarding our most recent meeting, October 1 to 4, we met at the same time you all were meeting, as a make-up for your meeting that got rescheduled due to the hurricane, and so that's why neither Dewey nor I was here, but we did meet in Cape May, New Jersey. A few of the things that we did, we adopted the spiny dogfish specifications for 2019, 2020, and 2021. The commercial quota for 2019 is going to be 20.5 million pounds, and it goes up from there. In 2020, it's 23.2 million, and, in 2021, it goes to 27.4 million pounds on the spiny dogfish.

We also then reviewed the squid and butterfish specifications for 2019 and 2020, and we left the Loligo and the butterfish specifications alone, but we did increase the Illex specifications another 8 percent for 2019 and 2020. We then reviewed the scoping document for an Illex permit, and that will be going out pretty soon to a public hearing regarding the issue in the Illex permits, and it looks like we're butting up against taking the total quota in Illex, and we actually had to close the Illex fishery last year, and so it appears now that that Illex fishery is fully capitalized, and so we're going to have to have a little bit more control on the Illex fishery.

We were looking at a need for industry-funded monitoring for the mackerel fishery, because we have some provisions in the mackerel fishery that if the bycatch of river herring and shad becomes very high that there has to be additional controls put on the Atlantic mackerel fishery, but it looks like we're not going to have to do that, because the New England Council has an industry-funded measure for the herring fishery, and most of the boats that are involved in the herring fishery are also involved in the mackerel fishery, and so those mackerel boats will be covered by the New England action, and so it looks like we're not going to have to do anything there.

Chub mackerel, chub mackerel is one of those critters that get caught along the east coast, and we tried to include it in the original forage fish amendment, and we were told by the agency that, no, it qualifies as more of a -- It doesn't qualify just as a forage fish, but there is a directed fishery on chub mackerel currently in the Mid-Atlantic. Actually, the recreational fishery is also developing for chub mackerel, in the absence of a bluefish fishery, and so we did approve a public hearing document for the chub mackerel fishery, and I believe you all are going to be having a public hearing via webinar regarding management of chub mackerel.

Regarding ecosystem, we continue work on our ecosystem approach to fisheries management, and we did some more work on our risk assessments, and we tried to define some specific management questions to address the highest priorities in the ecosystem, and we're trying to build some

conceptual models to help ensure that key relationships throughout the system -- I am still having a hard time understanding exactly what we're doing there, and so please don't ask me any questions about that, because it's a bit esoteric and complicated, and I'm still trying to wrap my brain around it.

We also did some work on our risk policy framework regarding work and direction that we should give our SSC to use in determining the level of uncertainty when developing an overfishing limit. When our SSC develops an overfishing limit, we need to know how certain or uncertain are they of that limit, and so we did some work on that.

Finally, not associated with the council, but a few weeks after the council meeting, we had a Law Enforcement Committee meeting, which I chaired, in Philadelphia. It was November, I think, 12th and 13th. What has evolved over the past year is a number of issues. It turns out that, with the sale of tunas, HMS species, there is a lot of -- Some folks will say illegal recreational sale, and other folks will say illegal commercial sale, but there seems to be a lot of boats that get the commercial sale permit for the tunas, but they don't have a U.S. Coast Guard safety inspection certificate, and so members of industry, and members of our council, have been in communication with the Coast Guard regarding what are the requirements for vessels selling tunas in the Mid-Atlantic region, and the Coast Guard agrees that, if it's selling fish as a commercial vessel, it should also have a commercial fishing vessel safety inspection sticker and number.

What we're recommending is that, when HMS issues permits for the sale of tunas, that they also request from the vessel that is applying for the sale permit -- That they also request a copy of the U.S. Coast Guard safety inspection sticker number, to demonstrate that they are complying with all of the regulations, because our full-time commercial vessels have to comply with the for-sale provisions, and, if Dewey was here, he would be going on and on about it, and rightly so, I believe, and so that was one issue that we explored in the workshop.

Also, in the workshop, we explored the responsibility of for-hire captains regarding the enforcement of fisheries regulations. There was a series of law enforcement actions that occurred in the Mid-Atlantic in October of last year in which state law enforcement officials met some large for-hire vessels at the dock to do a check on possession limits, minimum sizes, species in and out of season, and some of those headboats that they stopped have maybe a hundred people onboard, and it got to be a bit contentious, because they wouldn't let anyone off the boat until they checked.

The boat is at the dock, and the folks are trying to get into the parking lot, and these boats were held for three or four hours sometimes that people had to wait until they got off the boat, until the law enforcement officials were able to check, and I guess we'll call it a loophole, or some of the folks who were clearly breaking the law onboard the vessel -- What they did was they had their fish in coolers, but they just walked off the boat.

They got to the dock and they said, I don't have any fish, and they just walked off the boat, and so, the next thing we knew, the boat is at the dock and there is thirty or forty coolers on the boat with no names or anything with all of these undersized fish or over-the-bag-limit fish or out-of-season fish, and there was a lot of discussion about who is responsible for this. Is it the captain? Is it the passenger? How do you prove it if the person walked off the fish and didn't own the fish, or didn't claim to own the fish?

We had a Law Enforcement Committee meeting to address that issue, and one of the recommendations that I believe will be coming out of the council, although the council hasn't acted on it yet, but one of the recommendations from the committee has been that all containers onboard a vessel holding fish be labeled with the owner's name, so that it could be identified.

I know when I had my headboats that all of my containers, all the buckets that held fish, had my vessel's name on it. It had the boat's name on it, and that did two things. First of all, why we tell the passenger, it's because that's my bucket. If you put an illegal fish in there, my deckhand is allowed to take it out and throw it over the side, because I will not let you put an illegal fish in my container, and so that was pretty effective in enforcing the rules, but, when somebody has their own personal container, it was unclear as to whether or not I had a right to do that or not, and, if they had their own coolers on the boat, my deckhands weren't allowed to go into them.

What we're recommending is, well, if you have a cooler on the boat, it has to be labeled. If you're going to bring a cooler on the boat, you have to have your name on it and driver's license number on it or something, so that you can't just walk off the boat and leave all that stuff behind and say I know nothing about it, and so that was our workshop, and that's really about it.

Well, we did have -- We talked a little bit about our strategic plan. Someone that you may know has been hired by our council to work on developing our strategic plan, Dr. Michelle Duval, and I think her name is familiar around this table here, and she is under contract right now through the Mid-Atlantic Council to develop our strategic plan, and so that's all I have about the council meeting.

While I have the mic, I always say that we're cousin councils, and so, from your cousin council up north to all of you folks down here, have a Merry Christmas and a Happy and Healthy New Year. I hope the New Year only brings good things for you. Thank you very much, and I will be happy to answer any questions, Madam Chairman.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tony.

MR. SAPP: Tony, thanks for a great presentation there. The chub mackerel fishery, there's so much confusion over the name of those species, and is that what we call tinker mackerel, with a spotted belly, or is it a white-belly fish, more like a Boston mackerel?

MR. DILERNIA: I don't know. I can't answer that question. I can tell you, the first time we caught chub mackerel and I was running a headboat, the deckhand came running up, and they look like Boston mackerel, what we call Atlantic mackerel, only they have teeth. The deckhand came running up to me and said, look at this mackerel that's got teeth, and I said, well, look at that, and he said, what is that? Then we figured it out. That's what the chub mackerel is. It looks like a Boston or Atlantic mackerel, but it has teeth.

MR. SAPP: Then that's a totally different species than what we call chub or tinker mackerel. They don't have teeth, but they have a spotted belly and not a white belly like a Boston mackerel. The ones that have teeth, we call -- Not a skippy. Help me out here. Atlantic bonito have teeth.

MR. DILERNIA: No. What you call bonito, we call -- Well, what I call bonito up north, and they grow to be five or six pounds?

MR. SAPP: You're talking about bonita right now and not bonito, and there's so dang many of these things. Bonita don't have -- They are little tunny or false albacore.

MR. DILERNIA: You say tomato and I say tomato, I think.

MR. SAPP: There is so much confusion over all these species.

MR. POLAND: This is a prime example of why scientific names are good and useful.

MR. DILERNIA: Especially with my Brooklyn accent and you from down south a little bit, and trying to communicate sometimes gets to be difficult. I always used to tease Bill Hogarth about that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions for Tony? All right. Thank you, Tony. We're going to move into Committee Reports. First up on the Committee Reports is the Snapper Grouper Committee.

The Snapper Grouper Committee met earlier this week, and the committee approved the minutes from the October meeting and the agenda. We got an update on the status of commercial and recreational catches for species under ACLs and also an update on the status of amendments under formal review. We then received a report from the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel and a report from the SSC.

We then moved into Regulatory Amendment 30 for red grouper, and we had considerable discussion on this particular amendment and the timing of it, and so the committee provided some guidance and then made some motions. The committee considered adding Georgia and Florida to Actions 2 and 3 that modify the red grouper seasonal closure, and the committee opted to go with the closure only in the Carolinas. The committee requested that staff bring this amendment back to them for discussion in March and a potential final review, but that will be before the SSC meeting in April, and so we might not be able to approve this until June.

The committee made the following motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits under Action 1. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on this action? Any objection to this action? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee made Motion Number 2, which was to accept the IPT's suggested edits to Action 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee then made Motion Number 3 to accept the IPT's suggested edits under Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee then moved into Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 26, and the first motion that they made was Motion Number 4 to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 1. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

There was another motion that was made that failed, then we made Motion Number 5, which was to clarify that -- Go ahead, Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. I would like to re-make that motion. **I would like to move that we de-select Sub-Alternative 2c under Action 2 as preferred.** If I can get a second, I will make my case.

COUNCIL MEMBER: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so we implemented the four-month season for snowy grouper under Amendment 20, and it was implemented in August of 2015. We implemented a four-month season for blueline tilefish in Amendment 32, which was March 30 of 2015, and so we've had this four-month season in place since 2015. Since that time, we have had -- In 2016, our recreational landings for blueline tilefish were 197 percent, in 2016, and 289 percent in 2017, and 132 percent is looking like what we're at at this moment for 2018. Even given our current four-month season, we're already over our ACLs on an annual basis.

Northern North Carolina has only a short tourist season, from May through August, while Florida generally has a tourist season that runs throughout the year. Northern North Carolina has an extremely limited number of fish they can access and are almost completely reliant on a few species, including snowy and blueline, while Florida can access these and a large number of other species throughout the year.

Florida does have significant access to blueline tilefish during the current season and actually catches a larger percentage than North Carolina does during the current May through August season. Florida does not close state waters outside of the federal season, leading to some of these large intercepts from their 100-pound-per-person recreational limit on blueline. In 2017, one of these significant out-of-season landings occurred, contributing significantly to that 289 percent MRIP catch number. Florida does not close state waters, again, allowing that 100 pounds.

During public comment, we also heard from the Key West Charter Association representative that they would support the current season and bag limit and did not deem that January/February season as being imperative. I think Andy Piland put it best that the current season is working for the fish and fishermen and giving access to both ends of the region in an equal and fair manner.

MR. SAPP: It's interesting that a group from North Carolina decides that we have a year-round tourist season. If you ask our restaurants and charter industry, our tourist season is getting smaller and smaller, and it's strictly a wintertime tourist season, but what's very difficult for me is that our process here is supposed to be fair and equitable, and so, if we're saying that there is zero chance that Florida's charter industry gets access to this species, as well as our golden tilefish, which is almost impossible to catch in the summertime, when the current is raging, but North Carolina gets their season, their tourist season, entirely, for sure, guaranteed to be open, that does not seem in the least bit fair or equitable.

We heard from both Myra and Roy that the likelihood of closing that second season is quite minimal, in that Myra was saying that we probably wouldn't have the data back. Roy is saying,

even if we have the data back, with our uncertainty in these numbers, they don't find it likely that they would close that second season for North Carolina.

I have the good fortune of getting to fish out of Oregon Inlet quite a bit, and I heard all the -- I was really impressed with the amount of people you all were able to get out here so quickly, but I heard them talking about how important the species is, and I'm well aware of how important it is, and talking about how they've got to run forty miles, thirty-plus miles, thirty-five miles a few of them were saying, to get to this species.

The reality is, simply, that they are already there. It's the same fallback species for them as it is for us. They're out there yellowfin tuna fishing or dolphin fishing or white marlin fishing, and they weren't successful, and this is a very valuable fallback species. It's the same scenario for us. January and February can be very difficult in south Florida to catch fish. Not Key West, 180 miles away from the area most affected by this amendment. Brice is an extraordinary fisherman, and he doesn't have anything to do with the area that is most affected by this amendment, and so I feel we must discount his statements there.

Again, like I was saying, they're already out there, and so, not one time in my thirty days of listening to the radio, and those guys talk on the radio, and they've got nothing else to do while they're standing in the bridge, did I hear a guy say I am going blueline tile fishing today. Every time, it was, man, we struck out, and we're going to go hit the blueline, or we're going to go hit what we call grays.

Twice, I heard, in thirty days of fishing up here with these fellas, I heard a guy say, well, I'm going to hit them in the morning on the way out, and it was a rare event, and, on the radio, it was, really? Man, we ain't never done that before. Like I said, these guys talk and talk, and it's really entertaining. If you want to learn something about a group of phenomenal fishermen, sit on the VHF radio out there, thirty-five miles offshore in North Carolina, and you will learn all you need to know about them. They're a great group of guys, and they seem to care about each other, and they share a whole lot, but I just want them, in your festive spirit there, and you guys to share with us a little bit, please.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to add to some of Art's points, Art is right. Brice is talking specifically about Key West. As you know, in Florida, we have many, many different regions of the state, and so this particular action and this particular season, in January/February, is important for Broward and Palm Beach Counties. As Art mentioned, for us in Florida, it's not just about blueline, since we're adding a number of different species to this deepwater grouping. This particularly makes it so that Florida would not have access to golden tilefish.

I can also tell you that FWC, that we have on our workplan for the coming years, to look at additional regulations for blueline tilefish in state waters, and so this is another thing that we're working on, and we know that there is some inequity. We don't even have a size limit for blueline right now for state waters.

Also, I feel, like Art, that we are concerned, or I'm hearing concerns, about possibly closing down, based on hitting the ACL, but we're not sure. This is a new season, and it's got a number of different species in it, and I just don't feel that the fear of possibly reaching the ACL is a reason to cut out the State of Florida during this early season.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, having looked at this more carefully following the testimony, I am going to support Anna's motion on this. When I look at the landings of blueline tilefish, in fact, Florida lands more during the May/June/July/August period than they do in the January/February period, and so I don't see that they are losing access. They have access at that time.

Brice's comments are for a large portion of the charter fleet down there, and I grant you not everyone, and there have been, particularly in 2013, large Wave 1 catches of blueline, which, if they occur again, would result in the fishery being closed, and we would have those landings in time to close it before the May opening.

I also looked at golden tilefish, and there have been years when there were quite a few golden tilefish caught in Wave 3 and 4, and so the data is very sparse, and it's variable, and it's not that clear, but they do catch some golden tilefish at that time of year. I'm kind of glad to hear that Florida is going to look at some deepwater regulations, but they've been a long time coming, and I just -- Given that state waters are open year-round, I just can't support this early season.

I do believe that the fishermen up here have more dependence, based on what I heard, on blueline than the Florida guys do. I think they have a less diverse group of species to fish on, and, given all of these issues, I am going to support just retaining the current season, and I think, if we don't open this early season, we could also afford to leave the bag limit at three fish, and so I'm going to support Anna's motion.

MR. POLAND: Roy hit on a lot of the points that I wanted to make, and I certainly understand that the Florida fishermen, or the charter boat fishermen, feel like they would like this in that January/February timeframe, but, looking at the MRIP landings, it seems like they have access to the fish at the same time that we do. Yes, it is a make-up fish for our six-pack guys, our guys that troll up here, but, for our headboats that run out of here, that's about it. There's not much. There's that and some black sea bass. If you head south, maybe a few triggerfish, and so the diversity of snapper grouper species, especially if you're north of Hatteras, is limited.

It is unfortunate that we come down to this argument of a push and a pull for a fish that -- Or a complex that, for the most part, is only accessible by North Carolina and Florida. There are some landings from South Carolina and Georgia, but, just because of sheer distance from shore, it's just not a lot of landings there, and it would be nice if there was some way that we could accommodate both, but just, given those high landings in Wave 1 and the jeopardy that that might put our guys in up here for Waves 3 and 4, I don't feel like it's worth the risk potentially to shut our guys out of that fishery.

Also, we did receive a lot of public comment on Wednesday from our North Carolina guys, and, granted, yes, we are up here in North Carolina, and so they were here to give it, but this amendment has been out there for a while, and we have not received a lot of public comment from Florida in support of adding January and February.

MR. HAYMANS: My intention this morning had been to abstain, because of missing yesterday's argument, but, in hearing the discussion this morning, I am actually reading the committee document, and now I'm confused, and so a point of clarification. If I look at Motion Number 6, it talks about de-selecting Preferred Alternative 2f, and we don't have a 2f, and so I'm actually

wondering -- We were sitting on Preferreds 2b and 2c, and I would just like to make sure I understand where our preferreds are after yesterday, please.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think you might be on the wrong action.

MR. HAYMANS: Page 4, Motion Number 6, and is that not right? I mean, I'm looking at Vision Blueprint Amendment 26, right? Motion 4 and Motion -- Tell me where I'm supposed to be, guys.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're on the motion that failed. It's above Motion Number 5.

MR. HAYMANS: That's right.

MS. MCCAWLEY: De-select Sub-Alternative 2c under Action 2 as preferred.

MR. HAYMANS: Right. That's an un-numbered motion, but, as you go down this list, that motion failed, and I understand that it's being reconsidered right now, but I'm just trying to figure out --

MS. BECKWITH: That one is for Action 3. That's under Action 3.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's the bag limit action.

MR. HAYMANS: I see Action 3 at the end now, and so you have to read the rest of the sentence. I will go back to my first question. What are the preferreds after yesterday?

MS. MCCAWLEY: The preferred on Action 2 is Sub-Alternative 2b and 2c. That's the season, and so it's both of those seasons.

MR. HAYMANS: So the preferreds didn't change yesterday? The motion to change them failed, and they stayed the same as they were?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes. Right, and so, also, another aspect of this was the motion that I started making, which is Motion 5, is about how the wreckfish season would be affected, and so that's also a piece of this as well, is how wreckfish works with all of this.

MR. SAPP: The unfortunate thing here is that every other species in the complex, aside from some snowy groupers, is outside of state waters, and so they are going to be off limits for the majority of the year for us, which is very unfortunate, but, like I said, I do have the good fortune of knowing quite a few of the fellas out here, and a couple of them showed me a text that went circulating through them, and they already dislike Florida guys. I have learned that pretty quickly. Us flat-brimmers, apparently, which I have never owned a flat-brimmed hat in my life, come up here and do terrible things to them, apparently.

Now we're -- I got to see the text yesterday, or the day before yesterday, saying that you all have got to come protect your fish and those flat-brimmers, us Florida boys, are trying to take them from you. They said they hadn't heard anything about it at all until two hours before, and so they scurried in here, and the majority of the discussion seemed to be, from them, aside from three guys about the seasons, was about the bag limits.

All they cared about was getting to keep more fish, it seemed to me, and so, understandably, they didn't know what was going on, and they weren't quite as well educated about what we were discussing here, but three of the sixteen fellas that spoke talked about the season. Everybody else was more worried about getting to keep more fish, and so, by going directly from their words and their desires, give them more fish, but please let us fish in January and February, when my trolling charter boats desperately need them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to add on a little bit to what Art is saying, and then I have Mel and Chester on my list, I would also be willing to go down to a lower bag limit, which, right now, our preferred is two, and so to stick with that two bag limit for the first season and then go back up to three for the second season, and so just to keep the fishery open in those winter months, which was something that had been brought up by the Florida folks since the South Florida Committee started meeting.

MR. BELL: We're just experiencing something that we've dealt with a lot, which is we've got a huge range within our council, and Florida is not like North Carolina, and the folks in between are somewhere in between, and so the only other solution to this, in my mind, would be to just not -- We're kind of restricted right now in terms of our ability to craft a better compromise, because we would have to completely go back and re-tool things and try to work out some sort of allocation thing or -- So, right now, in the interest of moving along, and having heard what folks have said, I would be inclined to support this motion.

It's certainly not a perfect solution, but we're not going to achieve a perfect solution, just given what we're up against every time we deal with these differences in fisheries and timing and prosecution, and, sure, what Art is describing is passion, and you get passion for things anywhere you go related to fishermen looking out for their interests, but it's just we don't have a lot of options right here, and so I would just -- I am leaning towards just moving on with Anna's motion, and that's what we'll do.

MR. BREWER: I don't know the first damn thing about tilefish. I have never fished for them in my life, and so I'm not going to go there, but where I do want to go is this notion that Florida has now a year-round tourist season. That is not accurate. If you're talking about Key West, yes, that's year-round. If you're talking about Disney World in Orlando, yes, that's year-round, but, when you're talking about the coastal areas -- I live in Palm Beach County.

The coastal areas, there very definitely is a season, and that season is January, February, and March. You can go during those months, and there is no sense even trying to get into a restaurant. You're going to be eating at home, because you can't get into a restaurant, and, if you take a look at the marinas, the marinas are full, and the charter boats are chartering like crazy, because that's the season. That's the season where you've got people coming down with the dream of catching a sailfish.

What Art is talking about is accurate. When he is chartering during those months, people are -- What they want to catch is a sailfish, and maybe a white marlin, but probably a sailfish, and, if you've got a bust, he wants to be able to put those folks on some bottom fish, which is very understandable.

To me anyway, without getting into the numbers of fish during this and that, it seems like North Carolina is saying, hey, guys, this is our season, and you all are talking about May to August, when people are coming to get down to the water, where it's a little cooler and get in the ocean and have a wonderful time, but, for us, that same season is January and February and March, and I think, out of a sense of fairness, we ought to be sharing some of these fish, and that's all I've got to say.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I, in part, come back, and I don't mean to put Jessica on the spot or be critical of the Fish and Wildlife Commission. Their decisions are their decisions to make about state waters, but the fact is that we have these fisheries open year-round in state waters, and we all know how incredibly difficult it is to enforce that three-mile line out there. It's not just blueline, but it's blueline, it's golden, it's red snapper, it's a host of species, and I just can't support further openings to accommodate south Florida until we see some progress on achieving compatible closures on the east coast.

MR. SAPP: It sounds to me like we're telling our federally-permitted charter boat guys that, look, if you want to catch these things, you've got to do it illegally. If we're federally permitted, we have to abide by the most restrictive laws, which is closures for blueline tile, from the sound of this amendment, and, if they get caught with their federal permit on the boat with blueline tiles and the season is closed, they're nailed, no matter where they were, inside or outside of that three miles.

DR. CRABTREE: I am not telling anyone not to comply, and, if you're federally permitted, Art, I expect you to comply, but there's an awful lot of other fishermen that aren't charter boats, and there are people who aren't federally permitted, but there are landings that occur outside of these seasons, and we need to see some action to get all on the same page with this, and I would be willing to return to this issue at some point, but I'm not encouraging anyone not to comply. Folks choose to have a federal permit, and that's part of the deal, and they need to stick to the deal.

MR. SAPP: Well, they're not choosing. They're choosing to try to be as legit as possible in a proper -- They are trying to abide by the law, and, by the law, we're supposed to have our federal permits, and so they're kind of getting slapped in the face again for abiding by the law.

DR. CRABTREE: To that point, because I was here and voted to make that law, these guys choose to get a federal charter boat permit. They choose to get the privilege of running charter boat trips in federal waters. In exchange for that privilege, they agree to abide by the rules. It's a perfectly reasonable and proper arrangement.

MS. BECKWITH: I agree that that portion of it is unfair, but, for all the federally-permitted charter guys in Florida, they should be coming to their commission in support of getting these regulations complemented in state waters, so everybody is on an equal playing field and you don't get these completely out-of-whack intercepts during the open state season that tend to skew our MRIP landings.

Even if we didn't have an in-season closure, the stuff still impacts the stock assessments when we come around to a stock assessment, and so it's not like this stuff doesn't have an impact in the long run, and so, if we have continuous overages of fairly large magnitudes over the ACL of 200 and 300 percent, then, when we get around to a stock assessment, it puts us in a position where we're opening ourselves up to having an overfished or overfishing determination, which then puts us into a pretty awful spiral, and blueline tilefish -- We have had some of those experiences and had to

battle against the stock assessments and those issues, and so that is a concern, is not only the immediate impact of this, but what it actually comes down to if we have five or six or ten years of consistent overages that then have to be put into the stock assessments.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just want to point out that Florida has completely consistent regulations on things like hogfish, and, as you guys have seen, one intercept sends a downward spiral. One intercept at one point at one landing dock in Homestead sent that whole -- The landings and everything else, the assessment, all those problems, and we have completely complementary regs, and we complemented the new regs, and so that's primarily a Florida fishery, and going consistent did not fix that problem, and so I just wanted to point that out.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that's a data issue though, and it's somewhat different. With respect to this issue of charter boats and they can't fish when the federal season is closed, that problem only exists because Florida is leaving state waters open. If we had consistent closures, it would not exist, and that problem would go away, and I think that's where we need to get to, Madam Chair.
I move to call the question.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The question has been called. Let's take a vote to call the question.
Those in favor of calling the question, eight in favor; those opposed; abstentions. The motion passes, and so we're calling the question.

The motion is the same motion that failed, de-select Sub-Alternative 2c under Action 2 as preferred. All those in favor of the motion, raise your hand, seven in favor; those opposed; abstentions. The motion passes. Now we're moving into Action 5.

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

MS. MCCAWLEY: Actually, no it wasn't, because I had just started reading Motion Number 5, which is about wreckfish and not about that. She just made a brand-new motion that was a motion that failed. However, the motion was made -- We hadn't actually gotten to that motion yet, and so -- Technically, Roberts Rules says that the previous motion that was failed, I don't think it can come back up by the person that brought it up, but go ahead, Doug. Technically, that motion couldn't have been made by Anna.

MR. BREWER: That motion is out of order. That motion has to be made by somebody who voted on the --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, the motion -- Did the motion fail for lack of a second, or did it just --

MS. BECKWITH: It failed for lack of a second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It just said the motion failed, and I think that the motion did not get a second the first time, and so that's possibly -- It was those substitute ones, but -- Go ahead, Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I did have a parliamentary inquiry about the call the question, and is it -- Well, our delegation over here has discussed the fact that there was somebody remaining to speak who hadn't spoken, as a point of to call the question in order, or can you vote on it at that point, because Spud had something he wanted to say, and he hadn't said it.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: I thought they told us in Atlanta a month ago that there wasn't somebody who wanted to speak that had not spoken yet that you couldn't do that, and that's just from memory, and so I'm not a hundred percent sure of that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would have to look that up. In the meantime, we're going to look up some Roberts Rules of Order here, just for fun, and I'm going to make another motion that had nothing to do with that, and it's about wreckfish.

The motion that I had started reading was Motion Number 5 to clarify that Action 2 would retain the existing recreational season for wreckfish, which is July and August. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

We're going to do some consulting of Roberts Rules up here. Doug, what have you got?

MR. HAYMANS: If we could all agree on a method to move forward, could we do that, until we look it up?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure. What are you --

MR. HAYMANS: I don't want to speak for Spud, but I think he had a question regarding bag limits, which I know is a different motion, but if we could consider bag limits as part of this question, which is always something to argue about in the way that we go through this -- If we could consider bag limits first, maybe it would change the current question.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Let's have a discussion about bag limits. If you're confused about where we are on the bag limits, let me explain that I believe that the final motion that passed was two fish per person per day for both of those seasons, and so, if the motion before the wreckfish motion, if that one stands, based on what we're looking up with Roberts Rules, then that would just apply to -- The two fish would only apply to what we're calling the second season, as opposed to both the early and the second season.

MR. WOODWARD: My question was going to be whether or not there would be consideration given to a one-fish bag limit during the January/February season, to try to alleviate some of these concerns. If it is a make-up fish for Broward and Palm Beach County fishermen and not a meat fish that people go out and actually target, would that alleviate some of the concern about the catch estimate generated by MRIP exceeding the ACL and thus leading to a closure of the summer season?

I know part of the answer to that question is it doesn't take much, and you made the point a while ago. I mean, an out-of-season catch can throw us into exceeding the ACL, when they are that small and we have the imprecision and the lack of accuracy that we do with MRIP for these deepwater species, but I just wanted to put that on the table. Was it an option that was worth considering? If not, then --

MS. MCCAWLEY: As I mentioned in the earlier part of the discussion, we got to two, but partly because there was a motion to apply the one fish in the first part of the season, and then I believe

three fish in the second part of the season, and so the first part being the early time period. That one failed. I mean, I will look to Art. I could possibly live with one, as opposed to zero, but two would be better. I felt pretty comfortable with two, as opposed to one, but I could possibly live with one, instead of zero, but I am going to look to Art.

MR. SAPP: Seeing the writing on the wall that zero is the number currently, yes, one is much better than zero, but zero still is a very jagged pill to swallow.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. After reading some Roberts Rules of Order here, a call the question vote requires two-thirds, and we did not have that, and so that means that we should not have moved forward with the vote itself, and so we need to continue the discussion, because we technically couldn't have called the question, or we -- Even though the question was called, the two-thirds majority vote -- We didn't have that, and so we shouldn't have called the question. It's under discussion, and we will have to make this motion and have that discussion again, and so Spud's discussion right now is in order, if we're considering especially both of these motions at one time. I believe, Anna, you had your hand up.

MS. BECKWITH: I was originally going to say that my intent was to bring the bag limit back up to three per person for the standing season, which is the current status quo, but then that was not what Spud was referring to, and so --

MR. GRINER: So we're back to discussing the blueline?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, we're back to discussing the season, correct, and then Spud was making an argument that he felt that the season and the bag limit were tied together, and so we should have a discussion of both at the same time, and that's kind of where we are.

MR. GRINER: Well, to the season then, what I'm hearing Chester, and I guess, to a large extent, Spud as well, is that this season is a very important season to them. It's the height of their tourist season for this particular portion of the coast. You can't get into a restaurant, and everybody is coming down there to go marlin fishing, sail fishing, and they're not coming down there to go blueline tile fishing. They are coming down there to go sail fishing, or whatever it is they're doing.

It just seems to me that, whether or not you can keep one or two blueline tile, it's not going to keep anybody from not going down there for their vacation. They are coming down there for something else, and I understand it's nice to be able to stop and get that fish on the way in if you were not able to capitalize on the target fish that you came down there for. However, there's a lot of other fish that you can stop and get on the way in.

It seems to me that these people that are coming down there for this experience are going to come back again whether or not they catch one or don't catch one. In fact, I think you could make the argument that, if you came down there and struck out, it just makes you want to come back more, and so I'm not really sure how important that one or two blueline tiles really are for the actual customer that is coming down there for the experience. I am really leaning with Anna on this one.

MR. SAPP: We're not talking about one or two blueline tiles. We're talking about zero right now, and we're not also talking about whether they're going to come back again or not. We're talking

about whether my mate is going to get tipped or not, and success generally makes a difference whether he's making a living that day or not.

As to other species we get to go target, our groupers are already closed, which is a wintertime fishery, or was a wintertime fishery for us, and is no more, and, while we're in the tropics, yes, at times of year, there is a plethora of species, in the wintertime there is not. It's the same as -- I mean, it's fishing, guys. You're a fisherman. There are days when there is hardly anything to catch, but you know what? Those gray tiles are generally there, and they're generally cooperative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Before I go to Mel, just a couple more points on that. Blueline tilefish is not necessarily the main thing that Florida is interested in in those months. It's golden tilefish and the rest of the complex. I agree with what Art is saying, that that portion of south Florida already lost out on the grouper season, which was another thing that came out of the South Florida Committee, and that's why I really did not want to not have a winter season for this entire deepwater complex that we were creating.

I do feel like, if we stay at zero during that first season, I am not convinced that the FWC commissioners are going to actually shut down blueline in the months that you want in state waters, because they wouldn't have another fish, and so there's -- I am just concerned about that, and I can tell you that we're asking the commission to consider this, and a number of other consistent regulations, but, if the number is zero for federal waters, that oftentimes sways our commission, because they are about access, especially during certain months of the year. The discussion about the bag limit, I still -- One is better than zero, but I still think having some access in the earlier time period of the year is important for south Florida.

Okay, and so what do we want to do here? Do we want to talk about the season more? Do we want to take another vote on the season? Is there some indication that people want to do a one and three on the bag limit and then that changes what you might want to do on the season? Okay. I see people nodding their heads.

MS. BECKWITH: We did not establish that my previous motion was out of bounds, or did we?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's not that it's out of bounds. The call the question was what was, and so the vote that happened on it shouldn't have occurred at that time. It's not that the motion goes away.

MR. HAYMANS: So it seems to me that, if we go to the one-fish and three-fish bags, with the North Carolina preferred, we've hit the compromise, and, if that's what we vote for, then --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think so, but I'm not sure that we're all the way there, and I don't want to take a poll here, but I am seeing some heads nodding on this side of the table, but I think that, in order to do that, since we're talking about the season, it seems like someone would need to make a substitute motion to put the preferred back to the two seasons, and then we could vote on that and then discuss the bag limit option, and so do folks understand what Doug is suggesting here, that we would change the vote on the season and then go in and select different preferreds for the bag limits for the two seasons? Okay. I see heads nodding that it looks like people understand that. Okay. Art, are you making a substitute motion?

MR. SAPP: **I am happy to do so, with a lot of assistance from Myra, as I am so new to this, and my verbiage would probably be terrible.** Can we not make the bag limit and seasons all in one nice, clean package? Why wouldn't we do that, to make them more comfortable?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We can, and then that would negate some of our other actions, and so I believe that you could make a substitute that included both the season and the bag limit.

MR. SAPP: **That is my preference.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so then I guess -- I think that what you're suggesting, and Myra is typing, is that, in the season action, you would choose two preferreds, the first season and the later season, which were the preferreds that we had when we started this council meeting this week. Then, on the bag limit, I think that you're suggesting that, for the earlier season, one fish and, for the later season, three fish.

MR. SAPP: **Roger that.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so let's let Myra get that on the board.

MR. SAPP: Again, remember, guys, it's the holiday season, please.

MS. MCCAWLEY: At the end of, respectfully, Myra, can you add that that is under Action 3? Thanks. I saw a hand up over here, and I think we have the motion on the board.

MR. BELL: I just had a question. What we might want to do is make sure we understand where we're going to land with wherever we settle. My question is I thought I heard, in discussion of the blueline, that Art or somebody said these are like two-pound fish or something, and did I hear that when we were discussing this earlier on or something? They are two-pound fish?

MR. SAPP: They are small. That may have been a bit of an exaggeration. I have looked back, and the average is four to seven pounds, though the majority I have ever seen are closer to four, but what you've got to understand too here is we're allowing access to other species that otherwise would be gone forever as well. It would be terrible. It would be devastating.

MR. BELL: So it's not about the retention of one four-pound fish.

MR. SAPP: Per angler. Now, mind you, that's still six fish, which, for a vacationing tourist, they get to take something to the restaurant, in a catch-and-cut scenario, which at least they've got something, and that adds to their experience greatly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That restaurant that they can't get into. I'm just saying. Chester says they will wait in line, and so a little bit more about what Art was saying. We're talking about access to the entire deepwater complex that we've created, which, in the deepwater complex, blueline is most important for North Carolina. Other species in the complex, like golden, are more important for Florida and in the earlier months.

MR. GRINER: Now that we're --

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The motion that is on the board that was made by Art is seconded by Doug. Then I'm going back to this side of the table.

MR. GRINER: Now we're going back to one two-pound blueline tile, and, if a mate doesn't get tipped over one two-pound blueline tile, then somebody didn't do their job, and my biggest fear in the whole thing is that one two-pound blueline tile could trigger an intercept that, as Dewey will tell you, is going to get whacked out of order and we're all going to be shut down over one two-pound blueline tile.

You don't know that you're going to catch six of them. You're only going to catch one of them, and so I really don't know how many you're going to catch. Maybe you've only got three people on the boat, and I don't know, and so it's one per person. If one person catches their one and gets intercepted, it could have a devastating effect for the entire South Atlantic for the rest of the year, and that's just not right.

MR. HAYMANS: **I was simply going to ask that the motion read, rather than the "respectively", for clarity, that it reads Sub-Alternative 2b for Season 1 and 2f for Season 2, so that it's clear.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That's a good point. I'm going to let Myra work on that. The motion maker is Art. Are you okay?

MR. SAPP: **Yes.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and the seconder was Doug, and so, while we're fixing it up, I'm going to Kyle and then Art and then Anna.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: I guess I just -- For me, it seems like we're concentrating on the blueline tilefish, and that's for North Carolina. This is about you guys. For Florida, this is the whole deepwater group that it's affecting, and it's not just one fish that you guys are cutting them back on. I mean, if you add everything else they could catch in that, it does expand it to a lot better day. I mean, like I said, we're concentrating on one two-pound fish, and we're tripping over a dollar to save a nickel is what we're doing here, and so I just wanted to remind everybody that this is not one fish that we're looking at and it's a group.

MR. SAPP: Everything you're saying over there, the ifs and buts and could happen in North Carolina, guess what? It will happen to Florida. It's guaranteed to close, should the previous preferred pass. Guaranteed it's closed. North Carolina, maybe or maybe not. We've got a pretty good chance of surviving this thing, but Florida doesn't survive. We're dead at the stick right now.

MS. BECKWITH: Because I am still concerned about this, I would like to make a substitute motion for my original motion, which was to de-select Sub-Alternative 2c under Action 2 as preferred. Depending on where we land with that, because of all the discussion and the concerns and the fact that -- Another option we have is to go with no action on these and just not create the deepwater complex and just start over, because this is not working for --

This just isn't working, and so blueline is so important to us up here that, if this is going to reduce our guys' access to these fish, with that is one of their only species, then maybe this is not the right

way forward at all, but this is a real concern that we -- For all the reasons that we have discussed, and for all the MRIP reason, and for all the -- Another concern I have with this is, if we were going to go with the substitute motion, part of the discussion we had in committee was that there isn't an analysis specific to this, and so, while it's sort of under NEPA, and it is under the range of alternatives that we could move forward with, the analysis has not been done, and so I think, if we did --

If my motion failed and we went with the substitute motion, I think we would have to delay final approval of this until we've looked at this again in March and actually got the opportunity to look at the analysis and what the impacts would be of that one per person and the season and so on and so forth, but let's just see where we land with this.

We have been at status quo, and we went through this amendment for two years, and we got a lot of feedback, and I understand. I understand where Florida is coming from, and I've got concerns, and I think, if we're going to move away from where we were sitting on this for two years, I think we've got to give the public a little bit more opportunity for input if we're going to veer off from the current season that they've been accustomed to since 2015.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so a couple of things. One, the Roberts Rules of Order police up here say that this motion is out of order, because the substitute is the same as the main motion, and so the motion that Art made was a substitute to the original motion, and so you can't have a main motion and a substitute that are identical, and so your motion is the main motion. You can't have an identical substitute and main, and so this motion is out of order here.

MR. POLAND: I mean, this is a bad situation. It's obvious that we don't have the flexibility to accommodate North Carolina and Florida, and I sympathize with that, and Kyle made a good point. We're talking about the complex, and we've got snowy grouper in this deepwater aggregate. Well, January and February, snowy are spawning, and so we just need to consider that, too.

Also, I think this is a good time to point out that, with for-hire logbook reporting, and if we had recreational reporting that could get some of these PSEs down in these MRIPs, we might have a little better understanding of what's actually going on, what's actually being caught, because what this boils down to is it's an MRIP issue.

I mean, if we get one or two intercepts in that January/February, all of a sudden, we're over the ACL, and accountability measures might trigger, and we're cut out, and I certainly understand that, if we move forward and de-select January/February, yes, that's leaving Florida out of it, but, you know, we've been out of it for the last three seasons, and, going back and looking at MRIP landings, and granted with the caveat that they're MRIP landings, I mean, even before blueline was included in that four-month season, there were not a lot of charter landings from Florida in that January/February timeframe, and there are a lot of landings in that April/May/June/July/August timeframe.

DR. MCGOVERN: Just with regard to the species in the complex, I looked at the landings for all the different species in MRIP, and there are hardly any landings -- Well, I didn't see any landings of misty grouper, very few yellowedge, and snowy grouper and tilefish are mostly taken off of Florida. There are not a lot of snowy grouper landings in January and February, and snowy is a summer spawner.

There are some landings for golden tilefish off of Florida, about 20 percent, in January and February, and blueline is really the species that's a North Carolina/Florida concern, out of all of these, and, like Roy said, there are blueline tilefish landings during January and February off of Florida, and not off of North Carolina, but most of the landings for blueline tilefish are May through August off of North Carolina and Florida, and Florida catches more blueline than does North Carolina.

MR. SAPP: You made my argument there. There was more ifs and buts from North Carolina and guarantees for Florida in the negative, but you made my argument. It's not that common of a fishery, but, when it's needed, it's desperately needed, and so the likelihood, other than the whole MRIP disaster there, of having these landings is minimal until the fishery, the traditional fishery, is not strong, and I argue that the vast majority -- In the Keys, and now we're going to down to Brice's land, that's where the yellowedge and those type of species are caught, and there aren't intercepts.

These are going back to private docks or charter docks that aren't being watched, and so there are a considerably better quantity of these species being caught down there, but they're just never being seen, and they're highly unlikely to ever be seen. Even at that point, the people that are looking at them, they'll look at a bleached-out snowy grouper, after he's been laying in the ice, and it looks no different than any other grouper to a lot of them, or a misty. Most people don't even know what a misty looks like. We catch them down there quite a bit, and so, again, they're going to look at that, and is it a snowy or is it a misty? The people taking these readings are looking at these fish, and they don't know, and so you're not likely to see a misty reported, though there are plenty of them there.

MR. HAYMANS: Not that I am one to change the regulation on a whim or every other Sunday, but, if this is successful and we go through a couple of seasons and we need to make a change, this is ripe for a framework, and is that right, if we change within what we're reviewing now? We could come back with a framework action?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think so. You mean to change a bag limit?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes. If this is successful and we have these two different bag limits and there is two seasons, if, two fishing years from now, we figure out that that's not working, we can do a framework within what we're considering here to change the bag limit, right?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Bag limits are framework-able.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say that I think we seem to be hearing a lot of -- We're getting a lot of information now that we didn't seem to have early on in these discussions, as we were trying to craft this, and I just get the sense that we're pushing towards, and maybe changing things at this point, but we're pushing towards, with good intentions -- We thought we were trying to simplify things and improve things, but, for the range of needs and trying to craft a compromise, I'm not sure we have the tools we need right now to get it out of what exists in the actions as it's printed at this point, and so I just have this sense of kind of rushing to failure here, and so I would be inclined to just leave things like they are, rather than to mess with something, thinking that we were doing something good and then ending up causing more harm, perhaps, than indicated, but I

think part of that is because I don't recall getting this much specific input from particular pieces of the fishery about this early on, when we were crafting all of this, and I don't know where folks were, if they weren't paying attention or there wasn't --

MR. SAPP: I wasn't here. I didn't exist.

MR. BELL: Well, I'm just saying that we seem to have tried to come up with something that's not working real well, and I don't see a lot of room in here to craft an adequate compromise to help kind of both ends of the spectrum.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so a couple of things. We could still vote on this, or we're going to have to vote on this substitute motion, or the other thing that we could do is we could not take final action at this meeting, which we've talked about before, and try to come back at another meeting specifically to resolve this particular issue. I know that nobody likes that, but you're hearing from both Florida and North Carolina arguments about the importance of access to certain species in certain times of the year.

The way part of this discussion is going, you basically eliminate an entire state's access to an entire newly-made deepwater complex during what is their prime tourist season in order to give it to another state during what is the existing time of the year right now. This has gone all the way back to even pre-visioning, when we were having discussions with the South Florida Committee and the importance of these various seasons in certain times of the year. In cutting out here one part of the region, I feel like we're flirting with violating National Standard 4, but I am not certain that that's where we would end up. I want to give everybody a chance to speak that wants to speak on this before we vote on the substitute motion, and I will go over again what we're voting on.

MS. BECKWITH: To Mel's point, I think, obviously, our two species of importance are blueline and snowy, and you guys are talking about losing access to golden tilefish. Obviously, North Carolina doesn't catch golden tilefish, and so that's a valid argument. I understand that. That makes sense to me, and so, to that point, maybe the deepwater aggregate isn't the right way forward.

It was intended to be a way of reducing discards and concentrating effort and all of these other aspects that we discussed, but, if this is this difficult, then I think a way forward would be to pick no action and not create the deepwater complex and leave things as they are, and that would allow Florida to keep their access to golden tilefish, and it would allow North Carolina the access, not fearing the current seasons for blueline and snowy, which are the ones that are most imperative to us, and it's pretty awful that we've put the staff through Amendment 26, but I don't see a way forward, and I think, if this motion passes, I'm not sure that we get to where we need to be. Would you guys like me to make a substitute motion to do no action?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me throw out some suggestions, and I just want to note that there was still another hand in the air. Before we stop all the discussion, let me throw out some possible alternatives here. Yes, I agree that Anna made some good points about what we're trying to accomplish here doesn't appear to be getting us to where we need to be, and so the parliamentary team up here has looked in the book, and we could table this motion, and so there is a substitute motion on the table.

We could table this motion until the next meeting, or we could take action on the motion. If we are going to table the motion, we could then table the entire amendment, also, for discussion at the next meeting. There is some options here, and we don't necessarily have to wind ourselves up with the substitutes and more substitutes. We can, but there is multiple options here about what to do. While you all are thinking about that, I am going to go to -- Steve had his hand up.

MR. POLAND: I was just going to support what Anna was just saying. I mean, it's pretty obvious that the issue is we have lumped these deepwater species together, and we did it -- Our previous council did it with the intentions of simplifying things and making it easier, but it's obvious that it's not making this issue easier from a management perspective, and, I mean, I could support going back and reconsidering Action 1 and supporting no action, or modifying our preferred to maybe go back and look at that deepwater species, because you run the risk of -- You take stuff, and you throw it in a category to simplify, but, when you categorize things, or throw things in groups, you kind of lose those fine details out there on the end of the tails and stuff, and it seems like we're so far away from Florida on this blue line and golden tilefish thing that this deepwater species aggregate just might not be appropriate.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I've got a list of people in the queue, and so, as I go around, if you can, can you maybe speak to what you want to do? We heard two things on this side of the table about going back and picking no action.

I am not saying that that's a bad idea, but, if we're going to go back and pick no action, I definitely don't think that we should be acting, taking final action, on this amendment at this meeting, because that was kind of one of the main purposes of this entire amendment, was to go in and look at these complexes, and it appears that we're having a discussion today that maybe the complex is not right, and so I'm glad that we're having the discussion now, before we finalize the amendment. Kind of as I go through the list of people in the queue, be thinking about what you would like to do as a path forward today. I do not think we should take final action today, and let me just throw that out there.

MR. BELL: Madam Chair, I am certainly not comfortable with final action, and what I would say is if we could just step back for a second and think about what we're trying to do here, is I think we've reached a point where we really realize, in the things we were trying to do with deepwater, that one size does not fit all, and there were some things where it makes sense to -- Some of the approach, but we're finding out that that doesn't work, and so what we're trying to do is figure out how to achieve a better product, a better compromise, a solution that's perhaps not available to us now within the existing actions.

I would just say that I don't know what the best thing -- Whether it's to table the motion or -- I would take a recommendation on that, but what we want to do is come back and try to figure out how to achieve a better outcome that takes care of Florida and takes care of North Carolina, and I just think we're trying to limit ourselves to what we have to limit ourselves to, which is the analyzed products in here, and so, whatever it takes to step back for a moment and achieve that compromise, I think it's worth it, because we don't want to do something that basically creates more problems, and so I'm open to whatever the best way forward is, based on staff's recommendation and whatever we come up with.

DR. MCGOVERN: I agree that we don't want to take no action and then take final action on this, and I have looked at the recreational landings, and I think, if we were to table it, we would want to include more analysis in the amendment. One thing that is absent, when you look at the amendment, is predicted dates of closures with the different alternatives, and I think the MRIP data are uncertain, but we might be able to add something like that in there, and then, like Mel says, maybe come up with a list of other things for the IPT to consider and analyze and bring back to the next council meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we're having some debates up here about how to do this, and so there's a couple of options, and so we've said the word "table", and a motion to table is non-debatable, and is a little bit different than a motion to postpone. I think that what -- I am just going to make some suggestions here, and then we can talk about how we want to do it. We need to take action on this motion, but that action could be to postpone the decision until a time certain, being the March council meeting.

Let's pretend that we take that action to postpone the decision on this substitute motion until the next meeting. We would then need to take a second action to postpone the entire amendment discussion until the next meeting, and so we would be postponing the action on the motion, and, in addition, postponing the action on this entire amendment, the remainder of the amendment, because I really don't think we should keep going through all these actions here if we're going to be blowing up the whole deepwater complex and all that, and so I don't think that we should really continue these discussions, and so then I would do two postpones, and the time certain would be to the March council meeting. I am seeing thumbs-up. Mel has a procedural question.

MR. BELL: That being the case then, I would ask staff to -- So that gives us until March. Is that adequate time to do some of what Jack was talking about, and would you kind of come back with some --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have to say that I didn't hear what Jack said, because we were up here having a parliamentary discussion, and so can someone tell me what Jack said? Jack, can you tell me what you said?

DR. MCGOVERN: If I can remember. What I was saying is that, if we were to postpone this, or table it, that one thing we could look at is, for the actions, is the predicted closures, the date of the closures, that would occur with the different alternatives, because there is kind of a qualitative discussion about that in there, but there's not the expected date, and so it may be difficult to do though, because those are MRIP data, and so there's a lot of uncertainty with it, but, still, we might be able to do something to give folks an idea of what would happen if you had a January/February opening and then a summer opening and what would happen for the different alternatives.

MR. WAUGH: Mel had raised the issue before that you really have two different areas, two different situations, and Steve mentioned the issue with the deepwater complex, and the reason it's a complex is because those species co-occur in deep water, and you don't want them out fishing for one and discarding the others. Would you all be interested in looking at some options to allocate the recreational ACL to a northern zone and a southern zone to address these two differences, because, to me, that seems to be the more effective approach, rather than dismantling the deepwater component.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and I heard some yeses.

MR. BELL: Yes, that's an example, and so what I'm saying is, by the time we get to March, we want to have some different information, different options, different things that we can work with, so we're not just looking at the same stuff again in March, and my question was is between now and March adequate for staff or whomever to kind of pull some of that together, and so that's a good example, Gregg. That's my real-world question, in terms of moving forward. Is March adequate?

MR. WAUGH: Well, I think Myra is thinking about that. You know, it's a matter of just compiling the data and looking at some alternatives to allocate, and I think one question would be timing. If you are interested in looking at that, a question for Monica is, if we were to make the public aware that we're looking at this, we would get those analyses in the briefing book, and people can comment, once that briefing material is out.

Would a hearing at the March meeting, taking public comment at the March meeting, be sufficient, or would it be more prudent to do a hearing via webinar prior to the March meeting, in addition to taking comment at the March meeting? That might give the public more access to it. Now, they would be looking at a range of alternatives for allocating without knowing what the council was going to do, but certainly they could give you input on those.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so my thoughts on that are we all know that allocation discussions are probably some of the most difficult discussions that we have. I don't think that just a webinar and then final action in March -- That might not be enough. I am concerned that having an allocation discussion -- I like the idea, and I don't mind having the discussion, but I think it's just going to take longer.

I am not comfortable with allocating among the coast and then now taking final action and then the public would technically get to have a discussion on it before we even saw what the options were or looking at the alternatives, and so that concerns me, too. I think that -- Me, I would like to review what those state-by-state allocations would look like, or region-specific allocations, if you put Florida in one region and the Carolinas in another, and I would like to see that before we send it out to the public.

I would also like to bring up another point here. Triggerfish in in there, and triggerfish is in an action at the end that is not about deepwater. It's about the twenty-fish aggregate and establishing ten-fish bag limits within the twenty-fish aggregate. I am just wondering if we could split that out all by itself and somehow let that move forward, and I'm okay with delaying action on that until March, but maybe split this into two pieces, and that piece may move forward separately, especially if we're going to get into allocations along the coast, and that's just some thoughts there. I see lots of hands in the air.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This recreational visioning amendment has been difficult for the council for a while, difficult to figure out what exactly to do, and what I am hearing today is a lot of uncomfortableness with people going ahead, because they're not happy with what is currently in the document in terms of even the new information that's come forward and all that sort of thing, and remember, when you're thinking about all of this, your purpose was to address recreational stakeholder input to increase predictability for the deepwater component, in addition to minimize

regulatory discards and improve regulatory compliance and all that, and so, if you decide to postpone, that's fine, but think about really what your purpose is going to be, because you may need to change that.

Allocations can't be done via a framework. They are a plan amendment, and so, if you were going to split that out and maybe make that a plan amendment, that's fine. The real -- For folks who are newer council members, a plan amendment just requires more public comment and that sort of thing when you go to see if it's going to be implemented, and so, if you want to split this out, that's fine. I am hearing a lot of people who just want a little more time with this.

That said, that's fine, and we could bring it back in March. We're going to have to look at the data to see how old the data is, and you will want the newest information you have anyway, right? You look at what's in the document and then if you can update that, and so my thinking is we can hear Myra and Chip, but it's probably going to -- You will see something in March, but you're also going to be thinking, between now and then, of maybe different ways to attack the problem, and so you probably could split some of it out, like for the gray triggerfish and those other ones, and take action on that, final action on that, in March.

If you wanted to do a webinar, that's fine, but a public hearing, I think, in March on the part you wanted to bring forward, if I am hearing what you want to do is attack some of this stuff with the deepwater complex and put that aside and figure out how to deal with it, but then maybe the part you retain in Regulatory 26 is gray triggerfish and those other actions, and, sure, you can do that.

MS. MCCAULEY: Okay, and so let me state what would be retained in this particular amendment. It would be Actions 5 and 6, and so there's two actions at the end of this document. One of them is the size limit for triggerfish, and the other is the bag limit, the ten-fish bag limit, within the twenty aggregate.

MS. BROUWER: Also, to remind you, the action to take away the minimum size limit for those three deepwater snappers has already been approved for the commercial sector, and so, if you exclude that action, you're going to have something out of whack there.

DR. COLLIER: I just wanted to point out that, as Monica said, that this data goes from 2014 to 2016, and so it might be a good idea to include 2017, and, given the uncertainty in some of the information, and the PSEs are pretty large for the deepwater species, the analyses are likely to change, and I'm not certain -- I haven't looked at the data to see how they will change, but, in all likelihood, it is going to be different than the information that you're seeing now.

In regard to looking at the impacts for Season 1 and these different things and trying to determine when a season is going to end, and you're looking at an aggregate, it becomes very difficult for me as an analyst for this to really figure out what the fishermen are going to choose to select on a trip where they might have more than one species.

Right now, there is -- At least within MRIP, there is not a lot of information where they are catching more than one deepwater species on a trip. Within some of the headboat trips, the information is better, but that is a census survey, and so we are able to figure out which one they are picking to keep on those trips, but, if we go down to one fish per person, there is definitely going to be some selections that go on, if you guys want to give me some recommendations on that, but it's going

to be very difficult for me to go forward, but I'm happy to try to complete any analysis that you would like to do in order to calculate how the seasons will end or how fishermen will pick these fish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so, before I go to Steve, there was a discussion before that of you could include, in one amendment, Actions 4, 5, and 6. I am not comfortable with that. To me, 4 is about deepwater species also, and, depending on what we're thinking about, I am a little concerned about taking any action on that. I would rather just pull 5 and 6 away and keep that by itself, and I guess my question for Monica is could we take final action on 5 and 6 today and not take action on the rest of the items, or is it better to wait, since we're going to pull this into a couple of pieces, and just take final action on that piece that would be Actions 5 and 6 at March?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, you probably could do it, take final action on 5 and 6. If you do that, are you taking no action then on the rest of those alternatives? That's really what you're doing, or the rest of the actions, Actions 1 through 4, you're taking no action on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: You're removing them and putting them in a different vehicle, because, if you're going to do allocation, you're in a different type of plan amendment.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, I know, but I'm talking about the current actions as they exist in the amendment, and so I guess, if you allow -- If you were to take final action on 5 and 6, then you wouldn't have -- You would have that document in front of you, but it just would be having a lot of extraneous information in it that wouldn't be needed, and so, if we go through the process where we allow the Chair to review the document after staff gets it in shape, based on your actions here, then, yes, I think you could go forward with that. Then, if you thought it was too substantive, as the chairman, and you didn't like what was in the document, you could bring it back in March, but I'm thinking that, yes, you could take final action on 5 and 6 today, yes.

MR. POLAND: Three things, and I really added the third thing after Chip. It sounds like, if we had some type of reporting, that would help, and I'm just putting that out there. I really just wanted to speak in favor of pulling the Action 5 and 6 and moving forward with that for Florida, because it just makes sense, and I feel like all of our discussions kind of supported that, and, since Art questioned my Christmas cheer, I wanted to make sure that I did something for Florida, but I don't see a problem including Action 4 in that either, because it's for those three species, and, as Myra said, it would make it consistent with the commercial regs on that.

Then, to speak to state-by-state or regional allocation, I am definitely in support of considering that, just with the caveat of we'll have a lot more of these kind of arguments and discussions around this table of pushing and pulling in the future, because, I mean, you can go to a Mid-Atlantic Council meeting, or an ASMFC meeting, where they have similar state-by-state allocation management, and it can get contentious, and it's hard, but life is hard, and we just keep trucking along.

MS. BECKWITH: I would also speak in support of just moving forward with Action 4. It's pretty mild. I mean, we're just removing the minimum size limit on the three snapper species to avoid barotrauma discards, and so I'm okay with moving forward, and I had another point, but I can't remember.

MR. HAYMANS: Just for clarity for the public, can we split this then into a 26A and B, and the A moving forward today or -- That way, when we come back, the public still knows it's 26, and we're taking deepwater in the 26A and --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that's a good point. Monica, would that be -- I know that Myra is talking over here, and is that okay, to split it into like 26A and B and do it that way? I guess part of my concern is -- I hate to keep throwing monkey-wrenches in here, but I guess I could get onboard. It seems like people are okay with 4, 5, and 6, and I could get onboard with those actions, but I don't think that the existing purpose and need that we have really -- The purpose and need speaks to deepwater, and that would be in 26A, like Doug is suggesting, and 26B would be just 4, 5, and 6, and so it seems like there is a lot more changes, and I'm not certain that we can finalize it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's certainly cleaner if you wait until March, until you see it all. However, if you want to do it today, I think you can, but I was going to also advise you to go back and look at your purpose and need and revise that. We can't do a 26A and B, only because, if this turns -- Well, if this turns into a plan amendment, you cannot do a 26A and B, because you're up to 48 or 47 or whatever it is for a plan amendment, and so, just in terms of numbering, and I appreciate Doug's idea on trying to keep it simple for the public, but, if you end up dealing with allocations, then it's going to be a plan amendment, and it will be some other number. If you don't deal with allocations, and you wanted to do an A and B, sure, we could do something like that.

MS. BROUWER: I was going to suggest, if it helps at all with your discussion, in terms of just the logistics of getting a document ready for you all, if you choose no action for Actions 1 through 3, then we wouldn't have to change the whole document around and extract sections and all of that. If you take the actions out, it's going to take a little bit longer, because then we'll have to kind of synthesize and tighten that amendment, and I think, if you spoke on the record, as far as why you're taking no action on 1 through 3, it's -- You are talking a lot about access, and that's not really your intended purpose of the amendment, and so I think, and Monica can speak more to that, I think you could probably have enough discussion on the record to go no action in those three actions for now and then reconsider them later.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Myra did a better job than I was trying to get at earlier, is thinking about the revisions that would be needed to be made to the document if you were just going to go forward with some of the actions and not the others. Really, you would be selecting no action for those, and so I don't know -- For Actions 1 through 3, because you look at me puzzled, Jessica, you would really be taking no action on them.

Now, that's if you wanted to go forward today, and that would be the easiest thing for staff, and there could be discussion as to why, because the council is going to consider them more and those sorts of things. Though, if you do want to go final today, you should go look at your purpose and need though and change that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, that's my concern, is that, if we take no action, the purpose and need is primarily about the deepwater complex, and we would really need to go back in and re-work that. I have Anna and Mel in the queue, and then we're taking a bathroom break before we figure this out.

MS. BECKWITH: The point I was going to make earlier is that we started with the deepwater complex. It was the last thing we left in this amendment, because it was the low-hanging fruit. It was the easy thing that we thought that we could get done without a lot of BS and controversy, and so now we've taking the simple thing, to reorganize something that was supposed to be easy, and we're talking about regional allocations, which is way complicated, and so I think, at this point, I would actually support taking no action on 1, 2, and 3 and just leaving things as they are now, and, in some future mechanism, we could start with something as simple as a white paper on what it would look like for regional allocations instead of putting this council through the whole discussion of regional allocations, but consider it slowly, rather than having to push an amendment, but I just wanted to say, at this point, with everything that has happened, all the discussions, this was the low-hanging fruit out of all the things, and here we are.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All good points. You mean regional allocation for a deepwater complex, and that's what you meant? I just wanted to clarify. Okay.

MR. BELL: I think Myra covered what I was going to say. I was just sort of looking at -- There is a time imperative, perhaps, for 5 and 6, from a Florida standpoint, and there is not necessarily a time imperative on 4, and then 4 just makes more sense, logically, attached to 1, 2, and 3, but, I mean, either way, I am fine. If it's easier just to keep all of this together and just take no action on 1, 2, and 3, that works. 4 is just -- There is no time imperative for 4, necessarily.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Let's take a bathroom break, and we will continue this discussion when we come back from the bathroom break.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Here is the tentative plan, if you all like it. The plan, I think, would be to take no action on the first three actions in this amendment and move Actions 4, 5, and 6 forward, and so, just to reiterate, what's in 4, 5, and 6, 4 is remove the recreational minimum size limit for certain deepwater species, 5 is reduce recreational minimum size limit for gray triggerfish, 6 is modify aggregate bag limit for the twenty-fish aggregate.

We would take final action on those, and we would give staff some direction to modify the purpose and need a little bit, and then, those first three actions that were about deepwater, to have staff prepare maybe a white paper document that looks at some type of state or regional allocation for those deepwater species and have that not come back until say June. Okay. I see heads nodding. People seem to love that. All right. Can we just have a substitute motion to take no action on Actions 1, 2, and 3 in this amendment?

MS. BECKWITH: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. The motion is by Anna and seconded by Doug. Let's get that on the board. While she's typing, did you have a question?

MR. BELL: Is that last substitute motion still hanging up there or -- What are we substituting, just procedurally?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me clarify here, because we had a similar discussion up here. We are making a substitute motion. The previous substitute motion was about two of the other remaining -- The 1, 2, and 3 actions, and so two of the three actions that we're talking about here, and so they're all relevant, and they're all related.

If we pass this substitute motion, then this would become the main motion, and then we would vote on the main motion, and then we would continue moving forward with the other three actions in the amendment, and we'll go back to the committee report, and we'll also give direction to staff to come back in June with something, a white paper or some mechanism, to look at the deepwater species, including by region. All right. I feel like we've had plenty of discussion here, and we don't need any more. All those in favor of the substitute motion, raise your hand. I'm sorry, Myra. Did you have your hand up?

MS. BROUWER: I did. I think it would probably be good for the record if you explained that the reason you're selecting no action is because these regional differences and access to these species are actually not addressing the predictability component that's in your purpose and need, and, for that reason, we need to come back and revisit this, and so I guess I just will feel more comfortable if you addressed that specific little bit of the purpose and need, and, if you do that, then we don't need to go back and change it, because you are explaining why these three actions do not in fact meet your stated purpose for this amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I agree that, by selecting no action -- Well, trying to move forward with Actions 1 through 3 is not addressing predictability, because we can't resolve that issue, and there seem to be other remaining issues with the deepwater complex and some regional differences that are not resolved, and so, thus, we would be selecting no action on Actions 1, 2, and 3, which would be Alternative 1 for those three actions. Okay. Does everybody know what we're voting on? All right. **All those in favor of this motion, raise your hand. That passes unanimously.**

The substitute motion becomes the main motion. Let's take a vote on the main motion. **All those in favor. All right. That is unanimous as well. That passes.**

Now we need to move on to Actions 4, 5, and 6 in this amendment. We are at Motion Number 7 in the Snapper Grouper Committee Report. **Motion 7 is modify the title of Action 4 to specify that the species it applies to (queen snapper, silk snapper, and blackfin snapper), and so we've changed the title, basically, and so, on behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion of that motion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Now I think that we are ready to recommend for approval. There is a draft motion on the board there, if someone would like to make a draft motion, and, once again, we're going to add a little bit more to that draft motion. Doug, I saw your hand in the air. Are you making the motion?

MR. HAYMANS: **Yes.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so I'm going to read the motion. **Recommend approval of Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 26, as modified, for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair**

authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text. All right. Do I have a second? It's seconded by Mel, and that's a roll call vote.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Sure.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. McGovern.

DR. MCGOVERN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Christiansen.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Whitaker.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **It passes unanimously.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank goodness. Thank you for that discussion.

MR. WOODWARD: Trust me. Nobody wants to get home in this room any more than I do, but I just -- An additional source of information that may help us continue to chew on this piece of gristle that we have stuck in our mouths is the workshops that are going on that Mike Leonard alluded to. I mean, we're going to be getting some input from fishermen about what is their preferred method of dealing with some of these struggles out there, and, in those discussions, obviously a part of that is going to be, well, how do we get better information from you on which to base decisions, and so at least delaying this -- We're going to have that coming online in hopefully March or so.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Good points. All right. We're going to continue moving through the Snapper Grouper Committee. Next up, the committee looked at Regulatory Amendment 42, which is the sea turtle release gear and framework modification, and made the following motion.

The motion is to approve Snapper Grouper Amendment 42 for public hearings, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection?

MS. BROUWER: I just wanted to make sure -- What I heard yesterday during Executive Finance is that you would like to conduct those hearings at the March meeting, and is that correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I believe so. Thank you for that clarification. All right. **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Next, the committee talked about the allocation review trigger plan, and the committee passed no motions related to the allocation review policy and triggers, but we did give a lot of direction to staff, and I believe that this document is coming back to the March meeting.

Then we moved into Regulatory Amendment 32, which was yellowtail snapper AMs, and the committee made Motion Number 9 to postpone consideration of Regulatory Amendment 32 until after the next yellowtail snapper stock assessment, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee then moved into the recreational accountability measures amendment and made one motion, Motion 10, to recommend that the council send Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 31 and Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 2 out for scoping via webinar prior to the March 2017 council meeting. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee then discussed the vision blueprint biennial evaluation, and we made no motions on this item, but there are a number of points in the committee report of direction that we gave to staff. The update on red snapper CPUE index was removed from the agenda, and then we had a discussion on characterization of the commercial snapper grouper fishery, and we made a number of points, and we said that we would continue discussing this following the March 2019 meeting, when the Region is coming back to talk about permits, and so we're going to continue these discussions in the future, and there were no motions.

There was no other business, and then we have a timing and tasks motion, and I'm assuming that we need to modify this to add in the white paper coming to the June meeting on the deepwater species, and so I'm going to let Myra get that up there, and then, ultimately, I will need somebody to make this large timing and tasks motion, but let's let Myra get this on the board.

Okay. So it's direct staff to bring white paper on deepwater species allocations to the June 2019 meeting. Do we think that the captures the regional differences that we're talking about here? Okay. There is a large timing and tasks motion.

MR. HAYMANS: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's moved by Doug, and I will read the timing and tasks motion. Go ahead, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Just one more thing highlighted here for clarification. The development of a webpage or a story map to update stakeholders on progress to date on the vision blueprint, do you want to see that in March, or do you want us to just do it and bring it to you for approval, or was your direction for us to just do it and put it up on the website and go from there?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We can certainly review it. Do we want to do that review in March? I don't necessarily think it needs to come back in March, and so maybe by June. If you guys get it ready for March, that's fine. If it gets ready in June, that's fine, too.

The timing and tasks motion was made by Doug and seconded by Mel. **The motion is to finalize Regulatory Amendment 26 and submit to the National Marine Fisheries Service; direct staff to bring white paper on deepwater species regional allocations to the June 2019 meeting; conduct public hearings on Amendment 42, the sea turtle release gear requirements and framework modifications, during the March 2019 meeting; include snapper grouper FMP objectives evaluation material from 2014 visioning project in March of 2019 briefing book; include a snapper grouper commercial permit application in the March 2019 briefing book; develop a webpage/story map to update stakeholders on progress to date on vision blueprint activities during 2016 through 2018 and bring to the committee in March or June of 2019 for approval; request a presentation from the SERO Permits to be delivered to the Snapper Grouper Committee during March (see additional list of questions and topics); hold scoping for recreational AMS amendment via webinar prior to the March 2019 council meeting; prepare a draft allocation trigger review policy based on council discussion for March 2019; prepare Regulatory Amendment 30 (red grouper) for approval for formal review in March.** Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stand approved. Thank you, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: You had asked for us to consolidate the list of questions or topics that you would like for us to request that be included in the presentation, and so up on the screen are some of the things that I thought were relevant. I mean, back in October, recall that we had this discussion, and you brought up some things that had more to do with enforcement or GC type stuff, as opposed to permits, and so these are things that were left that I think are relevant as well as what the Snapper Grouper AP suggested, and if you want to just quickly take a look and see if that is what you would like.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The one thing I don't see is the item that Tim brought up that had to do with not getting that pin number to go and apply online, and I'm not certain that that's covered here. Can you look at the list, Tim?

MR. GRINER: Yes, I think we need to add that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you give Myra something to type up there, something about questions of why there was no pin number sent out this year for filling out an application online or why is it sent out some years and not others, and I don't know what to write up there, and can you help?

MR. GRINER: I think the way that it was worded on the website, on the new website, was that, with your renewal package, you would be given an invitation number that would allow you to enter the system, and so nobody is getting that invitation number with their renewal package, and it should have been for all permits, with the exception of golden crab and the historical permits, but it seems that, at least in the snapper grouper, king mackerel, at least in the closed permits, we're not getting that invitation number with our renewal package.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I would add that that's in order to fill the permit out online, renewal online. I see that staff have come to the table.

DR. MCGOVERN: I think it's called a unique invitation code that is sent out with a letter.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you.

MS. RHODES: Based on information that was provided by Kevin McIntosh, who is over at the SERO Permits Office as the Acting Chief over there, it seems that there are some exceptions to that at this time. It's not only just the golden crab and the historical captains, but it's also if you are a commercial dealer that you're not going to be able to get the activation code at this time, and so that could be why -- Tim, you have a dealer permit, right?

MR. GRINER: Yes, but I understand that you can't renew your dealer permit, but the dealer permit and my package for that is totally separate than my actual fishing permits, and so I understand that, but I don't see why that would not allow you to renew your fishing permits online.

MS. RHODES: My understanding is that, if you hold one of those permits, that eliminates you from the activation code pool at this time. They are working on getting everybody up and running. I could be incorrect on that, and I will get some further clarification from Kevin later this week, but my understanding is that, if you do have one of those, they're not accepting your stuff online, no matter what other permits you might hold.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I still think that we should keep it on the list, so they can provide clarification for us, and so those are good points.

MR. HAYMANS: So this is a list of questions for the Permits Office, who is going to come here and talk to us, and so I'm going to continue to beat my drum. In addition to what would happen if a permit were revoked in a limited access fishery, what about the open access fisheries? How do they continue to issue a permit to someone who has had one revoked? I want to continue to ask those questions, especially of the Permits staff.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Good questions. Any other modifications to this list? All right. Are we good, Myra? Okay. I think we're good with this list. All right. Thank you. Next up is the Habitat Committee, and I believe that Wilson is going to give us that report.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Habitat Protection and Ecosystem Based Management Committee met here in Kitty Hawk on December 4. I will not read the entire report. I think everyone should have that in front of you, but I will just point out a few highlights.

Under the topic of Atlantic Coast-Wide Discussions about how to address species expansion northwards, we noted that the Mid-Atlantic Council members were unable to attend, due to a conflict with their meeting, and so the joint session with all three councils will be held at the council's March meeting. In the meantime, council staff did revisit potential avenues previously discussed to address species shifts and provided us with new landings data for those species.

We had a discussion scheduled by Roger for habitat and ecosystem tools. In the interest of efficiency, that was combined with AP Chair Anne Deaton's report. Anne gave us a very thorough report on a plethora of topics, and I'm not going to read all of those topics, and they are in front of you, and a second committee session that we had covered renewable energy development with Will Waskes from BOEM and Craig Poff of Kitty Hawk Offshore Wind giving us some very excellent reports on the types of surveys that are being done in the wind areas, and then Craig specifically addressed the Kitty Hawk offshore wind area.

Under Other Business, we briefed the committee on NMFS's recent issuance of MMPA authorization for seismic testing. Roger read into the record the council's previous position on that, and I'm not going to read that again, but I will only indicate that I think the council should pay close attention, because our understanding is that BOEM still has to issue final permits on that and, in addition to potential impacts on marine mammals, there are certainly potential impacts of seismic testing on habitats and other resources managed by this council, and so I think the council should keep a close eye on that and possibly consider additional comments at such time as the opportunity arises to make any additional comments to BOEM.

We have a draft timing and tasks motion, Madam Chairman, and I will note that, after consultation with our counsel, Monica has given me appropriate language to make a motion, which would be, on behalf of the committee, to committee so moves, but I think, following your lead, we probably would have to have somebody from the committee to make it and second it, but I will go ahead and read it, if that's appropriate.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great.

DR. LANEY: Okay. **The motion is: 1) prior to February CCC meeting staff will prepare the following support information to inform and support SAFMC input during the joint session during the March Council meeting, and that would include (a) a table of recreational and commercial species in the Snapper Grouper and Coastal Migratory Pelagic Management Units for Massachusetts and New England regions, in pounds caught, including identification of management jurisdiction, to include, per request I think from Chris, non-managed species; (b) table of management and coordination alternatives available to the council to address species change in distribution and movement north; (c) pros and cons on permits; (d) tables of ACL for managed species; 2) coordinate with the Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Councils to reschedule the joint session on species expanding north for the March 2019 SAFMC meeting.** We need somebody to make it and second it.

MR. BELL: **So moved, Madam Chair.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Steve.

DR. LANEY: Is there any discussion on the motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, Madam Chairman, it's approved, and that concludes my report.**

I will only mention one other thing, and that is that Dr. John Hare and staff of the Northeast Fisheries Science Center have done a great deal of work looking at vulnerability of a great number of species, I think eighty-some different species, relative to climate change, and so that's something that the council may want to take a look at in conjunction with that multi-council discussion coming up in March, and I think I have that paper, Gregg, and I can provide that for distribution to the council.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great, Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Wilson. All right. Over to Anna for Dolphin Wahoo.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met on December 4 and approved the minutes from the June 2017 meeting as well as the agenda for this meeting. We received a status of commercial and recreational catch, and our first discussion was about the potential for adding frigate and bullet mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo Management Plan as an ecosystem component. We have a timing and tasks motion that I will review in a few minutes that will go over some of the asks from that particular discussion.

We also proceeded -- We decided to proceed with Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, and, if you look down at the report, there is the -- We decided to move forward with all the actions that were originally in there except the action to review the acceptable biological catch, the ABC control rule for dolphin wahoo, which is being taken care of in another amendment, and we added a number of new items for consideration within this amendment, and I will go through those motions now for adding those to Amendment 10.

Motion 1, we decided to add for-hire bag limit sales of dolphin by dually-permitted vessels to the Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

The second motion was to consider HMS gear and training requirements in the pelagic longline fishery for dolphin and wahoo. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? One point of clarification that you guys would see in the list is that we are not considering tracking equipment in this request, and so VMS and that sort of thing is not within the scope of what we are looking at. We are looking at potential gear and some training requirements, but that gear does not include monitoring technology. **Is there any opposition to that motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

Motion 3 is to add an action to reduce the recreational vessel limit for dolphin to forty. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?

MR. POLAND: We heard some comments Wednesday night that forty fish is not divisible by six, and I think that's a very valid point made by our six-pack guys, and, also, I would kind of -- Since this is going out for scoping and analysis by staff, I would kind of like to leave this action a little more open-ended, just to allow them to analyze different bag limits within the dolphin wahoo fishery, and so, if I can, and I don't know if it needs to be a substitute motion or --

MS. BECKWITH: You can just give a direction to staff to consider a range of potential vessel limits for dolphin, and would that be enough, that is divisible by six?

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am fine doing a range. Art and I were suggesting forty, because that seemed to be what certain people in Florida had been asking for specifically, and so I know that forty is not divisible by six, but I would love to see it analyzed as one of the options.

MR. SAPP: I would understand that argument if every fish were the exact same size, but they're not, ever, and so you're not dividing six individual fish per charter customer. You're generally portioning them to what fits in a packaging system is divided by six. Therefore, the number really matters not. It's quantity of meat left over after filleting, and do you hear what I'm trying to say here?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, we hear you, and that may be an opportunity for public comment. Again, it's differences, and these guys do pick up trips in this area, and it's just a matter of public comment, which we will amply receive for this, and so maybe consider forty and then some other number that is divisible by six, say forty-two. Is there any additional discussion on this? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

Our fourth motion was to add an action to revise the ACL to accommodate the new MRIP data. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

The fifth motion was to add an action to revise sector allocations. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

We also provided some guidance, which I mentioned before, to remove Action 6 from Amendment 10, since this action is being pursued via Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 11, which is part of the generic ABC control rule. Below, we have a timing and tasks motion, which is our draft Motion 6. This one has not been made. If you guys would review this, it does go through some of the points that we would like to see come back in that white paper from the ecosystem component discussion.

The first is to send a response letter to the Mid-Atlantic Council stating that the South Atlantic Council is interested in gathering additional information on bullet and frigate mackerel and further investigating the potential to add two species to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP as an ecosystem component. We gave guidance to prepare a white paper for the March 2018 meeting on the concept of adding prey species to an FMP as an ecosystem component as well as regulatory parameters and mechanisms for doing so. We asked them to consider how other councils have addressed unmanaged prey species through designating them as ecosystem components in fishery management plans and potential management options. Additional background information on fisheries for bullet and frigate mackerel and identifying other major prey species for dolphin and wahoo, as an example flyingfish and squid, which were discussed during the committee. Then the final timing and tasks bullet is to prepare Amendment 10 for review at the March 2018 meeting. Is there anything else?

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Mel is going to make that motion, and Steve will second it.

MR. BELL: **I just move that we adopt the timing and tasks motion just read.**

MR. POLAND: I second the motion, but I guess John will be working on the white paper. Is March too early, or --

MR. HADLEY: Well, I mean, we could certainly have a more developed product in June. As was mentioned yesterday, the Mid-Atlantic and New England will have some representatives at the March meeting, and so I'm not sure if the committee wants to see that again at March for that purpose, but pushing it back to June would allow a little bit more time to develop the white paper.

In the meantime, in just thinking about -- As far as, moving over to Amendment 10, the IPT will meet and bring -- What we'll be coming back to you with on that is more trying to get some draft actions and alternatives put together and kind of the bookends, as far as what the committee wants to consider on that, and not a whole lot of analysis there, but we will have the new revised MRIP recreational numbers for you too to look at, but not much analysis there, with the intention of potentially sending those back out to scoping between March and June. Then, moving back over to the bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel issue, that would be going over the white paper as we could develop it in the meantime.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, and so the question would be if the committee is interested in having any portion of that discussion with the Mid-Atlantic and the Northeast Council. That would be our opportunity.

MR. POLAND: Certainly, if we get them all in the same room, we can hit them with this too, but I just didn't -- I don't know what's out there, and so I don't know what you would run into, and I was thinking more of the March or June in the timing and tasks motion, but if you feel comfortable that you can get something to us in March.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All of those March dates are for 2018 and not 2019.

MS. BECKWITH: Good eye. I think what I am hearing is there is some flexibility in that white paper, and, if there's something to come before us, we can talk ourselves in circles with the Mid-Atlantic and the Northeast Council. If it does not come before us, then we will talk ourselves in circles at the June council meeting amongst ourselves. Does that -- Is everyone comfortable with that, giving John some flexibility in when the paper comes to us? Gregg, did you have something?

MR. WAUGH: Yes. Just, in terms of clarification here, the concept of adding prey species, that's just how you would do it, but our intent is still just focused on bullet and frigate, right, and maybe flyingfish, but not the broader concept of adding other species, but it's more the mechanism of how you add it, but the species we're still looking at is still this fairly short list?

MS. BECKWITH: Correct, and so it's the mechanism and the top-most important species to these, and I would say that we should probably not consider more than the top three species to each of these.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to clarify, to add-on to what Gregg is saying, I think it's also what designating them as ecosystem components means or what it gets you in all of that. I just want to be clear.

MR. HADLEY: There again, I think, as Steve commented during the committee discussion, just the tools in the toolbox, so to speak, if the council were to pursue that route.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there any further discussion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** That concludes my report. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Anna. Next up, we have SEDAR. The SEDAR Committee met earlier this week and approved the minutes from the September meeting and the agenda. The SEDAR Committee met during closed session to make appointments for the tilefish assessment and the scamp stock ID process, and I will make those motions in a minute.

Then we received a briefing from the SSC Chair, George Sedberry, about the SSC recommendations specific to SEDAR topics. Then we talked about SEDAR project approvals and reviewed schedules and terms of reference for snowy grouper, tilefish, and scamp. Then we got an assessment projects update, and so there were some delays and other items that we discussed. Then, under the SEDAR Steering Committee item, we discussed whether we wanted to conduct the red snapper stock assessment as an operational rather than a research track, and, ultimately, we decided that we wanted to keep red snapper as a research track.

The committee made a number of motions, and so the first motion is move to appoint those listed in Table 1 to the SEDAR 66 tilefish assessment. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was move to appoint those listed in Table 2 to the SEDAR 68 scamp stock ID process, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion 3 is move to appoint Steve Poland to SEDAR 66 and Tim Griner to SEDAR 68 stock ID process. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion 4 is move to appoint Alexei Sharov to replace Marcel Reichert on the SEDAR 58 data workshop for Atlantic cobia. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion stands approved.

Motion Number 5 is move to approve the terms of reference for SEDAR snowy grouper update. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion stands approved.

Motion 6 is move to approve the terms of reference and schedule for the SEDAR 66 tilefish stock assessment. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion stands approved.

Motion 7 is move to approve the terms of reference and schedule for the SEDAR 68 scamp assessment. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion stands approved. Thank you, John.

MR. WAUGH: During the committee discussion, there was some talk about the impacts of funding changes to our fishery-independent program that could affect the assessment schedule, and I know the details are still being worked out. It may be helpful, and I think it would be helpful, if the council was to send a letter to Chris Oliver again indicating that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is under-resourced. It's one center with three councils, and it's got HMS and ICCAT, and so it's, in essence, like five councils.

On the west coast, you've got a situation where you've got one council that has two centers serving it, and we're not trying to get money from them, necessarily, but it's just to, again, point out that our center is understaffed, and we would like some attention paid to that and some more resources applied, and, in addition, Chris has offered to attend each council meeting, and we had him scheduled for ours a couple of years ago, but it got knocked out because of the hurricane. We could reiterate that invitation and tell him that this funding situation is one of the topics that we would like him to attend, and so, if that's of interest to the council, maybe just some direction to staff to write such a letter would be helpful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that sounds great. I would certainly welcome a letter. What are you thinking is the timing on when the letter would be sent out?

MR. WAUGH: Well, there's a lot going on right now, and it would probably be wise to wait until early January to get it to him. I can contact him and let him know we would like to have him

attend our March meeting, and so that gets in the planning, but then get a letter to him in early January.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great. Any more comments on that?

MR. BELL: Just something to note. I mean, the issues that poor Clay has to deal with, it has trickle-down effects. We're just not properly funded at the level we need to be, given everything that our region has to deal with, and we notice it, and we hear about it at every meeting, and our Snapper Grouper AP noticed it, to the point where they're ready to start lobbying, which, of course, they can't do, but it's just something that I think it couldn't hurt to just point it out.

Then, in terms of the immediate trickle-down impacts, I know I've talked with Clay and others, and I think the idea there is to get folks together and make sure we can work through this and keep things on track that need to come to the SEDARs and keep things going, and so that's going to be a concerted effort of folks working together and communicating and just planning how we deal with the immediate shortfalls and the near-term shortfalls and then potentially some longer-term, but I think we're on the right path, but it sure can't hurt to -- If that works just for direction to staff, but I think it would be a good thing to just point that out and have it on the record.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is that enough, Gregg? Do you need more discussion?

MR. WAUGH: I think that's good.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Mel.

DR. LANEY: Just a question. I know Mel said the AP can't lobby, certainly as a body, but my understanding is individual members of the AP could certainly -- They would not be precluded from contacting their members to discuss the issue, right? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We are moving into Citizen Science. Mel, you're up.

MR. BELL: You will find that in the folder. I am not going to read all of this, but the Citizen Science Committee met on December 6, and the main work of the committee was to really review the draft Citizen Science Program Standard Operating Policies and Procedures, which we did section-by-section, and you will see in there a lot of detail. We went through it and got feedback, and out of that discussion came one motion.

The motion is to adopt the Citizen Science Program SOPPs, with modifications as needed. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any objection to the motion? Hearing none, then the motion passes.

Then the other area of business was really an update on some of the programs and projects we had ongoing, and so we've got some detailed updates on that, and staff presented the mobile application and the release project and then also a mention of the FISHstory Project, which should be pretty interesting, and then there was really no Other Business, and no timing and tasks. There were no additional motions made. Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Next up, we have Personnel Committee and Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Personnel Committee met on the afternoon of December 3. Our first item of business was the Executive Director performance review. Mr. Waugh gave us a report, which was, I think, taken to heart. There were some discussions that were had thereafter, and Jessica and I will be meeting and going over the minutes of that particular portion of the meeting and putting together a written report, which will be presented to Mr. Waugh.

Next, the council -- I should mention the committee, for the sake of consistency, met as a committee of the whole. Next, the Personnel Committee reviewed staff medical benefits, and there was a great deal of discussion on this item. However, at the end, the consensus was that the -- Essentially, it was to maintain the status quo with regard to staff benefits. Since we were maintaining the status quo, no motion was made. Therefore, Madam Chair, I have no motion to bring before the Full Council, and that concludes my report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chester. Next up is the SOPPs Committee, and I'm going to turn it over to Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks. The SOPPs Committee met on December 3 and 4, 2018, and it was a - - It evolved out of the Personnel Committee. We approved minutes from the October 2018 meeting and the agenda, and then we reviewed policies for inclusion in the handbook. Most of this, or all of it, was in closed session on Monday, and then we met in open session on Tuesday morning to report on actions, and we approved many changes and provided guidance to staff on further modifications and some additional wording. We're going to meet again in March in a closed session, and then we'll open it back up to complete the review and approval of the handbook. There were no motions. Under Other Business, there was no items. There is one timing and tasks motion that I will look for someone to make, and that is to adopt the -- Can I get somebody to make the motion, or do I need to read it?

MS. MCCAWLEY: You can do either one first.

MR. CONKLIN: I want you to read it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. **Work with NOAA GC to clarify identified issues in the handbook; revise the handbook based on approved changes for use at the March 2019 meeting; and schedule a partially-closed SOPPs Committee meeting at the March 2019 meeting.**

MR. CONKLIN: I am going to second that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. CONKLIN: Is there any objection to that motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just had a clarification. Basically, between 1 and 2, part of the handbook is getting revised based on what we talked about, but then there were some outstanding issues, and this is basically saying that those issues are going to be clarified and brought back and we'll look at all those changes again in March, and that's what that is saying, right, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: That is correct.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. CONKLIN: Very good. **Is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion stands approved, and, Madam Chair, that concludes my report.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chris. All right. Next up is Executive Finance. The Executive Finance Committee met earlier this week, and the committee approved the minutes from October and the agenda. We had a lengthy discussion about Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization, and we talked about H.R. 200, and we talked about a new S. 1520 Senate bill, and then we spent some time working on the Senate staff working draft of an MSA reauthorization bill.

As part of this, Gregg is going to prepare some comments, and council members are going to get any additional comments to Gregg by December 13. Then he will send a draft to the Chair on December 14, with the goal of sending our letter back on December 18. Gregg also mentioned the SHIFT bill that was provided by Tony, and he will be accepting any comments on that, and then he will circulate a letter to all council members with a very short deadline for comments, and he will use past council comment letters and the CCC working paper to develop comments on these bills. We then looked at the CCC working paper, just quickly, and it hadn't been updated with our edits from the October meeting, and so Gregg is going to work on updating that document.

We then looked at the approved calendar year January through December 2018 expenditures, and there were no actions on that, and then we looked at council follow-up and priorities and tiering, and you can see, on the screen there, what the council is suggesting come back to March of 2019 and then a draft list of items for June of 2019 and September of 2019.

Then we talked a little bit more about the process for doing the priority rankings, and then we looked at the preliminary list of items for the January through December of 2019 calendar year budget. As part of that discussion, we discussed including adding a Mid-Atlantic Council liaison, remove from consideration an additional SSC meeting, added contract support for Dave Whaley, and support for ongoing training for current council members through some type of forum-like meeting, and the committee directed staff to prepare a draft 2019 budget based on this input.

I also thought that Chester made a comment about the first couple of items on the list, which were the previous reductions, and I think you were saying to bring those back also. Okay. Just a clarification. Then, under Other Business, the committee briefly talked about the proposed rule for financial disclosures and voting recusals and directed staff to review and prepare comments prior to the February CCC meeting and the March 2019 council meeting. The council will finalize their comments before March 6, which is the deadline. The committee made the following motions.

Motion Number 1 is the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council is not in favor of Section 302(b)(2) being applied to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion stands approved.

The committee made another motion that the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council is not in favor of Section 108(b)(5), and this is the roll call vote provision, and, so, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion stands approved.

We have a fairly lengthy timing and tasks motion. Can I get someone to make the timing and tasks motion and possibly read it?

MR. HAYMANS: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Moved by Doug and seconded by Chester. Can you read it, please, sir?

MR. HAYMANS: Sure. **Move to adopt the following timing and tasks: directed staff to prepare draft comments on the Senate Staff Working Draft MSA Reauthorization bill. Comments from council members are due to Gregg Waugh by 12/13/18, a draft letter to the Chair on 12/14/18, and final comments sent on 12/18/18. Number 2 is directed staff to prepare draft comments on the SHIFT bill. This bill may be introduced in the current session. If so, we will not have time to get our comments to them in time. Staff will monitor and prepare comments for the Chair's review if the timing works out. Number 3 is directed staff to prepare draft comments on the simplified S. 1520 bill. This bill may be introduced in the current session. If so, we will not have time to get our comments to them in time. Staff will monitor and prepare comments for the Chair's review if the timing works out. Number 4 is directed staff to prepare a draft 2019 Calendar Year January through December budget for review at the March 2019 meeting based on guidance provided at the December 2018 meeting. Number 5 is directed staff to work on the following items for the March 2019 council meeting: Snapper Grouper Regulatory 30, red grouper rebuilding; Snapper Grouper Regulatory 31/Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory 2, recreational accountability measures modifications; Snapper Grouper Regulatory 29, best practices and powerheads; Dolphin Wahoo 19, ACL sharing, optimum yield, and other actions; Snapper Grouper 45/Golden Crab 11/Sargassum 4/Coral 11; ABC control rule; wreckfish ITQ review; Snapper Grouper 42, sea turtle release gear and framework modification; and review of allocation triggers policy.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. That motion was seconded by Chester. Any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

MR. HAYMANS: Seeing as how this is Executive Finance, I will ask a question. We have gone back and forth about reading timing and tasks over time, and I don't think they're necessary. Everybody has got them printed, and they go to the recorder in a printed format, and why do we need to read all of those things, unless there is an update to them?

MR. WAUGH: Well, we don't send the reports to the recorder. When they are transcribing the minutes, they transcribe from the verbal minutes, and so that's why we read them.

MR. HAYMANS: But we have in the past not read them. I mean, this is, to me, the --

MR. WAUGH: We may not have done that in the past. I think, for quite a while now, we've been doing it, and there is congressional interest in ensuring that there is full transparency, and so I know it's a bit of a pain, but I would advise that we continue doing it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Next up on our agenda is our Liaison Reports, and I'm going to start on this side of the table. Doug, would you like to give us a report from Georgia?

MR. HAYMANS: Between now and the March meeting, we will request a federal fishery failure for the shrimp fishery. Our shrimping industry for 2018, the landings, at the moment, look like about half of where they were over the five-year average. There is a 35 percent threshold to ask, and I think we're above that, and so we've been in contact with NMFS staff about doing it, and I am going to let Mel handle what they're doing on theirs.

Next week, we will be deploying two barge loads of material, one at a reef that's about seven miles due east of Sapelo and one that we call a beach reef that's about four miles due east of Savannah, and that will be a -- The barge that is taking the concrete out first will come back and get reloaded with metal and go back out, and they will sink the barge at the same time, and that's as quick as I can give it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, sir. Moving around the table, Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes, ma'am. Doug mentioned it, but Governor McMaster sent a letter to Secretary Ross in Mid-November requesting basically some relief for the penaeid shrimp fishery for South Carolina, due to the losses associated with the cold event, and so we're at about minus 56, 54 to 56, percent, in terms of the value of the fishery, and so, as Doug mentioned, the threshold is 35, and so we'll see how that goes.

We were very fortunate with the two hurricanes that visited us in part this year, in that there were minimal impacts to fisheries for us, but there was a great deal of flooding, particularly up in the Pee Dee drainage basin and all, and the Santee, and Winyah Bay turned into a lake again, freshwater lake, but of note there is these freshwater plumes were detected by MARMAP on their cruises thirty miles offshore. There's a lot of freshwater, again, very similar to the thousand-year flood in 2015, and so it seems like we're having -- The frequency of thousand-year floods has ramped up a little bit.

The white shrimp fishery improved in the fall, and that may be in part to fish, to shrimp, being displaced out of North Carolina and down, and I'm not sure, but we had some pretty good landings in the fall for white shrimp, and MARMAP/SEAMAP finished their field seasons, and we're approaching winter now, and I think the Palmetto is going to -- Instead of going in the yard, I think she's going to basically have local availability, and so that's all I really have to report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel. All right. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Just a few items from the Fish and Wildlife Service. One is that we have a new Regional Director, and I think some of you know that Leo Miranda, who was our Assistant Regional Director for Ecological Services, was selected as the new Regional Director. Leo is a native of Puerto Rico, and he finished his master's degree at North

Carolina State University, and so he has strong North Carolina ties and connections, and we look forward to working with him as the new Regional Director.

I know you all look forward with great anticipation to the quarterly reports on how many eels we have passed at Roanoke Rapids Dam, and now Gaston Dam, and so we're passing eels -- Well, Dominion Generation, Dominion Energy, is working with the American Eel Workgroup to pass eels, and so, this year, as of when we met on the 29th of November, Dominion had captured 78,445 eels at Roanoke Rapids Dam. We had a little mortality event after the big storm, when they got a surge of eels in the north eelway, and the holding tank is smaller than the ability to host all those eels, and so they lost about 7,000 of them, and so 71,108 was the number passed, and then, at Gaston, they passed an additional 2,151.

Some very good news is that Dominion has, at least conceptually -- They have to wait for approval from management, but they have conceptually agreed to take funding that is dedicated for American shad work, and because the American Shad Workgroup has, for a variety of reasons that I won't go into, decided to defer trap and transport for American shad, they are going to use that funding instead to do biological work on American eels and look at age and growth and hopefully try and put some tags in silver eels and also look at downstream passage at Roanoke Rapids Dam.

Then the only other thing I will mention is that I had the opportunity to show some of you this week the presentation that I put together on hurricane-related fish kills as a result of Hurricane Florence. We lost at least a dozen Atlantic sturgeon, and possibly more, in that event, including a female that weighed 158 pounds and was over six feet long that was found dead on the Cashie River at the Roanoke Delta in North Carolina. She was gravid, and had a whole bunch of eggs in her, and that could have been possibly a significant contribution to a good sturgeon recruitment year, and, also, we got the word from the Virginia folks that the Atlantic sturgeon reproduction was really good in the James River this year, and I sent that article around to a number of you, and so that concludes my report, Madam Chairman.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Wilson. A couple of things from Florida. The governor requested a fishery failure following Hurricane Michael. That was declared by the Secretary of Commerce on October 31. Now we're just awaiting Congress to appropriate the funds.

At the upcoming commission meeting, FWC Commission meeting, and that's next week, two items of note for that meeting are we will be discussing rules for shore-based shark fishing and a possible permit to do shore-based shark fishing, and I know that sharks has been a hot topic this week, and there has been considerable discussion about this in the past few months, and so we have a suite of regulations, but the main item that we're looking at is requiring a permit in order to shore-based shark fish.

We will also be discussing goliath again, and so this is not necessarily a discussion about a harvest or no harvest, but it's more a discussion about what is the research that FWRI is conducting right now on goliath and what type of management goal are we going to put in place for state waters. There is a federal waters management goal by the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils, a 50 percent SPR, and we're actually suggesting that it could be some time before we could actually measure SPR, and so we're suggesting five or six metrics that we would use instead of SPR to determine what the status is for goliath grouper, and so we will be having that discussion next week as well at our commission meeting. Moving around the table, Steve and North Carolina.

MR. POLAND: Thanks. Not a whole lot, because we were just together two months ago, and so we're still dealing with the effects of Hurricane Florence. Post-hurricane, it seemed like there was about six weeks that the fishermen really felt the impacts, either from infrastructure issues, the dock was tore up, or just dirty water in and around the coast, but it seems like -- It's not back to normal, but it's getting back to normal.

Seismic testing, our governor is speaking in opposition of that, and this is something that the division and the state as a whole submitted comments against the issuance of the MMPA permits for the seismic testing, and so I know our governor has come out with a stance on it, and as well as our department secretary.

We had a Spanish mackerel closure on November 4, and this is our second Spanish mackerel commercial closure, and that impacted our fishermen, and I have received a lot of public comment on that. It's still coming in, and I just got a press release from our PIO just notifying fishermen that our governor has asked National Marine Fisheries Service, or requested the Department of Commerce, actually, to declare a federal fishery resource disaster for North Carolina for recreational and commercial fisheries, and the press release goes on just to notify fishermen that they may be receiving phone calls and to provide information to help in this determination. Merry Christmas.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Steve. Moving down the table, Clay, do you have any additional for us?

DR. PORCH: No, not at this time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That was excellent. That was the bar right there. All right. Monica or Jack, do you have anything additional for us?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do not have anything additional.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jack.

DR. MCGOVERN: I have just one thing. Stephen Holliman, who was our Socioeconomic Branch Chief, he retired back in early 2017, and we have done an internal reassignment, and now Dr. Mike Jepson is the Socioeconomic Branch Chief in our division.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Did you have a question, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: Just quick to mention that Mike Jepson used to work on the South Atlantic Council staff, and so we've got two, at least two, infiltrators down here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Excellent. Coast Guard Report, Jeremy.

LT. MONTES: I can take a hint, and I will keep this short. In the late document folder, I've got a quick report in there. Just taking a look at it, this is just for September and October and November, and the numbers seem low. We've only got sixty-one reported fisheries boardings this year, as compared to last year, where we had 181 during that same time period. We like to sit

around and talk about data a lot, and I think that's a data issue on our side, and so we're going to resolve that. We are kind of cleaning up some things and internally making some changes, but, during that time period, we had one boarding with a fisheries violation, and it's noted below, and it was down in the Florida Keys.

Just to look at the entirety of all of Fiscal Year 2018, you can see the numbers on there, and so we had eighty more boardings in the South Atlantic area, with three less violations, for about a 1 percent increase in compliance rates, and so I actually did the statistics correct this time, and so everyone remembers from the last meeting where I couldn't do stats correctly. I did them correctly this time, and I changed it from a violation rate to an observed compliance rate, which is kind of our standard, and it's a bigger, more fancy number, in my opinion.

Marine protected species, just to make note that on 15 November we started enforcing the ten-knot speed restriction for the whale south areas, and then I've got five search and rescue highlights listed here, two capsizes, and one disabled, where we towed them in, and one grounding, that I'm actually going to highlight here in a second, and then a taking on water, where we responded and helped hoist the folks that were on there.

The grounding is the Fishing Vessel AMG. I don't know if anybody saw this, if anybody down in the Ormond Beach, Daytona Beach, area may have seen it in the news, but I just wanted to bring this case up as a highlight of something not to do, in that they -- Running aground is never an advised thing, but what they did was they ran hard aground on Ormond Beach and were basically high and dry. The surf put them up high and dry.

When the Coast Guard got on scene, and it was reported to us through 911 overnight, and the Coast Guard got on scene, and we couldn't get our boats in, and so we sent our shoreside inspectors in, and they would not answer to us, and so, despite the fact that the guy wearing a uniform just like me was standing in knee-deep water and saying, are you guys okay, they wouldn't come out on deck, and they wouldn't respond, even though the vessel was heeled over about twenty to thirty degrees.

Eventually, the next day -- We didn't want to jump onboard, because we didn't know what was going on, and it wasn't a law enforcement team that was there, and it was a vessel inspector. The next day, they finally ended up responding, and then we worked through about a month-long process to get a commercial salvage company out there to somehow get this boat that was in knee-deep water out, and so I encourage anybody that has a mishap at-sea to first call the Coast Guard, or, if it's not a life-and-death emergency, to call for commercial salvage at that point. Then, if Coast Guard inspectors or a Coast Guard law enforcement team shows up, to be compliant and answer it. All you do, when things like that happen, is you raise eyebrows of was there drugs or alcohol involved in that accident, and we start opening up more doors and asking more questions, and it makes it more difficult on everybody.

Besides that, I want to go on the record one more time and just say that I do not really endorse the including of PFDs for turtles, and I just need to bring that back up again, use of the PFDs, Coast-Guard-approved PFD, for a turtle cushion, in that it's a much better idea to avoid confusion for our boarding teams out there to use a dedicated cushion or some other device that is approved for use.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any questions? All right. We are now going to move into Other Business, and so the item remaining is USS Monitor National Marine Sanctuary. I am going to let Gregg introduce our team, and they're going to give us a presentation on the proposed modification to the size of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary, and, ultimately, we'll need a motion at the end, and I'm going to turn it over to Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. David Alberg is the Superintendent of the Sanctuary, and he's going to be giving the presentation, and David will introduce the other folks that he has here with him. Again, we have in the past had someone on that advisory group, and we may do so again, but there is a letter in the Full Council meeting materials outlining the request, and David is going to give us a little bit of an overview, and then, as Jessica said, we'll need a motion at the end, and so, David, we'll turn it over to you.

MR. ALBERG: In the back of the room, let me just introduce some of the folks that are on my staff and from the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries Headquarters. First, I have Matt Brookhart, who is the Regional Director for the Northeast and Great Lakes Region of the Sanctuary Program. Next to him is Paul Ticco, who is a Regional Coordinator for the Sanctuary Program in the Northeast Region, and then Joe Hoyt and Will Sassorossi, who are both archeologists on staff at the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary.

I would say that all of those folks have been involved or at least five years, if not closer to ten, certainly for Joe and Paul, on the proposal that we're going to show you today, and so, if there are any questions, when we get to that, that I may not be able to answer, they are available as well.

What I am going to show you today is, first and foremost, just the proposal that we're working on, and we presented to the council in 2016, and I want to say it was in March of 2016, down in Jekyll Island, when we had just completed scoping, following the Notice of Intent on the boundary review of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary, and so our goal today is we've gotten to the point where it was clear that where we were headed would need formal consultation with the council, but I am also going to be showing you a number of things about this expansion that don't require consultation, but I think it's good to put in perspective the changes that we are making that are part of that consultation process.

As I spoke to the council a couple of years ago, our site, since 1975, our mission has been focused entirely on maritime heritage, and most specifically on the history of the USS Monitor, launched in 1862 and lost off of Cape Hatteras later that year, and, since 1975, our office has worked to ensure that the story of the Monitor is passed on to the next generation.

The site, as it was established in 1975, was, and remains, the smallest sanctuary in the system. It was described as a column of water one-mile in diameter and centered roughly over the wreck, and that word "roughly" will become important to all of you here in a few moments, and I would say that the regulations were meant to, at the time, based on the technology and the navigation systems and the type of activities that were going on around in the waters of the sanctuary in 1975, to be as cautious as possible to protect the wreck. That was the goal.

I say that our focus has been, as a staff, in the forty-five-plus years that we have worked with the Monitor, as I said, it has been primarily about outreach and education and preserving history, but, in the course of that, we have become, especially in the last ten years, keenly aware of the

significant history that surrounds the waters of the Monitor, reflected in the numbers of shipwrecks that have gone down in World War I and World War II and during the Civil War, beyond the Monitor, and we've also become more aware, I think as a program, of the unique way that our nation has always respected battlefields and places that have been important to the national story, places like Yorktown, Antietam, Shiloh, places where conflict has occurred, the course of history was changed, and the ground has been consecrated and considered hallowed, places that are even more modern, like Pearl Harbor, and this is the Pearl Harbor memorial, and those places related to World War II that have a connection still to us, a connection that is passing away day-by-day.

By one estimate, the United States is losing approximately 375 World War II veterans daily, who are beginning to pass away into history, and so the time is coming pretty soon when the last of these people, these heroes, will have passed, and, as we've been working off the coast of North Carolina on the Monitor, we've become -- We have recognized that it is not just a collection of shipwrecks, but it is in fact a battlefield.

What makes it significant is that, if you look at World War II and the history of World War II, it was a conflict that was other places. Americans went to places in Europe and in the Pacific that they had never heard of before, and they had to look up names, but it really didn't affect the homeland in the way that those places were impacted, except with one exception, and that's along the U.S. east coast and the Battle of the Atlantic. The Germans themselves referred to the U.S. east coast as the American Theater of War, and it is the only place, if you consider Pearl Harbor and the Aleutians as sites of attacks, it is the only place where a sustained, multi-year battle took place.

Related to this, and to the passing of these generations, an article in *The Washington Post* last year indicated that two-thirds of all millennials surveyed in a recent poll were unable to identify Auschwitz and what its significance was, and I don't think that's a damning statement on youth or the millennial generation, but it is certainly a reflection of the fact that we're probably more distracted today, with technology and history, and, unless we work hard to preserve it, it is eventually lost.

Off the coast of North Carolina, in particular, and North Carolina is unique, given the continental shelf proximity to the shoreline, and Cape Hatteras's role in routing shipping around that point of land, you have a significant collection of shipwrecks related to the Second World War, seventy-eight merchant ships, eight Allied naval ships, four German U-boats, most of these lost in 1942 and into 1943.

Of those shipwreck losses, almost 1,700 total losses, of which 1,200 were members of the United States Merchant Marines, which I promise you that I won't do today, but I could easily talk for hours about the history of the Merchant Marines and their sacrifices that, unfortunately, were not elevated at the same level as our U.S. servicemen, the Coast Guard and others, who fought during the Second World War.

We look at this, and we traditionally have taken the approach of studying individual shipwrecks and their history as isolated pockets of history and artifacts, but now look at this in a different way, as I said earlier, as a battlefield, and this map here is showing probably a hundredth of the number of wrecks that are out there in the historic record. Certainly this is some of the more prominent

ones, but clearly this is a pretty special place, in terms of the number of resources that are out there, resources like this, the E.M. Clark.

Year after year, North Carolina is listed as one of the top ten dive destinations in the world for wreck diving, and places where these wrecks also serve as gravesites for those men that we just talked about. They are important breeding grounds and spawning grounds for fish. They create hard-bottom habitat, which is important, and so not only from the economic perspective, not only from tourism and the dive industry, but also for fishermen. Of course, new wrecks are found every year. This is the YP-389, a small patrol boat that was lost in 1942 that sits quietly in about 350 feet at the bottom.

For a number of years, we have been working to try to get our arms around what is the best approach to deal with these resources and do it in a way that doesn't impact, or has a minimal impact, on other users in the area. Our goal is to protect these fragile resources for future generations and to preserve the memory of the brave Allied servicemen and women and members of the U.S. Merchant Marines who fought to rid the world of tyranny. Perhaps all the more poignant, given our date today, seventy-seven years, almost to the hour, that the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

On January 8, 2016, we issued a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register to begin a boundary review of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary. We held five public scoping meetings in North Carolina and Washington, D.C., receiving about 225 comments, in total, and we took those comments and, since that time, have been working on our proposal. This proposal is not yet cleared by NOAA, and it has not gone through the formal clearance process, but we anticipate -- Where we sit now is we're in that ongoing phase of working with other federal agencies and developing our draft documents, including a DEIS, management plan, preferred alternatives, and working with states and local community governments, but, going through that, we have one area that we believe formally requires consultation with the council, and that is a change at the Monitor that I want to talk about here.

I think, to go on with the timeline, we intend, if we stay on schedule, to release draft documents for public comment, hopefully this summer of 2019, and we'll hold public hearings on those and then, again, if we stay on schedule, by summer of 2020, we will have a final rule issued by NOAA.

The expansion really has a single set of regulations that we're proposing over it, with a subset specific to the Monitor, and so I'm going to -- This next slide will show you the larger area that is currently being worked on as one of the alternatives for expansion, and it is an area -- It is divided into three areas, a northern area that is bound by the shipwrecks of the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter Jackson, the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter Bedloe, and the German U-boat U-85, to all the way to the south, an area off of Cape Lookout, which is bounded by the Carpathia, the Atlas, the Ashkhabad, HMT Bedfordshire, W.E. Hutton, and the Portland, and then a central box that is bound by the F.W. Abrams, British Splendour, the Malchace, an unidentified wreck site, the U-701, the San Delphino, and the City of Atlanta.

These boundaries that are here are not random, but they include -- They were bound by shipwrecks significant to our story and represent the center point of the battlefield of the Battle of the Atlantic. All told, there were roughly about 125 shipwrecks in these areas, some found and some known to

be in the area, but unidentified. Known wrecks that are related to the World War II story is about forty-five, and then it jumps up to about sixty that we think are in the area.

The regulations that I am going to walk through for this broader area, there are only two, and so, if you look at these three green blocks, we will be proposing only two regulations, and it is our opinion that, in these green areas that we're showing you here, that council consultation and approval is not irrelevant, but it doesn't really apply, and I will tell you why.

The regulations that we are proposing within that whole green block are that we would prohibit damaging, altering, possessing, or attempting to damage, alter, or possess an underwater cultural resource from or within the boundaries of that green area except in the course of lawful fishing without a permit, and so, again, to be clear, the goal here is to protect the maritime heritage resource.

It would stop looting, and it would stop the removal of artifacts, and it would stop, in some cases, wanton destruction of these wrecks for the purpose of salvaging metal in the off-season. The bottom line is we were very concerned that our language matches other federal laws, like the Sunken Military Craft Act, and that, if a fisherman unintentionally were to hit a wreck, that there is an exemption there so that it does not appear that we're trying to do a got-you by somebody hitting the wreck. In other words, you would have to intentionally be trying to do something bad here at this spot.

The second rule, or proposed regulation, would be that it would be illegal to sell, purchase, or transport artifacts that have been taken off these wrecks following the effective date of the sanctuary's designation, and so, in other words, if somebody has got a ship's engine register on their mantle that they took back in the 1980s, that doesn't apply, but, the date with which the sanctuary is designated, you would be in violation if you were moving artifacts around and selling them, and so, at that large green area, and I'm going to show it again just to make sure, that's it. You can anchor, and you can fish, and you can do everything that you're doing today, but you just can't take anything or damage these sites.

The second set of regulations apply at the Monitor, and this is the area that we don't believe, because there are no fishing restrictions in this larger area, that it applies to the council, and we would certainly welcome your comments and thoughts, but what we certainly have requested in our letter is concurrence from the council on the following changes.

This red circle, to orient you, is the current boundaries of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary, the red line. It is one mile in diameter, with a center point, and you can see the coordinates there. However, in 1975, when it was designated, the center point did not match up with where the shipwreck actually is. The shipwreck sits to the southeast corner, where that red star is. It was an error, a navigational error, but it, over to the years, has been looked to as an intentional effort by the government to keep the Monitor hidden, which was never the intent, but has come up more than a number of times.

Given that we are going through the process of reviewing the boundaries of the Monitor, we are proposing to correct some of these things, and so the one-mile diameter Monitor in red, in our proposal, would shrink to a -- It would be centered on the wreck, that red star, and the boundaries of what was the boundaries of the Monitor Sanctuary would become a special management zone,

which would shrink from 0.7847 square miles now down to 0.0758, a smaller area. A 500-meter buffer around the wreck, and, given, again, technology, I don't think there are many fishermen that are probably twenty miles offshore without a GPS or some other device that provides an extraordinary level of accuracy compared to Loran, if you had it, back in 1975.

So 500 meters, and we have surveyed this entire area, and we are confident that there is nothing but sand bottom and the Monitor within this area and that a 500-meter buffer is adequate to protect the wreck. The regulations, those green areas and those two regulations that I outlined, would also apply here. It's illegal to take anything. If you do and you move it around, that's not good, but there would be a number of -- A couple of other regulations that are already in place that would apply.

As I said, it would be centered on the wreck. This distinct management zone, its origins were from comments from fishermen and from our advisory council, and, as I said, we believe that this 500-meter zone would be adequate to look after the shipwreck. The three prohibitions that would apply only within that 0.0758 square mile area would be, one, that anchoring without a permit would continue to be prohibited, given the fragile nature of the shipwreck, and we do issue permits for people to anchor at the Monitor, but we do it in a way that provides us an opportunity to guide them through the process. There's a giant tire that is off to the side of the wreck, so that they're not tying into it, but we would recommend that this anchoring prohibition without a permit in that tiny little area remain, for obvious reasons.

The second one would be diving, which, since 1975, has required a permit. That would also be maintained, and so permits are -- We issue permits every year. There is no fee for the permits, and it takes just a couple of weeks to get them generated, but it allows us, again, to have an outreach and education opportunity with the individuals that are going to the site and make sure that they are conducting their research in a manner that protects the wreck. We would maintain that prohibition on diving, and we would add the words "underwater remotely-operated vehicles and autonomous underwater vehicles", which, in 1975, didn't really exist, and we would continue to issue those permits.

The last one, and this is the one that really gets back to the council, other than the size change and repositioning, is that we would maintain the trawling prohibition at the Monitor within that small area. Again, the goal here is to assure that you don't have -- Given the fragility of the wreck and its construction, that we don't get into a situation where somebody were to drag a net through the wreck.

From our consultation with the state and with National Marine Fisheries Service and others, I don't believe that trawling is really taking place here. It's taking place in the sound, and it has moved north, but this is a national treasure, and to just delete that trawling prohibition we think would be a mistake, and so we would be going from almost a mile of trawling prohibition now down to a 0.07 trawling prohibition, keeping people from taking things off the wreck, and, in essence, opening up some areas that currently are prohibited from fishing to being opened back up.

The last thing that is an independent issue, different from the issue on the table today, but I want to make sure that you are aware of it, is that, as we have been working through this, there is currently a NMFS prohibition on any type of fishing within the original boundary of the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary, and so we are working with NMFS, and they have agreed to move

forward with a rulemaking process to -- It's our hope that that gets repealed entirely, and the Sanctuary Program is working with them, and our partners at NMFS have been great in going through this and beginning this process.

It is separate and independent, but certainly related to what we are proposing to do, but you will be hearing more about this, I'm sure, as that gets moving. With that, I would like to answer any questions that anybody may have about what we are proposing and what action we are hoping the council will take.

MR. BELL: Is the Coast Guard your enforcement capability?

MR. ALBERG: NOAA Law Enforcement is a thing, but the reality is that the Coast Guard or the folks that are on the water, yes, sir.

MS. MCCAWLEY: More questions?

MR. SAPP: Not a question, but you may want to add some TDs to that thing, as many of the folks in this region don't pay much attention to GPS, and much prefer TDs.

MR. ALBERG: Right. Okay. Thank you, sir.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Questions or comments? That was a wonderful and informative presentation. I think that we would likely need a motion here, and we definitely want to send a letter. **We are within a comment period right now, and so we need to send a letter in December, maybe concurring with the revised USS Monitor boundary and that that remains consistent and compatible with the sanctuary's goals and objectives, maybe?**

MS. BECKWITH: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Anna and second by Chris. Any discussion of this motion? **Any objections? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** Thank you so much for coming and giving us this presentation and reaching out to us.

MR. BELL: I would just say that I really appreciate what you guys do. That's special, and I say that as a retired Navy officer. I really appreciate that very much, and I also spent a lot of time in a mobile diving salvage unit, too, in the Navy dive community and so we have lot of --

MR. ALBERG: It's part of our history, thanks. I will keep you all in the loop as -- It's got more work to be done, but thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds wonderful. Wilson, did you have another question?

DR. LANEY: No, just a comment to weigh-in and say thanks to David for that presentation, and I find it very, very sad, David, that two-thirds of the millennials polled don't know about Auschwitz. I have walked the grounds of Auschwitz, and it was so emotionally disturbing when we did so that -- I was with another couple at the time, and our two wives -- We had the opportunity to go on to Dachau, and our wives said that we can't handle it, and so I would encourage anybody to visit the Holocaust Museum in Washington, if you haven't done that, but, also, if you get a

chance to go to Auschwitz, do it, and my father and my father-in-law both served in World War II, and both are deceased now, but I am glad you guys are there to keep that legacy living.

MR. ALBERG: We work a lot with veterans groups, and this is -- The council work today is just one piece of our larger effort, but I can tell you that it means a great deal to the World War II generation that all of us collectively are working to make sure that that's not forgotten, and so thank you, again.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you so much, David. Great presentation. All right. Just to review, our next meeting is in March, in Jekyll Island.

MR. POLAND: Just real quick, before we move away from Other Business, there is one thing still hanging out there from the last meeting that we needed to go ahead and take care of. **During the AP Selection, we intended to appoint Scott Buff to the System Management Plan Workgroup, but a motion was never made, and so I just wanted to move that the council appoint Scott Buff to the System Management Plan Workgroup.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We have a motion, and it's seconded by Chester.

MR. BREWER: As Chairman.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. That motion is going on the board. Any more discussion? We have technically already had discussion on this. **Any objection? All right.** Any other business to come before the council?

MR. BREWER: First, a mea culpa. During the public comment period, and when we were talking about sharks, I went off the leash, and I did not follow the proper protocol, and I engaged directly with the folks that were here to talk, as opposed to asking questions and, if any statements were made, making them through the Chair, and I risked inflaming the situation, and also I prolonged probably public comment, and so, to the council, I apologize.

Although though, but, we continue to have our constituents, I mean, really, really upset about the situation with sharks, with good reason, and I got into a discussion that I shouldn't have gotten into with regard to ICCAT and pelagic sharks and whatnot, but the National Marine Fisheries Service, through the Highly Migratory Species, does manage large coastal pelagics, and the animals that we are getting the complaints about I think are primarily large coastal pelagics.

In our area, it's bull sharks, and so I would like to make a motion that we authorize a letter to the powers that be at the Highly Migratory Species that would express our level of concern with regard to either large coastal, or it could be specific species of sharks, that appear to be far, far too numerous and far, far too aggressive, and that's my motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I definitely think that something like that is in order. I am sure that I will only let Art second this motion, and I'm sorry, but no one else can second this. Yes, we have definitely been hearing this, and it's definitely been coming up. Can you shed some light on the timing that you're thinking about and when you would like to see the letter go out? Do you want this to go out say before the March meeting, or are you wanting us to look at the letter in March? What are you thinking?

MR. BREWER: I am thinking let's look at it in March. The problem has been going on for a number of years now, and so I don't think there's any great urgency.

MS. BECKWITH: Just so you guys know, it looks like the HMS meeting is going to be right at the end of April and beginning of May, and I will not be able to attend, and I had sent Gregg an email requesting that maybe John Hadley go in my place, representing the council, since there will be questions, undoubtedly, on this letter and Amendment 10 and some of the -- I think Doug is Vice Chair of the Dolphin Wahoo, and I'm not sure if he would want to attend, but I feel like John would amply represent the council and be able to answer questions appropriately.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that. That helps on the timing of the letter, and so I think that we can review this in March. More discussion on this letter? **Any objections to drafting this letter? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Is there more other business to come before the council this week? All right. Thank you, everybody, and we'll see you in March. Gregg has something else for us.

MR. WAUGH: Just in terms of upcoming meetings, given the number of items and some scheduling conflicts within the March meeting, we are looking to see if we can start that at 8:30 on Monday morning, and so we'll get back to you once we know if the hotel can accommodate us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Gregg. I forgot about that. Anything else? All right. Thank you, everybody. Happy Holidays. Safe trip going home.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on December 7, 2018.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
December 14, 2018

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: December 6-7, 2018

Meeting Location: Kitty Hawk, *NC*

Issue: *SG VISION BLUEPRINT REG. AM. 26 (RECREATIONAL)*

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MS. BECKWITH	✓		
MR. BELL	✓		
MR. BREWER	✓		
MR. CONKLIN	✓		
DR. CRABTREE / <i>DR. McGovern</i>	✓		
DR. CHRISTIANSEN	✓		
MR. GRINER	✓		
MR. HAYMANS/ MS. KNOWLTON	✓		
MS. MCCAWLEY	✓		
MR. POLAND	✓		
MR. SAPP	✓		
MR. WOODWARD	✓		
MR. WHITAKER	✓		

✓ LCDR. Jeremy Montes
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
(305)415-6788(ph); (305)710-4569(c)
Jeremy.J.Montes@uscg.mil

✓ Stephen Poland
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
PO Box 769
3441 Arendell Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
(252)808-8011 (direct); (252)726-7021 (main)
Steve.Poland@ncdenr.gov

✓ Art Sapp
2270 NE 25th St.
Lighthouse Pointe, FL 33064
(954)444-0820 (ph)
artsappsafmc@gmail.com

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

✓ David Whitaker
720 Tennent Street
Charleston, SC 29412
(843)953-9392
david.whitakersafmc@gmail.com

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

Rick DeVictor
N.K. Mehta
Shep Grimes
Erika Burgess
Dr. Jack McGovern
Monica Smith-Brunello
Dr. Clay Porch
Dr. Erik Williams
Tony Dilemma
Dale Diaz

Charlie Phillips
Michael Larkin
Brett Pierce
Vivian Matter
Heather Coleman
Kelly Elliott

Council Staff

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Executive Director ✓

Gregg Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Deputy Director-Science & Statistics ✓

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director-Management ✓

Dr. Brian Cheuvront
brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist ✓

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

Kimberly Cole
kimberly.cole@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist ✓

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

Kelsey Dick
kelsey.dick@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist ✓

Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fishery Economist ✓

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist ✓

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

Public Information Officer ✓

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Administrative Officer ✓

Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist ✓

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist ✓

Cameron Rhodes
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Accounting

Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager ✓

Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Social Scientist ✓

Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators ✓

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

Administrative Officer ✓

Mike Collins
Mike.collins@safmc.net

2018 Council Members

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

✓ CHAIR

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

✓ VICE-CHAIR

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

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

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

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

✓ Dr. Kyle Christiansen
150 Cedar St.
Richmond Hill, GA 31324
(912)756-7560 (ph)
christiansensafmc@gmail.com

✓ 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

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

✓ Dr. Wilson Laney
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695
(919)515-5019 (ph); (919)515-4415 (f)
Wilson_Laney@fws.gov

DEC 2018 COUNCIL MTG DAY 4

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
BENNETT	PAULITA	pbennett-martin@oceana.org
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Burgess	Erika	erika.burgess@myfwc.com
Conklin	Chris	conklinsafmc@gmail.com
DeVictor	Rick	rdevictor@yahoo.com
Dixon	Michael	mike@engelcoolers.com
Fenyk	Cynthia	cynthia.fenyk@noaa.gov
Foss	Kristin	kristinfoss@gmail.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@noaa.gov
Guyas	Martha	martha.guyas@myfwc.com
Hart	Hannah	hannah.hart@myfwc.com
Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net
Lindh	Ryan	nativetrade@bellsouth.net
McGovern	John	John.McGovern@noaa.gov
Pugliese	Roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
Pulver	Jeff	Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov
Ralston	Kellie	kralston@asafishing.org
Rock	Jason	jason.rock@ncdenr.gov
Sapp	Art	artsappsafmc@gmail.com
Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov
Snouck-Hurgronje	Julia	julia.snouck-hurgronje@noaa.gov
Surrency	Ron	captronacc@gmail.com
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov
Whitaker	david	David.Whitakersafmc@gmail.com
Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov
dick	kelsey	kelsey.dick@safmc.net
iverson	kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov