

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

**Bahia Mar Doubletree by Hilton
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

June 15, 2018

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

Charlie Phillips-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner
Doug Haymans
Lt. Warren Fair

Mark Brown-Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Dr. Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Jessica McCawley
Deirdre Warner-Kramer

Council Staff:

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Kimberly Cole
Mike Collins
John Hadley
Roger Pugliese
Amber Von Harten
Kelsey Dick

John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Chip Collier
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson
Cameron Rhodes
Christina Wiegand

Observers & Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dale Diaz
Dr. Jack McGovern
Shep Grimes
Mary Vera
Tracy Dunn
Dewey Hemilright

Dr. Erik Williams
Erika Burgess
Rick DeVictor
Karla Gore
Dr. Jessica Stephen
Jenny Lee
Dr. David Gloeckner

Other observers and participants attached.

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Bahia Mar Doubletree by Hilton, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Friday morning, June 15, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Charlie Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: I will call to order the Full Council, and, Monica, I don't think you have anything for us.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do not.

MR. PHILLIPS: Good. Let's do the voice recognition, and then we'll approve the agenda and the minutes, and we'll just start with you, Monica.

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

DR. CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.

DR. WILLIAMS: Erik Williams, Fisheries Science Center.

LT. FAIR: Lieutenant Warren Fair, Coast Guard.

MS. WARNER-KRAMER: Deidre Warner-Kramer, Department of State.

MR. HAYMANS: Doug Haymans, Georgia DNR.

MS. BECKWITH: Anna Beckwith, the great State of North Carolina.

DR. DUVAL: Michelle Duval, North Carolina Marine Fisheries.

MR. DIAZ: Dale Diaz, Gulf Council.

MR. BROWN: Mark Brown, South Carolina, council.

MR. PHILLIPS: Charlie Phillips, Georgia.

MR. WAUGH: Gregg Waugh, Executive Director.

MR. HARTIG: Ben Hartig, commercial representative from the greater State of Florida.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jessica McCawley from the sunshine state.

MR. BREWER: Chester Brewer, Florida.

MR. BELL: Mel Bell, South Carolina.

MR. BOWEN: Zack Bowen, for-hire, representing all fifty-seven for-hire permit holders in Georgia.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you very much. All right. Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. Are there any changes to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. We want to start with welcoming Deidre and thanking her for flying down to visit us for a short while, and it's not often we have people from the State Department come see us, and so we're honored. I think Tony and Dewey have already headed north. Dale, we appreciate you coming to see us and your thoughts and perceptions from the other side of the peninsula.

Before we get started, I personally want to thank the council and staff. It was a really nice hospitality the other night, and it was just -- It's been just good working with you all. Like I said at hospitality, you all are family, even though, like family, we want to scuffle every now and then have and some disagreements, but, in the end, we look out for each other and I appreciate it. It's been really good, and, Ben and Zack, it's been great working with you all. You've taught me a lot, and would either one of you want to say anything?

MR. HARTIG: I was going to say something at the end of my committee report.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Zack, did you want to say anything?

MR. BOWEN: I'm good. Thanks.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Thanks. All right. Today, like every other day, we've still got a lot to do, and we've got people that need to hit some planes at 12:30, or leave for planes, and so I guess I will turn it over to Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have the Executive Director's Report in the Full Council tab. It's Tab 15, Attachment 1. The time since our March meeting was quite busy. I've got the major items listed there. As Charlie mentioned, we've got our State Department representative here, and we have had people come and give presentations, but, since swordfish and billfish management was moved from the council, they have not attended on a regular basis, but we're glad to have Deidre here. As you know, we've got council members leaving. I will leave it to Michelle to tell us about the North Carolina representative, and I would be glad to get with anybody one-on-one and give any more details, but I know we're short on time. That's it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks. Anything else? Michelle, do you want to say anything about your replacement, or soon to be?

DR. DUVAL: I was going to do that during my liaison report, if that's okay.

MR. PHILLIPS: That will work. Then I guess we're going to do Kelsey with the MyFishCount.

MS. DICK: I am going to provide you all an update about the electronic recreational reporting project, MyFishCount. Back in the fall, we piloted the web portal, and it was very successful, and it received a lot of support from the recreational community, and we're excited to announce that, at the beginning of this month, we were able to take a lot of the feedback we received and turn the web portal into an app version as well, and so I wanted to give you a little demonstration of how the app works by showing you what it would be like to report a typical snapper grouper recreational trip.

This would be kind of a typical trip that an individual would catch on a snapper grouper trip. We have kept and released. We opened the app, and this is all of the information that the angler can provide. The information with the asterisk is required, meaning that you can't move to the next page without filling out this information, and then the other information is optional.

There is also the option to choose if you would like to log in individual or vessel mode, and then you can choose your target species and also your fishing method. Once you submit that, you can start logging fish, and we wanted to make this as flexible as possible for anglers, in terms of the way that they would like to log, if they would like to provide a lot of information or minimal information and log as quickly or take as much time as they would like.

The first function to log fish is the quick log function, and this function is really to allow anglers -
- Here we have seven black sea bass and four kept black sea bass to log as quickly as possible and to enter information later, if they would like to, and so you simply use the sliding bars to indicate how many you kept and released, and so, as you can see, those fish are now logged.

Now we'll log the triggerfish, and you can type the name into the search bar, and you can also type common names into the search bar, and it will also recognize the species. Those have been logged as well, and so, for something like spottail pinfish, where you might catch a lot of them, you will simply use the sliding bars again, and then, right now, we have it sliding up to ten, and so you would simply just repeat this function and just add another seven.

Once those are now logged, I will show you the other function to log fish, which is this middle button on the bottom, and this really allows anglers to submit a lot more information if they would like to, and so we'll choose the white grunt. As you can see here with certain species, a red bar will pop up and request a photo, to help with species identification. Then the angler can also choose to add a picture. We didn't record a lot of information for that one. Then you can also log fish by simply swiping left and duplicating a previous catch.

For this one, we can add a picture. You can either take a photo or add a picture from your saved library, and then you can add this additional information, if you would like, and, also, anglers can log a fish and go back and add more detailed information if they would like to, and, again, we really wanted to make this as flexible as possible and give anglers as many options to log fish and make this personal to them in how they would like to log.

All right, and so, as you can see, all of our fish have now been logged, and that took us about three minutes, and now we will finish the trip. This is just a summary of all the fish that we logged, and then you press the "go to end" button, and then you finish these final questions, in terms of if your trip was taken and completed, the date you arrived, the time away from the dock, and, if you're logging in vessel mode, it will also ask you the number of anglers that were on the boat, if your fish was sampled, and then the percent of time with hooks in the water, and so now the trip has been submitted.

I also just wanted to provide you guys a little update on some of the outreach that we've been doing, and so this is the web portal that we have updated, and it gives information about the project and about the app and about the council. Then we also have put information here about why you should report, what you should report, and you guys can visit this on your own time and take a

look at this information. We have put together some reporting tips and we put some best practices on here, by working with the people at FishSmart as well, how the data might be used, and we wanted to be really transparent about this. Then confidentiality and also our contact information. We also have links to the 2017 report that we put together, so anglers can see the type of information that we were able to collect.

We also have, on the council webpage, an electronic reporting tab. This gives some of the same information and directs users to the MyFishCount page, and we also have links here to our council YouTube channel, where we have more demonstration videos and instructional videos, in terms of how to use the app.

For outreach and moving forward, we are working with West Marine. We had our first in-store seminar this past week, and it went really well, and we'll be working with local captains and teaching recreational anglers about recreational reporting and why it's important and ways that they can report, and we will also be visiting and working with sportfishing clubs along the South Atlantic coast, giving them similar presentations and teaching them how to use the app, and so that's all I have, if anyone has any questions about the project or anything else. Thanks.

MR. HARTIG: Thanks for a great presentation, Kelsey. This is really cool. Say I fish for a year and I have put a bunch of stuff in MyFishCount. Can I get the results of that?

MS. DICK: Yes, and so, on the app, anything that you log, you can access all of your previous reports, and so the way that we're also incentivizing anglers to use this is that this is also a tool for them to become more efficient anglers, and you can -- On the MyFishCount website, you can go back and look at all of your previous catches, and there is different graphs that show you what was going on when.

MR. BOWEN: I like how, since Chip and I went through this app on my phone, I like how you all have come up with a way to just do it over and over and over. From a charter boat perspective, forty vermilions and -- That seems to be a welcomed add to this. Now I have a question for the rest of the voting members at this table, and how many of you besides me and Mark have downloaded this app, since we've got to make decisions on it? Doug? Cool. I highly recommend it. These guys worked hard to put this together. Download the app and look at it. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Kelsey, did you say that you couldn't type in -- If you have more than ten, you couldn't like type it in there if you had multiple species on either the kept or the released?

MS. DICK: Right now, we have the sliding feature, but that is -- We don't have a way to type it in, but we have heard from other anglers that that might be something that they want to do, and so we do have the ability to continue updating and revising the app. If that's something that enough people want to see, we could probably do that.

MR. BROWN: So you just have to keep reentering it over and over again?

MS. DICK: Yes, and so you can either use the slider bars and enter more information later or you can continually swipe left and duplicate, but, if you prefer to type it in, you could probably use the web portal. We might be able to make that a feature on the web portal, where you could just type in the amount.

DR. DUVAL: Awesome presentation, Kelsey. I'm glad that this is up and running. I wasn't aware. Otherwise, I would have downloaded the app onto my phone, and so thanks, Zack. I guess my question is really more about some of the future outreach efforts, I think, and so it sounds like the partnership with West Marine is going to continue, and so do you guys have plans to visit West Marine in each of the different states?

MS. DICK: Yes, and they've been incredibly supportive, and the feedback that we've received from the recreational community has been very supportive. Any time I tell somebody about the project, they always ask us how can we help and how can we promote it and what can we do, and so we're working with West Marine right now, and they want to do a lot more local events, and so this kind of is -- We're kind of helping each other out, and so we'll be -- We have events set up in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, and some of them are also holding recreational angler days, where it will be featured on radio shows and other events such as that, and so that's the direction we're going right now.

DR. DUVAL: Is it possible to just get a list of the places like in North Carolina, for me, where you guys are setting up, and I can make sure other folks have that information as well?

MS. DICK: Yes, definitely. Right now, we're kind of in the logistics phase of setting dates, but I would be happy to send around those dates to the council members if they would be interested. I can definitely do that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks. Any other questions? That was a great presentation. Thanks a lot. Then I guess we've got John Hadley, who is going to do a report on economic impacts of fisheries.

MR. HADLEY: Good morning, everyone. I will be going over -- In your briefing book, there is an economic contributions of fisheries for species managed by the South Atlantic Council. The report is Attachment 3a, and I will be going over kind of the highlight slides that I have put together, pulling from that report, which is Attachment 3b, and we can certainly toggle back and forth if there are any specific questions from the report that I don't cover in the presentation, but I have put together a brief presentation for everyone.

Really, the challenge here, and sort of the research question, was what are the economic contributions of fisheries for SAFMC-managed species, and it was really kind of looking at the overarching picture, looking at both the recreational and commercial fisheries, and this is really part of an effort to, there again, have that comprehensive overview, sort of the big picture and really coming at it from a public outreach and informational perspective rather than a policy perspective, and certainly not sort of an allocation standpoint or anything like that. It's just more of a here's the big picture, and we tend to look at this information in each FMP, but we're narrowed down to specific fisheries and certainly specific species, and so this is kind of the more high-level overview.

We'll talk about economic contributions, and, interchangeably, in the report, it's also referred to as economic impacts, but there are other sort of economic contributions that could be added, but, in the report, you will see jobs, full-time and part-time jobs, and income, and so wages, salaries, and self-employed income, and then value added, which is sort of the contribution to GDP, and sales or output impacts, which is sort of the gross business sales.

Looking at sort of a brief overview of the data and methods for the commercial sector, the main input here was the annual average ex-vessel value from 2014 through 2016, and so sort of a three-year average. Everything was adjusted for inflation to be in 2016 dollars.

For finfish and crustacean species, they're managed throughout the jurisdictional range of the council, and we looked at federally-managed species that were caught from both the EEZ and state waters, and so, really, that was kind of a decision there. Since we have these species that tend to migrate in and out of state waters, but they have a council aspect to them, that was included in the report, and you will see later that the same assumptions were made for the recreational sector.

The economic impacts provided were -- They essentially originate from the SERO economic impact tool, and this tool is really based on some of the multipliers that are found in annual report, *Fisheries Economics of the U.S.*, and so they're really supported by the NOAA Office of Science and Technology.

Moving over to the recreational side, and really the main input on the recreational side into the economic model is you're looking at recreational trips from 2014 through 2016, there again that annual average. You're looking at, for finfish, they're managed by the council throughout their jurisdictional range, and so effort for crustaceans, specifically looking at lobsters, and lobsters were not included, as well as onboard headboats, and so headboat effort is not in there as well, since really the main output here is what comes out of MRIP, and so there are no accompanying economic multipliers that go along with those other trips.

There again, looking at federally-managed species caught from both the EEZ and state waters, if they have a sort of council aspect to them, and, there again, using the SERO economic impact tool. As I mentioned, some of the multipliers originate from *Fisheries Economics of the U.S.* There is also some underlying data that is provided by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, specifically towards the for-hire impacts.

Looking at some of the results, the top species, by ex-vessel value, for the commercial sector, at the very top there you see the crustaceans kind of weigh-in, with spiny lobster being on top, followed by several shrimp species, and then you move into the finfish. There's king mackerel, yellowtail snapper, Spanish mackerel, vermilion snapper, dolphin, and golden crab. When you just look at finfish, and so the table over on the right, you have king mackerel, yellowtail snapper, Spanish mackerel, vermilion snapper, dolphin, and then golden tilefish, gag grouper, black sea bass, greater amberjack, and then wreckfish.

Looking at some of the economic contributions, or, in this case, the economic impacts, the way the model is differentiated, it looks at the harvesting sectors, and so you can think of this as getting the seafood product to the dock, and then, other sectors, you're looking at what happens to that seafood product as it moves to the final consumer, and so there is kind of a differentiation there. Overall, and, there again, this is on an annual basis, we're looking at about 17,000 jobs supported and \$463 million. There again, those are in thousands of dollars, and so, really, it's \$463 million. It's \$662 million in value added, and, looking at business sales, it's about \$1.3 billion.

These impacts are largely based off of approximately forty-million pounds in landings, with an ex-vessel value of about \$131 million, and this is in 2016 dollars. About a quarter of the landings

could be attributed to finfish, and this is on an ex-vessel value basis, with the remaining of the landings coming from crustaceans, and so you can kind of -- The economic impacts would be partitioned out in a similar manner.

Moving over to the recreational sector, there again, one of the major components of the economic model is -- What you put into it is really the effort, and that gets paired with an economic multiplier. You can equate effort to economic impacts, and, looking at the top species by directed trips, directed trips being harvested or targeted South Atlantic species, at the very top is dolphin, followed by Spanish mackerel, king mackerel, gray snapper, cobia, yellowtail snapper, black sea bass, mutton snapper, wahoo, and gray triggerfish.

Over on the right, that's the top species by harvest weight, and so a slightly different kind of line-up there. We're looking at dolphin with the largest harvest, followed by cobia, king mackerel, wahoo, Spanish mackerel, greater amberjack, yellowtail snapper, gray snapper, mutton snapper, and then also red snapper. If you remember, in the timeframe that was examined, we did have a few open seasons there.

Then, looking at the economic impacts from the recreational sector, as you will see, there is a range provided, and so, based on some of the feedback that was received from the council when the initial impacts were presented -- This was taken to our Socioeconomic Panel earlier this year, and one of their recommendations is to provide a range, and so sort of accompany sort of the uncertainty involved in the economic estimates and also some of the sensitivity of the model, as far as the trip estimate that is used, and so how many trips are input into the model really does influence whatever economic impacts are received from the model or your economic impact estimates.

In total, and this is differentiated by the for-hire sector and then looking at the private sector, and so this is both the shore mode as well as private vessel mode, and, in total, we're looking at approximately 4,300 or 4,400 jobs per year with income impacts of \$93 million to \$202 million. It's value added of \$152 million to approximately \$334 million, and then sales impacts, business sales, of approximately \$290 million to \$643 million.

There again, the range was provided per the SEP recommendations. It's approximately 1.3 million to 3.6 million trips, and so, basically, as the kind of lower and upper-end estimate that was used, it's looking at harvest-only trips. There again, that's coming from MRIP, and then sort of your upper-end estimate is essentially caught a South-Atlantic-managed species, and so this would be targeted, harvested, or caught. That is sort of your upper-end estimate, and that's approximately 3.6 million trips. This is about 19.6 million pounds in landings, and all of these, there again, could be attributed to finfish.

I put together a slide that's just sort of recreational results discussion. There again, it's based on some of the feedback that I received from the council based on the initial results and also some of the discussion from the Socioeconomic Panel. Really, what is provided on the recreational side is likely a lower-bound estimate of sort of the, quote, unquote, true economic contribution, and there are several reasons for this.

One is most durable goods expenditures are left out of this when you're looking at just recreational fishing trips, and the reason being that these durable goods last for multiple years, and they are

very difficult to partition out to specific species, and so you might have durable goods being a boat, a rod, some sort of item that is going to last for more than one trip. It's really difficult to partition that out to a specific species or even a specific group of species, since it could be used in several different areas, and, there again, that's sort of a data limitation.

On the other hand, there is a durable goods expenditures estimate for recreational fishing in general for the Southeast, or really for the nation, but the information is just not available to partition that out to specific species. There again, as I mentioned, lobster effort and headboat effort are not included in the analysis either.

Another note is the recreational results -- These, as I mentioned, the recreational model really is driven by the effort estimates that are input into it, and, as we have spoken about many times, we're expecting MRIP revisions, and so the effort will likely raise, and along with that the economic impact estimates will likely increase as well.

Looking at future updates, as I mentioned, the Socioeconomic Panel reviewed the recreational component of the report and provided several different recommendations, and those can sort of be pushed out into sort of long-term recommendations that really would take a longer time to dive into the model, in the data inputs, and then sort of short-term recommendations that could be fairly quickly addressed in the report.

Then one of the SEP recommendations was to look into ways to incorporate tax revenues for both recreational and commercial activities, and so the software that is used, nPlan, that many of these multipliers are based upon, one of the outputs of that model is an estimation of tax revenue, and this has been reported before. I cited one report from 2013 that estimated approximately \$961 million in tax revenues in the South Atlantic region alone from marine recreational fishing expenditures, and this was for 2011, and about \$464 million of these went to state and local governments, and then \$496 million went to the federal government, and so federal tax revenues, and so that's something that could certainly be looked into. There again, I mentioned, when you run these numbers through nPlan, it is an output that comes with it, but it's just a matter of reporting it. Then, also, as I mentioned, certainly incorporate the revised MRIP data when it is available.

Some of the general conclusions, looking at South-Atlantic-managed species, they support an estimated 19,000 to 21,000 jobs. It's \$556 million to \$665 million in income and \$1.6 billion to \$2 billion in business sales, and keep in mind that this is an annual estimate, and so presumably occurring year after year after year, and really this supports the need, in general, for continued resource access, but paired with continued long-term sustainable resource management, and so, ideally, these can occur year after year after year. That's all I have, and I will be happy to answer any questions.

MR. PHILLIPS: Are there questions for John?

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, John. It just looks to me like that the recreational -- I know there is a lot not included, direct expenditures and other things, but, just looking at the income impacts of \$202 million, there is national studies per state where individual states have that in the South Atlantic. I guess it's a statement or sort of a question to respond to, and I don't know, but it just seems really low.

MR. HADLEY: I see where you're coming from. Those estimates -- For example, if you compared this to *Fisheries Economics of the U.S.* and the recreational impacts, it's going to be lower. One of the main reasons is that you're taking kind of that sub-sector of SAFMC-managed species, and the inshore fisheries are quite large, and so those are excluded from these estimates.

MR. HAYMANS: I am referring specifically to marine species. I mean, Florida's economic impact, from some of the stuff I've seen, is way above that. I mean, little old Georgia is \$142 million in just marine recreational fishing, but that does take into account expenditures on goods and services.

MR. HADLEY: To that point, the durable goods is a major portion of that, and, there again, that is just a kind of artifact of the available data, as far as being able to partition that out. When you're looking at a group of species, you kind of, by default, have to exclude those durable goods impacts, and, if you look at *Fisheries Economics of the U.S.*, where many of these multipliers come from, that durable goods -- Those durable goods expenditures are quite large, and they are substantially larger than the trip impacts, and so that's likely where much of that is coming from.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any other questions?

MR. BREWER: John, I hope that you will make it very, very, very clear that the numbers that are used here are not to be used for allocation purposes, because I can see -- I mean, Doug and I both know that the numbers here for recreational are really, really low, and I understand they are effort-driven, and I understand that certain things are not being put in there, but the true number, if we want to call it that, is probably a magnitude of ten higher, and I would not like to see these numbers used for -- Personally, I would not like to get into allocation at all, but I'm afraid we're going to have to, and I don't -- Just please make it clear that this is not for allocation purposes.

MR. HADLEY: I couldn't agree with you more. I think most fisheries, if not all fisheries economists, would agree with you and that statement as well. I mean, when you get into allocation, you're looking at value, which is a totally different aspect. If you're going to get into allocation, you're not going to see economic impacts. That's an inappropriate comparison, and, really, the take-home point of this was trying to get, there again, that recreational and commercial combined overarching picture of -- We piece these out FMP-by-FMP, and what is sort of the big picture, but certainly -- That's why I kind of put a little plug in there at the beginning, but just to emphasize that this would not be an allocation piece or to be used in allocation.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, John. I think this was a great picture, and I think you have appropriately caveated the results, in terms of this being kind of a lower bound, and I know -- There has been a few comments on the inclusion of durable goods and the recreational side of the picture. Then, with regard to the commercial information, you have noted that it includes ex-vessel revenue and sort of how a product on the commercial side makes its way through the supply chain and how far down does it go, and so this does not -- I'm assuming it's through the dealer and maybe to a wholesale market or retail market or restaurant. Does it include the restaurant impacts?

MR. HADLEY: Yes, and, if you -- The way the model is kind of broken down, the idea is that it does take it through -- Well, ideally, it models it through the supply chain, so to speak, and so from the commercial harvester to the end consumer.

DR. DUVAL: I was just trying to -- I read the report, but I was just trying to find where that actually was noted, and so maybe just some specifics on what is meant by supply chain, like how far that goes down, because I know there has been previous economic studies where the models have not been able to travel that far down the chain.

MR. HADLEY: That's something that I can certainly kind of flesh out in the report as well, and so that's certainly duly noted.

DR. DUVAL: One final point. I think this is great, and it is an overall picture, and I completely agree with Chester that this is not something that should be used for allocation. I have had conversations with John about this before, because I have been in conversations with stakeholders in the past, where these types of numbers are being used to advocate for reexamination of allocations, and I think what this tool shows is just the overall value, a lower bound in value, of the fisheries in this region, and I think we could use that to advocate for things like the science needs that we have in this region, and so I really appreciate all the effort that has gone into this. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Michelle. Any other questions or thoughts? Seeing none, John, great presentation. Thank you, and I guess now we're going to move into SERO presentations, and so who is going to take care of that? Rick, I see you coming to the table.

MR. DEVICTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, SERO is on the agenda to give a few reports, and I have Jessica up here to help me also to go through these. We're on the agenda to give landings updates for species that we haven't gone over through the Snapper Grouper and CMP Committees, and so that leaves us two species, dolphin and wahoo.

In terms of commercial landings of dolphin and wahoo and where we are at so far this year, the 2018 ACL is just over 1.5 million pounds, and landings through June 4 is 434,060 pounds, and that's 28 percent of the ACL. Then, moving down to wahoo commercial landings through June 4, the ACL for wahoo is 70,542, and, so far, they have landed 18,289, and that's 26 percent, and that is below where we were at the same time last year.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Rick. Any questions for Rick? Seeing none, Jessica.

DR. STEPHEN: I will give the recreational landings, and there should be a presentation on that. For dolphin and wahoo, just some notes on the landings. These are in MRIP units, and landing estimates were included through Wave 6 of 2017, and, currently, 2017 landings are considered final, and MRIP also includes the headboat landings.

For the 2016 landings for dolphin and wahoo, dolphin was at 46 percent of the ACL, and wahoo was at 91 percent of the ACL. For the 2017 landings, dolphin was at 27 percent, and wahoo was at 55 percent of the ACL. I will just give you a second to look at the dolphin landings table. Then we can move on to the graphic representation. The next table is the wahoo landings table, and then that graphic representation. If there are any questions, we can answer those.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do we have any questions? I don't see any questions, and so thank you very much, and I think we're going to have data-related reports.

MR. DEVICTOR: The next agenda item that I see is status of recreational and commercial quota monitoring tables on the SERO website. I really don't have much to update you on that. As you know, dealer reports come in, and they go to the Science Center through the dealer electronic trip ticket reporting system, and that gets sent to the Science Center, and that gets transferred over to SERO on Monday, and we get that up on our website around Monday or Tuesday for the commercial sector.

For private recreational, as you know, preliminary estimates of catch and effort and participation are available forty-five days following the end of the sampling wave, and, as we talked about this week, the Science Center recalculates those, and we get that around fifteen days after, or just over that, and then we update our website for the private recreational and then the headboat sector. Then, for both commercial and recreational, we get final landings usually in the springtime, and then we put those on our website.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I had a question about the cobia commercially and the State of Virginia, and, last year, how you had landings on the website, and it shut down with quota left, and everybody was wondering why, and I know fishermen up in the Northeast and how Virginia doesn't have to report until later, and can you clean that up a little bit, or explain it, and is there anything that you all could do to help Virginia report more from the state waters or more accurately or closer? Not accurately, but closer, just so that, therefore, what you all put out on your SERO webpage there about quota monitoring will line up closer with reality, so that we don't have to guess what Virginia is doing. Thank you.

MR. DEVICTOR: Yes, we can do that, certainly.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else? All right. Thanks, Rick. I think we have protected resources updates.

MR. WAUGH: No, Rick has got another one.

MR. PHILLIPS: You've got one more, Rick?

MR. DEVICTOR: Looking at the agenda, there is two other reports, data-related reports and the for-hire amendment status and SBRM. There is a presentation in there, under the late materials, on SEFHIER, and I'm not going to go through the details of SEFHIER, because Dr. Farmer gave a detailed presentation last time you all met, but there is -- If you can just go to Slide 3, I will go through the current status of where we're at in the rulemaking and in the amendment approval process.

The NOA, Notice of Availability, published on March 14, and there was a sixty-day comment period on that, and so that is over with. The proposed rule published -- Again, this is the South Atlantic for-hire amendment that I'm talking about, and that published on April 4, and that was a thirty-day comment period. We received seventy-two comments on both of those, the proposed rule and the Notice of Availability, and most of those comments were in favor of the council and NMFS moving forward with this, especially if it was to improve stock assessments and monitoring of the catch limit. There were some comments against it, and especially they didn't want to put forward charter fees and such. The decision date for the amendment, which is specified in the

Magnuson-Stevens Act, that was June 12, and you saw that this week we sent a letter to Charlie announcing the approval of this amendment.

Just in terms of timing, what we're thinking about now -- Again, this could move. There is still a lot to do, and perhaps we can get the final rule published in the middle of August, and then the implementation date would be January 1. The SEFHIER has talked about this, and they have talked about a possible phase-in, where you would publish the final rule and people could start to report, but the start date officially would be January 1, and that is for people to get ready and perhaps to help out with compliance and enforcement and such, but that hasn't been decided yet. We're still working on this, and I will say, again, we still have a lot to do before the final rule has to get published, and we need to get PRA approval through OMB first, and that needs to be done, and we can't publish the final rule until we get that approval, and so we're working on that right now.

We're doing a lot of outreach and education, and we're going to be working on that, in coordination with the council staff, webinars and print material and such, and so we're working on the plan on how to let people know that this is coming down the line and just building on what the council has done so far.

Then I thought I would update you on the Gulf of Mexico. They are a bit behind us. It's more complicated, and there is a hail-out requirement and a tracking is required for that, and so they're a bit behind us. They haven't published the Notice of Availability yet. They are thinking around June to get that published, as you can see on this slide. Then they would publish a proposed rule sometime in August. The final rule would be around December, and then the implementation date would be around April. That's, again, just timelines, but they are thinking these timelines could shift, certainly.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any other questions?

DR. CRABTREE: It's not so much a question, but a concern I have that kind of falls out of the fact that the timing of the two amendments has gotten off by a few months, and recall that we have, particularly down here in the Keys, a number of dual-permitted vessels that have both the Gulf for-hire permits and the South Atlantic for-hire permits, and so the way this is set up is they would report to the more rigorous of the two programs, which would be the Gulf program, and so the question is whether they would be required on January 1 to begin reporting to the South Atlantic program and then on, I guess, April 1, when the Gulf program comes along, they would have to stop reporting in the South Atlantic and start reporting into the Gulf program.

I don't think we want that to happen, and so I have been talking to GC about how to deal with this, and one possibility is simply not to require the dually-permitted vessels to report until the Gulf program comes online, and so they just wouldn't report the first few months of this, and then they would begin reporting to the Gulf program. It seems to me that's a better situation than having them report for three months on one and then have to switch to the other, because I think that will -- One, I don't think they will be at all happy about that, and I think it will be confusing, and it seems more burdensome than it needs to be.

Given that the initial year of data collection with this is likely to be more bringing the whole program up to speed and seeing what kinds of issues we run into and things, I don't know that we

lose much from that, and so I would be curious as to your views on that and if you're kind of in agreement with my approach. I don't think -- It seems clear that our intent in the amendments was these vessels would report to the Gulf program, but we didn't really anticipate that the timing got off, and I'm assuming from this that you would prefer that we not delay the effective date of the South Atlantic program until the Gulf comes online and then have them both become effective at the same time, and that would be another way to deal with the issue, but I suspect your preference would be to deal with this in a different fashion, and so I'm curious as to your thoughts.

MR. WAUGH: To add to what Roy has just said, in terms of what our input might be, is a lot of people won't start reporting until it's required, and it might be helpful, and Mel may be able to weigh-in on this, based on South Carolina's extensive experience, to have the implementation date for the South Atlantic only permit holders be sooner. You certainly don't have to start doing enforcement right away, but, the sooner that becomes a requirement, you're going to have more people sign up, and it gives us more time to work with them.

We're got training continuing, and you will get more sign up, and the data would be more useful sooner the sooner it is made mandatory, and, if we were to be interested in pursuing that, I think the suggestion of just having the South Atlantic only start reporting first -- I don't see where that would be an issue.

MR. BOWEN: Did we note how many of our 1,703 permit holders actually hold a Gulf permit right now? Does anybody know that?

DR. CRABTREE: I am quite sure we do, but I don't know off the top of my head, and I am looking around to Rick or -- Can anyone tell me? Or those of you at the home audience and SERO, if you would like to chat me the answer, that would be great. Rick, do you know? It's probably in the document somewhere.

MR. DEVICTOR: We're looking it up right now.

MR. BOWEN: The second part is I agree exactly with what Dr. Crabtree said.

DR. CRABTREE: Rich Malinowski has your answer, I believe. It's how much? It's 166 is the answer, Zack.

MR. HAYMANS: I guess I don't understand how the data can become usable when you're lacking 166 reports, or you're at least lacking three months of reports from 166 individuals. That 2019 dataset will forever have an asterisk beside it, it seems to me. I would have thought bringing them all online at the same time would be appropriate.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, so this gets into being realistic about our expectations of what's going to happen. We aren't going to be able to use this program to generate catch estimates for probably several years. There is a whole validation that's going to have to occur, and there is MRIP certification that's going to have to occur, and, as I said at the last meeting, we may well come back to you telling you that you need to make changes to the program to get us there.

I don't have any expectation that the program will be used for catch estimation in 2019. 2019 is going to be an outreach and education period and troubleshooting and trying to figure out what are

the compliance rates and trying to get the validation program going, which we have funding issues, because, right now, we don't have clear funding for validation of either this program or the Gulf program, and so we're going to have to try to address that, and so we need to make sure that our constituents understand that this is a long-term effort, and using this for catch estimation is quite a ways out in time, I suspect several years, and so I don't think we lose anything by not having a hundred-and-some-odd vessels not report into it at first. I think probably the confusion that would result from it would be more of a setback of having them report and then move out.

MR. BELL: I guess, to the point that Gregg was making, having started up a mandatory charter boat for-hire sector reporting system at the state level twenty-five years ago, it was mandatory the day that the law said it was, but, in reality, we had a -- It's kind of a slow start-up, and we weren't so focused on enforcement immediately, or consequences for non-reporting immediately. It was mainly to get the thing up and running and get the fishermen familiarized with it and look at the data.

The first couple of years, for us, it took a while to get it up and running, but it was required. It was mandatory, and then you could gauge, at that point, what your compliance actually looks like in a mandatory reporting system. Now, I realize the law is the law, and, yes, from an enforcement standpoint, sure, we could have been writing tickets right away, but it takes a little while to get these things up and running and phased-in. Until it's a requirement, you're really never going to know what your actual compliance looks like, because, if it's voluntary, people don't have to.

MR. BROWN: Roy, I had a talk with Richie Gomez during one of the breaks this week, and he said he was dually-permitted, and he told me if this looked like it was going to end up being too much of a burden to him that he was just going to give up his Gulf permit, because he said he didn't use it that much anyway, but I thought that was pretty -- That's a shame that he was going to look at it that way and have to look at doing that, but he did tell me that.

MS. BECKWITH: I was just going to say that I don't have any real heartburn with having both programs come online at the same time if the time difference is three-odd months. I just don't see that making a huge difference in the long run, and, with our outreach efforts, we're going to get to folks slowly, and we're going to win them over slowly.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I have sort of the opposite feeling, simply because we know that it's going to be at least a good year worth of transition. We're still doing outreach, and so I think any differential between when the Atlantic program comes online and the Gulf program comes online is probably going to be miniscule in terms of getting people up to speed. I do agree with Roy that it's going to be confusing for dually-permitted vessels to start reporting under one system and then report under another, and so I think that, for those folks, you would want to just hold off for those dually-permitted vessels.

The other thing is I was noticing in the rest of the presentation that, with regard to future outreach, and I think it's like on Slide 8, in terms of the joint efforts between the Regional Office, the Science Center, and the council staff to develop the outreach plan and inclusion of data and resource managers, and I know that the council's outreach efforts right now include those of us who are partners at the state level, and one of the things that I brought up previously with the -- I can't even say the acronym, but the SEFHIER or however you guys say that effort, and it seems like now is

the time to really bring in some of your state partners, your recreational data managers, particularly if there is questions about validation.

I have always had a little bit of concern that the states have not been represented in that effort, and you don't necessarily need someone from every state, but at least someone who can speak to the state perspective in that regard, and so I guess my question is when is there going to be some of that communication with the states, in terms of what they could do to support validation and outreach?

MS. VON HARTEN: I just wanted to make sure or remind you guys that we are going to be going to south Florida and mid-Florida in September and October, and so being able to provide a firm date, or if this decision is being considered, would be helpful, because we have been modifying out outreach materials as we go to each state, and the timeline has changed, and so having some clear direction on which way this might go, particularly since most of those dually-permitted holders are going to be down that way, but that would be helpful.

DR. CRABTREE: Right now, the dates we had up are the best we've got, and how accurate that is is hard to say, and, if we're going to let the dually-permitted folks wait until the Gulf system comes online, we would have to put that decision in the final rule, which I forget what the date on that was, but I think it was in July sometime, or August, and so, if that happens, then that decision would be documented there, and so, if you're down here in September or whenever, you should know by then, but I can't assure you that that final rule will happen at that date, but we will do our best.

MS. VON HARTEN: I will echo what Mark said. We have done some trainings even in north Florida so far, and we had several fishermen say that they probably would drop their Gulf permits, just because of the requirements, and so there's just that chance of -- The VMS requirement, and so there's just that chance.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, every time we have ever done a requirement like this, some people have dropped out, and that happens. My view is that's not a bad thing. Having permits that aren't used and that people are just hanging onto, to me, is an inefficiency in the fishery. It's pointless to have permits that aren't active and that aren't being fished, and so, if this results in some permits being transferred and sold to people who might actually use them, I don't think that's necessarily a bad thing.

MR. HARTIG: I agree with Michelle's comments. I mean, until these guys -- On our side, a number of these people aren't even going to know this is coming until it comes, and so, if we don't have -- If we aren't moving forward with the education and stuff, and I think those go hand-in-hand on the South Atlantic, and so start as early as you can. In the Gulf, it's going to be different. Those guys are tuned in, and they have a limited-access permit in the Gulf. If you have ever been to a Gulf Council meeting, the charter boat representatives are there, and so it's different. They're going to be more in-tune than we are, and so it's going to take us longer, and so we should start as early as we can to get as many of these people educated to the process as possible.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right, and so where do we want to go? What's the direction?

DR. DUVAL: I am just looking at the timeline that is up on the screen, and I am fine with an implementation date of January 1, 2019, understanding that the Gulf is going to come online later. For exactly the reasons that I outlined, I think the sooner we can start this process of transition and understanding and bringing people up to speed, the better. Again, I guess I am still waiting for an answer to my question about when is there going to be some communication with the states with regard to validation, and I'm just wondering when they're going to be brought into that conversation.

DR. CRABTREE: I would imagine that will happen in the fall, when we have more certainty that the programs are approved and we know whether they're going forward. I am also hoping to have some communications with certain people regarding what we think the cost of this is and explore ways to address that, and then I would think the folks at the Center who are going to be involved in this are -- We're going to need to do this Gulf and South Atlantic, and the MRIP folks will then reach out to the states, because I'm sure some of this is going to be integrated into MRIP and the whole program, and there will be a role for the states.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to make sure that I can sort of give people a heads-up, that's all, as sort of a rough timeline.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, you need to give that heads-up very quickly, before you leave and go to Pennsylvania.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mark, and then we need to wind this up. We're back behind schedule again.

MR. BROWN: The final rule is August 15, and then you've got a cooling-off period. How come the -- What's the rationale that you don't want to rein this in quicker?

DR. CRABTREE: Could you say that again?

MR. BROWN: Why would you not want to start this sooner?

DR. CRABTREE: Sooner than January 1?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, because people are going to have to potentially buy things, and they're going to have to get software. Somewhere out there, there is bound to be some charter boat captain who is going to say that he doesn't have a computer and doesn't have anything to report on, but, at minimum, they're going to have to go out and get software and things installed and be prepared to do this, and that takes some time.

We also are going to have to have our end of the software and the programming done and in place, and it seems to me to have it start at the beginning of the year makes sense, but we can look into it, but I think the more likely chain of events -- I am more worried that these dates are going to be pushed further out into the future rather than we could do it sooner. I have to correct the number I gave you, and I apologize, but I am now told that the number of dual-permitted vessels is actually 377, and so larger than what I told you previously.

MR. BROWN: Is that just in the Keys?

DR. CRABTREE: No, that is total, but I suspect that most of them are in the Keys.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Where do we want to land on this? Do we want to change anything, or we're just going to stay here and just keep working it out, which would be my recommendation?

DR. CRABTREE: I mean, I think I have a good sense of where you are on this.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right, and so I think we're to the protected resources updates, unless I have forgotten something, Rick.

MR. DEVICTOR: You did have standard bycatch reporting methodology update on there, and I just want to report that we're working on it now. This has to be in place, a review of the council's SBRMs, by February 21, 2022, and we're going to be forming an IPT-like process. Chip is the lead at the council, and Frank Helies at my office is the lead on this, and so we'll be able to report to you next time, hopefully, of forming the IPT and starting to meet and documenting this, which is required by law now, to get this done by February 21, 2022.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Rick.

MS. WIEGAND: The protected resources update is actually going to be given by Jenny Lee. Mary is doing a stint as the Section 7 Coordinator right now.

MS. LEE: Hi, everyone. I hope you've been having a great meeting, and I will help you get back on track, because I have almost nothing really to share with you this time around. As far as rules go, the final rule concerning using TEDs in skimmer trawls is back under development in SERO, working on some comments, and so that's still out there. As far as FMP consultations, again, not much of an update, but just that SF and PR are working through our various FMPs to address newly-listed species. In general, it looks like we will be doing a formal consultation to address manta rays on snapper grouper, and possibly a couple others, but interaction status is really low. We're really just trying to figure out what we've got, and so not much to report.

I wanted to share that -- I have some good news that I wanted to share, and it's a little old, but I think you're particularly interested, but, in GARFO -- GARFO has reinitiated on both their batched consultation, their lobster consultation, and their red crab fisheries. I know, in discussions about right whales, we often end up talking about lobster, and so I wanted to let you know that that consultation is ongoing, both to address their reinitiation trigger as well as new information.

I am pointing this out also because I wanted to highlight that you will note Pace et al. 2017, and our snapper grouper bi-op is 2016, but, really, the information is not substantially different from our baseline information that we analyzed in the bi-op, and so I guess a little pat on the back to you and us. We were very careful in doing that consultation, recognizing that there were some potential changes in growth trends, and, anyway, the bottom line is we do not see that we will be reinitiating, like GARFO is on that, and so I just thought you would appreciate that information.

Like I said, I was really stretching, and so I threw out some sea turtle nesting news. There is a typo. It should say the 2018 sea turtle nesting season is well underway, as opposed to just hard-

shells, and I have been having fun following Florida Leatherbacks, Inc, a non-profit corporation that is doing some nesting tracking, and so I just highlighted some information as far as the things that they have seen, a lot of leatherback encounters, but, really, that's about it, and you can see, under Marine Mammal Protection Act actions and news, it's really no changes, and so that will conclude my report.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Jennifer. Any questions? I don't see any questions, and so thank you very much.

MS. LEE: Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: I guess we will move on to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and Dave Gloeckner is going to give that.

DR. GLOECKNER: Good morning. I think what I had for you today is an update on the electronic logbooks for the commercial sector for HMS and Southeast-permitted vessels and a description of our process for developing landings by permit type for dolphin. For the electronic logbook, during February, we had agreed with ACCSP that they would be building a database structure and building codes, with a deliverable date of March 23, and I think they met that, and so we do have a database structure to handle the Southeast reporting.

They were also supposed to develop an API to allow delivery of data by April 13, and so that was pushed back about a month, and they are in the process right now of doing the final testing on the API, and they think it should be available next week, and so that pushed back our availability date of having trip reporting in June to probably late July, and so we expect, by late July, we should have something to allow people to report trips. As of right now, the Center actually put together software to allow fishermen to complete their no fishing reports, and that is in beta testing, and it should be available by the end of the month, and that's where we stand right now. Any questions on that?

MR. PHILLIPS: Are there questions?

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Dave, for the updates. I'm definitely looking forward to late July when the reporting, the commercial electronic logbook, should be online, and I know a lot of folks have been waiting a long time for that, and we really appreciate all of your efforts with ACCSP in that regard, and I guess so do you guys have plans to notify commercial permit holders?

DR. GLOECKNER: Yes, we plan to send out some permit holder letters at the end of this month to notify them that they can report their no fishing electronically now. Then, once we have a process in place with ACCSP to allow developers to pass data through the API, then we will send another notification out that trip reporting is available.

DR. DUVAL: Awesome. Thank you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Is there any ongoing effort with other regions to have one fisherman up and down the east coast report one time and it goes to everybody?

DR. GLOECKNER: Yes, that's the whole reason we're going to electronic, so that it will satisfy the Southeast. If they have an HMS permit, it will satisfy the HMS requirement, and, if they have a GARFO permit, it will satisfy that requirement, and so it's all going to go to ACCSP, and all the agencies can just pull the report from there, so fishermen don't have to report to the three different agencies.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: What do you think that the timeline, and I know stuff takes time, but when -- Is it a year that I will be able to hit that one button and it goes -- I was just wondering about when everybody else is getting online or when the agencies are all on the same page and how long that's going to take.

DR. GLOECKNER: I would say probably a year. I think it will depend on ACCSP finalizing their redesign for SAFIS and eTRIPS. Once that's in place and there is coordination between GARFO and the Southeast and HMS, then we can roll everything up, and so my guess would be about a year.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: One final question. How about, as the rollout is happening, is there going to be any commercial fishermen able to proof this or look at it before it goes primetime, like any attempts of education or outreach beforehand, even at the early stages, to proof it?

DR. GLOECKNER: There will be voluntary reporting available in July, or that's what I hope, and so that will allow fishermen plenty of time to test it and make sure it's what they want, and the councils can go ahead and make any modifications to the requirements at that point. Then, by the time they implement, they should have one report.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any other questions? Seeing none, very good.

DR. GLOECKNER: I think, last year, we were requested to develop a method to determine dolphin pelagic longline landings by vessels with dolphin wahoo permits only and vessels with dolphin wahoo permits and HMS permits, and so, to that end, we worked with ACCSP to develop a process, and so we will get trip ticket landings data from ACCSP and then, from SERO, we will get the permit information for all the vessels landing dolphin by pelagic longline.

The ACCSP process was to pull the landings by gear and vessel, and so they built that extraction from the warehouse. Now, they don't define pelagic longline gear in their gear codes, and they have codes for an unspecified longline, midwater longline, surface longline, and bottom longline, and so they pulled everything that was longline. Then they also had to develop a list of fishermen and associated vessels, and they ranked that by frequency, so that they can use that to fill in the vessel when it's missing, because there is quite a bit of reporting without a vessel. They compiled that information and then passed that off to the Center.

From there, we cleaned up the vessel numbers that came out of that file, and we had to do some trimming of the Coast Guard documentation numbers, because Florida has a habit of putting a "DO" in front of that number, which makes it hard to merge with just a standard Coast Guard number, and so we had to clean that up. Then we merged the landing file with the SERO permits file that we have on hand at the Center, and we matched the registration or the Coast Guard number and where the landing date was between the permit start and end date.

We also added columns to indicate whether the trip was positive for HMS and dolphin wahoo permits or just dolphin wahoo permits, and then we assigned the gear as general longline, midwater longline, and surface longline to pelagic, and the bottom longline was dropped, because it was assumed that that was reef fish gear.

The resulting data can be used to determine whether the pounds landed by vessels was for dolphin wahoo only or HMS only or both HMS and dolphin wahoo or with no permits that we could identify. This can be automated if need be, but right now it's not. If it's a once a year process, I would rather not spend the money on having developers build a process to do this automatically. If it's something that is required more frequently, then you all can let us know, and maybe we can build that into a project next year.

There is some additional information. Partners at ACCSP probably need to collect finer gear detail than just longline general, and so that might be something we have to work with the ACCSP on requiring that among their partners, and it would be nice if all the trip ticket records had either a vessel's state registration or Coast Guard number. Without that, we can't tie a permit to the record, and that's all I've got. Any questions?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I have been asking about this for a while, and I'm curious if the easiest and simplest way, and I might be totally off base, to figure this out is that you do it two ways. If you have a dolphin wahoo permit, it allows you to land mahi, and, second, if you have a tri-pack of permits, and so you will be able to distinguish between a council boat, so to speak, because that vessel will not have a tri-pack, and so, if you don't have a tri-pack, it's distinct ways of separating out who is fishing and then the surface gear for pelagic longline, instead of -- Because, if you're a pelagic longline, you've got to have the tri-pack, even though you have a dolphin wahoo, and I'm just wondering if it's simpler that way or is it simpler -- It seems like I'm asking for like two or three hoops, and maybe you all's way -- Maybe that's the way the system has got to work, to do five or six hoops, but I'm just curious.

DR. GLOECKNER: I think it's the way the system is built to kind of have to do five or six hoops, because we have to identify the permits first, before we even deal with the gear, and so we're identifying whether there is just a dolphin wahoo permit or if there is dolphin wahoo and HMS before we even decide what gear we're dropping.

MS. BECKWITH: You may have said this, but I missed it. For what years did you pull this information from?

DR. GLOECKNER: When we pulled it and passed that to the council, it was 2012 to 2016.

MS. BECKWITH: Then I guess my question would be to Charlie about when might we be able to see that information in a Dolphin Wahoo Committee meeting, because we haven't reviewed that information yet, have we?

DR. GLOECKNER: It was provided last year.

MR. HADLEY: I was just going to say that it was provided last year at the Dolphin Wahoo Committee in Ponte Vedra, but we can certainly bring that up again, as far as refresh everyone's memory on where that stands. That wouldn't be a problem.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, John. Anything else? All right. Thanks, Dave. Now we've got the FWC lionfish permit, and I guess we need to do a recommendation one way or the other on that, and who is going to present that? We have already talked about it, and John Hunt has been here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just call for some type of recommendation.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. We have already heard the discussion of the lionfish EFP, and is there a recommendation for the region to approve or not?

MR. BREWER: I would move that we recommend approval.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do I hear a second? Second by Michelle and Ben. Any discussion? No discussion, and so the motion passes and approval for the EFP. Next, we get into the committee reports, and so, Jessica, are you ready for Snapper Grouper?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think I can be. Just give me a second.

MR. PHILLIPS: As you all are looking down the list of committee reports to do, Anna pointed out that they were again trying to take away her vote, and she wasn't listed, and so we're going to put her back in.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The Snapper Grouper Committee met earlier this week, on the 12th and 13th. They approved the minutes from the March 2018 meeting and the agenda. We talked about the status of commercial and recreational catches versus quotas for species under ACLs. We got an update on the status of amendments under formal review, and then we jumped right into the extension of the interim rule for golden tilefish.

The committee made a motion to move to request extension of the golden tilefish interim rule for an additional 186 days. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of that motion? **Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We then began a discussion about the red snapper 2018 season, and we had a good discussion about how NMFS will consider whether or not to waive the cooling-off period and how much notice was needed for them to announce the season. We also got a Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel report and a presentation on bag limit and trip limit satisfaction in the for-hire sector, a case study of South Atlantic black sea bass. We then moved into the SSC report, and then the made another motion.

The motion is to move forward with adjusting catch levels for vermilion snapper and black sea bass based on latest assessments through an abbreviated framework amendment. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of this motion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Then there was a presentation on size selectivity of hook-and-line gear, chevron traps, and underwater cameras for red snapper and other reef fish in the U.S. South Atlantic. The committee made another motion.

The committee requests that the SSC evaluate the FWRI selectivity study to determine its utility in stock assessments and the red snapper interim analysis. 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 also got an update on the Southeast Reef Fish Survey, and then we moved into Snapper Grouper Amendment 46, which is the one about permitting and reporting for private recreational anglers.

The committee made another motion to approve Option 2 for the purpose of actions in Amendment 46. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee also made a motion to approve Amendment 46 for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

We then moved into Regulatory Amendment 29, which is the best fishing practices and powerheads amendment. **We made another motion to approve Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29 for scoping. 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 then moved into Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 26, which is the recreational management measures, and we have some additional work to do on this particular one, and so you will see some language there for the purpose statement, and so some language has been added there about clarifying what we're doing with the deepwater component of the snapper grouper fishery, and we have a question as to whether the predictability in the purpose statement should refer to the for-hire component of the snapper grouper fishery that targets deepwater species and, if so, then we need to allow staff editorial license to revise the purpose statement above. I am looking for some discussion on this particular question.

DR. DUVAL: I mean, I think predictability refers to all components of the recreational fishery. I mean, these modifications are going to affect both for-hire operators as well as private anglers, unless anyone thinks otherwise.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree.

DR. DUVAL: I think, if there's any wordsmithing that needs to be done, I am fine with letting the IPT do that, but I just wanted to make sure that we were all clear that this is affecting the entire recreational fishery.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more discussion of that? Myra, do you have enough clarification? All right. Then I'm going to move on. The committee made some motions that failed, and I'm not sure if we read the motions that failed. I am looking over there to Michelle, but I am seeing heads nod no, and so I'm going to pass by some motions that people made that actually failed. I see that there's another question about whether or not the twenty fish -- I am going to let Myra explain it. I'm a little bit confused.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Jessica. Basically, I just wanted to make sure that, since we were talking about the other shallow-water species, actions that pertain to that proposed aggregate, and since it appears that that is no longer going to be considered, I just wanted to clarify on the record that your intent is for the alternatives to impose a bag limit, potentially, for gray triggerfish or Atlantic spadefish, and those species would remain in the aggregate that is twenty fish for species without an aggregate bag limit, and so, if that's the case, then we don't need to do anything, but I just wanted to make sure that that was your intention.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Myra. I believe that's the committee's intention. I am looking around the room, and I see heads nodding yes. If that's not the intention, then raise your hand. It looks like people are still reading, but I think we're good. I am looking around. I think the answer is yes. All right. We're going to move on to one more clarification. Myra, I am going to let you explain this one, about the single-hook rigs.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you. Previously, a sub-action in the action pertaining to management measures for the deepwater species aggregate had alternatives for requiring single-hook rigs for that group of species. It's my understanding that you would prefer to address gear requirements in Regulatory Amendment 29, and so, again, just for clarification on the record that that sub-action would then be removed from Vision Blueprint 26.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I believe that was the committee's intent, and I think everyone was in agreement that we should keep all those gear modifications in one amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Great. Thanks for that discussion. Ben, did you have something else on that?

MR. HARTIG: I mean, I went online and looked at what was going on off of this area in the deep water, and it's primarily a rosefish fishery, a member of the scorpion family, and, also, I think most of it occurs in state waters, and some of it certainly doesn't, but one of the things that we're going to run into is, for species that aren't regulated by this council that are targeted by the recreational community, then we won't be able to go to the single-hook rigs for those particular species, and so keep this in mind.

I think there's a culture of multiple-hook rigs in the deepwater fishery, and I don't know that you're going to be able to change that. Hopefully we get there with the season and what we've put forward, and you may not want to go ahead with that single-hook rig in the deep water in the long term.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Ben. That was good information. Any more discussion on that? All right. Then we're going to move on. **The committee made a motion and moved an action addressing modification of the red grouper seasonal closure off the Carolinas from Regulatory Amendment 26 and 27 and develop in Regulatory Amendment 30, which is the red grouper rebuilding amendment. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of this? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We then moved into the Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 27, which is the commercial management measures, and we made a number of motions. I am not going to read the ones that failed, and so, if you see one in there that failed and you want to bring it back up, then you need to raise your hand. Motion 11 failed.

I'm moving into Motion 12, which was to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

There was a motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 4. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection? Well, on behalf of the committee, I so move Motion Number 13. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee made a motion to Selection Alternative 4/4a as preferred for Action 5. This is the commercial trip limit for vermillion snapper. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of this motion? Any objection?

MS. BROUWER: I'm sorry, but I believe there was a substitute motion that was made to select Alternative 2 as the preferred.

MS. MCCAULEY: Yes. Thank you, and then the substitute became the main motion. **The substitute motion was to select Alternative 2 as preferred, and, once again, this is the commercial trip limit for vermillion snapper. On behalf of the committee, I so move to select Alternative 2 as the preferred for Action 5. Any discussion of this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The committee made another motion to adopt the IPT's suggested edits under Action 5. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee made a motion to adopt the IPT's suggested edits under Action 6. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of that motion? Any objections? That motion stands approved.

The committee made a motion to adopt the IPT's suggested edits under Action 7. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee made a motion to adopt the IPT's suggested edits under Action 8. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee made another motion to approve all actions in the Vision Regulatory Blueprint Amendment 27 to consider approval for formal review in September of 2018. 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 then moved into Amendment 47, which is the snapper grouper for-hire moratorium. We gave staff a number of points for guidance to edit this particular document, and then there were some suggested locations for scoping meetings.

DR. DUVAL: I just want to clarify, where we're on the record, the North Carolina location, the third location, where it says Manteo or Hatteras, depending on meeting site availability, let's make that Manteo. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. We will get with staff about the Florida locations. **We made a motion to send the Snapper Grouper Amendment 47, as modified, out for scoping before the September 2018 meeting. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there discussion of this?

MR. BREWER: I thought we, later on, made the determination that this thing was not going to be able to be scoped before the September 2018 meeting, and there was a lot of discussion that was held at the -- Anna, I believe, actually suggested that there be some scoping that was done in September, but the face-to-face scoping be done after the September meeting, and that's not clear here.

Additionally, I wanted to say that I voted in favor of this motion at committee, and I can no longer support it. The reason is, in this document that is being put out for scoping, there are, or were, numerous -- I shouldn't say numerous, but several options in there that could get to perhaps where we need to get without having a moratorium and without having a Gulf-style limited entry program and without having a Gulf-style sector separation program.

In my discussions with people since that vote, to discuss those options and whether they thought them to viable, it's become clear to me that, unfortunately, only the Gulf-style system will work for them, and I cannot support that system, and I will not support that system, and so I am going to vote no with regard to Motion Number 20.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chester, and so I see some hands in the air, and I also want to seek clarification. I think that this got on the list and remained on the list in Executive Finance to go out for scoping before the September meeting. We did have some debate about what did that scoping mean, and so I would like to talk about that discussion.

It seemed like what we were saying was to do some webinars, and we agreed to send the postcard out to all the captains that have the federal permit, and I think that that was the only definitive thing that we decided that needed to be done before September, but I am going to look around to folks to make sure, and so I saw Roy's hand, Anna's hand, and Michelle's hand, and Zack.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, just to come back to some of Chester's comment, I mean, the charter boat limited entry program in the Gulf has worked fine. There haven't been problems with it. It's what we've done with all of our commercial fisheries, and so it's difficult for me to see why this is as controversial of an issue as it is.

Sector separation gets pulled into it, but the Gulf limited entry program is mackerel and all species of reef fish, and red snapper is the only species that we have sector separation for, and sector separation came about in the Gulf because of a number of things that we don't have in the South Atlantic.

Part of it had to do with specific Gulf requirements in the statute, and it also had to do with state waters, which are nine miles in the Gulf, and we don't have that situation in the South Atlantic, and it had to do with a whole host of things. Now, if you go to the Gulf and talk to the vast majority of charter boats, they would tell you that sector separation has worked well for them and it has stabilized the fishery and it's done good things, and I think it's becoming more accepted by the recreational fishery over there, and so we keep looking at the Gulf as if it's some horrible thing, but the fact of the matter is that, in the Gulf, we have an issue with how to manage the private recreational red snapper fishery, and maybe we've come to some solutions to that with EFPs.

Equating a permit moratorium that it's going to lead to sector separation, I just don't believe that is accurate, and, at any rate, the only way sector separation is going to ever happen over here is if the majority of this council decides they want to do it. I just don't share your concerns with that, Chester, and I have a lot of experience in the Gulf, and I can tell you that I have watched the charter boat fishery in the Gulf over the past ten to fifteen years, and the professionalism of that fishery has changed dramatically over the years.

The level of engagement with the charter boat organizations and in the Gulf with the council is just remarkable, and any of you who have come to these Gulf meetings have seen the level of participation we get from the charter boat industry and the level of input we get from them and the level of sophistication and their knowledge about the whole process, and it is just remarkable over there.

My experience has been, if you want to professionalize your fleet, you have got to enable them to be more profitable, because you're only going to have professional people if they can actually make a living doing this, and part of getting to that is making sure that you don't have way more vessels in it than you need and making sure that every time the economy gets going and everybody wants to go charter fishing that you don't have a whole raft of people come in and all of a sudden start charter boat fishing. There is a lot of good reasons for it, and so I'm going to support the motion, and I hope we keep looking at this.

MS. BECKWITH: My understanding was the same, that we were going to scope by webinar, with the postcards, and then come back in September and consider some additional in-person scoping between the September and the December meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Anna.

DR. DUVAL: I agree that we had the conversation during Executive Finance yesterday about doing our usual webinar scoping prior to the September council meeting, and I don't think it was clear to me that there would be additional in-person scoping. I think what I was trying to convey was our process when we develop an amendment. It normally includes two rounds of public input. The first round is scoping, which we've tried to go to a webinar-based approach in order to save time and money, and then, when we get to the point of having a draft document, we go out to in-person public hearings.

I don't think we would be in the situation of having a draft document in September for public hearings. To me, that would occur -- You would have in-person public hearings in January, and I think that there will be -- As long as this is an agenda item and the council is moving forward with

scoping at future meetings, I think, based on the comments that we have received previously online about this topic, you are going to continue to receive additional public comment, whether or not there is in-person scoping or webinar scoping, via the comment forms, and so webinar scoping I think is what we discussed yesterday prior to the September council meeting, and I think I would urge in-person public hearings in January if the document is ready at that point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have on the list Zack, Doug, and then Anna, and so, just to clarify, Myra is putting some items on the board here regarding this discussion. The only thing that I don't see up there is that people can comment online, and I assume that they will be able to do that. Staff is nodding yes, and, also, we need to clarify this in Executive Finance, because I do not think that this amendment was on the list of amendments that were coming back in September, but I am going to look to Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. The motion you approved in Executive Finance lists the top priorities for scoping and public hearings in August of 2018, and Number 7 is Snapper Grouper Amendment 47, for-hire, and then it says webinars only in August with a question mark and then additional scoping in September and October with a question mark. That's the motion you approved.

MR. BOWEN: I mean, the motion that was approved by this committee, or by the Snapper Grouper Committee, clearly states that it's out for scoping before the September 2018 meeting, and I feel like -- This may be shooting myself in the foot, but I feel like if we have members of this council that don't want this to go before scoping before the September meeting, that it would require another vote.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's going to get another vote anyway, because we haven't voted on it yet.

MR. HAYMANS: Gregg just actually addressed my question, because I heard that we would have a second round of scoping later on, not necessarily public hearings, and I don't think the document is going to be ready for public hearings by that time. More to the point that I wanted to make, it was the postcard issue. This isn't a referendum yet, and so sending a postcard only to the permit holders, to me, is a bit inequitable, and so I would prefer to see it just go out to the normal mailing list that typically goes out from the council, which is more inclusive than just permit holders. When we send the postcard just to guides, you are -- Well, I just think it needs to go wider.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I believe, even if we do send out a postcard, we always send out announcements to our entire mailing list of any hearings. It's available on our website, and so, if a postcard goes out, it's not going to preclude these other things from happening, and you may want to ask for additional clarification on why the postcard for those other people, but I can pretty much assure you that the announcement of our public hearings and scopings will go out to all of the people on our mailing list, regardless of their status.

MR. HAYMANS: I would ask then what the additional information would be on the postcard, and so why the additional cost of the postcard if it's already going out?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that there's probably some people that have federal permits that might not be on the council's mailing list now, and we were just trying to let them know, if you want to get engaged and start getting engaged, and I agree that a broader discussion needs to be had with

other folks, but we had talked about, at the March meeting, that we wanted to let everybody that had a federal permit in the South Atlantic know that we were starting this discussion.

MR. HAYMANS: So just add them to the mailing list of the typical council mail-out.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm just a little concerned about that. I just want to make sure they understand that this will affect their permit is all, and I think that that's the discussion that we had in March, and I see some heads nodding. I had hands up, and I'm going to continue to go back to my list of hands, and I have Anna and Mel.

MS. BECKWITH: To Doug's point, I mean, the National Marine Fisheries Service list does not maintain an email address, and so most of our mailings now go out by email and not physical paper, and so I think a lot of people would get missed, and so I'm in favor of the mail-out to the permit holders and then a regular with everybody else.

In terms of Michelle's point about sort of our hearing our regular public input, I think, to me, this is going to require extra scoping and extra public input, because I would like multiple opportunities for the guys to sort of give us feedback before we get into the true development, and so I even like the idea of getting, eventually, sort of an ad hoc -- A very casual ad hoc group of guides together from each state, three or four guides from each state, and sit around a table and hash some of this stuff out, and I was going to bring up that idea to be discussed in September based on what the first round of scoping would be, but anyway.

MR. BELL: I think I brought the postcard idea up, or at least notification to them specifically, and I never intended not to notify everybody, but it was just to make sure that that particular group, who had a real vested interest in this, couldn't say that we didn't try to make sure that they were aware of it when we get into this, if they don't get the emails or whatever, but it was an extra effort to make sure that group was definitely included.

MR. BREWER: I've got to believe that -- As the sole private recreational representative in this room, I have got to believe that there are a lot of private recreational anglers who are not on the email list for the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. I take a little bit of umbrage at saying, okay, well, this group over here, you're essentially going to get notified twice, because we're going to send you a postcard and we're going to send you an electronic notification, and then you've got a whole bunch of folks over here, probably on the order of a hundred times as many, who are not on the email list for the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I share those concerns, Chester, which is why FWC, at least for Florida, was going to go in and try to supplement with other additional in-person workshops. We're going to try to contact our own state-licensed charter captains and to try to talk to private anglers, because I agree with you that I think that the private angler group won't necessarily be activated unless they realize, or they're already on the mailing list or what have you, and I agree.

MR. DIAZ: I just want to go on the record as supporting most everything that Dr. Crabtree said. I think most of the stuff that we put into effect in the Gulf has worked for the Gulf, but it's kind of specific to the needs of the Gulf, and you all are going to strike your own path. You've got your own needs, and you all will figure out what works best for you all over here, but all of these things are controversial.

We had a lot of people show up at public hearings for all of these types of things, and it's just one of these hard things that you've got to work through, but I do agree with Dr. Crabtree that I think the things that have been in place for the Gulf work for the Gulf, but it fits the needs of the Gulf, and you all's needs might be different. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Dale. We have a motion on the board, on behalf of the committee. I am looking around for any more discussion before we vote on it.

DR. DUVAL: I think this motion still stands, and it's still, as modified, out for scoping before the September 2018 meeting. I think, when we get to the Executive Finance Report, that motion becomes clarified as to the method of webinars prior to September and then additional scoping after the September council meeting, and that might be in-person, and so I think that will be clarified in Executive Finance, just looking at that draft report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Any more discussion? **All those in favor of this motion, which is to take this item out for scoping before the September 2018 meeting, please raise your hand; all those opposed. Nine in favor and two opposed, and the motion passes.**

As Michelle said, we will come back. We have captured a little bit of clarification here, but we'll come back in Executive Finance about some of the specifics here. I am going to move on. Next, we talked about Regulatory Amendment 30, the red grouper rebuilding plan.

We made a motion to approve the inclusion of Action 1 and range of alternatives in Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 30. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The committee also made a motion to consider a commercial trip limit with sub-alternatives of seventy-five pounds, 100 pounds, 150 pounds, and 200 pounds gutted weight. On behalf of the committee, I so move. This is about red grouper, and is there any discussion here? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The committee also made a motion to send Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 30, which is red grouper rebuilding, as modified, out for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?

MS. BROUWER: I have a question. One of the things we talked about yesterday was to potentially hold a scoping hearing for this amendment at the September meeting, since the action specifically for the season has already been out to public hearings, and Michelle pointed out that you guys are adding one action on the bycatch trip limit, which you also received a lot of input from your advisors and the public, and so I just wanted to clarify that that scoping would be held in September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is it scoping or is it a public hearing? It's scoping, Myra says.

DR. DUVAL: If it's a regulatory amendment, it can still be scoping? I mean, technically, wouldn't it be a public hearing, because we only require like one round of public comment on a regulatory amendment, right? It just seems like it would be a public hearing, because I think scoping gives

the impression that we're going to come back around again. It's semantics, but I will ask our attorney.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, I agree with that. It should be a public hearing in September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we're going to modify this motion. We will make a substitute motion.

DR. DUVAL: **Actually, I think it might just be a motion to amend and to replace the words "out for scoping" to "public hearing".**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do I have a second?

DR. CHEUVRONT: **Can we just clarify that out for public hearing at the September council meeting?**

DR. DUVAL: **Yes.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. This is a motion to amend. Do I have a second? It's seconded by Ben. Any more discussion of this? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is amended.** Next, we moved into Regulatory Amendment 28, which is golden tilefish.

MR. HAYMANS: Don't you need to now vote on the amended motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am not certain. Do we need to vote again on the amended motion?

DR. DUVAL: I am pretty sure we do, because then you have the new motion as amended, and so we do actually need to take another vote.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we have an amended motion. We need to vote on the amended motion. **The amended motion is send Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 30, which is red grouper rebuilding, as modified, out for public hearing at the September council meeting.** Is there any more discussion for that? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Now we're moving into golden tilefish. **In the discussion of golden tilefish, the committee made the motion to accept the purpose and need as modified.** Any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

I am going to turn it over to Myra to talk about the clarification of whole weight versus gutted weight issue and how it affects the golden tilefish ABC and ACL, or Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I'm not Myra, but give me just a second, because I created a document to help us get through this. This is not on the website, but I can make sure it gets there, but I wanted to have the discussion, because I didn't want people to read this and wonder what this is all about without having some kind of explanation, and so I will make sure that it gets in there.

There has been a little bit of confusion about what's going on with the ACL for golden tilefish, and it was brought up also in the public comment on Wednesday, and so, since Wednesday, up through yesterday, staff has been trying to figure out what's going on and deconstruct what happened and figure out what the resolution of the issue might be.

Everyone agrees that the ACL that was used in the 2017 interim rule and considered by the SSC in May of 2018 was 362,000 pounds whole weight. What we discovered is there was an issue related to what conversion factor should be used to convert whole weight to gutted weight.

When SERO determined that the ACL for golden tilefish in the interim rule was going to be 323,000 pounds gutted weight, a conversion factor of 1.12 was used. However, when the Science Center assessed the stock in SEDAR 25, they used a whole weight to gutted weight conversion factor of 1.059. The number doesn't sound so big, but, when you use the Science Center conversion factor, you get an ABC of 342,000 pounds gutted weight and not 323,000 pounds gutted weight, as was used in the interim rule.

Now, what the council can choose to do is to use the Science Center conversion factor, with the following rationale. In the past, the council has stated, explicitly, that ACLs should use the same conversion factor as was used in an assessment. According to the assessment, using the conversion factor of 0.159 will not result in overfishing, and the SSC, in May of this year, saw the gutted weight as 342,000 pounds, using that conversion factor that was in the assessment.

This is what they approved as the gutted weight conversion from 362,000 pounds whole weight, and so, basically, the bottom line is we wanted to get this on the record, so that you understand that what's going to go probably into the document, assuming that everybody is in agreement and there is no issues raised with this, is that, instead of it being 323,000 pounds gutted weight for the entire ACL, the total ACL for golden tilefish, it is going to increase by an additional 19,000 pounds and become 342,000 pounds gutted weight.

Now, what that is going to do is that's going to cause a little bit of modification to the document, because we have to go through the whole document and make sure that everything is now consistent with that higher value, and it's not going to change the rationale on anything that you have seen, but we wanted to get this out there. It's not going to delay the implementation of this amendment for the beginning of the fishing year in January, but we wanted to make sure that when you see this and you're wondering why is the ACL higher than what it was in the interim rule, the whole issue gets down to the conversion factor that was used.

Basically, what we're doing is we're informing you that we're going to be able to increase the total ACL by about 19,000 pounds, and so I didn't know if you all wanted to have additional discussion or ask for any clarification on this and go from there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's unclear to me whether we need a motion to modify that alternative or if this discussion is enough.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I think the discussion is probably enough. Well, you've got a lawyer over there, and let the lawyer handle it.

MR. GRIMES: My preference would be that you pass a motion and explicitly discuss that the committee looked at draft codified text which used the lower number with a different conversion factor, and that's what is in the amendment that was approved by the committee, and my preference would be that you have some formal adoption of this. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Shep. I would feel a little bit better about that, too.

DR. CRABTREE: I just wanted to say that I did talk to Dr. Porch, and he consulted with Dr. Williams, and they are all in agreement that the appropriate conversion is the 1.059 percent, and so I think this is what we need to do. **I would like to make a motion that the gutted weight ABC for golden tilefish be calculated using the 1.059 percent conversion and that the document be altered to reflect a catch level of 342,000 pounds.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's seconded by Chester. I have Michelle and then Shep.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Madam Chair, but I was just going to make the motion that Roy just made.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. **The motion is that the gutted weight ABC for golden tilefish be calculated using the 1.059 conversion factor, resulting in a catch level of 342,000 pounds gutted weight and be used to derive the quotas.** The motion was seconded by Chester. Is there any more discussion on this motion? I forgot to go back to Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would just note that, when we do this and we derive the quotas that get codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, there is a fish, number of fish, quota for the recreational sector, and it's my understanding that the number of fish is derived from the whole weight and not from gutted weight, and so we'll have to figure those numbers out, and we will update what was approved by the committee, but I don't believe the numbers of fish for the recreational sector will change, but they're just a very small portion of the harvest anyway. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Shep. Thanks for bringing that up. Sorry that I forgot to go back to you. Any more discussion on this particular motion? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Now we're going to go to the following motion that was selecting our preferred, and so we selected Alternative 3, Sub-Alternative 3a under Action 1 as the preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? I am assuming that this is going to get modified, because of the previous motions and the language, and this will be modified. **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, this motion stands approved.**

DR. CHEUVRONT: I just want to clarify that I don't think the motion itself needs to be -- I mean the wording needs to be changed so much, but it's the tables that reflect the values.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think the wording of the alternative is going to get changed, but maybe I'm wrong.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Because we just said the ACL equal to ABC, and so, with the value that was calculated, that all goes in the discussion, and so it will be there. It's just that you don't have the actual pounds in the alternative and sub-alternatives in the actual document, and so you're safe with what you've done. The direction is clear by the motions that you've made that it's the 342,000 pounds is what is the starting point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that clarification. We forgot to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 1, and so if someone would like to make the draft motion.

DR. DUVAL: **I move we approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 1.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's seconded by Ben. Any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The committee then made a motion to select Alternative 4 under Action 2 as preferred. **Then we did a substitute motion that was to select Alternative 1, no action, as the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any more discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We have a draft motion on the board. Remember that we decided to wait to make this motion until after we had the public hearing, if someone would like to make this motion.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Madam Chair. **I move that we approve Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 28 for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Motion by Michelle. Do I have a second for that? Seconded by Ben. This is a roll call vote.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

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

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're going to keep rolling through the committee report. We then moved into Amendment 42, which is the modifications to sea turtle release gear and snapper grouper framework. **We made a motion to approve the purpose and need statement. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We then made a motion to approve Alternatives 1 through 2 under Action 1. Any discussion? On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee also made a motion to approve Alternatives 1 through 2 under Action 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

We have some timing that is listed in a little chart for Snapper Grouper Amendment 42, if someone would like to make a motion for this particular timing, and I will let you guys check it out.

DR. DUVAL: I guess, before I make the motion, and I know, when we talked in Executive Finance yesterday, one of the things we talked about was is this super urgent? I mean, can we just go ahead and wait until January for this? It seems like maybe this might be a little bit premature and, once we get to Executive Finance, that we could take care of some of those scheduling things.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is that okay? Myra says that that's okay, because I think that this was not on our list to come back in September, and so let's hold off on this. All right. We then moved into Regulatory Amendment 32 for yellowtail snapper, and we forgot to approve the purpose and need statement, and so if someone would like to make a motion to approve the purpose and need statement.

DR. DUVAL: **I move that we approve the purpose and need statements.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's seconded by Ben. Any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

MS. BECKWITH: **I would like to make a motion to add an additional alternative to Action 1, and that would be to add an alternative that adds an in-season closure. An in-season closure will occur for the commercial sector when the total annual catch limit meets or is projected to meet 80 percent.** If I can get a second, I will provide my reasoning.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't think that's exactly what Anna said.

MS. BECKWITH: Let me repeat myself. An in-season closure will occur for the commercial sector when the total annual catch limit meets or is projected to meet 80 percent. My rationale is I am still extraordinarily concerned that the commercial harvest might have the opportunity to close the recreational and charter access to yellowtail snapper, and, during our public comment, we certainly heard plenty of concerns from some of the charter industry in the Keys suggesting that yellowtail is an extraordinarily important species for them and that it is a day-saver, and so I would like -- While I understand the plight of the commercial guys for the yellowtail snapper fishery, and I'm fine moving this forward, I would like to retain a portion of the ACL that cannot be used by the commercial guys to assure that the recreational and charter industry does have access to that fishery.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have Monica, and this motion was seconded by Michelle.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I was thinking about those comments that we all heard, I guess, during public hearing as well, and I was just going to suggest -- From my perspective, this is fine, and maybe you want to give the IPT editorial license to bring you back some other options that might meet this same goal, and so you could see that again next time you saw the document, but it seems like a great idea to cover that aspect of this so that the recreational sector makes sure that they are not adversely affected by this kind of action.

DR. CRABTREE: A couple of things. **I think, Anna, instead of saying “when the total ACL meets or is projected to meet 80 percent”, I think what you mean is when the total catch meets or is projected to meet 80 percent of the ACL.**

MS. BECKWITH: **That’s fine.**

DR. CRABTREE: Then the other thing I think you need to add in there is also if the commercial sector quota is reached. You could have a situation where the recreational catches went way up and the commercial catches were lower and you got to 80 percent of the ACL and so then you would close the commercial fishery, the way that’s written, even though they might not have caught their --

MS. BECKWITH: **All excellent suggestions.**

MS. BROUWER: I’m sorry, but I didn’t catch that second revision there, Roy. Would you help me out on that one?

DR. CRABTREE: **I think there needs to be something in there that says, “and the commercial quota is caught”.** It shouldn’t just be the 80 percent. It should be the commercial quota is reached and we project that 80 percent of the ACL is caught, right?

MS. BROUWER: If you wouldn’t mind, does that capture what you just said?

DR. CRABTREE: I believe it does, if that’s good with Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: **It is.** Thank you for the assistance, Roy.

DR. DUVAL: This is a really tough issue, right? Because this is a really important fishery for a lot of constituents in south Florida, and so it’s very important for the commercial guys, and it’s important for the charter guys. Anna has already reviewed that we heard public comment on this, and so I’m supportive of including an alternative that would try to address that and ensure that there is some access for everybody, and I like Monica’s suggestion of allowing the IPT to wordsmith this a little bit.

I mean, we don’t just want to get ourselves back to the accountability measures that we have right now, and so I think the intent is clear that we want to make sure that there is still -- We want to allow for additional -- We want to make sure that there is efficiency in the fishery and utilization, but we also don’t want to disadvantage one sector over another. We still want to allow all sectors to have access, and so I understand the intent of Anna’s motion, and I am supportive of it, but, as Monica indicated, it might require some IPT efforts.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have some concerns with this, because I just think we’re not tracking the recreational sector in real time, and I’m not quite sure exactly how this is going to work. I mean, I get the intent. The intent seems sound, but I’m just not sure how it’s going to be executed.

DR. DUVAL: I think we’re probably going to have that problem no matter what, because, given the current -- Given the existing alternative that is in there, which is to not close the fishery until the total ACL is met, you’re still kind of faced with that same in-season tracking of recreational

harvest. That doesn't mean that you have to select this, and so we approved it for scoping, and you all were going to see it again in September and select a preferred alternative then.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there more discussion?

MR. HARTIG: One thing you might want to keep in mind is that when it closed in our jurisdiction that there are fishermen with Gulf permits that are going to the Gulf and catching yellowtails now, and so, if we do this and they're allowed to still fish in the South Atlantic down the line, there could potentially be more fish caught in the South Atlantic than there would have been if we had that closure.

What I'm saying is what we've done now is we have forced fishermen to go into the Gulf and fish and catch yellowtail, and they are doing that right now, but, if you go back and you make it easier to stay in the South Atlantic, then more fish will come out of the South Atlantic, and so it's a problem, but is it -- I'm just bringing it up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Since it's all one stock, is it really a problem? It's only because we have split it between the Gulf and Atlantic, and, ultimately, one of the long-term actions was looking to combine the ACL, because it is one biological stock off of Florida.

DR. DUVAL: Just one question. Has the Gulf side ever closed?

MS. MCCAWLEY: No. All right. Any more discussion on this motion? **Is there any objection to this motion? I see no objection, and the motion is approved.**

The next motion the committee made was to remove Action 2 from consideration in Regulatory Amendment 32. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee made a motion to approve Regulatory Amendment 32 for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Then we have a list of timing and tasks, and I want to point out a council of things. One thing that we did not discuss after we saw that triggerfish presentation was the SSC hadn't seen that presentation yet, and do we want to ask the SSC to look at that particular presentation and then also -- I think we had some discussion about the vision blueprint during the Executive Finance Committee, and I think we're kind of holding off on that, and so I think we can remove, I think, the item that is highlighted here about the vision blueprint, but then what do we want to do about the triggerfish presentation?

DR. DUVAL: We have had similar presentations on black sea bass discard mortality reviewed by the SSC, and so I do think it would be a good thing to have it reviewed, should we want to use that information in the future, and so I would support keeping that bullet in there and also, on the public input on the vision blueprint activities, we might just better address that under Executive Finance. I do think we had conversation about that, and I would like to clarify it when we get to that committee report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great, and so would someone like to make the timing and tasks motion that includes the triggerfish presentation, but does not include the vision blueprint activities?

MR. HARTIG: You may ask the SSC a specific question on gray triggerfish as to what is the utility of the size limit, given the new discard information.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's an excellent addition.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Do we want to add that to this timing and tasks motion? Was that enough direction? Myra is getting it on the board. It's been edited to add in what Ben just suggested. Would someone like to make this timing and tasks motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Motion by Charlie and seconded by Michelle. Any more discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, the timing and tasks motion is approved, and that concludes my Snapper Grouper Committee report.**

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you. All right. Let's take a ten-minute break. I think Mike said that checkout was 11:00, if anybody hasn't checked out. We'll come back in ten minutes, and we are several reports behind, and so I'm going to talk to Gregg, in case we need to rearrange some stuff, because some people have to catch planes.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. PHILLIPS: Let's get to the table, and we're going to change things up a little bit. We've got some people that need to leave to catch planes, and so we're going to go ahead and do Executive Finance.

The Executive Finance Committee approved the minutes from the March 2018 meeting, and we talked about the Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization, the hearings that had been held, and where we are in the process, and I'm not going to read all of this. Then there was -- We talked about the CCC working paper. New topics were added and identified.

Then we had a discussion of the 2017 expenditures and the draft 2018 budget. Mike and Gregg presented the budget with expenditures through late May. The expectation is that funding will be level, but we are going to get another \$107,000 for -- I think that's going to be 2018 and again in 2019, and we talked about draft budgets and making changes to staff comp, FICA, retirement amounts, based on the 2 percent cap and merit/cash awards, and we're going to look at it again in September and make sure we have covered all the bases. We're going to continue working under the draft budgets, and we hope to have final funding notification in September.

The committee indicated that the Chair, Executive Director, and Administrative Officer have flexibility to allow participation at AP meetings by new council members if they so desire, to try to help get them up to speed. Go ahead, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, but if I could, before we leave the budget, we got some word that the Interior and CJS Bills were approved yesterday by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and there's a couple of items that I would just like to give you a heads-up on. This still needs to be enacted, but, at least through the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Fisheries Councils and Commission line item, they provided about a 12 percent increase over Fiscal Year 2018 funds, and they provided draft wording that NMFS is to apply that percentage increase equally across the councils and commissions.

In the National Fish Habitat Program, some direction to the Service to reduce the administrative costs more, so that more funding can go towards projects, and a couple of items specific to the South Atlantic Council area of a fishing gear selectivity study, directing that, within funding provided for fisheries data collection, surveys, and assessments, NOAA shall consider conducting a multiyear, agency-independent study to evaluate the selectivity and potential bias of different gears used to assess reef fish populations in the South Atlantic.

That is to build on work that's being done by states in the South Atlantic, and it should address whether the use of certain gears by MARMAP, such as the chevron traps, fail to adequately sample across age classes of reef fish, including red snapper, due to differences in behavior and habitats by larger and smaller fish. NOAA is further encouraged to initiate a multiyear, independent study using multiple-hook gears to sample South Atlantic red snapper for age composition, sexual maturity, and egg production.

Finally, for South Atlantic reef fish, NMFS shall consider employing the independent and alternative stock assessment strategies directed by the committee for the Gulf of Mexico to NMFS assessments of reef fish in the South Atlantic. The committee provides up to \$1.5 million for these activities and notes deficiencies that have plagued reef fish management in the Gulf of Mexico also affects NMFS management of reef fish in the South Atlantic, and so that's some extremely good news, and we hope that will be fully enacted.

MR. PHILLIPS: Sometimes we feel like the red-headed stepchild compared to the Gulf getting funds, especially for things like red snapper. Then we're back to the council follow-up and priorities. Brian reviewed the priorities approved at the March 2018 council meeting and presented the additional items identified at this meeting. Then we've got our list of priorities, and we provided those.

Anyway, we discussed our priorities and provided guidance to staff for scoping/public hearings prior to September and for items to be included on the September agenda. I suppose that everybody can see our list, and I am not going to read it. We went over it pretty thoroughly when we built it, and so this is Motion 1. It's to approve the priorities for scoping/public hearings in August of 2018 and bring back to the council in September of 2018 for additional work, and so we've got our scoping/public hearing list and the amendments that we want to bring back.

DR. DUVAL: I think a couple of clarifications. With regard to Item Number 3 under the priorities for scoping and public hearings, the red grouper rebuilding, and I'm going to look to Myra, because I thought that we had indicated that we could probably do Regulatory Amendment 30 as one of the items for public hearing in September, and Myra is nodding her head yes, because she noted that we've already had a couple of those actions that have been out with regard to the red grouper spawning season extension. Those have been out for scoping and public hearings.

The addition of the action for a commercial trip limit was something that was brought forward by stakeholders, and it was brought forward at the AP meeting, and that was direct input from the public hearings, and so we may not need to have yet one more item that would require public input during August public hearings, and so I'm hearing some heads nod, and so that would be one suggestion.

Then the other suggestion was in terms of Snapper Grouper Amendment 47. I think we clarified that we would like to see webinars in August, but that additional in-person public scoping to occur in September or October, and so it seemed like we could take the question marks off of those.

Then the third item I wanted to bring up was the vision blueprint evaluation, and so, in the blueprint, the council is scheduled to review the input from the evaluation in December, and I just wanted to remind folks that this is an evaluation of everything that we've done and not just the management measures, but the governance, the communication, the science, and so that includes citizen science and that includes the fishing best practices and that includes all the communication efforts that our staff have made and the changes that they've made over the past year.

My suggestion yesterday was that we simply have a couple or three webinars in between the September and the December council meetings. Those would probably have to occur probably in October, something like that, to gather that input, and I don't think we need anything that is in-person. That's how we did this last time, and it's very flexible within the blueprint, but I just don't want to see us have to change that timeframe of the blueprint, and so I think we can easily get this input during webinars and that staff can determine when best to schedule those between September and December. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Michelle.

MR. HARTIG: I mean, I am happy -- I mean, I'm aware of the timeline, but I am concerned that with the timing of the hearings that late and bringing all that information back before the council in December, if you're going to do it in October, that's a concern.

DR. DUVAL: Is your concern that webinars to provide the public with the information in regard to what has been accomplished under the vision blueprint is --

MR. HARTIG: No, that's not the concern. The concern is, between the October webinar and the December council meeting, to have everything that we need to look at based on the vision blueprint and that it's going to be able to be assembled, and that's it. If it's not that big of a deal, that's fine, but it just seemed like possibly a lot of input from the public about visioning based on what we had done, but I don't know. It may be okay.

DR. DUVAL: I mean, I guess I would look to Myra and Amber if they feel like there is too much work to do to conduct webinars like that.

MS. BROUWER: I think, if I may, I think we'll be fine. There are going to be opportunities. You had already given us guidance that during the Snapper Grouper AP meeting, which is already scheduled for October, that would be one opportunity to obtain input, and then, as long as you give

us guidance to use webinars, perhaps comment forms and that sort of thing, I think we'll be okay in synthesizing all of that for you for December.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's what I would like to see. Thanks.

MR. WAUGH: One additional item that Brian raised that we need to clarify is, at the March meeting, you had given us direction to bring the evaluation of the wreckfish ITQ program back to you in September, and so we just need some clarification as to whether you want that added to this list or leave that and pick it up at a future meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think I have three things. Yes, I think we need to bring the wreckfish back. I thought we were under a timeline or a deadline for that. Also, the thing that we talked about earlier under Snapper Grouper that's not under the September list is Amendment 47, and so we keep saying that we're going to look at the comments and then figure out how to proceed, but Amendment 47, unless I am missing it, does not appear to be in the September list.

Then the final thing is that lengthy discussion that we had about developing this tiered system of work and how many of each tier could be brought back to each meeting, so that we could figure out how to do this, instead of just listing the top six or the top ten, but the development of that tiered system is not -- I don't see it in the committee report at all, and so I just wanted to make sure that -- I don't know if we need a little phrase here of direction that staff is going to develop this tiered system between now and the September meeting or what, or maybe it's in the timing and tasks. It looks like it's getting added, and those were the three things that I had.

MR. PHILLIPS: Anything else?

MR. HADLEY: Just a point of clarification to staff regarding Amendment 47, just so I make sure that we're meeting your expectations. We would come back with the webinar and scoping comments and a summary of those comments, and so what we receive on the webinar and what we receive from online comments, but there would be no -- There is no further development of the amendment, as far as coming up with draft actions and alternatives or purpose and need or anything like that, and that would be my assumption, unless advised otherwise.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't think we need any actions, but there were a number of those bullet points that we looked at, like changing the title of the amendment and things like that, and I'm hoping that those type of things can be incorporated, but actions, no, in my opinion.

DR. CRABTREE: I think, with respect to wreckfish, that the only timing constraint you had was to begin the process, and so, if you want to hold off with wreckfish until December and give staff a little more time, there is no time constraint that would prevent you from doing that.

MR. PHILLIPS: To that point, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then I say wreckfish comes off of this list then, and I was the one that had added it.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with Jessica to leave wreckfish until December and also the bullet points that are in the Snapper Grouper Committee report with regard to Amendment 47, like incorporating that into the scoping document as well.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Are there any more comments? Is everybody comfortable with the list on the board as presented?

MR. WAUGH: I would suggest, just to make it easy, just to indicate that we're approving the list as modified.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. **Everybody has looked at the list, and we've talked about it a lot, and so, on behalf of the committee, I move that we approve the list as modified.** Any more discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, then our priorities list is approved.**

Then we get down to our regulatory reform, and Brian went through our list for final recommendations on regulatory reform and regulations that should be removed for removal or potential modification, and the committee provided guidance on what to remove and for further consideration for modification or not for further consideration of removal, since some of those things were out of our pay grades. Any discussion on that?

Seeing none, then we had the report of the May 22 to 24 CCC meeting, and I, Mark, and Gregg were there, and it was a very good meeting. It was a long way to get there, and I think we've covered most of those items in earlier reports. **Then we have a motion that the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council will start an aquaculture FMP, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: There is opposition at the back of the room.

MR. PHILLIPS: Sorry. Then, under Other Business, then we talked about the need to review all the agendas prior to being finalized in the briefing book. Then timing and tasks, and I think we just adopted the following timing and tasks, and so we directed staff to work on the public hearings, and we just modified that list. Then the structure of the council agenda, and we've talked about trying to have the meetings begin at 8:30 and end at 5:00, so we're not overloaded and staff is not overloaded. We will send a letter to NMFS with the recommendations of what regulations we want to have removed. We talked again about we directed staff to develop a specific process and date for committee chairs to review agendas and committees and to prepare comment letters, as indicated, on the CCC report, and I think -- Did we have something else for our list of stuff? We have stuff that Jessica added, and so we would make a motion to adopt the following timing and tasks, as modified, on our board.

DR. DUVAL: I am happy to make that motion, but, before I do, just clarify in that list that Item (c) under Item 2, the Snapper Grouper red grouper rebuilding, just adding that phrase that's in the list above that the public hearing would be in September, and that's all. **Mr. Chairman, I am happy to make that motion.**

MR. PHILLIPS: Do I have a second? It's seconded by Jessica. Is there discussion? **Do we have any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

I think that concludes the Executive Finance Report. Then we will move back to Ben and Mackerel.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Charlie. I appreciate that. The Mackerel Committee met yesterday afternoon. After we approved the minutes and the agenda, we went into the status of commercial and recreational catches from SERO, and we also -- The next item was the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel Report from Ira, which was really good, because we had a great AP meeting and a lot of people came to that meeting.

The one thing I would say is that there were a number of items that came up in Other Business under Mackerel, and it's clear that we need to go into mackerel and have like a mini-visioning thing sometime in the future, and I know what's on your agenda now, but sometime as we go along, and both North Carolina -- Well, all the states in particular, but it's primarily a North Carolina and Florida fishery, and the fishermen have some ideas now that they would like to see, and it would be great to formally -- I know we've talked with Christina, but formally go through an abbreviated process of how we may address mackerel issues, and it was interesting that king mackerel is the single-most valuable species from Mr. Hadley's report, and so it was the number-one species, at least from the species perspective.

The next item of business was Coastal Migratory Amendment 31, the Atlantic cobia management, and we had a discussion on that. **The motion that came out of that discussion was to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 31 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. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any more discussion on that amendment?

DR. DUVAL: It's a roll call.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, it's a roll call.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: No.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: No.

MR. WAUGH: **It passes with two no votes.**

MR. HARTIG: All right. The next item of business was king mackerel tournament sales and MRIP estimates, and what came out of that research was that catch from tournaments is identified on both commercial dealer reports and MRIP APAIS survey reports. Landings from tournaments are counted against the recreational ACL. Commercial dealer reports indicating tournament catch are removed and not counted against the commercial ACL. That was interesting, and it's something that we've had questions on for quite a long time, and we found out the determination on how those are dealt with.

The next item was Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 6, the Atlantic king mackerel trip limits. The following motion came out of that discussion. **That is to approve the IPT's recommended changes to the purpose and need.** On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The next motion out of that was to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 6 for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

There is a timing and tasks motion at the end of our committee report, and the timing and tasks motion was to adopt the following timing and tasks: 1) prepare Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 6 for public hearings and for the September 2018 council meeting; 2) upon approval by the Gulf Council, prepare Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 31 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce. Would someone like to make that motion?

MR. HAYMANS: **So moved.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Doug and second by Michelle. Is there discussion on the timing and tasks? **Is there any objection to that? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

That concludes the committee report. However, I would like to have a little bit of time to talk about some of the things that I neglected to mention at hospitality, which so graciously -- We really appreciate that, the Monday night. That was really cool, and it was a lot of fun, and the first thing I would like to say is I would like to thank staff for their colorful, tropical ensembles today. I mean, it's very cool to see that, and I really appreciate that.

The other thing that I neglected to mention on Monday night was the people that I get to meet in this process, and, I mean, that's probably the biggest success story that you get to enjoy in this process, is to meet these different people, from the agencies, from the CCC meetings, the fishermen themselves. I mean, I can't tell you how many lifelong friendships, through these different groups, that I have been able to develop over time, and it's really been rewarding for me to be able to deal with the people part of this process, and the other part is, frankly, as a fisherman, coming to this council, the things you're allowed to do over and above what I would have ever been able to do as a commercial fisherman, to get to places, to get to NMFS hierarchy and meet the people that were -- Where these big decisions are made.

I mean, that wouldn't happen without being involved in this process, and so I'm very thankful for the opportunity that's been provided to me over the years to be able to do that, and I'm going to miss you all. I'm going to miss you all at the table, but I'm not going very far, and so I'm still involved in the fisheries, and I'm still going to be giving you all input from the other side, and I'm still going to be grinding my teeth now when I'm in the audience listening to the discussions, because that happened before, but I very much appreciate the opportunity and you all, for sure, and so thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Ben, and obviously I won't be here either, but I have an idea that we will stay in touch. We're going to do Spiny Lobster and then Law Enforcement and then we're going to come back and do Mark's Citizen Science.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Spiny Lobster Committee met on June 11. We approved the minutes from the March meeting and the agenda. Then we talked about the catches versus the ACLs and gave direction to staff to note years with hurricane activity occurring during the spiny lobster season.

We got a Spiny Lobster AP report, and then we went into Spiny Lobster Amendment 13. **The first motion the committee made was to select Alternative 2 under Action 1 as the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Then the committee made a motion, under Action 2, to select Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee also made a motion to select Alternative 1, no action, under Action 3 as the preferred, with the intent to move to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee also made a motion to move Action 4 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee also made a motion to select Alternative 2 under Action 5 as the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? All right.

There was also direction to delete the two highlighted portions from that procedure and protocol document and direction to remove an additional bullet point from the protocol. **The committee made a motion to approve Spiny Lobster Amendment 13 for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion here? We've already had a lengthy discussion about this at Executive Finance. Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The committee also has -- There is a timing and tasks that's made that would be to prepare the spiny lobster amendment for web-based public hearings and for the September council meeting, and I think we decided to not do those web-based public hearings. We're not going to hold webinars, and so we're strictly going to do this at the September council meeting itself, and then another one of our timing and task pieces is to revise the language for the enhanced cooperative management protocol and procedure, as directed. Then, of course, this is going to the Gulf next before it comes back to us, and so I am looking to someone to make a modified timing and tasks motion.

MR. HARTIG: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Motion by Ben and seconded by Doug. Any more discussion of the timing and tasks here? Any objection to the timing and tasks? **Seeing none, that timing and tasks motion is approved.** That concludes my committee report.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. That takes care of your report, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you very much. Mel.

MR. BELL: I will be giving the Law Enforcement Committee Report. The committee met on June 11. The first item of business was selection of the 2017 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year, which we accomplished. That award will be given in September at the council meeting in Charleston.

Then we had a summary of the Law Enforcement AP meeting from April, and that was provided by Captain Bob Lynn. I won't go into other details of that, but the highlights are that I think that one of the good things that came out of that is that I think the AP would like to meet twice a year, however we can make that happen, and that would be a good thing to have law enforcement have visibility into what we're doing twice a year, rather than once, through that group.

We mentioned our efforts to try and see if there was interest in the operator card beyond the discussions we were having from the other -- At least interest from the other councils related to standardization or revising the system, and I don't think we've really heard back from anybody on that, to date.

There was discussion of just other things at the AP meeting, but one of the things that did come up was just some comments from law enforcement on enforceability, and so, any time we consider stuff, we need practically about enforceability, and that might be a good thing to have them kind of give us some feedback a couple of times a year rather than once.

We had some discussion about VMS and whether or not it could be used in the sense of a penalty-type thing, and Karen Raine from NOAA General Counsel provided us some feedback on that. Then I would also mention that, at the meeting in April, there was a Coast Guard officer from Sector Charleston, and they're getting input on issues and priorities, and then also we had some discussion of just how priorities are set for the Coast Guard or NOAA OLE. I think the two of those groups communicate, and they should continue to, and perhaps there is ways of improving communication there or setting priorities and all, but some discussion of that, and Tracy Dunn is here from NOAA OLE. Really, that's it. There were no motions made, and so, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mel, for a very efficient report. Now we're going to move to Mark and Citizen Science, if you're ready.

MR. BROWN: The Citizen Science Committee met here at this meeting and approved the June 2018 Citizen Science Committee meeting agenda and the minutes from the March 2018 meeting. The Committee discussed the establishment of the Citizen Science Operations Committee and recommendations for appointments to the committee. The following appointment motions were made.

Motion Number 1 is move to appoint the following individuals to the Citizen Science Operations Committee: Holly Abeels, Scott Baker, Brett Fitzgerald, Bob Lorenz, Jack McGovern, Marcel Reichert, a designee from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. On behalf of this committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objections? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion Number 2 is move to appoint Dr. Michelle Duval to the Citizen Science Operations Committee, pending her completion of duties with the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. On behalf of this committee, I so move. Is there any discussions on this? Is there any objections? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee received an overview of the structure and function of the Citizen Science Program and were proposed to include the Action Teams, Advisory Committee, Operations Committee, and Program Oversight Board. The Citizen Science Advisory Panel Pool and associated five Action Teams have been working since August of 2017 and the program components associated with Projects/Topics Management, Data Management, Finance & Infrastructure, Volunteers, and Communication/Outreach/Education.

The recommendations being developed by the Action Teams will be used to create Standard Operating Policies & Procedures for the Citizen Science Program. The Action Teams and other advisors from the council's SSC, SERO, and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center will be appointed and serve on the Operations Committee. The anticipated timeline of SOPPS development is for the council to review a draft in September 2018 and adopt by December of 2018.

Staff presented the draft citizen science research priorities that are being considered for the Citizen Science Program and some 2018 to 2022 research and monitoring plans with draft priorities and developed in coordination with the Action Teams and reviewed by the Snapper Grouper and Mackerel Cobia APs. The committee provided feedback on the topics under consideration to include suggestions for additional topics, additional species to consider for each topic, and suggestions for potential partners.

Feedback on the topics were such as age sampling, maturity data, discard information, genetic sampling, and monitoring in the managed areas. There was also some feedback to add a bullet for potential partners, such as researchers, agency staff, and fishermen that are involved with research for each particular topic. The suggestion also was made to include fish tagging efforts as another tool for citizen science projects to collect data for specific research questions.

Potential partner suggestions also were Barbara Blake, a North-Carolina-based researcher that would be a good point of contact for the socioeconomic for fishing infrastructure, historic photos, and oral histories.

The committee received an update from the staff about the work of the Action Teams, including the products and materials produced by the teams for both the development of the program and the scamp pilot project. The teams are developing plans for data management, communication, and volunteer training for the project. The committee asked how the program would approach partnerships for projects. Staff discussed the research and suggestions from the Finance & Infrastructure Action Team about the need to identify other programs, agencies, or organizations with goals, objectives, and research interests that align with the council's program and approach partnerships based on a mutually beneficial relationship. There was no further business that was brought before this committee, and no additional motions were made, and that concludes my report.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mark. We are going to do the SSC Selection Committee, which is me. The SSC Selection Committee approved the minutes of the June 2017 meeting and agenda. We had SSC reappointments, and the council staff presented the members who were up for reappointment for another three-year term, and these applicants were discussed by the committee.

We had some new applicants. The council presented the applicants for the open seats created by those SSC members who had decided not to reapply for another term, and there three open seats to be filled. These seats included the North Carolina state representative seat, a socioeconomic seat, and an open seat. The applicants were discussed by the committee. After much discussion, the committee decided not to fill the one open seat available on the SSC at this time.

The first motion is to reappoint Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Dr. Alexei Sharov, and Dr. Fred Serchuk to the SSC for another term. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.

Motion 2 is appoint Dr. Yan Li to the SSC for the North Carolina DMF seat. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.

Motion Number 3 is appoint Dr. Chris Dumas to the SSC. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any opposition? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, that motion was approved.

Then that leads us to timing and tasks, and we have a draft motion for timing and tasks, I think, and so would anybody like to make that motion?

MR. HARTIG: **So moved.**

MR. PHILLIPS: Ben makes the motion to adopt the timing and tasks as listed. Do I have a second? Second by Michelle. Any discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

That concludes the SSC Report. Because the ABC Committee met as a committee of the whole, we won't really have a report, but we do have some timing and tasks, and so, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to go through the ABC Control Rule report, but I am going to straight to the timing and tasks motion. **The items under timing and tasks are to incorporate the council's recommendations for the ABC control rule document and prepare for scoping and conduct scoping between the September and December 2018 council meetings; request that the SSC develop initial stock risk ratings at its October 2018 meeting; review scoping comments and SSC recommendations in December; and consider timing and future development of the recreational accountability measures during Executive Finance in September 2018.** Based on all this, the committee would not need to meet in September. Would someone like to make that motion?

MR. HARTIG: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second by Ben and seconded by Michelle. Is there any discussion on this timing and tasks? **Any objection to the timing and tasks? Seeing none, that motion stands approved, and that concludes my report.**

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Having a committee of the whole makes things a little faster sometimes. All right. The next committee is the SEDAR Committee, and my draft report is not coming up on my laptop, and so I can read it from the screen right here. The council approved the minutes from the March 2018 meeting and the agenda. Then we have our SEDAR appointments. The committee convened during closed session to address appointments for the cobia and yellowtail assessments.

Motion 1 is move to appoint the participants to SEDAR 64 as listed in the table, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? The motion carries.

Motion 2 is move to appoint Manny Herrera to the SEDAR AP. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Motion 3 is move to appoint participants to SEDAR 58 as listed in the table. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Motion 4 is move to appoint Anne Lange to the Cobia Stock ID Technical Review Panel, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Motion 5 is move to appoint Jack Cox, Bobby Freeman, Kenny Fex, and Ben Hartig as observers to the red porgy assessment. On behalf of the committee, I so move.

MR. HARTIG: You had Ritchie Gomez, and he was from Key West, and so Ritchie happened to be in the audience today, and I want to comment on Ritchie wants to participate a lot more in the process. He's in business, but he's selling his business, and he's very interested, and that was shown by his ability to be in the meeting most of the week, and so I talked to Richie, and I asked him about the importance of red porgy in Key West, because I certainly didn't want to bump someone from the Keys who actually interacted with that species, and they don't interact in any big way with red porgy in the Keys is what he told me, and it's just that he wants to be more involved in the process, and so I talked to John, and, down the line, when we get species that Ritchie is familiar with and has input to give, it would be good to include Ritchie, because he does want to participate. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks. Any other discussion? **On behalf of the committee, I moved it, and we've had discussion, and is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

Motion 6 is move to appoint Kenny Fex and Ben Hartig to the SEDAR AP. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.

Then we have SEDAR approvals, and the committee reviewed project schedules and terms of reference for the cobia and yellowtail snapper assessments, and the committee provided some modification to the cobia TORs, as noted in the motions, and approved the project schedules and TORs.

Motion 7 is add the yellowtail snapper data workshop Terms of Reference 7 and 8 to the cobia data workshop and indicate why to the cobia data workshop TOR 4, Bullet 6, and approve the TORs for the cobia as modified. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.

Motion 8 is move to approve the TORs for yellowtail snapper SEDAR 64, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion passes.

Motion 9 is move to approve the schedules for SEDAR 58 and 64. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Then we had an assessment projects update, and the council staff provided an update of SEDAR projects that are underway. The impacts of the revised MRIP data and the adjustments to be applied by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center for weight estimates and the charter vessel survey were highlighted. Providing the revised assessments of black sea bass, red grouper, vermilion snapper, and blueline tilefish for SSC review in October 2018 is a priority.

The SEDAR Steering Committee, the council staff gave an overview of the May 14 and 15 SEDAR Steering Committee meeting. The Steering Committee provided guidance on the research track approach and the scamp research track pilot. It was noted that future scheduling efforts will more explicitly address data preparation bottlenecks. I guess that's it, and that concludes my report, and so we will go to the Habitat Report.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Habitat Protection and Ecosystem Based Management Committee met on June 11 in Fort Lauderdale. Council staff provided a summary of the May meeting of the advisory panel, including the following topics: spatial presentation of habitat and ecosystem conservation in FEP II Dashboard, regional fishery independent research and data supporting EBFM and the developing Ecopath model, NOAA Fisheries key milestones supporting EBFM in the South Atlantic Region, including a South Atlantic Ecosystem Status Report, multispecies/aggregate production modeling, community vulnerability analysis for the South Atlantic, a multispecies climate vulnerability analysis, and supporting council-led ecosystem-related activities, including implementation of the council FEP II and ecosystem modeling activities.

In addition, facilitated sessions conducted during the panel meeting resulted in completing development of a habitat policy/threat matrix for inclusion into the FEP II Dashboard, identifying fishery monitoring and research needs for integration into strategic plans supporting SECOORA, and input on BOEM's request for feedback on the Path Forward for Renewable Energy on the Atlantic.

The FEP II Dashboard was updated to include the approved FEP II Implementation Plan and Roadmap and outstanding habitat sections approved at the March 2018 meeting. In addition, two new web services developed by FWRI, the South Atlantic Artificial Reefs Viewer and the ACCSP data, will go online following the June Council meeting. The South Atlantic Ecopath model, funded by SALCC, is on track to be completed in advance of the fall SSC meeting. In addition, there were three timing and task items, and I would appreciate a motion to accept those.

MR. PHILLIPS: **So moved.**

MR. HAYMANS: Motion by Charlie and seconded by Michelle. Is there any discussion on those? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, is there anything additional to come before this committee?**

Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report. I have one more thing. The advisory panel also elected Anne Deaton from North Carolina DMF as their new Chair and Cindy Cooksey, NOAA Fisheries, SERO Habitat Conservation Division, as their new Vice Chair, and that concludes my report.

MR. PHILLIPS: It concludes a very efficient report. Thank you. I think, behind that, we're going to have the Joint Habitat/Shrimp/Golden Crab Committee, and do you want me to do that, Doug, or do you want to do it? Are you pointing at me? I think you are. That's what I thought. All right.

The committee met and saw the Coral and Shrimp and Golden Crab Advisory Panel Meeting Reports. The Golden Crab and Shrimp Advisory Panel report included discussion of the options paper for Coral Amendment 10, Golden Crab Amendment 10, and Shrimp Amendment 11, regulations recommended for removal, and deep-sea research. The Coral AP report included discussion of the options paper for Coral Amendment 10, Golden Crab Amendment 10, and Shrimp Amendment 11. They also talked about coral disease off southern Florida, Southeast Florida Coral Reef Ecosystem Conservation Area, deep-sea research, and regulations recommended for removal.

Council staff presented a draft options paper for Coral Amendment 10, Golden Crab Amendment 10, and Shrimp Amendment 11. After background was provided, Howard Rau, a commercial golden crab fisherman, provided a description of how the fishery operates. The committee discussed the actions and alternatives and provided the following comments to add sub-alternatives for 1,600 to 1,900 feet and 1,600 to 2,400 feet under the alternative for depths, which is Alternative 3, of the action to consider adjusting the golden crab access areas in the Stetson Miami Coral Habitat Area of Particular Concern; consider the ecosystem importance of the nursery habitat function of sand habitat adjacent to coral habitats; and provide background on previous council rationale for creating access areas or closed areas. The committee approved the following motion.

The motion is to approve Joint Coral Amendment 10, Golden Crab Amendment 10, and Shrimp Amendment 11 for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Under Other Business, the Okeanos Explorer is conducting research in the South Atlantic region from June 13 through July 2. The ship offers live stream to remotely operated vehicles when

operating, and we've seen some of these on the board, and there is your link, and so that should be really nice stuff to look at.

Note that the council staff drafts the timing and task motion based on committee action. If points require clarification -- All right. We have a draft timing and tasks. Would somebody like to make that motion?

MR. HARTIG: **So moved.**

MR. PHILLIPS: Motion by Ben and seconded by Michelle. Is there any discussion on the draft timing and tasks? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, the draft timing and tasks is approved.** That concludes that report. Last, but not least, is Anna with HMS.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Highly Migratory Species Committee met on June 13. The committee approved the minutes from the June 2017 meeting and the agenda. We first discussed incorporating Spawning Special Management Zones into the highly migratory species bottom longline regulations.

Specifically, we reviewed a white paper focused on two main topics, one being the potential for shark bottom longline gear to be fished in some of our SMZs and the other topic covered a discrepancy between the specified coordinates listed in the snapper grouper and HMS regulations for the Charleston Deep Artificial Reef Site.

Members noted that bottom longline gear is not a compatible gear for use in our spawning SMZs and that the coordinates for the Charleston Deep Artificial Reef Site needed to be aligned in federal regulations. We made one motion.

The motion is as follows, to send a comment letter to HMS to include bottom longline gear restrictions in spawning SMZ sites and update coordinates for the Charleston Deep Artificial Reef MPA Site. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

Under Other Business, we did have some additional discussion about a previous approval by NOAA Fisheries of an exempted fishing permit. There was one motion put forth, and it did fail, and I am looking around to see if that needs to come up for discussion again.

MR. BREWER: I would like to re-make that motion with a slight modification. **The prior motion was that the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council send a letter to Chris Oliver with a copy to Wilbur Ross stating that the SAFMC did not take a position on the Kerstetter/Dayboat EFP to longline in the conservation area off of the east coast of Florida, and I would like to change that a little bit to did not take a position, but rather express concerns regarding the Kerstetter/Dayboat EFP.**

We went through all of that, and everybody, I think, was in the room, and so I'm not going to take up a bunch of time, but I do think that it is important though that the record be straight, because there is information going around out there, both in writing and verbally, as to what the position of this council was, and that's the reason that I made the motion, and I think we ought to send a letter, and if I can get a second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I will second it.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. We have a second by Jessica. Is there discussion?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: **Do you think that you might want to add in there “pelagic longline”, ahead of “longline”, just to be distinct on what gear you’re talking about, in case they get confused up there?**

MR. BREWER: Yes, it is -- I am talking about pelagic longline, and this is not state boats, or sometimes you all refer to them as council boats. Do you want to put “pelagic” in there? Dewey, is that what you want to do, is to put “pelagic” --

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I think it just helps you perfect your motion there a little bit better, describing what gear you’re talking about.

MR. BREWER: **I have no objection whatsoever to that addition.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so the motion has been made and seconded by Jessica. Is there any additional discussion on the motion? Okay. **All those in favor of this motion, please raise your hand, eight in favor; all those opposed, one in opposition. The motion passes.** Is there any other business? Seeing none, that concludes the committee report.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Anna. Very well done. We will make a note that we -- Since the SOPPs Committee did not meet, there is no report.

MS. BECKWITH: Sorry. Let’s go back and make the timing and tasks motion, which will now include a second letter, and so we have a draft motion to direct staff to do the following, and one was to send the letter to the HMS, and then we would have to add this additional letter. Can I get someone to make that motion, please?

DR. DUVAL: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Motion by Michelle and seconded by Doug. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, now that concludes my report.** Sorry, boss.

MR. PHILLIPS: That’s all right. Okay. I think that brings us to liaison reports, and I think we will start with Michelle and just work down the coast.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of things. It’s been a pretty active legislative session in North Carolina thus far, even though it is the short session. There’s been a lot of activity on the aquaculture front, as I have alluded to previously, and so this is probably not the last time that we hear about it, and it mostly pertains to inshore efforts, with a lot of proposed modifications to how the state issues shellfish leases, and so we have had some fisheries legislation introduced that would look at modification to how commercial licenses are issued. It doesn’t seem like there is going to be any additional movement or conclusion to that particular legislation. I think folks are probably pretty anxious to get out of town.

I did want to thank everybody for your hospitality this week in regard to Steve Murphy, who is our new Marine Fisheries Director, and I say new, and he's about six months in, but he really appreciated the opportunity to come to this meeting and meet everybody and listen to this process and see how we do things down here in the South Atlantic.

Then, finally, I am very pleased to report to you all my replacement here at the table, and so, as I think I had indicated to some folks, there had been a little bit of a delay in the hiring process, just due to the state's new job classification system rolling out, but I am very pleased to announce that Steve Poland will be the new North Carolina designee.

Steve is known to some of the staff folks. He was the division's participant at the SEDAR 58 cobia stock ID workshop, and Steve is a very talented guy, and I think he's going to fit in really well around this table. I will be working with him to bring him up to speed on the council's activities, and I know that everyone here is going to make him feel very welcome, and so he's gotten his slice of the council experience, as it has been through cobia, and so I think that sets him up well here to sit at this table, and so I really appreciate everything. My email address will be active through the end of the month, and so Steve and I will be working to hand things off to one another, and feel free to contact me with anything. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's been a pleasure to see you guys all one more time.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Michelle, and we will ease down to South Carolina.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I mentioned yesterday that our General Assembly put into law the federal regulations pertaining to cobia, and so that would help with the transition from shifting to current management over to the ASMFC, and so we're good there, and we do appreciate them doing that in a timely manner for us.

The other big thing for us this year that this group would be interested in, of course, is our shrimp fishery, and we were able to use the authority we had, the system and process we had, from the shrimp plan to request that the National Marine Fisheries Service close the fishery to shrimp trawling off of South Carolina federal waters, and that was extremely necessary this year, as, by the time we started our monitoring in January, we were at a 99 percent reduction of our overwintering white shrimp, and so twenty-one sustained days of water temperatures below the nine-degree threshold really took a toll, and so we really needed to close, and close quickly, and I do thank Roy and Jack and Rick and everybody that helped us facilitate that quick closure, and so the good news, I guess, now is that we've now also facilitated a reopening, and we do appreciate that.

We reopened on I guess it was Wednesday, but we do have some white shrimp out there, and so it became extremely important to save what we did have, and I think the only shrimp that we did have, in terms of coming into the spawn this year, were probably shrimp that had managed to escape out into federal waters and survive, and so it was very beneficial to save them, and even through our June sampling efforts inshore, we were still at a very, very low level, but I think we have now experienced an adequate spawn of the white shrimp we do have, and so we made a decision yesterday to open our state waters concurrently with Georgia on the 19th of June, hopefully. That's made my phone stop ringing, apparently, but it was ringing a lot yesterday.

Another item is, and it was mentioned, I think, at some point, is our Research Vessel Lady Lisa, which is the vessel that we do all of the SEAMAP work off of, and some MARMAP work, occasionally, but she's an older shrimp boat. It's forty years old now, and she's going to need replacing in the next three to five years, we figure.

Hopefully it will last that long, but she's a wooden boat, and wooden boats are hard to maintain, and we've gotten a lot of work out of her, and so that's just something to think about, in terms of supporting continuing work for SEAMAP and pieces of MARMAP down the line, and that's something we're going to have to deal with, and maybe we should start a Go Fund Me site or something, or pass the hat, but that will be coming up. That's really all I have to report that's of interest to this group.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Mel. We'll ease on down to Brother Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Brother Charlie. Echoing Mel's comments, thank you to the SERO staff for the quick and efficient processing of both the request for closure and then the request for reopening within -- I think it was within forty-eight hours of each request that we had them in place, and so thank you, guys, for doing that.

Because of it though, now we have -- I'm sure Mel is going to be getting it too, but we have requests from multiple communities for assistance in declaring fishery failures and disaster declarations, so that they can get Congress to appropriate dollars, which at least in Georgia's experience has not been very successful, and there is some debate on how we go about doing that. The threshold is 35 percent before NMFS will really even think about it, and we're right at the cusp of that threshold. Anyway, long story short, the saga continues on the shrimp season.

The only other piece of information that I will provide, and it's something that you all probably already know, but longtime Georgia DNR employee and SSC member Carolyn Belcher has been promoted to our Chief of Fisheries, effective May 1, and so she's getting her feet under her and getting moving. I have all but begged her to take this seat, but she really wants to stay on the SSC, and I can't imagine why, but, anyway, Carolyn will be even more engaged in the council process than she has been in the past. That's all I would bring to you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Doug.

MR. HARTIG: Not pertinent to Doug's discussion, but Mel's discussion, when he mentioned SEAMAP, and there was a SEAMAP presentation at the advisory panel, at the Mackerel Advisory Panel, which showed the recruitment index for king mackerel, and it showed exactly what the fishermen have seen over the last about five years, that there has been recruitment every year, and so it was interesting to see that those two observations meshed. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Ben. Then we'll move down to the Sunshine State.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I have three items to report. The first is our commission took up the issue of whether or not to harvest goliath grouper at their last commission meeting, and you can tune in. In fact, you can go back and watch the recording if you would like to see it, but they ultimately decided that, no, they did not want to pursue a harvest at this time, but they did direct staff to come back with maybe some additional management metrics for state waters and what

would be needed to declare success in the future, so that state waters could possibly be opened to goliath harvest. We were directed to bring that back before the end of the calendar year, and I suspect it will come to the December commission meeting.

The commission also, at that same meeting, took a lot of public comment on an issue that's become a hot topic for Florida, which is shore-based shark fishing, and so they took multiple hours of testimony on that, and the commission will be doing a number of workshops this fall and pursuing some type of permitting system for likely individuals and tournaments in the shore-based shark fishing realm.

We currently do not have a specific permit that you have to have in order to do shore-based shark fishing. In addition, we're working on some best practices. We have something that we call shark smart handling guidelines that we're working on, and a lot of it had to do with how people are handling prohibited species when they are doing shore-based shark fishing.

Then, finally, also, at the last commission meeting, the commission finally took final action on extending the sheepshead and tripletail regulations into federal waters, and so sheepshead was removed from the FMP a number of years ago, and FWC said that they were going to make regulations in federal waters. After a year-plus of gathering stakeholder input on both of these species and then multiple commission meetings, they finally completed that action, and so both of those regulations are extended into federal waters.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you very much. We will move on around to the Gulf and Dale.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our staff did put together a lengthy report, but we have covered the vast majority of it. There is only a few items that I want to touch on. For recreational red snapper seasons, the federally-permitted for-hire season is fifty-one days in 2018, and that started on June 1. For private recreational anglers, NOAA Fisheries has issued exempted fishing permits, which allows each of the five Gulf states to set its own season for red snapper in state and federal waters during 2018 and 2019.

When fishing for red snapper in federal waters, private anglers will need the appropriate permit or license for the state in which they wish to land, and that state's season in federal waters must be open. Anglers can fish anywhere in federal waters, including federal waters off of states with closed seasons. If the season for the state where they intend to land is open, private anglers must abide by all other requirements for landing red snapper in state waters and follow federal bag limits of two fish per person and federal minimum size limits of sixteen inches total length for red snapper taken from federal waters.

All states except Texas have a minimum size limit of sixteen inches total length for state-water-caught red snapper. The minimum size limit in Texas is fifteen inches. State-licensed for-hire vessels without a federal Gulf charter/headboat permit for reef fish may not fish for or possess red snapper in federal waters.

All of the five states right now currently have open a red snapper season. Each one of the states has set a season that best fits the needs for their states, and the seasons vary in length, and some states chose to do weekends only. As far as state management programs for recreational red snapper, this is something long-term that we're working on. The council continues to work on a

series of documents that will enable each Gulf state to manage its recreational harvest of red snapper in federal waters, and we plan to continue working on those documents at every meeting for the near-term.

Coral and habitat, the council reviewed a public hearing draft of Coral Amendment 9, which considers creating and protecting fifteen areas in the Gulf that are known to have an abundance or high diversity of corals that make them unique and sensitive to human impacts. These fifteen areas may have fishing regulations associated with them. The amendment also considers designating an additional eight new areas for habitat areas of particular concern, HAPC, status without fishing regulations.

The council heard recommendations from its science advisors and the Scientific and Statistical Committee and added a new preferred alternative that would establish an HAPC without fishing regulations named the West Florida Wall. The council plans to host public hearings on Amendment 9 before taking final action on Coral Amendment 9 at the next meeting.

For shrimp, the council heard an update on the stock assessment for pink, brown, and white shrimp. All stocks are healthy, are not overfished, nor experiencing overfishing. We had two exempted fishing permits come before the council at our last meeting, and the first requested authorization for exploratory fishing for two years to test a small-scale fishery for golden crab, to see if it would be viable in the Gulf of Mexico. The council chose to recommend to NOAA to approve the permit and request that traps not be set near coral or that traps be placed in depths that will conflict with royal red shrimping grounds.

The second permit request sought authorization to test the viability of a small-scale aquaculture cage array to raise albacore jacks for two years. The council chose to recommend that NOAA Fisheries Service approve the permit and asked that the council concerns relative to impacts of hurricanes, cage lighting, baseline benthic substrate assessments, genetic testing, and the potential for biofouling be considered.

That concludes my official report. I do want to wish Zack and Ben and Charlie and Michelle good luck, and I would like to say that I am a better council member for having been able to serve with all four of you all. I think you all have been a good example for me, and I thank you for that.

I want to wrap thing up, but I have to pick on Charlie just a little bit before I close out. In my mind, Charlie has always been you all's council king of idioms, and "the way to run the rabbit" has kept him on top the whole time. I am sad to say that at Charlie's last meeting he has been dethroned. Mel came up with this thing about this is like smacking a hornet's nest, and that took him right off the top. I do keep up with idioms at our meetings and at you all's, and you all have some colorful sayings. Thank you, all.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Dale, and, if you didn't notice, I am wearing a shirt with whales on it because it's just been a whale of a time being here.

MR. DIAZ: That's another one. I've got to put it on my list.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Jack, I think I will let you go.

DR. MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have -- I think we have covered most everything for this meeting, but I also wanted to take the opportunity to thank Zack and Ben and Charlie and Michelle for their service on the council. All four of you have been engaged and constructive, and you've been kind always to each other, which I think is the personality of this council, and you've been really great council members, and so I wanted to thank you on behalf of the Southeast Regional Office for your time.

I also wanted to thank Gregg and Brian for allowing us to do the face-to-face with our staffs this week. I think that was a really good thing for both our staff in the Region and the council staff to meet, and I agree that we should try to do it every year at the Florida meeting, just as long as we can afford to do it, and so thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Jack. I talked to Gregg earlier today. After the public hearing, just sitting and listening to people, and you pick tidbits out here and there, and it's just so incredibly important to be able to interact, and you get a lot with webinars, and you can get a lot of bang for your buck, but these personal talk to people and get to know them meetings are just priceless, and so thanks a lot, and it's really been good working with you, and I still have your number, and I may be calling and asking questions. Erik, I am guessing that you're going to do the Science Center report?

DR. WILLIAMS: Actually, I don't have anything.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Then I have something for you. We really enjoyed Clay being here, and I have enjoyed working with him the short time that I've been here, and I know the council is going to really enjoy working with him in the future, as you all work with your operational assessments and all the other things, and so I will say that on behalf of the council. We are thrilled to have him onboard, and, since he snuck out before we could tell him, please pass that along to him.

Then we will ease up to the Coast Guard and Lieutenant Fair. I forgot to welcome you properly, and so I'm going to do it at this late date, and they're used to me forgetting stuff, and so don't feel like it's out of the ordinary, and so what do you have for us?

LT. FAIR: Thank you, sir. Just, on behalf of the Coast Guard, thank you for letting us participate. I know usually there is a different face every time sitting in this seat, and the continuity is not that great, and that is something that we are sensitive to, and it's been a discussion at the district office, and so, as these discussions happen, it's very hard to be behind the power curve and figure out -- Just play that catch-up game. We're looking at trying to implement a little bit more consistency and not have this be just a collateral duty, but somebody to have more of an involved role and see more of a consistent face on a regular basis, and so thank you very much.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, and we know that we give you regulations and you say, what did they tell us to do? We know that, and we appreciate you -- We do appreciate what you do. Wilson is not here, and so we're not going to have a Fish and Wildlife report. The next thing would be our Department of State, but Mark has a plane to catch, and so does Michelle and I think Mel, but I am going to let Mark say a couple of words about some upcoming meetings, and then we will circle back around.

MR. BROWN: At the September meeting, we've got planned to have a private recreational workshop, and this workshop is to try to help develop some ideas for the future, for creating some private recreational reporting and some accountability and see if we can't figure out -- We've got some organizations that are going to be present there that are going to be associated with this, and so it will give us a chance to be able to reach out a little bit more to the public.

MR. WAUGH: We will get out something in the next couple of weeks in a little more detail, but this will be optional for council members to attend, and it will be on Sunday afternoon and Monday morning, and it's working with ASA, and they are going to contract with Kari MacLauchlin to facilitate that and do some additional workshops, but we'll get some details out to you in the next couple of weeks.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Mark and Gregg. All right. Then I think next we have Deidre Warner-Kramer from the State Department, and we are privileged to have you. We don't get such high-ranking people to come visit us very often, and I think you have a presentation for us, and so do you want to work it from up here, or what would be your pleasure?

MS. DEIDRE WARNER-KRAMER: Just to save time, why don't I stay here? It's a pretty short presentation. It's mostly just some pictures, and so I can talk it through here. I appreciate your kind words, and I'm not that high-ranking. Technically, I should have been here long, long ago, and so I'm really happy that I have finally made it to my first South Atlantic Council meeting and I'm not just giving all the love to the Mid-Atlantic and the New England folks.

One of the reasons that I haven't come here so much is that there haven't been as many international issues involving this particular council, but the reason I'm here today is because there is something coming up in the future that may change that, and so you may be seeing more of me. What I wanted to talk to you about is a process that is getting underway with a whole lot of questions, and so this is the key thing, is to come here first and let folks know what is happening and make sure that we can be getting a good amount of input and feedback from stakeholders in what this might look like in the future.

As many of you probably know, the world, over the last twenty-five years, has been covered in an alphabet soup of international organizations that deal with shared fisheries. Some of them are formal regional fisheries management organizations, like ICCAT, that bring countries together so that they can agree to legally-binding measures for how we will manage and share fisheries out on the high seas or that either straddle into or move in and out of our zones.

Some of them are science organizations, and some of them fall under the umbrella of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization as advisory bodies, and they bring together all of the countries in a given region to share information on science and on fisheries, but, at the end of the day, they can't develop any binding rules. They can only develop recommendations that countries then can go home and implement or not.

One of those bodies is the Western and Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission. The U.S. is a member of this, as are all of the countries in the wider Caribbean, stretching down to Brazil, and it covers the regions out into the middle Atlantic and up to the Mid-Atlantic, off of Cape Hatteras. Where it stops is basically the boundary of one of those regional fisheries management organizations called NAFO, which is the U.S. is a member of and can develop binding

conservation and management rules, but doesn't really pay attention to anything outside of the Grand Banks. It also then covers down to basically the point of Brazil, where it stretches to the east and a little bit to the south.

This organization has existed for quite some time, and it has been reasonably effective back and forth for bringing together the countries to do information sharing and cooperative science and a number of different things, but there are no mechanisms in this region for dealing with the transboundary resources that exist, other than the highly migratory species that fall under ICCAT's management authority.

The U.S. and a few countries in the region have been saying for quite some time that there could be value in coming up with some kind of mechanism that would deal better with things like spiny lobster and queen conch that are fished throughout this whole area and that don't have any real way to get countries to follow the same rules, and especially where the United States is a major market and has its own strict management measures, and countries in the region aren't always following those, and products can come into our market that are caught in ways that we wouldn't do ourselves. We have tried, over the years, to try to make it a little bit stronger, but it hasn't really done much so far.

The structure of the commission as it exists right now, and this is not for information other than to let you know that the members are the ones who make the decisions on the recommendations at the end of the day, and the FAO, which is the global body that has global expertise and kind of brings together the whole world when it comes to fisheries and aquaculture issues, brings in a lot of technical expertise, and then, underneath it, you have a number of different processes that are looking at different cooperative science and different shared resources and shared interests.

The U.S. has been very actively involved in a number of these, especially these working groups, and the Caribbean Council has been an active partner, because they are, of course, the most directly affected in a number of the things that WECAFC talks about, like conch, lobster, flyingfish, and then a lot of those other issues, including recreational fishing and fighting IUU fishing in the Caribbean region.

Several years ago, the countries of WECAFC got together and agreed that maybe it was time to start looking at whether there was a way to strengthen this regional cooperation, and a lot of questions still remain. If WECAFC is going to eventually morph into a body that can actually develop some binding conservation and management measures for shared resources, one of the first questions is what geographic area will it cover?

Again, the area that is currently under the WECAFC area is huge, and it has a large area that is high seas, but it also has a lot of area that is under different countries' EEZs, including the Gulf of Mexico, which has those two tiny little bits of high seas, but is largely covered by the U.S. and Mexico. One of the key questions will be, whatever this new mechanism might be, what will its geographic scope be? Will it mirror what exists right now? Will it cover only the high-seas areas? Will it bring in some coastal waters, depending on the stocks that are there?

One of the other important things is that a lot of that high-seas area is deep-sea area, which means that there are not a lot of resources that would be fished out there that aren't otherwise covered by ICCAT, but there are some seamount areas, and there are some places where there could be fishing

eventually in the deeper-sea parts of the ocean, and so a lot of questions about the geographic scope.

One of the other key questions is what stocks will it cover? Right now, WECAFC covers an area where there is wide fishing for a whole lot of resources, both things that are done mostly very close to the shore, but also a number that are targeted throughout the whole geographical area, and some of them are primarily targeted by small-scale coastal fishers who are taking them for their own use or for small markets, and some of them are major commercial stocks, and so one of the key questions is what species will be under here?

We know it wouldn't duplicate what ICCAT already has, and so that takes out most of the HMS stocks, but it leaves a whole range of other things and questions on what that would be, and, if you look at the graphs that you have up here, the U.S. is the single largest fisher in that area. Keep in mind that those statistics include the Gulf, and a huge amount of that is shrimp, and so one of the key points that the U.S., I think, is already thinking, going in, is we certainly wouldn't want to keep the Gulf out of this, because those are areas where we have already pretty good management, but then what is left is a lot of what we fish off the coast of Florida, Georgia, the Carolinas, and, of course, the areas in the Caribbean.

The other key thing is whether the whole future of WECAFC will be turning into a full regional fisheries management organization like we have in other cases, or would it be something that would be a little bit different. There are other organizations in the area, and we have already talked about ICCAT, but there are sub-regional organizations, like OSPESCA, which is the Central American countries, CRFM, which is the fisheries branch of CARICOM, which includes most of the English-speaking Caribbean countries, that can already adopt binding conservation and management measures at a sub-regional level.

WECAFC, right now, sort of works to coordinate among all of these, and they can act as sort of the body that develops the general policies that would then get taken to these sub-regional bodies or to ICCAT or would some of that go to WECAFC itself. Right now, there is a process underway, under something called the CLME-Plus Project, and that's the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Project, which is looking at how to improve that coordination between WECAFC as the one place that everybody is and those sub-regional organizations that have different subsets of countries in the wider Caribbean involved. Some of this may just morph into a more structured arrangement, or it may be something brand new.

The main thing is there are huge questions, and it's not even entirely clear what the United States wants to see this process do, but it's certainly not clear what a lot of the other countries in the Caribbean want to do. Most of the small island countries in the Caribbean don't belong to any of these RFMOs. They are not members of ICCAT, and they are not members of NAFO, but some are.

The United States has always been one of the leading countries to push for these sorts of international agreements, largely because we have the best-managed fisheries in the world. We have some of the strongest rules in place in the world, and, where we have fisheries that we are targeting and other countries are targeting, we want them to be held to the same kind of standards that we do, and so we see these regional mechanisms that are established by an international agreement that is a binding treaty that creates a mechanism for us to compel the same kind of good

science and good management that we do at home for the other parts of the fisheries that are outside of our waters.

As a general rule, we would like to see something in place that can help strengthen the regional management in the region, but we don't really know exactly yet what we want that to look like. It will certainly have implications for some straddling stocks, if there are fisheries that would eventually fall under this new mechanism that are fished within the U.S. zone, or it could have implications for that, and we would want to look at that very carefully. It could have resource implications, because, if you start an organization, you've got to start paying dues to it, and that will cost money.

For the small island countries in the Caribbean, they are really focused on the money issue, and they're really focused on that relationship that they have with the Food and Agriculture Organization that provides them a lot of technical assistance and support, and so whatever we see come out of this will probably be a long time coming, and it's going to take a lot of negotiation and a lot of time to work out the details.

Each step along the way, we will be working very closely with stakeholders. The State Department will be leading the negotiations, and I will probably be the lead negotiator on it, but we will be checking back in regularly with the councils and with our HMS team and with lots of others on all of this.

The next clear step is we have to decide whether we want to launch these negotiations or not, and that's something that we will be doing over the next couple of months, basically making an official step to say, yes, we're ready to start negotiating. Then there's going to be a meeting of what's called the reorientation process within WECAFC, and that will basically start to set some terms of what this negotiation might look like, and then WECAFC itself will hold its next meeting, and it meets every two years, with all the parties together, and the U.S. is going to be hosting that probably somewhere around here, sometime early next year, and that will be the trigger that will formally launch this process or not.

Each of those steps along the way, we will be looking for lots of feedback, lots of specifics on issues and concerns and opportunities that the states and the different sectors see for this process and concerns they might have. Then, eventually, we will start some negotiations, which will take years, and then, once we get an agreement, it may take a long time for that to enter into force, and so get used to seeing me. I am going to be back here a lot to talk to you.

Everybody has my contact information, I hope, and I would very much welcome any feedback. Obviously, we're running out of time here to have any discussion now, but any initial thoughts or questions or concerns that folks have, please send them to me right from the start. I would like to know who are the folks that are particularly interested in staying in the loop on this, because we can work through the councils, but also we can make sure that we have the folks that we can reach out to directly in the coming months, as all of this starts to get a little bit more certainty for the future. Thanks very much, and, if there is questions and there is time to take them, I am happy to take them now. Otherwise, I will be here for a little bit after we break, and people can talk to me as well.

MR. BROWN: I have been looking into the FAO, and we had some discussion about it when we were at our last CCC meeting in Alaska, and I have some interest in going to this. The way the councils do this is it's on like a rotation between the east and west coasts, and my understanding is that, for the east coast, our council is up for the rotation for this next year, and so, anyway, what my question was is -- In order to send somebody, this is kind of costly, and so I was wondering if the State Department has funding where they can slip it over to the Commerce Department to send somebody to this?

MS. WARNER-KRAMER: If you're talking about the broad FAO Committee on Fisheries meeting, the FAO Committee on Fisheries, which is the global body that kind of sets the agenda, and it's where we launch the negotiations to the Port State Measures Agreement and a lot of things like that, but it's having its next meeting in July. NOAA reached out to the councils already, and we'll have somebody from the North Pacific Council, I understood was the designee. If there were wires crossed within the councils, you all need to hammer that out, and sorry about that.

The question about funding though is that we do not -- The State Department doesn't fund the participation of anyone other than, obviously, State Department people. NOAA has to pay their own, and the Coast Guard has to pay their own, and it is expensive, and this is a challenge. We can certainly talk to NOAA about whether NOAA has money out of what they use to support the participation in the future if it's something that's been a stumbling block.

The delegations to the Committee on Fisheries are always really small, and the main action that happens is everything that happens after that at the regional level and in these other meetings, and so this WECAFC process is not going to be on that agenda at all. This is all happening separately.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any other questions? All right. Is there any other Other Business to come before the council?

MR. WAUGH: One quick item. I will be sending out an email with a little more details that I got from Dave Whaley on those funding issues, and I just wanted to mention that I know a lot of people hand their hands in that, but Mike Leonard at ASA reached out to the council EDs and got some background information on funding needs, and so they were helpful, I'm sure along with other people, in pushing that, and I just wanted to acknowledge their help.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Gregg, do you want to go through the upcoming meetings?

MR. WAUGH: Not really. We will get something out with more details about the September meeting, and we've got direction on revising which committees are going to be meeting, and so look for something in the next couple of weeks.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Are there any last thoughts before we adjourn the meeting? Seeing none, we are on time, after all this week, and so thank you all very much, and we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 15, 2018.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
June 25, 2018

2018 Council Members

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

COUNCIL CHAIR

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

VICE CHAIR

✓ Mark Brown
3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
(843)881-9735 (ph.); (843)881-4446 (f)
Capt.markbrown101@gmail.com

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

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

✓ 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

✓ Zack Bowen
P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
(912)398-3733 (ph)
zackbowensafmc@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

✓ 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

✓ 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

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

✓ Deirdre Warner-Kramer
Office of Marine Conservation OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W.
Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
(202)647-3228 (ph); (202)736-7350 (f)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Erik Williams
Lt. Warren Fair
Dale Diaz
Erika Burgess
Dr. Jack McGovern
Rick DeVictor
Shep Grimes
Karla Gore
Mary Vera
Dr. Jessica Stevens
Tracy Dunn

Jenny Lee
Dewey Hemilright
Dave Glickner

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Council Staff

Executive Director

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

Deputy Directory-Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
John.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director-Management

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

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
Myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

Kathleen Howington
Kathleen.howington@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/ Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
Cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
Kim.iverson@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Kimberly Cole
Kimberly.cole@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
Roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Dr. Chip Collier
Chip.collier@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Cameron Rhodes
Cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
Mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Suzanna Thomas
Suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Kelsey Dick
kelsey.dick@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

✓ Amber Von Harten
Amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fishery Social Scientist

✓ Christina Wiegand
Christina.wiegand@safmc.net

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
John.hadley@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

June Council Mtg Day 5 6/15/18

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Blow	Wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Crosson	Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov
Cunningham	Leda	lcunningham@pewtrusts.org
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Foss	Kristin	kristin.foss@myfwc.com
Gallagher	Kevin	kevingallagher74@gmail.com
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@noaa.gov
Gorham	Bill	getbowedup40@gmail.com
Guyas	Martha	martha.guyas@myfwc.com
Hart	Hannah	hannah.hart@myfwc.com
Hartig	Ben	mackattackben@att.net
Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov
Hemilright	Dewey	fvrtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Horton	Chris	chorton@congressionalsportsmen.org
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Jiorle	Ryan	ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov
Kalinowsky	Chris	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov
Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net
Lamberte	Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov
Laney	Wilson	wilson_laney@fws.gov
Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov
Matter	Vivian	vivian.matter@noaa.gov
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
PUGLIESE	ROGER	ROGER.PUGLIESE@SAFMC.NET
Poland	Steve	steve.poland@ncdenr.gov
Porch	Clay	clay.porch@noaa.gov
Pulver	Jeff	Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Ralston	Kellie	kralston@asafishing.org

Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@ncdenr.gov
Shiple	Krista	krista.shiple@myfwc.com
Shipman	Susan	susanshipman@att.net
Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov
Stephen	Jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov
Wrege	Beth	Beth.Wrege@noaa.gov
bowen	zack	fishzack@comcast.net
brewer	william	williechet@aol.com
brewer	chester	wcbsafmc@gmail.com
brouwer	myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
o reilly	rob	rob.oreilly@mrc.virginia.gov
q	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Diaz	Dale	Saltwaterlife@live.com
Howington	kathleen	kathleen.howington@safmc.net
Johnson	Denise	denise.johnson@noaa.gov
Rock	Jason	jason.rock@ncdenr.gov
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@gmail.com
Stillman	Karolyn	karolyn.stillman@noaa.gov
Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov
dilernia	tony	tony@rocketcharters.com

FULL COUNCIL – ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: 6/15/18

Meeting Location: ^{PT. LAUDERDALE, FL} Charleston, SC

Issue: Cmp Am 31 - Formal Review

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MR PHILLIPS		✓	
MR BROWN	✓		
MS BECKWITH	✓		
MR BELL	✓		
MR BOWEN	✓		
MR BREWER	✓		
MR CONKLIN	NOT PRESENT		
DR CRABTREE	✓		
DR DUVAL	✓		
MR GRINER	✓		
MR HARTIG	✓		
MR HAYMANS	✓		
MS MCCAWLEY		✓	

FULL COUNCIL – ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: 6/15/18

Meeting Location: ^{FT. LAUDERDALE, FL} Charleston, SC

Issue: ^{S6} RA 28 for final review

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MR PHILLIPS	✓		
MR BROWN	✓		
MS BECKWITH	✓		
MR BELL	✓		
MR BOWEN	✓		
MR BREWER	✓		
MR CONKLIN	NOT PRESENT		
DR CRABTREE	✓		
DR DUVAL	✓		
MR GRINER	✓		
MR HARTIG	✓		
MR HAYMANS	✓		
MS MCCAWLEY	✓		