

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

**Marriott Hutchinson Island
Stuart, Florida**

June 13-14, 2019

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Dr. Kyle Christiansen
Tim Griner
LCDR Jeremy Montes
Art Sapp
Spud Woodward

Mel Bell, Vice Chair
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Doug Haymans
Stephen Poland
David Whitaker

Council Staff

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Cierra Graham
John Hadley
Kelly Klasnick
Christina Wiegand

John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson
Cameron Rhodes

Observers and Participants

Martha Guyas
Rick DeVictor
Dr. Jack McGovern
Kate Siegfried

Dr. Wilson Laney
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Clay Porch
Shep Grimes

Other observers and participants attached.

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Marriott Hutchinson Island, Stuart Florida, on Thursday, June 13, 2019, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're going to get going, and so the first thing is, while Charlie Phillips is still here, we're going to bring him up, and we're going to skip over to Full Council and do the Whale Take Reduction Team Report, and so if Charlie and Christina could come up here for this whale discussion.

MR. PHILLIPS: Good morning, Madam Chair. What do you want to know?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you tell us about the most recent meeting that you all had and what the team is working on and how that relates to the South Atlantic Council area?

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. We were up in Providence for three days, three-and-a-half days, and, for the first time ever, we almost had consensus, ever, which was quite a feat. They were trying to get the PBR down to 0.9, and we had, I think, seven calves, and the fatalities are coming down. Canada said they didn't have any, but I got an email a couple of days ago, and one fatality had some Canadian gear on it, and so it looks like there were still some interactions in Canada. They are still working with Canada on ship speed restrictions, and Canada is moving their boxes around for their snow crab and lobster gear regulations, and so they're doing stuff, which is good.

The main part of the meeting was how do they get -- It wasn't so much traps, but they needed endlines out of the water, which is the traps don't tangle the whales, but it's the endlines. Ground lines sometimes are implicated, but it's generally endlines, and so they spent a lot of time talking about weak rope, weak links, breaking sleeves, and it looked like 1,700 pounds was going to be the number they were going to use in most places. Some of the offshore fishermen that are fishing 500 or 600 feet deep, that small rope really wasn't going to work for them, and so I don't know what they -- They are still working on how to figure that out, but, if they get the number of endlines down, and I think the goal is close to 50 percent reduction, which is huge, and most of those are in Maine.

Maine came back with a proposal, and the bottom line is they just want to stretch their trawls out and so, if they're running ten-trap trawls, they're going to try to run twenty-trap trawls, and so you can still pretty much run the same number of traps and cut your endlines in half.

One of the issues with that was the inshore guys, the new people and the people that work lobsters out of skiffs, they can't run trawls. They have to run singles, and it's just impossible for them to do anything else, and so they're going to make an exemption for those folks and build that into the plan. They're going to be working on rulemaking the rest of this year, and I think, toward the fall, go out to scoping and public hearing, and hopefully have it -- Their plan is to have it implemented in 2020, early 2020.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I know that, this past year, the past few months, there was a whale interaction in northeast Florida, but, at the meeting that you guys had, the model that Nick Farmer ran, that didn't even include the South Atlantic Council area, right? When they were considering the reductions, they were focusing on a different part of the United States, and they weren't really focusing on the South Atlantic Council area, and is that right?

MR. PHILLIPS: They did not look our way. They did mention the crab trap, and we'll call it an interaction, but they were -- They had their hands full. Sam Rauch came, and he basically told the teams that you need to make a decision, and you've got to make it today, and it's Friday, and, if you don't make it, we're going to make it, and, no, you're not taking it back to your stakeholder groups and we don't have time to do that.

The table, to their credit, they came together, and I would say there was one dissenting vote out of about forty people at the table, and I haven't been on that a long, long time, but I've been on it long enough to know that that is a very, very rare thing, and it was great to see people working together and figuring out what they had to do and trying to make it work.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do you think that it's the intention that, after they complete the rulemaking for that portion of the U.S., are they coming back to look at the South Atlantic and try to reduce interactions further in the South Atlantic, or did you all not discuss that at all?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, one of the things they're going to do is they're going to try to do state gear marking, so they can follow-up on whatever gear they find on whales and try to identify where it comes from more than they're doing now, and they may change our gear marking down here for black sea bass pots, but, under this rulemaking, that's going to be pretty much it. They're not going to do anything else. The next meeting, I think, is tentatively scheduled for the fall of 2020, and I was told by staff that they may be looking at things like gillnets then, and that's probably like the Mid-Atlantic, and I don't know that we've got very many gillnets down here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Spanish mackerel.

MR. PHILLIPS: But we've got a year of they're not going to be looking at us, and I guess a lot of it depends on how many fatalities they see and what the calving rates do. If the calving rates keep going up and the fatalities keep coming down, my gut feeling is they won't be looking at changing things, especially down here, and it's probably going to take them a while to implement actually getting those endlines down in New England, and they talked about having some more closed areas, and they talked about dynamic rolling closures, kind of, as whales went by, and that's got a problem. By the time you see the whales and you tell the fishermen to move the gear, the whales are gone, or could be gone, and so that is a problem.

When you go down a river here and you see crab traps everywhere, well, they've got lobster traps like that everywhere, even more so than we have crab traps, and so there is a lot of gear in the water, but I heard an interesting note, that Canada catches more lobsters than we do in the U.S., but they do it with a third less gear, and I guess we just have too much gear in the water, or it could be argued that we might have more gear in the water than we need to catch, and so maybe, at some point in time, they will decide they want to lower their traps, for economic reasons more so than - - But that's for them to decide, but I thought it was interesting that Canada had a lot less traps in the water than we do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are there any other questions about the Whale Take Reduction Team meeting or how this affects regulations, or possible regulations, in the future here in the South Atlantic? All right. Thank you, Charlie, and thanks for that report. Thanks for attending those meetings for us and reporting back.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am free help.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tony, can you do the Mid-Atlantic report real quick right now, before we start Mackerel?

MR. DILERNIA: Give me two seconds to pull it up on the screen.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. While we're switching, I'm going to turn it over to you to give us your liaison report.

MR. DILERNIA: The Mid-Atlantic Council met last week in Manhattan, New York City, and it was a short meeting, two-and-a-half days. The first day dealt with setting the specifications, the 2020 specifications, for Atlantic surf clam and ocean quahog. I will remind the council that that's an ITQ fishery, and, because it's an ITQ fishery, we have been advised by the agency that the current provisions in the plan to protect individuals from acquiring excessive shares -- Those protections that are in the plan are insufficient, and they have asked us to develop additional protections against individuals acquiring excessive shares, and so a good deal of the meeting was devoted to developing a public hearing document to address the excessive shares, or preventing development of excessive shares, in the ITQ fishery for the surf clams and ocean quahogs.

We received some research regarding surf clam research in the Great South Channel habitat. Let me just say that, for whatever reason, and many of us believe climate change, surf clams have relocated, and it's interesting that a critter with only one foot can go from the Jersey coast to southern New England, but what was once a high concentration of surf clams from Ocean City, Maryland, up through Sandy Hook, New Jersey and the south shore of Long Island, now the concentration appears to be more in southern New England, offshore of Montauk and Great South Channel and Georges Bank, and so we received a report on that.

We also received a report on our forage fish, where our forage fish controls are regarding our forage fish amendment, and we received reports regarding those critters that are under our control, and it was pretty clear that there has been no development or no increase in the landings of the forage fish that came under our forage fish amendment, and some will say, well, the amendment is working, and others will say, well, there was no interest in the first place, but, again, because that forage fish amendment is in place, if folks start to get silly regarding perhaps increasing their harvest of those critters, we have protections in place, particularly trip limits.

What we did was, again, is we froze the footprint of what was landed. The lesson we learned was with the chub mackerel. The chub mackerel was hardly ever fished, and then, in one year, it went up to five-million pounds, and so that set off alarm bells, and that's what, in a sense, caused us, or motivated us, to set our forage fish amendment, and I would suggest that this council review our forage fish amendment. I am sure that staff will be willing to help and work with you as you look at how to address bullet and frigate mackerel.

We received a report on the Northeast Regional Strategic Plan, and we set our specifications for mackerel, squid, and butterfish, and we worked on the ilex, or the offshore, squid. There is

basically two squids in the Mid-Atlantic region, the loligo, which is the inshore squid, or the long-fin squid, and the offshore squid is the illex squid, and recent increased effort on the illex fishery has motivated the council to look at placing additional controls on that fishery.

We received our Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team report, much like you received today, and we reviewed our strategic plan. Some of you may be -- We are very happy. Your loss was our gain, and Michelle Duval is now under contract to the Mid-Atlantic Council, and she is developing our strategic plan, and she gave us our most recent report, and that is it. Our next meeting will be in Philadelphia in August, and I will be happy to take any questions, Madam Chairwoman.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tony. Any questions about his liaison report? All right. No questions. Thank you, sir.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: The first thing we're going to do is we're going to do a voice recognition around the table, and we're going to start over there with Kyle.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Kyle Christiansen, Georgia.

MR. HAYMANS: Doug Haymans, Georgia.

MR. WOODWARD: Spud Woodward, Georgia.

MR. WHITAKER: David Whitaker, South Carolina.

MR. BELL: Mel Bell, South Carolina.

MR. SAPP: Art Sapp, Florida.

MR. CONKLIN: Chris Conklin, South Carolina.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jessica McCawley, Florida.

MR. WAUGH: Gregg Waugh, South Atlantic Council staff.

MS. GUYAS: Martha Guyas, Gulf Council liaison.

MS. BECKWITH: Anna Beckwith, North Carolina.

MR. POLAND: Steve Poland, North Carolina.

LCDR MONTES: Jeremy Montes, U.S. Coast Guard.

MR. DEVICTOR: Rick DeVictor, NOAA Fisheries.

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

DR. MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.

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

DR. SIEGFRIED: Katie Siegfried, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Beaufort.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, everybody. I will just note that we are missing two folks. We are missing Chester Brewer from Florida and Tim Griner from North Carolina. All right. The next order of business is Adoption of the Agenda. Are there any changes or additions to the agenda? Are there any objections to approval of the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved.

The next order of business is Approval of Minutes from the March Meeting. Any changes or modifications to those March minutes? Any objection to approval of those minutes? Seeing none, the March minutes are approved.

MR. WAUGH: You all know that Wilson has recently retired, and so we wanted to take a few minutes here and just recognize Wilson for some of his work. He's been around for quite a while, and he's been on our Habitat AP earlier, and he's worked with ASMFC and with the South Atlantic Board and has done a lot of habitat work there. He worked with us on FEP I and II, and, for those you that remember Bill Cole, when he was the Fish and Wildlife Service rep, Wilson supported Bill in his work here.

In July of 2005, Wilson was named one of the designees for Fish and Wildlife Service, after Bill Cole retired, and he attended some meetings there in that capacity, and then, effective at the end of the year in 2007, he became the sole Fish and Wildlife Service designee, and those of you who have ever looked at Wilson's notes, they are thorough, and it's like having a court stenographer here. You can go back and get that information, whatever you need, but he retired effective March 30, 2019, and so we talked with Wilson, to try not to lose all that expertise.

We talked and worked with the Council Chair, and Jessica was kind enough to appoint him to the Habitat AP as a liaison between the council and the AP, and so he's here, and he can bring to the AP issues that we send to them, and vice versa, and he will work with the council staff and the AP panel chairs, and we have a process where the chairs review projects and develop letters, and so he will be very helpful in that. He will be available to participate fully during committee meetings here, and so he's welcome to sit up at the table during committee meetings. We are very excited to have Wilson in that capacity, and I think Jessica wants to give you some further recognition, Wilson.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Wilson, if you'll come on up here to get your box, and I will read what it says. This is presented to Dr. Wilson Laney for his thirty-eight years of service representing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and guiding policy and management to conserve fish, fish habitat, and the marine ecosystem of the South Atlantic region. We want to thank you for everything that you have done, and we're so glad that you're going to stay engaged and stay with us. (*Applause*)

DR. LANEY: Wow. So that wasn't on the agenda. It was not listed. Well, you all know how I feel about the work, first of all, that all of you do, and I have a special passion for diadromous species, and I think you know that too, and so I will sneak in eel update reports at future council

meetings. Thank you so much for accepting me as kind of an outlier as a Fish and Wildlife Service rep to take Bill Cole's position, and I won't say take Bill's place, because Bill is irreplaceable, and I will give you all greetings from Bill. He now lives in Raleigh, and he's about five minutes from my house, and so I get to spend a good bit of time with him.

I wish that he was able to come and participate more than he is, because of health reasons, but thank you so much, again, for making me feel very much a part of this family. Thank you, also, especially to those state directors who weighed-in with the Fish and Wildlife Service and pled for the service to allow me to continue a role at the table, and I won't say any more about that. Let's just say that my priorities and the Fish and Wildlife Service priorities sort of diverged, and they wanted me to work on fishes like the Cape Fear shiners and the Carolina pygmy sunfishes and the Waccamaw silversides, and those are all wonderful and important species, but they just didn't ring my bell like interjurisdictional fisheries work, and so thank you so much, and I love you all, and I'm glad that I still can be engaged, thanks to the creativity of your wonderful chairperson here and also Gregg and ASMFC, because they have found creative ways to keep me engaged in the Habitat Committee there and the Atlantic Coastal Fish Habitat Partnership as well, and so thank you so much, and I love you all. *(Applause)*

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Tim and Chester, you missed our voice recognition, and so I'm going to start with Chester and then go to Tim. Can you please state your name and your state?

MR. BREWER: Chester Brewer, Florida, recreational.

MR. GRINER: Tim Griner, North Carolina, commercial.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, guys. Next, we're going to move into the Council Staff Reports, and I'm going to turn it over to Gregg to give the Executive Director's Report.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. You've got mine as Attachment 1, and I'm not going to go through that. It was quite a busy period since our last meeting, and we also hosted the eight-council CCC meeting, and we talked about that already. There is a link to the presentation that our staff gave. If any of you haven't seen that yet, I would urge you to click on that and look at it. We got a lot of positive comments from other councils, and I was very proud of our staff and the job they did.

As you know, Kelsey Dick has moved on to another position, and BeBe Harrison was hired in her position. She has already left today to travel back, and I hope you all had a chance to meet her. If you haven't, you will. She's going to be continuing on the MyFishCount work. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Gregg. Next up is -- Is Chip going to be able to give us the MyFishCount update? Kelly says yes, and so I'm going to turn it over to Chip.

DR. COLLIER: This is Attachment 2, and there's a short overview for MyFishCount. As Gregg noted, we did hire BeBe Dalton Harrison to take over the Outreach Specialist role for MyFishCount, and then I provided a little bit of background of what we've been doing, starting off with how the number of users is increasing over time, and we had an increase of 115 users

since the last council meeting, and we also had an increase of seventy-eight trips since the last council meeting.

That is looking at just vessel trips, and it's not looking at individual reports, and a little bit of background on there. At the council table, there is two of our better reporters, Art Sapp and Chris Conklin, and they tend to be two of the best reporters that we have in the program, and Chris actually reported on the 1,000th trip with the MyFishCount, and so that was pretty interesting. We now have 2,700 fish, over 2,700 fish, reported by private recreational anglers, and so we're getting some really good information on the private recreational fishery.

We've been promoting the use of MyFishCount, primarily through some web meetings, and we had two of these since the last council meeting, one on April 30 and one on May 1, and these were done in conjunction with the Angler Action Foundation. Brett Fitzgerald led the meeting and went through the app, and it was a really good presentation that he provided, and we also have a Shiny app that is available to present the data that's being collected through MyFishCount.

I'm in the process of cleaning up the data right now and actually understanding what non-probability sampling means and how we can get from what's reported in MyFishCount to meaningful measures, and so I'm working on that, and hopefully we'll have a report to you guys for the September meeting, if possible.

Then, continuing down, as you know, we've been working with the South Carolina Federation to support data collection on usage of best fishing practices. Through the tutorial, they suggest that fishermen can report their information through the MyFishCount, indicating whether or not they are using the best fishing practices, and this can also be tied to depth and several different factors, whether or not they're using the best fishing practices, because we are recommending using descending devices only when they are seeing signs of barotrauma, and so they don't need to descend all the fish, but it's just the fish that you're seeing signs of barotrauma.

As I mentioned, I am going through some data cleaning right now, and then we've also been working with ACCSP with the development of the API. The test API was working, and now we have transitioned over to the live version of the API, and we're having a few issues with that, but we are working through it, and hopefully we're going to be submitting data to the ACCSP within the next two weeks, and that's all I have for you guys, if there's any questions. One last thing. Brian Cheuvront is going to be taking over my duties as the manager for MyFishCount.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Are there questions for Chip? I also forgot to ask if there were questions for Gregg, and so are there questions for either one of those folks? All right. Then we're going to move along here. Next up is the Citizen Science Update, and we have John and Julia.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I will give the update on the Citizen Science Program. Yes, we mentioned Julia, and, as I think folks all know now, Amber moved on from us, and Julia has taken over as the Program Manager, and she's really been doing a great job. There was a lot of stuff thrown in her lap, as I'm going to highlight a few of the things that have been happening and that she's been trying to keep moving ahead, as we're in a really important time for the Citizen Science Program.

Right after the council meeting, we headed off to the Citizen Science Conference in Raleigh, and our team led a symposium that was highlighting our efforts to develop the program. We had

representatives from all of our A-Teams that gave their perspective on working in the citizen science arena, and one of them was Brett, who is the back of the room there, and he's one of our A-Team members that came to the conference and presented and helped make that symposium a success.

It was really great, and we had excellent questions from people, and we learned how everyone around the world, essentially, as it turns out, is struggling with a lot of things related to citizen science, and so it was a good conference, and we learned a lot. I also participated and gave a talk that was related to problem-driven citizen science, which is squarely where we are, trying to start from what are the problems to solve and is citizen science a good tool to get there.

Another thing that Julia will begin working on, now that we've approved the research plan, is updating the citizen science research priorities. The whole process was part of the blueprint and the program plan that says how we'll go from the council's research needs into citizen science topics, and there is several projects which are underway.

We have the pilot project to address scamp discards, and we have the FISHstory pilot, where we're looking at the historical photos, and we have been collaborating on a Nature Conservancy project in Gray's Reef Natural Marine Sanctuary, where they're trying to find out more information about the fisheries and the fishermen and what's going on within the sanctuary itself.

The Scamp Release is very close to being released, or the application released, and available for people to use. We have learned that all of these things take about three-times as long as you thought they would, anytime we seem to be dealing with this mobile applications, and recall that we're trying to cover all sectors of the fishery and simply get information on the released fish, their sizes, where they were in the depths, use of descending devices and hook types and things like that, and so it will help better inform the discard mortality rates that are used in the stock assessment, to make sure the fish are put into the proper bins of the population within the assessment as well.

Here is a quick screenshot of what the app is going to look like. I think the last bugs were worked out in it this week, and so we hope that, any day now, it's going to be up and available and folks will start downloading it, and we'll make a big push to get it out into people's hands and let them use it, and we'll also be highlighting -- This is one of the things we'll be highlighting when we go to ICAST in July. Julia has been working pretty hard, the last few weeks, getting the webpage up and getting training materials developed, and all of that will be on the council's website, in the citizen science section, so people can go through and actually learn how to use it, and then there will be a full-court press to get out and talk to folks and encourage them to use it.

We realize that one of the challenges is scamp is not a particularly common species, and so finding the people who catch a fair number of scamp and actually release some and getting them to participate is going to be the biggest challenge, but, then again, that's going to give us a chance to work on a much smaller dataset, to figure out just what is required of us to manage this type of data and to handle QA/QC and such about it.

The project FISHstory is one that is just getting started, and, in fact, we have made an offer to someone to come take this project on in a part-time position, and they have accepted, and I think they are starting on July 1 or so, if memory serves me properly, and the gist of it is to take pictures

like this, being provided by Rusty Hudson, and you know he's talked a lot about his family's historical pictures, and use of the Zooniverse platform and get, really, volunteers from wherever, and people all over the world work on this type of stuff and look at these fish and tell us what species they see.

They have an opportunity to say how many red snappers and how many mackerels or how many -
- One of these pictures even has a sailfish, which was quite amazing to me to see, and so what this person will be doing who is taking the job on is they will be creating the tools within Zooniverse that help people identify the fish and as well as setting up a group of experts who can go and do the validation of the identifications that people do, and I think it will be really interesting for you guys, once the Zooniverse project is going, to get in there and do it.

I have found that it's kind of addictive. There is pictures of wildlife on the plains of Africa, game cameras, and you pick out zebras and wildebeests and all kinds of crazy stuff, which is kind of neat, and so there's a lot of people all over that will just do these projects, and so we're pretty optimistic that it's going to be a success. Folks love looking at old pictures. Everybody we talk to says, oh, I've got a bunch of pictures, and we would like to get them in there, and so it's kind of challenging and different, but we're pretty optimistic about it, that we're going to get a lot of data out of it and a lot of people taking part.

Rusty gave me the first dump of pictures this week, and he's got about halfway through his scanning. We got a really nice scanner, and the quality of the pictures has just been outstanding, and so we've got the coordinator coming on, and they're going to get the platform going and start recruiting these species experts, and so, hint, hint, those of you that are really good at looking at pictures -- Rusty looks at it says, oh, yes, that's a such and such, and that's a that, and so we're going to sit down with him and say, okay, how do you know that's a gag grouper and not some other grouper kind of stuff, and you can tell a snapper from a grouper from a triggerfish, of course, but trying to get within the individual species of the general classifications may be a little tougher, but I think, all-in-all, it's going to be an interesting exercise.

We have the website, which tells you everything about what's going on and keeping you up-to-date, and the last thing I will highlight is the ACCSP recently put out their RFP, and you have about a three to four-week turnaround, in terms of getting projects, but one of the things that we talked to the folks at North Carolina, at DMF, was they have challenges with flounder, and then the MRIP discards are just landed as flounder, but North Carolina has three different species of flounder which are actually caught.

They were interested in developing some sort of app to help fishermen identify flounder and see how well fishermen identify flounder and be able to allocate those flounder discards into individual species and look the SAFMC Release as a potential tool, which has led to us working with them and ACCSP on a potential project that we submitted to be funded for next year that would take North Carolina -- They call it Catch You Later, and they're going to have that built by Harbor Light Software, and that's pretty catchy, Catch You Later.

Then it will take SAFMC Release and bring them together under ACCSP SAFIS, and that will allow ACCSP to take care of long-term care and feeding, essentially, of these apps and then have the vision that there would be -- This would be the start of really a flexible reporting tool, because there is a number of other jurisdictions that are interested, of course, in the Release data, and we've

already had feedback from Rhode Island. They have some released fish issues, and so there's a lot of entities that would like to get more information on their releases, and ACCSP wants to prevent having just a whole plethora of individual apps all doing their own thing, or, as they like to call it, stovepiping, which is a catchy little term.

We are hoping that this project will get funded, and we'll work with North Carolina on bringing these things in together and really taking the first step in terms of having a comprehensive reporting tool that is very flexible, and Harbor Light Software, which has worked on so many of these, is excited.

They got very inspired going down to Georgia and working on trawl surveying, and Fran just couldn't believe all the handwork that was necessary for entering data, and so they believe that they can create kind of a menu-driven tool that anybody could create the app they need and select the data fields they want and just hit "generate", and it will make you a slick little app that will give you all that kind of data, and ACCSP would create one API, and they would be able to get all the data coming into them, and so that's sort of where we're headed for these kind of non-standard data things, and, if that gets funded, I will certainly keep you guys posted. Julia has been doing a great job and catching up and getting her legs under her to run with all this stuff and recruit people, and I definitely appreciate the support of all of you on the council.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, John. I am super excited about the program that is taking all the historic fish photos. I just think that's super cool. Any questions for John about the various projects that are being worked on? I can't believe that you don't have a certificate for Chris for reaching his 1,000th reported MyFishCount.

MR. CONKLIN: No, I was the Number 1,000.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Got it. I thought you had reported 1,000 fish, and I'm like, good grief.

MR. CONKLIN: I will take a clock.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Challenge coin. Yes, we've heard that a couple of times this week, council challenge coin. All right. Thank you, John.

MR. WAUGH: I should have mentioned, during MyFishCount, that Brett Fitzgerald is in the back of the room. If you haven't met Brett, take the time to talk with him. He attended a council meeting and gave a presentation three years ago, and that's where we talked to Brett about helping us with MyFishCount, and so we wouldn't be where we are without him and his organization. It was the Snook and Gamefish, and now it's Angler Action. Between him and Chip, they really did a yeoman's job, and so I just wanted to acknowledge Brett and his organization. We are going to be working with them over this final year of the grant, and the intent is to sort of blend their two apps together, and so hopefully, long term, they will be taking over maintenance of the app. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. All right. Any additional questions before we move on to the next reports? All right. We have already received the whale update, and so we're going to move into the NMFS SERO Presentations, and so next up is the Status of Commercial and Recreational

Catches Versus ACLs for species that weren't already addressed, and I'm going to turn it over to Rick DeVictor.

MR. DEVICTOR: We haven't covered golden crab, and so we were at 8 percent of that ACL.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's it?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Just related to golden crab, those guys typically don't send in their logbooks until they renew their permits, and so there usually is a big rush right at the end, before they have to re-do it, and so don't worry. There probably isn't a whole lot wrong with golden crab right now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Next up I believe is the Data-Related Reports, the For-Hire Amendment Status.

MR. DEVICTOR: We are working on the final rule, as we reported at past meetings, for the for-hire reporting amendment. We have talked about before possibly having a sixty-day cooling-off period after that publishes before it's effective. eTRIPS should be available in mid-July to collect all the data, and so that will be ready to go for people to download that app when this effective and when we publish the final rule, and we are also working with Bluefin and VESL, to ensure they meet our requirements also, but ACCSP is ready to collect the information, once we get going on this, and we'll do some outreach sessions and send out a packet to permit holders with the letter announcing the requirements.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any questions? Rick, I believe we're going to have Jennifer on the line from Protected Resources to give us a presentation. No?

MS. WIEGAND: It looks like Jenny is not on the webinar. It's possible that, since it's after 5:00, that she had to run home. I don't know, Rick, if she mentioned it to you. If she didn't, I can run through what's in the document. We'll muddle through with what we have.

MR. DEVICTOR: I haven't heard from her, but I can check chat, but, if you want to move forward, I think that's all right.

MS. WIEGAND: No, it's all you.

MR. DEVICTOR: No, I'm not doing the report.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Well, it looks like the new tech memo for the sea turtle release gear was released, and this would have been the one that had all the gears in it that we recently put into place with Amendment 42 that's going through rulemaking. It looks like the final rule for the 2019 MMPA List of Fisheries has come out, and there were no classification changes to South Atlantic fisheries, always good news. You guys got the TRT update from Charlie, and so I won't belabor that.

We have talked about the unusual mortality event for North Atlantic right whales before. In 2017, you had seventeen confirmed dead whales, and twelve were from Canada and five in the U.S. In 2018, there were three whales stranded in the U.S., and, so far, no whales stranded in 2019, which

is excellent news. The most recent North Atlantic right whale population estimate was around 458 whales, which is up from about 270 in 1990. However, there has been a consistent decline since 2010, and that is what on the Protected Resources briefing document.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Christina, for jumping in on that. I would ask for questions, but I'm not certain that Christina can answer them.

MS. WIEGAND: If you have questions that I can't answer, I can make sure I get answers for you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Any questions? All right. Thank you. Next up, we have the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Presentations. I believe that the first one up is the Commercial Electronic Logbook Program. Clay, are you going to give it?

DR. PORCH: They are on the webinar, yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Got it. Excellent. Is it Vivian who is on the webinar?

MR. PIERCE: If you have any questions, feel free to stop me, but just to recap, the database infrastructure that is needed to accept Southeast Fisheries Science Center commercial e-logs is essentially in place. We have done some data reconciliation with ACCSP, and, for the most part, I believe that everything is pretty much in place, and, if there's any issues that do come up, they should be relatively minor and not impede kind of our progress. The bulk of our efforts since then have been working on bringing the data that will be submitted to ACCSP into Southeast Fisheries Science Center databases, and, of course, a big part of that is how we're going to link that data and those reports to compliance.

With ACCSP and SERO, we have created a shared table that uses a unique identifier to link these entities that will ultimately link reports that are submitted, whether they be negative fishing or actual logbooks, to compliance. ACCSP has shared with us an implementation plan on how all of that will function, and we're in the process of reviewing that and providing edits and going back and forth with the team at ACCSP, to make sure that we're all on the same page.

The very first aspect of that plan is to utilize ACCSP's negative fishing report platform and have that count toward compliance at SERO. Once we get this infrastructure and this process in place, then it should be that far of a leap to do electronic logbook data reports that come into our database systems as well as have them count toward compliance, and so the first part will be to get negative fishing reports done and make sure that any accounts and entities that are in ACCSP are linked to any accounts and entities with SERO and make sure that everybody is reporting correctly and that compliance is working and that our logbook staff can make sure that any issues can be resolved with those reporting platforms.

The next immediate steps will be to send out our technical requirements documents to potential vendors, and we're just a few weeks away from sending those out, and then it shouldn't be long while the apps are being developed that utilize the ACCSP API to get data into their system, so that we can begin working on pulling that data into ours. With that, are there any questions?

MR. CONKLIN: It looks like a great deal of work has been done. I know we've been working on this for several years, and it's come a long way. I'm just wondering. I mean, we have a staff

position allocated to -- Somebody is in charge of handling this, and what does the council need to do on our end to help you finish this, so that we can start reporting?

MR. PIERCE: Specific council objectives or how they can help us, mostly what we need -- We can basically take care of this in the short term by working with ACCSP, right now. The bulk of the work has been to ensure that the database is correct, and that's taken a couple of years, as they were in the process of doing a redesign, and so we're trying to figure out how we fit into all of that, but we're fairly confident, in the last few weeks, that, with this database they've set up for us, that it shouldn't be too much more effort to get this done.

We have already begun working with electronic vendors and letting them know to be expecting something for us soon, and we've also been working with Harbor Light, kind of giving them our preference, and so we are kind of picking up steam and kind of moving on to the next phase of this, and so I don't know if I personally can speak to any kind of specific needs that the council can provide. I have been in contact with them, and I guess you have also kind of made some outreach efforts, but we're not quite there yet, and so I don't know if that answers your question or not, but that's kind of where I see things going.

MR. CONKLIN: So you don't need a letter or anything like that stating what our intent is, and you guys are pretty close? Okay. Has there been any thought of like a digital dashboard for permit holders, where they can go to one place and have a file to renew and report and check their delinquency and all that stuff? Is it just one central location, or is that further down the road, because I know the Permits Office has created something.

MR. PIERCE: I'm not sure how ACCSP would -- I am not sure that would relate to ACCSP, since we will have several reporting platforms. I know that the goal is to ultimately get a singular account, so that you can log into ACCSP and do all of your reporting there, or if you report through the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Ultimately, we do envision kind of having that unified reporting platform, but that's something we're just not quite there yet.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any other questions?

DR. PORCH: Brett, during public testimony and in corridors, a number of fishermen have expressed a desire to have an auto-populate feature, so they don't have to type in the same information every single time, and so I was just wondering if there was a plan to do something like that.

MR. PIERCE: Different vendors will have different preferences in the way they set up their software. In our technical requirements document, we do indicate strongly, in the very first part, that we need to reduce the reporting burden any way possible, and we give them a list of possibilities and ways that they can do that. One of them are auto-populate features. Another thing that will be helpful to us is that, if we do have a list of valid entries, that will not only enable fishermen to select favorites, so that they don't have to report the same dealer or report -- Kind of log and key-in the same gear time after time, and it will also reduce validation errors, because then we're giving them kind of a restricted list that has already been accepted.

Many of the vendors of the software versions that we have seen already have that auto-populate feature. Some of them are very sleek and can be tailored to specific gears, sets, and vessels, but

that is generally a feature that is pretty prevalent on most, if not all, of the vendors of the software that we've seen.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any additional questions? All right. Thank you so much for that presentation.

MR. PIERCE: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Next up, we have the Status of MRIP Conversions. I believe Vivian is going to give us this presentation.

MS. MATTER: Hi. Yes, this is Vivian Matter. As I stated, I think, since the December council meeting, our MRIP conversions have been completed for the FES, APAIS, and for-hire survey changes. We still need to use different estimates for management, and so we -- S&T provides these CHTS-like estimates, and we prepare those in an ACL file that we send to SERO, and so these dates here are not the latest dates. I don't think that my latest presentation got up there, but we did provide the latest ACLs to SERO on May 30 and May 31, and they include final MRIP estimates through 2018, and they included preliminary estimates for 2019 Wave 1 in the CHTS-like units, and we also -- These estimates are in number and weight.

We have also -- As I said, the calibrated estimates are -- S&T has calibrated for FES, the Fishing Effort Survey, and the APAIS adjustments, and, at the Science Center, we have completed the charter calibrations, and so, from that, we have now been providing SERO, and sometimes the councils, for SAFE reports, what we have been calling the FES ACL file, which has all of the latest calibrations. That has been completed, and the latest one I sent to SERO was on May 31, and then, for the South Atlantic, the last assessment that we have was cobia, and that was complete on March 19, and, right now, we have red porgy and greater amberjack assessments that data has been provided for, but those are currently on hold, and that's all I have, if there is any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any questions? I don't see any questions. Thank you, Vivian.

MS. MATTER: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Next up is our Review of the EFP, and Rick gave us a description of that earlier in the week, and we had some discussion about the whole live rock issues, but, ultimately, we need to decide what our recommendation is going to be for NMFS, and so we need to talk about that a little bit more. I think I got my concerns out when we talked about this on Monday, but I just had some concerns about the way that they were harvesting live rock as well as why can't they purchase live rock or get it from somewhere else other than actually removal of the live rock, but I'm not sure if other folks want to talk about this.

MR. BELL: I think that was the only sort of thing that came up that was a question, and I guess - I mean, I know you all have live rock down here, and I don't know if the live rock down here is totally suitable, based on what's going on for up there, but, if there's some way they can mitigate any damage or -- I don't know how you convey that to them or how we would require that, but that would be, I guess, the only -- That's the only concern that I remember talking about.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I didn't know if we needed to have further discussion on it or if people had surfaced other concerns about this exempted fishing permit. All right. I think we need a motion of our intent here on this exempted fishing permit. We need to have a motion to recommend approval of this EFP, if that's our intent.

MR. POLAND: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Steve, would you like to make a motion?

MR. POLAND: Yes, Madam Chair. **I recommend approval of the North Carolina Aquarium EFP.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is there a second? Seconded by Mel. I would also suggest that maybe, in the letter that the council writes, maybe we bring up some of these concerns about the live rock. Any more discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** In case it's not clear, this is the final discussion of this North Carolina Aquarium EFP, and so, if you have something else that you would like to say about this --

MR. SAPP: I am curious how there wasn't any forethought and how they didn't take some live rock, or whatever the case, and stick in the ocean a year ago and let it become live rock and take it out and -- How was there no forethought for this?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know. I would look to Rick. If you know anything else about -- This is not their first EFP, or, Gregg, do you know anything about this?

MR. WAUGH: Well, as far as putting material out, we have a live rock aquaculture program that is regulated, and so you have to be permitted, and there are certain areas that you are allowed to put that material in, and so not just anybody can go out and put material in. It has to be nonindigenous material, and so there is quite a few requirements, but it would seem that they could certainly purchase live rock from one of those live rock culturers.

MR. BREWER: We don't want them going out there like they used to with dynamite, but certainly approve it, but maybe we could add something that just says we would recommend purchasing the live rock from an aquaculture dealer, and I'm not sure what they call themselves.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Live rock aquaculture dealer. Do you want to make that direction to staff to add that to the letter?

MR. BREWER: Yes, please.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so let me help Kelly get it up there. So direction to staff to clarify or --

MR. BREWER: Encourage.

MS. MCCAWLEY: To recommend purchasing live rock instead of harvesting. Does that capture it, Chester?

MR. BREWER: Pretty well, but you might want to put something in there about aquaculture, and I don't know. There may be people that are -- I am assuming that you can't sell live rock unless it's coming from one of these approved aquaculture dealers, and so that may very well --

MS. MCCAWLEY: You could purchase live rock from another country, but, if you're going to purchase it say from Florida, you would need to purchase it from a live rock aquaculturist, but there are people in Florida who import live rock from other countries, and so maybe this is enough, and it's up to the North Carolina Aquarium to determine whether they want to get aquacultured rock from the U.S. or they want to get live rock from another country.

MR. BREWER: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Anything else on this?

MR. BELL: I was just going to say, on behalf of all of us from out-of-state, we appreciate you and your staff and the Florida delegation putting on dinner Monday night. That was outstanding, and it was a nice place and good weather, but that was really nicely done, and so thank you very much. *(Applause)*

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, you guys. I am not sure we can top that at the next Florida meeting, and I'm just going to throw that out there. Key West next year. All right. We are going to conclude our business for today, and we're going to pick back up at 8:30 in the morning, and, believe it or not, we're back on track.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on June 13, 2019.)

- - -

June 14, 2019

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Marriott Hutchinson Island, Stuart Florida, on Friday, June 14, 2019, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am going to do some introductions that we left off yesterday as we're getting going here. We have Martha Guyas at the back of the room, and she is the Gulf Council liaison that's been here all week, and we also have Kate that's been here for Erik Williams, and so she's been over there at the table, if you've been wondering who that is.

Also, we have a number of folks from FWC, and so, in addition to Erika, we had Joseph Santiago, who is from our IT Department, who was here. He's not in here right this minute, but he was in here to keep my computer running this week. Back there in the corner, we have Hannah Hart, and she's one of our Regional Biologists, and she's based out of the Merritt Island National Wildlife Refuge, and we have David Rathke, and he's our agency's Chief Operating Officer, and we have

Mason Smith, who is a Regional Biologist in this region. Hannah and Mason are Regional Biologists for the Division of Marine Fisheries Management, and so you also might see our agency's Regional Director come in sometime this morning for the Biscayne National Park presentation, and his name is Tom Reinert, and so I'm just welcoming some folks that I forgot to welcome yesterday.

Earlier in the week, Monica introduced Duane, and Duane would love to come up and say a few words to us, since he's going to be a regular at our meetings, and so welcome, Duane, and we look forward to having you at the meetings, and, if you want to say something, then feel free to go over to that microphone.

MR. SMITH: I just wanted to address you all very, very briefly. Some of you I've had the opportunity to speak to in the margins, and that's been great, but I haven't had a chance to speak to all of you, and so I wanted to make sure you knew who I was and a little bit of my background and also just explain a little bit about what my office does and why I take the time out of my schedule and my boss thinks it's important enough to send me and my colleagues to the council meetings to sit in the back for five days.

Quickly, myself, this is my eleventh year with NOAA, and I started down here in the Southeast Region and did five years with enforcement work here and then went to the Pacific Highlands region for six years. Before that, I was raised by wolves with the Coast Guard, and so I spent twenty-seven years, between reserves and active duty, with the United States Coast Guard before retiring to take the job with NOAA.

I work for the Office of General Counsel Enforcement Section, as you know, and we are sort of the very tail-end of the dog. You all figure out what the rules are, and you figure out the really hard, honestly hard, and complex policy stuff, and then, at the end of the day, you come up with the best plan you can going forward, and we turn that into regulations at the agency, and it's my job to try to make sure that those regulations are something more than just a wish.

I work with Pat O'Shaughnessy and his folks at the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, and my office also prosecutes all the cases that come to us from our JEA partners and all the cases that come from the Coast Guard, and so that's a little bit about what my office does. There is two other attorneys, and you may see one of my colleagues at one of these meetings, and I know you know Cindy Fenyk, and I took Karen Raine's job, and so she was here before that.

We try really hard to be fair, and we try really hard to be effective, and we try really hard to be transparent, and part of that process, that transparency, is being here. We want to be available to you, as the council, and we want to be available to the public, if people have questions. If you're not sure how this works, if it's a little bit of a black box to you, it's my job to make sure that we demystify that, and we talk about what it is we do and how we do it and why we do it.

The final plug I would put in is we have a website. If you just google "NOAA Enforcement Section", you will find our website, and we've got all of our charging of cases is listed there, all of our cases that are settled are listed there, all of our decisions from administrative law judges, circuit courts, the Supreme Court, and it's all there. There are frequently asked questions and our procedural regulations and our penalty schedules and our summary settlement schedules, and so, again, the idea is we want this to be a transparent process, and we want folks to have confidence

in the system, and we want to be available to you all, to make sure that we're doing our part and making that happen. With that, I know it's a busy day. Unless someone has questions, I'm done.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Duane. We're happy to have you. All right. One more housekeeping item. I think, Spud, you wanted to say a couple of words about ICAST.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to let everybody know that, again this year, the council will have a presence at ICAST. If you are curious what ICAST stands for, that is the acronym for the International Convention of Allied Sportfishing Trades. It's basically the country's biggest trade show related to recreational fishing. Over the years, it has evolved into a Conservation Corner, with the State of Florida and South Carolina and Georgia, and some other federal agencies have been there. It's a unique opportunity to interact with the recreational fishery on a pretty bit scale.

Some statistics from last year of 220,000 square feet, with 626 exhibitors, 15,000 people, 1,254 people from seventy-one countries, and so it's a very unique opportunity to interact and to explain things one-on-one to people that are not only fishing themselves, but also involved in the business of fishing and all its various aspects, and so Kim will be leading that effort, and we'll be emphasizing citizen science and the things that we're trying to bring anglers into to help us get better data, and so I just wanted everybody to know about that, and that will be the second week of July in Orlando.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Spud. We will certainly be there. A number of states, as you mentioned, will be there. FWC has quite a large presence at that event, and over in the Conservation Corner area, we're trying to do things such as promote sportfish restoration and talk to manufacturers from the State of Florida and thank them for their contribution to that program. We are going to jump into committee reports, unless there's anything else before we get going. We are going to start with the Snapper Grouper Committee.

The Snapper Grouper Committee met earlier this week, and we approved the agenda and the minutes. We got a status of the commercial and recreational catches for species under ACLs, and then we got a status report of amendments under formal review, and then we got a presentation from Marcel on the Southeast Reef Fish Survey.

We also got a report from the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel's Chair, which was Jimmy Hull, and we got a report from the SSC on snapper grouper items from Dr. Sedberry, and then we got into Amendment 38 for blueline tilefish, and so we talked about the catch level recommendations, and the committee approved the following motion.

This is Motion Number 1 to begin development of Abbreviated Framework Amendment 3 to establish a new South Atlantic blueline tilefish ACL, and, 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 directed staff to bring a document on blueline back in September for their consideration, with the intent of approving it for public hearings in December.

The committee also got an update on the system management plans and approved the following motion. **Motion Number 2 is approve the spawning special management zones Story Map for review and comments by the Information & Education, Law Enforcement, and Snapper**

Grouper Advisory Panels. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee also received an options paper for removing jacks from the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan, and the committee decided to not pursue modification of the placement of the jacks in the fishery management plan at this time.

Then the committee moved into Regulatory Amendment 33, which is red snapper season modifications, and this would hopefully be modifying the season for red snapper starting in 2020. There were a number of discussions here regarding the minimum number of days to allow recreational and commercial harvest of red snapper, and the committee made the following motion.

Motion Number 3 is remove Options 4 and 6 and all sub-options under all options for Action 2. Then there was a substitute motion. I am having a hard time telling, and so was Motion Number 3 the one that actually passed, Myra?

MS. BROUWER: Well, the substitute motion is the one that passed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. **Then a substitute motion was made to remove Options 4, 6, and 7 from Action 2. This would retain the sub-options under that particular action. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The committee then made Motion Number 4 to remove Options 4, 5, and 6 from Action 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? No objections, and the motion stands approved.

MS. BECKWITH: As you and I had discussed a bit earlier, I was wondering if it might be prudent to add an option, if we were to pick four Saturdays, or just Saturdays, being the days that we want to provide access to the fishery, and I was wondering if there was a way of crafting an alternative that would allow for a certain portion of those Saturdays to be opened up in May, but not the full, and so let's say we get five Saturdays, and three Saturdays get opened up in May, until we get the results from that, and then any additional Saturdays are opened up in September or October.

My concern for that is twofold. One, if we're going to go with the time where most recreational anglers have the greatest access, then that certainly would be Saturdays, but, until we get a handle on the effort and the catch rates, that would be a precautionary method to make sure that we're not also going over our quota, and so that was just a suggestion, if the committee or the council was interested.

MR. HAYMANS: So we announce there is going to be five days, three in May and two in September, but then, after the wave comes back in and we see that three is over the limit, we're not going to have those two in September? I just think that's pain that we don't need. I mean, I just -- It's so few fish as it is, and I would prefer -- I like the idea, but I don't necessarily like going back and telling them that, no, we're just kidding and you can't have those last two days.

MS. BECKWITH: The way I envisioned is that we would know that we have five possible days, but we would only announce the opening of three in May. If there was additional quota to be

caught, then we would announce an additional opening in the fall, and we wouldn't be announcing all five in advance.

MS. MCCAWLEY: This is something that's been done in the Gulf, for Gulf red snapper. What's the pleasure of -- Go ahead, Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move we add an alternative that would do what I just described, because I don't know what the right verbiage is.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me see if I can try. What I think you're suggesting is that we would start the season earlier in the year, and then we would have NOAA Fisheries look at where we were relative to that quota, and, if there were available days, then we would consider reopening in the fall, and is that what you're thinking? Myra is getting that on the board.

Okay, and so there was a side discussion happening here about we could say allow harvest in May and then allow harvest on non-consecutive weekends or something like that, but I'm up for whatever. I think that what you have on the board there works, and so let me read that. **It says add an alternative to Action 2, which is the recreational season, to allow harvest starting in May for a portion of the projected days and resume harvest in the fall if enough ACL remains, and do you think that captures it?** Is there a second to that motion? It's seconded by Steve. It's under discussion.

Do folks understand what the intent of this is? It's to fish -- For example, if there's five days, we would say fish the first three or four, and then NOAA Fisheries would go in and figure out where we are relative to the quota, and so that would be taking MRIP data as well as taking state data, like what the FWC collects, and figuring out where we are relative to that quota and, if there is additional quota available, then that could call for a reopening in fall, or a reopening in the fall could happen. Any more discussion on that?

MR. GRINER: Would you have that data from MRIP in a timely enough fashion to make an announcement to do anything?

MS. MCCAWLEY: In theory, you would, because this is suggesting that that first season starts in May, and so then thinking that you wouldn't reopen again until September or October or so, and it has happened in the Gulf, and I think it could happen here in the Atlantic as well, if that's something that we want to consider.

MS. GUYAS: It has sort of happened in the Gulf. It's come about a different way. The way that the season -- At least if we're talking about red snapper. If you're talking about something different, let me know, but the way that the season worked in the Gulf was it always started on June 1, and NOAA would project the season. Then, following that season, if we got data or additional quota or some other weird circumstance that it maybe -- There's been a handful of times where we've been able to reopen the fishery, because there's still quota on the table, but it's not like we started the season knowing that we were holding quota back for a later season.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Another reason we've opened the season in the fall was because there were some significant bad weather days, storms or what have you, during the regular season, and so then it was reopened.

MR. POLAND: I supported this motion just because I want to see the analysis on it, but I share a lot of the same concerns that Doug has, as far as some of the blowback that we might receive if we hold some quota back, just in anticipation, and, I mean, I understand Anna's point. If we just go to all Saturdays, and that's when the effort is the highest, there is a potential that we'll just blow it out of the water and not have a season the following year, but I just -- I'm a little uneasy, but, like I said, I will support it just to see the analysis.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The option that you heard Martha talk about was not as prescriptive of this. It was just fishing what we thought would be the whole season, and then there was some reason, whether it was additional quota was released or bad weather, and so the entire quota wasn't caught, and so it wasn't as prescriptive of this. It happened another way.

MR. HAYMANS: With the end of the last season, some time went by, I think, and NMFS decided that the state data was the best data to use. Doing it this way, I think we're saying we're going to use state data, because I don't think you can get MRIP data out within one wave, and so we're kind of committing ourselves to that, which is okay to me, but I think that's what we're saying, is that we're going to use state data.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Good point.

DR. MCGOVERN: That was kind of going to be my point, too. We do use state data for the recreational seasons, and we wait for the state report to come from Florida, so that we can do the projections. The other thing with this alternative is it's pretty complicated, and, if it were to move forward, we would really need for the IPT to figure out can we do it and how would it work, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

MR. SAPP: In theory, I like the idea, Tom, but I think you would have to advertise a three-day season, because your for-hire group -- If they were to book those two more days at a red snapper trip and then they're gone, that would be devastating for them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, that's another good point.

MR. BELL: Just a note of caution related to moving forward with this. What we're doing is potentially improving the extraction efficiency, because the fishermen aren't satisfied with what we have, but we're working within an ACL, and so we witnessed what happens when you have a pretty good year, and we went from six days to five days.

We just need to give some thought to how we're going to manage this if we do really well and you improve your extraction efficiency, when we know there are more and more fish, and you're liable to have a really, really good year and then find out you're down to three days, down to two days, down to one day, and I don't know how that's going to work, but we just need to be prepared to deal with that and be able to explain that when it comes, because people are unhappy with this now, but they're going to be really unhappy if we find ourselves in a position where we need to go down to two days or something. That's fine, and we just need to give some thought to how we're going to manage that, and I'm not saying right now, but just be prepared to deal with that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think also -- Let's say that this motion doesn't pass. I think that we can make it clear that our intent is, at any time, if there is quota remaining at the end of the season, whether NOAA looks at MRIP data or they look at state data or they look at wave height at buoys offshore or whatever it is, that it would always be our intent that if any of the ACL remains that we continue fishing later that year with a reopening, and I think that that would be our intent no matter what, whether this motion passes or not.

This is just kind of a prescriptive way of how to do it. If this goes in the document, then it would be analyzed by staff and taken out to the webinars, and so any more discussion on this motion? **Let's see a show of hands of those in favor of this motion, nine in favor; those opposed, three opposed; any abstentions.** The motion fails, but, as I mentioned, I still think that, even though this motion fails that -- **It passes.** Sorry. It's been a very long week. It's almost as good as Mel voting on the wrong committee. Okay. **The motion passes.**

It will be added to the document, and it will go out to webinar. While we're having this discussion, I also wanted to bring up -- We have a couple more motions from this committee on red snapper, but I just want to make it clear that what is happening here is the document is going to get modified, and we will not see it again before these webinars, and so I don't know if there's any concerns about that, that the document would go straight to the webinar without the council members seeing it again, and we wouldn't see the analysis.

Then my other concern is I'm wondering if we should pair these webinars up with listening stations in the states, just because I'm a little concerned about something as important and controversial as red snapper and us only doing two or three webinars and maybe not having opportunity in certain cities for listening stations, and so it would be up to the state folks, and I'm not thinking that the council staff would go man the listening stations, and I think it would be up to the state folks to help man those listening stations for the webinar, and so I don't know if that's something that we want to consider or not as this moves forward, or if you have any comments or concerns on this.

MR. HAYMANS: We can make that happen in late July.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think we would be looking to have these webinars in July or August. The webinars would have to be before the next council meeting.

MS. BROUWER: July probably would not give the IPT enough time to get any kind of analysis put together, and so, if you want some numbers to go out on the webinars, they would probably have to happen sometime in August, maybe even late August.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Along with that, there is the procedural issue of making sure there's enough time to get the FRN published, and that's twenty-eight days or something, and so the IPT needs the time to figure out -- We need some logistical time to figure out when these things can occur, and so you probably are looking at August for this to happen.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so it sounds like, if the webinar/listening stations occur in August, then they might be able to come back to September, and I'm just making sure that the council understands that we won't see this document again.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I view this really as more like scoping, because you're putting these ideas out there for people's feedback. I also think August is probably great, because this is the first year under Amendment 43 that you're going to have a July season under this amendment and this ACL and all that, and so perhaps you'll get some feedback from people in August as to what the July season was like.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica.

MR. HAYMANS: The week of the 19th is good for us, August 19th.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. We can work with staff and try to figure out the best dates for those webinars/listening stations. Are folks good with adding listening stations to those webinars in the states? I see the state people nodding their heads. Okay. I am going to go back to the committee report.

The committee, and this is also still on red snapper, made Motion Number 5, which was to approve the purpose and need statement as modified. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion 6 was to approve Regulatory Amendment 33 for public hearings to be conducted via webinars and bring the document back to the committee in September. On behalf of the committee, I so move, and we have added guidance here that we would add listening stations, and we've also had discussions that it appears that these need to occur in August, and so that would just be guidance to staff. Any more discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Then we went into Regulatory Amendment 29, which was the best fishing practices and powerhead amendment, and there were a number of briefings that we received, and we went over what all the APs had to say about this amendment, and we talked about a number of items, and I am just going to highlight a couple of them.

One of them is that the Gulf Council will be hosting a release mortality workshop October 7 through 9 of this year. The next version of the draft will include the description of some of the homemade and commercially-available devices that fit into the definition used for descending devices, and so I'm going to go into the next committee motion.

Motion Number 7 is remove, within six months of implementation of Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29, language from Alternatives 2 and 3 in Action 1, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move.

MR. BREWER: We are going to obviously approve this, I think, but, anyway, I just wanted to get on the record sort of what I think the council's thinking was after we had a long discussion about venting, some of which was my fault, or most of it was my fault. There is a perception out there, and we saw it in public comment, that the council is putting venting on sort of a level field or -- That we're requiring venting in some way or another or that we're disallowing venting in some way or another, and we're not. All we're saying is, for commercial and recreational boats, you're required to have a descending device onboard. If you have it onboard, you comply with this regulation. You are not precluded in any way, if you feel comfortable and if you've got the

knowledge to do it, from venting a fish. We are just saying you've got to have the descending device onboard. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Chester.

MR. WOODWARD: I certainly don't want to belabor that point, but I think we have sort of made it difficult for these ongoing education and outreach efforts to send a clear message now. We have sort of -- As Chester said, we have sort of tacitly condemned venting by not overtly acknowledging it as an acceptable method of dealing with barotrauma, and so we've created an education and outreach challenge for Kim and Cameron, as well as these other things, and so they're going to have to figure out a way to -- As Chester said, we heard it from the headboat operator, that now I've got to carry six or seven descending devices, and that was less than twenty-four hours after we made the decision, and it's already that the coconut telegraph has the misinformation all over the place, and so it's something we need to think about, how to deal with that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Spud. Yes, I agree with all of those things, and I think that the intent is, at the next meeting, that we would spend some time talking about the outreach plan, and so that would -- Is the next meeting the final approval of this amendment? The next time we see it, we hope that we can approve that for final, but we also need to talk about how we're going to do outreach, and I agree that there seems to be some confusion during the public comment period, when we had just finished talking about it.

MR. BELL: To that same point, I think the materials I saw from FWC related to explaining this is -- They are both tools to accomplish the same purpose. One of them is a little, perhaps, simpler to use, and one maybe you should have some training or know what you're doing, and it's kind of like chopping down trees. You could have an axe, or you can have a chainsaw. With the axe -- We're saying, basically, at a minimum, you have to have an axe, but, if you want to use the chainsaw, you need to know how to use the chainsaw, because you can do more damage, sometimes, with a chainsaw than with an axe, and so it's a tool. They are both tools. We just kind of maybe adopt that same approach and explain them both, the benefits and pros and cons, and just let the public make that decision, but you're required to have the descending device, at a minimum.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, Motion Number 7 stands approved.**

Motion Number 8 was to modify the definition of "descending device" as follows: For the purpose of this requirement, "descending device" means an instrument sufficiently weighted that will release fish at a depth sufficient for the fish to be able to recover from the effects of barotrauma, a minimum of thirty-three feet or greater, and ideally released at the same depth that it was caught. The device can be, but is not limited to, a weighted hook, lip clamp, or box that will hold the fish while it's lowered to depth. The device should be capable of releasing a fish automatically, releasing the fish by actions of the operator of the device, or by allowing the fish to escape on its own. Since minimizing surface time is critical to increasing survival, descending devices shall be rigged and ready for use while fishing is occurring. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Next up is Motion Number 9, which was to accept the following edits to Action 2, Alternative 1, Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. This, I certainly have some concerns about the way that we've edited this particular action and alternatives, and I'm going to go ahead and go to Chester and then come back to me.

MR. BREWER: I think this is either my second or third mea culpa so far this session, and I did not realize that we had let something slip by us until late Tuesday afternoon, when Ira came up to me, and he said, do you realize what you all just did? I said, what do you mean? He said, you killed the drift boat industry. We call them drift boats. We don't call them headboats. We call them drift boats.

The fellow that was here from the Miss Blue Heron Fleet, he's got five boats, and he made reference to that as well. South Florida, as we have mentioned many times, we have the Gulf Stream that comes pretty close to our shore, and there is a method of fishing that has been utilized for decades and decades, which is drift fishing, and we have boats that are dedicated to that, what we might otherwise call headboats.

They provide a service to both the residents of south Florida and for our visitors. They provide a relatively inexpensive method of getting out and going fishing in the ocean. What they do is they get out, and they take a set on these boats, and they may have twenty or thirty or forty people onboard, and they fish with sardines and what we call triple hooks. Not treble, but triple. That's a j-hook with the eye through the shank, eye through the shank, and it's got three hooks down the body of the sardine. They get out and they drift these over the reefs, and they drift in seventy to a hundred foot of water, and sometimes shallower.

Unfortunately, there is really no other way to drift effectively, and circle hooks are not going to work. What we did, inadvertently, is we said that, throughout the range, you had to use non-stainless-steel circle hooks. That's going to kill them. That's a tremendous economic negative, and then I want to go and talk perhaps on a different level. That's an economic problem, but there's also a sociological problem.

In south Florida, there is several entities and groups that run kids fishing days, and the fishing club spearheads one of them. On a yearly basis, we will run 750 or 800 disadvantaged kids through this program, and the FWC plays a big role in it and the Marine Industries Association plays a big role in it, and Palm Beach County, at least with ours, plays a big role in it. I think, Doug, you were even involved in it at one time, weren't you?

It's a wonderful program. You get kids out on the water who they may not have even seen the ocean before, much less gone fishing in it, and, as these drift boats go by the bye, then that program becomes impossible, because we can't afford to put these kids on six-packs and stuff like that. The only economical way to do it is with these drift boats. I would like to propose that we go back -- We originally said that below, I believe it was the 28 degree line, that you could use j-hooks, and I would like to propose that we go back to that.

I don't see any really bad biological problem with doing that, or conservation problem, because most of this stuff is designed for red snapper, and we don't have red snapper. We have never had red snapper. There is some starting to come up the coast a little bit in the Keys and whatnot, but that's the Gulf fish that have gotten so crowded over there that they're extending their range, but,

historically, we have never had them, just because of our bottom and the way our waters are, and so I don't think we would have any meaningful adverse effect on red snapper, but, on the other side of the coin, we would have really bad economic problems and really -- I mean, it would just be a shame to kill those kids fishing day programs.

I tell you. They say that the most common last phrase that they hear in these cockpit recorders right before a plane crashes is "oh shit", and that is exactly the way I felt when Ira came up and explained to me what had happened, and it just went right by me, and I forgot about the way that they fish on these boats. Anyway, I plead that we -- Please fix that problem.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Chester. I have a couple of ideas here. I really feel like we need to edit two motions here, and so this first motion is making a couple of different types of edits to the sub-alternatives, and then also the next motion, that we haven't gotten to yet, was changing the sub-alternative, or changing our preferred, and so it was selecting the sub-alternative with the new language that we added, and so it seems like we want to kind of do two things here.

Me, the language that's in yellow that is to accept the other non-stainless-steel hook types may be used when fishing for yellowtail snapper with natural baits, I think that should come out, but it could also stay in, and then we just move to Motion 10 and select a different preferred, but I saw that Jack had his hand up, and so I'm going to go Jack, and then we'll come back to how we're going to turn this into a motion for what Chester just described.

DR. MCGOVERN: Motion 9 has to do with adding the yellowtail snapper language to Alternatives 2b and 3b, and I think what Chester is talking about is changing Motion 10 and changing the preferred alternative. I think it would be good to leave that yellowtail snapper language in there for analysis, even if you change the preferred in Motion 10, and Ira provided good information, and he's a straight-shooter, and so I think we should go back, the IPT should go back, and include the information that Ira provided and also analyze 2b and 3b with the yellowtail snapper information in there, and then all that information can be then presented to the council back again in September, and they will be more informed on how best to make a decision on this.

MR. BREWER: To that point, where are we from the standpoint of having public hearings with regard to this language? Is that pretty far off in the future?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just let me remind you of the timeline, and Myra can help me. We are set to finalize this amendment at the next meeting, and so, if I understand that correctly, that means that the only hearing item left would be when we do public comment at the September council meeting, and so that's all that's left.

MR. BREWER: Yes, because I just -- I am worried that, once again, when the telegraph gets cranked up about this, we're going to hear something, and I would like to proactively have corrected the problem, so that we can say, oh, no, we took care of that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: One thing -- I think that we definitely need to, on Motion 10, which is the next motion, we need to change that, and so hold that thought. On the motion that we're on right now, which is modifying the wording, and so it's adding what is in yellow here on the screen, and so Jack was making an argument to keep the language that I read, which is in Preferred Sub-Alternative 2b and in 3b, which is that except that other non-stainless steel hook types may be used

for yellowtail snapper with natural baits. This is modifying that alternative so that it can be analyzed, as Jack is suggesting, and then come back, and we can see it at the next meeting.

The other thing is that, if we just choose Preferred Sub-Alternative 2a, which was our preferred before, and we had modified it in the next motion, then I think that that does what Chester is suggesting. You are basically saying that, south of the line that's already in place, and we had put that line in place to allow people to do this for yellowtail snapper, but, instead of calling yellowtail snapper out, you're just saying there's this line, and, below that, we can still use circle hooks, and so I think that -- I'm sorry. Still use j-hooks.

I think we can leave this motion as-is, and this wording as-is, and we'll just change our preferred in the next motion, but, if people have other ideas, then I -- Since we're still on this one, which is Motion 9, any more discussion on Motion 9, which is modifying the wording of these alternatives? It is primarily adding wording. The most substantive thing is we're removing the "and/or possessing" from a couple of these alternatives, and then we're adding wording that will get analyzed so that it's just applying to yellowtail snapper in one of the sub-alternatives. **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Now let's go to Motion Number 10, and so we have a couple of options here. I'm going to make this motion, and we can either vote this motion down, or, Chester, you can offer a substitute to choose a different preferred. Let me make the motion.

Motion Number 10 is to de-select Sub-Alternative 2a and select Sub-Alternative 2b as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Chester, do you want to make a substitute motion? I think that what your substitute motion would be is it would be to select Sub-Alternative 2a as preferred.

MS. BECKWITH: I am just thinking that, if we vote this down, we go back to our original preferred, and so it makes more sense just to vote this down, and it's cleaner.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Myra says the same thing. Let's just vote it down. Instead of a substitute, let's just vote this motion down. Just to be clear, then it would default back to our previously-selected Sub-Alternative 2a as the preferred. Okay. Any more discussion of this motion? **All those in favor of this motion, raise your hand; all those opposed, raise your hand.** If you heard what Chester said and you're for that, then you want to raise your hand, because we're going to vote this down. **Ten opposed. The motion fails.** Now it goes back to our previously-selected Sub-Alternative 2a as preferred. All right.

MR. HAYMANS: Just to make sure that I understand, we are non-offset, circle, non-stainless north of 28, and we're non-stainless throughout the entire EEZ, and that's 4, correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and Myra can help me. Preferred Alternative 4, which is still a preferred, if I understand it, is to require the use of non-stainless-steel hooks when fishing for species in the snapper grouper fishery management unit with hook-and-line gear and natural baits in the EEZ. That is still a preferred as well, right, Myra? All right.

I am going to keep moving on here. We then got into Regulatory Amendment 30 for red grouper, and this is revising the rebuilding schedule and modifying the spawning season closure for red

grouper off of North Carolina and South Carolina and implementing a commercial trip limit for the region.

We had a significant discussion on this, and the first motion that we made was Motion 11 to approve the IPT's suggested edits to the purpose and need statement. On behalf of the committee, I so move.

MS. BROUWER: Actually, I was going to suggest that we go over your intent for the purchase and sale prohibition, to make sure that we capture that correctly and that is indeed how you want that to work, but we can do that after this motion, if you like.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Discussion of this motion that is editing the purpose and need statement for red grouper? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** I am going to turn it back to Myra, and so this is the sale language for the Carolinas during the closed season, and so I'm going to turn it back to you.

MS. BROUWER: Correct, and so what we understood, or I understood, I think, is what is up on your screen, and so I'm going to go ahead and read it, and I see that Shep has come to the table, and so we just want to make sure that -- You're about to approve this for formal review, and so making sure that it's going to reflect your intent, and, also, we received the revised codified text, and so I'm going to bring that up in a minute, to make sure that everybody has seen it before you pass a motion to deem it as appropriate.

As far as a sale prohibition, the committee clarified their intent that sale and purchase of red grouper harvested in the EEZ off the Carolinas by federally-permitted vessels in May will be prohibited in all South Atlantic states. Sale and purchase of red grouper harvested in the EEZ off of Georgia or Florida by federally-permitted vessels during May will be allowed in all South Atlantic states. Is that what you intend?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that is our intent, and so let me try to restate it. Basically, you couldn't land, harvest, or sell from the Carolinas during those spawning months, the fish that came from the Carolinas, but you could sell -- A wholesale dealer in those states could sell or move a fish that was harvested off of Florida or Georgia during those spawning months, and I think that's what we meant, but I'm going to go to the hands. Tim says yes, and I'm going to go to Mel.

MR. BELL: That is what we decided. The only sort of tricky part to that, I guess, is that, if I understand this, a vessel could harvest off of Georgia, if they had them, or Florida, and the vessel could come into South Carolina or North Carolina waters if they weren't harvested, right?

MS. MCCAWLEY: No, that's not my understanding. My understanding, and I will look over here to NOAA Fisheries, but my understanding is it would first have to be landed in Georgia and then go to one of those other states, but let me go to Shep, and then I will go to Tim.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. That's exactly right, because you're still prohibited from possessing red grouper in the EEZ and, if you're a federally-permitted vessel, also in state waters off of North Carolina and South Carolina. If you're going to bring them in, you need to bring them to land, I guess, and truck them up to North Carolina and South Carolina.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, that's good, but then folks just need to know that they can't catch them in Georgia and transit through federal waters in South Carolina or North Carolina.

MR. GRIMES: There is no possession of red grouper in the EEZ off of North Carolina or South Carolina by anybody, and, if you have that federal permit, you can't possess them in state waters either.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, that works for me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Tim, do you want to add anything to that? Okay. Myra, is that -- Do you feel like we've had adequate discussion on what our intent is here?

MS. BROUWER: I believe so, and I wanted just to make sure that we projected the revisions to the codified text that you did not get a chance to review during committee, and so that's what's up on the screen, and it is found under the late materials for snapper grouper.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so Myra has got the codified text there, if folks want a chance to review it. Once again, this is located -- If you need to look at it some more, this is located in the late materials for snapper grouper. It was worked on this week. It looks like it's also allowing frozen fish on hand by those dealers in the area that is closed.

MR. GRIMES: That is standard in all of our regs. If you have it and harvested it legally, then it's okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I see folks are still reading. Do people feel good about this? If so, I'm going to move on to the next motion. **Motion Number 12 was to approve the IPT's suggested edits in Action 1. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? This is just changing the years. **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

If someone would like to make the following motion to move this amendment to the Secretary, and there's a draft motion on the board that we would need folks to read, as soon as Myra gets this saved somewhere.

MR. HAYMANS: **Madam Chair, I move that we approve the Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 30 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 and codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Doug and seconded by Mel. It's under discussion. This is a roll call vote, and I'm going to turn it over to Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Absolutely.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. McGovern.

DR. MCGOVERN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Christiansen.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Whitaker.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

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

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Moving on to the wreckfish ITQ, the committee received a summary of work done, and the committee agreed with the conclusions and recommendations of the IPT, as well as the Snapper Grouper and Law Enforcement APs and the Socioeconomic Panel of the SSC and the wreckfish ITQ shareholders. The committee had no additional conclusions or recommendations not already provided by these groups, and then the committee is expecting to see a final draft of the review at the September council meeting, and we'll vote on final approval at that time. Then the council may discuss initiating an amendment to consider modifying the current wreckfish ITQ program.

The committee then received the economic performance of the snapper grouper fishery report, and then there were some items for other business that we didn't get to during the meeting, and I am going to turn it over to Myra to discuss the first one, which is recreational deepwater species regional allocations.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Jessica. This is an item that was left from the December 2018 meeting. You had requested that staff put together a white paper to explore regional allocations of deepwater species for recreational harvest. That work was sort of delayed, and recall that, at the time, we were awaiting results of the recreational workshops that were sponsored by ASA and the council and other partners, and you received the results of those workshops in March.

We just wanted to bring this back up and ask what you would like for us to do. I know that this came up during Executive Finance yesterday, and I don't believe that item made any of the priority lists, but, just for completion, we wanted to make sure that we brought that up and we understood what you want us to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me try to restate what Myra said. In the past, when we were working on -- It was under the visioning when we started this discussion, recreational visioning, and it was part of where this came from, and then, also, it was continued with the presentations made by ASA, and we made a request for a white paper on regional allocations for deepwater species.

I am just going to throw this out there, that I don't think that we have the time or the staff manpower to bring this back to the next meeting, or maybe not even the meeting after that, and I think we probably still want to see it eventually, and I'm wondering if Brian can maybe add this to our list that we can get surveyed on at future meetings, but it wasn't selected yesterday, and I'm not even sure that I understood which item that it was when I was doing my voting. Is it our intent that we want to retain this on the list to do in the future?

MR. WOODWARD: I think the results of the workshop and the input that we got said that we're looking for novel ways to deal with some of these particular challenges that we have of data collection and small-scale fisheries and stuff, and this seemed to be the lowest-hanging fruit that's out there in the snapper grouper complex. I mean, it's -- In terms of its regional importance, I mean, in Georgia, it's a non-issue for us, but it's important in North Carolina, and it's important in Florida, and I would like to see it stay on there. When it's feasible to do what's necessary so that we can perhaps -- You are probably looking at something that will require experimental fishing permits, or who knows, but, really, the thing is what's feasible to address the interest in doing something non-traditional like this, and that's what we're really looking for.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think so, and I think that was a good way of explaining it, and so, right now, it seems like we want -- Just based on what Spud said, it seems like we want to retain this item on the list, but clearly, between now and the end of the calendar year, there is really no time to consider it, because there's a number of other priorities that we have put ahead of it, but we're just indicating that we want it to be retained on this list. Is everybody okay with that? It's just direction to staff that we want to retain it. I see heads nodding yes to retain.

DR. MCGOVERN: I'm okay with retaining it as well, but I think we've got to remember that the recreational ACLs are so small that sub-dividing it will make a rare event even more rare, but I think that will just come out when this --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I have those exact same concerns, and I'm thinking that, once we get the white paper on that, it's going to surface some of those concerns, but I still think we will retain it on the list, and staff can work on it at a later date. Now I'm going to turn it back to Myra for an issue with lionfish and traps.

MS. BROUWER: This is an issue that SERO will discuss here in a second, and I'm going to bring up a table for that purpose, and then, Rick, you're going to go over it? Okay.

MR. DEVICTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair, for allowing me to bring this forward to the council. This has to do with lionfish, and so, as you know, in 600.725, it's general prohibitions in the regulations, and there is a table in there that we refer to it as the allowable gear table, and it specifies the authorized gear for different fisheries, and so Myra has it on the screen there. Use of any gear or participation in a fishery not on the following list of authorized fisheries and gear is prohibited, and so, basically, it makes clear to the public as to what gear is allowed in different fisheries.

It's important to note, and I have that highlighted also, that the list of fisheries and authorized gear does not, in any way, alter or supersede any definitions or regulations contained elsewhere. That basically says that what is stated in this table does not supersede what it elsewhere in the regulations, in 622, and so that's an important point to remember.

Here is the table on the screen, and it's separated by council, and then we have it by FMP and non-FMP, and so, of course, we have golden crab and snapper grouper under FMP, and so I want to bring three things forward. One is we have to do a general cleanup to this. We found some mistakes. Some things are stated as FMP, as you can see here with red drum, and we simply just want to make that non-FMP. That can be done through rulemaking, and it doesn't need an amendment, and so that's the first thing, and that's pretty straightforward.

Then, secondly, we were looking at this in terms of lionfish, and, of course, I think we can agree that, with lionfish, there's a general and growing problem in the South Atlantic region, and we would like the authorized fishers to retain lionfish bycatch when legally fishing gear types, if the council does not object to that, and so we want to make it clear to the public as to what gears are allowed to harvest lionfish, and, just like we have here for non-FMP, like whelk and baitfish, we suggest, recommend, adding lionfish as non-FMP and then pull in some gear. We've looked at this, and, under Rows 20 and 21, we would take a lot of those and bring them down into lionfish non-FMP.

Last week, we presented this idea to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and it didn't seem like they objected to this idea, and, again, this could just be done through rulemaking. However, this point, and with the one that I'm about to bring up next, what we are going to recommend is we work with council staff on a white paper, because I think that there are concerns that, hey, perhaps there are unintended consequences, and this could reopen fisheries and have pressure up north, off the Carolinas, with say spiny lobster traps or whatever, and so I'm going to recommend -- We recommend that we work with the council and flesh this out some more.

That's the second issue, again, is adding the lionfish fishery as non-FMP. Again, the purpose of adding that would be to authorize retention of lionfish while legally fishing additional gear types, again to make it clear to the public.

The final topic concerning lionfish, and this has to do with the fish trap definition, and this is in 622.2, under definitions and acronyms, and that's on the screen also, where we define what a fish trap is, and a fish trap means, in the South Atlantic EEZ, a trap and its component parts, including lines and buoys, regardless of the construction material, used for or capable of taking fish, and so a fish trap takes fish, and that makes sense, except a sea bass pot, a golden crab trap, or a crustacean trap that is a type of trap historically used in the directed fishery for blue crab, stone crab, red crab, Jonah crab, or spiny lobster that contains at any time not more than 25 percent of the number of fish, other than blue crab, stone crab, red crab, Jonah crab, and spiny lobster. I put on the screen there "and lionfish", and that is not in the regulations, but I just wanted to show that to you, that that's a possible thing we could look at in this white paper, in terms of clarifying for the public.

The issue that we saw here is, by this definition, where it says "crustacean trap", you cannot have, at any time, not more than 25 percent by number of fish, which would include lionfish, even though lionfish is not managed, but you would not be able to retain more than 25 percent by number of lionfish, and so, if someone were out there using a spiny lobster trap with the proper permits during the season and legally fishing for spiny lobster, and they bring up a trap, and say you have five lionfish and no spiny lobster, then those lionfish would need to be returned to the water, according to this definition.

One possible solution would be to add those two words at the end of this, and I think we determined that this would have to be an FMP amendment and be very clear as to the intention of this, but, again, this would be something that we could work out through this possible white paper. We would like this white paper -- We could bring it back in September, to deal with it sooner or later. Certainly, at least in terms of adding lionfish fishery non-FMP, because I know the intent is to move that forward in the Gulf of Mexico region, and so I think that's something we would want to deal with.

Just in terms of -- I know there's a huge workload on this, and there's a lot of people in our office that are dealing with this, and we could take the lead on this and do the heavy lifting of working on this white paper, but including council staff. We want to work with the council on this, certainly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for the explanation. I feel like we've just ripped off a band-aid on a gigantic issue. Let me just bring up a couple of points. In theory, I have no issue with modifying this, because the lionfish/finfish amount in those traps might be a number greater than 25 percent. I also want to remind you of some fisheries out there that FWC regulates, like the marine life

fishery, the aquarium trade fishery, and it has limited entry permits, and we allow people to take those aquarium trade finfish in lobster traps, and there's a special endorsement for people to do that, and we regulate the marine life fishery in state and federal waters.

I am just going to kind of throw that out there. I'm not quite sure how this interacts, but I feel like we're pulling a thread here on multiple issues, and, like I said, in theory, I have no problem with trying to fix this for lionfish, but I really feel like we're pulling a thread on a number of different issues here. I think there's also been some issues in the Gulf brought up that have to do with grunts and black sea bass in stone crab traps in federal waters, and, also, FWC is managing stone crab traps in federal waters now, and so I'm just -- Lots of other issues that could be at play here, and so I appreciate you guys working on it, and it sounds like your intent would be to bring this at the September council meeting, as long as there is time and as long as you guys can make significant progress on it. I don't know if other folks want to speak to this or ask questions or bring up any other points. Gregg, do you have anything you want to add here?

MR. WAUGH: Not really. I think doing the white paper is the right approach, because we need to look at issues like the EFPs that are out there now, so that we understand what the level of finfish bycatch is in these lobster traps that are made more of wire, and so I think we're good in putting that white paper together and bringing it back for the council to consider.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Jessica, you raised some great issues, and so I think it's really important to work with our state partners here to see what other unintended consequences there could be for this particular issue, because I know everyone wants lionfish to be harvested, but it's a little complicated.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I agree. I feel like we've been struggling with a number of these issues of bycatch and traps, especially on the Gulf side, and we have hit some significant snags, and so it's not a simple issue. We have determined that we've been working on it for a number of years, and so, yes, we look forward to working with you guys on it.

MR. HAYMANS: Not to oversimplify it, but, realizing the issue that lionfish is in the southeast U.S., can there not be an overarching rule that says that lionfish can be taken by any means necessary, without touching all the different gear? I mean, just a very basic --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I mean, I know it sounds flippant, but we've done similar things in state waters, and we have allowed a number of gears, except for things like bang sticks, but, I mean, we've allowed a number of gears that we wouldn't allow for other species. We have removed the recreational license and other things like that, and so we've removed licensing barriers and everything else to try to get lionfish out of the water.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So we'll look at that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

MR. BREWER: I was just going to follow-up on what you said. I mean, we've got -- It's not aquatic, per se, but, any way you can kill an anaconda, that's legal.

MR. BELL: Well, that would be any means necessary except fish traps, I guess.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's the issue.

MR. BELL: Well, the reason I say that is, at the CCC meeting, I sat next to a gentleman from the Virgin Islands who apparently has figured out how to do it with traps, and quite well, baited traps, and so I know we've had issues, and they don't tend to go into the MARMAP traps, but, for whatever reason -- Apparently it can be done, maybe even without an EFP kind of thing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Maybe. They love lobster traps.

MR. BREWER: I was just going to say that the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's Association filed an EFP request, application, to see if they could modify lobster traps so that they would attract lionfish, and they were going to try to find out if there was some way they could configure them so that they would catch primarily lionfish, and, for whatever reason, that EFP request was denied.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Ultimately, I believe that they withdrew it, and so then FWC resubmitted the EFP request, working with a number of the fishermen that were in that EFP, and that was approved, and so FWC is conducting that now.

MR. BREWER: Okay. I take it back then. I'm sorry, but I thought -- I didn't know about resubmitting it. I knew it had been denied or withdrawn, whichever one it was, and I didn't know it had been resubmitted and approved. That's great, because what I was going to suggest is maybe we could have a request for proposals or something like that go out to say -- Maybe even some grant money, and I don't know, but to figure out how to design those traps so that they would attract only lionfish, or primarily lionfish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I also want to let you know that FWC received money from the state legislature to do this as well, and we have a number of projects in the works, both on traps and ROVs, trying to target lionfish and test trap designs and efficiency, et cetera, and so we've got the EFP as well as money from the state legislature doing additional projects that are being conducted by universities and partners other than FWC, and so we've got a couple of different routes here.

DR. MCGOVERN: The EFP that Chester is referring to was withdrawn. It wasn't denied.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion on this? It seems like we're okay with giving guidance to prepare a white paper on this for the council to consider. All right. Then I believe we have a timing and tasks motion here. It's a lengthy timing and tasks motion, and so, before we get into the timing and tasks, I believe there is another item for Other Business in Snapper Grouper, and I'm going to turn it over to Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks. I wasn't here on Tuesday morning when we talked about the jacks paper, and I apologize, but there is something -- **I will get the motion up, and then we'll see if we can get it approved, but it's something that's been talked about for a long time, and that's to remove almaco jack from the jacks complex.** If I can get a second, I will move forward and elaborate more.

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

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks. For years, the commercial fishermen from North Carolina on through, many of them have -- We shut down early every year, usually in July or August, because almaco jack is one of the biggest bulk species in the jacks complex, and the jacks complex has such a low ACL. Almaco jack has become a very important economic fish for commercial fishermen, snapper grouper fishermen primarily, and it used to be a thirty or forty-cent fish a few decades ago, and it's crept its way on up into the \$1.50 to \$2.00 range sometimes.

With the many other species' trip limits going down, almaco jack now goes into the box, and it's a welcome species onboard, especially when the Gulf is closed or the Keys aren't cranking out greater amberjack, and so they really make or break a trip. With Amendment 27, there's a band-aid to extend the jacks complex out, I think with a 300-pound trip limit that is supposed to come through, but that's just not going to do the commercial fishermen and snapper grouper bandit fishermen any good.

It's only going to hurt them, and the only way forward is to get these fish out of the complex and get them their own ACL and get them assessed and try and come up with some more landings and do away with that little 300-pound trip limit eventually, but there's my reasoning, and I looked through the summary motions from several meetings, and I know we have talked about this at the end of meetings for years, and I don't think there's ever been a motion, that I could find, and I think the only way we can initiate work on it is for me to make this motion, and it's way past time, and so thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Chris. I guess I would look to Myra. How would this come back? Would it come back as a white paper, or what would it look like? Does it get tacked into an amendment and then just analyzed that way? Help.

MS. BROUWER: I suppose we could prepare like an informational document, or a white paper or what have you, much like we did for removing jacks from the FMP, and sort of plan out the steps and the things you're going to have to consider, the fact that this is not an assessed species and you need to probably give rationale for why you would remove it from a complex when it hasn't been assessed and it's not in the schedule for an assessment. It does have its own ACL, because that's how the complex ACLs were calculated, and each species within a complex has its own ACL, and so all of those things we could outline for you in an informational paper, and then you could consider that and tell us what to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I like that idea.

DR. MCGOVERN: One other thing to consider is I think the Gulf Council is considering a minimum size limit on almaco jack too, and so maybe that would be part of the discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so it sounds like this would come back in the form of a white paper, and is that okay, Chris? Okay. Then, if we approve this motion, we then need to talk about the timing of when it would come back, because I feel like we're a little overloaded for at least the next meeting, and maybe the meeting after that, and so, if it's approved, this motion is approved, then we need to talk about the timing of it.

MR. BELL: Do we need to modify the motion to be clear that what we're doing is really saying bring us a white paper to consider that, because it just says -- I am just asking. We've discussed it, and, if that's good enough --

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a good -- Yes. **Would you mind, Chris, if we modified this motion to say to prepare a white paper about removing almaco jack from the jacks complex? Is that okay?**

MR. CONKLIN: **That is fine with me, as long as we start getting some staff to work on it.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Is that good with you, Anna? All right. We have modified the motion a little bit. **It now says prepare a white paper to consider removing almaco jack from the jacks complex. Any more discussion on that? Any objection to that? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We have a draft timing and tasks motion that we need, but, first, let's talk about when we want that white paper to come back on removing almaco jack, and so let's have some discussion on that. I feel like that September is really bad, and so, Chris, can you offer some insight?

MR. CONKLIN: Can we see it in December?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We could put it on the list for December, I think, and then talk about it at the September meeting and make sure we have time for it in December. All right. Folks seem okay with that, and I see heads nodding. Then I need someone to make this timing and tasks motion, and someone would need to read it. Would someone like to do that?

MR. HAYMANS: Not that I would like to do it, but I am willing to do it. **The motion is to direct staff to complete the following tasks: initiate development of Abbreviated Framework 3 to address catch levels on blueline tilefish in the South Atlantic; conduct public hearings on Regulatory Amendment 33 (red snapper seasons) via webinar and listening stations and continue to develop the amendment for the council's consideration in September 2019; finalize Regulatory Amendment 30 (red grouper) and submit to NMFS; prepare Regulatory Amendment 29 (best fishing practices) for the council to consider for final approval at the September 2019 meeting; finalize the wreckfish ITQ review for the council to consider for final approval in September 2019; include review of the SMP Story Map in the next meetings of the Snapper Grouper, I&E, and Law Enforcement Advisory Panels; to assist SERO with a white paper on lionfish and traps issue to bring to the September council meeting for consideration; and to prepare an information document (white paper) on removing almaco jack from the jacks complex and bring for council consideration at the December 2019 meeting.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's seconded by Mel. It's under discussion. Any discussion or concerns with this timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to this timing and tasks motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** That concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee, and let's try to at least get through one more. Let's try to do Law Enforcement, Mel, while Myra is up here, and get through that before we break.

MR. BELL: The Law Enforcement Committee met on June 11. The committee approved minutes from the June 2018 meeting and the agenda for the June 2019 committee meeting. We opened in closed session, and the committee reviewed nominations for the 2018 2018 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award and deliberated in closed session to recommend one nominee to receive the award during the September 2019 council meeting.

Then we went to open session, where we had just one action item, and all we had was we received a report from the LE AP Chairman, Captain Bob Lynn, who briefed us on the Law Enforcement AP's meeting in Charleston on May 23 and 24, and topics that were covered included status of amendments under development, update on outreach for the for-hire electronic reporting amendment, regulations on harvest of dolphin aboard for-hire vessels in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions, and we had discussion of that.

Then Regulatory Amendment 29, priorities for joint enforcement agreements, guidance on prohibition on retention of species in state waters when harvest in federal waters is closed for federally-permitted for-hire vessels, enforcement of the heads and fins intact requirement for snapper grouper species. Then you can also access the entire report through that link. There were no motions made in open session. One other item was Captain Scott Pearce from the Florida Wildlife Commission was selected as the Vice Chair of the Law Enforcement AP. Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, sir. Let's see if we can do one more. How about the Mackerel Cobia Committee, Christina and Doug?

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Mackerel Cobia Committee met in Stuart, Florida on June 13, 2019. We received the status of commercial and recreational catches from SERO staff, and we received a report of amendments under formal review. We heard a report from AP Chair Ira Lax, which resulted in a lot of discussion and the first direction of staff, which was to add a discussion of port meetings to the next Mackerel Committee agenda, including possible collaboration with the Gulf Council, and you will see that later on in the timing and tasks as well.

Then we heard a discussion on the consideration of Atlantic king mackerel trip emergency action, and this resulted from the Mackerel AP meeting in April 2019. **That resulted in Motion Number 1, which was to request emergency action for Atlantic king mackerel to raise the current fifty-fish trip limit to a seventy-five-fish trip limit south of the Flagler/Volusia County line for Season 2, which is October 1 through the end of February, for the 2019-2020 season. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any additional discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: There is a roll call vote on emergency action.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you very much. Mr. Waugh.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. McGovern.

DR. MCGOVERN: No.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Christiansen.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Whitaker.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **It passes with one no vote from NMFS.**

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Gregg. Next, we CMP Framework Amendment 8, also a recommendation from the Mackerel Cobia AP. **That resulted in Motion 2 to approve the proposed language for the purpose and need statement. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any additional discussion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Motion 3 was to approve the inclusion of Action 1, Alternatives 1 through 4, in the CMP Framework Amendment 8. You will see on the screen and in what was online. You will see those actions and alternatives there. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

We had a very spirited debate, and we had information about the history of the Spanish mackerel management and a spirited debate about what to do with it and what the motion should look like. **The result was Motion 4, which was to direct staff to prepare a white paper on the necessity of controlling effort in the commercial Spanish mackerel fishery, especially the gillnet fishery. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any additional discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The final motion from the committee, and I will need to explain this in just a moment, was made by Ms. Beckwith. It was determined that the language that was typed on the screen was not the exact language that Ms. Beckwith used, and so, even though this motion was approved by the committee, it was felt that it needed to come back to the full committee with the exact wording as is included in yellow, including the date of March 7, 2019. If I could ask someone to make that motion.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move to make the control date for the Spanish mackerel commercial permit from the date of the March 2019 Mackerel Cobia Committee meeting, which is March 7, 2019.**

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you. Is there a second? Mr. Woodward. Thank you. Any additional discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** The final thing is timing and tasks, and if someone could make that motion for me for timing and tasks.

MR. POLAND: **I move to adopt the following timing and tasks: prepare for a discussion of port meetings to gain a comprehensive look at the commercial and recreational king and Spanish mackerel fisheries; work with SERO staff on an emergency rule to the raise the commercial king mackerel trip limit south of the Flagler/Volusia County line from fifty-fish to seventy-five-fish for Season 2 of the 2019-2020 season; continue work on CMP Framework Amendment 8 and prepare a draft for the September 2019 meeting; and prepare a white paper with a thorough analysis of effort in the commercial Spanish mackerel fishery and a discussion of possible avenues to control effort, including a limited-access commercial permit, a limited access gillnet endorsement in the Southern Zone, and collaboration with state agencies.**

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Steve. Is there a second? Second by Anna. Any additional discussion? **Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is passed.** Madam Chair, that concludes the Mackerel Cobia Committee.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks. Let's try to do another one, while we have Christina up here. Let's try to do the Spiny Lobster Committee. The Spiny Lobster Committee met on June 10, and the committee approved the agenda and the minutes from the October 2018 meeting. They got a report on the status of spiny lobster catch versus the ACL, a status of amendments under formal review, and then started discussion of spiny lobster commercial trip limits for vessels with snapper grouper and spiny lobster permits.

Following that lengthy discussion, the committee made Motion Number 1, which was to recommend the council start work on a regulatory amendment to create a commercial trip limit for vessels holding a snapper grouper unlimited and spiny lobster tailing permit off of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. If it's not clear, this is particular to diving and not the use of traps north of Florida. Now we just have a timing and tasks motion, if someone is willing to make the timing and tasks motion.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I move that we adopt the following timing and tasks: 1) to begin work on an amendment that will address spiny lobster trip limits for commercial vessels holding a snapper grouper unlimited permit and a spiny lobster tailing permit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's seconded by Mel. **Any objection to that timing and tasks motion? That motion stands approved.** That concludes the Spiny Lobster Committee Report, and let's go ahead and take a fifteen-minute break.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: We are going to do the SSC Selection Committee next up.

MS. BECKWITH: The SSC Committee met, and the committee approved minutes from the June 2018 meeting. The first thing we reviewed was the SSC re-applications. The council staff presented a list of SSC members whose terms have expired but have re-applied for another term, and the following motion was presented. **Reappoint all six SSC members who have re-applied for the SSC: Robert Ahrens, Luiz Barbieri, Jeff Buckel, Churchill Grimes, Genevieve Nesslage, and George Sedberry. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

We also looked at one additional seat and considered new SSC applicants, and staff informed the committee that the expertise most needed on the SSC at this time was general ecology, ecosystem, and habitat. The committee discussed and addressed changes to the SEP would be done at the next meeting in June of 2020. **Our second motion was to appoint Wilson Laney to the SSC. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.** We did have one additional timing and tasks motion, which I would request that someone make. Who would like to make that timing and tasks motion?

MR. POLAND: **I move to adopt the following timing and tasks: draft and send letters to all the SSC members that were re-appointed to the SSC for another three-year term; draft and send a letter to Dr. Wilson Laney announcing his appointment to the SSC for a three-year term; draft and send letters to all the other applicants who applied for positions on the SSC but were not appointed, thanking them for their applications.**

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Mel seconds. Is there any discussion on that motion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.** That concludes the SSC Report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Anna and Mike E. Next up, we're going to do the SEDAR Committee. The SEDAR Committee met on June 13 and approved the minutes from the March meeting and the agenda and then talked about SEDAR appointments for the scamp research track assessment and made the following motion.

Move to appoint those listed in Table 1 to the SEDAR 68 assessment of scamp. Table 1 is included at the bottom of this document. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Then the committee talked about the SEDAR activities update, and then we talked about the SSC report, and this was given by Dr. Sedberry, and then a lot of discussion about the South Atlantic Council's research plan. Following a review of the research plan, the committee made the following motion. **Move to approve the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council research plan for 2020 through 2025. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection of that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** There is a timing and tasks here, if someone would like to make the timing and tasks motion.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move to approve the following tasks: conduct SEDAR committee review via email of the black sea bass and red grouper assessment scopes of work prior to submission to the SEFSC; forward the research plan to SERO and Southeast Fisheries Science Center; and provide the committee the SSC's final MRIP workshop TORs.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is there a second? Seconded by Mel. **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** That concludes the SEDAR Committee. Thanks, John. Next up, we have AP Selection Committee, Chester and Kim.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Advisory Panel Selection Committee met in closed session on Monday morning, and the committee approved minutes from the March 2019 meeting and the committee agenda. The committee then addressed the following items. The committee discussed the continued solicitation for applicants for commercial representatives on the SMP Workgroup and Habitat and Ecosystem-Based Management Advisory Panel and approved the following motion as recommendations to the council.

Our first motion was to modify the sector-specific seats on the Habitat AP to no longer require the seats be sector-specific. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of this motion? Any objection? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

The second motion was to modify the structure of the Habitat AP to create an agency seat for the current at-large geologist/research seat. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

The committee then reviewed the responsibilities of the Cobia Sub-Panel. Since the creation of the sub-panel in 2016, management of the Atlantic cobia, and that's from Georgia all the way up to New York, has been designated to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. As a result, the committee approved the following motion as a recommendation to the council.

This is Motion Number 3, that we dissolve the Cobia Sub-Panel on the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, is there any opposition? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

The committee then had a good deal of discussion with regard to the folks that had served on that sub-panel, and I think the consensus opinion was that we would like to reach out to them and let them know that we very much appreciated their service and the reason that we were doing away with the sub-panel is because of the change in the management system. Therefore, the committee acknowledged the valuable contribution of the members of the Cobia Sub-Panel and directed staff to ensure their appreciation as reflected in the follow-up communications and further encourage them to apply for AP positions.

We did have a timing and tasks motion. **This is our Motion Number 4: 1)staff will send thank-you letters to members of the Cobia Sub-Panel on the Mackerel Cobia AP to advise them of the council's decision and acknowledge their contributions; 2)staff will advertise open seats on the council's advisory panels, as appropriate, for consideration by the AP Selection Committee at the December 2019 meeting.** Would anyone care to make that motion on behalf of the committee?

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MR. BREWER: Motion made by Mr. Bell. Is there a second? Second by Doug. We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion of this motion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to these two motions, actually? Seeing none, the motions stand approved.** Madam Chair, that concludes our report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, sir. Next up, we're going to go to the Dolphin Wahoo Committee with Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met in Stuart, Florida on June 12 and 13. The committee first approved the agenda and the minutes, and we then had a discussion of the status of commercial and recreational catches, noting that neither the commercial nor the recreational sectors were close to reaching their respective sector ACLs for either species.

We then had a pretty healthy discussion on reviewing the goals and objectives of the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan, and we provided quite a bit of guidance to staff on those goals and objectives for further discussion at a future meeting, and we also requested some additional

data to be brought forth to us at the next meeting and requested that we contact the Dolphin Research Program to see if we can have another presentation from their research.

We then began discussion on Amendment 10, which would revise the dolphin wahoo management measures, and we provided quite a bit of direction to staff, and we will begin with the motions. **Our first motion relative to Amendment 10 was to approve Action 1 and the proposed modified range of alternatives for consideration in Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

Our second motion was to approve Action 2 of the proposed modified range of the alternatives for consideration in Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.

Our third motion was to add Alternative 5 to Action 9. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.

Motion 4 was to add Actions 4 and 5 from the Recreational Accountability Measures Modifications Amendment to Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.

The next motion was to remove Action 13 from Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would like to make a substitute motion. I thought it was Action 13, actually.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, this is Motion 5 to remove Action 13 from Amendment 10.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Got it. **I would like to make a substitute motion that for Action 13 that we add an alternative for Florida only.**

MS. BECKWITH: Then this was the bag limit sales action in Amendment 10. During committee, we had this discussion, and we did have a motion, a substitute motion, during committee which failed, and then we did vote to remove this action, and so what Jessica is putting forth is the original motion to have bag limit sales only in the State of Florida, and that was the original substitute motion that was provided to us at committee. I will open up discussion on that substitute motion. We do need a second on the substitute motion. Art is the second, and so I open up discussion for that substitute motion.

MR. GRINER: We spoke about this at length, this very thing, and it's pretty clear, unless Jack can tell me otherwise, that we really don't have a mechanism for taking bag limit sales from the recreational sector and counting them toward the recreational sector. They will, in fact, come out of the commercial ACL, as far as I know, unless that has changed between the other day and today, and I don't see how we would account for these, other than coming out of the commercial sector's ACL.

MR. BELL: I am not going to re-plow any of the previous soil, but I will just say that what I did learn from the public hearing we had is there were a number of folks who were charter boat folks

from that area, and all I heard was primarily a concern for the health of the resource and concerns about additional commercial harvest, but primarily health of the resource, and so, that being the case, I think it would just be unwise to do something that would basically promote or encourage or incentivize additional commercial extraction from the resource when that's what they seem to be worried about, the health of the resource. I felt, even after I heard them speak, I felt like we had really done the right thing, and so I wouldn't support doing that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to respond to what Tim was questioning, and I felt like there were a lot of things about the mechanics of how this would work, which, to me, would come through analyzing this particular action, but there's nothing that says it couldn't come from either ACL. To me, that's the mechanics of what the amendment would do. I can certainly tell you that, on Florida trip tickets, we can add and subtract, and we have fields. We added a field to allow for tournament sales from tournaments, based on a discussion that we had on mackerel a few years ago. This is not insurmountable, but, to me, those types of arguments that you are making are about the mechanics that would come out as staff fleshes out the options, and so I think that that's something that we would make a decision on, and then we would direct folks to make that happen.

MR. SAPP: Aside from Ira, the majority of the gentlemen that were here to speak on behalf of this heard us shoot it down and thought that was it, it's over for another however many years it takes to bring it back up, and so that was why they told me they didn't even speak on it during public comment, and that's a bit of a failing on my part for not getting in front of them and saying, hey, guys, it's not totally dead, and keep talking, but, again, a part of the -- One of the main reasons for doing this is to allow us to put more high-quality fish in the marketplace, and it has to come from the recreational ACL. Write it in however you want, or at least let's continue to discuss it. Don't make it go away forever and that it will go that way, and, if it doesn't, then I'm willing to say, no, we can't do this, but it has to come from the recreational ACL. We can't burden the commercial fishermen any more than they are already burdened.

MR. HAYMANS: We heard from several fishermen as well that, in addition to the economics to the crew, it was also some -- There was no self-control from the fishermen, and they would take their limit and then not want to take their ten fish, and, to me, there is also an option in there to reduce the vessel limit, thereby hopefully, if not eliminating that problem, at least lightening the burden of if they take their limit and they don't want the fish, and so I stick by our original motion and don't support this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I forgot to mention the other day also -- There was a lot of talk about what some of the other APs had said, and so, when we had met the Dolphin Wahoo AP the last few times, they actually were in support of the bag limit sales, and so I didn't bring that up the other day, but, even though other APs had discussed it, we haven't met that Dolphin Wahoo AP in a while, and I just wanted to bring that up, that they were in favor of this.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I didn't advise you on this at the committee, and Shepherd did, and he is not here, and I don't want to plow ground either, as somebody said, but, if this goes forward, I think you're really going to have to consider National Standard 4, that conservation and management measures shall not discriminate between residents of different states, and so I think you would have to build a record as to why this wouldn't violate National Standard 4. I am not asking you to build the record now, but I'm just saying, if this goes forward, I think you're going to have a real concern with National Standard 4.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I agree with Monica. I'm not sure that I want to spend the time building that record at this point, and so, if this were to pass, then that would be the appropriate time to begin to build a record. Art, did you have a point?

MR. SAPP: I did, just in that we're talking about a state that is already saying, within this recreational limit, we are willing to forego the sixty and drop to forty, happily, so far from everybody I've spoken to, but, at the same time, there are fish that could be utilized in the commercial industry from the recreational catch, even with that reduced number, and so we're separating ourselves, to some degree, in a conservative manner, and now we're saying still let us help our guys out a little bit here with what's left over, which it will be minimal. Obviously, it's not going to be a lot of fish, but it will be something that would benefit the industry, in my opinion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I feel like we've had ample discussion between the committee and now. Is there any last points that have not been brought up that folks feel the need to make?

MR. CONKLIN: Just that the intent is to be sold to only a federally-permitted dealer, and is that correct?

MS. BECKWITH: I would presume that, yes, it would be dually-permitted boats sold to a federally-permitted dealer, if this were to move forward, and we would have to deal with all the mechanics of the fish that is sold is commercial, period, and so how you deal with that would be part of the mechanics we would have to sort through. Doug, last word.

MR. HAYMANS: Last word, and to that point. If I understand it right, most of the charters that I have heard sell directly to the restaurants and not through -- I mean, that's what I have heard from a lot of folks. It may be incorrect, but I have heard that they go straight to the restaurants, and that's not a federally-permitted dealer, in most cases.

MS. BECKWITH: To that point, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: That is not the case, and we have done a lot of law enforcement sting operations to get at just that, and so not specific to dolphin, but just to target back-door sales. I mean, we are very serious about it, and we make cases all the time, and so, no, I would say that my intent is just like Chris asked, that these fish would be sold to a federally-permitted wholesale dealer that is properly licensed. We are all about not allowing back-door sales in Florida.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester, you have not spoken, and so go ahead.

MR. BREWER: I struggle with this, I really do. It's a blurring of the line, but, in taking a look at the blurring of the line, you are only -- From what I understand of the plan, you are only going to allow this for those guides who hold the appropriate commercial permits. They know how to properly handle these fish, and that was Bob Jones' big problem, was listeria, and so I am torn, and I really would like to consider this some more, and I know you probably hate to hear that, because we've been over it and over it, but I am in favor of the substitute motion, because I would like to hear more.

MR. CONKLIN: I wouldn't be able to support it unless it was all the states, and I don't know if I could still support it then, but that's why I'm going to vote against it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: If it's all the states, isn't that just the action as it was, Alternative 2? I guess I'm kind of confused as to what Chris is saying. That would just be not approving the main motion, and am I saying that right?

MS. BECKWITH: What happens here is, if the substitute motion passes and then it becomes the main motion, this would come back into the action. At that point, the sort of motion before would just have gone away, and so we would have never have removed Action 13, and so we're going to take this in pieces, because it's going to get confusing. We're going to vote the substitute motion. If the substitute motion passes, then it becomes the main motion, and, if that passes, then we would not have in fact removed Action 13 from Amendment 10.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I just have a question for our parliamentarian, who is Gregg, by the way, I believe, although he --

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's Kelly. Kelly is back there lurking.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My question is why is this a substitute motion? This is Full Council, and you're reading the committee report, and so why isn't this a motion before Full Council? I am thinking you don't need a substitute motion here, right? You are reading the committee -- This is Full Council, and you met as a committee, and you are reading the committee report, and so now you're before Full Council, which is a slightly different body than the committee.

MR. BREWER: (Mr. Brewer's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. BECKWITH: Monica, I did move the original motion on behalf of the committee, and so that is a live motion.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm sorry. I just confused things, but I understand. Okay. I take it back.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so we're going to go ahead and vote now. **We have a substitute motion on the floor to add an alternative to Action 13 to allow bag limit sales of dolphin in Florida only. All those in favor of this motion, please raise your hand, four; all those opposed to this motion, please raise your hand, I see eight hands. This motion fails.**

Now we are back to the original motion, which was to remove Action 13 from Amendment 10. We have had discussion. Is there any additional discussion needed on this motion? Seeing no additional discussion, all those in favor of this motion, raise your hand, I am counting seven; all those opposed to this motion, please raise your hand, I am counting four. This motion passes.

The next motion that we dealt with was Motion 6 to add Alternative 3 to Action 14. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on this motion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.

Then we had Motion 7, which was to accept the IPT's suggested edits to Action 14, and those are highlighted for your review. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on this? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.

Then our Motion 8 was to allow filleting of dolphin north of North Carolina for charter/for-hire only, the intent being skin on the entire fillet and two fillets equaling one fish. No frames need to be retained. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Of course, this motion is particular to the Mid-Atlantic request to allow filleting of dolphin in their region. Is there any discussion on this motion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.

Then we began a discussion on bullet and frigate mackerel as an ecosystem component species in the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan. We provided a bit of direction to staff, and we moved the following motion. **Direct staff to initiate an amendment that would designate bullet and frigate mackerel as an ecosystem component species within the Dolphin Wahoo FMP to acknowledge their role as forage for dolphin and wahoo. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion on this motion?

MR. WAUGH: Just a question for clarification. As I recall, we had some direction to look at some appropriate regulatory actions to include in there, and so it's the council's intent that staff would work on those?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, that's my understanding. Is there any additional clarification or discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** There was no additional business to come before the Dolphin Wahoo Committee. We have one final motion, which is our timing and tasks motion.

MR. HAYMANS: **Madam Chair, I would move to direct staff to continue work on Amendment 10 for review at the September 2019 meeting; to continue work on revising the Dolphin Wahoo FMP goals and objectives at the September 2019 meeting; and to provide an options paper on adding bullet and frigate mackerel as ecosystem component species to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP at the September 2019 meeting.**

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Doug. Is there a second? Steve. Thank you. Is there any discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.** Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Anna and John. Next, up, we have the Committee of the Whole. The Committee of the Whole met on June 13 and approved the agenda and minutes, and then we began a discussion of the allocation trigger policy. We began reviewing this policy, and we reiterated our desire to apply both indicator-based and time-based criteria as triggers and for triggers for re-examining allocations.

We reviewed that spreadsheet with information regarding the first year a time-based allocation trigger would be reviewed, and we populated that spreadsheet, and we reiterated our desire to have time-based criteria triggered every seven years, should no other indicator-based criteria trigger a review.

When the review is triggered for any reason, the year of the next review would set as seven years following the most recent review, and so then we updated the wording for indicator-based triggers, and I'm going to read this, but I also want to note that we forgot to have discussion on one of our indicator-based triggers, and so the four bullets that we had edited during the Committee of the Whole state that either sector exceeds its ACL or closes prior to the end of its fishing year three out of five consecutive years; either sector underharvests its ACL or OY by at least 50 percent three out of five consecutive years; after a stock assessment is approved by the SSC and presented to the council; and after the council reviews a species fishery performance report.

The one that we neglected to have discussion on was the economic or social indicator arises that could be addressed through reconsideration of allocations, and so if we could have a little discussion on that. I believe, Brian, that we had discussed this at the previous meeting, but we just forgot to have this bullet on there, and so, in the document itself, the document had gone through what we had done in March and what we had done in December, but it wasn't kind of all combined into one area. Brian, do you want to elaborate on that a little bit?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and thank you, Madam Chair. There's also, in that draft letter that's in the briefing book, a discussion of specifics of social and economic indicators that could be considered for the trigger. If you would like, I can bring that up real quickly, so people can see exactly what we're talking about.

This is the first full paragraph that starts on the top of the second page, and let me just read it to you. Economic tools that could contribute to developing indicator-based review triggers could include cost-benefit analysis, which is used to examine changes in economic efficiency and economic impact analysis, which is used to examine changes in employment, sales, income, and value added at the national, regional, and state levels. Social indicators could include a range of social metrics, such as community resilience, dependence, vulnerability, and well-being. Examples of -- Well, I don't need to go into the ecological, but that's where some of the things are.

This could come also as part of an amendment, where the council staff and SERO staff bring back to the council an economic or social effects analysis that could indicate that there could be something very serious going on, or if these analyses were done under some other requirement, but we didn't want to leave this out, because we wanted to give you the option that you could say, if you chose to, that you wanted to re-look at allocations based on economic or social considerations, which was not in the indicator list previously.

MR. BELL: I mean, that's fine, and my only concern with it is I could see folks interpreting that in a way that it could be misused, because you can certainly build a strong case where you could compare economic valuation studies of different sectors, and you can show tremendous -- I mean, when I look at my own fisheries, in terms of how we're divided, if you look at the value of the commercial fishery versus the value of the recreational fishery, there is significant more economic impact, potentially, associated with the recreational side of it sometimes, and so I could see that being misused, perhaps, to argue for -- I mean, why even have the other sector, if it's based on just some economic consideration or value, and so it's fine if you want to keep it in there, but I just see the potential for it to be -- I know it's our decision, but I could see people leaning on us to use it, and that's just my only concern with it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I have some of those same concerns, and we could leave it out. We've had a robust discussion of our other indicator-based triggers. Reading the paragraph, we would just keep the portion of that letter that talks about how we're going to use stock assessments, and we'll talk about fishery performance reports, because that's not outlined in the letter yet. Basically, I think that Brian and I would have to go in there and update the letter some to more reflect this language, but we don't have to put it in there. I feel like we haven't really discussed it, and the letter has to be finalized, and it's time sensitive, and I agree with Mel's concerns. Do we want to just leave it out right now? I see heads nodding yes. Tim, did you want to say something?

MR. GRINER: I was just going to say that I share those same concerns, and I think we just need to leave it out at this point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we want to leave it out. I'm going to let Brian work on that. While he's working on that, I am going to continue with some other items from the committee report. In the committee report, there's a table in there that's just a tally of the assessed species and other species that would have their allocations reviewed each year, and this is something that we had asked about, and so there is the tally. You can see the tally per year, how many we would look at in 2019, 2020, 2021, and so going down the list there. I think it might be okay. In 2021, there is eight. In 2024, there is eleven, but I think that the reason that some of these are fairly high numbers is we grabbed the entire complex, I believe, right, Brian?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and I would like to clarify that that's why I didn't put just the total in there. The one that, following the logic that you all used, and that made sense, of course, is, in 2021, you have some assessed species that are going to be coming out, and that was largely the source of those, and so you're going to be looking at them anyway as a result of stock assessments.

In 2024, you will notice the assessed species is red, and that was for red snapper. Wasn't that clever? The reason why I highlighted that is because I'm sure you're going to have some pretty serious discussions about red snapper at that time, and so I didn't know what you all were going to think about that, but the other species in 2024 were complex related, and so you could treat those all as one lump, but I just wanted to point those things out.

Frankly, other than 2021, which you kind of have set up for stock-assessed species, and 2024, which just seemed to have a large number of complex species, you're pretty even, and you've got a little ramp-up time for the next couple of years, to help the council figure out how they're going to get through this process, and so that may not be so bad, and I've had some discussion with some SERO staff regarding this, since the Committee of the Whole met, and I didn't get a feeling of that they are terrified that this is going to be a huge workload. We haven't had a huge discussion on it, but they would have told me right away if they were like, oh my god, how are we going to do this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't -- I am not super concerned with it, especially at this time. We're a few years out from that, and those ten are from the complex, and, also, as Spud mentioned, this is going to be somewhat of a living table that we'll be looking at periodically, and I think, as we get closer to 2024, if we want to adjust when we're going to look at the species in that complex, I think that we can, but I would certainly open it up if people have other ideas or concerns about when we're looking at those species.

MR. WAUGH: Just a clarification. When this year will we talk about those three species, and then, also, in the next paragraph, it says the Executive Finance Committee will review a status report for triggers at the December council meeting each year, and is that going to start this December?

DR. CHEUVRONT: The three this year. This is when it starts. This is not when it's going to be completed, and, right now, we have allocation actions in Dolphin Wahoo 10, which are unassessed, and so they fall into the other species, and I forget what the stock is that is being assessed now. I could look it up if you really wanted to know, but it's something that is already underway.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I think we're okay. To go back to that section of the document that Gregg was talking about, staff is going to prepare this allocation trigger status report that would be presented during the Executive Finance Committee every December, and then the council staff indicated that it was their intent to keep that Excel spreadsheet updated, which would not just have the year that we intended to look at it, but it would also check-off if we did look at it and possibly decided that we didn't even want to review.

Just let me point out to -- Brian, if you could pull up our letter, I just wanted to point out one other item in our letter. The last paragraph of this letter -- As I mentioned earlier, I would have to work with staff on updating the letter, so that it's more reflective of those points, because we reworded the points, but we didn't get to the other portion of the Allocation Committee, where we were going to discuss some of the broader items and the past allocation discussions, and so I wanted to talk a little bit here about when we're going to do that, but there was something that was highlighted in this letter that concerned me a little bit.

The highlighted language says that the council will establish a working group that will help it identify information needed to determine whether and how a sector allocation will be modified in its published policy, and so there were multiple things that concerned me in this document, or letter.

Number one, I think this presumes that we want to have a council policy, and so I'm a little concerned about creating a council policy. This is not the trigger policy, but this would be an allocation policy that would be developed by the council, and I'm a little concerned about doing that, and so the policy, to me, would say something like we're going to look at years of landings from here to here, plus we're going to bring in information X, Y, and Z, every time we look at allocations.

I guess my concern with creating a policy like that is that I think, as we start looking at the various species, when they come up through this process, that there is almost always going to be some exceptions, and so let's take yellowtail. We're going to look at yellowtail. I think that, when yellowtail comes up, that we're going to be asking for economic information about the Florida Keys, or we're going to be asking for information about what other fisheries yellowtail snapper fishermen participate in, because some yellowtail snapper fishermen are full-time, and some of them are actually full-time in other fisheries, and it's just lots of nuances that I think are going to come up with each fishery.

If you think about king mackerel, we probably want to go back and look at landings that are a lot older than the landings that we would look at for other species, and so my concern with creating a

policy is that we could likely be writing exceptions to that policy, and, if every species is an exception, then why do we have a rule or a policy for it, and so my concern is creating a policy.

The other part of this discussion that we did not get to at this meeting was having a discussion about historically what had been done, and that was inside the Story Map, and part of what we were supposed to do at this meeting was talk about what had happened in the past and then figure out what pieces of information we were going to see in the future as these allocations were to arise.

For example, the yellowtail stock assessment is underway, and we would direct staff that, okay, for that species, or for most species in general, we want to see this type of economic information, and we want to see commercial and recreational landings, and we want to see -- Then whatever the list is, and so we could develop the list that gives staff a heads-up on the types of information we're going to see without developing a policy.

I still think it would be good, in the future, to start or continue the discussion that we didn't really get to at this meeting and direct staff what type of information we would like to see, but I have concerns about developing a policy itself if we're going to constantly develop exceptions to that policy.

Also, I am concerned about establishing a working group. I think Brian put this in this letter because, originally, when many of the allocations were developed, I believe in 2013, when what was the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, when that one went through, which used to be the Allocation Amendment, and then it was changed to Comprehensive ACL, and I believe, at that time, there was an allocation committee formed that met outside of the regular council meetings, and they got together and discussed that these are the years of landings we're thinking about using, and this is the type of information we're going to use, and then they presented that to the council. Brian, I actually think that you were on the council at the time, and you chaired that committee, and so I don't know if you want to talk about that a little bit.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Thank you, Madam Chair. You are right on all of those counts. The committee was formed in December of 2007, and I was appointed the chair of that committee, and that committee largely worked outside of the council process, and we met a few times. We met during council meetings as well, but we met a few times away from the council meetings, where we went through and talked about the different kinds of variables that could be included in the allocation discussion.

At the September meeting of 2008, that committee came back with a recommendation of four actions with alternatives that the council should consider, and, in fact, that's when the council adopted what later became known by various names, but, basically, it was the formula that used 50 percent of long-term landings plus the 50 percent of short-term landings combined together came up with the total percentage ACL that was applied by each sector.

That is part of what we'll be talking about when we do get to the presentation, when we do it, and so, the idea of establishing a working group, that's also part -- I believe the Gulf Council has something similar in their plan, and whether you want to take it out of the letter here or not, I can't advise you on that, other than I think that, at some point, it would probably be good if the council did have a discussion of how they want to deal with allocations in the future, if nothing else to

provide guidance to staff, so we know what is expected when we know you're going to be looking at allocations for a given species.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have a list of people that had hands in the air, but I guess what I'm saying here is -- To add on to what Brian is saying, I am suggesting that we delete that yellow language from this letter, because we haven't determined that we want to form a working group, and we haven't determined that we want to have a published allocation policy, and so, to me, we still need to have those discussions and make those decisions.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to reiterate what Brian was saying, the reason that working group was formed was because, as you can imagine, and as you will see when you start to deal with this, the council was spending a lot of time trying to figure out the allocation, and was getting wrapped around the axle, so to speak, and so they said let's do a working group and see if you guys, you people, can come up with anything that may work for us, and so that's why that working group was formed. Even if you don't put that here and you delete it from this letter, the highlighted portion about the working group, you can always establish one later on, and so you've got a lot of flexibility here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica.

MR. BELL: So the first sentence then is okay, because that means -- That's what we were supposed to do, is have a trigger policy.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I agree that that sentence needs to have the word "trigger" in it, that the council will publish this trigger policy.

MR. BELL: Yes, and then the one you want to remove -- That's kind of down in the -- That's the how we do this, and, like you said, we really haven't talked about the how are we going to do this exactly, and maybe we go to a working group or a committee or something, and I don't know, but we haven't really got to that point yet.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I agree with that.

MR. CONKLIN: Do we need a motion to delete it? I mean, we've built a record, haven't we?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think direction is fine, and so if you want to say that the direction to staff is that we delete that highlighted sentence in the letter and modify the letter according to how the Committee of the Whole discussed those triggers earlier this week.

MR. CONKLIN: Do we need to just, since we didn't finish it, finish all of our discussion, say they're ongoing and, when we get finished with them, we will have you another letter saying that we're done and this is how we're going to do it?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't even know if we need another letter, because this is the only thing that was required of us, was to develop the trigger policy.

MR. CONKLIN: If we met the mandate, then let's just --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and then, after that, it's up to us what we want to do. I'm going to go Spud, and then I have another idea, because we also need to talk about when we're going to talk about allocation again, and that was one of the items that we talked about in Executive Finance.

MR. WOODWARD: Right, and that was sort of the point that -- I think that we should just delete it. I don't think we need to commit to anything at this point. Delete it. The more important thing is that we continue addressing the topic, because we have created an expectation that we're going to do it. We're going to have a GAO report at some point that is going to have examined the way we do things, and it may provide some guidance on whether they are acceptable in their eyes or unacceptable or suggested alternatives, and so this is going to be a process that is going to carry over into next year. I mean, we know that, and so I think you fulfill your obligation with the trigger policy and we just keep moving forward as we can.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree, and Spud brings up a good point that the GAO is conducting this review of allocations, and that report is supposed to be completed by December of this year, and I don't even know if we want to finalize any of our allocations discussions, other than this trigger policy, until after that report is completed, and so I'm just going to throw that out there.

It seems like we're giving direction to staff to delete that portion of the letter and update the letter to make it more reflective of what we discussed in the Committee of the Whole, and so then my final item here is when do we want to talk about allocation again? We didn't even get to our other discussion that was about the history that was inside the Story Map, and so we didn't even get to that at this meeting, and then Chris had suggested that, at the next meeting, we block off a four-hour time period to discuss allocation.

I am thinking, at this point, that that probably can't come to September, between the parliamentary course that's half a day and the interviews of the new Executive Director and all these other things. We're talking about a whole day for Dolphin Wahoo, and I just don't think we're going to be able to do it, and so I'm going to throw that out there, but I would like to hear some more about the timing of when we want to see it again.

MR. CONKLIN: Maybe the allocation history powwow is not a -- I mean, we learned a lot this week, and the Story Map was great, and it accomplished a lot of what it needed to. I really was thinking about this this week, and these folks from the GAO, in doing this report and all, it might be best to wait to talk about it until after the report comes out to Congress. That way, we have our marching orders or we don't, and we know better, because, if we start something, and they come in and tell us to do something different, then we're just wasting time, and we could have a problem, and so I would look for it to come back in March.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I'm good with that. I like the idea of having that report, which wouldn't be completed until December, and looking at that, and then I would like to go back to the Story Map that was created and go over the history. I would do all of that in March, I think is what Chris is suggesting, and so we would do that in March and figure out where we want to go. We would have the GAO report, hopefully, as well as go over the Story Map that was in the briefing book this time and then continue the discussions from there. Are folks okay with that?

DR. MCGOVERN: Yes, that's fine, but the GAO isn't going to tell you what to do with allocations. It's just going to provide recommendations, and I think the whole idea with the

workgroup that Brian is on, they're just going to provide some kind of template for doing allocations in the future, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am just a little concerned about creating a template that then we just continue to make exceptions to, but I guess we start having those discussions in March, and so we have fulfilled our obligations on the trigger, and, if we go back to the committee report, we had a timing and task relative to this trigger letter that we need made, but I'm going to go to Brian first.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Because you have now decided when you want to come back to discussing allocations again, in your report here, the decision that you had made, our understanding was that you wanted to start the allocation trigger status report in December of this year, but you're not going to address allocations and things until March, and so do you want to wait until December of 2020, and I can just add "for the December council meeting each year beginning in 2020", if that seems more appropriate.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That sounds great to me, and so we'll get that added in there. Then the timing and tasks, and so would someone -- The timing and task is about the trigger policy letter that does have a deadline, and would someone like to make that motion?

MR. CONKLIN: **I will make this timing and task motion, Madam Chair. I make the following timing and task motion: to prepare a letter to be signed by the Council Chair with the council's allocation review trigger policy.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do we have a second? It's seconded by Mel. Any more discussion on this? Does everybody understand what we're doing? Thumbs-up. Okay. I see heads nodding. **Any objection to this timing and task motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** That concludes the Committee of the Whole Report, and we're going to go into SOPPs, and I'm going to turn it over to Chris and Gregg.

MR. CONKLIN: The SOPPs Committee met at the Hutchinson Island Marriott in Stuart, Florida on June 10, 2019, in Salons 1 through 4, in the Year of our Lord. We first approved the minutes from the March 2019 meeting, and we also approved the agenda. Then Gregg went into talking about the handbook, and, after that, he went in and talked about the SOPPs.

There was a couple of motions that came up. **The first motion was to approve Number 9, the dress code for staff, to the handbook. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any objections? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

There was another motion that was to approve Item C, the dress code for council members, to the handbook. Is there any discussion on the motion? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

There was another motion, Number 3, to approve the following wording to Item E, Transportation. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on the travel motion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

There was no other business to come up before the SOPPs Committee, and I am going to look to the council to make a timing and tasks motion, and, if I can get somebody to do that, that would be fantastic, and it's up on the screen.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I can make that motion. I guess my -- I see in there that it says cap on POV costs to the cost of an airline ticket, and I didn't think that we had actually decided that that was where exactly we wanted to go. I think it's fine to bring back clarification, but I didn't think we had consensus on that. I mean, bring back some language to look at, but I didn't think we had consensus on that.

The timing and tasks motion, I move that we adopt the following timing and tasks motion: 1)to work with NOAA GC to clarify the remaining identified issues in the handbook; 2)revise the handbook and bring the document back for review/action at the December 2019 council meeting, and this would add wording from the November 2019 CCC meeting, as appropriate, and add additional clarification on travel (e.g., applies to authorized travelers with a council travel order and cap on POV costs to the cost of an airline ticket).

MR. CONKLIN: Did we get a second?

MS. BECKWITH: I am suggesting -- **I agree with Jessica that we should take out that cap on POV costs to the cost of an airplane ticket.** I think we don't need to be locking ourselves into things to be that strict, and that has to be sort of a case-by-case. I mean, I travel from Costa Rica for our March meeting, and so I think it would be -- If my travel cost is from North Carolina versus Costa Rica -- I think we just have to have some flexibility.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I felt like we had a lot of good discussion about how the language that staff already wrote, that we approved, was allowing that flexibility by allowing the ability to consider extenuating circumstances, but also trying to be reasonable. We also had a discussion about how council members should take it upon themselves to be reasonable about what they're doing when they are traveling, and so I felt like the wording you already had in there was good.

MR. WAUGH: So you want to delete that wording? That's fine.

MR. CONKLIN: **Okay, and so that's deleted now.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: You still need a second.

MR. CONKLIN: We still need a second. Can we get a second now? It's seconded by Chester. Is there any more discussion on the motion? **Is there any opposition to it? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** As I am not following the dress code today, I was making myself sort of an oxymoron, and so I apologize. I didn't want to have to go back into my luggage, and so, anyway, my bad. That concluded the SOPPs Report, and, Madam Chair, I am going to turn it back over to you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Chris. Next up, I am going to turn it over to Chester and Gregg to do the Personnel Committee Report.

MR. BREWER: All right. The Personnel Committee met on June 10, and we approved the minutes from the December 2018 meeting and the agenda. The Personnel Committee, our discussions centered around the search for a new Executive Director. We reviewed the process and timing being followed by the Personnel Committee in the search for the new Executive Director, given that Gregg Waugh will retire at the end of the year. Applications are due on or before June 21, and we gave about thirty days for those after we advertised for the position for those applications to come in. They have been slow, but I see we've gotten one or two actually while we've been here at the council meeting, and so hopefully we'll see some more.

The goal is to conduct in-person interviews at the September 2019 council meeting, the next council meeting, and make a final decision at that meeting. That decision will not be made by the Personnel Committee. It will be made by Full Council. We are hoping that there is some overlap with our current Executive Director and that it will be possible for the new Executive Director to come onboard prior to the December, or during the December, 2019 council meeting, and that's a hope.

There was a question raised as to whether or not the ability to come onboard prior to the December of 2019 council meeting would in some way affect the criteria utilized for selection, and it was pretty well made clear that, no, it doesn't, and it's aspirational. Madam Chair, we don't have any other information, and we had no motions and no timing and tasks, and, therefore, that concludes the Personnel Committee Report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chester and Gregg. All right. We're going to move on to Executive Finance. The Executive Finance Committee met multiple times this week, and the committee approved the minutes from the March meeting and the agenda for this meeting. We received a report from Gregg on the May 2019 CCC meeting that was held in Charleston, and we reviewed a report from that meeting.

Then we talked about the Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization and the Modern Fish Act. We received a presentation from Jack McGovern about the Modern Fish Act, and we had a number of questions. When we -- I thought it was in the timing and tasks. We asked him to prepare a table of the items. It is. It's in the timing and tasks motion, that we asked him to prepare a table of all the items coming out of the Modern Fish Act. They would be including the deadlines, the guidelines, and what agency is going to be conducting the various reports and reviews.

Also, during the CCC meeting, Dave Whaley indicated that comments on the Senate staff working draft would be helpful, and the committee directed staff to prepare draft comments and circulate them for council review and input and then provide them back to Dave Whaley by the end of June.

The committee also discussed the CCC working paper, which has various topics that all the councils have provided information on. We reviewed three topics in particular, and they were stock rebuilding, stock assessment and survey data, and aquaculture. All of these were modified by the CCC at their May meeting, and so, as always, each council is free to change their regional perspective at any time, and we had a discussion on experimental fishing permits, and we expressed a desire to have a higher-level review for any project that a council, state, or regional group provide objections or that is very controversial. I believe that Chester might have some wording for us.

MR. BREWER: I do. We made a motion, or gave direction to staff, and I'm not sure which, that language be added to our CCC regional portion of this thing, and so Gregg has prepared, in accordance with the direction, several options, which we can scroll through, but the one that, at least to me, best reflects the intent of what was discussed, and let me just give a little bit of history here, and you all probably already know this, and you know that I get teed-off on it.

99 percent of EFP applications are wonderful, and they're for real research and for real scientists, and we don't need to mess with them, but there are -- Every once in a while, you get one that is somebody who may be favored by the agency or have some ties or something happens, and you get an EFP that is highly controversial that would result in a significant financial benefit to the applicant, and, even though the science that would be derived is -- I am not even going to use the word *de minimis*, but there is not a lot of science involved, and the thing gets granted.

The EFP that dealt with getting the longlines back into the nursery off of Florida is a perfect example of that. That EFP was, in the first instance, granted. It was later denied, and it was highly controversial, and there was a lot of stuff that went on in that, but Option 1b that is up here that was prepared by Gregg is -- **It is the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's intent that, in addition to provide EFP requests to the councils, NMFS would provide EFP requests to all affected state agencies, and, if they object, or if the EFP request is particularly controversial or if a substantial financial benefit would be derived by the applicant, the affected council's Scientific and Statistical Committee will review the EFP request and provide recommendations to the council. The council will consider the SSC comments during their discussions to develop recommendations for NMFS. Madam Chair, I would like to put that option in the form of a motion.** If we can get a second, we can discuss it further, or there may not need to be a lot of discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's seconded by Art. I have one thing that I wanted to point out. I am looking at the language that says, "the affected council's Science and Statistical Committee will review the EFP request and provide recommendations to the council", and I don't mind that. I guess I'm just concerned about the timing.

Since the SSC only meets a couple of times a year, and we often get EFPs more frequently than that, I just have concerns about the timing, and I'm wondering -- If I look down at Option 3 on this list, it says that the council may send the Southeast Fisheries Science Center comments to their Science and Statistical Committee for review, and so I'm wondering if we make it more open-ended, to allow for this timing, and do you see the sentence that I'm talking about? It's a "may", instead of a "must", just because I'm worried about this timing issue, and, if that ends up holding up an EFP that maybe we want to happen because of the timing, but maybe that's what you intend, and so that's why I'm bringing this out.

MR. BREWER: I am not the head of it, but, Mr. Waugh.

MR. WAUGH: Just to clarify on the timing issue. For single issues, we do have the option of having the SSC review it by email and by webinar, and they have done a number of single-issue items by webinar, and that has worked quite well, and so I think we could address the timing issue.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then I'm good.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to suggest that, if the council were in favor, it's not controversial, and it doesn't need to go to the SSC. This is just those rare issues, like getting into a closed area.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes. All right. Any more discussion on this motion? Once again, this language would be added under the EFP section of the CCC working paper, and so there is the section, and there is a consensus position, and then each council has a regional position, and so this would be added to our regional position. Any more discussion on the motion?

MR. WAUGH: Just for clarification, we would add this to our regional perspective position, and then, at the next CCC meeting, we would try and get the other councils to go along and add this to the consensus.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that clarification.

DR. MCGOVERN: I just wanted to mention that some of the things that are mentioned in here are already required by the regs, like sending an EFP to the affected states and the U.S. Coast Guard, and there are things in here, like issuance of an EFP that would have economic allocation as its sole purpose, other than compensation fishing, is a grounds for not approving an EFP.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

MR. BREWER: To that point?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure.

MR. BREWER: That was not followed with regard to that application that was put forth by Dayboat Seafood and Dave Kerstetter.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, it wasn't approved, Chester, but, also --

MR. BREWER: It was the first time, until NOVA Southeast University demanded that their name be taken off of it, and we can discuss privately what happened after that, but I do not want to discuss it in open council.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's fine. Would you actually read the motion one more time into the record, just for clarification?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes. **The motion is adopt Option 1b. It is the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's intent that, in addition to providing EFP requests to the councils, NMFS would provide EFP requests to all affected state agencies and, if they object, or if the EFP request is particularly controversial, or if a substantial financial benefit would be derived by the applicant, the affected council's Scientific and Statistical Committee will review the EFP request and provide recommendations to the council. The council will consider the SSC comments during their discussions to develop recommendations for National Marine Fisheries Service.**

MR. BELL: So we would find out about these the way we normally find out about them, and so we would be at a meeting, and we would decide if we had issues with it, and we would defer it to the SSC, and they would somehow look at it and then get back with us at the next meeting? That is just the way that would work, right?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, that's how it would work, unless, once we are made aware of the EFP request, and we know it's controversial, then we could go ahead and try and get the SSC review prior to the first time the council would consider it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We also talked about the Draft Calendar Year Operational Budget for 2019, and the council approved the budget, and I believe that we had a motion. **Motion Number 1 was approve the Calendar Year 2019 Operational Budget. 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.**

Then we also talked about our priorities and our tiering, and so we have listed up there what we're going to bring back in September and then what we think is going to come back in December. Then I think the only thing left here, if I'm scrolling past the EFP stuff, is the timing and tasks motion. We have a timing and tasks motion, and it's very lengthy, on the board. Would someone like to make the timing and tasks motion?

MR. BREWER: **Madam Chair, I move that the council adopt the following timing and tasks: 1)direct staff to prepare short discussion papers on the following topics and provide to the council for review/input and send to Dave Whaley by the end of June: a. shifting stocks and changing ocean conditions; b. forage fish; c. timelines for amendments; d. Habitat. Next, request National Marine Fisheries Service provide specific examples of how the councils can make use of the flexibility for managing recreational fisheries. Next, request NMFS prepare a table showing the reports required by the Modern Fisheries Act and what will be included, deadlines, guidelines, responsible agency/group, et cetera. Next, directed staff to prepare draft comments on the Senate draft wording for MSA reauthorization, circulate them to the council for review/input, and provide to Dave Whaley by the end of June. Next, direct staff to revise the CCC working paper, as needed, and provide the revised document to Dave Witherell, Chair of the CCC Legislative Work Group. Next, direct staff to work on the following items for the September 2019 council meeting: Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29, and that's the best practices and powerheads; Snapper Grouper Abbreviated Framework 3, and that's the blueline tilefish ACL; CMP Framework 8, and that's the king mackerel trip limits in Season 2; Dolphin Wahoo 10, and that's dolphin wahoo actions and goals and objectives; Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 33, and that's the red snapper season modifications; bullet and frigate mackerel as ecosystem-based species in the dolphin wahoo fishery; Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 34, and that's with the North Carolina and South Carolina special management zones; Spanish mackerel white paper; wreckfish ITQ review; Coral 10/Shrimp 11/Golden Crab 10, transit provisions and Oculina extensions and golden crab allowable fishing zones. Are there others? Seeing none, Madam Chair, that is my motion.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Can I get a second? It's seconded by Chris. Any discussion of this timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** I believe that concludes the Executive Finance Committee Report. Next up, we have the HMS Presentation, and I believe that Karyl is going to give us this presentation. Thanks for hanging in there with us.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: Thank you, everybody. My name is Karyl Brewster-Geisz, and I'm here on behalf of the Highly Migratory Species Management Division of NOAA Fisheries, and I want to thank you for the opportunity to come and present to you. We have a lot of actions going on right now, and we are definitely looking for advice and comments from the council. We actually have four actions here that I am going to talk about, and the first action is in regard to a draft environmental impact statement, or DEIS, that we have out right now, and the proposed rule for that should be coming in just a couple of weeks, and then the next three actions are all in the scoping phase, which means that we are looking specifically for comments and assistance in what direction we should be going.

Those scoping actions have an issues and options paper out there. The good thing about all of these is the scoping comment all ends on July 31, and so you only have to remember one day, and so, starting with the DEIS, this is to modify the pelagic longline bluefin tuna area-based and weak-hook management measures, and we are taking this action in order to continue minimizing bluefin tuna interactions with the pelagic longline fishery while also reducing redundancy in the regulations.

This action focuses on three areas, the northeastern United States area, up here off of New Jersey, the Cape Hatteras Gear-Restricted Area, and then these two smaller areas in the Gulf of Mexico, and they were all put into place in different places. The northeastern one was put into place back in 1999, and it is only effective in the month of June, and it is specific to reducing bluefin tuna dead discards. The Cape Hatteras Gear-Restricted Area was put into place as a result of Amendment 7, just a couple of years ago, and it is an area that fishermen are allowed to go into if they meet certain performance metrics, and so those performance metrics include following the logbook and the observer programs and showing that they do not catch a lot of bluefin tuna.

These gear-restricted areas in the Gulf of Mexico also went into place with Amendment 7 a couple of years ago, and they are effective April through May of every year, and the fishermen are not allowed within them, and then, also, within the Gulf of Mexico, we require that all pelagic longline fishermen use weak hooks.

In this action, we looked at a number of alternatives. Of course, the first action we looked at was no action, which I just described to you, and we also looked at changing both the northeastern and the Gulf gear-restricted area to have performance metrics, and this would make it consistent with what the Cape Hatteras is, and we looked at changing the boundaries of that smaller northeastern area, to see if it would still be effective that way. Ultimately, we ended up preferring changing the northeastern and the Gulf of Mexico areas into basically monitoring areas, where we monitor the catch over a three-year time period. Each year, there is a threshold. If the threshold is not met, those areas remain open, unless the agency decides to take other action. If that threshold is met, the areas are closed, and no one is allowed back in them until the agency takes further action. At the end of that three-year period, if they have remained open, they continue remaining open.

Then the last preferred alternative is to remove the Cape Hatteras Gear-Restricted Area, and so this would remove all those performance metrics as well, and people could continue fishing them. The main reason that we're doing this, and we feel that this will be effective to continue to minimize bluefin tuna, while also removing redundancies, is because of the individual bluefin tuna quota program that is currently in place for the pelagic longline fishery. This is a quota system where every vessel has a specific quota for bluefin tuna, and they can lease quota from other vessels if they exceed their quota. That seems to be very effective.

The weak-hook alternative, right now, weak hooks are in place year-round in the Gulf of Mexico. Our preferred alternative is to make it a seasonal requirement, just effective January through June. As I said, this currently is out in draft environmental impact statement, and we are accepting comments on that, and the proposed rule really should be out in another week or two, and we will announce a bunch of hearings for that proposed rule, once it's out.

Now we're on to the three scoping actions. The first one is the data collection and research to support spatial fisheries management. I think you talked a little bit about the EFP to allow for research within the Florida east coast closed area, and that was our first attempt to try to collect fishery-dependent data in some of our area closures.

All of these area closures can be very effective for management, and the problem that we have realized, over the years, is some of these areas have been closed for twenty years, and we have had no fishery-dependent information coming from those areas, and the fisheries have all changed, both in terms of where fish are along with how the fishermen are fishing, and so we really are looking at ways to collect scientifically-robust statistical information, specifically fishery-dependent information, in these closed areas.

This is a map of some of our closed areas. These are the pelagic longline closed areas, and I just talked about some of the areas that are being looked at in the draft environmental impact statement that I just talked about, but there are others. Typically, when people hear about our closed areas, they immediately think about these, but we also have bottom longline closed areas, and we have areas that are closed to recreational fishermen, and we have areas that we have closed to -- We have closed loopholes with this council, and with all the other councils, and so there are large portions of the ocean that we are not getting fishery-dependent information from, and so that is our goal with this action, and we are in the scoping phase, and so we are accepting all comments and thoughts.

We have put together seven options to start the conversation, and these range from changing our current EFP process to allow for and adjust for some of the controversies involved in allowing people in closed areas to making research more like what we do for the shark research fishery. The shark research fishery is something we established when we prohibited sandbar sharks, and these are the only fishermen who are allowed to land sandbar sharks, and it's been a really successful program. We allow about five to seven vessels every year to fish for sandbar sharks, and they have a large number of restrictions on them, and all of the data that is being collected is used, and has been used, to improve stock assessments for all sharks, and so we could do something like that.

We could do something like what we did back in 2003 for the Grand Banks and the Northeast Distant and do a partnership research program, and we could decide that what we really need is

fishery-independent information and use the NOAA vessels and try to collect information that way, or we could use something like what we have for the Cape Hatteras area currently, and that is make it performance-metric-based, where, if vessels meet certain performance metrics, yet to be determined, we could allow them in those areas to collect research, and that would be the whole purpose of making any of these changes, is to collect information and research. As I said, the comment period for this ends on July 31, and there is a lot more information in-depth in the issues and options paper.

Next up is Amendment 13 to our FMP, and this is specific to bluefin tuna. I talked a little bit about the individual bluefin quota program, and this was implemented under Amendment 7. The pelagic longline fishery focuses on swordfish, yellowfin, and bigeye tunas, and they are not allowed to target bluefin tuna, which is why bluefin tuna is always such a pressure point for them. There is also the purse seine fishery involved in Amendment 13. Right now, the purse seine fishery for bluefin tuna is currently inactive, and then this action will also be looking at some of the other directed categories, the harpoon, general, and angling categories.

As part of Amendment 7, we made a commitment to do a three-year review of the IBQ program, and we have just completed our draft three-year review, and that showed that there might be some good modifications that we could make to that program, and so part of Amendment 13 is to look at those results. The purse seine fishery, as I said, has been pretty inactive in several years, and so we're looking at ways to address that and the bluefin quota that is allocated to the purse seine fishery, and then we are looking at all the categories, in order to figure out how to optimize fishing opportunities.

In regard to the IBQ program, we are looking at how do we allocate those initial shares every single year to all the bluefin tuna pelagic longline fishermen and how do we want to deal with IBQs? Right now, vessels can only lease IBQs, and do we want to allow permanent sale? Then there are other aspects of the IBQ program that we're looking at, including modifications to some of the cameras and the electronic monitoring system, along with possibly a mat that people have to put the fish on that would allow us to come with estimates of fish length.

Regarding the purse seine fishery, we're looking at removing that as an acceptable category or maybe phasing that category out, and then how do we deal with reallocating that purse seine quota? The general category quota is currently allocated certain percentages throughout the year, depending upon what month it is, and do we want to modify those percentages throughout the year? In terms of all gears and categories, do we want to modify all of those allocations? The angling category has specific trophy areas and allocations, and so we're looking at that. In case you haven't guessed it, for Amendment 13, there's a lot going on about allocations. Then other uses and allocation ideas regarding the other gear types.

Again, the comment period ends on July 31, and the issues and options for this amendment is really long, and it has a lot of depth, and it has a lot of really good information, and the three-year review also has a lot of good information.

The last action that I'm going to talk about is in regard to Amendment 14, and this is shark quota management, and I understand you had an interesting discussion about sharks the other day, which I missed, and I definitely would look forward to hearing more about that. We are looking at how

we manage sharks and the whole quota system, just like this council is looking at it. in terms of the National Standard 1 Guidelines and what came out and where do we want to go.

We have not looked at changing our ABC/ACL structure since the late to mid-2000s, and so we're looking at this, in order to determine acceptable levels for rebuilding success of sharks, along with increasing management flexibility for harvest, and so, specifically, we're looking at ABC control rules, whether or not we want to do a standard or tiered approach, how we set ABCs when we have no stock assessment, which is true for a number of shark management species, what do we do about phasing-in the ABC provisions, and do we want to phase-in major changes in the ABC based on stock status or all the time, regardless of stock status.

What do we do about total allowable catches and annual catch limits? Do we want to manage all sectors? Right now, we directly manage the commercial sector throughout the year, with lots of in-season changes. Do we want to do that for the recreational sector as well and open and close it? Those are all things we're considering.

Carryover provisions, I think this council is very much aware of carryover provisions, along with multiyear overfishing determinations, and so, as you're working through council things, we're considering the same things for sharks. Again, the issues and options paper is out there, and it has some more information in-depth, because there are a lot of options under each of the issues that I just talked about, and the comment period ends on July 31.

We are currently doing a lot of scoping meetings. The next scoping meeting is specific to Amendment 13, and it's up in Chatham, Massachusetts, though we do have more down in the South Atlantic area, including one that looks at all three of those scoping issues of Amendment 13, spatial management, and Amendment 14 in Fort Pierce on June 14. We have been doing webinars as well, and there is only one webinar left, and that's on spatial management, on June 19, and that's all I have.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Karyl. That was an excellent presentation. Are there questions for Karyl?

MR. BREWER: My name is Chester Brewer. First, I heard you say that there has been no research in some of these closed areas for twenty years. I don't know how long you've been with HMS, but are you aware of the 2010 fisheries-dependent research that was done in the Florida east coast restricted area?

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: I have been with HMS since the mid-1990s, and so, yes, I am aware of all the research that has been done on the east coast.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Do you know -- Well, I am not going to jump you over that. I am just not going to do it. I am tempted, but you're too nice, and I'm just not going to do it. I will tell you though that, as I read through the options paper, particularly with regard to the EFP requirements, it seems that HMS has taken -- Essentially all of those options are that, if something is related to research in closed areas, or restricted areas, that the level of scrutiny related to the EFP would be lessened. Here, as I take this example, you would say, okay, well, we're going to -- One of the options is to get a template, and we'll take public opinion, or public comment, on the template, but, once it's in place, we're really not going to take any further public comment.

That allows people, purported researchers -- As long as they fit the template, as long as they fit the template, then they get their EFP, at least from my reading of that option. I've got to tell you that, because of what went on in 2015 and 2017 with that Dayboat application, and I know the chief scientist was David Kerstetter, that the agency's reputation for truth and veracity and neutrality took a pretty big hit, and this options paper and the way it's framed, from the standpoint of EFPs, is yet another body-blow.

You were here when we made the motion with regard to our contributions to the CCC and EFPs in these areas when they are controversial or when there is a potential substantial financial benefit to be derived, and it would be my hope that you would put an option in that set of options dealing with EFPs that would be very similar to what we just passed, such that, if you've got an EFP application that is highly controversial, and/or that there is a substantial financial benefit to be derived by the applicant, that that EFP would have a higher level of scrutiny, rather than a lower level of scrutiny.

That's because a lot of the stuff that goes on, or that has gone on in the past, because you had to -
- For the Florida east coast, you had that 2010 study that was Hogarth and Margo Schultz-Hagen, and the paper on it was written by David Kerstetter, and it was extremely, extremely, controversial, and we had probably 1,500 people in Fort Lauderdale meet about that. It was overwhelming, the negative comments that were made. In fact, you had the governor of our state, at the time, Charlie Crist, who wrote a personal letter to Bill Hogarth saying please don't do this. It was done anyway.

In 2015, with Dayboat and with Kerstetter, the hue and cry was -- I mean, it was major, but it was granted anyway, and all they did was go from 1,080 sets per year, over a three-year period, to 720 sets, and that was the mitigation. That application was deemed withdrawn, because Nova Southeast University requested that their name be taken off of it, and it was later put back with a one-man corporation, and that was David Kerstetter, and, the second time through, it was denied. When you've got something like that that is going on, and the credibility of the agency is kind of on the line, it just seems like, to me, that you need to have higher scrutiny, rather than less, and that's my comment. Thank you, ma'am.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: Thank you for that. I did want to go in a little bit about the EFP option, and so we can definitely accept your comment that it could need more scrutiny. The way we issue EFPs in HMS, I think, is slightly different than how the council does, in that, every year, we issue a notice of intent to issue EFPs, and we outline all the EFP applications that we are expecting to get for the year, and most of these are pretty standard.

We have a lot of scientists that want to go out and place tags on certain species, and we have some fishermen that every year want to collect, or aquariums that every year want to collect, certain species for display, and so, in that notice of intent, we issue -- We describe all of these activities and say we intend to issue the EFPs.

If something is controversial, we would also put it in there, if we knew that we were getting a controversial one, and accept comment on it and consider those comments. If needed, we would go out for public hearings, and so that is standard. What we are talking about in here, one of the options is to actually do an FMP amendment or a framework action that would set up, as you said, a template for what research could look like, and we would still intend and expect that, if anything

came up controversial, we would still need to go out with that public hearing phase, but we would also have in there already some of the basics of what is needed and whether or not it met those basics, and so, yes, I definitely hear what you are saying, and we'll certainly do that and be clearer next time. If it's controversial, we will definitely go out for public hearings.

MR. SAPP: I just want to be real quick, because it's getting late here, but I wanted to request that you find a way to get the shark research permits on those sandbars to spread out further than primarily up around Canaveral, as we're recognizing an explosion in that species from Key West through Jacksonville and beyond. We need those fish to start being taken, please.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Did you want to respond?

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: There's not much to respond. We are hearing that request, and we are looking at seeing what we can do. We do have a number of shark species that continue to be overfished, and protecting those species oftentimes is what is driving us. I am hopeful that the assessment that is going on right now regarding Atlantic blacktip will be a positive assessment and we will be able to increase quotas here in the Atlantic, which may help alleviate some of what you're seeing, but that is still a couple of years off. They are not finishing that assessment until the end of 2020.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks, Karyl, for the presentation. Taking it a little bit broader out, this council certainly recognizes that getting good data from closed areas is a problem that is not going to go away any time soon. As a council, we encourage data collection efforts promoting the use of system management plans, similar to our efforts that we use for our spawning special management zones, and we certainly support the concept of citizen science and cooperative research.

Looking through your options in that paper, of course, in a perfect, ideal world, where funding was not a concern, Option 5 and 6 would be ideal, but I think we all recognize that that type of research and funding for all of those are more and more difficult to get, and so, amongst your other options, where you guys have the ability to be flexible, depending on what the situation is, I wish you luck figuring that out, and maybe we can learn something from your process.

Moving over to Amendment 13, I would personally like this council to put a letter forth supporting the immediate discontinuation of the purse seine fishery and the redistribution of that quota, and we would also like to see the January sub-quota end date extended to the end of April, and, unless there is some concern from this council, I think Jessica and I might work together on a letter that John might -- That we might be able to provide as comment on those two particular issues to HMS.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Would you like to make a motion, maybe, that says that, just so it's clear what we're doing here?

MS. BECKWITH: I would be happy to.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Give John a second to get over there.

MS. BECKWITH: **In reference to Amendment 13, I move we send a comment letter expressing our desire to see the immediate discontinuation of the purse seine fishery, with**

the appropriate redistribution of that quota, and our continued support, because we have supported this in the past, and so our continued support of extending the closure date of the January sub-quota to the end of April.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We don't have it either, and so --

MS. BECKWITH: In reference to Amendment 13, **I move we send a comment letter to HMS that supports the immediate discontinuation of the purse seine fishery, with the appropriate redistribution of that quota, and expressing our continued support to extend the closure date of the January sub-quota to the end of April.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. He is still trying to catch up, and so the word was "redistribution" and not "reallocation".

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and it's not really an allocation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Help, Anna. Redistribution of that quota.

MS. BECKWITH: Correct. As appropriate. I mean, there is some debate amongst the HMS AP panel on how that should best be done, but I don't think that's necessary.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It seems like there was more to your motion. What was the rest of it?

MS. BECKWITH: **And our continued support, expressing our continued support, to extend the closure date of the January sub-quota to the end of April.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

MS. BECKWITH: That looks good. Nice job, John.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Steve, is that a second? All right. It's under discussion.

MR. BREWER: I can't support that, because I don't know what that does, and I don't remember us expressing support to extend the sub-quota at any time.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, we have had a previous letter from this council. The January sub-quota currently closes March 31, and, if there is -- Certainly, for North Carolina, it is important, if we still have quota on the table, to have the ability to harvest that quota if the fish come in later in the year.

MR. BREWER: Okay. I understand that, and so that's fine, but I have always viewed that purse seine quota as our buffer, quite frankly, and I know we have a reserve, but you also have that purse seine quota, and I have looked at that as really as a buffer, and I've got reservations about just completely doing away with it, because there's a fair amount of quota that's in there, and so the repercussions of just saying, okay, we're going to kill that and redistribute, which is what you said, I would have to have a lot more information about what would happen there.

MS. BECKWITH: That quota within the purse seine has been redistributed into the reserve category and utilized, except for a very small portion, over the last many years. Karyl can correct me, but I believe there is actually only 25 percent of that original purse seine quota remaining assigned to the purse seine category. 75 percent of that has been redistributed into the reserve category, and so it's done on an annual basis.

What this is moving towards is just making that redistribution permanent. The quota is being basically used and moved around as needed, and, as you know, of course, there is the importance of bluefin tuna availability, in order to have our industry in the United States be able to catch their swordfish quota, which is important in the international ICCAT arena, is quota important, and so having that bluefin tuna unused, or not being used to the benefit of the nation as a whole, is not, in my personal opinion, not very productive.

MR. BREWER: To that point?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead.

MR. BREWER: If I knew that all of that quota was going to be used in North Carolina, I would stand up on my head and applaud that, but I don't.

MS. BECKWITH: It's not a North Carolina quota. The entire nation has access to that quota. It just is simply we have a lot of folks from the Northeast that come down and fish. The fish are generally more available in our area, but they are certainly migrating north during that portion, and so it is not a North Carolina quota. It is open to everybody in the United States, and it is the January sub-quota, and so what I am expressing, as a North Carolina contingent specifically, is that sometimes, when the fish come in later, they are still accessible to us off of North Carolina and Virginia during that time period, and there have been times -- Not in the recent past, but there have been times in the past where we have had quota left over that might have been able to be harvested, given the opportunity to access those fish, in the early weeks of April.

MR. BREWER: Thank you. I do know where the quota is distributed, and, no, there is no state that has quota, and I do know that.

DR. PORCH: Karyl, you mentioned in a couple of your slides the potential for funding or combining funding from public and private institutions with this EFP type of process or something, and I do want to reiterate, for those of you who may not know, that I think the data situation for most of our HMS species is even worse than what you're used to dealing with here.

In fact, I think bluefin tuna is the only one where we actually have an age-length key, and that is because we cobbled together a series of grants and such to collect that information, and so I wonder if, maybe, Karyl, you could give us a little picture of what that might look like. Is there any funding coming from the agency on the horizon? Are we going to partner with Sea Grant, because I know they got a plus-up to run an FFO for highly-migratory species research, et cetera.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: At this time, this is all not funded. If we were to go one of those routes, it would have to be something like through an S-K or CRP program funding option.

MR. GRINER: I was curious about the handful of purse seiners. Have they just abandoned the fishery on their own, or are they participating in something else, or what happens to those guys, or what are they doing?

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: Back in 1982, the purse seine fishery was made into an IFQ program, and there were only five vessels that could harvest bluefin with purse seines. Those vessels -- The owners could change vessels over time, but the owners themselves could not change, and so, over time, there have been owners that have moved out of the fishery. What we saw in recent years is the one vessel that was left started running into smaller and smaller bluefin, because purse seines can only keep the very largest bluefin, and so they were running into the smaller ones and exceeding their allowance for those smaller bluefin, and so even that one vessel has not been active in recent years.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more questions for Karyl? We have a motion on the board. **Once again, the motion is, in reference to Amendment 13, send a comment letter to HMS that supports immediate discontinuation of the purse seine fishery, with redistribution of that quota, as appropriate. Also, express continued support to extend the January sub-quota to the end of April.** Any more discussion on this motion?

MR. BREWER: I could support it if we split it, but, if it's going to be in the conjunctive, I can't support it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Anna is not willing to split. Any more discussion or questions for Anna or questions for Karyl? Let's take a vote on this motion. **All those in favor of this motion, raise your hand, seven in favor; those opposed, one opposed. The motion passes.** Any more discussion on this presentation? All right. Thank you so much, Karyl.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Next up on the agenda is a Biscayne National Park presentation that I'm going to give you guys. Sorry. We have an ICCAT-related letter that John is going to pull up, and we're going to look at that.

MR. HADLEY: Anna, I don't know if you want to introduce this letter.

MS. BECKWITH: Sure. Sorry. I was off in la-la land. This letter was requested by the Northeast Council, and ICCAT has an advisory committee, and we meet twice a year to pull together sort of our -- Not only our council opinions, but also other opinions on how we want to handle different topics at the international meetings at ICCAT.

The Northeast Council did not have a representative at the last meeting, and so they have quite a bit of feedback and are concerned about the state of yellowfin and bigeye tuna and asked that the councils put together a joint letter showing extra support, to be presented to NOAA and Chris Oliver, to make sure that it was clear how important these U.S. goals were, to be put forth at this upcoming ICCAT annual meeting.

This is basically the same information that came out of the ICCAT Advisory Committee meeting, and most of the councils, I think, have so far been in support of it. The Gulf Council requested one clarification on Number 5, and I'm sure you guys haven't had a ton of time reading this, but this was approved -- This is what the advisory committee kind of came out in support, and so we did put a little bit of clarifying language that Martha and I agreed upon.

If you guys have specific questions, or you really want me to go into the history of the IAC and the positions for yellowtail, and I suspect that no one actually wants to hear me talk about this, and so I can tell you that I reviewed this letter, and it's completely appropriate, and it supports what the ICCAT Advisory Committee already put forth as their opinion, and so I will leave that there, and, if anybody has questions, I'm happy to support it. Otherwise, I think we should sign-on and support this letter, with the additional clarification.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think Chester had some comments, and I sent someone out of the room to go get him. While we're waiting for Chester, are there other comments or questions on this? We, ultimately, need a motion to send this letter. Do you want to go ahead and make that motion?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. **I move that we support or sign-on to send this letter to Chris Oliver in support of the things in it or whatever.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: I've got it. He says he doesn't have anything. **The motion is to support the bigeye and yellowfin tuna management letter.** It's seconded by Doug. Any more discussion on this? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We are going to be talking to you today, I am, about some actions with Biscayne National Park, and, ultimately, I'm going to be asking the council for some action on this item. I am just going to give you a quick review of this. I don't know if we have any council members that were here with all of these controversial Biscayne National Park discussions that we had, and so just a little bit about the park.

The park is located in sight of Miami, and it's a very busy area. It's a 95 percent water park, and it's easily accessible from four public marinas and boat ramps, and we have over 62,000 boats launching from there annually. The park hosts over 500,000 visitors a year, and there's a number of management and environmental challenges in this particular park that you can see listed on the screen, including water quality, the proximity to urban areas, and fishing pressure.

There is a diagram here on the right of Biscayne National Park. The park is about 174,000 acres. 91 percent of the park is in state waters, but 8.8 percent of the park is in federal waters, and so let me try to show you here with the mouse. This red line here depicts federal waters, and so this is the state/federal waters boundary, and so these slivers of the park here are the part of the park that is in federal waters. Right now, the park rules for fisheries are FWC regulations in state waters and then council regulations for federal waters.

The park became a National Monument in 1968, and so this central portion of the park that is not hashed is the actual monument portion of the park, and the park itself, and the Department of the Interior, they have the authority over the waters and the fishery resources in that area. At a later date, in 1980, these sections that are hashed here on the end, they were given by the state for this to become a national park, and this is now the current size of the park, and FWC maintains

authority over fishing regulations in these areas at the end sections of the park, and so you can see where there could be some confusion here if FWC wanted to make some changes in certain portions of the park and then the park wanted to make fisheries regulation changes in their portion of the park.

There is a number of diverse user groups within the park. You have everything from flats fishing, reef fish fishing, people lobstering, people fishing for pelagics, and you've got commercial shrimping and trapping and ballyhoo fishing in that park, and you also have a lot of recreational diving, and there's historic shipwrecks there and coral reefs, and lots of recreational boating and kayaking and birding in that area.

The controversy really came about when the park started working on these two management plans, and so the first one was the general management plan, and this is the overall plan for the zoning philosophy of the park, and we're going to get into when this was started, but the park doesn't necessarily have to coordinate with FWC for this general management plan. The fishery management plan, on the other hand, this is a plan that the park decided to embark upon, and the fishery management plan is actually under the general management plan, and it is a long-term plan to try to balance fishing and protection of natural resources and to ensure that fishing can continue to be sustainable, and there has been a series of memorandums of understanding between the Parks Service and the FWC about how the fishery management plan would move forward.

To get into a little bit more detail, the original GNP was approved in 1983, and, in 2000, the park began development of this new general management plan, and it really got underway in 2001 and 2002, and the park started holding these scoping meetings, and this is when I guess the explosion really started happening, because, inside this general management plan were lots of boxes and polygons, where the park was indicating their intent to establish a very large what they called marine reserve zone, MRZ, and it was really a no-take area for fishing.

The park was receiving lots of comments, and they had a number of public hearings, and they were working with FWC during this time period, and there were a couple of congressional oversight hearings about this process. The park worked with the FWC, at the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to try to come up with some new alternatives for this general management plan and zoning in the park, and that was done in 2013, and then the bottom line was the park really didn't like what the FWC helped come up with, and they finalized the GNP in 2015, and it included this large marine reserve zone for no fishing. A congressional hearing was held, and they asked the park to stop work on implementation of that large closed area, and it was a 10,000 acre closed area to fishing over the reef tract.

Also, FWC has been working with the park on the fishery management plan, and there's an actual MOU in place, and I will get into what some of the specifics of the MOU state, but this has been a long process, and the fishery management plan was finalized in 2014, and there was an MOU about this plan that basically stated that -- It recognized the park had some management goals that were different from other places in the state, and it was a national park, and it was a special place, and it specified that we were against this marine reserve zones for no fishing, and the big thing is that it confirmed that FWC and the Parks Service agreed to regulate fishing together throughout the park, and it basically acknowledged that the FWC would implement the fishing regulations for the entire park. You saw that we only have authority in a certain area of the park, but the park is suggesting that we implement the regs for the whole park.

There is a number of actions in this plan. The big action is trying to increase the abundance and average size of targeted fish and invertebrate species inside the park by at least 20 percent, and there is a number of actions in there to do that, which includes modifying size and bag limits, limiting spearfishing to no scuba or trigger mechanisms, and there would be coral reef protection areas, trap-free zones, a no-trawl zone, possible elimination of lobster mini-season, and then the park would consider a commercial fishing phase-out.

This is just some specifics about what is going to be considered, and so there's a number of species, and you can see, in the column on the far-right, the proposed changes, and so you see the current size and the proposed size, and so what's been done here is basically increase that size limit by 20 percent, and then the park and FWC are also talking about implementing some aggregate bag limits for the park. They have something similar in Everglades National Park, and so those bag limit groupings are at the bottom of this slide.

There is also a science plan that has been developed with FWC and Biscayne National Park to figure out the baseline resources, where they are, using the RVC data, which is primarily a dive survey, and this would be what we're monitoring against, to figure out if the regulation changes have resulted in this 20 percent increase over time, and so this type of science plan is similar to a type of science plan that was in place for the Tortugas.

The science plan is intending to monitor two different groups of species, and we have the species that are most commonly targeted, and we have the most data for them, and then Tier 2 -- If more money is available to monitor those additional species, then they will go up into that first category, and we would ramp up the monitoring on those species as well. The science plan is measuring the success of whether or not the regulations that would be implemented by FWC are achieving this 20 percent goal of increases from the baselines of what's in the park right now, and this slide outlines a little bit how those progress reports would work.

This is kind of getting the meat of what we're asking here. I showed you that there's about 8.8 percent of the waters inside Biscayne National Park that are in federal waters, and so I know that Gregg and Monica have had some conversations about whether FWC could actually promulgate the rules, at the park's request, for the entire park, even though part of those waters for the park are in federal waters, and so I guess that what we're requesting is -- I believe that the South Atlantic Council can allow the FWC and the park to manage that sliver that is in federal waters, but I will turn it over to Monica to address that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't know if "allow" is the right word. There is no -- Unlike with the National Marine Sanctuaries process, there is really no role for the council here. What I mean by "here" is between -- The Biscayne National Park and the State of Florida have a relationship, and I think it's set up in the park legislation and then in various MOUs through the years that Florida and the Parks Service have agreed upon, but there is no real role for the council here to consult on it, like you would with the Sanctuaries Program. To me, even for this part of the water, this part of federal waters, it's between the Parks Service and Florida to work out and decide upon, however those MOUs and the legislation is. It's not really within the purview of the council.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The reason why we're bringing this to you is, if you were on the council a number of years ago, the council asked to get involved on Biscayne National Park, and you had

the superintendent at the time, Brian Carlstrom, come and speak to you basically every time that we were in Florida, and he talked about what the process was and where it was at, and the council had asked to be kept informed about this process, and, since FWC is about to embark on the process of putting regulations in place for the park waters, this is the opportunity here to make comments, because -- Let me show you the timeline here.

Our intention, at this time, is to bring the first round of rulemaking to our July FWC Commission meeting, and then we would do a series of public workshops in August, and we would have some stakeholder meetings, and we would start working on a new MOU with the park, and then there would be a draft rule at an FWC Commission meeting in October and then a final hearing, hopefully, at the December commission meeting.

Basically, if you're wanting to be involved, or you're wanting us to come back here and go over the regulations, or give you an update on what the public comment is about this area, then you need to let us know. Otherwise, I think some kind of indication that you don't have any intent to be involved here and that you're good with FWC promulgating the rules, I think that would be great, if we could get some kind of letter like that.

MR. BELL: Basically, something as simple as we feel that's a reasonable approach and just keep us advised as to how it goes?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so, just to be clear, these are regulations that would be put in place that are above and beyond what the council already has in place, and so they would be more restrictive than what the council has in place for the region for this park, and it would be in this tiny sliver, and so just above and beyond that.

MR. BREWER: I realize that we have no regulatory authority whatsoever with regard to this, and it's the National Park Service and the State of Florida, but I would -- I am very interested about what goes on in Biscayne National Park, and I would love to be kept advised, and, if there is something that maybe our opinion was sought on, and it wouldn't be binding, but I would still like to be kept advised as to what's going on there and what the plan is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is the council just wanting FWC to take that as direction, or would you be willing to write a letter that states this as part of the rulemaking, that you recognize that you don't have a role, and you want to be kept informed, you appreciate maybe getting an update about this process at future council meetings, and I'm seeing a head-nod from Chester.

MR. WAUGH: We can take that as direction to staff, to prepare a letter to that effect.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you so much for listening to this presentation on Biscayne National Park and preparing a letter. Now we're going to go into the Agency and the Liaison Reports, and I am going to start over there with Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Pass.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I will move around the table to Mel.

MR. BELL: Gosh, I wrote my down. Of interest to us at this point, I mentioned that South Carolina might have its own spadefish regs in place, and that didn't get through the General Assembly, and so we still have what we have here, based on the federal regs. Reef construction is taking place, and we have -- Of interest, and you can go on and google this, but the South Carolina Aquarium is doing some work out on some of our reefs with lionfish, if you're interested in that, and that's kind of it for us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any questions for Mel? All right. We have one thing from Florida that I'm also looking for a council action on. There is a letter in your late materials about FWC's intent to regulate blackfin tuna in federal waters, and so Magnuson states that, if the councils do not have the intent to regulate, and in the absence of an FMP, then the state can extend their regulations into federal waters, and so the state is starting rulemaking for blackfin tuna, and we sent the council a letter of our intent to regulate in federal waters, and we would be looking for a letter back. If the council has no intention of regulating blackfin tuna in federal waters of the South Atlantic, we would be looking for a letter that states that.

MR. SAPP: I just wanted to mention that this member of the council would love to see the State of Florida put a minimum size limit for fish intended to be brought home for food purposes and that if the intention was for bait, if that's at all possible.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That type of regulation is pretty challenging. You would be asking law enforcement to determine someone's intent, and so, right now, the package that FWC is bringing forward to the July commission meeting does not include a size limit. Right now, it's just a bag limit, and so it says two fish per person or ten per vessel, whichever is greater. That way, if you were on a headboat, you would go by the two per person. If you have fewer people, then you're at the ten per vessel, and so it's whichever is greater.

MR. SAPP: Again, I'm a big fan of separating that out a little bit, because it just -- I guess twelve fish on a charter boat, but a recreational boat could end up killing a bunch of those little ones, again, and I would love to see that slow down or stop.

MR. HAYMANS: I was going to make a motion, but Monica wants to speak first.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to clarify the record, and for other council members, Florida will be regulating Florida-registered vessels in the EEZ off of Florida.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

MR. BREWER: I didn't want to step on Doug's toes, but I wanted to make a motion. Doug, were you going to make the motion?

MR. HAYMANS: That's fine. Go ahead.

MR. BREWER: **Madam Chair, I move that the council send a letter to the FWC indicating that it does not intend to regulate blackfin tuna.** Does that cover what the FWC is looking for?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, that will work. It's seconded by Art.

MR. HAYMANS: Heaven forbid that I drag this out, but Florida is only going to regulate Florida-registered vessels, and is that what you said, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes. Under Section 306(a)(3) of the Magnuson Act, a state may regulate fishing vessels outside the boundaries of the state in the following circumstance, and this is this circumstance that Jessica is talking about. If the fishing vessel is registered under the law of that state, and (i) there is no fishery management plan or other federal fishery regulations for that fishery; or (ii) the state's regs are consistent with an FMP. Since there is no FMP, Florida can regulate their state vessels, Florida-registered vessels, in federal waters for this species.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, and so two things. I was just making sure that there was no nexus with cobia and all of those discussions, but it doesn't sound like this is the same case, since there is an FMP, or at least there is a commission FMP, but, secondly, a Georgia-registered vessel who happens to be visiting south Florida can take these blackfin tuna no problem?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Not if you intend to land them in Florida. If you're going to land them in Florida, then you would need to abide by the regulations, even though you're not a registered vessel. If you come into state waters, you're going to have to abide by the regulations, for sure. Monica, do you want to add anything to that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't want to speak to what Florida can do in state waters, but that's right, I think. If a Georgia vessel comes down and stays in the EEZ, they wouldn't be regulated under whatever it is that Florida is going to do for their Florida-registered vessels.

MS. MCCAWLEY: As long as you don't land them in Florida. If you return and land them in Georgia -- That's what you would have to do.

MR. HAYMANS: I've got it. I'm just thinking about like my friends here, who might take their boats to the Keys or to south Florida, and they're actually in a marina, and the fish doesn't leave the boat, but that's still landing. If they're checked in Florida, they are --

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's right, and, technically, they're in state waters, and so yes. All right. There's a motion on the board. Any more discussion? **Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** I am going to move around the table to more liaison reports. North Carolina is gone, and I'm going to turn it over to the Coast Guard and Lieutenant Montes.

LCDR MONTES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Conveniently, the 7th Coast Guard District does not extend into North Carolina, and so their absence isn't really all that applicable. That's just convenience. Normally, I come with a decent amount of numbers and observed compliance and all of that fun stuff, and we had about a three-week outage in our system that was resolved this morning, I guess happily, but all I can say is I don't have that, because I wasn't able to access any of those numbers in preparation for the meeting.

I can say that we're averaging about ninety fisheries boardings per month right now. With the summertime upon us, those numbers typically go up into the hundreds, and even into the two-hundreds and three-hundreds, depending on what's going on, and so we'll look forward to that increased effort, as the increased fishing effort goes on throughout the summer.

I do want to highlight one case that happened this week, and I know we've been talking about dolphinfish a whole lot, and I figure I will kind of reinforce it and foot-stomp it a little bit more. There was a recreational vessel boarded earlier this week by a station down in the Keys, and they had a whole bunch of fish onboard, of which twenty-six were dolphinfish. Twenty-five of those twenty-six were undersized, and the owner-operator stated that he thought that the length was twelve inches total length, and he decided to keep all of them, and so he was obviously cited for that, but that just is -- It was said at one point that people are going to keep these undersized fish, and I forget who said it this week, but that's definitely the case, where they are catching undersized fish, and he's just keeping it, because he didn't think that he was going to get boarded. Very fortunately for us, he was.

Some of the kind of operations and things we've got coming down the pipe between now and our next meeting is Operation Dry Water is July 5th through 7th, and that's not really fisheries centered, but we end up doing a lot of fishery boardings during that time period and enforcing boating under the influence laws.

We're also working with NOAA down in the Keys and Miami, to get a Lacey Act-focused operation developed for the summer, and so we're looking specifically at the vessels coming back from the Bahamas and enforcing the Lacey Act regulations on them, and then, of course, lobster mini-season coming up next month, and we'll be looking forward to working with FWC and doing some boardings down in Miami and the Keys, and, with that, that concludes my report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I am going to back up to the Gulf Council Report from Martha.

MS. GUYAS: Thank you. We have had two meetings, I think, since your last meeting in March, and so, in April, the thing that I will highlight is that we finalized state management for the private angler red snapper fishery, and so that's now pending approval by the Secretary, and, essentially, it would make the tests that each of the states are doing under the EFPs to manage their adjacent federal waters -- It would just make that a long-term deal.

We also had a meeting last week over in Destin, and I'm just going to highlight a couple of things that affect either the South Atlantic or you would be interested in, and so we already talked about carryover and how we put that to the side for the time being, so that we can consider these interim analyses that Clay's shop will be working on.

The other thing you all want to put on your radar is the multiday possession limits on federal for-hire trips. We have a provision in the Gulf, and you also have one for the South Atlantic, although it's a little bit different, that allows anglers on federal for-hire trips, under very specific circumstances, to retain, in the Gulf, two daily bag limits of reef fish and king and Spanish mackerel if the trip lasts longer than twenty-four hours. They have to have two licensed captains onboard, and all the anglers have to possess a receipt indicating that the trip was over twenty-four hours.

We got a request from some of the operators that are running these trips for clarification about specifically when their customers can have that second bag limit, whether it's the first day or the second day or whatever, and it's -- The way that this is outlined in rules apparently is not the way that these operators have been fishing historically, and so we'll be working to clarify that, and I think, if Dr. Crabtree was here, he would ask that, whatever the Gulf does, the South Atlantic

probably would want to consider something similar, to make this an easy issue in the Keys, and so there's that, just something for your plate in the future.

We also have been working on our commercial IFQ programs and maybe making some tweaks to that, and we've had some amberjack issues, and we took final action to reduce the trip limit for commercial to 1,000 pounds, with a step-down to 250 once we've got 75 percent of the catch target met.

Then we will be looking at recreational greater amberjack seasons again, based on some concerns coming out of the Florida Panhandle. We tried to do a split season, but, because the quota got caught in one part of the season, we haven't had the second part, and so that's causing some issues for the fleets that fish during the part of the season that ended up not opening this year. I will note that, based on what you guys did with almaco jack, the commercial minimum size limit, we're going to consider changes to our setting an almaco size limit, potentially, after we get some information about that species from our SSC, and I will stop there. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Martha. Any questions for Martha or for Lieutenant Montes? All right. Then I'm going to move on around the table. Any more updates from NOAA on this side of the table?

DR. MCGOVERN: I think everybody saw the Fishery Bulletin that we're closing recreational golden tilefish on June 17, and we also sent out a Fishery Bulletin about Amendment 42, and I think that's the sea turtle amendment, and the NOA has published for that, the notice of availability for the amendment, and all the comments are due by August 12.

Also, we're in the final stages of changing our website, and so we're going to a new Drupal content management system, and I'm not sure what that means, but it's different, and so this signifies merging more than twenty NOAA Fisheries sites, regional offices and science centers, into one national NOAA Fisheries website, and so it's going to change on June 30, but we will still be able to post stuff on our website, and people will still be able to go to it.

I want to thank Brian and Gregg for allowing us to have the face-to-face with council staff and Rick's staff this week, and I think it was very positive, and it really allows for a more kind of synergistic working relationship. The Gulf does this a lot, but they're both in the Tampa/St. Pete area, and so I'm hoping that we can continue that every June, if our budgets allow. Then, finally, I want to thank the Florida folks for the hospitality and the social that we had last week, or was it the week before, or was it Monday? It was really fun. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Jack. Any questions for Jack?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I won't ask Jack a question, but I do want to say, just for me, I know you're interested in the aquaculture litigation, and so, as the new briefs are filed, I will forward them to Gregg and Kelly, so they can send them all to you. If you want, we can discuss them at some point, when all the arguments are filed, or at the next meeting, whatever your pleasure is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica.

DR. SIEGFRIED: Clay asked me to tell you all something.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay asked you to tell us something? Thanks for hanging in with us all week. We appreciate you being here.

DR. SIEGFRIED: I appreciate you all letting me sit at the table, and I know that's not the case for all councils. He just wanted to mention that your approved research plan is very timely. He will be meeting with our leadership team next week, to work on our priority-based resourcing, the way that we rank our activities, both operational and research, based on our available funding, and so it's perfect timing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Kate. All right. I think next up is Pat O'Shaughnessy is going to give us a NOAA Law Enforcement Report.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I see we're up against the one o'clock window, and so I will make this very short. Deputy Special in Charge Antonaras apologizes that he didn't have the quarterly report out before the council, but it will be out next week, and they will send it to all council members, and you can see that.

I just want to give a quick snapshot on work that we've done in the second quarter. The Office of Law Enforcement opened up seventy-six incidents. From that, there was twenty-five summary settlements issued and then nine cases forwarded to General Counsel for review. The remaining were either unfounded, fix-its, or handled with compliance assistance. Those summary settlements range from a \$275 fine for, for example, an undersized fish, or \$900 for retention during a closed season.

Of the twenty-five summary settlements, twenty were recreational and five were commercial vessels, and they ranged from one TED issue, two Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction, and those were trap issues, seven seasonal closure violations, seven undersized violations, two charter vessels without federal permits, two failure to retain intact, one exceeding the bag limit, and then three fishing in the sanctuary closed areas.

Of the nine cases forwarded to General Counsel, six were commercial, and two were merchant vessels, and those were the speed restrictions for the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Act, and one recreational. Those consisted of one TED case, two Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction speed cases, one exceeding the commercial shark retention, one lack of a permit and closed season violation, one shark fins not attached, one no permit, one trap/pot violation, and one observer harassment, and so those are the cases that we sent over to General Counsel.

Real quick, personnel-wise, we have hired one new enforcement officer for New Bern, North Carolina, and we haven't had an agent or an officer up there, and so we have a new enforcement officer, and he has completed his formal training, and he's completing his field training right now, and he will cover North Carolina and the northern portions of South Carolina. We have also hired three new special agents in the South Atlantic, one in New Bern, North Carolina, one in Jacksonville, Florida, and one in Miami, Florida. That fills up all of our special agent vacancies in the South Atlantic, and we now have eight special agents.

Unfortunately, those three were filled with current NOAA Enforcement officers, and so it's a net gain of zero, as we just moved enforcement officers to special agents, and we hope to have an

announcement out over the summer to fill those three enforcement officers. That's just a quick snapshot that I wanted to pass along. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Any questions? All right. Did I miss anybody giving a report? I think we have covered everybody. All right. The other item I had for Other Business was that Chinese tariff letter that Bill Kelly brought up, and I'm just wanting to see if it was the council's intent to send a letter to the Secretary of Commerce indicating how the Chinese tariffs are affecting the live lobster fishery, if that's something that we want to do.

MR. WAUGH: If you do, what we would do is write a fairly factual letter to the Secretary of Commerce, I believe would be the appropriate place, and just noting that, as those tariffs have affected farmers, they have also affected some of our fishermen, and, if they're providing relief to farmers, could there be some consideration for relief to our fishermen, and we would run that by the Region and NOAA GC, to make sure we're squeaky clean on what's in there.

MR. BELL: To that, I had no idea the percent -- I mean, Bill told us 80 percent or whatever, and I had no clue, and so, yes, factual would be great.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so is that direction or a motion to send a letter to the Secretary of Commerce about the effects of the Chinese tariffs? Direction will work, and so is that direction?

MR. BELL: I would be fine with that, to direct staff to prepare it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion on that? Any other business to come before the council? All right. Gregg is going to give us the dates of some upcoming meetings.

MR. WAUGH: You have got this in Attachment 11 under the Full Council materials. Just call attention to ICAST the second week in July, and we'll have several people there, and we're also preparing for the red snapper season opening, and then our next council meeting is September 16 through 20 in Charleston.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That concludes our business. Thanks, everybody. Safe trip going home.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 14, 2019.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
July 3, 2019

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2019 COUNCIL MEMBERS

✓ Jessica McCawley, **Chair**

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

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

✓ Mel Bell, **Vice Chair**

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

✓ Tim Griner

4446 Woodlark Lane
Charlotte, NC 28211
(980)722-0918 (ph)
timgrinersafmc@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

✓ 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

✓ Anna Beckwith

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

✓ Chester Brewer

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

✓ Dr. Kyle Christiansen

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

✓ Stephen Poland

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

✓ Chris Conklin

P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
(843)543-3833
conklinsafmc@gmail.com

✓ Art Sapp

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

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2019 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

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

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

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

Martha Guyas

Dr. Wilson Laney

Rick DeVictor

Monica Smit-Brunello

Dr. Jack McGovern

Dr. Clay Porch

Kate Siegfried

Shep Grimes

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

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

Deputy Director – Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

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

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Cierra Graham
cierra.graham@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Cameron Rhodes
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Staff Accountant

Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer
julie.neer@safmc.net

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2019 COUNCIL MEMBERS

- ✓ Jessica McCawley, **Chair**
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
- ✓ Mel Bell, **Vice Chair**
SCDNR-Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
217 Ft. Johnson Road
Charleston, SC 29422
(843)953-9007 (ph); (843)953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov
- Robert Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
1050 N. Highland St. Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 22201
(703)842-0740 (ph); (703)842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org
- ✓ Anna Beckwith
1907 Paulette Road
Morehead City, NC 28557
(252)671-3474 (ph)
AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com
- ✓ Chester Brewer
250 Australian Ave. South Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
(561)655-4777 (ph)
wcbsafmc@gmail.com
- ✓ Dr. Kyle Christiansen
150 Cedar St.
Richmond Hill, GA 31324
(912)756-7560 (ph)
christiansensafmc@gmail.com
- ✓ Chris Conklin
P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
(843)543-3833
conklinsafmc@gmail.com
- Dr. Roy Crabtree
Regional Administrator
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
(727)824-5301 (ph); (727)824-5320 (f)
roy.crabtree@noaa.gov
- ✓ Tim Griner
4446 Woodlark Lane
Charlotte, NC 28211
(980)722-0918 (ph)
timgrinersafmc@gmail.com
- ✓ Doug Haymans
Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-2318 (f)
haymanssafmc@gmail.com
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD
- ✓ LCDR Jeremy Montes
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
(305)415-6788(ph); (305)710-4569(c)
Jeremy.J.Montes@uscg.mil
- ✓ Stephen Poland
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
PO Box 769
3441 Arendell Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
(252)808-8011 (direct); (252)726-7021 (main)
Steve.Poland@ncdenr.gov
- ✓ Art Sapp
2270 NE 25th St.
Lighthouse Pointe, FL 33064
(954)444-0820 (ph)
artsappsafmc@gmail.com

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2019 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

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

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

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

Martha Guyas

Rick DeVitor

Monica Smit-Brunello

Dr. Jack McGovern

Dr. Clay Porch

Kate Siefried

Dr. Wilson Lancy

Shep Grimes

Erika Burgess

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

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

Deputy Director – Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

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

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Cierra Graham
cierra.graham@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Cameron Rhodes
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Staff Accountant

Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer
julie.neer@safmc.net

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: June 10-14, 2019

Meeting Location: Stuart, FL

Issue: EMERG. ACTION FOR ATL KM TO 150-FISH TRIP LIMIT
S. OF FLAGLER/VOL LINE FOR SEASON 2 TO 75-FISH

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

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: June 10-14, 2019

Meeting Location: Stuart, FL

Issue: SG RA 30 (RED GROUPER REBUILDING)

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

SAFMC Council Meeting - Hutchinson Island - June 10, 2019 - Webinar Attenda

Last Name

First Name

Bianchi

Alan

Soss

Alison

Sapp

Art

Buckson

Bruce

collier

chip

Conklin

Chris

Graham

Cierra

Chaya

Cindy

Porch

Clay

whitaker

dAVID

gloeckner

david

Glasgow

Dawn

Hemilright

Dewey

Haymans

Doug

Helies

Frank

Sedberry

George

Hart

Hannah

Takade-Heumacher

Helen

Laks	Ira
Cox	Jack
Doe	Jane
Pulver	Jeff
Stephen	Jessica
Godwin	Joelle
McGovern	John
Byrd	Julia
Neer	julie
Gore	Karla
Howington	Kathleen
Ralston	Kellie
Klasnick	Kelly
Iverson	Kim
Foss	Kristin
Seward	McLean
Travis	Michael
Larkin	Michael
Mehta	Nikhil
DeVictor	Rick
Gonzalez	Rosalinda

Hudson

Rusty

Driscoll-Lovejoy

Ruth

sandorf

scott

poland

steve

thomas

suz

Smart

Tracey

SAFMC Council Meeting - Hutchinson Island

- June 11, 2019 - Webinar Attendance

Last Name	First Name
Bailey	Adam
Bianchi	Alan
Gray DiLeone	Alisha
Tong	Amanda
Sapp	Art
Wrege	Beth
Salmon	Brandi
Runde	Brendan
LAVINE	BRITNI
Jaggard	Cameron
collier	chip
McHan	Chris
Package-Ward	Christina
SR	Christopher Conklin
Graham	Cierra
Whitaker	David
Wyanski	David

gloeckner	david
Glasgow	Dawn
Hemilright	Dewey
Helies	Frank
Sedberry	George
Hart	Hannah
Takade-Heumache	Helen
Laks	Ira
Cox	Jack
Pulver	Jeff
Stephen	Jessica
Godwin	Joelle
McGovern	John
Byrd	Julia
Byrd	Julia
Neer	Julie
Gore	Karla
Howington	Kathleen
Howington	Kathleen
Ralston	Kellie
Klasnick	Kelly

Brennan	Ken
Iverson	Kim
Foss	Kristin
Stevens	Laurie
Stevens	Laurie
Clarke	Lora
Levy	Mara
Sramek	Mark
McPherson	Matthew
Seward	McLean
Travis	Michael
Larkin	Michael
Mehta	Nikhil
DeVictor	Rick
Cardon	Robert
Hudson	Rusty
Lawler	Sean
poland	steve
Gerhart	Susan
thomas	suz
Mask	Tad

Smart

Tracey

Bonura

Vincent

Bubley

Walter

SAFMC Council Meeting - Hutchinson Island

June 12, 2019 - Webinar Attendance

Last Name	First Name
Bianchi	Alan
Gray DiLeone	Alisha
Stoltz	Amanda
Tong	Amanda
Sapp	Art
Wrege	Beth
Salmon	Brandi
Runde	Brendan
Barr	Brice
LAVINE	BRITNI
collier	chip
Conklin	Chris
Package-Ward	Christina
Graham	Cierra
gloeckner	david
Records	David
Whitaker	David

Glasgow	Dawn
Johnson	Denise
Hemilright	Dewey
Smith	Duane
Helies	Frank
Sedberry	George
Hart	Hannah
Henninger	Heidi
Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Laks	Ira
Waters	James
Hull	James
Murray	Jason
Pulver	Jeff
fabbri	jeffrey
Stephen	Jessica
Freeman	Jim
Godwin	Joelle
LAYNE	John
McGovern	John
Reynolds	Jonathon

Beaty	Julia
Byrd	Julia
Byrd	Julia
Neer	Julie
Gore	Karla
Howington	Kathleen
Ralston	Kellie
Klasnick	Kelly
Brennan	Ken
Dancy	Kiley
Iverson	Kim
Foss	Kristin
Stevens	Laurie
Clarke	Lora
Levy	Mara
Vara	Mary
Seeley	Matthew
Seward	McLean
Travis	Michael
BROUWER	MYRA
Mehta	Nikhil

OShaughnessy	Patrick
Robins	Rick
DeVictor	Rick
Cardon	Robert
Pugliese	Roger
Hudson	Rusty
Crosson	Scott
sandorf	scott
Mccoy	Sherylanne
poland	steve
Smart	Tracey
Bonura	Vincent
Bubley	Walter
mershon	wayne

SAFMC Council Meeting - Hutchinson Island

June 13, 2019 - Webinar Attendance

Last Name	First Name
-----------	------------

Bailey	Adam
--------	------

Bianchi	Alan
---------	------

Hundrup	Alyssa
---------	--------

Sapp	Art
------	-----

Z	Barb
---	------

Salmon	Brandi
--------	--------

PIERCE	BRETT
--------	-------

Jaggard	Cameron
---------	---------

collier	chip
---------	------

Conklin	Chris
---------	-------

Graham	Cierra
--------	--------

Chaya	Cindy
-------	-------

Porch	Clay
-------	------

Whitaker	David
----------	-------

gloeckner	david
-----------	-------

Franco	Dawn
--------	------

Glasgow	Dawn
---------	------

Hemilright	Dewey
------------	-------

Helies	Frank
Sedberry	George
DuBeck	Guy
Hart	Hannah
Laks	Ira
Busse	James
Pulver	Jeff
Powell	Jessica
Stephen	Jessica
Godwin	Joelle
McGovern	John
LAYNE	John
Reynolds	Jonathon
Byrd	Julia
Beaty	Julia
Byrd	Julia
Neer	Julie
Gore	Karla
Howington	Kathleen
Siegfried	Katie
Ralston	Kellie

Klasnick	Kelly
Brennan	Ken
Iverson	Kim
Anderson	Krista
Foss	Kristin
Stevens	Laurie
Cunningham	Leda
Acosta	Leo
Clarke	Lora
vara	mary
Smith	Mason
Seward	McLean
Travis	Michael
Larkin	Michael
BROUWER	MYRA
Mehta	Nikhil
malinowski	rich
Robins	Rick
DeVictor	Rick
Cardon	Robert
Waddick	Robert

Pugliese	Roger
crabtree	roy
Hudson	Rusty
sandorf	scott
Lawler	Sean
poland	steve
Gerhart	Susan
Mask	Tad
Smart	Tracey
Bonura	Vincent
Matter	Vivian

SAFMC Council Meeting - Hutchinson Island

June 14, 2019 - Webinar Attendance

Bianchi	Alan
Thomas	Amanda
Sapp	Art
Salmon	Brandi
Jaggard	Cameron
McLaughlin	Caroline
brewer	chester
collier	chip
Conklin	Chris
Graham	Cierra
Porch	Clay
Records	David
Whitaker	David
Helies	Frank
DuBeck	Guy
Hart	Hannah
Laks	Ira
Pulver	Jeff

Godwin	Joelle
McGovern	John
LAYNE	John
Byrd	Julia
Byrd	Julia
Neer	Julie
Howington	Kathleen
Siegfried	Katie
Ralston	Kellie
Klasnick	Kelly
Iverson	Kim
SHIPLEY	KRISTA
Anderson	Krista
Foss	Kristin
Latchford	Lauren
Stevens	Laurie
Cunningham	Leda
vara	mary
Seward	McLean
Recks	Melissa
Travis	Michael

BROUWER	MYRA
Mehta	Nikhil
Lyons Gromen	Pamela
OShaughnessy	Patrick
DeVictor	Rick
Waddick	Robert
Cardon	Robert
Pugliese	Roger
crabtree	roy
Hudson	Rusty
sandorf	scott
poland	steve
Gerhart	Susan
thomas	suz
Mask	Tad
Smart	Tracey
Bonura	Vincent