

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION II

**Westin Hotel
Jekyll Island, Georgia**

March 10-11, 2022

TRANSCRIPT

Council Members

Mel Bell, Chair
Robert Beal
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Trish Murphey
Andy Strelcheck
Spud Woodward

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair
Chester Brewer
LT Robert Copeland
Judy Helmey
Jessica McCawley
Tom Roller
Laurilee Thompson

Council Staff

Myra Brouwer
John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
John Hadley
Allie Iberle
Kelly Klasnick
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Suzanna Thomas

Julia Byrd
Cindy Chaya
Dr. Judd Curtis
Kathleen Howington
Kim Iverson
Roger Pugliese
Nick Smillie
Christina Wiegand

Attendees and Invited Participants

LeAnn Bosarge
Shep Grimes
Dr. Jack McGovern
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Monica Smit-Brunello

Rick DeVictor
Dewey Hemilright
Dr. Genny Nesslage
Dr. Clay Porch

Additional Attendees and Invited Participants are attached.

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Hotel, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Thursday, March 10, 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: Welcome back to Full Council Session II. We're going to go ahead and start off with a legal brief, if needed, if desired, and I see that Monica is here, and she's going to give us a quick brief on some things.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just one thing in particular, and you will remember that you have an electronic reporting program for the for-hire group, and the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council has a for-hire reporting group -- A reporting requirement for that same group, charter vessels, and you may recall that there was a lawsuit, there is a lawsuit, going on by a group of primarily charter vessel owners, and they certified it as a class action. We just got an opinion from the court last week, which was favorable to the government, and so I will just read you a little bit of a blurb on this.

On February 28, and that was last week, the Federal Court in the Eastern District of Louisiana rejected all the claims brought by several federally-permitted for-hire vessel captains and vessel owners in their challenge to the recently-issued rule that implements new electronic reporting requirements, and the rule requires an owner or operator of a vessel with a Gulf of Mexico for-hire permit, such as a charter vessel, to submit an electronic fishing report for each fishing trip, to notify NMFS prior to departing for any trip, and declare whether they are departing for a for-hire trip or on another trip type, and to use NMFS-approved hardware and software with global positioning system location capabilities that, at a minimum, archive vessel position data during a trip for subsequent transmission to the Fisheries Service.

The plaintiffs claimed that this rule results in unlawful surveillance that violates the 4th and 5th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. They alleged that it exceeds NMFS' authority under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and that NMFS violated a couple of other laws. In an eighty-one-page decision, that I will ask Kelly to send to you, if you're interested, the court determined that NMFS complied with the requirements of all the laws and that the Magnuson-Stevens Act authorizes the Service to require the vessel tracking requirement.

The court found that the vessel tracking equipment does not violate the 4th Amendment's protections against unreasonable searches and seizure, because the fishing industry is a closely-regulated industry, and the requirement is reasonable under the Closely-Regulated Industry Exception to the 4th Amendment's warrant requirement. Again, I will forward that to Kelly, and he can send it around to you all.

On another note, you're going to hear, I think a little bit later, that the VMS portion of that rule, which had kind of been delayed, became effective on March 1, and the other piece of the lawsuit that I will tell you about is that the plaintiffs immediately filed a notice of appeal to the 5th Circuit, and so, as that case goes on, and we get a decision from the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, I will report on that as well.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for that, Monica. Any questions for Monica about that case or anything else, while we have her here? All right. I don't see any questions. Thank you. I appreciate that. All right. That takes us to our next item, which will be a presentation by Marcel

Reichert, and we already told you that Marcel is retiring, and we've stressed him so much that he's running to the mountains, which I'm trying to figure out how I can go up and live in his basement or something, but Marcel is going to give us a briefing on the Southeast Reef Fish Survey, and he is no stranger here, and, even after retirement, we hope you won't be a stranger, and so take it away, Marcel.

DR. REICHERT: I will try not to be a stranger, but, again, thank you for once again allowing me to give you an update on the Southeast Reef Fish Survey. I first need to acknowledge others who have provided me with the information and some of the analyses, Wally and Dawn and Tracey, who were working very hard, until last week, to get the trap indices ready for you, and Christina, Nate, Todd, and Adam at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center provided the data, and also the video index, that became available recently, and so I added those to the presentation today.

I added a brief summary for some of the new council members and as a reminder for you, and it's been a while since I gave this update. The Southeast Reef Fish Survey is collaboratively conducted by MARMAP and SEAMAP at South Carolina DNR and SEFIS, housed at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center in Beaufort, and we are using three vessels, and SEFIS is mostly using the NOAA Ship Pisces and the Research Vessel Savannah at the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography at the University of Georgia, and we are mostly using the Palmetto for our surveys.

The primary gear we're using is the chevron video trap, and the little video on the lower-left-hand side is a brief overview of our sampling and some underwater video, and we target low to medium-relief live-bottom habitat to a depth of about 110 meters. The trap has been used consistently and standardized since 1990. It's a baited trap, and we let it sit on the bottom for about ninety minutes, and what's important is that, since 2010, we added two underwater video cameras to the trap, and you can see those in those red circles on the right photo.

That provided us a lot of additional information concerning habitat and fish interactions and trap behavior, and, mostly importantly, it allowed us to develop additional indices of relative abundance, and you will see some of those later in my presentation.

We currently have about 4,300 trap sampling sites in our sampling area from roughly Cape Hatteras to south of Cape Canaveral. They are indicated by the blue Xs on this map on the right, and the golden, or yellow, Xs are short bottom longline stations, and the pink, or purple, boxes are our long bottom longline stations.

Last year, we randomly selected about 2,500 of those stations for sampling, and our sampling season is roughly from mid-April to mid-October. We conduct the field sampling collaboratively, but MARMAP and SEAMAP, at South Carolina DNR, our staff processes all the life history samplings, including the otoliths and life history, and we generally develop the trap and longline indices, and our colleagues at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center are responsible for examining the underwater videos and developing the video indices, and we manage a combined database that you can actually query online at seamap.org.

In terms of our 2021 sampling, it's important to remind you that there was no sampling, due to COVID, in 2020. In 2021, in spite of the challenges, we had a full crew scheduled. However, we decided to conduct our sampling with a reduced scientific crew, to comply with COVID protocols, and what we tried to do is optimize the number of traps that we sampled, and I think that we were

successful in doing so. However, we did have to decide to reduce our life history sampling, but we focused on collecting otoliths, because the age compositions for the various species is critical for stock assessments.

As I said, we were very successful, and we completed one-hundred-eighteen-and-a-half days at-sea, and we made a little over 2,700 gear deployments, including 2,025 chevron video traps, and that's the highest number of traps that we collectively deployed in the history of our survey, about 184 more than the previous high. We also, as part of a MARFIN-funded project, deployed 144 short bottom longlines.

We collected just under 40,000 fish, representing eighty-six species. Of those, we kept a little over 6,000 for life history processing, representing thirty-three species, and we collected mostly age, and some reproductive information, and the DNA sampling included the red snapper for Dr. Patterson's red snapper project, and here is the staff celebrating our thousandth trap deployment.

This is a little overview of our most-encountered species, the top twelve plus a couple of other key species. Generally, the top twelve species don't change a lot, as you can see here. Between the brackets is the ranking from last year, and these species are ranked in number of fish that we collect in our traps. You notice that red snapper currently is the fourth most abundant species in our traps.

In our overview of the CPUE, and, again, we didn't sample in 2020, and the longline data is -- The analysis of the longline data is still ongoing, and so I will not present that today, but what I will show you is the chevron trap index, and that time series was from 1990 to 2021, and we used the number of fish in the traps to develop that index, and those data are relatively easy to get by. As you see, the video index runs from 2011, and you may remember that we started adding traps in 2010, and it runs through 2019. Analyzing the video data is a lot more time consuming, and staff at the Science Center analyze thousands of underwater videos, and so the video data for 2021 are still ongoing, and so that's why the video index -- The terminal year is 2019.

The index is standardized using the zero-inflated negative binomial model, and this is a widely-used model nowadays in stock assessments, and it's appropriate, and it reduces the uncertainty, because it takes the variability in sampling and the environmental parameters into account, and, since the -- This is the first time that I added the video index, and that is developed by the so-called mean count method, and the examination of the videos start about ten minutes after the trap hits the bottom, and one snapshot for every thirty seconds is analyzed, and Nate Bacheler said he would be available to answer any additional questions, because the Science Center staff has done that analysis, if you are interested in the details.

This is to orient you on the figures, because all the figures in the graphs, in the overview, are about the same, and I will first show you the chevron index, followed by the video index, and the red box -- I added the red box to indicate the length of the video index relative to the trap index. Also, all the figures are normalized to the long-term average, which is the 1 here, and, as an example, 2 means twice the long-term average, and 0.5 means half the long-term average.

The black, or the red, line, and it's black in the chevron and the red line in the lower graph, are the standardized index, and we also added the gray areas, or the dotted lines, which are the 95 percent confidence intervals, and then, for reference, we also added the red dots, or the blue line, and that's the nominal value, and so that's the non-standardized value for the indices.

Last time, you asked us to keep including the distribution maps, and, again, all the maps are roughly the same, and we updated them through 2019, and the 2021 data are still being analyzed. It basically means the warmer colors, like the red, are the higher nominal CPUEs, and so this is not standardized, and these are the trap catches only, and so video data is not included in these maps, and green is low catches, and blue means that fish was absent from our traps. White means that we did not sample in those areas.

This is the usual list of caveats, and please realize this is a summary overview, and it is not an update of stock status, and that would need a lot of other updates also, such as landings and life history information. For the traps, we use the same models, the same constraints, every year, and they may be different than those used in SEDAR stock assessments. However, for the video, Science Center staff used the methods that were used in the stock assessment, and so the models here are the same as those used in stock assessments, with the updated video index through 2019.

Obviously, not all species that I am going to present an overview of today have been assessed or updated through SEDAR, and so not all those trends and analyses have been discussed in that framework. The first couple of slides are going to be for species that we only have either a video or a trap index, and then I will close with species that we have both indices for.

This is greater amberjack. The trap index was not used in the latest stock assessment, but the video index was, and you will see that the relative abundance, the standardized relative abundance, kind of bounces up and down around the long-term average. This is gray triggerfish, and one thing that I meant to -- That I failed to mention is, since we don't have the 2020 data, I connected the 2019 to the 2021 data points, with a dotted line, but, obviously, the CV has no meaning, because we don't have the data for 2020. Here, you can see that, in recent years, the gray triggerfish standardized CPUE fell below the long-term average, and so, unfortunately, the CPUE went down for gray triggerfish.

Gray triggerfish is widely distributed throughout the region, over the shelf edge, as you can see by the map here, and tomtate is an important prey species. In the last couple of years, the relative CPUE, the standardized CPUE, was around the long-term average, and it came up from a low around 2005. Tomtate is also widely distributed, especially over the shallower parts of the shelf edge.

White grunt -- As you can see, this white grunt, on the lower picture here, was very disappointed to hear that their stock assessment may once again be kicked off the SEDAR schedule. He is really disappointed. He may be even more disappointed to see that the recent CPUE fell below the long-term average. White grunt is one of those species that has this disjunct distribution, and we see them a lot off of northern South Carolina and North Carolina, and this is a genetically-distinct population, and we don't catch them a lot off of Florida, and, of course, it again occurs off the Florida Keys and in the Caribbean, and North Carolina is actually close to the northern part of the northern edge of its distribution along the southeast coast.

Here is knobbed porgy, and it has consistently been under the long-term average, since probably the early 2000s. Knobbed porgy is also a species where our sampling region is the northern edge of the distribution, and we see them mostly off of South Carolina and North Carolina, and then

they disappear, but we don't catch them in the traps or on the videos off of Georgia and Florida, and then, again, they occur further south.

Red porgy, this is the first species that we have both the trap and the video index for. Unfortunately -- By the way, this is a little video of two red porgy interacting near the trap, and the decline in CPUE, unfortunately, continued in 2021, and the video index showed a similar pattern. Red porgy is distributed mostly in the deeper parts of our sampling area off the shelf, as you can see here by the red and yellow dots.

Black sea bass, also, unfortunately, the downward trend in CPUE continued in 2021, and the video index, as we are seeing in a lot of species, follows the same pattern. Black sea bass is, again, widely distributed, but mostly found in the shallower areas of our sampling area.

Red grouper remained low, and we've seen that in the last couple of years, and, again, the video index -- This is a good example, I would say, of the value of a long-term dataset, because, if we wouldn't know what was happening in the early 2000s, or the late 1990s, it may have been more difficult to interpret the pattern of a shorter time series. Red grouper has this distribution, where we see them in the traps off of North Carolina, and then we rarely see them off of Georgia and South Carolina, and then, again, they appear in the traps off of Florida.

This is gag, and it remained low, and this is an example of the value of the additional video index, and this is a little video on the right, with some gag in the video, and we catch them in very low numbers, and the same with scamp, and those two species we catch in very low numbers in the traps, but we see them regularly on the videos, and that allows us to probably develop a more robust index, using the video, and this is the video index for gag from 2011 to 2019, and, maybe with the exception of the early part, it's seeing a similar pattern.

This is gag, and, again, all those blue dots are more of a function of the fact that we don't see them a lot inside the traps, and we caught about, I think, twenty-six gag last year, and about twenty-three scamp, and so the catches in the traps were low, but, as I said, we see them regularly on the videos, and, as a reminder, the maps are based on the trap catches and not on the video observations.

This is scamp and yellowmouth. Since we have the fish in-hand, we can identify scamp to species, and we can take them into the lab, to examine them in detail, and we can take DNA samples. With videos, it's a lot more difficult to identify scamp and yellowmouth, and, based on conversations at the last stock assessment, the video index is a combination of scamp and yellowmouth grouper, and you can see, in the video on the right, some scamp changing color, as part of either territorial or courtship behavior. Scamp, again, remain well under the long-term average, and the video index showed a similar pattern to that of the trap index. Scamp is found mostly in North Carolina and South Carolina and Georgia, but, again, this may be a function of the fact that we don't get a lot of catches of scamp, relatively speaking, in our traps.

Then vermilion snapper, and the upward trend is going above the long-term average, and they kind of seem to have stopped, and the 2021 data point is under the long-term average, and the video index showed a similar pattern to that of the trap. Vermilion snapper is a species that we catch in relatively high numbers in the trap, and, actually, it was our second-most abundant species in the traps in 2021, and, again, they are widely distributed in our sampling area, throughout the shelf.

Then last, but not least, is red snapper, and we saw a bit of a reversal in our long-term trend, and so the standardized CPUE came back up a little bit, but I want to point out the large CVs around the standardized CPUE, and, here again, the general trend in the video index is similar to that of our trap index, and this is the distribution of the red snapper in our traps, and we catch them mostly off of Florida and Georgia and then again off of North Carolina.

That's the last species that I have an update for, and so the last slide is our 2022 plans, and we plan to do our regular sampling, a full sampling, season from mid-April to mid-October with the three vessels, with a complete scientific crew, and hopefully we can return to a full fisheries sampling schedule, but, obviously, that all depends on how things develop in the spring, but we are in full swing relative to the preparations of our sampling season.

Before I thank the many people that contributed to this update, I want to mention that MARMAP started in 1972, and so last year was our fiftieth anniversary, and 1973 was our first field season, and so this year will be our fiftieth field season, and we're actually having a celebration later this month, on March 26, to celebrate fifty years of MARMAP sampling. With that, I want to acknowledge the many people, past and present, that have contributed to MARMAP and SEAMAP and SEFIS, staff and students and vessel research crews. This is a big and long-term project, and many people have contributed, and also NOAA for funding and South Carolina DNR for their support. With that, I will let this video run again while I entertain any questions, if you have any. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Marcel, for the outstanding presentation, as usual, and, as Marcel noted, there will be a celebration at the end of the month, and it's a double celebration. We're celebrating that, but we are recognizing that Marcel will be leaving us, but it is MARMAP's fiftieth anniversary, combined with a farewell to Marcel, and, as you all can see, the entire reef fish survey efforts are a big part of what we do, in terms of collecting data, to feed the management process for the species we've been talking about for the past couple of days here, and so it's a big deal, and it's extremely valuable programs, and certainly, as you mentioned, long-term indices and having data going back fifty years, in some cases, is extremely valuable, and so thank you, Marcel, for everything you do and have done and all your people and everyone involved in the overall reef fish survey program. Any questions for Marcel? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks. Thanks for the presentation, Marcel. I'm just curious. With the video camera, are you all seeing any lionfish, getting any sort of just qualitative idea about the lionfish abundance and distribution? I mean, I know it doesn't show up on the trapping, because I'm sure they don't trap very well, from what I understand, but I'm just curious.

DR. REICHERT: Yes, we do. This is an exception. This is a frame with twenty lionfish in one frame, the left-hand, the blueish video, and so I believe lionfish are one of the species that we are identifying, or that are identified, in the videos, to develop kind of an idea of their densities. One of those was the first video, I believe, that we saw, that tomtate and vermilion snapper actually harassing lionfish, but these are some examples of fish that we rarely catch in the traps, but the video gives us an opportunity to study some species that we did not have a lot of information from before.

MR. BELL: He's got a lot of good shark video too, everything from great white to --

DR. REICHERT: Yes, and these are two fat tiger sharks.

MR. BELL: Dewey, did you have a question?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was wondering, and what's the shallowest -- I might have seen it, but what's the shallowest you all sample?

MR. REICHERT: It's about fifteen meters.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Given that, how about off the southeastern parts of North Carolina, the potential windmill projects that could be potentially off the coast, and I think it's thirteen to fifteen miles off that area, and I was wondering, and did you all get into that area? Are you familiar with that potential area, and I was wondering if you all get into that area.

DR. REICHERT: I am not sure, and is that -- That's south of Cape --

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Cape Lookout. I mean, Cape Fear.

DR. REICHERT: Cape Fear, and I'm not entirely sure. We have the -- We have our sampling sites, and we produce a cruise report on an annual basis, and I distributed it to the council and SERO and Science Center staff, and that has our sampling locations in it, and I'm not entirely sure whether that -- I wouldn't be surprised if it overlaps, but I cannot tell you off the top of my head.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I'm just curious, because I don't believe them areas have been out to lease yet, but it seemed like other surveys that have been done for that area -- That it had relatively some hard bottom and different things like that, and I was just curious if you all made it in there. One other question, and, given that you all use menhaden, and is that just availability and the cheapness of that?

DR. REICHERT: It's because that's what we have done since the beginning, and what we try to do is keep the method as consistent as possible, to make it a standardized -- Initially, I think it was because it was widely available and relatively cheap, and that has changed over time a little bit, but we don't want to change that, because we don't want to change our methodology.

MR. BELL: You all saw that big red snapper go in there and have some lunch. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: On the trap, how many cameras are facing out?

DR. REICHERT: Two. We have one camera that faces out over the entrance of the trap and another camera that faces forward, and I believe, and Science Center staff can correct me, but one of those cameras is mostly used for the counting fish, and the other one is for habitat, to see where the habitat is, because we take that into account in our standardization of the method, and sometimes -- These two videos are from cameras inside the trap, but we've done some studies to look at fish behavior inside the trap also, to see, for instance, what fish go and out of the trap, what's the behavior of the fish inside, and so we are conducting some other studies too, but mostly we have those two cameras on top of the trap.

MR. CONKLIN: Are these the images where they're measuring with the stereo ruler?

DR. REICHERT: No, and that is something that we started doing recently, and, Clay, maybe you can correct me, but two years ago we started putting stereo cameras on the traps, and, at South Carolina DNR, we are currently conducting a selectivity study, and so we acquired some stereo cameras specifically for that study, but I think the plan, or the intention, is to make that a more standardized way of collecting our videos, because it's -- Currently, we don't have, except for those couple of years that we had the stereo cameras, we don't have length measurements of the fish in the video index, and it would be extremely helpful if we have that, and so hopefully we will have that available in the future.

MR. BELL: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: What's a stereo camera?

DR. REICHERT: Sorry, and it's two -- All of these videos are from one camera, and the stereo cameras are two cameras, and, like with our eyes, if you have two cameras, you can combine that image, and that helps you to see depth, and that helps you to actually measure the fish that you see, and so it's a rather -- It's complicated, and the analysis is very time consuming, but the information that we get is really valuable, but that's what those two cameras do.

MR. BELL: Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I was just wondering if -- I mean, would it mess up the survey of counting how many fish are out there if you guys switched over to those 360 Go-Pros or whatever that let you see everything?

DR. REICHERT: Yes, and all new technology will provide additional information. I think the biggest challenge there is that the analysis of all that additional information is really time consuming, and so I would love to see that, because it gives you a good view, and the question is how much time does that take to analyze, and what is the information that you get from the cameras, and so I think, right now, the best bang for our buck is the stereo cameras, so we can get some length for the fish that we see on the videos.

MR. BELL: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Marcel, for the great presentation, and congratulations on your retirement.

DR. REICHERT: Thank you.

MR. STRELCHECK: We'll miss you, and I have a number of questions. I guess, first, I was really surprised that, given there is potential for trap selectivity, it seemed like all of the video indexes that you were showing were largely the trap index. Are you seeing any species where trap selectivity is showing one trend, versus the video is showing another trend?

DR. REICHERT: For the ones that are seen here, and for the ones that we've seen in stock assessments, I think, by and large, the trends track each other. There may be years where one

index shows a slightly different pattern than another, but I think the overall patterns are relatively similar. The big advantage, for some species, is that the data on the video, in some species, is more robust than the traps, and the data on the traps, in some other species, is more robust than the video, and so it's using the strength of the method for stock assessment.

MR. STRELCHECK: Okay, and then two other questions. In terms of sampling locations, you show composite graphics over like a five-year time period, and there's some white space on the map, where you haven't sampled, is that just simply because of randomization of the sites, or is that not suitable habitat, or is it too shallow, in terms of why there is holes in the sampling regime?

DR. REICHERT: It's mostly because we target live bottom habitat, and those are the unconsolidated habitats, and we've done this survey for a long time, and so we've traversed the area a lot, and we have sampled areas that are white, and they are mostly because they are unconsolidated sediments.

There are, no doubt, areas that are live bottom habitat that are not in our sampling universe, but, since SEFIS started sampling, part of that was to see if we could increase -- Most of the funding that SEAMAP provided to the reef fish survey was aimed at increasing our sampling universe, and we've done that, especially in the first couple of years, but, in the last couple of years, we have added very few new, truly new, sampling areas, and so the white is mostly because it's not the habitat that we typically see the managed reef fishes on.

MR. STRELCHECK: All right, and the last question, and this is just me kind of eyeballing some of the graphics, but, where red snapper is kind of highest abundance from your surveys, there is a number of species that really aren't present there. Now, some of that could be because of their life history and geographic distribution, but species like red porgy are thriving in areas where red snapper aren't as abundant, from your survey, and so I'm just curious if you've seen any shifts in abundance throughout the years and if -- I am really curious about the ecosystem effects we have when we rebuild stocks, or when stocks are in decline, and how those shifts might be taking place.

DR. REICHERT: In the last presentation that I gave, I contrasted two time periods, an earlier time period and a later time period, and the difficulty with interpreting those data was the increase in sampling intensity in the most recent period relative to the earlier period, but, even in those, we saw some shifts, but it's difficult to explain whether that's due to a change in sampling or whether it's a true change in distribution.

Our intention is, next time around, to show -- Because the SEFIS has now been conducted for almost ten years, and so that allows us to do two five-year periods, and so our plan is to provide -
- Or, for my colleagues, the plan is to provide that and continue to do that, and so you can see the potential change, and I have to say that Tracey Smart is currently doing some analysis on changes in spatial distribution in the region, and it looks like, for some species, that there were some changes in the spatial distribution of some species. I hope that answers your question.

We have seen -- To be honest, over time, we have seen some species occur in much higher numbers in the traps and in the videos, species that I would associate much more with my diving in the Caribbean, like cornetfish and some angelfishes that we see on a regular basis, and the problem is that we only have ten years of video data.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Marcel? Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you for this, Marcel. It's always fun to watch this video, and I just want to emphasize, for everyone, that the chevon trap survey, and the video survey that started after, is really the lynchpin for our stock assessments, and, I mean, it's the flagship survey here. Now we have the South Atlantic deepwater longline survey, which will supplement this for the deeper-water stuff, but, without this survey, the assessments would not contain a whole lot of information, and this is really, really key.

Having said that, a couple of people asked questions about making changes in the surveys in various ways, and Marcel is right that we keep things as constant as possible, so that any changes we see are really changes in fish abundance and not changes in the way we operate. You can adjust for that, if we make some changes, but that means running basically side-by-side comparisons and coming up with calibrations, and so it can be done, but it's time consuming, and it has to be done with care.

Having said that, one of the things we did do is implement the stereo cameras, in I think it was 2018, and so we're starting to get some good video data there, but, as Marcel pointed out, it's time consuming to read it, and so one of the big research initiatives that we've all been working on is automated image analysis, and we've got some really good stuff that's coming out of both our Beaufort and Pascagoula laboratories, where they're actually able to identify a large fraction of the species you're seeing, and so there's an algorithm that actually can essentially look at the image and figure out what type of fish it is, and that saves a huge amount of time, because you can imagine, if you had to sit there and watch the TV for hours and hours, trying to read all this video and write it all down, not only does it get really, really tedious, but it's extremely time consuming, and it takes us month to process the information.

What we're hoping to do is make some further improvements on this automated image analysis, which would allow us to process the information much faster and free up people's time to do other things, since there's so many other things we need done, and also identify a lot of these other species that normally we don't take the time to do, to get a better picture of the ecosystem and how it's changing, and so thank you for that, Marcel, and this is great work, and I'm really excited to see it progressing.

DR. REICHERT: Thank you, Clay, and I think it's also important to realize that this is a multispecies survey, and we realize that there is always compromises, in terms of what gear you're using, and it's not just either a black sea bass or a red snapper survey, and so thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, thanks, Marcel, and thanks for all the questions. It's a good discussion, and, again, we'll miss you. From the DNR perspective, I will definitely miss you on the campus there, and I do know that you have good leadership, and you've got good people, and MARMAP will carry on, and we'll be fine, but thank you so much for all you've done.

DR. REICHERT: Thank you, and I agree with that, and so I appreciate it, and thank you so much.

MR. BELL: All right. We'll move along here, and we've got a series of council staff reports that we'll get right into, and, John, you're leading off as the Executive Director.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you, sir. It is great to have Marcel here with us one more time before his last month winds down to an end, and, for some of you that have been around a long time, Marcel has -- He's been a great asset to the council, through his job with South Carolina DNR, and he served as SSC Chair, and he was a long-time SSC member, and so some of the newer folks might not realize that, but he has been a familiar face over the years, and, for those of us who have the pleasure of working with him, on things like the SSC, like Carolyn and I, have really appreciated knowing him over the years and all of his contributions, and so thank you very much, Marcel. We are sad to see you go, but it is well deserved.

Continuing on some personnel updates, some of you may have noticed Ashley Oliver here this week, who is our Sea Grant Communication Fellow, and Christina will be presenting her in a little more detail and telling you about her and introducing her, and she's been around this week, and I think yesterday she was out visiting tackle shops and having a lot of fun, and so a lot of us were quite jealous that that's where she was all day, because I think we all enjoy doing activities like that.

The other personnel update is, as you've noticed, Cameron is no longer with us, and we mentioned that in December, and she has moved on to other opportunities and pursuing things of her own interest and her own career, and so we are hiring to replace her with someone who will continue to work on the website and help us out with hopefully some abilities to do more graphics and just helping get information out and really assisting Kim with the communication roles, again much as Cameron did. We've conducted interviews for that position, and we hope to be hiring someone here pretty soon, and so certainly, for the June meeting, expect to have someone onboard for that.

A bit of good news to share, and thanks to it seems like years and years of work on dealing with our managed areas and getting them on various mapping platforms, Navionics is going to include our managed areas on their maps, which is a great step in the right direction, and so I know that -- Hats off to Chip, and that's something that he has certainly pursued for many years, and we're really glad to see that finally happening.

I want to bring your attention to our Award of Excellence, and some of you may recall that is something we approved back in I think it was March of 2020, when we actually approved the process, but we withheld taking action and making the awards because of COVID, and it was something that we wanted to do in-person, and it just, in 2020, didn't really seem like something that was the right move to do at the time, but this is really a new award that we created to recognize people for their contributions to the overall council process, and it really could be a variety of ways that they contributed.

We'll be sending out some information, and there will be more details in your mailboxes next week, about the process and submitting the nominations. Nominations can be submitted by council members, AP members, and SSC members, and they will be due on June 30. Just as a refresher, the Executive Committee will review the nominations, and we intend to make the award in September, and so be on the lookout for that, and start thinking about folks that you might wish to nominate for their contributions to basically your management program.

I do want to thank Georgia for getting us back on track, and it was here in 2020 when we all went home wondering about that COVID thing, and it took us a long time to get back. We were almost

fully back to normal, it seemed, in December, but I really feel like, this week, we have finally gotten there and gotten back to our pre-COVID way of meeting, and it's been great, and so definitely thanks to the Georgia contingent for putting on a great dinner. We're sorry that Doug wasn't able to be there with us, due to the call of duty to go to the capital, but, you know, his efforts really helped us have that dinner, and thank you very much for that, Georgia.

Then, looking ahead now, we have Key West, coming up in June, and so I think Jessica will be working on another event for us there, and we'll probably start on Monday morning, and so go ahead and start planning now that you're likely going to need to travel on Sunday, which getting to Key West, for most of us, is pretty much the story anyway, and so we're starting to work on the agenda now. As you can imagine, after this week, it's going to be a pretty full week, but it will be nice to get down to Key West for a change, and it's been many years since we were there, as I recall, and I don't remember how long, but it's been quite a few. That was all my updates, and everyone else is going to come up here and cycle through the rest of the things, but those were just a few bits that I wanted to bring to your attention.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, John. Any questions for John? I don't see any. Thanks, John. Roger, you're up next.

MR. PUGLIESE: On to some broader topics. Today, I was going to give you all an update on the East Coast Climate Change Scenario Planning effort, and this effort is something that is a follow-up from really something this council had initiated in discussions with our other partners on the Atlantic coast, and if some of you remember all the way back when we first had the discussions with the New England and Mid-Atlantic Council, during the session, on advancing how we coordinate on issues and crossing boundaries and the potential for shifting species.

To a degree, this has been picked up by the Northeast Coordinating Council, and they're spearheading this initiative, in cooperation with the New England Council, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic Council, and NOAA Fisheries, both regions and centers.

We are in a process now that I have touched on some of the earlier steps on orientation, and we have got the information about initiating this process and beginning to look at how some of these different -- Especially the focus on how we deal with moving species and shifting stocks in our regions, across regions, and really focusing on management and governance issues related to that and how we would do that.

The intent of this process is to engage an effort for scenario planning that's been used in other areas, and we are now into actually moving out of the exploration phase, and we just had driver webinars that were looking at oceanographic issues, biological issue drivers, and social and economic drivers, and we were lucky enough to have Ira Laks actually, who sat in on the -- He was a representative during one of the panel sessions, and Tom Roller on the socioeconomic panel sessions, and we're advancing pretty far.

The whole idea was really to kind of catch up everybody to speed on where some of these different things were and how we would look at those different big-picture items that would affect where we go into here and how that goes into the scenario development.

What we were doing was we were looking at really educating and looking at engagement, as well as some of the -- Setting the stage for, like I said, really getting into the next stages of where we go beyond here, and so all the different components and how they affect what we do, because what you need to do is identify what those drivers are, and those drivers will help identify then scenarios to think into the future about what may come and where we go from here, and those have been fairly successful. We had 269 attend the oceanographic session, and they identified temperature and primary productivity and currents as being like the biggest drivers into the system, and there was an in-process discussion polling system that was incorporated, and that was very effective, to help us at least being to focus on different areas.

The biological session had 215 people attend it, and it provided distribution shifts and productivity as being a couple of the major drivers, and then, for socioeconomic, we had 176 attendees for that, and it really focused on consumer demand and tech change and cost pressures that are going to be coming up, and so at least it gave a gauge, and there was a lot more in the discussions of those sessions, which we're compiling now, and we are moving from there to really the next stages, and these are the different ones that I had mentioned that were held just recently.

The exploration phase, and so now we're shifting into the next phase after that, and these were the polls, again, that I just mentioned about some of the drivers that we had highlighted for -- In this case, that was the oceanographic that had just happened in advance of the briefing book going out.

Where we're at now is we're taking a step from the driver area, and we're moving into the creation phase, and so this is where we're going to engage a group to look at where we go from here and develop of scenarios for up to the next twenty years and what would the different conditions potentially be that could affect how we manage or how we govern fisheries into the future, and now these are not predictions, but suppose they give you a gauge of how you advance and what you should be considering as you move into the future.

After that phase, and so we're just literally working on the logistics and the design of that phase, and that's going to involve a workshop. Between all the groups that we have going right now, the workshop looks like it's going to be I think June 21 to 23, and at least that's going to go forward, and a lot of this that I'm talking about literally is going to be going forward to the NRCC as a proposal to advance the workshop process, the selections of individuals to participate, and one of the biggest things that we had identified, early on, is that, to accomplish this, it's going to have to be fairly focused.

The group, I think, is going to be around seventy-five, and we're going to have an engagement of how to get individuals involved and reach out and be able to provide the ability for each of the participants to -- Or the partners to provide input on exactly how we deal with the input we get from these different questionnaire systems that we're going to be setting up and discussing and reviewing, and so the idea is to get that group to look at these different drivers and break out into different sessions and be able to come up with scenarios that look into the future, and those scenarios then, after that session, will actually look at going to the individual regions and providing those types of scenarios to look at where we go and then maybe some fine-tuning, and then it's anticipated that, at that level, we'll actually have, potentially, a discussion, at the September council meeting, on how this is evolving into the considerations to actually take this and begin to even think about how you apply it into management and governance.

I always -- They have always put it as governance and management, but I always look at it the other way, because I think, you know, you kind of exhaust your management capabilities that you have at-hand already, and then, if you look at governance needs for how we cross borders and different things, that's going to be discussions across the different councils and the commission and NOAA and how we advance that, and that's a bigger picture.

With this, we will develop like three to five scenarios. Under each scenario, you have particular challenges and what governance you would face. How well would the current fisheries governance and management arrangements cope with those scenarios, if they were to occur, and then what needs to change for the fisheries governance or management to prepare for those scenario possibilities, and then, ultimately, what are the tools and processes that need to advance now, in order to ensure that fisheries are governed and managed effectively as we move into an era of climate change?

Down the road, you're looking at potentially a set of scenarios that provide us stories and qualitative terms of the different ways in which changing climate might affect the east coast fisheries, a better understanding of the real challenges and opportunities we have in fisheries management, and then near and long-term management priorities that need to achieve management objectives, potentially policy recommendations, and that's when you're starting to really get into the weeds about issues and broader governance changes that may improve any of the ability to adapt, because a lot of these things -- Once you looked at all of those together, it was a little bit overwhelming, when you looked at oceanographic and biological and -- Yes, it was a lot of things happening at one time that's going to be a challenge for all of the partners to deal with.

Then, of course, the data that's going to be needed to be able to understand and monitor what some of these different situations, and we've already had that, and I think, in our first discussions, years ago, we talked about the two levels being management and then also being some of the science that drives that, and that gets to the data and monitoring and science needs, and then a framework for going beyond here, because the whole idea of this is not to be just something that we kind of package and look at and put a document away and move forward. The idea is that you begin this and then keep a dialogue going on how we can advance and refine it, as things are continually changing and affecting it.

That is where we are with the climate scenario planning effort, and we literally had a core team meeting today, that they are fine-tuning the logistics document, and we'll be wrapping that up and hopefully going up to the CCC in May, or not the CCC, but the NRCC, and there's too many mixes between the different groups, but the NRCC in May, to fine-tune how that process goes forward, and that's actually going to get into ensuring that we know some of the funding of the individuals who are participating, et cetera. Any specific questions?

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Roger. Any questions for Roger? I will say there is, like you mentioned, there is the oceanographic stuff that we're dealing with, and that's a matter of understanding what is going on, but, when you move into the governance, that's where kind of the rubber hits the road for us, is the areas that we have divided off and assigned authority, or jurisdiction, to certain groups, and, if things start crossing lines, which they're doing, then how do we deal with those sorts of things, and so that is a challenge.

Do we need to tweak our governance structure, or do we -- How do we adapt, and we're already kind of doing that on the fly now, and so that's an important topic, and so I'm looking forward to hearing about that. All right. Thanks, and do you have another one?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, I've got one more. Let me shift gears, and these are all kind of the bigger-picture efforts that are ongoing, and the next area that I was going to touch on was the CCC area-based management sub-committee, and it's addressing the discussions that gets referred to as Thirty-by-Thirty or America the Beautiful activities, and the steering committee has been working on how to address this and provide input, and we have -- The committee has representatives of the councils, and we have observers from NOAA Fisheries that have been pretty key on advancing this process and to have somewhat of a unified council review and discussion and providing a bigger perspective of area management as it goes into that forum, because there is a lot that the council, over all the years, has been accomplishing to advance this.

The CCC group is moving forward, and the intent is to prepare a report based on existing fishery conservation information and, ultimately, advance that, through the May CCC meeting, to have discussions on how that can provide a foundation for understanding how much the councils have done and how much, in our regions -- It's kind of even a broader picture that we have been addressing.

What has occurred, over time, is we've met, and actually it's nine times now, and it was eight originally, but we developed a draft definition and criteria, a database of existing conservation areas in federal waters, and it's broader, and it's council and other components, and summary tables and initial coordination on mapping capabilities, to understand what has been built, and, to capture the broader sense of it, the CCC's working definition really looked at the conservation area as established -- As an area that's established geographically with a defined area, and it's planned management or regulation of environmentally-averse fishing activities, and it provides maintenance of biological productivity, diverse ecosystem function and services, including recreational seafood production, and so we are kind of packaging it into a council perspective on how this is being presented up the chain.

To that, it includes protecting aspects of the ecosystem and maintain biodiversity, and so a category that looks at like ecosystem conservation and a category that addresses spatially-driven fishery management challenges, like mortality reduction and stock rebuilding and allocation, and bycatch concerns, such as year-round fisheries management, and then areas that are designated to address spatially-driven fishery management, but are on a seasonal basis, and so it was trying to capture kind of the broadest sweep of what we could do.

For an example, the spreadsheets that we've been building are far more extensive, and we were whittling down to here, and, actually, there was even generations that get into the finer discussions of each of the different types of -- This was representative, and you all know these, because these are areas that we've been looking at, but these are just a snapshot of like some of the ecosystem protection ones, with like our deepwater coral habitat areas of particular concern, the ecosystem protection coral marine protected areas, and we're trying to provide area, and we're also looking at how it addresses some of the America the Beautiful principles, and so how we can document those and connect those to those discussions and advance those.

Also, on fisheries management, and, for example, with the dolphin and wahoo, we've got the east coast pelagic longline closed area that has compatible regulations, or comparable, complementary, regulations with the HMS regulations for that closed area, as well as, for example, our snapper -- We've got the black sea bass pot prohibitions to address areas in our region, and then some of the closures that are tied to some of the protected species interactions.

Getting the scope of all of these, and all the councils are looking at all the different -- Because there's a lot of variation between the councils on some of these, and so that's been being compiled for a while, and this is a very preliminary table, but it does provide a big snapshot of how many areas, and it's well over 600 for all of the regions, compiling those ecosystem protection and year-round management and seasonal areas, and some are moving in and out of the system, to some degree, but, if you combine all of the councils' areas, and I was talking with Heather Singer, who is the rep, and up the chain into NOAA for us, and we were looking at like 54 percent of all the EEZ areas throughout the nation, I think, that they were looking at.

We are working on this and refining it and advancing it and moving it forward to councils, and, now, one thing I will say that is that, the way we structured it, it was fairly stringent and trying to tie it to the way that things were moved forward in America the Beautiful, but one of the aspects from the South Atlantic side that I am going to add in is discussion about how many other types of things we have in there, because our council has been building conservation from day-one, and so we've got things such as the trawl prohibitions, roller rig trawl prohibitions that we've got, and entanglement gear prohibitions, and the bottom longline, a lot of these things that have been in place for many years, this foundation that we've got, and a coral plan, which is, again, unique to coral, coral reef, and live hardbottom.

I always say that, because it covers all of that habitat, and it's not just -- People think, oh, it's just a coral plan. No, when we did the live bottom amendment, it covered all of those habitats, and so basically anything that is live hardbottom systems were in there, and so we have all of these other types of components that are not technically area, other than basically regionally identified, that are foundational conservation components, and, where those exist in other regions, we're going to be including some of that discussion, and I'm going to try to push to include a map of that too, in our regions, beyond just the maps that they're going to use for these.

With that, that's where we stand, and John is going to be fielding things as we move up the chain to the CCC at the next meeting and how we advance into the future, and I think this is a good opportunity for the councils to weigh-in on how much in our region, and, as I said, the way we're taking the perspective, it's not just our -- It's the councils, in cooperation with other things, such as the national sanctuaries, all of those together, to look at that snapshot, and, when you do look at that, there is a pretty significant amount in our region that's been done in those tiers and layers over all the years, and that doesn't even include all the things such as our species closures, like Nassau and different other species, and then some of the seasonal spawning closures.

I mean, it's -- There is a lot more that needs to be understood in this process, and a lot is still up in the air on how they're going to interpret it up the chain on what they're doing, but I think it's good that the councils are getting ahead of the curve on highlighting how much has actually been done with this process.

MR. BELL: Right, and, again, it's a matter of what we can -- We have done an awful lot, but we just need to be able to get credit for it, I guess, in terms of what we have achieved, and this is an example of -- If you remember, John made the presentation on the CCC and what it was all about, and this is a good example of the different councils working together within the CCC to move something forward, and so any questions for Roger? Laurilee and then Jessica.

MS. THOMPSON: Let me think how to phrase this, Roger. This is great, but, in your ecosystem protection areas, the partial chart that you showed, I didn't see anything that has anything to do with estuaries, and so are you guys considering estuaries, because there is a lot of vulnerable species that come out of estuaries, or they need the estuary as part of their life cycle, and I really - I am thrilled with what you're doing, but, if you guys aren't looking at estuaries, who is? Where do estuaries fit in in this whole fishery management process? Thank you.

MR. PUGLIESE: We had a lot of discussions about that, because is all the types of designations that are in place and everything, and I think what has happened is a lot of the states have picked those up in their coordination on providing some of that, because, if you open that door with us, our EFH designations go through all those different areas, but I think we were trying to focus is, in federal waters, where there is rulemaking and actions that are actionable, so that you can provide the Federal Register notice, the area, the cycle, and understanding those linkages are there, but also understanding there is a whole other process that is connecting a land-based and state-water systems that are intended to all kind of come together in this process.

Yes, I'm well aware, and I really appreciate that concern, because that's where I was coming from, is, well, why don't we just look at all those types of areas, but I think what we were trying to do is be on the highest ground, in terms of regulatory connections, so that we can weigh-in big on that and then make sure that they understand the interactions and connections, and I think, in our area, we do -- For example, the Florida Keys Sanctuary, we encompass the whole thing, because it does -- I know the state does it, but I think we have to, because it's a functional, connected system, and so with a rulemaking authority for the entire system.

I think it's not lost, and it's the way the entire national system discussion, at the council level, ended up, because there was a lot of back-and-forth, and I think -- I know you all have been buried in some of this already, and so I think Jessica can really weigh-in on that.

MR. BELL: Go ahead, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee kind of hit on one of my questions as well, is because I don't really understand the nexus for states getting involved to submit their state areas in a similar way to what's happening here. I mean, was someone supposed to have already reached out to us, or what do we do, and how can we get involved more to, just like Roger is saying, submit all the areas in state waters?

While I think that this group -- It answered a lot of my questions, but I still have these concerns. You know, they're wanting 30 percent of land and water areas protected by 2030, which is an admirable goal, but it's just when do you start counting, and are they going to suggest that, well, these areas are ten years old, or fifteen years old, when they were implemented, even though they're continuing to meet the goals of the Thirty-by-Thirty program, but, because they're not recent, we can't count them. I guess I just still have some questions about this, and I feel like you

guys are one step ahead of the states, but I'm just wondering if you had heard anything about how the states can get involved to submit the same type of information.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think the bottom line is the council just move forward with it, because there has not been necessarily -- Other than the public request for input on what should be included, and the recent atlas request was out, and how you move -- But that's a request for some of the combining of the information, and where it's actually going to be evaluated and how they determine it, that's still up in the air, and they don't even have the actual definition down, and so I think there's a lot still evolving on the whole process, and we're trying to get ahead of the system, from the council's perspective, with the acknowledgment of the importance of our -- Especially in our area and all those inshore systems and -- I wanted to open the door on all of our EFH and HAPC designations throughout the entire region, because then we would cover all those estuarine habitats, but then we didn't have the rulemaking connections, and that's at the state level.

Maybe there is going to be an opportunity to look at how that really does, and I'm sure that they are -- Because they're having to deal with the whole land-based side of this, and so Interior is being involved, and so a lot of the federal agencies are reaching internally, but we're not seeing yet a lot of that that means, and so I think that we are trying to take at least the highest round, with what we have in-hand, and really highlight how much actually the councils have been doing over the years, and I think that's the biggest thing here, is to get ahead of the curve, to show in this -- I was going to -- If you bear with me, and I'm just going to -- I haven't even provided these to our -- It's just to get a little bit of an idea of -- Let's see.

I had transferred, and I had created images for the conservation areas, and the biggest thing that I wanted to show is that layering of all these different things. In the beginning, they're going to be all the suspects we know, the HAPCs and the MPAs and the spawning SMZs and the SMZs and Oculina Bank and all of these different -- The bottom closure and the sea bass -- That will be kind of that first layer.

The next one was beginning to look at those broader areas, the larger system ones, like the Charleston Bump and the inshore bottom longline prohibition, and then the one that really is that one that I mentioned before is that layering of all the habitat conservation, the sargassum prohibition and the coral and coral reef and live hardbottom prohibition, and just all those, and then all those gear restrictions, because I had discussions back and forth, and I am still going to follow-up with some of the hierarchy on that, about maybe that can actually get even further in there, because, even though it doesn't have that same kind of a small area designation that fits into something like this, this is even bigger.

MR. BELL: When I said earlier that we, we the councils, we in particular, and I know, from our perspective, we've done an awful lot, and, when I said it's a matter of what we can kind of get credit for, it goes back to that, and they were still kind of discussing the definition, and that's where, depending on how the definition works out, we either -- It's either included or it's not, and, to your question about the states, I know our land and water people, within our agency, have been involved in discussions, because it goes all the way inland as well, but I'm not sure -- Different states organize differently, and I'm not sure how you all might be handling that, but nobody has reached directly to the marine side of the house, that I'm aware of, and said what about that, but it is meant to include everything.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and that's the one is really -- I mean, this is supposed to include everything, and so it's supposed to go all the way in the whole land-based system of the entire United States.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Roger right now? I don't see any. Thank you, Roger. Julia, come on up.

MS. BYRD: All right. Good afternoon, everyone, and so I'm just going to give you all a quick overview of what's been happening in the Citizen Science Program since your December meeting, and so, first off, I just want to give you kind of an overview of some of our kind of programmatic-level activities. We took all of the input that you guys provided in December on the research priorities and incorporated them and have put the new research priorities within our kind of citizen science SOPPs document, and they're on the website, and we have pushed them out via social media.

As far as kind of programmatic cit-sci outreach that we've been working on, Nick Smillie has done a great job hosting our social media cit-sci Fridays, and he has been working to update our citizen science brochure, and so we'll have a finalized, updated brochure for you guys to check out in June.

In January of this year, we submitted a grant proposal for the SMILE project, and this is a project where we're partnering with REEF, which is a non-profit that is citizen-science focused and works with recreational divers and SECOORA, and so the idea of this project is to work with recreational divers to collect some additional length information from some data-limited species, and so the REEF folks are trying to develop kind of a handheld stereo camera that could be used by recreational divers to collect video that could then be analyzed to get length information, and so this project is really kind of a pilot to kind of develop that tool and test it out in some areas of the Florida Keys, where REEF has a lot of different activities going, and so we'll hopefully find out, in a couple of months, if that gets funded.

Over the past year or so, we've also been working with some of our NOAA colleagues to put together a special issue of a magazine called *Fisheries* that is put on by the American Fisheries Society, and so we've kind of put together a special issue that is focusing on citizen science, and so we've submitted articles to get peer reviewed now, just last month, and so we're hoping to kind of get input on the articles that we've submitted and hopefully get that special issue out later this year.

As far as our kind of program evaluation work, we've continued working with Rick Bonney, and he's been conducting interviews, and I know that several of you have been interviewed by him, and so thank you so much for making the time to chat with him, but he has, I think, maybe three more interviews to finish up, and then we'll have a report kind of summarizing that information that we can share with you guys later this spring.

Then the last programmatic thing that I wanted to share with you guys is that our Citizen Science Operations Committee will be meeting on May 12, via webinar, in the afternoon, and some of the items on their kind of -- The tentative agenda for that meeting will include kind of sharing information on the interview work that Rick Bonney has done and getting input on kind of the next step in that kind of initial program-level evaluation, as well as we're hoping to get input -- I know one of the things that you guys provided to us, when you reviewed the research priorities, was

maybe figuring out a way to kind of rank, or prioritize, those priorities, and so we want to kind of run that by this group, just to get their input on that. If they're onboard with that, we'll hopefully work toward a method that the priorities could be ranked that could be shared with you guys later this year.

Next is just a quick update on the FISHstory project, and so I'm excited to announce that the pilot project is finally kind of wrapping up for FISHstory, and we submitted our final grant report just last month, and so, in the upcoming weeks, we're kind of developing outreach materials and summarizing those findings that we can share with volunteers and you guys and other folks within the council community.

I do want to note that, as we kind of move forward, we're also interested in continuing some of the analyses that were done. The FISHstory project collected an enormous amount of information, and so I think there's a lot more things that we can kind of dig into in that data, and we're also interested in trying to kind of continue and expand the project, and so that means trying to look for additional funding sources, but we're also really interested in trying to kind of expand the historic photo archive that we have.

As you guys know, for this pilot project, the photos were provided by Rusty Hudson and represent Daytona Beach, Florida, and so we want to try to see if there are kind of other kind of pockets of historic photos that we can kind of incorporate or kind of add to our archive, and I know Chester has been wonderful in kind of helping connect us to the folks at the West Palm Beach Fishing Club, who sound like they have an incredible archive of photos, but another thing that we're really interested in trying to do is maybe explore having kind of a photo-scanning night at some of our meetings, whether it's a council meeting, or maybe an AP meeting, kind of announcing in advance that we're interested in historic photos and trying to scan them at the meeting.

We can provide the folks who bring photos kind of digital copies of them and collect some kind of metadata, some kind of historic information, to gather some context for those photos, and so that's something we're hoping that we might be able to do at a meeting later this year.

Then on to the SAFMC Release project, and so, through this project, we have continued collecting shallow-water grouper release information in our SciFish app, and, in January of this year, Nick Smillie put together a great newsletter that was sent out to project participants, kind of summarizing the data that have been collected thus far, and there's a link in the presentation, if you all are interested in checking that out.

We have also been working, over the past couple of months, in working to kind of expand the species in SAFMC Release to include red snapper, and so, next month, kind of mid to late April, we're shooting to kind of include and add red snapper to this project, and we're also planning to make a large kind of outreach and recruitment push, to hopefully get more fishermen involved in this project, and Nick Smillie is really the one who is kind of leading efforts on that outreach, and he's already started visiting a number of tackle shops around South Carolina, and he's done some in kind of southern North Carolina and northern Georgia, and so he'll be continuing those efforts.

Another thing that I want to note too is I know you will kind of hear from Ashley and Christina in a few minutes, but they're going to be doing a lot of kind of best fishing practices outreach, and so we're really trying to coordinate any outreach that we're doing through Release with them, so

that we can kind of get the biggest bang for our buck, and I think kind of a lot of the things that we are trying to collect and communicate with our Release project are similar to some of the same things they're trying to communicate with their best fishing practices outreach, and so I think it's a really good kind of collaboration, and it can really help us kind of amplify our outreach efforts.

One other kind of outreach initiative for Release and best fishing practices that we're really excited about, and this is really due to Nick and Ashley's hard work, but, at the end of April, we are planning to kind of partner with some for-hire captains in the Charleston area and a tackle shop, and it's kind of Mark Phelps and Chet Brecham who are kind of for-hire captains in Charleston, but they're also serving on some of the council's APs, and then Mike Able at Haddrell's, who put together a seminar on kind of effective and maybe responsible bottom fishing, and so the idea here is that the captains would be able to share kind of tips on bottom fishing, and then Ashley and Nick would be able to share information on best fishing practices and the use of descending devices and kind of the SAFMC Release project.

That is a quick update on what's happening with that project, and then the last thing that I just wanted to quickly mention is, as we've moved over to this new SciFish app, which can host multiple citizen science projects, we've been working to create kind of a project builder that will allow us to build apps kind of on the fly, by choosing from a set number of data fields, and so progress is underway for the customizable project builder piece of that app, and we actually saw a demo of it for the first time, or I saw a demo of it for the first time, earlier this week, and it's really coming together, and so hopefully we'll have kind of a prototype this summer that we can kind of share with you guys and you can check out, and I think it's going to be a really great way, and cost effective way, to have kind of a developed -- A project data collection tool on your phone that can go anywhere, and so that's a quick update on what's going on with the program, and I am happy to take any questions.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Julia. That's some great stuff, and we're thinking of new things for you to do, too. Any questions for Julia about anything going on with citizen science? Clay has got one.

DR. PORCH: Thank you for that, Julia. It's always interesting, especially the stuff with the historical photos, because it gives us some perspective on how much, or not, things have changed since like those in the 1950s, and, at least in my area, that's -- When I talk to the people that were the old-timers when I first started, they all said that everything was shot, at least in the Florida Keys area, and you've got to understand the high population density, but they said it's all been shot since the 1950s, but it's all just anecdotal and talking about where they went fishing and all, and so it's really cool to see this kind of information. Having said that, you mentioned that you have -- Almost your entire photo record is what Rusty contributed from Daytona?

MS. BYRD: Yes, and, right now, for the pilot project, all of the photos were from kind of Rusty's family, his family's fleet, and so it's multiple boats, but they're all from the Daytona Beach, Florida area right now, and so, ideally, we would like to kind of spread out over the geographic range, where we have photos from, but that's kind of a next step in the project.

MR. BELL: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: I loved it, and it was very good. I do have some pictures that I would be glad to send you from Savannah.

MS. BYRD: That would be awesome, Judy. I will follow-up with you a little bit later.

MS. HELMEY: All right.

MR. BELL: Thanks for the offer. Any other questions? All right. I don't see any. Thank you, Julia, as always. Good job. All right. We've got one more staff presentation. Christina, are you going to do that one?

MS. WIEGAND: I think it's all you, Kim, if you want to start, and then, once you've gone over everything, I will hop in and talk about the fellowship.

MS. IVERSON: Okay. Thanks. Thanks, everyone, and thank you for the opportunity to take a couple of minutes here this afternoon just to provide an update on the communications and outreach. As John mentioned earlier, we're excited about filling a Communications and Digital Media Specialist position, and the interviews have been completed, and we've had some excellent candidates, and I personally am looking forward to the new person as we expand our outreach and communications efforts. As Julia just mentioned, there is a lot of things going on, and it's been an interesting week of listening in and all of the outreach and communication needs that have been identified this week.

I did want to touch quickly on a couple of updates, the Marine Resources Education Program, the management workshop, is scheduled for April 11 through 14. It's April 11 through 14 at the Hyatt Hotel in Tampa. Kind of like this meeting in Jekyll Island, our last workshop was held in February of 2020, as a science workshop, and so we're reaching out to, or we reached out to, the 2020 cohort, as we refer to them now, and I'm excited to say that fifteen of those folks are coming back for the management workshop, and we have some other participants that needed to complete that management portion of the two-phase workshop, and so they will be gathered in Tampa.

For this particular workshop, since this is a little bit different, due to COVID for the past couple of years, we're going to have a science refresher on Monday afternoon, and then we'll jump into the management workshop first thing on Tuesday morning and complete it on Thursday afternoon.

The MREP plan team is working on a 2022/2023 schedule now, to start back on our normal workshop schedule, with a science workshop being first, followed by the management workshop, and so, council members, if you're interested in participating, as we get back on schedule, please let me or John Carmichael know, and we'll take notes, and hopefully get everyone that's interested at the table within the next couple of workshops.

I just wanted to say thank you to the council members, and also to NOAA Fisheries, to Andy and the Regional Office, and to Clay and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, for their continued support of MREP over the past few years. It's been difficult not having the workshops in-person, and we're all excited to be together again down in Tampa.

Also, I wanted to let you know that the council will once again have an exhibit at ICAST, ICAST 2022, down in Orlando, Florida, and that will be July 19 through 22, and we've had a two-year hiatus, due to COVID, and we are participating again this year, and we've confirmed that we'll have a booth, and we're hoping for a ten-by-twenty booth, where we can highlight our best fishing

practices efforts and also the council's Citizen Science Program and all the amazing things that are happening there, as Julia just highlighted, including SAFMC Release and the expansion to include red snapper.

For those of you that haven't been before, ICAST is the world's largest sportfishing tradeshow, and it gives us an opportunity to network with a unique audience, including manufacturers and bait and tackle manufacturers and industry leaders, and ASA is a sponsor, and there are a lot of agencies, both state and federal, that participate. We are going to be part of what is known as the conservation corner, and Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission always has a prevalent booth there, and a number of their personnel there, throughout ICAST, and so we're excited to be back, and we really appreciate that opportunity to attend and add that to our outreach and communications effort.

I won't take up more of your time, but, as Christina noted, she's going to talk more about the best fishing practices intern, and I hate that I wasn't there, but I'm sure you have enjoyed meeting Ashley this week, and getting to know her a little bit better, and so, Christina, and, if anyone has questions, please let me know.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Kim. It's good to hear from you.

MS. WIEGAND: Thanks, Kim, and so I'm sure that many of you have had a chance to meet her over the week, but I did want to take a moment to formally introduce Ashley Oliver. She is our new reef fish fellow, and you guys have heard about this fellowship a couple of times, but just sort of as a refresher, and this has been in the works for a while, and it's really Cameron Rhodes' sort of project that I've been lucky enough to take over, but there is a large extension grant that went to the Sea Grants within the Gulf and throughout the southeast.

There was a small pot of money that was allocated to the southeast Sea Grants, and so North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, and those groups got together and realized that, while there was a small amount of money for each state, it would actually be much more efficient to combine their efforts and hire one person to work on reef fish outreach.

They were wonderful enough to invite the council to be a part of this project, and, through many meetings, and lots of organization, the reef fish extension fellow position came to be. It's a two-year position, and the focus is going to be on reef fish outreach, but, specifically, best fishing practices, and it's going to involve a lot of really cool stuff that Ashley is going to get to do for us, and I'm a little bit jealous, but going on a number of media tours and traveling to tackle shops all up and down the coast, as well as conducting some charter trips in these different states, and so, if you haven't had a chance to talk to her this week yet, please do. We'll be reaching out to a lot of our council members, as we start going to each of these states to begin to do outreach.

This is sort of the first position of its kind, which the councils have collaborated with Sea Grant to have this type of opportunity, and I think it's important to remember that this is really allowing the council to do a lot of outreach work that we otherwise wouldn't have the manpower or funding, perhaps, to do, and so this is a really unique experience, to be able to partner with Sea Grant, and we're really appreciative that they were willing to bring us into the fold to make this happen, and, with that, I couldn't let her get away without a formal introduction, and so I'm going to let Ashley just introduce herself, real fast, to you guys.

MS. OLIVER: All right. Well, thanks, Christina. Hello, everybody. I will make this short and sweet. I'm Ashley Oliver, and I'm coming from the Midwest, and so please don't judge my accent too much, and I'm from southern Indiana, and I went to Ball State University, and my degree was in zoology, aquatics biology, and fisheries, and I just spent the last two-and-a-half years living in Wisconsin, and their accent is way worse than mine, and so bear with me on that, and I worked for the University of Illinois, and I worked on their nearshore yellow perch project in Lake Michigan, and I also did creel surveys along the Illinois waters. I'm really excited to be here in the Southeast, and this has been like a goal of mine, to live on the ocean, and now I get to travel, and I'm super excited to be doing best fishing practices, and so thank you all.

MS. WIEGAND: If anyone has any questions about the reef fish fellowship, I'm happy to answer them, and, like I said, please take a chance to get to know Ashley. I know she's going to be doing some really great things up and down the coast for us.

MR. BELL: Welcome. I didn't think you had an accent. All right. Any questions? Okay. Well, welcome, Ashley, and thank you for that, Christina. We're going to move down to the end of the list here, and Christina is going to do Protected Resources.

MS. WIEGAND: Jenny Lee, who normally does our Protected Resources Update, had other obligations today, and so you guys get to listen to me muddle through this Protected Resources Report. If you have any questions, and I am unable to answer them, I will make sure to get up with Jenny afterwards and get those questions answered.

We've got the usual stuff on here, the threatened Caribbean corals, and there's no change there. I am sort of going to skip over the stuff that Jenny has gone over with you before. I will pause here for the Endangered Species Act Section 7 related actions, and, as we've talked about a number of times, the Dolphin Wahoo FMP consultation, or the biological opinion, is currently underway, and the agency is working to complete that draft assessment for the consultation on the fishery. There is also a new consultation for the CMP resource, and they're working on an amendment to the FMP to address the listing of oceanic whitetip sharks and giant manta rays.

Another thing we really wanted to highlight here is the consideration of amendments to the North Atlantic Right Whale Vessel Strike Reduction Rule. Back in 2020, I believe, there was a report released, and one of the things that report found was that there is a significant amount of non-compliance with vessel speed regulations within the southeast, as well as issues with smaller boats and collisions, and so NOAA Fisheries is working to evaluate options for ways to further reduce those lethal vessel strikes, and, as they continue to move towards a proposed rule, in the late spring of this year, we'll be sure to keep you updated.

Then there's the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team, and you guys had a presentation about Phase 2, which is focused more on the Mid-Atlantic and Southeast area, back in September of 2021, I believe, and so, right now, they're working on organizing all of the scoping comments that were received during that period, holding additional informational webinars throughout the spring, and then there should be a meeting of the take reduction team scheduled within the next few months, and, if you will remember, Captain Charlie Phillips is your representative on the take reduction team.

Next up, we've got right whale calving season, and there have been two mom-calf pairs detected so far this season, and I believe Number 1245, Slalom, was sighted by our own John Hadley, and so, if you haven't bothered him to see the video he's got on his phone of this mom and calf, I highly recommend that you do.

Then, last, but not least, the Marine Mammal Protection Act list of fisheries, the comment period closed back in September, and we anticipate the final list of fisheries to be published sometime early this year, and, of course, we'll update you if there are any changes to listings of species that this council manages, and, with that, if there are any questions, I will do my best to answer or pass them along to Jenny.

MR. BELL: You're doing a great Jenny impersonation, I guess. Any questions for Jenny through Christina? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I was just going to offer a job to Christina to come work for us. She did such a good job.

MR. BELL: I like the enthusiasm about the whale report, too.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks for filling in for Jenny, and I just wanted to make two additional comments, and so you had -- I didn't read, in detail, the reference to the mom-calf pairs, but we've actually had fifteen total mom-calf pairs that have been sighted this year, and so that's a good thing. Unfortunately, it's not good enough of a thing right now for right whales, and we really need, obviously, the calf production to even increase above that, but at least a decent calving year, and so that's positive.

The other thing of note is Johnson's seagrass, and so you have essential fish habitat designations, and we're actually going through a de-listing, under the Endangered Species Act, for Johnson's seagrass, and we've done a proposed rule already, and we've finalized the comment period, and we're working toward a final rule, but, through a series of genetic analyses, we determined it was a clonal species of another seagrass and not a unique distinct species, and so I just wanted to give you a heads-up about that.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks. Tom, you had a question?

MR. ROLLER: Real quick, and you said, on the North Atlantic right whale vessel strike reduction rule, they mentioned that there were more strikes by small boats, and I was just curious how "small boat" was defined, and we don't need to answer that now.

MS. WIEGAND: I don't remember, off the top of my head, but I can send the report out to everyone.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks. Any other questions? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just in response to Tom, I don't remember the exact length, but I think there's been strikes of boats as small as thirty feet in length, but most of them are in the kind of forty feet and above length.

MR. BELL: All right. Anything else on protected resources? All right. Well, thanks to everybody that contributed to that. We've got one item left under the Southeast Regional Office Report, which would be Michelle Masi, if she's on, with the SEFHIER Program Update.

DR. MASI: I'm here. Can you hear me?

MR. BELL: Yes. Welcome. I guess we've got to cue up the presentation for you, and I think we're driving from here, and you'll handle the -- Just tell them when to change slides.

DR. MASI: Okay. Sounds good. Are you ready?

MR. BELL: I believe so.

DR. MASI: Okay. Great. I see you went ahead and jumped to the second slide, and that's fine. Just briefly, I am Dr. Michelle Masi, and I'm the SEFHIER Program Manager. On this slide, I'm showing an update on the number of permit user accounts that are set up with each reporting platform, and the platform type is listed in the rows, with the permit type in the columns, and the numbers in black are the number of active permit accounts, with the numbers in orange showing the increase in the number of accounts since the last time that I presented this information to the council, which was in November.

Based on the numbers, of course, you did see that the number of accounts is still increasing, and that's definitely good news. The bottom total row there, in the South Atlantic permit account column, is showing that we have 1,390 permit accounts that have been set up in the South Atlantic, and that is an increase of 133 accounts since November. Also, in that same column, you will see, in the total row, what we have about 900 permit holders that have yet to register an account. However, remember that we are expecting about a 20 to 30 percent permit latency, and we also anticipate that we'll see an increase in program participation as the permits come up for renewal this year.

On this slide, I just want to highlight that we are definitely continuing to try and connect with our constituents who are not yet complying with the SEFHIER program, and so, on this slide, I just wanted to highlight some of our recent outreach efforts, and so, first, and hopefully you all received it, but, in case you missed it, we sent out a year-end SEFHIER Fishery Bulletin on December 17, and, if you didn't receive that bulletin, you can access it at the link that is provided, and you can also register to receive future SEFHIER Fishery Bulletins.

The second bullet here is just highlighting that we recently updated our Gulf and South Atlantic program toolkits, and you can access those new program toolkits at the link that is provided on that bullet.

The third bullet is noting that we recently worked with GulfFIN to develop a NOAA permit requirement letter for the Gulf SEFHIER validation survey, and that letter was developed so that the SEFHIER validation surveyors could pass it out at the dock, should anyone that they're surveying be unaware that they're actually required to complete that survey as part of their Gulf federal limited-access reef fish permit. Then, finally, we're continuously updating our SEFHIER program website, and you can access our website at the URL provided there.

I definitely recommend that you check it out, if you haven't yet, and our SEFHIER program website is really now a one-stop shop for all of our SEFHIER program information, and it's where we're putting our important updates and announcements as well.

On this slide, in regard to the VMS updates for the Gulf federal for-hire-permitted vessels, the VMS rule went into effect on March 1, and, in order to be compliance with the VMS rule, the VMS rule must be installed by a qualified marine electrician, be permanently affixed to the vessel, operate twenty-four hours a day, and collect vessel position data at least one time per hour, unless the vessel is under an approved power-down exemption.

Regarding the second bullet, we actually have a number of satellite and cellular type-approved VMS units, with the newest cVMS, or cellular VMS unit, being the ZenVMS-LTE, and that one was actually just type-approved last week. If you're looking for a VMS unit to satisfy your Gulf for-hire permit requirements, then you can actually access the list of our type-approved units for the program at the link provided at the bottom of the slide. Then the third bullet there is just a reminder to the council that the hail-outs and the VMS units are expected to provide better data on federal for-hire fishing effort and allow for better enforcement of the fishing regulations.

On this last slide, just a couple of reminders, and so, as a reminder, if you're catching HMS species and using the VESL app to report, then you still need to complete the HMS-required reports separately. If you need any more information about HMS reporting requirements, I put the URL to that program on that second bullet there, and remember that eTRIPS/mobile will actually prompt for the HMS-required questions, and so, if you're using eTRIPS to report, then you will only need to submit the one report through eTRIPS, in order to satisfy both the SEFHIER and HMS reporting requirement.

Then, for our dually-permitted federal commercial reef fish and for-hire permitted vessels, at this time, you do need to complete both the commercial reef fish and for-hire trip declaration when you're going on a for-hire trip. We are internally working to streamline the submission process for this, but, at this time, these two separate notifications are serving different purposes for each sector, and they have different regulatory text.

Then, finally, the last bullet is just a reminder, to our Gulf federal for-hire-permitted vessels, that the SEFHIER validation survey began in October, and so, if you do happen to be approached by a state surveyor at the dock, then you are required to participate in the survey if you have a Gulf limited-access reef fish permit, and that takes me to the last slide, and concluding this presentation, and so I will go ahead and open the floor to discussion. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Michelle, for the presentation and updates. Any questions? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Looking at page 2, I noticed that we have almost 900 South Atlantic permit accounts who have yet to register, and how are we handling those permits when they come up for renewal?

DR. MASI: I will try to explain this, and so, basically, the permit process is online, and so, when the permit comes up for renewal, at some point in the near future, we're going to have our compliance module set up to where it will automatically feed the data, the non-compliance data, to the permits system, and so, as the person is online and going to submit their application, they

would get a notice, essentially a letter, that says here's the reports that you are missing, and you need to contact us, in order to get into compliance, so that you can apply, or transfer, your permits, and so that's how it will be handled.

Then, if, obviously, they didn't get into compliance, the choice then would be that they could give up their permit, if they wanted to, and there's a process for that that they can call us about, or the Permits Office, and, otherwise, they would probably be out of compliance, and then they would be needing to be contacted by OLE, if they didn't comply, and I will open the floor to Jessica Stephen, who may have a better answer than me, if needed.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Michelle. Any other questions? Okay. That was my question too, and I was going to ask about that. Go ahead, Tom.

MR. ROLLER: This is a little bit more of a comment, and I think I've said this before, but I would be curious to see if there is any compliance differences by the states in the South Atlantic, particularly since North Carolina doesn't have JEA.

DR. MASI: Thanks for that question. I will try and answer this question, to my best ability, but, essentially, right now, we're not really looking at compliance by state, and we're kind of looking at it more program-wide, and so we haven't really taken a dive into state-specific compliance, and I honestly have not -- I am not sure what the specifics are between state-to-state, and so I can't really answer that question well at this time.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks. Any other questions for Michelle? I don't see any hands, and so thanks for being here. We appreciate the presentation, and I'm sure we'll be talking to you again.

DR. MASI: Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. That's all I had for us today. We will go ahead and recess for the day, and we'll pick it up in Full Council tomorrow morning, at 8:30, as scheduled, and we're pretty much right on track, and so, tomorrow, we'll have our committee reports, and that will take a little while, and we'll go through our workplan review. We have one presentation from the Southeast Science Center, and we're going to see if maybe we can talk to the individual and maybe do that first, and then clear the day just with our business, and see how that goes, but that's the plan for tomorrow. Everybody get a good night's sleep, and well done today. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on March 10, 2022.)

- - -

MARCH 11, 2022

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Westin Hotel, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Friday, March 11, 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: Good morning, everyone. We're going to go ahead and reconvene in Full Council Session II. We've made a slight adjustment to the order of things. Julie Brown from the Science Center agreed to go ahead and make her presentation first this morning, and so we'll do that, and then we'll shift into committee reports, and then we'll have some discussion of the workplan, and then, under Other Business, I've got just a couple of minutes for something, and we may have another thing to bring up, and so let's -- If we've got Julie, we'll go ahead and start when she's ready.

DR. BROWN: I am ready, and so I will just wait for someone to pull the slides up.

MR. BELL: We're just trying to find your presentation, I think. Thanks for being here, Julie. I appreciate it.

DR. BROWN: Thanks for actually bumping me up. This works out great, and so hopefully I'll just take up a couple of minutes of your time.

MR. BELL: This will be an update on the commercial e-logbook.

DR. BROWN: I guess we'll just go ahead and go the next page. I'm Julie Brown, and this is March. All right. These are the questions that I hope to answer by the end of the presentation, who is currently eligible for the e-logbook reporting, what does it look like, and what are the future e-logbook needs, in the long term?

Here is a reminder of all the different permits that are subject to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center logbook program, and we have permits issued from the South Atlantic and the Gulf Councils and from the HMS office, and so a large diversity, but we simplify those down into two categories, the coastal fisheries, which report at what we call the trip level, and then the highly migratory fisheries that report at the set level, and so, if a vessel has only one, or multiple, of these permits, we do need a Southeast Fisheries Science Center logbook reported every time that vessel goes out to commercially fish.

Of course, to add an extra layer of complexity, there is also some vessels that have what we call dual permits, which means that they owe logbooks to both the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, which serves the permits that are issued from GARFO. Valid and expired permits are constantly subject to change, but, last time we checked, this was around a hundred vessels, mostly fishing in the Mid-Atlantic region.

Switching gears back to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, the new electronic logbook is basically designed to replace the various fishing trip logbooks, and the surveys also that are associated with the logbook, and so the discard and the economic, and then, of course, the no-fish reports, which are due monthly when, as the name implies, no fishing takes place.

Right now, there is just one mobile version that is approved for people who have dual permits, but, in the future, other developers will have the opportunity to develop software or websites or forms

that could be associated with VMS units, and so emphasis on opportunity. NOAA doesn't develop the software or the websites, and we can't force VMS vendors, for instance, to develop forms, but we certainly encourage it and would want to work with anybody who does wish to develop that.

The precision of modern e-logbook effort requirements have been, and will continue to be, an evolving process. Our original plan was to move all of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center effort elements, and so the coastal and the HMS, to be what we call set-based, higher resolution for the location points, similar to what the HMS fisheries currently have, but, after some feedback from the Gulf APs, they weren't really happy with that, and so, for now, we're going to stick with low-precision, trip-based reporting for the coastal gears and, conversely, higher precision for the HMS gears, but I should note that, just as an aside, GARFO has recently implemented their electronic logbook program, and they have what I sort of think of as a medium, or in between, set versus trip based, and so they actually call that a sub-trip reporting level.

Their users are required to report high precision latitude and longitude for their fishing effort, but then, after that, they're only required to log another effort if the vessel changes grid area, and so they move to a very significantly different area, or if the fishing bleeds over into a second or third day, that sort of thing. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff are working with the GARFO staff to streamline the reporting definitions for future logbook requirements.

What does all of this actually look like? Here is the old paper logbook that probably a lot of people are familiar with, and the HMS forms look very similar, but the only difference being that there is one sheet for each set, instead of one sheet for each trip.

The new mobile app, eTRIPS, looks like this. These are just screenshots, and I'm not going to be doing a full demo or anything like that today, but the first thing you do is select your vessel, and you say if you're commercial or recreational fishing, and then the software populates the correct fields based on what you input there.

Some elements are going to be slightly different, and here's one example. The old logbook used a four-digit grid code, which corresponded to a very simple latitude and longitude. We have slightly revised the grid codes, so that now we can be more consistent with what other partners are using, and so now users are going to locate their three-digit grid code, and, as you can kind of see here, it's no longer a one-by-one-degree latitude and longitude, but it is kind of similar.

Most of the other reporting element details should look pretty familiar. The eTRIPS software has the ability to set up favorites for things like species or ports, and that's going to save users time with either scrolling or typing through whatever they're catching or the different port that they're landing in, for example.

Now, for the effort section, you go to the catches section, and you log what you kept, what you discarded, and you can say what dealer you sold to here, or you can wait until the very end, if you are planning on doing more fishing and you don't know what dealer you're going to sell to. Last, but not least, you have to do what we call the signing ceremony, which means you promise that you're reporting in good conscience.

For now, what we're going to stick to is the current reporting deadlines, and so, for SERO permits, that is seven days after landing, and, for GARFO permits though, they actually have forty-eight

hours after landing, and so, right now, since the only people who should be using this app to report are dual-permitted vessels, they actually have to meet the stricter deadline, and so those would be forty-eight hours. We want to encourage people -- It's a good idea to have their effort and their catch details filled out at the time of landing, just in case you're interacting with law enforcement or you don't want to forget if you fished for six hours or eight hours, but the final submission deadline is, right now, forty-eight hours for dual-permit owners.

When I made this presentation, we had 431 trips that had been reported from those dual vessels, and we have begun to process those reports. Soon, very soon, we will be able to give preliminary compliance for their SERO permits, even though they haven't really been screened for errors at the same level that we do for paper logbooks, and some of the error screening can be directly translated from the paper logbooks to the electronic ones, but other ones have to be a kind of evolutionary process, like those grid codes that I showed you just a few minutes ago. Right now, we won't be able to cross-reference the new codes, to see if they make sense with, for instance, like the landing port that you report. With that in mind, we will open the e-logbook up to more volunteers soon, but we're not quite ready to open those floodgates.

As always, and I always like to have a slide where I remind people that we do currently have a website that is maintained by NOAA where all users, all SERO users, can create an account and submit the no-fish reports. You can definitely avoid getting yourself into a pickle if you already have your account set up and you realize that you forgot to report a month, or your permit is expiring soon, et cetera, and so lots of people are keeping themselves out of pickles through this website.

Here is just a generalized diagram of the pathway moving forward to be able to accommodate more advanced scientific assessment tools. We're going to accept electronic logbooks, initially, with virtually no changes from the paper logbooks, but, through outreach and collaboration with the different council APs, and with coordination with other agencies that also have their logbook program running, and last, but not least, input with users, whose reporting burden we are always considering and do in fact want to reduce, and we want to eventually move forward to a joint resolution with the councils that will update the requirements.

A quick recap, and who is eligible for logbook reporting right now? We have a diversity of permit owners in the Southeast, but, right now, we're currently accepting e-logbook submissions from dual-permitted vessel owners only. What does the e-logbook look like? It has the exact same reporting elements as the paper logbook. However, right now, it's a mobile app.

Finally, what are the future e-logbook needs, in the long-term? We're having ongoing discussions about the resolution of logbook data at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and we're moving to streamline those logbook definitions and requirements with other partners, and I think that was it, and so I will open it up to any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Julie, for your presentation. Any questions? Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for that, Julie. Currently, on the coastal, the paper coastal logbook, when we send it in, if we make an error on it, I usually get a copy back that's highlighted with the error, or whatever section I did not fill out correctly, and then we send it back in, and we mail it back for the second time, but what I'm seeing on this resolution, as far as at the species level here,

you've added a -- It looks like they've added a section in here for number of fish, and that's going to be -- That seems like it would be very problematic for us in the snapper grouper fishery, and we don't really count the number of fish. The resolution is really just in pounds, and so I was curious. If you keep that resolution in there, where you're looking for the number of fish, would that get the form rejected?

DR. BROWN: Right, and so you're absolutely right. This is something that we're still currently working on and trying to negotiate with other partners, and the coastal logbook, right now, only asks for number of fish if you have been selected to participate in the discard survey. Right now, only if you're reporting discards would we expect you to estimate the number of fish.

We want to get things going towards that direction with the e-logbook, but, right now, the only way for us to get the number of fish that is required for the HMS fisheries, and so the people that are catching swordfish and tuna, is to ask that question for everyone, and so that is something that we're working on, and we hear you, and we do absolutely understand that counting the number of red snapper when you're fishing is going to be an estimate, at best, and that's not something that would get your logbook kicked back to you as being incorrect. Does that answer your question?

MR. GRINER: Yes. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was wondering if it's possible, when an individual registers to like renew his permits, and you go to deficiencies, and it might show that he needs a logbook or something, and is there any way like to add to where you go and hit a button and go right to report no-fishing reports at that time, rather than having to go into another system, because sometimes we forget and learn about our deficiencies when we're renewing our permits, and it would be easy for the fisher, if he was able to hit that button at that time and just do no-fishing reports, and he might have one or two or a few deficiencies, instead of having to go to another system and do that, and I was just curious if anybody has thought about that, and so that's like more one-stop shopping added there. Thank you.

DR. BROWN: Yes, and so, right now, we have the order of those button clicks is kind of reversed, and so there is a page that has all of the different reporting technologies that you can use, and one of those buttons will take you to the website where you sign up for that account, where you do report those no fishing, and then there is also a link on that page where you check if you have delinquent reporting.

The websites are pretty closely tied together conceptually, like for someone who is Googling, for instance, but the only caveat is that you do need to already have an account set up, where you can do the no-fishing reports, in order to do those, and that process requires basically me mailing you a PIN number in the mail, and so that's why I always encourage people to go ahead and get that account set up, because it's not going to be an immediate process when you do need to do those no-fish reports, but, if it's already set up, you should be good to go.

MR. BELL: Did you have a follow-up, Dewey?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I already am set up, but I've just got to do a little more digging, I guess, on my part. Thank you though.

DR. BROWN: Okay, and, if you ever lose the link for that website or something, just give us a call, or send us an email, and I will be happy to provide that link to you. I lose links all the time myself, and so don't sweat it.

MR. BELL: Thanks. Leann.

MS. BOSARGE: Thanks. I was just thinking about what Tim said, and it's the same in the Gulf, and so you said you have to have those -- The box for numbers of fish, in order to get what you were hoping, was to actually have that apply to your HMS-type species, and so is there a way that you can -- In this form, you're going to tell them what kind of species that you're fishing for, and, if you click on HMS, then that numbers of fish box would pop down, and, if you don't declare that it's an HMS species trip, then it wouldn't, and I say that because I'm a little worried, for snapper and grouper trips in the Gulf, that the data that you're going to get for that numbers of fish is probably not going to be all that great, and then you're going to go to use it, for science, and I guess maybe try and come up with average weights on things, because you will have pounds and numbers of fish, and it just is probably not going to be the best data, and it would probably be good, better, to just keep it in pounds, and so is there a way to do that?

DR. BROWN: I hear everything you're saying, and I agree completely. We have a couple of options, but these options are going to kind of require negotiating with the HMS office, for example, and so there's not a way to just say I'm doing HMS fisheries, or I'm doing coastal fisheries, and, basically, we would need to have the question be triggered by either the species that selected or the fact that it was designated as a discard.

The problem is that, on the HMS logbook, every single species, regardless if it's the target species or non-target species or something that's completely, completely random, has been counted, and so, moving forward, we would need to come up with a kind of Frankenstein rule where, for instance, we could do something like all tunas, all swordfish, and all sharks need to be counted, and also all discards, and a few species might fall through the cracks. It's an ongoing negotiation, but we absolutely agree that, for certain fisheries, like the snapper groupers for example, counting those fish is just going to be not great data, like you said, and we definitely would not use that as a field that would keep somebody out of compliance, if they're just trying to estimate something.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for that. Go ahead, Dave.

DR. GLOECKNER: I think I just wanted to point out that part of the problem here is that we're trying to have one system that meets the needs of SEFHIER, which is a big problem, for coastal, HMS, and the Northeast, and so we've kind of got a rigid structure that was initially implemented that we're going to have to work on, and so, right now, it's treating SEFHIER and the commercial logbook as a single program, and, unfortunately, SEFHIER wants counts of fish, and we want pounds of fish, and so we're seeing both right now, and I think we're going to work to see if we can separate those into permit-based requirements that can be implemented within this software, and that should resolve this issue.

It might just take us some time to work with ACCSP to make that happen, but I think we'll get there, and we've got some other issues with permits and ACCSP having access to the permit and us having access to reliable permits, and I think, once we resolve all of that, we can move forward with this and open this up a little bit, so we can have some volunteer folks submit data and still get compliance, be in compliance with submitting it electronically. I think that's all I wanted to say.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Dave, for weighing-in. It's obvious that -- Conceptually, you originally think, gee, how hard can this be, but it has a lot of moving parts and details to be worked out. Clay and then Chris.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to emphasize though that we do need the numbers information from the logbook. We use it for catch per unit effort, and we actually have to report numbers of fish discarded and caught to ICCAT, and so it is something that we actually need. We don't have a lot of confidence in the weight information, and so, generally, we don't use that, and we have other sources of weight information. Thanks.

MR. BELL: Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Just it seems to me that you could just have an initial opening page, or a unique user ID, for different people in different regions, that you have -- It takes you straight to your type of a report, sort of a one-size-fits-all type of thing, and you could say where do you fish, and I'm a South Atlantic or -- I know there's another -- Like, on the Fish Rules app, it says what permits do you hold, and that's the regulations that you get, for the permits that you hold, and it seems like you could tailor it more to the type of permits you hold and get around this.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Chris.

DR. GLOECKNER: Can I respond to that?

MR. BELL: Yes. Go ahead, Dave.

DR. GLOECKNER: All right. So that is what we're trying to do. Unfortunately, we all have very different permitting systems, and so the Northeast has one permit for a vessel, and multiple endorsements, and so that's easy. The Southeast has multiple permits, a separate permit for each stock, or the commercial versus recreational, and so the for-hire, and trying to make all of those talk to each has proved to be very, very difficult. As we work through that, what we have right now is kind of a system that we hope will work in the interim, as we work through trying to make those permit systems talk to each other and get to a permit-based variable list that will work, as you just stated. Thanks.

DR. BROWN: To follow-up on that, a lot of these hoops that we're trying to jump through right now are to accommodate people who have multiple permits at once, and so we're bending over backwards to get things to the point where people who do have those multiple permits can submit one single form and get compliance across-the-board.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Julie. Any other questions for Julie or Dave? I don't see any hands. Well, thanks for the update, and thanks for the continuing work on this, and I know these things are never as easy as they seem, and this one is obviously pretty complex, but it's something

that we've been hearing for years, that it's desired by the industry, and it would help us with data, and so it's well worth the effort, and so thanks, guys, for being here this morning and for everything you're doing to get this thing going.

DR. BROWN: Yes, and thanks for your time.

MR. BELL: All right. We will roll into committee and council reports, and we're going to do these in the order in which they came as we flowed through the meeting. All right. First up is me with Full Council Session I. The council approved the agenda and the minutes from the December 2021 and February 2022 meetings, and this is the report for Monday, as we started.

First, we received reports from NOAA OLE, the Coast Guard, state agencies, council liaisons, and the council approved the following motion, and this motion was attached to after Florida made their presentation and brief and the action related to goliath grouper that FWC took recently, and so this motion was necessary. Motion 1 is request that the SSC reconsider the ABC for goliath grouper, and that was approved by the Full Council at that time.

Then the next area we spent some time on was the ABC Control Rule Amendment. Staff presented the most recent actions and alternatives language drafted by the IPT concerning the ABC Control Rule, carryovers, and revisions to the framework procedures. The SSC Chair provided the SSC's recommendations on the ABC Control Rule modifications and the carryover alternatives.

The council reviewed the methodology for developing stock risk ratings and the approach for implementing carryovers through framework procedures. The council provided the following guidance, and this is under direction to staff, to continue development of the amendment, including removal of Level 1, Tier 1, classifications 4 and 5, under Action 1, Alternative 3, as recommended by the SSC. Development of the stock risk rating component of Action 1, Alternative 2, and Action 4, as discussed at this meeting. I'm sure you will remember all those numbers. Discuss among the IPT and add language, as necessary to describe precedence of council-specified rebuilding plans, application of the ABC Control Rule to jointly-managed species, carryover for split-season fisheries.

Then we shifted to the next topic that we spent a good bit of time on, which was the allocation decision tool review. To help the council incorporate multiple sources of information when making sector allocation decisions, staff developed a decision tree approach and presented the most up-to-date draft to the council in February of 2022. Remember we had that separate meeting.

At this meeting, the council further discussed the approach, potential changes, and how to use the approach moving forward. The council provided the following direction to staff, and I won't read you all the details of that, but, under the headings, there was things under public input tool, fishery performance reports, and you can see the bulletized items there.

For additional review, we asked the Socioeconomic Panel to review the FPR and allocations decision tool questions, as appropriate. Coordinate with NMFS staff for additional targeted input, and then the next steps would be to apply the allocation decision tool to Spanish mackerel for review at the December 2022 meeting, and so that was all basically the things we came up with. If nothing is missing, then that's the completed list. Any questions or comments? Then that concludes my report. That was Council Session I. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am not going to let you get off that easy, Mel. A question directed to John Carmichael or Jessica, and so, with the motion for goliath, it's very open-ended, with regard to SSC reconsideration, and you, obviously, at the FWC, have come in and specified a 200-fish catch limit, right, I will call it, and you're not maybe calling it that, and so, I mean, are you wanting them to reconsider the ABC just in light of the management measures imposed by Florida, or more broadly than that, because I think it's going to be important for us to frame this for the SSC and then figure out what information and data they may need for this discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Good question, and John maybe can help add to this, and I can certainly bring to the table everything that FWC used to go with the 200-fish, plus all the pieces of the rulemaking and how we're going to do that, and, yes, I would love that they consider all those things, and I thought that John was hoping maybe that they also considered things for other species that were maybe in a similar situation.

MR. BELL: Go ahead, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We did think about that, because the council has other species that have been under harvest prohibitions for many years, like speckled hind, warsaw grouper, and Nassau grouper, and we thought that, if they were going to look at goliath grouper, they could look at those others as well that are under basically that same justification of an ABC equals zero, just reflecting the council's management action, which I don't think is really how ABCs are intended to be constructed, and it should go the other way around.

MR. BELL: Go ahead, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to add to that, I mean, the one that I think is kind of driving this is goliath grouper and the action that FWC took, and so, to me, that would be the most timely. I saw, back in looking at older minutes of this goliath workgroup, that they would hoping that the SSC, both the Gulf and the South Atlantic SSC, would form a workgroup to kind of talk about all these species and how to do that, to try to be more consistent. I just think that doing something like that is going to take more time.

MR. BELL: All right, and there is more of a time imperative related to goliath, obviously, and so was this -- I am just asking, and was this something we were going to just take to the regular SSC meeting, or were we were going to -- Okay, and so, at their next actual meeting, this would just be a topic? Okay. Any other comments or questions about that? We've got some additional direction there then, and we don't need to modify the motion or anything, and we can just take the direction. Okay. All right. Leann.

MS. BOSARGE: So, for goliath, Jessica, you all are going to allow that fishing on both sides, right, the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and I should know this, because I think I was at the Gulf SSC meeting, when they decided not to bless that as the best available science, that last time they looked at it, and I remember asking, well, what do you need? Do you need an exempted fishing permit, to get more data, or what, and so is that somehow -- Is it one stock? Is it jointly -- What does the Gulf have to do, if anything?

MS. MCCAWLEY: The Gulf will need to do the same thing, and so we'll be coming to the Gulf Council's April meeting to ask for the same thing, and so the ABC and OFL on the Gulf and the South Atlantic aren't the same. They haven't set those the same. There is no OFL on the South Atlantic, and there is an OFL on the Gulf.

MS. BOSARGE: So we did bless that stock assessment in the Gulf and set an OFL?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would have to look back to the history of when that was done, and it might have been set prior to that last stock assessment that was completed in 2016 and then just not looked at again, since the stock assessment was deemed not usable for federal management.

MR. BELL: Okay. Any other questions about that, or anything from Council Session I? Are we good? All right. Let's go on to the next one. The next report will be for the SEDAR Committee. We met on Monday, March 7, and we approved the agenda, and then we got right into the meeting.

The first thing we talked about was the terms of reference for the yellowtail snapper interim analysis. The committee discussed the interim analysis for yellowtail snapper. The interim analysis will incorporate landings from 2018 to 2020, but will not update indices and age data, due to the limited time to conduct the analysis. The document will include modifications recommended by the SSC. This includes an evaluation of the 2020 recreational landings, which may have issues, due to the limited sampling that occurred in 2020. The committee recommended, and you will see there is an attachment for SEDAR, A1a, in the late materials for this briefing book, as the terms of reference for the interim analysis.

The next item was the golden tilefish statement of work. The committee was informed that National Marine Fisheries Service did not have any changes to the statement of work for the 2024 tilefish operational assessment, and the version approved by the council in December of 2021 was the accepted version. Staff will start to develop terms of reference from the statement of work.

Then, under Other Business, we had the SEDAR planning grid, and remember that we had some discussion about the SEDAR schedule. The committee discussed the SEDAR planning grids and requests to move up the assessment of Atlantic group cobia, up from 2027 to 2025. The committee was concerned about delaying an assessment of cobia until 2027, due to the time between assessments. The council species that were included in the planning grid for 2025 were gag, king mackerel, red porgy, and snowy grouper. The committee decided it would be best to move snowy grouper back one year, and this will result in removing the white grunt research track from the planning grid.

In addition to a snowy grouper operational assessment in 2026, the committee recommended putting in a placeholder for a dolphin management procedure workshop, and then there is an attached grid below. Timing and tasks, there was not a timing and tasks motion, and attached to this is what we talked about, in terms of the grid. Any questions? Okay. That concludes my report from the SEDAR Committee.

Remember that we moved up the Executive Committee, and so we'll go ahead and do that. The Executive Committee met on Monday, and the committee approved the meeting agenda and the prior minutes. The first thing we talked about was -- Basically, what we talked about in the meeting

was John did a -- I called it CCC 101, and it was a CCC overview, and it was basically what the CCC is and how it works and the significance of it.

Draft agenda topics for the May 2022 CCC meeting were reviewed, and the council discussed the seafood certification and marketing topics and provided several comments and suggestions. This is what we came up with. NOAA, USDA, and the University of Maine are collaborating on a project to evaluate seafood direct marketing practices. Imports are a concern. Few countries have regulations or safeguards that are similar to those in the U.S.

We are encouraging National Marine Fisheries Service to develop sustainability certification programs to reduce the need for costly third-party certifications, and we encourage National Marine Fisheries Service to support direct marketing platforms that could be available to smaller producers. Include a progress update on the Executive Order on Promoting American Seafood Competitiveness on the CCC agenda, and we discussed truth in labeling and that greater consumer protections are needed to appropriately support wild-caught product, and we had no motions, and that concludes the report. Any questions or comments? Okay. Leann.

MS. BOSARGE: I know that I'm slowing you down, but I was just going to say that I think, when I get to the Gulf meeting, and I thought I would just let you all know, I'm going to mention to them that one other thing that we may want to bring up at a CCC meeting, at some point, is this issue that we're having essentially getting deckhands and backfilling deckhands and captains that are dying, honestly.

I mean, it's just the graying of the fleet, and I've seen that here, and we operate in the South Atlantic too, and obviously in the Gulf, but, as I travel, it's universal, really, and not even just in the U.S., but overseas as well, in those fisheries, and so there's a lot to be said for sustainable fisheries, but, a lot of times, what comes with that is a reduction in capitalization of your fleets, and so you don't get those sons coming up in their father's footsteps to learn the ropes and take over, sons and daughters, but typically sons. You can't go to college to do what we do, right, and it's on-the-job training, and so, anyway, I think it's something that, at some point, we really need to start talking about it at a national level.

MR. BELL: Yes, and you're right that isn't unique to just the Gulf, and part of it is the graying of the fleet and, like you said, you don't see that generational passing down, but, also, I think I hear a lot of other issues that folks are struggling with that maybe we're even seeing in the -- For us, in the overall economy and workplace, and it's just people that are willing to do that type of work, or go into that, because it is extremely demanding, and I've spent a lot of time talking to Dewey about just his career and life on a boat, and it is not for the faint of heart, but you're right that that is something that affects us all, and so we've captured that.

MS. BOSARGE: You know though, it kind of goes back to that promotion, and it's really promoting our industry not just to consumers, for the seafood, but actually to the people that are going to come up in our industry, and I think they're there. There are still young people in high schools that want to do the labor that we do, and it's long hours, and it's hard work, but it's very rewarding, but we never -- We don't really promote it to them, and we're not there telling that it's a viable career path for you.

MR. BELL: Yes, and how do you recruit, and how do you get interest. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Leann, I don't know -- I know you pay a lot of attention to what's going on over here, but one of the other places we struggle with this, and, as Mel mentioned, it's not just the graying, but it's the -- You know, our commercial industry, snapper grouper is two-for-one. Now, obviously, we don't have a lot of room for expansion in that fishery, and I don't support expansion in that fishery, but then, if that's the case, the price becomes so cost prohibitive to folks trying to enter, and so it's economic in the entrance of the fishery, which is what I think many people of our generation and the generations before did not have. If you had a boat, you could kind of go do it, and so I think the idea of new entrants into the fishery is really important, but it's beyond aging, and I say that as a person whose sixty-year-old husband is leaving to go offshore for a week tomorrow night and doesn't want to do it.

MR. BELL: It's beyond aging, and it's multiple factors, and it's even just getting a crew, an adequate crew, and whether or not it's somebody that wants to do that forever. Okay. Anything else? That concludes my report then, and so we will shift to Dolphin Wahoo.

MS. MARHEFKA: On Tuesday, March 8, the Dolphin Wahoo Committee met, and we approved the minutes from the September 2021 meeting and the agenda. We heard about the status of amendments under formal review, and we were updated on Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, which revises total ACL, sector allocations, sector ACLs, and recreational AMs for dolphin and wahoo, and it also has an action, if you recall, that will allow the retention of dolphin and wahoo when trap, pot, or buoy gear are onboard a vessel. It will remove the operator card requirement and reduce the recreational vessel limit for dolphin from sixty to fifty-four fish. It was submitted to NMFS in October of 2021, and it is in the rulemaking process.

Then we moved on to discuss modifications to the minimum size limit, recreational retention limits, and reducing for-hire captain and crew bag limits for dolphin, and this is going to be Dolphin Wahoo Reg Amendment 2. Measures in this amendment will extend the applicable geographic range of the minimum size limit, modify recreational retention limits, and remove or reduce captain and crew bag limits for dolphin.

We were provided an update on recent actions enacted by Florida that modify the recreational dolphin retention limits for the east coast of Florida. The committee reviewed an options paper on the amendment, provided the following guidance on the initial range of options to consider in the amendment, and made the following motion.

For direction to staff, we told them to look at modifying the applicable range of the minimum size limit for dolphin, and we had a range up through North Carolina, North Carolina through New York, and North Carolina through Maine, and we looked at modifying, or are asking to look at modifying, the daily recreational bag limit for dolphin, and we're going to come back and look at a range of options for a bag limit of two to ten dolphin per person, and we will continue to consider different bag limits by mode, whether it's private recreational, charter, or headboat vessels.

Then we are looking at modifying the recreational vessel limit for dolphin, and our range of options that we talked about at this meeting were a vessel limit of thirty to sixty dolphin per vessel, and we want to include increments divisible by six and add an option that would remove vessel limits. Again, we will continue consideration of different vessel limits by mode, and then we will look at

adding a regional option for vessel limit changes, and that will be either off Florida only or other potential regional vessel limits that we hope to get during scoping.

We're going to look at modifying captain and crew recreational daily bag limits for dolphin onboard charter vessels, and we will continue consideration of removing or reducing captain and crew bag limits for dolphin. We will include a range of options for bag limits of two to ten dolphin per person, if the bag limit is reduced, and consider an option that is off Florida only.

Under other options, we decided that we would add options that would include a vessel limit or a bag limit, whichever is greater, instead of whichever is more restrictive, and the committee made the motion to approve Regulatory Amendment 2 (minimum size limit and recreational retention limits for dolphin) for scoping. Is there any discussion on this motion? Any objection? I guess we were a committee of the whole then, but now the motion is approved by Full Council.

Topics for the spring 2022 Dolphin AP meeting, which will happen in April in Charleston, we're going to talk about -- We're going to tell them about Amendment 10, and we are going to look at all of our options in Reg Amendment 2, and we're going to have them look over the fishery performance report for dolphin and get some updates on citizen science and the climate change scenario workgroup, and we had some other items down here that we thought we might ask them for additional input.

Previously, the council has discussed the potential need to examine making the commercial dolphin wahoo permit a limited access permit, potentially changing the commercial trip limit, any other regional management needs, ask the AP if they have other thoughts on sort of management measures they think we should take, and the council previously identified for-hire bag limit sales, which was discussed at the AP's previous meeting in October of 2020, and so, if it's the council's desire, they may talk about that again as the advisory panel.

We were thinking the first couple -- Between the update on Amendment 10 and talking about Reg Amendment 2, they have time to talk about some other things at this meeting, and that's where the additional input came up, and it's things we've discussed before as a council, and so I just want to make sure that the council is comfortable with that list for the advisory panel coming up in April. Any comments on that?

MR. BELL: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I know that we've kind of shot down for-hire bag limit sales, but I feel like the AP is going to talk about it whether we put it on the list or not, and I'm just saying. I'm not saying that we're going to change it, but I feel like it comes up every single time, and so I don't mind if they talk about the other items listed there, like the limited access permit and other things, if there's time after they talk about those other items above that I guess we think are the priority.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say, are you wanting to add something, or are you okay? I mean, I agree with you that it will come up. One way or the other, it will come up. Chester.

MR. BREWER: I think it's important to go back and discuss the step-down that we currently have in commercial with regard to trip limits. Right now, until you get to 75 percent of the sector ACL,

there is no trip limit, period. You can bring in 30,000 pounds of dolphin on one trip, and it's perfectly legal, and, if we're going to try to extend out our time limit, or the availability of dolphin, and that's going to be important in the commercial sector, I really think that we need to take another look at that and have some sort of a trip limit that starts from fish-one, whether that's 3,000, 4,000, 5,000, whatever it is, but I think it needs to be in place from fish-one and not just come in when there is 75 percent, because, if you miss it -- Sometimes, and you might remember in 2005, or 2015, excuse me, and that got blown out that quick, and it was because there was no limit at all, and people were bringing in massive, massive trips of dolphin, and blew it out really quick, which presents you with two problems.

Number one is the season gets blown out, and that one ended on I think June 15, for the year, for the entire east coast of the United States, and the other problem that you have is catching it in time, when you're bringing that many fish in, like what happened then and trying to catch it at 75 percent, to slow it down, and it also can become problematic, and so really think that we need to take another look at that. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Okay. Dewey and then Jessica.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I would hope, given Chester's comment of wanting to revisit some of this, that some of the factual basis on the record would be also given to the AP, if they so choose. One thing, and the reason that we look at it is that this council -- It's not been a regulation yet, but it set the commercial quota at 1.7 million pounds, and there's got to be all reasonable opportunity for the commercial industry to harvest that quota.

Now, reckoning back to 2015, the commercial quota was about 1.1 million pounds, and you've got to look at what the recreational take on the mahi was, which it was an abundant year that year for both sides, and so, though some want to talk about these massive trip limits, in reality, in 2015, it wasn't massive trip limits, and I bet you that it was probably less -- I probably doubt that there was one 25,000, or a couple of 25,000, trip limits, and so we need to look at the record that's there, so that, when we're going forward and giving this to the AP, they have a correct factual basis of the actual record and not maybe some recollection that is not what we have on the record.

The commercial industry should be given every chance to harvest the quota that is set for the commercial by this council, and I'm a fierce advocate of us being able to -- This is your piece of the pie, and do it, and that's why you put this step-down in there, so that what would happen, possibly could happen, that happened in 2015 wouldn't happen again, and, so far, it hasn't happened, and everybody, I believe, at this council, when this step-down went into effect, the people there -- At the time, there was a majority of votes for this to happen, and so we need to make sure that, when this AP looks at something, that they have the information of the available factual record that both the council and SERO has on-hand for them to deliberate such a thing, looking at it. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Dewey. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was going to talk about the regional management needs, and I think that that would be a discussion for the AP, and so, if we're looking at that list of items there, if they have time, could we move the limited access permit down, and like move the regional management need item up and move the limited access permit down lower in the list, because we have talked

about that a lot, the regional differences in this fishery, and I think, if they have specific ideas about how the council could address that in different various ways, different ways than what we thought about around the table, I think that would be helpful, even in the current amendment, but also going forward, if we're going to start new amendments.

MR. BELL: No, that's a good observation, and I would support that. Chester.

MR. BREWER: This is -- I am kind of an across-the-board, and I know we discussed it, but, specifically, I would like to see the AP -- That they have in front of them the goals and objectives for, in this case, the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan, and I think that's something that should be done across-the-board, and we've discussed that, but I would like for them to have that in front of them when they have these discussions, because it needs to taper back, or we need -- We may need to change the goals and objectives, but, right now, those are the goals and objectives, and those are the things that we're trying to achieve, and so thank you.

MR. BELL: Yes, and that makes sense. I mean, that came up in the meeting earlier, and I think that's sort of a fundamental thing. You've got to make sure you're on track with what it is that you're trying to accomplish. Andy and then Tim.

MR. STRELCHECK: I have two comments. One, just in terms of the alternatives we're considering, we have the bag limits to go down to two fish, and we talked about multiples of six for the vessel limits, and maybe it was my confusion during committee, but I was thinking that we would set vessel limits based on multiples of the bag limits, for consideration below thirty, but I know we also talked about kind of whatever is most restrictive.

Knowing that Florida is set at thirty, my concern is that's really not constraining as a vessel limit and that we should consider lower vessel limits, and so I would recommend that we consider vessel limits below thirty, or at least have them analyzed and presented to us, and then, with regard to the comments about the commercial trip limit, I think we really need to think about what the purpose is and what we would be accomplishing there, and, right now, we're not even coming close to the commercial quota, and we're not coming close to the recreational quota, and so we would be imposing some inefficiencies on the industry, and so are we trying to impose trip limits for conservation and management? What is the goal that we're accomplishing, because it's certainly not going to be to slow harvest, or constrain harvest, because we're already not catching the quotas.

MR. BELL: Okay. Andy, did you have a suggestion to go below thirty, how low to go, or just --

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't. I mean, I'm not recommending going down to twelve, per se, but, given that it's kind of multiples of two, two times six, and we could do twelve, eighteen, twenty-four, thirty, and then on up, and certainly that would provide a wide range.

MR. BELL: I was just trying to make sure that staff had some guidance on what -- I didn't want to wear you out, and is that enough, in terms of do we want to change that to go below thirty?

MR. HADLEY: Just for clarification, and so, essentially, it would be vessel limit. I mean, as far as the bookends of your range, it would go as low as twelve and up to sixty, presumably? Okay. Yes, we can do that.

MR. BELL: Thanks, John. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I will pass.

MR. BELL: Okay. Tim.

MR. GRINER: To Andy's point, I think, if the AP is going to look at this, we need to update that chart we had that showed the commercial landings back from 2015 to the present, broken down by gear type and number of vessels in the longline industry, because I think it's clearly -- That chart clearly shows what is happening. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Tim. Anything else? Any additional detail that we want to provide or guidance? It's going to be a full meeting. Okay. All right. Kerry, did you have a timing and tasks motion to deal with there?

MS. MARHEFKA: On behalf of the committee, I will make the following motion to adopt the following timing and tasks: 1) to conduct scoping meetings for Reg Amendment 2 prior to the June 2022 meeting; 2) to continue developing Regulatory Amendment 2 for review at the June 2022 meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MR. BELL: It's seconded by Jessica. Any discussion of the timing and tasks? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I kind of raised this in the original discussion, and I just -- I am kind of concerned about the timing of this. You know, we're moving very fast to put this through to scoping, and, even with the AP discussion, they won't have another year of dolphin fishing to really kind of, you know, give us good input on, and we're doing this before Amendment 10 really even takes place, and so I just wanted to have that conversation, if it would make sense to do scoping a little bit later, particularly since we have so much more on our plate, and I would love to hear from people once Amendment 10 takes place.

MR. BELL: Okay. Good point. Anyone else have concerns about timing, or are we comfortable with the timing? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I have had some sidebar conversations with folks about the same thing, that we're looking at implementing a regulation and then, very quickly, possibly changing that, and we get a lot of criticism for regulatory whiplash, and I just wonder -- Particularly the vessel limit is - - If we believe that there is a possibility that that will be changed, and is there a flexibility to delay implementing the sixty to fifty-four vessel limit change, knowing that we have this other amendment in play, and I don't know. I don't know what the procedures and protocols are, and, I mean, maybe we've just set ourselves up for regulatory whiplash, and that's just the way it is, but, anyway, it's one of those things that is difficult for the folks affected by these decisions to understand.

MR. BELL: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: On that note, and on the whiplash issue, I mean, I've had this discussion with people in the for-hire industry and the recreational industry in my state, and there's just a lot of confusion, because people will say, well, we just did this, and so I'm just concerned that we won't get the input we need, since we're moving so quickly.

MR. BELL: Okay, and so we're actually discussing a motion, and is there a desire to modify the motion? Chester and then Tim.

MR. BREWER: I mean, what we're really talking about here is we've got a lot of dissatisfaction with what went on in Amendment 10. People wanted to see a lot more, and they didn't see it, and I'm sure that everyone here has gotten an earful about going from sixty fish to fifty-four fish and what does that accomplish, and the answer is about nothing.

Amendment 10, as it stands right now, you're getting rid of the operator cards, and you're allowing possession of dolphin where you've got pot gear and certain types of other gear, and you're going from sixty fish to fifty-four fish, and I think that's pretty much the bulk of what's in that amendment, and I am now questioning, in my own mind, whether we ought to ask the powers that be at NMFS to hold on to that thing, or just hold it in abeyance, do something to stop the implementation, or slow it down, until we can get some of these points worked out, and that, to me, makes a lot more sense than saying, okay, we're going to go ahead and do Amendment 10, but, even while we're asking for approval of Amendment 10, we're going to be redoing Amendment 10, and so it just seems like, to me, it's putting a lot of work on NMFS that doesn't need to be there, because we know we're going to change some stuff. Pretty much for sure we're going to change something in there, and so I really think it might be a better course just to delay action on Amendment 10 until we take another look at it.

MR. BELL: To that, I would say, as you mentioned, there are a number of other things, and remember that Amendment 10 started out even more massive, and we pared it down to the degree we did, but it still has some other stray things in there that aren't particularly related to limits, but so it is a little broader. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to say there's still a lot of things accomplished in that Amendment 10, because you've changed your -- You're addressing ABCs and ACLs, and you're doing dolphin and wahoo, and, I mean, it looks like, to me, if you delay that, you've delayed a lot of other important stuff, and I know there's concern about how much it did management-wise, but I am kind of with Tom at this point. There's a lot of work that went in there, and a lot of stuff that was done and moved forward with Amendment 10, and maybe hold off on this and see how Amendment 10 works, and so those are my thoughts.

MR. BELL: Okay. Before I go to Tim, Monica, do you have something to that point?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't think there's any way for you to hold back on Amendment 10, and I think, under the Magnuson Act, decision day for the Secretary is in a couple of weeks, and the proposed rule has gone out, and the final rule is being prepared, and we're responding to all the comments in there, and so I think that you ought to take that idea off the table for you to consider today.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, Monica. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I think Monica just cleared the air on that pretty well, but I also wanted to add that it does give the appearance of a kneejerk reaction here, and I think, as Jessica said, this is the perfect time to let this amendment go through, and let's see how it shakes out and then apply these regional differences, because that's really all we're really talking about here, is the regional differences between the dolphin fishery in Florida and the rest of the South Atlantic, and so I think that's kind of where we need to focus, is on these regional differences.

MR. BELL: All right. We still have a motion there. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I guess I would just ask, or defer to staff, that, if we were to consider delaying this, what would be appropriate to do that, given the rest of our scheduling, and is that a fair question to ask?

MR. BELL: Well, that comes to mind, and we will be talking about the overall schedule at the end, of -- When you start moving things around, it's a little more complicated than just a simple slide it so many months or whatever, but okay. I mean, we can certainly discuss it when we get to the schedule at the tail-end. The motion is as you see it, adopting that particular timing and tasks. Any further discussion of it? Any objections to -- Myra.

MS. BROUWER: One thing you could do is modify it, and so this is a draft motion, and the committee did not pass this motion, and so you guys can modify it as you wish. **We could strike the part that's highlighted and just leave it up to us, I guess, and, when you've had more time to discuss your workplan, here in a little bit, and basically just leave it open-ended, to conduct scoping, but we just don't say when.**

MR. BELL: **Okay. That sounds reasonable.** I mean, we know what we want to do, but we just don't quite know exactly when we want to do it yet. Okay. All right. Then we would approve it as modified or just wait until -- It's made and seconded. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So would we need further striking on Line 2 as well, "for review at the June 2022 meeting", if we're holding off? I mean, I'm just asking.

MR. BELL: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would like to continue discussing Regulatory Amendment 2, and so I'm fine with holding off on the scoping, but I would like to continue discussing this document, and I guess I would ask staff, and when is the Dolphin Wahoo AP meeting? Is it before the June meeting, or is it after the June meeting?

MR. BELL: Do we have the date for that?

MR. HADLEY: The Dolphin Wahoo AP will be meeting towards the end of April, and so you'll have that report at the June meeting.

MR. BELL: Okay. So we're okay with -- We'll have something to discuss, and we'll have their input. Okay. All right. **Any objection to that motion, as modified? I don't see any, and the motion passes.** Thank you. Have you got anything else?

MS. MARHEFKA: That concludes my report. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you very much. Next will be Mackerel Cobia. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council met on March 8, 2022, and the committee approved the minutes from the December 2021 meeting and the agenda. The first item was an update on amendments recently submitted to NMFS.

At the December 2021 meeting, the council approved CMP Amendment 32, which is Gulf cobia catch levels and management measures, for formal review. The Gulf Council approved CMP Amendment 32 for final action at their October 2021 meeting. Council staffs transmitted that document to NMFS on February 18, and NMFS has begun the rulemaking process.

Next, we had a presentation on Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34, which is updates to king mackerel management, based on SEDAR 38. At the June 2020 meeting, the council directed staff to begin work on an options paper that would include consideration of sector allocations and catch level adjustments, based on SSC recommendations and the recent stock assessment update.

Public hearings were held, via webinar, in November of 2021, and council staff reviewed a decision document, including the draft council rationale. The committee noted, in addition to the draft rationale, Alternative 2 under Action 4, which is increasing the bag limit in Florida from two to three, was selected as the preferred alternative, because the recreational sector has not been reaching their ACL, and a higher bag limit is anticipated to help increase harvest.

Captain Scott Pearce presented feedback from the Law Enforcement AP on Action 5, which is recreational cutoff and damaged fish regulations. After a somewhat unanticipated, but lengthy, discussion about the definition of “cutoff and damaged”, the council requested that staff develop a definition that is specific to fish that experience depredation and are subject to mutilation, and so, after staff worked with NOAA, NMFS, we have a draft motion here. I will read it, and then I will ask for someone to make that motion.

It is to accept the proposed definition of a cutoff (damaged) fish. For the purposes of Action 5, “damaged fish” refers to king or Spanish mackerel that are damaged only through natural predation. Is someone willing to make that motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: **So moved.**

MR. WOODWARD: Motion by Jessica. Is there a second? Second by Mel. All right. Is there any discussion on this motion? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just want to say I appreciate this, and I think that this helps the concern that we had about the word “cutoff”, and so this, to me, clarifies that.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you. Any other further discussion on the motion? **Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.** Also, since we had that issue looming, we did not move forward with approval of the amendment for secretarial review, and so we have, in front

of you, a draft motion to that effect, and so I would ask someone if they're willing to make that motion. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34 for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you. Do we have a second? Second from Trish. All right. Any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries unanimous.

MR. BELL: We've got to do this as a roll call, technically.

MR. WOODWARD: Sorry. Okay. Then back up.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I hate to slow him down. He's on a roll.

MR. WOODWARD: I know. I'm just trying to move on.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right, and so we'll go ahead and call the names that are alphabetical, until we get to the Chair. Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Brewer.

MR. BREWER: (Not audible on recording.)

MR. CARMICHAEL: Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner. Come back. Helmey.

MS. HELMEY: (Not audible on recording.)

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roller.

MR. ROLLER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Chairman Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **The motion carries with one abstention, at the time being.**

MR. WOODWARD: All right. It messed up my unanimous vote. Oh well. Oh well. So be it. We'll get him an absentee ballot. How about that? Wait a minute. That's a touchy subject in this part of the world, and so I'm going to leave that alone.

Moving on, next, we had a presentation from Matt Freeman of the Gulf Council staff on CMP Amendment 33, which is updates to Gulf king mackerel management, based on SEDAR 38. He presented draft options to be considered in that amendment, which proposes modifications to catch limits and sector allocations for Gulf king mackerel, based on SEDAR 38. The stock assessment found that Gulf king mackerel were not overfished or undergoing overfishing. However, recruitment has been low over the last ten years, and the spawning stock biomass is below the SSB at maximum sustainable yield.

The committee reviewed the proposed actions and alternatives and actions taken by the Gulf Council during their January 2022 meeting. **We had a couple of committee motions to move Option 2c and 2d of Alternative 2 in Action 2 to Considered but Rejected. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, the motion carries.**

We had another motion to remove Action 1 from Amendment 33 and start a new framework action. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. We didn't have any other business, but I do have a timing and tasks motion, if someone would like to make that on behalf of the council. Mel.

MR. BELL: **Move to adopt the following timing and tasks: Prepare Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34 for transmittal to the Secretary of Commerce and work with the**

Gulf Council staff, as needed, to continue work on Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 33.

MR. WOODWARD: Do I have a second to that? Second by Jessica. Any discussion on the motion? **Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.** That completes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Spud. All right. Let's go ahead and take a break, and let's come back at 10:00, and we will go into the Snapper Grouper report.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: All right. We'll get back at it, and we will go to the Snapper Grouper Committee report, whenever Jessica is ready to get us going.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Mel. The Snapper Grouper Committee met this week and approved the minutes from the December 2021 meeting and the agenda for the March 2022 meeting. We then got an update on the status of exempted fishing permit requests in the South Atlantic, and then we went into the release mortality reduction framework, or whatever we're calling this action, and so, in September, the council directed staff to begin work on a framework amendment to reduce dead releases of snapper grouper species.

We also heard from our Law Enforcement AP Chair, to provide the Law Enforcement AP recommendations, and council staff presented data depicting the scale of releases in the recreational snapper grouper fishery, as well as a decision document summarizing current information, scoping commentary, and potential next steps in the framework amendment. The committee approved the following motions and gave the following direction.

The committee made Motion 1 to develop the framework amendment based on time, area, and depth restrictions, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion on that motion? **Any objection to that motion?** Go ahead, Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry. I was wondering if the committee, the council, may be amendable to, under the discussion of the release mortality framework, where it says, "the council directed staff to begin work on a framework amendment to reduce dead releases of snapper grouper species", to add a statement that says, "in response to concerns about red snapper dead discards".

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Myra is getting that typed up there. All right. Thank you for that, Kerry. Continuing with this discussion on this motion, any more discussion on this motion? After we get through this motion, we're going to go to the bullet points that are the direction to staff and figure out what is going to come back at the June meeting, and so any more discussion on the motion? Tim.

MR. GRINER: Do we need to second the motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It came from committee. I think we're good, but I just wanted to look at Mel and make sure I was right. Okay. Yes, it came from committee, and so we're already good with

that. **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion is approved by committee.**

Then the bullet points that we have there on the screen are the lengthy list of items that we were suggesting that we wanted to see analysis on, and, basically, as you would imagine, staff cannot complete the analysis on all of these items before the June council meeting, and so we need to figure out what all can come back in June and, really, how I see this is almost like a white paper, or the pre-analysis, before we actually start putting the actions in that framework document, and so this is the big list of actions that we talked about, or analyses that went to see, and you guys might have to look at your committee reports, and then Myra is going to scroll down to -- Here's the start of a list on what would come back from the analysis in June.

I would just say that I think that we might need maybe a little bit more than what is listed there, bullet-wise, and I was wondering if there are other items that already exist out there that we could bring back, like maybe some economic analysis from the two-for-one report or Amendment 39, so that we can look at some more information about kind of how many commercial permits are out there and other things, as we go through this list. Kerry, do you have some suggestions here?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and, really quickly, this morning, I was looking over it, and it seems like there's some good information that is in the Snapper Grouper Commercial Visioning Blueprint, as far as number of boats that target a lot of those species, and I'm not sure there is any -- I didn't see any red-snapper-specific information in there, but I just perused it very quickly, and there was the update that Kari MacLaughlin did, and Jessica remembered that, that Kari MacLaughlin did to Rhodes et al. from the late 1990s, and I think that has a good bit of commercial social and economic information, and, again, I am focusing on commercial because that's what I know, and I'm sure there is more, whatever we had in the two-for-one.

I'm not sure what's out there in 17A, as far as information that would have been analyzed, and that would have some area information and depth information, economic analysis, I believe, and social analysis, and then I wasn't sure -- I haven't discussed this with anyone else, and so I don't know if this is appropriate, but the SEP, I believe, is meeting with the SSC in April, and maybe it's going to be important to have them discuss possible information that's out there for analysis for this pre-scoping Reg Amendment Thirty-Whatever, and sort of get them to look over what we're considering, because I don't think we bring them in as often.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. While Myra is typing, there's also a line there of pros and cons of potential management approaches, which is one of the lines from the previous list of items, which is a little bit out of context when brought down at the bottom there, and I'm wondering if what we're talking about is pros and cons of the impacts of these changes to commercial, for-hire, and private, and then the items that Kerry just listed I think could get us some of that information. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks. On that first bullet, I think we need to add in, behind "definition", and "delineation options", because, you know, we heard that from Captain Pearce, about how would you actually delineate depth zones in a way that would facilitate enforcement, and as well as clarity of understanding by the folks in the fishing community.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, I agree, Spud, and that's, to me, ultimately, what you're going to get this economic-type analysis on. You're trying to evaluate how this would affect different parts of the fishery, I think. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just from, I guess, a workload expectation standpoint, the delineation options, that might take a bit more time, and so I think it's more realistic to maybe have some depth zone definition, especially if we can get some work in cooperation with folks like at the Science Center that might be able to help out with some type of information like that, but the delineation, the actual drawing of the points, that might take a bit more time to flesh out, and so that might be an after June thing, but definitely part of this project.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. First to Andy and then to Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Just to follow-up on that, and not really necessarily going through a delineation process, but sort of examining -- You know, back to this pros and cons concept of do you use existing nautical charts and the delineations on those, or do you go in and establish fixed points, because, you know, Captain Pearce mentioned that, in the Gulf, they use an array of fixed points, and then you draw lines between them, and so just not so real specific detail, but kind of more of a high level of what would be -- What's available out there to the average fisherman to use, and how trustworthy it is. If you're going to get into depth zone management, you could enforce it, and the people that are going to be affected by it understand it, and that's all. Not actually mapping it out yet, but just really to analyze which one of them is probably the most efficacious.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and what Spud said was kind of what I was thinking. Not having all of the delineation figured out, but, yes, what would you even use to figure this out, and what are the pros and cons of some of those big-picture ideas. Andy, Clay, Kerry, and then Judy.

MR. STRELCHECK: A couple of things. This is, obviously, a very heavy lift, and so I appreciate the prioritization. I think, when we get to the discussion of timing and tasks and what we're going to accomplish between now and the next meeting, we probably need to ramp up the level of effort on this and look at maybe reducing the level of effort or pushing something aside for another meeting, if we can.

With that said, regardless of whether we can make headway in terms of the analyses, I think there's a couple of data requests that are really relevant here, and Clay can certainly comment to this, but we need to really know what the level of discard reduction is that we will achieve, right, and what that gets us in terms of kind of translating discards into landed catch, and then the other part was the use of fishery-independent surveys, and I mentioned this in committee.

My thought here is the spatial area analysis, right, and so can we start using that fishery-independent data and explore hotspots and areas where we might be able to keep fishermen off discards that then reduces discard mortality, and that's just, I think, an analytical request that we make, without the expectation that it comes back in June, because that's going to be fairly complex.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was thinking the same thing. Clay.

DR. PORCH: I agree with what's been said, and this is actually a pretty heavy lift, to do it right. There's probably a few things they can crank out in June, but, to that end, I just want to reiterate that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center has assembled a team, with a number of partners, and we're happy to have more partners, to look at these very issues, and we got some funding to do it.

It's a two-year study, because that's pretty much how extensive this is, but I really want to underscore how important this issue really is, and I'm not sure that everyone fully appreciates it, but the bottom line is this is, in my view, probably the biggest elephant in a room full of elephants that we have in the room. If you think about it, we've talked several times about various of our stocks being on rebuilding plans for a long time and not rebuilding. Well, discards are a big part of that, because the projections that the SSC considers assume that, however you're reducing the landings, you're going to reduce the discards somehow by the same proportion, and we're not generally doing that.

We monitor the landings, and we try and make sure the landings are reduced, but we're not monitoring the discards, and we're not finding ways to exactly reduce discards in the same proportion as the landings, and so, if you don't reduce the discards enough, of course, the stocks aren't going to rebuild as fast as you would hope they would rebuild, and they may never actually make it to the rebuilding target, and so this is going to be a huge issue. I think it's going to involve maybe bigger reductions in some things. Like if you talk about closed area seasons, then we might be comfortable with it, but there's really no way around it, and we're going to have to find a way to roll up our sleeves and get this done. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Clay, and I also like Andy's idea that, when we look at the prioritization, that maybe this takes two slots, or maybe we prioritize this over something else, when we look at that list. All right. Kerry and then Judy.

MS. MARHEFKA: I wanted to touch on the pros and cons bullet there, and I don't know if we can do this by June, but, in my mind, it was something very qualitative, in terms of some sort of chart that says, you know, if we do this, if we do an area closure, it has, on a scale of one to five, a two potential to have a positive biological benefit, a five potential to have an economic negative benefit, some sort of scale like that, that's qualitative, so we can hone-in -- Considering we're on a timeframe, we can hone-in fairly quickly on the ones that we believe, using our informed judgment, will give us the highest bang for our buck, and so that's sort of how I visualize that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry. Judy.

MS. HELMEY: Thank you. I was just looking at Gray's Reef, and, you know, they closed off part of Gray's Reef for stopping -- They closed off Gray's Reef as a part of a research area, and that's one way, if we could look at that, and that would be a good way to do it with points, and our GPS -- You could get it to where you could have it in your GPS, and it would actually keep you out of the spots that you weren't supposed to fish, and your track would be there, too. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Judy. Anything else that we need to talk about here on these points of what would come back on this analysis for June? A reminder that this is also going to the Snapper Grouper AP, and we've also talked about it going to the SEP. All right. Thank you for that discussion on these items for June, and I'm going to continue moving through other parts of this committee report.

All right. **The committee also made Motion Number 2 to initiate a regulatory amendment to incorporate catch levels for red snapper based on SEDAR 73. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** It's under discussion. There's a note there, and so the framework amendment, which was Motion 1, what we just talked about, and then this regulatory amendment, which is Motion 2, are really actually the same document, and so this is Number 35, and it will consider both the time, area, depth restrictions that we're going to see the analysis on in June as well as red snapper catch levels, based on the most recent SSC recommendations, and so I'm just trying to be clear about what we mean, because we didn't use the same words on what we called it. Any discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.**

All right. Then the committee went into the private recreational permitting and reporting amendment, which is Amendment 46, and this was previously developed in the first half of 2018, and it was approved for scoping at the June 2018 council meeting, but, due to time constraints over the council's workplan and the need to gather additional information on potential approaches, this amendment was never scoped, and so staff instead focused on piloting the MyFishCount mobile app and that portal, and then other related efforts had been underway, most notably the private recreational reporting workgroup, which met five times in 2021 and 2022, and our workgroup chair, Spud Woodward, provided an update on the group's progress and presented the group's recommendations.

Then the committee reviewed an options paper on the amendment and provided the following guidance. They provided guidance to, Number 1, establish a private recreational snapper grouper permit to fish for, harvest, or possess snapper grouper species in the South Atlantic region, and so this would be developing options that would establish a permit covering all snapper grouper species, examine options for a vessel and individual permit, and add discussion on whether there would be a fee associated with this permit.

Number 2 is implement reporting requirements for private recreational fishermen or vessels, develop options that would phase-in reporting at a later date, bring back information covering how a permit could be incorporated into a survey or supplementing existing sampling efforts, versus census-level reporting. What future survey or sampling efforts could be enhanced or implemented via existing regulations, and maintain flexibility to develop the best survey possible, as the opportunity arises. Then Number 3, the ad hoc advisory panel work with technical experts and state agencies to develop an ad hoc panel for private recreational permitting and reporting. Initial membership would be reviewed during the AP Selection at the June 2022 meeting. These weren't actual motions, and this is just direction here, and is there any more discussion on this? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just neglected to mention, during our discussion on this, but we certainly have the basis of this advisory panel in our workgroup, and it's just a -- I will work with John and Kim and all, and other folks, to recruit the folks we need from the workgroup and then to add to it the subject matter experts that we're going to need, and so thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Spud. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Something came up at public comment the other night, and I just want to clarify, based on other things we've done, where clearly I left walking away thinking we were all

thinking one thing, and we weren't. During public comment, someone had brought up the fact that not to forget the purpose of why we were doing this, and the purpose of why we're doing this is red snapper, and I just wanted to make sure that that was not necessarily the correct comment, because my understanding of why we have looked at these recreational licenses certainly expands far beyond red snapper, and, in fact, I think we originally started talking about it for deepwater species. I just want to make sure that I am understanding that the intent of these is to be all-encompassing of all snapper grouper species, however it grows, and it's not strictly a red snapper issue.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a great point, and that was under Number 1, and so this direction was to develop options that would establish a permit covering all snapper grouper species. While we might not ultimately end up there, it seems like, right here at the start, we're considering all of them, and there might be one thing for deep water, and there might be something else for a subset, and a reminder that the Florida survey, the Florida State Reef Fish Survey, only covers thirteen species, and so we might dice this up later, but I agree, and just reminding folks that we said all snapper grouper. All right. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: A couple of thoughts here. Really, I support this effort, and I think it's really important. I think this is one of those things that we need to think about in terms of timing, right, and we've got a lot of statutory deadlines that we need to meet, and so kind of how quickly this moves and how much we have on our agenda I think will be really important. I think, once we stand up the workgroup, they can, obviously, get to work and then report back to us, and so that will be important, in terms of timing considerations.

The other comment would be we have, right now, the goal of all snapper grouper, and I would like to, I think, think about this maybe from a smaller scale, to start with, and can we do a pilot, or can we look at a specific subset of snapper grouper species, like deepwater, and get the workgroup thinking along those lines, rather than just trying to tackle the whole snapper grouper complex all at once, and so that's just a suggestion for how they could proceed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Andy. All right. Any more discussion on this? All right. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I wouldn't support it unless it was for all snapper grouper species.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm just putting it out there that that's where they're starting, and we're going to ask these technical experts to look at that, and that's definitely where the State of Florida started as well, and ultimately ended up with thirteen species, and so thank you for bringing that up. All right.

Then the committee jumped into the wreckfish ITQ modernization, which is Amendment 48, and a review of the ITQ program was completed in 2019, and it included recommendations for improvement, particularly with respect to confidentiality issues and related constraints, moving away from a paper coupon-based program to an electronic program, cost recovery, wreckfish permit requirements, allocation issues, offloading sites and times, and economic data collection, and so a decision document with updated actions and alternatives was presented for consideration by the committee, and the committee provided the following input.

Compare the value of the wreckfish fishery to the cost of moving to an electronic individual transferable quota system. Discuss the pros and cons of removing the wreckfish permit requirement with the wreckfish shareholders, specifically with respect to share ownership and transferability. Continue to consider a VMS requirement for the wreckfish fishery and discuss monitoring needs with the wreckfish shareholders, and consider matching the wreckfish individual transferable quota cost recovery system with the system utilized in the Gulf of Mexico individual fishing quota program.

A meeting of the wreckfish shareholders will be organized this spring, and the committee approved the following agenda topics for them. Update on Snapper Grouper Amendment 48, discussion of electronic reporting for the coastal logbook requirements, and possible voluntary pilot program, and the fishery performance report for wreckfish. No motions during this discussion, and just this direction. Is there any further comments on wreckfish? Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you. Just throwing out there something for consideration, and Amendment 48 does include the FMP goals and objectives, as modified through the vision blueprint, and so I'm mentioning it now, because that's currently in that amendment, which is moving rather slowly, and I heard the Snapper Grouper Committee talk yesterday about wanting to potentially get those goals and objectives going a little bit faster, as far as adoption, and so you could consider maybe including them in greater amberjack, Snapper Grouper Amendment 49, which I think is the one that would possibly be approved next, and you could adopt those in there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I really like that idea, and we did have a lengthy discussion of that. What do folks think about that? Do we need a motion to move them into amberjack, or is it just direction to staff? I am looking around the table here, but I like the idea. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was going to say I just like the idea of getting those approved as soon as possible. If that's an effective way to do it, it's fine with me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and Myra is moving -- Typing this, that we would move it to the amberjack FMP, and, just to clarify, that means we would see these again at the June meeting, which was one of the concerns that Kerry brought up, that we're not seeing these every time, and we have to go look for them and try to find them, to remind ourselves what they are each meeting. All right, and so this would be a little bit faster mechanism. All right. Anything else on that? All right.

Then the committee moved into greater amberjack, Amendment 49, and staff presented a decision document summarizing the draft amendment and preliminary analyses of the current actions. The committee reviewed proposed actions and corresponding analyses and made the following motions and provided the following direction.

First, to include review of the most recent Amendment 49 alternatives and associated analysis in the Snapper Grouper AP's agenda, requesting feedback on recreational and commercial minimum size limits, commercial trip limits, and the April spawning closure.

Then the committee made Motion Number 3 to change the preferred alternatives under Action 3 to Alternative 1, no action, of twenty-eight inches fork length. On behalf of the

committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **That motion stands approved.**

Then the committee made Motion Number 4, which is to de-select Alternative 3 under Action 4 as the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Once again, this makes it so we are not selecting a preferred under this action, and we're waiting for input from the AP before we select a preferred, and so we're de-selecting the preferred. Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Then we had some more direction there to provide information on spawning, considering regional differences in timing or behavior, and add language to Action 6, Alternative 2, noting the addition of the recreational sector to the April spawning closure. **Then we made Motion Number 5 to approve Amendment 49 for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. This may not be in proper order, but I have a motion related to Amendment 49 that I would like to make.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead.

MR. WOODWARD: **I move that we change the preferred in Action 2 from Alternative 1 to Alternative 3, and, if I can get a second, I will provide some supporting discussion for my motion.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Spud and seconded by Chester, and the motion is going on the board there, and this is to change the preferred in Action 2 from Alternative 1, no action, to Alternative 3. Do you want to provide some additional rationale here, Spud?

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, ma'am. There is no doubt that the introduction of these FES calibrations have proven to be a vexing issue for this council, and it will continue to be a vexing issue. We are working on a decision tool to help us co-mingle qualitative and quantitative data upon which to base our allocation decisions. However, that tool is not ready to be used, and we're not sure when it will be used, and so, at this point, when we sit down to deliberate on an allocation, we're looking into the past, and we're looking at the present, and then we're trying to look into the future.

Obviously, the future is unknown, and we have now found out that sometimes even the past is unknown, when you have things like recalibrations that come into the equation, and so it makes it all that much more difficult. The current preferred alternative shifts a considerable amount of fish from the recreational sector to the commercial sector, and it actually increases the commercial sector allocation by 114 percent, and I know this council, even though it's not formal, and it's not a policy, we're trying to make sure that, when we do have a larger ABC, that the benefits of that are shared across all sectors and within sectors, and it's my position that the current preferred alternative shifts a disproportionate amount from the recreational sector to the commercial sector, and, even though some of the projections don't show that the ACL may be exceeded, we're facing the same situation, I think, in the recreational sector as is being faced in the commercial sector. As the ability to harvest some of these other species is limited, it's going to shift pressure to other species.

We could see situations where a species like greater amberjack is going to be in much greater demand and much more important as part of an aggregate trip satisfaction, and, particularly off of Georgia, and we don't have mangrove snapper, and we don't have some of these other larger fish, and, if you will recall, the workshops that were done, I believe in late 2018 and reported by Kari Buck, is folks in the recreational sector like to have a trophy fish, at least one trophy fish, that they can carry home, and sometimes that trophy fish is the greater amberjack.

Those are sort of qualitative things, but I want to call everybody's attention back to the analyses and the summary of effects, and the biological effects across all those alternatives are pretty much the same. When you move down, and you look at economic effects, if you sort of consider high, medium, and low, that the Alternative 3 is sort of the medium impact on both sectors, in terms of benefits and potential negative effects, and so, in my mind, that preferred -- Moving to a preferred alternative for 3, which is the 65/35 percent, which is a more reasonable and balanced approach to this, it certainly increases the commercial sector's allocation by 84 percent, which is not an insignificant amount of fish, and it also will leave fish in the water and available to possibly meet increased recreational demand without the risk of running into in-season closures, and so that's my position on this, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak to it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Spud. Any more discussion on this particular motion? Tim.

MR. GRINER: I appreciate that, Spud. It's kind of hard to throw this up there and not have the tables back in front of us again, and so I don't know if we can pull that back up, but I keep harkening back to the same thing. If all this is based on these new FES numbers, well, I don't want to discount the fact that the commercial harvest has been constrained through that entire timeframe, and so, if we could put that chart back up, that would help me a great deal. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're working on it, Tim. Go ahead, Spud, and then over to Chris.

MR. WOODWARD: I understand what you're saying, but, also, you've got to remember the recreational sector was constrained too, and maybe not in units of effort, but what they could do per unit of effort, and so there's been constraints on both sectors, and I think that needs to at least be considered, when you're looking at this, and I think we would all like a turn-of-the-crank machine that took us out of this, and we could plug it in there and turn that handle and spit out, but that's not what we have, and we're not likely to ever have that, really, and so we're always going to be faced with making value-judgment-based decisions on what we think is going to happen in the future.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Spud. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I found an error in the decision document, on page 8, under Table 1, and Alternative 3 is allocating 60 percent to the recreational and 35 percent to the commercial.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: That was a typo that we changed in the meeting, and it's 65/35.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: This hasn't sat well with me since the committee discussion, and so I appreciate the motion. I'm going to support the motion, for some of the same rationale that Spud

stated. In looking at kind of recent performance of both sectors, neither sector is bumping up against their catch limit currently, and this is a substantial increase, at least initially, in year-one, for both sectors, but, as the catch levels come down, I feel like the 65/35 represents a nice compromise, where it would still leave the commercial sector with catch limits that are above what is currently specified, as well as take into consideration the higher catch estimates that FES is providing and that increase in catch that, obviously, we're going to be using to monitor the recreational sector going forward, and so I speak in support of the motion.

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

MR. GRINER: What percentage of the recreational quota is being caught currently, under the new FES numbers?

MR. STRELCHECK: Just, in response, we don't have a quota in FES numbers, and so we're not monitoring in FES numbers at this point. Until we change it, we can't give you that statistic.

MR. GRINER: Then what about in the Coastal Household numbers?

MR. STRELCHECK: We can look it up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It's been a couple of days, and so I forget where the 65/35 -- Are those just sort of arbitrary numbers picked, or is there some sort of reasoning behind them?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Originally, they were picked as kind of a midpoint between the other two options, but it also happens that that midpoint is tied -- Like it's connected to the ten-year average, the most recent ten-year average, of landings, and it works out to 65/35 as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: You can say that one. It's your turn. Chris wants to go after me. I am not going to be in support of this motion, and I'm not going to be able to articulate it clearly at the moment, but I know that we'll come back and have a chance to look at this again, and so I have time to do that. What I would like to say I just think is an interesting data point is the restaurants we're selling amberjack to right now in Charleston are charging \$41.00 a plate for amberjack, \$41.00. This fish has become -- I know, and people are paying it. They're paying it.

My point is -- Like I said, I can't articulate this all out, and I will have a point in June, when we come back to this, and I am not just not supporting the motion to be -- Just to be whatever, but I think it's an increasingly important commercial fish, and I think things change, and we need to recognize that things are changing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry. Chris. All right. Yes, Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Just to put it out there, in looking at PSEs, the PSE on this species is pretty decent, by some of our standards. I mean, it's below 30, for the majority of them, and so, again, to put it out there with the idea of the confidence on your rec landings.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I think we should consider adding another alternative. I mean, if nobody is happy, and we can't meet in the middle, we should have one for 50/50.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Okay, and so we're -- We have this motion on the table, and maybe we can dispense with the motion and then talk about adding another alternative to the document. Okay. Any more discussion on the motion? **Once again, the motion is to change the preferred in Action 2, which is sector allocations, from Alternative 1, no action, to Alternative 3, which is 65 percent recreational and 35 percent commercial.** Any more discussion? All right. **Let's see a show of hands of those in favor of the motion; those opposed; any abstentions. The motion passes eight to four with no abstentions.** All right. Let's go back to Chris's suggestion for adding an alternative under this action, and I believe you said for 50/50?

MR. CONKLIN: Sure, and I would also like to add another one for 60/40, and so the typo in Table 1.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So the no action alternative, the current percentages are 59.34 percent for rec and 40 for commercial.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so that was the no action one that we just changed. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I just wanted to point out that this is something that the committee has passed a motion for it to go out to public hearings, and, if we add another alternative to this action, we can still go out for public hearings, but you all wouldn't see any analysis on it before it goes, and it would just be we put it in there and it goes out, and I just wanted to make sure that you all are comfortable knowing that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm looking around the table, and I see heads nodding that they understand that it would go out to public hearing without seeing it one more time. All right, and so we still want to add an alternative here to do 50/50, and we agreed that 60/40 is already in there. Okay. I am going to look to Mike to get that on the board. While he's typing, Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: **I want to add another one for 55/45.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do you want to do that in the same motion?

MR. CONKLIN: **I sure do.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. 55 commercial? Okay. Just checking. All right. I think your motion is there, and make sure you check it out there. **It looks like the motion is to add alternatives to Action 2 for a 50/50 allocation and a 55 percent commercial and 45 percent recreational allocation.** All right. Do we have a second to that motion? It's seconded by Kerry. It's under discussion. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Can I ask Chris and Kerry to then explain their rationale for why we're adding these, or they want to add these?

MR. CONKLIN: If we're not comfortable, or the commercial sector is not comfortable, with the Option 1, this is sort of a meet-in-the-middle. My first rationale, on 50/50, was, if we can't come to an agreement, that seems to be pretty fair right down the middle, and then the other one, the 55/45, is probably -- If we do win this argument, it's probably where we would land, and that's what my rationale is. It's sort of common sense, and it's not based on much else.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Does anybody else want to make any comments on this? Tim.

MR. GRINER: I am trying to look up, real quick here, and it looks to me that, going back -- I don't know, but all the way back to 2017 or 2018, but the recreational sector is not meeting 50 percent of their quota as it is right now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chester, did you have your hand up?

MR. BREWER: If we thought that 60/40 was a big allocation, these two numbers are absolutely out of the ballpark huge reallocations, and so I can't support that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion on this motion to add alternatives to this action? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I want a clarification, because, in all the other alternatives, the recreational was listed first, and the commercial second, and so, Chris, was it your intent to do 55 commercial and 45 recreational, or is it supposed to be the other way around?

MR. CONKLIN: Hang on. Let me get back on the document. I might have been -- I'm sorry, and I know it's Friday too, you all. Now I can't find it. **It was the other way around.** Thank you. My intent was the other way around. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we're going in and editing that, and I'm going to re-read the new motion. Okay. **The clarified motion is add alternatives to Action 2 for a 50/50 allocation and a 55 percent recreational and 45 percent commercial allocation.** The seconder, are you good with that, Kerry? Okay. Any more discussion? All right. **Are there objections to this motion?** Andy, are you objecting? Okay. Any other objections? I see two hands. I see multiple hands going up. **Let's go with who is in favor of this motion, and let's start with that; those opposed, same sign; any abstentions.** All right. **I've got seven to five, and so the motion passes.**

All right. **Back to Motion Number 5 that was made by the committee, which was to approve Amendment 49 for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? Just a reminder that the new item that was added, that the committee, council members, would not see that before it goes out, I don't think. Myra and then Mike.

MS. BROUWER: I just wanted to clarify that the intent is to hold a public hearing at the June meeting, and the actual presentation of the material will take place during the Snapper Grouper Committee, and so you will see whatever analyses are prepared for this then.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Great clarification. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I know this might not be the spot, but I sure would like to see us have a lot more in-person public hearings and scoping sessions, since things are clearing up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, that would be the intent, if it's at the June meeting. Okay. Any more discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **That motion stands approved.**

Then the committee got into red porgy, which is Amendment 50, and staff reviewed the minor changes to the language of the alternatives addressing sector allocations, and the committee discussed the rationale for only considering a couple of alternatives in one of the actions. The committee received input from the Law Enforcement AP pertaining to the proposed changes to the recreational bag limit wording, and staff briefly reviewed the draft conclusions for each of the actions in the amendment.

The committee approved the following motion, which was to approve Amendment 50 to be sent to the Secretary, but that is a roll call vote. I am going to read that motion. **The motion is to approve Amendment 50 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate and give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text. On behalf of the committee, I so move, and I think that's a roll call vote.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: Same drill as before, alphabetically and ending with the Chair. Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Helmey.

MS. HELMEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roller.

MR. ROLLER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

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

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The committee then began discussing gag grouper, Amendment 53, and the committee was provided an overview of the SSC's discussion from their February 2022 meeting, along with a summary of scoping comments. Staff then reviewed the discussion document, and the committee made the following motions and gave the following guidance.

We have one thing highlighted there, just to make sure we understand what we did by doing nothing here, and so we received a report, and so I will look to staff, and let me see if I can explain it, and then I will look to staff to add here, and so it's my understanding that we sent an item back to the SSC to look at 60 percent probability of rebuilding, and then the SSC came back to us, and Genny gave a presentation, and they reiterated that they weren't comfortable with the 60 percent, and that they felt like we should go with the 70 percent. I just want to confirm that we are okay with that recommendation of the 70 percent rebuild, or we wanted to stick with the 60 percent rebuild, and anybody's thoughts on this? Mel.

MR. BELL: At this point, I'm fine with taking it and going with 70, and that's just me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We are going with the 70 percent rebuild. All right. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I know that, during the SEDAR for this, and also the SSC meeting that I was listening to, they basically said that we can't go with anything else, unfortunately.

MS. IBERLE: I believe, and, Myra, correct me if I'm wrong, but that is the decision of the council and not the SSC.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes, that is the council's prerogative, but I think -- I appreciate them looking at it, and we asked them to look at it, and they looked at it, and they gave us their advice, and I am prepared to just accept the advice and move on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is everybody else okay? All right. **Then the committee made Motion Number 7 to select Option 3 as the preferred option for Action 1. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: The only reason why I'm comfortable with 70 is because I am confident that people will go with Tim's rebuilding strategy otherwise.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. All right. **The committee then made Motion Number 8 to select Option 2 as the preferred option for Action 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right.**

Then there was some direction to staff to remove Option 5 from Action 2, remove Option 4a, and modify Option 4b from 2018 through 2020 to 2017 through 2019 for Action 3, remove Option 3 from Action 4, and consider the effect of a vessel limit of recreational headboats for Action 5, and remove Options 2a, 2c, 2e, 3, and 4 from Action 5.

Then the committee made Motion Number 9, which was to remove Action 6. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Then we had some discussion about Action 7, which is, I believe, the accountability measure action, and there was some confusion there at the end, and I think that our intent is that we want to modify Action 7 to include language for both the commercial and recreational sectors under the accountability measures. Since we weren't 100 percent sure about that, I'm just looking around the room to see if we need to have any more discussion on that. I don't see any hands. All right.

Snowy grouper, Amendment 51, the committee reviewed the scoping comment summary and then an updated decision document, which included suggestions from the IPT and the scoping comments, and the committee made the following motions and gave the following guidance.

Work with the council's Citizen Science Program to explore development of a project to gather supplemental snowy grouper data, and this would include outreach to dealers. Consider creating a workgroup, or a design team, to include the Science Center, the state TIP samplers, the citizen

science workgroup, dealers, and Sea Grant members, and also consider state data collection when developing a project, and also to provide an update to the committee, at the June meeting, on the workgroup members that were identified and the potential data needs. This was just a lengthy discussion about collecting additional information. Any more discussion on this? Yes.

MS. BYRD: This will be quick, but I just wanted to clarify the supplemental data for snowy grouper that you all are looking for, just to make sure I'm doing what you all are interested in, and so, from the discussion earlier in the week, and from talking with Dewey a little bit more, it seems like you all are looking for data for the commercial sector that would, at a finer scale, kind of spatial resolution, so you could look at things like differences in average weight for size distribution for commercial snowy grouper, kind of across the kind of range from North Carolina to Florida, and is that what -- Is that correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, I believe that's correct, but I think Clay had said that the only thing that would -- The thing that would be most useful, specifically, was length and not weight, and is that correct, by area?

DR. PORCH: Well, they're somewhat interchangeable, but length is easier to get sometimes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that discussion. All right. **Then the committee made Motion Number 10, which was to select Option 2 as the preferred option for Action 1. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Then the committee made Motion Number 11 to select Option 2 as the preferred option for Action 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion is approved.

The committee then made Motion Number 13, which was to select Option 1 as the preferred option for Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Then there was some additional direction to staff to remove Action 4 from the range of actions, and there's some rationale on why, and then, also, direction to gather additional input from the Snapper Grouper AP on what might be the best recreational season to account for regional differences, since the season is already very short, and we need a little bit of additional discussion here.

We talked about including two single-wave season options, one that would be Wave 3, May to June, and one that's Wave 4, July to August, and this would be within Action 5, and I just want to make sure that that's what we intend. All right. There it is, and so it's on the screen there, and it's in blue, where it talks about gathering the additional input from the Snapper Grouper AP, and so just making sure that those are the months and the waves that we're talking about. I don't see any hands, and I think we're good. All right.

Moving on to golden tilefish and blueline tilefish, which is Amendment 52, the committee made the following motions. **Motion 14 is to select Action 1, Option 2 as the preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** It's under discussion. Any discussion on this? **Any objection?** All right.

MS. BROUWER: This little bit that's highlighted, we were taking notes as you guys were discussing, and, even though the action that we were just talking about has to do with ABC, there was this note in here about investigating trip limits, and so we wanted to clarify that that was in fact what you all wanted to do, and so that would obviously be in the action that addresses commercial management measures.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I'm all about having the most profitable trip you can have, but, if we've been running over this quota, it might be a good way to constrain the catch towards the end of -- I know Rick is going to hate me, but towards the end of the season, and so maybe we should look at it much like we did with like vermilion or something, but step it down to 3,000 pounds, or something like that, or 2,000, when like 90 percent of the quota is caught or something, unless we think we can do a better job of kind of hitting the nail on the head, but we sure don't want to be overfishing and triggering those accountability measures.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I guess this is a question for Andy, but, if we did trip step-downs, would that -- Would we be able to get rid of then the expanded landings estimates? Would that get us closer to being able to fish all the way up to the end of the season?

MR. STRELCHECK: Not necessarily get rid of the expanded estimates, because the expanded estimates are based on late reporting, and so one of the challenges we've had with these step-downs in the past is, when we hit the trigger, what percentage of the quota, and then being able to quickly implement that step-down sufficiently to slow harvest toward the tail-end of the season, and so, the more timely the data, the more real in-season landings that come in, the better we're going to be able to hit whatever that target timeframe is to then put the step down in place.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have a question, before we go to Chris, and we're talking about the longline portion, right, because that's not stated up there, and I'm just making sure. Okay. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I am hearing it's -- We heard in committee that it was the reporting, and, I mean, until we can better polish the dealer reports, I don't see a way around it, and I'm not sure what level you would step it down, at what percentage of the quota, and I would have to leave that up to the experts, but, I mean, this would definitely constrain the catch, and it sucks that the fishermen -- What does stink about this is the fishermen will be ultimately less profitable, just because people aren't reporting in a timely manner, and so maybe it's not a good idea, but, I mean, until we make dealer permits limited access, you're going to have a bunch of sorry dealers that don't do what they're supposed to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I was just curious, and maybe Andy could help me with this, but we don't have many longline boats that have this endorsement, and is there really a whole lot of late reporting on the longline component of this fishery? It seems to me that, with this limited amount of boats, that they're all probably going to the same dealer every time, and I just can't really imagine why we have much late reporting, with such a small, specialized fishery.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm not the best person to talk about the specifics of golden tilefish reporting, and I think we would want to get Dave Gloeckner, or someone from the Science Center, to speak more directly to this and get back to you on this. The main challenge is these very short seasons, and so we're talking longline being open for a matter of months, right, and so, even if dealers don't report for a week, or a week-and-a-half, that seven to ten days is a critical time period for us to know what has or hasn't been landed, so we can project the season, but we certainly can get more information and be better prepared to discuss this in June.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: The only other thing that I wanted to say was I want to make sure that we get the endorsement holders together, so they can come up with some solutions, so we don't have to do a top-down kind of management plan and shove stuff like this down their throat, because I'm hearing that they want to get together and hash some stuff out, and so let's make it a priority.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Jessica. What I'm hearing then is that this investigation of the potential trip limit reductions would be something that you would want the longline endorsement holders to discuss, and actually not include it as an action in the document for the time being?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I see thumbs-up on that. Any more discussion on that? Myra is getting that on the screen. All right. **The committee then made Motion Number 15 to select Action 2, Option 2 as the preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion is approved.**

There was also some additional direction to staff to review the range of alternatives under Action 2, modify as necessary, and select a preferred to facilitate further analysis and do not add an action to modify commercial gear allocations. All right.

Then the committee looked at Action 3, which is to modify the golden tilefish commercial management measures, and they made Motion Number 16, which was add an action to modify the commercial fishing year for golden tilefish. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right.

There was some additional direction to staff to look at the ranges to analyze to include January 15 to the third week in January, but no later than a February 1 start, with options for longline and hook-and-line, and convene a meeting of the longline endorsement holders to discuss management of that gear sector and to remove Action 4.

Then there was some additional direction to staff, I guess, under some additional actions. Under Action 5, modify the golden tilefish recreational accountability measures, consider the same post-

season AMs for golden tilefish as are being considered for blueline tilefish, and then, under Action 6, modify the blueline tilefish recreational management measures, analyze the recreational bag limit for blueline tilefish of three, two, and one fish per person per day, and analyze disallowing retention of recreational bag limit of blueline tilefish by captain and crew.

Then it looks like modifying the length of the recreational season, or modify the blueline tilefish recreational management measures, we're suggesting analyzing -- I'm sorry. Clarification is needed, and I'm going to turn it to Myra to help us with this.

MS. BROUWER: Right, and so you guys discussed the benefits of having the analysis done on a month-by-month, and then we also talked about single wave, versus a wave-and-a-half, versus three months, and so what I was envisioning was some kind of a decision tool, similar to what we put together for you guys for red porgy, and so, if we're going to be looking at closures, or season openings, month-by-month, then you guys can play around with that and say, okay, these two months, or these three months, and so we don't really need to have this huge range of combinations, and that's mainly all I wanted to clarify.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mel.

MR. BELL: So then we just pick and choose, and you all can construct that all right?

MS. BROUWER: Right, and I'm assuming that that's what you guys would like to do, is to have a little bit more flexibility, and then you can open and close different months and see what that does.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I see heads nodding yes. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I'm fine with that, and I think the only reason that I sort of brought it up on a wave-by-wave approach is thinking that that's the only available data to do it at that level of resolution, but certainly, if it can be analyzed on a month-by-month basis, and if we feel confident that there's not some sort of interrelationships between months to get lost in that single-month analysis, then I'm all for that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It looks like Myra clarified that.

MS. THOMPSON: Before we get off of the golden tilefish, I didn't see anything in here about Chris's suggestion that we look at the longline endorsement holders being allowed to have some amount of bycatch if they are hook-and-line fishing for snowy grouper and yellowedge grouper and happen to catch a tilefish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I didn't see that level of specificity when bringing those endorsement holders together, and maybe Myra can capture that. That would be for discussion by the longline endorsement holders. All right. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I would just say that the intent, for me, would not be for it to be for discussion by the longline endorsement holders, because it's going to affect the hook-and-line guys too who are going to be at the AP meeting. I would think that it would be included in the document for analysis, but what I would really like to see is up to 250 pounds and how that changes the closure

date for the hook-and-line. To the extent that can be analyzed, I don't know, and that's not what I am good at thinking about, but I think it needs to be in the document for the AP, because everyone needs to comment on it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so let me clarify that. We modified the direction to staff there a little bit, and so, basically, this would add an option to the document for the bycatch allowance for the longline sector of up to 250 pounds, and, by adding it to the document, then also the Snapper Grouper AP would look at this, as well as the endorsement holders. Okay. All right.

MS. BROUWER: I'm sorry. Just one more clarification, just so I understand, and so this would be -- This bycatch allowance is once the longline component catches their quota and that sector closes? Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Myra is clarifying that. All right. Then we talked about modifying the post-season blueline tilefish recreational accountability measures, and we gave direction to staff to analyze options for post-season recreational AMs and add a table on the accountability measures, similar to how the AMs were presented for golden tilefish.

Then the committee also got an update on the 2022 red snapper season and then received an update on the snapper grouper management strategy evaluation and updates on the South Atlantic red snapper count and greater amberjack count, as well as additional information from the Law Enforcement AP that was not covered under previous agenda items. Then we reviewed the list of topics for the Snapper Grouper AP meeting. Just a clarification there, under gag, and are they looking at the whole document, or what is the AP doing with the gag item?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: There wasn't any specific direction within the gag portion of the meeting for the AP to look at anything, and, at the stage that that document is right now, the IPT is developing the alternatives and doing the analysis, and so the initial thought is that it would be just letting the AP know this document is being worked on, and this is the stage that we're at, but not having a direction presentation or a discussion of that in this AP meeting. Is that fine with the council?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, I think with the intent that -- I think we're going to talk about it in a minute, and we had talked about it before, that we're going to have to probably figure out a way to have an extra AP meeting between -- Have two, basically, between now and September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The committee also looked at consideration of a separate webinar meeting that they were suggesting between June and September to discuss some additional topics, and you heard Kerry talk about that a little bit more, that there might be some other items coming from the June council meeting that we would want them to discuss before the council's September meeting, and so before their regularly scheduled meeting in October. All right.

There were no items under Other Business, and then we have a lengthy timing and tasks motion. I guess let's make sure all the items are in the timing and tasks, and I can read that, and so let's make sure they're all in there.

Develop analyses that could inform future actions for Regulatory Amendment 35; work with technical experts and state agencies to develop an ad hoc advisory panel for private recreational permitting and reporting. Initial membership will be reviewed during AP selection at the June 2022 council meeting; convene a meeting of the wreckfish shareholders this spring; prepare a public hearing draft of Amendment 48 (wreckfish) for approval at the September 2022 council meeting; conduct public comment for Amendment 49, which is greater amberjack, including a public hearing during the public comment session at the June 2022 council meeting; convene a meeting of the golden tilefish longline endorsement holders to discuss alternative ways to manage that fishery; convene a meeting of the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel in April and consider convening another meeting of the AP prior to the September council meeting. Is anything missing from that? Would someone like to make that motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: **I don't have to read it again.** Well done.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there a second? It's seconded by Spud. Any discussion? **Any objection to the timing and tasks motion?** All right. **That motion is approved.** Mel, that concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee report.

MR. BELL: Outstanding job. Thank you. Leann.

MS. BOSARGE: I just have one question. I've been sitting here thinking about amberjack, and it's bothering me. So, when -- You know, I listened to all of you all's discussion about amberjack, and you all were lowering some -- Or looking at possibly lowering some size limits and things like that, minimum size limits, and so your outlook on amberjack is that it's doing great, or doing well, and that you're going to be increasing quotas, and is that your general outlook on amberjack?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would say yes, but, also, maybe cautiously optimistic, because I think that we're concerned that there might be some effort shifting over to amberjack from what's happening to these other fisheries, and is that what you're asking?

MS. BOSARGE: No, and just the general outlook, and it kept bothering me, because, with these changes to FES -- You know, it's really hard to look at the ABCs and stuff that's coming out of your new stock assessment and compare it to your old stuff and really understand are you actually increasing, or are you staying about the same, or are you doing better, and the only way I have found that I can actually see what the stock is doing and which way we're headed, as far as catch levels are concerned, is to look at commercial, because that's the piece that -- As long as you go back and figure, refigure, allocation percentages, you can see, on that commercial quota, whether things are getting better or worse.

I just -- I was sitting here doing that, while you all were going through this, and it almost looks like you've got a good year class or two of fish coming through there, and then you're actually going to end up decreasing your quotas. Okay. I just wanted to make sure that I was on the right page. Your quotas are actually going to go down below where they are right now, and so you go up for two years, and then you go down below where you are now. Okay. I'm just making sure.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Leann. All right. We've got one last task here, which is no small feat, and that is to go through the workplan. Does anybody need to take five, just literally five?

Okay. Let's take five, which will stretch into a council five, but just come right back, and we're deal with the schedule, and then we'll figure out how we're going to do all this stuff.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: Let's go ahead and have a seat, and we'll get at the next task, which is our last task for today, which is, again, figuring out how we're going to cram a whole bunch of stuff into the June meeting and then beyond. John Hadley is going to help us with this, and there is the magic multicolored Excel spreadsheet. What we need to do, of course, is pay particular attention to the next meeting in June, and I think, given the importance of a number of the things that we're going to be dealing with, that there are things that we can -- We may need to consider moving some stuff, to free a little time, and also maybe consider not worrying about updates, maybe some updates and things in-person, and we'll see where we can free up some time and balance stuff, but this, as you guys know, is a balancing act. Okay, John, and do you want to start walking us through?

MR. HADLEY: Sure. Thank you, Mel. At the top -- As you may recall, the top part is the amendments are under statutory deadline. Of note, Amendment 50, and then, down the list there, Amendment 34 will be dropping off, because those will be moving forward and submitted, and so that will be coming off of your workplan, but it is still fairly full overall. When you scroll through, this kind of green part -- These are all the amendments that are going to be underway.

Kind of focusing on this column, this is what we'll be reviewing, as of now, at your June meeting, and the one thing to think about is thinking about, if you do want to free up some time at your June meeting, for discussion purposes, and kind of lightening the workload on that end, the -- You know, we had a pretty good discussion, at Full Council, on Amendment 46, which is the recreational permitting.

In the meantime we will be working on -- We will be working on convening the ad hoc advisory, the makeup of the ad hoc advisory panel. For that, you will be reviewing the membership of that at that meeting, but that's something that could move a little bit, and there is not a statutory deadline there, and it's probably going to be a pretty lengthy discussion, if we do discuss it in June, and so it's up to you. We can certainly have it in June.

Moving down the line here, you're also scheduled to have an options paper on the commercial e-logbooks, and that's one that could slide one meeting without too much of a consequence in general, and then, looking at -- Moving outside of the FMP realm and moving into some of the other topics that the council would review, there is AP Selection and SSC Selection, and the Citizen Science Committee is scheduled to meet, as well as the Law Enforcement Committee, and then some updates on outreach and communications and a species shift scenario planning.

Overall, when we tally everything up, as it stands now, it is slightly above the council's target, at eight, but it's just above that, and so I will turn it over to the council to discuss. Do you want to keep this workplan as-is, or is there anything that you maybe want to shift back a meeting, and then specific guidance on -- If you do want to see an options paper on the commercial e-logbooks and specific guidance to go ahead and have that prepared for you for review in June. Then the other outstanding item that was left, during discussion of the committee reports, was when to hold scoping for the dolphin wahoo framework amendment.

MR. BELL: The commercial e-logbooks, could that become kind of just a report or something that we get to read or -- I mean, I don't know how much time we were going to discuss that or something, and I guess I'm looking for things to potentially turn into a -- Free up some time, to where we're not necessarily discussing a lot, and have you got any ideas on that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We were thinking that's going to be pretty short and straightforward, in terms of its actions, and it would give the authority to do the e-logbooks, along the lines of what was presented this morning, and then, as you saw in that presentation, there was discussion of better collaboration between the different reports, get them all more synchronized, and potentially look at set level, and I think that would come in a later action, if we were to look at that, and so, potentially, this will be one action that just says allow electronic report submission in all of your FMPs that have reporting now, and so I don't think -- I think we can do that with maybe a short discussion, probably about the same time as if we send a report, and maybe we can trim some off of it. As John mentioned, the rec permitting and reporting, maybe we don't need a full four-hour session there. We may be able to get a little less time.

MR. BELL: Right, and so we were -- Going to the bottom, we were at 8.5 in the red, and so, if you've got some suggestions for things that we could get out of 8.5 and back to a more acceptable level. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: John, when you were talking about the e-logbooks, are you -- I am making sure that I understand what you're saying, and that is the council starts development, officially, of an amendment to begin the process of amending all the FMPs to accept electronic commercial logbook reporting.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and we would bring basically options, and hopefully you approve for scoping, at that meeting, an action probably pulled from the language that gave the authority for doing the for-hire electronic reporting, and the language that's already been put in place for snapper grouper, and just make it apply to all and clarify that it is for all participants, and you're not just doing supplemental, but you're doing all of your reports electronic, and so that would be essentially starting the amendment and, as you see here, the intention would be that you look at it and you approve it for scoping. You look at scoping comments and approve it for public hearing in September, and then you final approve it in December, because, really, like I said, one action -- Now, if this grows, and you start throwing other stuff in, then that little three-meeting plan goes out the window completely.

MR. BELL: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just a couple of things to think about. One, is that timing good for the Center, because they mentioned they were working out some things behind the scenes and trying to get some of the things accomplished that people brought up, in terms of the reporting issues they would have, and then, two, is that going to be a joint amendment with the Gulf, because we have -- We share the CMP, right, Coastal Migratory Pelagics, FMP with the Gulf, and I would think that the Center would want to have the commercial electronic reporting across all the Southeast FMPs, to the extent that was possible, and so would you just have one amendment that you might share with the Gulf, or one document, excuse me, that you would share with the Gulf, kind of along the lines of I think we did dealer reporting that way, and it's just something to think about, to not complicate it, but to have everything go in place at one time, as best we could.

MR. CARMICHAEL: When we've talked about it in the past, that hasn't been how we've talked about it, and we've talked about it as just the South Atlantic giving the authority. I think, with CMP, we may want to try to loop them in, but I think the important thing is that we've tried to shy away from this with getting into additional and more complicated changes in the program, because we've had this on the docket for like five years, and it's kind of shifted around.

You know, in some cases, we were told that, no, it's okay, and we'll make it voluntary, and you don't need to give us the authority yet, and let's see how it goes, and then maybe you can do the authority and make changes, and then it seemed like there was some issues with other partners prioritizing it, and so it was like, oh, let's go ahead and get this done quicker, and so we're sort of now at the point of just saying, look, let's just give that basic authority to submit the forms electronically.

In the past ones, the council hasn't weighed-into a lot of the specific details, and a lot of the things discussed this morning are left to the discretion of the agency anyway, and so we're sort of hoping that, by doing this, and however long it takes to get it approved, that the Center is ready to kind of have this going and let everyone do it, by the time this is approved and it becomes mandatory, and, of course, the agency can also hold off on making it mandatory as well, as they did with say SEFHIER, and so, for all those reasons, we just feel like, if we can get this out of the way, it's good for the overall workload, and it lets everyone know that this is coming.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Sure, and I agree with keeping it simple, to one simple action, one single action, excuse me, to amend all these, and so I will talk with folks back in our office, and we can look at this, because there is one -- Like the commercial king mackerel permit, the commercial Spanish mackerel permit, that is shared between the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and there is not separate permits, necessarily, and so we'll work that out behind the scenes.

MR. BELL: Leann.

MS. BOSARGE: I see you have shrimp on there, under that commercial e-logbook, and so you have some logbooks being filled out, I know, in those other finfish species, but shrimp doesn't have a quota, except for rock shrimp, but what are you -- So are we going from no logbook to a logbook, or what is going on there?

MR. CARMICHAEL: This hasn't been talked about, going from no logbook to a logbook. It has just talked about existing logbooks.

MS. BOSARGE: That's why I asked, because, in the Gulf, we haven't -- It hasn't -- Like we have that list of all that, but shrimp isn't in that list, and so I didn't know if that was just an accident or what, because that may slow down your amendment.

MR. BELL: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I was thinking through the priorities, based on statutory deadlines, and we've talked, obviously, about the logbook action, which it sounds like would be fairly simple to bring back, and we can talk about it with Gulf Council. The rec permitting and reporting, that could take some time, in terms of appointing a workgroup, and so I'm wondering if that could be

something we maybe do as either a later meeting or potentially a virtual meeting of the council at some point, outside of the June council meeting. Then we can let that workgroup convene and meet, and then that will set the timing and tone for that work to proceed on rec permitting.

Then the other action is dolphin wahoo, and we will likely have a decision on Dolphin Wahoo 10 and a rulemaking between now and the June meeting. Given that we're in the Keys, it's probably good to keep that on there, but it's certainly a lower priority right now than some of the other actions.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think, based on what we decide with say dolphin wahoo scoping, if we don't scope now, then you see that whole thing is going to shift to the right column, because we would then potentially consider approving for scoping in June. Then I think, on the permitting and reporting, if the council is pretty content with where that thing stands now, a good outcome would be to appoint that group, and maybe have that group meet and report out to you in September, unless you feel like you have some new things that you would put on the table for them to start talking about.

MR. BELL: I think I had Trish and then Jessica.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to go to the dolphin wahoo thing, and John kind of hit on it, but I guess what I was thinking was, when we shift -- Though I guess we made a motion that we would have a document in June, and does that negate -- I was actually thinking, to help with that 8.5 red, you could shift the document to September, but I don't know if that's against, because of the motion that was made to do it in June.

MR. BELL: Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: On dolphin, the Keys are really part of the dolphin issue, and I think you should leave that item on the agenda. I think people are going to comment on it anyway, and so I think it would be prudent to have it on there and at least have a short discussion. I was going to speak to the rec permitting. I agree that the rec permitting and reporting -- Maybe we just select the people at the next meeting, during the discussion, the AP discussion, for that ad hoc group and then push it back one. Then, also, I saw, like when you scrolled down, like the Law Enforcement Committee and those types of things, and I don't know if there is some other of those committees that maybe we don't need to meet, and I know we need to meet the AP Selection, but do we need to meet Law Enforcement? I don't know.

MR. BELL: Well, that was for the purpose of selecting the Officer of the Year, but, I mean, we can maybe look at doing that in a different manner somehow, but, Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I would hate to wait until June to actually stand up this advisory panel. We're sort of -- We've got a little inertia going here, and it would be nice -- I mean, do we have a mechanism or something where we could have those members nominated and we appoint them through some sort of virtual or electronic means or something like that? I mean, you're just appointing people to an advisory panel, and get them stood up and moving, and then, that way, they might have something to give us in June, or just give them a few months, and let's worry about reacting to some guidance in September, when we've got something tangible to react to.

MR. BELL: I was thinking we would get the group up and running, and we probably wouldn't have anything, necessarily, for them to tell us by June, and it probably would be more September, but I wasn't thinking of the formality of appointment or something, and I don't know if we would have to officially --

MR. CARMICHAEL: That will take a meeting and discussion in closed session, and you have talked some about filling in vacancies and appointing people to SEDARs outside of the process, but, this being creating really essentially a new AP, I don't think I would recommend doing that outside of a meeting. We can hold a webinar meeting, and if you pick the date thirty days from today, to get the Federal Register notice in, and so you guys kind of know how that process is, and so you could do a meeting just devoted to that. We might get it six weeks sooner than if you wait until the June meeting.

MR. BELL: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I would certainly recommend that, and I think this can has been kicked down the road for a long time, and now we've finally picked the can up, and now we're going to chuck it in the ditch again, and it's like let's keep things moving, if at all possible.

MR. BELL: I think that is the idea, is to get it moving, and I think -- Again, what I am kind of focusing on, with the meeting time, is, if there are things -- I would consider that sort of an administrative thing. If there are things that we can shift out of meeting time and over somehow into a different format that are more administrative like that, and we have a quick -- I mean, it would be a fairly quick meeting via webinar, and it has to be noticed, obviously, or whatever, but there are some things we can kind of cover in a separate format. Of course, everybody has to make the time to do it.

Well, that's not a crazy idea, but that -- What I'm looking at is, given the magnitude of some of these things, and the essential timeliness, is making sure we take the meeting time we have available to us to focus on moving those amendments forward, and so, if there are things we could shift, that I would say are kind of more of an administrative nature, to a separate meeting, a quick one, maybe we ought to consider that. Spud and then Andy.

MR. WOODWARD: I can foresee the discussion on this framework on gear and all taking a fair amount of time to wade through all of those possible combinations of things, and so I would sure hate for us to shortchange ourselves and feel like we've got to do a rush job on that and then come out of the meeting not any better off than we are going into it, and so, I mean, if we can move things around and pick up some administrative things, like you said, through a virtual meeting -- I mean, it worked out good for the decision tool, I think, to have some time to do that, and so we're all sort of used to doing that now, and so I would certainly support that.

MR. BELL: Fortunately, we became really good at it. Andy and then Kerry.

MR. STRELCHECK: I have some additional thoughts here from my team, and so they talked about, with the dolphin wahoo action, doing just an advisory panel report-out, and we have a ton of analysis, and so that would save the analytical team some analytical work for the June meeting, and it would allow us to get some public input in June, and then we could build on that, obviously, for the September meeting, the analytical work.

With blueline tilefish and golden tilefish, we do have the increase for golden tilefish, in terms of the catch limit, and so that's probably the most urgent thing in the document, and I guess the question is whether or not we could move to March for final action and still get that in place for the 2023 fishing year, and that would influence a catch limit increase for golden tilefish, but, otherwise, I don't see a lot of urgency to have to get that done by December. Now, whether that means it comes off the June meeting agenda or the schedule changes down the road, but I just wanted to kind of throw that out there for consideration.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, I don't know, and maybe it's time to really consider, at least for now, officially planning on having one virtual meeting between every council meeting. We sort of do what we do now, and we always know the March meeting is going to be the first week in March, and we always know the June -- I mean, it's been that way since I've been around, since 1998.

To make ease for noticing and to allow us some time, and we're just rushing through some of these big issues, and there's some stuff coming up that's going to get even bigger, and so maybe we all just have the expectation, and it's always like three or four weeks after a council meeting, however long you need, four or five weeks post-council meeting, we always know that we're going to have a one-day virtual council meeting, because we're -- I hate to be rushed on issues like this. I really, really do.

MR. BELL: That's a good point, and we've talked about this before, and, I mean, we can just tell our operational tempo is increasing, and the amount of things we're dealing with, and I don't know that we need to commit to that as a practice, but we find ourselves seeming to lean on it. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: The Gulf has five meetings a year, and I'm just letting you all know.

MR. BELL: Well, they've got five states.

MR. CONKLIN: I wanted to speak to something else on the list, if that's all right, if it's an appropriate time.

MR. BELL: Are you talking about adding another item for consideration in June?

MR. CONKLIN: No, and we had an item on here for years, and it has disappeared, and it was separating almaco jack out of the jacks complex. The quota on jacks is very, very low, and fishermen interact with them a lot, and they're important in the commercial marketplace as well, and I wonder if we have enough information to get an assessment on almaco jack, and I think that we would have to separate that out of the complex to get an assessment, I believe, instead of a new catch level, so it's not -- There's other species, like banded rudderfish and lesser amberjack, in the same complex, and there's some pretty high landings on banded rudderfish over the years, and it's driven the fishery to close a time or two.

I don't know the exact history, but I know that a little 300-pound commercial trip limit is not doing it, especially when we're losing other economically-important species, and so, if we could get a more robust assessment, even in the next decade or something, and I don't care, but it just makes

sense to do something like that, and it was on the list for a number of years, and I'm not sure what happened to it, but I think it's really important for both sectors.

MR. BELL: I remember a lot of that discussion, and I think John could give us some details.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The first part of the question, about the separation, that is intended to be considered when we do the unassessed stocks ABCs and ACLs, et cetera, which is scheduled to start once the ABC Control Rule is completed, and so it's down lower, the unassessed ABCs, et cetera, and so, at, I don't know, eighteen months or so ago, or a year ago, we agreed to take that almaco out as a separate action and do it when we do that, and so that's lumped in there.

As far as doing an assessment, that's kind of a different level of calculation, and that's something we would need to say raise at the SEDAR Steering Committee, start looking at it, and maybe ask the SSC to look at the data and see if -- The Science Center to look at the data and see if there's even an opportunity, with what we have, to do an assessment, and so we can look into that as well.

Mell, I think, overall, if we do a closed session meeting, and potentially deal with appointing the special AP and deal with the other AP appointments, and we potentially then have maybe the Law Enforcement Committee stick around, or come on early, and handle those two items, we've probably addressed the timing issues for the meeting, and then the other things -- It's a matter of seeing just how much of the analysis comes together, to know how much we have to actually present to you, and I think it's good to keep some of that stuff on there.

Even though we may not be able to do all of the analysis that's desired now, it can be helpful kind of bring the first order of questions to you and say, okay, we've got this much, and where do you see this going, because that potentially narrows the analysis, as we move through the workplan.

MR. BELL: Okay. Of course, we're all going to have to commit to being able to find a day for a meeting, and I know it's like Kerry said, and this is something that -- I would hope that we wouldn't have to do it every time, but it's just the state of the world we're in, and so we think we've freed up a reasonable amount of time, and we can kind of get out of the red now, at least? Go ahead, John.

MR. HADLEY: One point of clarification for Amendment 46, the private recreational reporting amendment, and so we'll convene ahead of time, and the advisory panel for that will be established, and the membership taken care of, and would you like to maybe move the council's review of that to September, instead of June, and, that way, in the meantime, the IPT can work on it, and the advisory panel can work on it, and that's the next time the council would discuss it in-depth.

MR. BELL: That's what I was thinking, because they're going to need time to -- We form them, and they're going to need time to meet, and so it probably wouldn't be until September. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, and that's what I was recommending. I mean, let's let them get organized and get a scope of work going and start -- Maybe -- I mean, there's been a lot of effort expended already, and maybe they could come back to us in September and say at least vessels -- Let's don't go down the vessel route, and let's say with the individual road, or vice versa, whatever it might be, and help us start focusing on that effort, so that we can get closer to decision points.

MR. BELL: Okay. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Then, just to be clear for me, the council is going to have a virtual meeting of some sort before June that will actually appoint these folks as council AP members, correct?

MR. BELL: Yes, and that's what we were saying. What else? Anything else? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to reiterate, and it was said, about prioritizing, obviously, the analytical work, and so I know, John, we have a great working relationship with your team, and we'll need to discuss kind of what we prioritize, both on the economic side as well as the biological analyses, and we added a lot of new alternatives to actions and amendments this week that will require analytical work.

Then the other point of emphasis, I think, in terms of looking at our agenda for June, and we get a lot of routine presentations and updates, and so, if we can try to minimize those, and maybe have a report-out of some of the things just in writing, rather than actually doing a presentation, that will be beneficial.

MR. BELL: I agree with that, and we've tried to do that, and talked about it. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: To get your permission, I guess, for what I think you're kind of leaning towards is so two of the things we get, meeting after meeting after meeting, have been the SEFHIER updates and the e-logbooks, and, considering we start talking about e-logbooks in another way, I don't see a need to ask for a Center report, and I think SEFHIER is maturing, and it's to the point that things are going on, and this could perhaps shift back to less frequent updates, and maybe something -- You know, once the data is available for a year, to start reporting-out to you about how things are going and such, and maybe a quarterly update on how many people are participating and that sort of thing, if you want to keep tabs on it. Just as, like we're saying, as like a written report, as opposed to someone walking through it, and so, if you're comfortable with that, then we'll pull that off the list of things that we have highlighted that you have requested in the past that we talk about at each meeting.

MR. BELL: Sound good? Okay. Anything else? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: John, I'm happy to talk to you further, and there is, I think, a number of other things that we could talk about. Do you want a Protected Resources report at every meeting from the agency? Although it doesn't take long, the amberjack and red snapper count -- We seem to get an update at every meeting, and really not a lot is changing on that, and so I think there's a lot of examples that we can point to, but there's also some things that we probably haven't gotten a presentation on that we could get a presentation on as well, and so there's a balance there.

MR. BELL: I think we'll find ourselves -- I mean, we can save a half-an-hour here or a half-an-hour there or something, but then, like you said, there may be something else that you really did need to spend half-an-hour on that we can prioritize, based on that. Okay. Yes, sir.

MR. HADLEY: One more clarification, just to make sure we're all on the same page. The council will review Dolphin Wahoo Reg Amendment 2 at the June meeting, but we'll specify when to hold the actual scoping for that after the June meeting, and is that correct?

MR. BELL: Okay. Good.

MR. HADLEY: Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Nothing else to deal with there? Maybe we'll be out of the red. Okay. Great. All right. Then I have nothing else to add to the scheduling stuff. Is there anything else? Do you need to talk about meetings?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We have the meetings update, and there's a couple of things that are late additions here, and one is we have a topic for the April seminar, and it will be how are the South Atlantic Council deepwater MPAs doing, which I think will be pretty interesting, and then, as you see, we have the April that typically is the AP meeting month, and so we have a lot of APs going on there.

Then in May, and May is going to be a pretty busy month, and there's a SEDAR Steering Committee, and the CCC is meeting, and we also have the seminar topic lined up, and this is the Pacific groundfish management. This is what was rescheduled from the February seminar, and we're going to look at how they approach their species that are really similar to our snapper grouper species, and we have some more APs going on in May.

In June, we are off to Key West for the council meeting. In July, just recall that we have an SSC meeting scheduled to occur sometime in July to look at that Spanish mackerel assessment, and we will be catching up with a few more APs, and we're also going to have the AP chairs gather to talk about the ABC Control Rule, assuming that keeps on track and keeps progressing as-is.

In August, we'll have a seminar, the topic to be determined. In September, welcome to Charleston, and we'll have a council meeting earlier in the month. A few more APs coming up, and so, as we've mentioned a few times, and we've said that we need to get these APs that haven't met in a while meeting, and so you're seeing that laid out here.

October seminar and then back to the CCC, and this one is hosted by D.C., and it will be in Washington, and then our regular couple of APs, and including the SSC in October. In November sometime, we're hoping to have both the Habitat AP and then a special council webinar meeting to go over the habitat blueprint, and so, Kerry, what you sort of talked about is kind of happening on its own accord. We have different events planned during the year, and we're going to probably continue to have these intersessional, as some folks like to call them, webinar meetings of the council, to deal with these other bits of business. Then we'll be at the council meeting in Wrightsville Beach, a place we haven't been in a long time in December, and so a lot coming up for this year. Hang on to your hats. We'll keep you busy.

MR. BELL: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: John, just a reminder about the November meeting, if it goes through, for Kerry, Jessica, and myself in Colorado.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Right. Then you guys are on for the CMOD, which hopefully will go through for November, and that's why some of the things are to be determined in November, and we're waiting to see how that settles out.

MR. BELL: Thanks. That's a year at a glance there. You throw that on top of the spreadsheet, and it does start filling up. Okay. Anything else about scheduling or meetings?

MR. CARMICHAEL: One other question about the golden tilefish endorsement meeting, and what is the timing there, looking at this?

MR. BELL: Did we have an approximate time? Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I would think it would probably need to be in the fall, to make sure that -- Late summer or early fall, to make sure the fishery is closed.

MR. BELL: That would make sense. All right. Let's pencil that in. All right. Anything else? All right. Is there any other business to come before the council? All right. Let me just say that you all have done a great job, super, and we are facing a lot of challenges, but you're the group to do this, and I'm very proud of you. In terms of a council, you're able to disagree on things, which we will, but you've done that in a manner that is respectful and productive, and so just keep that up as we move into some of these pressing issues, and we're going to find ourselves, obviously, in some areas that we're going to need to make some tough decisions, and some probably unpopular decisions, but you guys can handle that, and I will also say that all of us at the table wouldn't be at the table without the support from all of those around the table, as well as our individual agencies, or staffs, and so it's definitely a team effort, and you guys are a great team. With that, I have nothing else, and so we will adjourn, and everybody be safe out there on the wet highways. All right. We'll see you in June.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 11, 2022.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
April 26, 2022

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS

COUNCIL
SESSION 2
THUR, 3/10/2022

Mel Bell, **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

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

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, **Vice Chair** ✓
GA DNR - Coastal Resources Division
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-3143 (f)
Carolyn.belcher@dnr.ga.gov

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

Jessica McCawley ✓
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
620 South Meridian St
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850)487-0554 (ph); (850)487-4847 (f)
Jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

Chester Brewer ✓
4440 PGA Boulevard, Suite 600
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
(561)655-4777
wcbsafmc@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

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

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

Laurilee Thompson ✓
P.O. Box 307
Mims, FL 3274
(321) 794-6866
thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com

✓ Leann Bosarge
✓ Rick DeVictor
✓ Brian Porch

✓ Shep Grimes LT. part 0
Munica Smit-Brunel Dr. Jack McGovern (web)
Dewey Hemilright Dr. Gentry Neslage (web)

Shaughnessy (web)

A-11

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Science

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net ✓

Outreach Program Manager

Cameron Rhodes
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net ✓ WEB

Fishery Scientist

Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net ✓

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

Dr. Judd Curtis
Judd.curthis@safmc.net ✓

Citizen Science Project Coordinator

Nicholas Smillie
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net ✓ WEB

**Fishery Economist &
FMP Coordinator**

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net ✓

Staff Accountant

Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net ✓

Fishery Scientist

Allie Iberle
Allie.iberle@safmc.net ✓

Fishery Social Scientist

Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net ✓

Public Information Officer

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net ✓ WEB

SEDAR

Administrative Officer

Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net ✓

SEDAR Program Manager

Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net X

Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net ✓

SEDAR Coordinator

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net ✓ WEB

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS

COUNCIL SESSION 2
(FRIDAY, 3/11/2022)

Mel Bell, **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

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, **Vice Chair** ✓
GA DNR - Coastal Resources Division
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-3143 (f)
Carolyn.belcher@dnr.ga.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~~

Chester Brewer ✓
4440 PGA Boulevard, Suite 600
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
(561)655-4777
wcbsafmc@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

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

Jessica McCawley ✓
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
620 South Meridian St
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850)487-0554 (ph); (850)487-4847 (f)
Jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

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

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

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

Laurilee Thompson ✓
P.O. Box 307
Mims, FL 3274
(321) 794-6866
thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com

Leann Bosarge
Rick DeVictor
Dr. Clay Porch
Shep Grimes

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dewey Hemilright
Dr. Benny Neslage (web)
LT Pat O'Shaughnessy (web)
Dr. Jack McGovern (web)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 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~~

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Science

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net ✓

Outreach Program Manager

Cameron Rhodes
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net WEB

Fishery Scientist

Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net ✓

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

Dr. Judd Curtis
Judd.curthis@safmc.net ✓

Citizen Science Project Coordinator

Nicholas Smillie
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net WEB

**Fishery Economist &
FMP Coordinator**

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net ✓

Staff Accountant

Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net ✓

Fishery Scientist

Allie Iberle
Allie.iberle@safmc.net ✓

Fishery Social Scientist

Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net ✓

Public Information Officer

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net WEB

SEDAR

Administrative Officer

Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net ✓

SEDAR Program Manager

Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net X

Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net ✓

SEDAR Coordinator

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net WEB

SAFMC March Council

Attendee Report: Meeting (3/7/22 - 3/11/22)

Report Generated:

03/11/2022 06:31 AM EST

Webinar ID

914-670-795

Actual Start Date/Time

03/10/2022 08:08 AM EST

Duration

8 hours 57 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	Aukeman	Trip
Yes	BROUWER	MYRA
Yes	BYRD	01JULIA
Yes	Bachelor	Nate
Yes	Bailey	Adam
Yes	Barnwell	Will
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Bonura	Vincent
Yes	Brame	Richen
Yes	Bubley	Walter
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Chaya	Cindy
Yes	Cheshire	Rob
Yes	Conklin	00The Real Chris
Yes	Cox	Derek
Yes	Crosson	Scott
Yes	Curtis	Judd
Yes	DOVER	MILES
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	FRANCO	DAWN
Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Flowers	Jared
Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Glasgow	Dawn
Yes	Glazier	Ed
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Gray	Alisha
Yes	Guyas	Martha
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Harrison	Alana
Yes	Hart	Hannah
Yes	Haymans	Doug
Yes	Heffernan	Katie
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Hemilright	Dewey

Yes	Hiers	Homer
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01 Kim
Yes	KELLY	BILL
Yes	Kellison	Todd
Yes	Kittle	Christine
Yes	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	Kolmos	Kevin
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Larkin	Michael
Yes	Lee	Jennifer
Yes	Lewis	Drew
Yes	Mahoney	Andrew
Yes	Masi	Michelle
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Merrifield	Mike
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Cain	Elijah
Yes	OShaughnessy	Pat
Yes	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Reding	Brandon
Yes	Reeder	Kelly
Yes	Scott	Tara
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Shults	Byron
Yes	Sinkus	wiley
Yes	Smart	Tracey
Yes	Smillie	Nicholas
Yes	Spanik	Kevin
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Sramek	Mark
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Thomas	01 Suzanna
Yes	Travis	Michael
Yes	Troha	Luke
Yes	Walia	Matt
Yes	Wallheiser	justin

Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes

Walter
Wamer
White
Willis
Wolfe
Wyanski
brewer
colby
fish
griner
moss
sandorf
vara

John
David
Geoff
Michelle
Wes
David
00chester
barrett
andrew
tim
david
scott
mary

SAFMC March Council

Attendee Report: Meeting (3/7/22 - 3/11/22)

Report Generated:

03/12/2022 01:33 AM EST

Webinar ID

914-670-795

Actual Start Date/Time

03/11/2022 08:07 AM EST

Duration

4 hours 2 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	BROUWER	MYRA
Yes	BYRD	01JULIA
Yes	Beal	Bob
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Bonura	Vincent
Yes	Bubley	Walter
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Chaya	Cindy
Yes	Conklin	00The Real Chris
Yes	Copeland	00 Robert
Yes	Cox	Derek
Yes	Cox	Jack
Yes	Crosson	Scott
Yes	Curtis	Judd
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	E Brown	Julie
Yes	FRANCO	DAWN
Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Glazier	Ed
Yes	Gloeckner	David
Yes	Godwin	Joelle
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Gray	Alisha
Yes	Guyas	Martha
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Harrison	Alana
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01 Kim
Yes	KELLY	BILL
Yes	Kittle	Christine
Yes	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	Kolmos	Kevin

Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Larkin	Michael
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	Merrifield	Mike
Yes	Mroch	Ray
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	OShaughnessy	Pat
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Rhodes	Cameron
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Sinkus	wiley
Yes	Smart	Tracey
Yes	Smillie	Nicholas
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Sramek	Mark
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Thomas	01 Suzanna
Yes	Thompson	Laurilee
Yes	Travis	Michael
Yes	Walia	Matt
Yes	Walter	John
Yes	Wamer	David
Yes	White	Geoff
Yes	Willis	Michelle
Yes	Wyanski	David
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	fish	andrew
Yes	moss	david
Yes	sandorf	scott
Yes	vara	mary