

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION

**Town & Country Inn
Charleston, South Carolina**

October 4, 2018

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Dr. Kyle Christiansen
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Steve Poland
Spud Woodward

Mel Bell, Vice-chair
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
LCDR Jeremy Montes
Art Sapp

Council Staff

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Kimberly Cole
Mike Collins
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson
Cameron Rhodes
Christina Wiegand
Kathleen Howington

Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Chip Collier
Kelsey Dick
John Hadley
Roger Pugliese
Amber Von Harten
Julia Byrd

Observers and Participants

Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Erik Williams
Shep Grimes
Erika Burgess
Tracy Dunn
John Foster
Vivian Matter
Steve Durkee
Lora Clarke

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Tom Frazer
Rick DeVactor
Frank Helies
Kelly Denit
Brett Pierce
Jenny Lee
Rusty Hudson

Other observers and participants attached.

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Town & Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Thursday morning, October 4, 2018, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We are going to move into Full Council, and we're going to try to get through everything today, and so just some orders of business, and so this is calling Full Council to order. We want to welcome our new council members, Art, Spud, Kyle, and Steve, and we still have one new council member coming, and hopefully they will be at our next meeting.

I also want to thank Tom Frazer for being here this week from the Gulf, who is going to give us a Gulf Council report later in the meeting. The Mid-Atlantic Council liaisons couldn't come this week, because they were meeting the same time as we are. I want to also thank Dr. Erik Williams for representing Clay Porch, who is recovering from surgery, and also thank you to our Coast Guard rep for coming this week as well, and I really want to thank everybody for rearranging their schedules, and we had a major hurricane, Hurricane Florence.

Last year, it was Hurricane Irma. This year, it's Hurricane Florence, and we had to reschedule this same meeting last year, and so I want to thank everybody, council members and council staff, for rearranging things. Some folks, like Steve, still have damage at their house from Hurricane Florence, and so I want to thank everybody for rearranging their schedules and making it here for this council meeting this week.

Our first order of business is to adopt the agenda. Are there any changes or additions to the agenda? The agenda stands approved. The next order of business is to approve the minutes. Are there any changes or additions or deletions to the minutes? Any objection to approval of the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. I am going to turn it over to Gregg to go to the elections.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. First, how this will work is I will handle the election of the Chair, and then the newly-installed Chair will handle the election of the Vice Chair. Are there any nominations for Chair?

MR. BREWER: **Gregg, it is my honor and very great pleasure to nominate our Acting Chair, Jessica McCawley, for the position of Chair of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.**

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

MR. SAPP: I will second the nomination, and I move that the floor be closed to nominations and that Ms. McCawley be appointed by acclamation.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Art. **Are there any objections to that motion? Hearing none, Ms. McCawley, you are elected as our Chair.** *Congratulations. (Applause)*

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Now I'm going to handle the election of Vice Chair. Are there any nominations for Vice Chair?

MR. CONKLIN: **Madam Chair, it would be my honor and pleasure to nominate our current Acting Vice Chair, Mr. Mel Bell, to serve as our Vice Chair.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are there any other nominations?

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I will second the nomination and move that the floor be closed to nominations and that Mr. Mel Bell be appointed by acclamation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. **Is there any objection to that motion? Hearing none, Mr. Bell, you are elected as our Vice Chair.** *(Applause)*

MR. BELL: I would point out that I noticed that Captain Spud had his name tag there, and I am an actual retired captain.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think I just heard a request for a new name tag for Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: He told me what Captain Spud was, and that's a whole different -- I've got to check that out.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We will save that story for hospitality. All right. Well, let's talk about the dress code for a second. There were some people here that wondered if we needed to wear a coat and tie. I will note that Spud now has on long pants today, but no coat and tie needed for Full Council. If you want to wear long pants, that's fine. If you want to wear shorts and Hawaiian shirts, that's fine as well, or long pants.

I want to thank everyone for hospitality on Monday. I want to thank staff for putting together hospitality here as well as Mel for our event on Monday night, and so we actually had hospitality on Sunday night, and I keep forgetting that we were actually here on Sunday. Sunday night and Tuesday night, and then Mel put together our soiree on Monday night. Thank you, Mel. *(Applause)*

We are going to go into -- Since we have folks that definitely have to leave, but we're going to try to get through everything today, we are going to go into the various committee reports, and the committee chairs will be presenting their own reports. I believe we're going to go into Snapper Grouper first. I don't know if I have the final report.

MR. WAUGH: The report is posted on the website under Committee Reports. That is where you will find all the committee reports.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I've got it now. All right. I'm assuming that everybody around the table knows where the committee reports are and now has them. All right, and so the Snapper Grouper Committee met on October 2 and 3 of this week. They approved the minutes from June and the agenda.

We got a status on commercial and recreational catches versus quota for species under ACLs, and we also got a status of amendments under formal review. Then we went into Regulatory Amendment 29, best fishing practices and powerheads, and there were a number of items that were guidance to staff, and you can see those on the screen. There were five bullet points here, everything from the definition of descending devices to consulting with folks about the line that

we would use for circle hooks and getting information from the AP and talking more about corrosion-resistant hooks that are not stainless steel.

The first motion the committee made was to approve the suggested purpose and need statement in this amendment, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion the committee made was to approve the inclusion of Action 1, Alternatives 1 through 3, in Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29, as modified, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The third motion the committee made was to approve the inclusion of Action 2, Alternatives 1 through 6, in Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29, as modified, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion 4 was to remove Action 3, Alternatives 1 through 3, from Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion, Motion 5, was to approve the inclusion of Action 4, Alternatives 1 through 3, in Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29, as modified. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of this motion? Any objection? That motion stands approved.

Those were all the motions that were made on that particular amendment, and then we moved into the Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 26, which is the recreational management measures, and so there was also guidance to staff. We have two bullet points on the board here for guidance to staff on this particular amendment, and we made Motion Number 6. **It's to select Alternative 2 as the preferred under Action 1 in this Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 26. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Motion 7 was to add a sub-alternative for a recreational season January 1 to the end of February and select as an additional preferred for Action 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion 8 is to add another sub-alternative to Action 2 for a recreational season from December 1 through January 31. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion stands approved.

Motion 9 is move Sub-Alternatives 2c and 2d under Action 2 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion 10 is to select Alternative 4 as preferred under Action 6. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of this motion? Any objections? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Then we moved into the Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 27, and these are the commercial management measures, and there was also some guidance to staff here, and then we made a motion.

Motion 11 is to change our preferred alternative to Alternative 3, Sub-Alternative 3a, under Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of this motion? Any objections? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion 12 was the change the preferred under Action 5 to Alternative 4, Sub-Alternative 4a. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion, Motion 13, was to accept the IPT edits throughout the document. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right.

Motion 14 is going to be a roll call vote, because we're going to be sending this to the Secretary, and so I'm going to read the motion. This is recommend approval of Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 27 for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any 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. Any discussion?

MR. HAYMANS: Didn't we hold off on making the motion at committee until we heard the public comment?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I thought we did, but I can't remember, because some of them we did and some of them we didn't.

MR. HAYMANS: Just to make sure, I will second that motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. It's under discussion. Any additional discussion of this motion? I'm going to turn it over to Gregg for a roll call.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Christiansen.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Sure.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **It passes without objection.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Moving into our next amendment, it's Amendment 47, which is the Snapper Grouper For-Hire Permit Modification. The first motion that was made was -- **This is Motion 15, and it's to direct staff to discontinue work on Amendment 47. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion on this motion?

DR. CRABTREE: I would encourage folks to re-think this one. We're just talking scoping, and we certainly heard at least one member of our AP give testimony yesterday afternoon, and obviously it was very important to him, and it's been recommended by our Snapper Grouper AP, and I think we owe it to people to at least go out to scoping with this. We've spent a lot of time on it, and there are a lot of reasons why we ought to think about this, and so I'm going to oppose the motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more discussion on this motion?

MR. BELL: My main concern was just one of -- I know that legally we're fine, but it was more of just an appearance of having announced a series of public input opportunities, and then we heard from Ira, and we've heard from the Snapper Grouper AP, and I just felt like, if we were going to decide not to move forward with it, it would have been a cleaner break, perhaps, coming after the scoping meetings that we've already announced.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just for clarification, I am going to look over to Gregg and Myra. If this motion is approved, then I'm assuming that today or tomorrow that those hearings would be canceled via another notice, and is that how that would work?

MR. WAUGH: That's correct. We couldn't get anything in the Federal Register in that time, but we would certainly use all of our abilities to get the word out, Constant Contact, Facebook, and let folks know.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then would the Federal Register notice go out for the cancellation? I'm looking over on this side of the table.

MR. WAUGH: We could draft the cancellation and get it up, but, I mean, before it could be published, the meetings would have passed, and so I don't know the utility in pursuing that avenue.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I didn't know if you wanted to say anything, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, there's not enough time to get anything filed in the Federal Register. I think some of these meetings start next week, Tuesday, and so there's just not enough time to get anything in the Register before the meetings.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Is there more discussion on this particular motion?

MR. SAPP: I was accused of calling names during some of the comment, and I don't find it appropriate here, especially, to do so, and I did not, and won't, and, also, whether the intention for anybody is to monetize this thing, it will happen, if it were to pass, intentions or not, and I'm not a fan of that in the least bit, and that's my two-cents.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Any more discussion? Once again, I am going to call for a vote on this, those in favor and those opposed. If you are in favor, then you are in favor of discontinuing work on this amendment, and so all of those in favor of discontinuing work on this amendment, raise your hand; all those opposed, like sign, five. I can vote. I voted when we were --

MS. BECKWITH: We're still missing somebody, and so, if you guys are -- Then let's do a roll call like we did last time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's do a roll call, so that we're 100 percent. Let's just do a roll call vote, so that there's no question about it.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes is --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me go over it again, because it is confusing. Yes is to stop work, and no is to continue work. No would be continue to scoping.

MR. BELL: No.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: No.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Christiansen.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: No.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: No.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Poland.

MR. POLAND: No.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **It's seven to five, and the motion passes.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so the motion passing means that we are going to discontinue work on this amendment and the meetings that were scheduled, the scoping meetings, will be canceled.

Moving on to Regulatory Amendment 30, which is red grouper rebuilding, Motion 16 is approve the IPT edits to the purpose and need statements. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to select Alternative 4 as preferred under Action 1. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stand approved.

The next motion, Motion 18, was to approve the IPT's suggested edits on Action 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion the committee made was to add a sub-alternative to Alternative 2 under Action 2 that would add a closure from January through June. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to approve the suggested edits to Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Motion 21 was to add a Sub-Alternative 2d to encompass January through June. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion was to add Action 4 and the range of alternatives. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion, Motion 23, and we had a substitute motion. Substitute Motion 23, which I believe then became the main motion, was to select Sub-Alternative 2d as preferred under Action 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection?

MR. SAPP: I'm sorry, but was that delta or bravo?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's 2d, as in dog, yes. Are you good? Any discussion on that?

MR. SAPP: Thank you. Perfect. No. All good.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. **Any objections? That motion stands approved.**

Motion 24 was to approve all actions in Regulatory Amendment 30, as modified, to consider for final approval in December of 2018. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

We then moved into Regulatory Amendment 32 for yellowtail snapper. **There was a motion that was made that was then withdrawn, and so our first motion that we voted on was Motion 25 to select Alternative 3 as a preferred under Action 1, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

The next motion was to accept the range of alternatives under Action 1, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

We then moved into the Abbreviated Framework 2 for vermilion snapper and black sea bass. As Doug was mentioning earlier, this motion was definitely not made in committee, and so there is a draft motion on the board to approve this abbreviated framework. Would someone like to make this motion?

MR. WOODWARD: Move we approve Snapper Grouper Abbreviated Framework Amendment 2 for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.

MS. MCCAULEY: Motion by Spud and seconded by Chris. It's under discussion. Any discussion? This is also a roll call vote, and I'm going to turn it over to Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Christiansen.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Absolutely.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

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

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Then we had some lengthy discussion about agenda items for the Snapper Grouper AP's meeting this month, in a couple of weeks, and so we talked about getting their input on the vision blueprint, and we talked about a presentation on permits from SERO staff that the council will get first in December, and then the AP will get it after that, but we're going to get some comments from them on what they would like to see in that presentation, and then we had -- There were also a number of amendments that we were wanting their input on, and so the amendments are listed there on the board that we were talking about and some additional questions for that.

The committee then went into Other Business, and, under Other Business, there were some motions made, and so the first motion under Other Business was to develop a white paper to look into the extent of use of spearfishing gear in the commercial and recreational sectors of the snapper grouper fishery and existing ways to track its use and potential biological/ecological effects. Include possible ways to reduce effort by means of a season. Also include how this relates to National Standard 5. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

There was also some additional direction to staff, and then we have a timing and tasks motion, and I am going to let Myra talk to us about that timing and tasks motion, because we were having some discussion during the break about the yellowtail amendment, and that probably needs to be added to this list. It looks like that could come to the December meeting as final as well, but I'm going to let Myra talk to us about the timing and tasks.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Jessica, and so, yes, that is one item that needs to be clarified, what your timing would be. If you want regulations to be in place to potentially affect the current fishing year for yellowtail, meaning avoiding any in-season closures that could happen in the summer months, then the National Marine Fisheries Service would have to have the amendment submitted to them by December.

You would have to approve it in December, and so you have the option of potentially -- You have already received scoping, and there's been a lot of outreach, and FWC and Jessica and Erika can talk more about that. They reached out to fishermen and got input in that manner for the proposed yellowtail changes, and so, if you give us direction to do our best to try to bring this to you in December, we could do that, so that potentially regulations could be in place before the beginning of the following fishing year.

I would add that to the timing and tasks, and then the other thing, if I may, Jessica, is, this white paper on spearfishing, one thing you didn't give us guidance on is timing, and so if you could maybe discuss that a little bit, and I will add that to the motion while you're talking.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so be thinking about the spearfishing item and when you want to see that white paper. I'm thinking maybe March, based on the list of items we've stacked up here, but let me talk a little bit more about yellowtail. When we talked about this in committee, we hadn't thought a lot about when we would do this. We talked a little bit about the fact that if we had a public hearing at the December council meeting that that's actually in North Carolina, which is about as far away as we can get from the Keys, where yellowtail is being prosecuted, but it occurred to us early this morning that if we didn't do it final in December, then there might be a possibility that in 2019, in the summer again, that it would close early again, which is the whole reason that we're working on this amendment.

As Myra mentioned, yellowtail was discussed a lot by the South Florida Committee and about how to regulate, and this particular issue came up during those south Florida discussions, which also went out to workshop. Also, as Myra mentioned, I had met with wholesale dealers and a number of folks in the fishery back in February of this year, and then, at every one of our FWC Commission meetings, we give a presentation on Gulf and South Atlantic Council issues, and, since the council has been talking about this, yellowtail snapper has been in every one of those presentations, and there is the ability for the public to make comments during that discussion, and I would say that the public was making comments on yellowtail snapper at all of those FWC Commission meetings, and so there has been some additional comment gathered through time, and so I'm a little less worried about the fact that we would be having a public hearing on this amendment at the December meeting in North Carolina, but it appears that this is going to need to come to December if we have any chance of getting it in place before the fishery might close in the summer again, since the fishing year is in the summer.

MR. BELL: If you're comfortable with the level of -- Because you are the center of the yellowtail universe down there. If you're comfortable with the level of input you've got, then, if we don't get a lot in December, we'll be okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and remember we also had some meetings, some webinars, about yellowtail before we came to this meeting, and then I can also talk to some of the fishery representatives, like Bill Kelly, and they could probably submit written comments prior to the December council meeting as well, and so I feel pretty good about that, and so I would like to see the yellowtail amendment added to this particular timing and tasks motion. Then let's talk about when we want to see the spearfishing.

MR. HAYMANS: I am okay pushing it off until we get to the Stuart in June. We might actually get a few spear fishermen show up for public comment and give us some read on what we're hearing from the papers, and so I'm okay pushing it to June.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Other folks on this side of the table?

MR. CONKLIN: Yes, I agree with Doug. In June, where we'll be, it's kind of the hotspot for spearfishing, and so I think we'll get a lot of good feedback.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm going to look at Steve and Tim. Are you okay with June? Were you hoping that this was coming back sooner? What are your thoughts?

MR. GRINER: I was hoping that it was going to come back a little sooner, but, if March is too much of a push to get it done, then --

MS. BROUWER: We could put March or June, and then we'll do our best to try to get something to you in March, but, if we can't, then we'll push it to June. We can just leave it a little bit open-ended, and it's okay.

MR. POLAND: Yes, that's fine. I share Tim's concern, because, again, I've been getting a lot of calls about this issue in south North Carolina, but, certainly if council staff can update us on how progress is going at December, or even in March, and if they need more guidance or anything, because the big thing is I want this fleshed out pretty well before we make any decisions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so, Myra, change that phrase to say "prepare white paper on spearfishing for the council to review in March of 2019", or do you want it to say "in March of 2019 or June of 2019"? Doug says March or June of 2019. Are folks okay with that? Okay. I see heads nodding yes. If we are done editing this timing and tasks motion, then I would look for someone to make that motion.

MR. HAYMANS: **So moved, Madam Chair, to accept the timing and tasks.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Mel. Do we need to read that entire motion, Myra? Doug, do you mind reading our timing and tasks motion?

MR. HAYMANS: **Madam Chair, I move that we approve the timing and tasks as follows: prepare Regulatory Amendment 29 to be approved for public hearings at the March 2019**

meeting; prepare Regulatory Amendment 32 to be considered for formal review in December of 2018; update Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 26 for review in December and approval for formal review; prepare Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 27 for submission; request presentation from SERO Permits Office for March of 2019; include an item on the December agenda to review snapper grouper commercial fishery characterization; prepare a white paper on spearfishing for council to review in March or June of 2019; prepare Regulatory Amendment 30 for formal review in December of 2018.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and that motion was seconded by Mel. Any discussion of this timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to the timing and tasks motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

That concludes my committee report. Thank you, Myra. Next, we're going to go into Mackerel Cobia, and I'm going to turn it over to Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: The Mackerel Cobia Committee met on October 3, 2018 and approved its June 2018 minutes and the agenda. We received reports on the status of commercial catches versus the quota for species under ACLs and the status of amendments under formal review from Mr. DeVictor.

We then discussed the CMP Framework Amendment 6. The new regulations for king mackerel established in CMP Amendment 26 became effective on May 11, 2017, including updated commercial trip limits for the Atlantic Southern Zone. Comments from stakeholders have indicated that fishermen operating out of Volusia County travel farther offshore to target king mackerel and often complete trips lasting two or three days. The fifty-fish trip limit in March makes it challenging for fishermen to make enough money to pay for a trip, causing undue hardship to fishermen and communities.

Additionally, at their April 2017 meeting, the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel recommended that the council review the March trip limit and consider a different trip limit for north of the Volusia/Brevard line that would support those multi-day trips while still allowing year-round access to the king mackerel fishery. All of that resulted in the creation of Framework Amendment 6 that we reviewed, and we have a draft motion in front of us to send Amendment 6 to the Secretary. If I could get a motion to send that forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I will make that motion, and the motion is to approve the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 6 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. HAYMANS: I've got a second from Chris, and I do understand that the Chair will be making some gillnet corrections in the text when she sees it. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none, I would ask Executive Director Waugh to do a roll call vote, please.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Christiansen.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **It passes without objection.**

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, sir. There was a bit of other business, in that we have received requests from members of the mackerel fishery and the Mackerel AP to look at some additional trip limits for a county south of Volusia, and I requested not to have a December 2018 meeting, because of my possible non-attendance, and I asked to push that to 2019, and so we're going to look at some additional trip limits in 2019 that we can put in front of the Mackerel AP in April of 2019. There was the timing and tasks motion, which is basically to prepare this document that we just voted on, and is there a motion to accept the timing and tasks?

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MR. HAYMANS: Motion by Mel and a second by Jessica. Thank you. Any additional discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that passes.** Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Next up we have Spiny Lobster, and I need to go locate the Spiny Lobster Report. Hold on. All right. The Spiny Lobster Committee met earlier this week, and the committee approved the minutes from March and the agenda. We then got a status of spiny lobster catch versus ACL, and just a note that the staff noted years with hurricane activity occurring during the spiny lobster season. We talked about the spiny lobster -- This is actually the June report. I'm in the wrong folder. All right. Let's get to the correct council meeting. All right.

The committee approved the minutes from the June 2018 meeting and the agenda, and we did get a status of spiny lobster catch versus ACL, and then we went right into Spiny Lobster Amendment 13, and there is a draft motion on the board for approving this amendment for formal secretarial review.

MR. HAYMANS: **Madam Chair, I would move that we approve Spiny Lobster Amendment 13 for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is there a second? It's seconded by Mel. Any discussion of this particular motion? Seeing none, this is a roll call vote, and I will turn it over to Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Christiansen.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Ms. McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: **It passes without objection.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: **There is one timing and tasks motion, which would be to work with the Gulf Council staff to prepare Spiny Lobster Amendment 13 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce.**

MR. HAYMANS: **So moved.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Doug is making that motion, and is there a second? It's seconded by Mel. Any discussion of this timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to the timing and tasks motion? Seeing none, the timing and tasks motion is approved.**

Next up, I believe we have AP Selection and Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: This will be the report from the Advisory Panel Selection Committee. The committee met in closed session on Monday afternoon, and the committee approved the minutes from the June 2018 meeting and the committee agenda and addressed the following items. First, we looked at the System Management Plan Workgroup, and the committee received an update on the SMZ Workgroup and approved the following motion as a recommendation to the council, and this will be Motion Number 1.

Motion Number 1 is appoint Rusty Hudson (Florida commercial) and Michael Dixon (Florida recreational) to the System Management Plan Workgroup. Madam Chair, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of this motion? Seeing none, is there any objection or opposition? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

Then we went into the recommendations for the different advisory panels. The committee reviewed applications for the Coral, Dolphin Wahoo, Habitat, Law Enforcement, Mackerel Cobia, and Snapper Grouper Advisory Panels and approved the following motions as recommendations to the council. As I go through these, I am not going to say that, Madam Chair, on behalf of the committee, I so move.

Motion Number 2 is reappoint Dr. Sandra Brooke, Henry Feddern, and Ken Nedimyer to the Coral AP. Dr. Feddern and Ken Nedimyer have served out their terms, but we do have a provision, as you all will remember, where folks can be appointed for a one-year term, and that would be the case with Dr. Feddern and Ken Nedimyer. Is there any discussion on this motion?

MR. GRINER: When we were looking at the handbook and the SOPPs, I thought it said in the appendix that you could appoint them for three years.

MR. BREWER: We had that discussion, and I think it came down to that it was for -- If they had served out their term, it was a one-year, and I'm pretty sure that we had that discussion, but I've got to tell you that I didn't go review the handbook or the SOPPs, but I see that perhaps Mr. Haymans has some thoughts on that issue.

MR. HAYMANS: I am going to actually agree with Tim. I went back and looked over this, and I didn't pull it up, but, if memory serves, they get reappointed for an additional term as if it were their last term, which means they get reappointed for another full term, but, when they get to the end of that, it's like it's their last term. I will vote for this and move it on, for lack of getting it confused, but I think we need to kind of look back and make sure what it says, moving forward.

MR. BREWER: Well, I would kind of like to get it cleaned up, so that we know what to tell these folks, insofar as what their term is. Is there anybody on staff that can help us with this?

MR. GRINER: It was in that appendix under the AP appointments, the appendix at the end of the SOPPs. I think it had to do with if there was nobody else that applied or they were the most -- I think you can do them for another three-year term.

MR. BREWER: What it says is it says for at least one year. That's what it says, and so it doesn't specify one year or two years or three years. Now, with regard to these folks, I have absolutely -- The Chair has no objection to them being appointed for a three-year term, but I think that, if we

receive a motion from someone who is on the committee that they be appointed for a three-year term, the Chair would certainly entertain that motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just a point, and I wasn't going to make a motion. I'm not on the committee, but I would support them being on there for a three-year term. We're working on the golden crab and shrimp areas, and I think we're going to need to meet the Coral Committee, and these guys are certainly well-qualified to speak on this issue. I would love to see them on there for another three-year term, all three of those folks.

MR. BREWER: Is there someone who serves on the committee who would like to make a motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It is a committee-of-the-whole, and so I guess anyone can make a motion.

MR. BREWER: You're correct. I'm sorry. It is the committee-of-the-whole. Mr. Haymans, do you have a motion for us?

MR. HAYMANS: Sure. **I would move that we re-appoint Sandra Brooke, Henry Feddern, and Ken Nedimyer to the Coral AP to include a full three-year term for Dr. Feddern and Ken Nedimyer.**

MR. BREWER: Is there a second for the motion? Mr. Griner seconds. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to --

MR. WAUGH: Sorry, but just what did we do with the prior motion? Wasn't that already moved on behalf of the committee? So this would be a substitute motion.

MR. HAYMANS: **That was a substitute motion, Mr. Chair.**

MR. BREWER: We have a substitute motion. Let's get it up on the board. Does the substitute motion look good to the mover? Thank you. Is there a second to the substitute motion? That would then be Mr. Griner. Is there discussion on the substitute motion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to the substitute motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved and becomes the new main motion.** Is there any discussion on the new main motion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to the new main motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Let's get moving again. **Motion Number 3 was to appoint Dan Owsley to the Dolphin Wahoo AP.** Any discussion on the motion? **Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

Motion Number 4 is appoint Charles Yeomans to the Dolphin Wahoo AP. Any discussion on the motion? **Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

Motion Number 5 is appoint Jason White (North Carolina conservation) to the Habitat AP. Any discussion on the motion? **Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

Motion Number 6 is re-appoint David Webb to the Habitat AP. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

Motion Number 7 is re-appoint Bruce Buckson to the Law Enforcement AP. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

Motion Number 8 is appoint Brad Phillips and Aaron Kelly to the Mackerel Cobia AP. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

Motion Number 9 is appoint Rusty Hudson to the Mackerel Cobia AP. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

Motion Number 10 is replace Randy McKinley with John Mallette on the Mackerel Cobia AP. Is there any discussion on the motion?

MR. CONKLIN: Do we need to actually formalize it and appoint John to the Mackerel Cobia AP?

MR. BREWER: I think we're good. The North Carolina contingent, this is what they wanted, and so this is what we're doing, but I will re-read the motion. Motion Number 10 is replace Randy McKinley with John Mallette on the Mackerel Cobia AP. Any discussion on the motion? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

Motion Number 11 is re-appoint Red Munden and Andy Piland to the Snapper Grouper AP and appoint Randy McKinley to the Snapper Grouper AP. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

Next, Motion 12 is re-appoint Rusty Hudson and appoint Randall Beardsley to the Snapper Grouper AP. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

Motion Number 13 is re-appoint Dick Brame to the Snapper Grouper AP. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.

That was, by the way, the last appointment that we discussed. We then, in closed session, discussed improving communication with the APs. The committee also discussed ways to improve communication and effectiveness when working with advisory panels. Staff reviewed concerns expressed by advisory panel members about the need to further consider recommendations presented to council committees.

Staff also provided the AP Selection Committee with an overview of practices for maintaining effective communication, including perceptions of process fairness, information sharing and dialogue with AP members, and the importance of anecdotal information. The committee then reviewed a list of the following options to improve communication with its advisory panels and generally agreed to pursue these options in the future.

I don't think, and correct me if I'm wrong, Kim and Gregg, as to whether this needs to be done in the form of a motion or whether we should just advise the full committee as to what these options are.

MR. WAUGH: Just advise.

MR. BREWER: Okay. We don't need a motion, and we'll just advise you as to the different options that were put forth and generally approved by the committee. The options that were generally approved by the committee were that the committee Chair and Vice Chair will provide more specific guidance on items they want the AP members to address for upcoming AP meetings. Have the AP Chair, committee Chair, and staff confer before the upcoming AP meetings.

The next bullet point was to include these items in the AP meeting agenda, using the SSC roadmap as an example, when feasible. The next bullet point is structure the advisory panel report to include the specific items requested by the committee. The next bullet point is, when the advisory panel report is presented to the committee, the specific items identified earlier by the committee Chair and Vice Chair will be addressed at the committee level. The next bullet point is staff could provide a PowerPoint slide or two to highlight recommendations in the AP Report and help facilitate discussion during the committee meeting. The next bullet point is have the committee Chair provide an update to AP members on actions/discussions by the committee at each AP meeting.

We then come to the next motion that is coming out of the committee, and it's timing and tasks, and the committee -- I guess you would say voted on and approved the following timing and tasks. Number 1 is re-advertise the following open seats for consideration by the AP Selection Committee during its March 2019 meeting. On the System Management Plan Workgroup, we have remaining sector-specific seats that need to be filled. On the Habitat AP, we have got one North Carolina commercial seat, one Florida commercial seat, and the at-large research/geologist seat that needs to be re-advertised. All three of those need to be re-advertised. Next, on Snapper Grouper, one South Carolina open seat and one Georgia open seat need to be re-advertised. Next, re-advertise open seats on the council's advisory panels as appropriate for consideration by the AP Selection Committee at the March 2019 Meeting. Lastly, standardize the format for all advisory panel reports to be consistent when presented to council committees. Now, that was in the form of a motion, and so is there any discussion on this motion for timing and tasks?

MR. HAYMANS: I am seconding your motion.

MR. BREWER: It's a committee motion.

MR. HAYMANS: Not until you --

MR. BREWER: Okay. I have made that motion on behalf of the committee, and it has been seconded by Mr. Haymans.

MR. POLAND: I talked to council staff about this about a month ago, or a month-and-a-half ago, and there is a vacant seat for North Carolina on the Spiny Lobster AP, and that didn't get advertised, and I just wanted to make sure -- I can't remember what we had talked about.

MS. IVERSON: Yes, we will advertise those seats, and then those appointments will be made in March, Steve, and the Spiny Lobster AP is not scheduled to meet between now and the March meeting.

MR. POLAND: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that got on the list.

MS. IVERSON: Yes, they will be advertised. There are those two open seats.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thanks.

MS. IVERSON: Thank you.

MR. BREWER: Any further discussion on the timing and tasks motion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition, with the clarification from North Carolina with regard to spiny lobster, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chester. We're now going to go into the SEDAR Committee, and let me find that report. The SEDAR Committee met this week, on October 1, and the committee approved the minutes from the June 2018 meeting and the agenda for this meeting. The SEDAR Committee then received an assessment projects update and then talked about the recent SEDAR Steering Committee meeting and then what would happen at the upcoming SEDAR Steering Committee meeting in the spring of 2019. The committee then made two motions.

The first motion was move to appoint Steve Poland to SEDAR 58. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion the committee made was move to appoint Tim Griner to SEDAR 60. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of that motion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

This concludes the SEDAR Committee report, and we're going to move into Habitat.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee met on October 2. We approved the agenda and the minutes from the June 2018 meeting. Then we had two discussions, and one was the Atlantic coast-wide discussion regarding species expansion northward. We had planned for the three Atlantic coast councils to meet at this meeting, but, because of Hurricane Florence, it was put off, and scheduling is going to move that meeting to March of 2019 at Jekyll Island. Again, the three councils will be meeting during that time to discuss species expansion.

We will hopefully see presentations, which will include the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP Amendment to extend the jurisdiction through the Mid-Atlantic Council area and highlight the

Atlantic councils MOU regarding deep-sea corals and Atlantic coastal management of dolphin wahoo as examples of how the councils can work together to solve some of these issues.

In 2017, the South Atlantic Council reviewed summarized landings of snapper grouper species in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions, and the committee discussed -- The committee requested that this information be updated for discussion during the December council meeting. The committee's initial discussion on priority species identified include king and Spanish mackerel and various snapper grouper species, depending on the level of landings.

We also received a report on habitat and ecosystem tools and model development and regional partner coordination from Roger. In lieu of a presentation, the committee was provided with an update on the outline of the FEP II Dashboard to highlight developing habitat and ecosystem tools and developing the South Atlantic next generation modeling and regional partner coordination.

Staff highlighted a couple of regional coordination issues, including an upcoming presentation of the South Atlantic Ecopath model funded by the South Atlantic Landscape Cooperative something else during the fall SSC meeting, with a proposal to establish an SSC workgroup in cooperation with members and the Ecosystem Modeling Workgroup supporting model development. God, that's a whole lot of models.

NOAA Fisheries Draft EBFM Implementation Plan for the South Atlantic Region was out for public review. The South Atlantic draft plan complements work already underway by the council for FEP II, FEP Implementation Plan, and the two-year roadmap. Council staff is coordinating comments with the Chair on the Draft EBFM Implementation Plan for the South Atlantic Region.

There are three items under the timing and tasks, and I will read those. It's to develop additional summarized information on council-managed species catch north of North Carolina for discussion during the December council meeting, to coordinate with the Mid-Atlantic and Northeast Council and re-schedule the joint session for March of 2019, and to work with the Habitat and Ecosystem Committee and Council Chair to finalize comments on Draft NOAA Fisheries South Atlantic EBFM Implementation Plan by October 12. Is there any other timing or tasks motion that needs to happen? Then I would entertain a motion.

MR. WOODWARD: **So moved.**

MR. HAYMANS: Motion by Spud and a second by Jessica. Thank you. Is there any additional discussion on timing and tasks? **Seeing none, any opposition? Seeing none, the timing and tasks are accepted.** Madam Chair, that completes my report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I am going to turn it over to Spud to give us a report from the recreational workshop earlier this week.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the afternoon of Sunday, September 30, and the morning of October 1, a workshop was held to discuss fresh, and not innovative, approaches for management of the private recreational sector of the snapper grouper fishery. The workshop was made possible by the American Sportfishing Association, in partnership with the Coastal Conservation Association and Yamaha Marine Group. Dr. Kari MacLauchlin-Buck is the coordinator of this project and facilitated the discussions, and we had good attendance from both

council members as well as representatives of the sponsors and the Snapper Grouper AP and the SSC.

The workshop is the first step in a process to explore approaches to management that hopefully will address some issues of concern in the private recreational sector, specifically unpredictability in fishing opportunities. The purpose of this workshop this weekend and earlier this week was to create a facilitated discussion about management approaches and which of those we think are most feasible and have the greatest chance of success, which would, in the terms of the private recreational sector, would be increased accessibility, predictable and consistent seasons, improved angler satisfaction, and more acceptance of recreational reporting.

After the two days of discussion, we considered depth management, harvest rate management, seasons, and harvest tags. The fruits of the discussion ended up being the following, which will be taken out to some regional meetings in each South Atlantic state, and these are: exploring options for harvest rate management of key snapper grouper species; use of harvest tags for certain deepwater species to collect information on anglers targeting these species and options to track recreational harvest of these species; input on information that would be needed to explore seasons; latitudinal management to incorporate regional differences in seasonality, key species, angler preferences, and recreational effort; electronic recreational reporting, specifically how to improve acceptance and willingness to participate; registration or a recreational stamp for federal reef fish to get information on who is participating each year, which could also lead to voluntary or selective recreational reporting; release mortality reduction with best practices, descending devices, and so forth.

The plan is to conduct these meetings in the remainder of the calendar year, and then a more detailed report on the results of those meetings will be brought back to the council at its March meeting for consideration, optimally being to allow the council and the Snapper Grouper Committee to focus on approaches that are both feasible and would address some of these issues in the private recreational sector. You have a more detailed report in the briefing book. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Spud. We're going to go ahead and break for lunch, and we will come back and do the SOPPs and the Executive Finance Committee reports, and let's try to make it back here at 1:15.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: We are going to go through the SOPPs Committee report, and I'm going to turn it over to Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Standard Operating Practices and Procedures Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council met in Salon D at the Town & Country Inn in Charleston, South Carolina, on October 1, 2018, in the Year of our Lord. The committee approved the minutes from the March 2018 meeting and the agenda.

Gregg Waugh gave a brief review of the SOPPs versus the handbook. The handbook is a council document that we can update as needed. The SOPPs reflect the basic legal requirements that govern the council's operations. The committee reviewed the handbook and made changes and

directed staff to develop some additional wording. The revised handbook includes all the changes and requested draft wording. There were also no motions. I am going to turn it over to Gregg to go over the handbook.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I will do is just point out those areas where we made changes, and then the idea is, if anybody has any questions as we go along, we will deal with them and get verbal approval of those changes, and, in the end, deal with one motion to approve the revised handbook, and this still shows all the changes, so you can follow along.

Here is the first potential change, and it's just rewording some of the -- It doesn't change the intent or anything, but it's just rewording the explanation of temporary appointments, and so it would read: Employees appointed by the Executive Director to a position for a limited term, not to exceed one year, unless the grant funding period is longer, in which case the period of time would be tied to the grant or funding. Employees in this classification may receive some benefits, as selected by the Executive Director. However, they have no grounds for appeal upon termination. Any concerns about including that language? Okay.

Then clarifying permanent and part-time appointments, and that would refer to employees appointed by the Executive Director to permanent and part-time positions on a continuing basis for as much as half-time. Employees receiving such appointments may receive some benefits, as selected by the Executive Director. I am not seeing any concerns there.

We were directed to develop some wording to deal with -- When we hire employees, they're on a one-year probationary period, and so how do we handle their reviews at the end of that period, and so we'll add, under Performance Review, wording that states that new employees would receive an interim review at the end of their one-year probationary period. After receiving the interim review, new employees would fall under the annual performance review. Any questions or concerns? Okay.

Under Salary Additives, we were asked to come up with some wording to address how that cap is addressed each year, and so the proposal is to say the total amount of merit increase and cash awards is set annually by the council as a part of approving the annual budget. The 2018 budget allows for a 2 percent cap, based upon the total salary line item, including the new cost of living, if one is authorized by the Office of Personnel Management.

What we do is take the new salary, and so that was done for 2018. For 2019, we would do the same thing. Once we have our salary, once we know if there is a COLA -- Right now, there is no plans for a COLA. If there were one, we would add that in and look at the total of the salary, and then that percentage, whatever percentage you all agree to for 2019, would apply to the new salary after we add in the COLA. The council will review this cap each year during the budget development process, and so that gives you all the input and guidance to where you decide each year what that cap is going to be. Any questions? Okay.

These other changes, the committee looked through those and gave us guidance on, and so I'm just hitting the ones that we had questions about, and so, when we're looking at types of leave, in terms of sick leave, we were asked to clarify how years of full-time employees -- It refers to the above rate, and so we are proposing that this would read: Years of full-time employees where the

employee is sixty-five years of age or greater at the time of death will be paid for unused sick leave at the above rate.

What that means is up to 1,200 hours for those with greater than 800 hours as of June 11, 2018, unless their balance drops below 800 hours, when their limit would remain up to 800 hours, which is the same limit for all other employees. Then, years of employees where the employee is younger than sixty-five years of age, provide a payment equal to two years of life insurance, which is a larger benefit than unused sick leave. It's just tracking and reflecting the wording that's up here regarding sick leave and clarifying that. Any questions?

Jessica found a spot where we were to go through and change where it was Council Chair and Vice Chair to make committee appointments, and there was one spot I missed the in consultation with the Vice Chair, and so we've corrected that.

Then, in terms of the describing the function of the Executive Finance Committee, we have suggested wording to clarify how the council considers personnel-related costs each year in developing the budget, and so it reads: While reviewing and approving the council budget each year, should adjustments be necessary to personnel-related costs, up or down, the Executive Finance Committee will direct the Personnel Committee to review personnel-related costs, including the council staff benefits package, and to develop recommendations for council consideration. That just clarifies and makes very clear something that the Executive Finance Committee has the authority to do and has been doing, in terms of amounts.

MR. HAYMANS: We approved yesterday -- How does that jive with the two-year review that the Personnel Committee looked at yesterday?

MR. WAUGH: What we did for the Personnel Committee is saying that they're responsible for overseeing the administration of the council employment practices and reviews the council staff's benefits at least every two years, and so it doesn't change that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let me try to clarify. To me, I felt like that the way that the staff package would be looked at would be probably twofold. One is during the regular review, which is the sentences that you were talking about, where we removed the 2020 language and just said that they will do this overall regular review. The other way that we talked about would be if the Executive Finance Committee looks at the budget and says something like we want to cut X amount so we can spend this amount on something else, and then the Executive Finance Committee, like what happened when Charlie was the Chair, might direct the Personnel Committee to go in there and look at the items, so that particular reductions could be made to achieve a certain amount of reduction, and so twofold. They are both in there now.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay. Or, in the opposite, if the budget is good and we want to up the 2 percent, we could do that in an off-two-year review from the Executive Finance Committee directing Personnel to look at that as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that's what that blue language now means, that you could go in either direction, but it's saying that, in addition to whatever this regular cycle that you get on is, Executive Finance could go direct the Personnel Committee to go look at that package, based on budget issues.

MR. WAUGH: Any other questions? Under Travel Policy, Jessica pointed out that our newly-developed policy for council members wasn't in here for travel, and so we put that in, and this is how we've been operating all year. Council members, and it addresses AP travel and SSC meeting and Council Chair and Vice Chair travel, and it's just trying to keep the total council member attendance at any meeting normally at four or fewer. Any questions or comments?

This is in the SSC appendix, and it deals with when vacancies occur on the SSC due to resignation or council action removing a member. It's just to clarify how state agency representatives are appointed and a new Item 5 for additional clarity. 1 is revised to say that vacancies will be considered at the next scheduled meeting, and Number 2 says vacancies of state-agency-designated seats will be filled by a representative of that agency. The person identified by the agency will be reviewed and approved at the next scheduled council meeting. 3 is vacancies of designated expertise seats, sociologists or economists, will be filled from the pool of applicants by an applicant with similar experience. 4 is not changed, and vacancies of other seats will be filled from the pool of applicants on-hand at the time that the vacancy occurs. Then the new 5 is, if the council determines that no acceptable candidate is available in the pool to fill the vacancy, the vacancy may be left open until a future meeting, when additional applications can be solicited and reviewed. Any questions or comments? Again, this is for the SSC. Okay. For the AP, I don't think we had any changes in the AP. That's it.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks, Gregg. We have a motion up on the screen, and would anybody on the council like to make that motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: **So moved.**

MR. CONKLIN: Motion by Jessica and seconded by Doug. Can you please read it into the record, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure. **The motion is to approve the handbook, as revised.**

MR. CONKLIN: It was seconded by Doug. **Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

Now I'm looking for a timing and tasks motion. I have one here. Will somebody make that? Somebody needs to make the timing and tasks motion that's in the committee report. Can I get a volunteer?

MR. HAYMANS: **Mr. Chairman, I would move to adopt the following timing and tasks: work with NOAA GC to clarify how state representatives can participate on interdisciplinary plan development teams as outlined in the handbook; revise the handbook based on the approved changes; work with NOAA GC to determine whether any changes to the handbook require any changes to the SOPPs, and, if so, have ready for the committee in December 2018.**

MR. CONKLIN: Can I get a second? It's seconded by Jessica. Thank you. **Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** Madam Chair, that concludes my report. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I also wanted to thank Gregg and Mike for all the work that they did on the handbook. I know that took considerable effort to get through that and to compare that with the Gulf handbook, and so I wanted to say thanks for doing all that work on that.

I think, while we're getting the next committee report up, I think we're going to go ahead and do the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award. If our Law Enforcement Officer of the Year could come forward, Private First Class Randy Hering, and if you will come to the front, please. I am going to read a couple of things first, and you'll have to stand up here uncomfortably while I read these things.

When people talk about Officer Hering and his work enforcing federal fishery regulations, they use words like "dedicated" and "can always count on him" and "go-to guy" and "subject-matter expert" and "right-hand man". He is a highly motivated and intelligent and energetic individual who willingly works enforcing cases even on his days off. He goes out of his way to keep current on federal fisheries regulations and issues, and he has been instrumental in training new conservation officers in federal fisheries enforcement.

He treats everyone that he encounters with respect, and so here's some of his stats, just from last year. He issued fifty-nine enforcement action reports and conducted 183 JEA hours. He made eleven federal fisheries cases and assisted in thirteen federal fishery cases and issued twenty-three warnings.

Most recently though, he's been working with his fellow South Carolina Department of Natural Resources law enforcement officers, working long hours helping residents both prepare for Hurricane Florence and then, after the hurricane, continue to deal with extensive flooding. He consistently goes above and beyond the normal call of duty to enforce federal fisheries regulations, exemplifying his passion for the job, and so he is our 2018 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year. *(Applause)*

I think we have our final committee report for the day, the Executive Finance Committee Report. The Executive Finance Committee met this week, and we approved the minutes of the June 2018 meeting and the agenda. We spent a lot of time talking about the Magnuson Act reauthorization, including working on the CCC working paper, and we talked about the Wicker bill, and we talked about Senate Bill 1520, and we talked about H.R. 200.

While we were talking about the CCC working paper, Monica talked to us about the recent aquaculture lawsuit and the ruling that came out of the District Court in Louisiana as well as the District Court ruling that came out of Hawaii. Her advice to the committee was to hold off on any work on the aquaculture FMP until NOAA decides how to proceed and additional action by Congress following this lawsuit.

We then looked at the 2018 budget, and I'm going to get to the motions at the end, but, ultimately, we made a motion to approve the budget. We also looked at the council priorities and the tiering, and the list of those items for both the December meeting and the March meeting that we've worked on so far are indicated in the document. The ones with the asterisks by them are the ones that we are suggesting would be final at the December council meeting.

We talked a little bit about regulatory reform, and then we also talked about the items that National Marine Fisheries Service would possibly be asking the council to provide comments on. We then talked about the Law Enforcement AP meeting schedule and discussed some items under Other Business, including the timing of the review for health insurance, the Large Whale Take Reduction Team, and the SSC representative. I am going to go over the motions that the committee made.

The first motion was approve the 2018 general funding budget. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next motion the committee made was to approve the 2018 SEDAR funding budget. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The third motion was to appoint Charlie Phillips as the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council representative to the Large Whale Take Reduction Team, with the intent to cover travel costs, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee also made a motion to appoint Steve Poland as the SSC representative, and, on behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Then we have a lengthy timing and tasks motion, and is there somebody that is willing to make our timing and tasks motion?

MR. BELL: I would so move. Move to adopt the following timing and tasks: directed staff to prepare draft comments on the MSA Reauthorization bills to have ready if we are asked to comment; 2)directed staff to prepare draft comments on the Wicker Aquaculture Bill to have ready if we are asked to comment; 3)directed staff to prepare draft language to modify the South Atlantic Council Regional Perspective on Cooperative Research in the CCC Working Paper; 4)modify the draft 2018 agendas for the September meeting and include the recommendations from the Personnel Committee and address the major recommendations for the committee's consideration; 5)directed staff to work on the following items for the September 2018 meeting: December; Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 30, red grouper rebuilding; Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 26, recreational visioning; Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 42, sea turtle release gear/snapper grouper framework modifications; allocation review trigger plan; Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 32, yellowtail AMs; recreational AM amendment; 6)directed staff to work on the following items to be included on the September 2018 agenda: wreckfish ITQ review; Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29, best fishing practices and powerheads; Coral Amendment 10 and other amendments and the golden crab allowable fishing zones, Oculina, transit provisions and VMS for golden crab vessels, ABC control rule; 7)requested staff to schedule the closed Personnel Committee meeting on Thursday of the December meeting. Topics will be the annual Executive Director's Review. Then others, and I guess that was for us.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is there a second to that motion?

MR. CONKLIN: I will second that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chris.

MR. WAUGH: **Just a couple of corrections. The Number 6 should say “March”. Actually, start with Number 5. That should say for the December 2018 meeting. Then Number 6 should say for March of 2019. Then just the Number 7 should add medical, and that was the other.** That’s my mistake.

MR. BELL: **As modified there.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, what he said. Thank you for that clarification. Any discussion of this timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to the timing and tasks motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

We are going to come back to our MRIP presentation, and so we’re going to first do Council Staff Reports, and we have a number of reports. Gregg is going to give an ED Report, and Kelsey is going to give a MyFishCount update, and Kathleen is going to give an update on our for-hire reporting outreach. Amber will talk about citizen science, and Kim is going to talk about our transition to electronic newsletters, and Cameron will give a brief update on the efforts to document the recent hurricane impacts. Gregg, we’re going to start with you.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. This is included as Attachment 1 in the Full Council. I will just touch on a couple of items, and we’ve covered a lot of the things in here. Our audit was completed with only good things said, and that is how our audits generally go. We’ve got a great team that do a great job, and so thanks and congratulations to Mike Collins, Cindy Chaya, Kimberly Cole, and Suzanna Thomas.

We’ve got four new members, and they’ve been participating, and we will have an additional. We conducted their orientation, and they all got passing grades, and so we’re in good shape. We will have a new council member from the State of South Carolina for our December meeting, and then, finally, as you know, Mike is retiring at the end of the year, and we’ve hired Kelly Klasnick. I think some of you had a chance to meet him Sunday here, and then he was out at hospitality on Monday night, but he will be starting on October 15, and so you will see him at meetings from then forward, and that’s it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Gregg. Now do we want to move into our MyFishCount update? What document is this that you guys are looking at?

MR. WAUGH: It’s probably Attachment 2, I think.

MS. DICK: Yes, we have 2a and 2b there under 10a. They are there just for reference, but I will be talking about them. We just wanted to give you guys a brief update on the recreational reporting pilot project that we’ve been working on called MyFishCount. At the last June meeting, we presented a demo video demonstration of the app, and, for the new council members, at the new council member orientation, we went through the app with them as well and made sure that everybody is up-to-speed and has access to all of the documents and information about the project.

Since June, when we first released the app to the public, we also started advertising the app for the red snapper season, and the app is now available to allow anglers to report multiple species in addition to red snapper, but we're trying to pair it with the opening of different recreational seasons, to get interest and to get people to use the app.

The two reports that are under Tab 10 are reports that we sent out after the first and second weekend of the red snapper season, and these, again, had very high click rates, in terms when we sent these out. A lot of people opened and we think were interested in these, and so this is some of the information that we reported. We included information about other species in addition to red snapper, and so you guys can look through those.

In addition to promoting it during the red snapper season, we also attended ICAST, and we received a lot of support and interest from the recreational fishing industry, and then we also presented at AFS and received a lot of interest and support from the academic community as well, and so those are both very positive events.

In terms of what we have next, we are going to be hosting a series of webinars in order to give anglers a chance to ask questions and train them on the app and show them different features that we have of the app and receive some of their feedback in order to continue improving it. We are also developing a Shiny app, which Chip has been working on, which will allow anglers to access certain information of the reported information, and we are also working with West Marine, where we are hosting local fishing seminars about recreational reporting and why people should use the app and how to use the app.

Finally, a few months ago -- We have been working with a graduate student from UNC and sending out a survey and trying to understand different perceptions and opinions of recreational reporting and the app, and we are about to send out -- She is about to send out another survey here soon, and hopefully we'll have a brief report for you guys in December about some of the feedback that she's been getting from that survey, and so that's all I have, and I would be happy to take any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Excellent update.

MR. CONKLIN: How many trips were reported between June and now?

MS. DICK: I don't have June and now, but, from November -- You will keep in mind that, in November, we released the web portal for people to report, and then, in June, we also had the web portal and the app for people to report, and I just looked before I came up here, and, right now, we have 795 users and 876 trips and over 2,000 logs.

Just to keep in mind that, on the app, people can report in individual or vessel mode, and so it's actually -- When you go through the data more, it's actually more trips than those that I just reported, because people are reporting for multiple anglers on their vessel. Does that make sense?

MR. CONKLIN: Sure. The only other thing is, when I was using the app, the time away from the dock, I didn't know if that meant what time did we leave or how long were we gone, just for you. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are there more questions?

MR. WAUGH: We're eagerly awaiting word on getting additional FIS, Fishery Information System, funding to continue this work. Our hope is that they're going to fund another year of this work, and we'll work very closely with the MRIP folks to incorporate their input.

We are also working with ACCSP to get some consistency along the Atlantic seaboard. I think you're starting to see some of the issues having to do with incorporating different types of programs in the Gulf, and I think we have an opportunity along the Atlantic to develop a common set of data elements and standards, such that, if a state or someone else is interested in implementing some private recreational reporting, then there is some guidance to them and some consistency, so that the data can go to ACCSP and just have a more consistent approach, and so we're hoping to hear any day now that we're getting that additional funding.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's great to hear.

MR. HAYMANS: Remind me of where is the data being housed.

MS. DICK: Right now, we're currently housing it, but we're working with ACCSP to develop an API, and so, right now, the developers that we work with, Elemental Methods, ourselves, and ACCSP are mapping and matching the data, to make sure that we can house it properly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions? All right. This is excellent news. Thank you. I think next up is Kathleen.

MS. HOWINGTON: Hello, everyone. This is just an update on the electronic reporting outreach project that has been happening, mostly between March and August. On the for-hire training toolkit, we have been in talks with our web developers on creating the forum, and we've created a basic design and gotten an estimate on that, and so we're still in the planning stages, but we're hoping to be able to move forward with that.

The website, we put up links for the NOA and the proposed rule, and I did a mass email to all the charter captains that have contacted me at all about doing public comment on that, and then the schedule has been constantly updated, and so the website is basically changing every couple of weeks. As for our apps, we have been continuing ongoing eTRIPS development, and I believe I have shown the majority of you what eTRIPS looks like. It has upgraded itself, and we're still hoping to move to our mobile app as of January. The app developers are still on schedule for that.

The law enforcement compliance app has been shown to the Law Enforcement AP, and it is on my phone, and so I'm able to actually give some feedback on that. It's relatively simple. It's just a blank page, and you put in either a permit number or a vessel ID, and then it pops up that here's when the last report was, positive or negative, and that's it. It's very straightforward, and it's very easy to use.

Then, due to some pretty consistent feedback we've been getting, I've also been developing two permit graphics, and I've been working with Chip on developing an app. The first permit graphic is a graphic that explains what permits you have, and then, in relation to that, what region those permits apply to and then what office those permits belong to.

The second one is specifically for electronic reporting and what permits you have and what region you need to report to, and then the app actually is something that we're hoping that fishermen will be able to use. They can go on and say that I catch these species, and you will pop up that, well, if you catch these species, these are the permits you need, and this is the office you get it from, and so we're working on those, and I'm hopeful that that will help with helping fishermen understand exactly what they need.

As for the in-person trainings, since March, I have gone back -- The council has gone back to South Carolina, and we had twenty-five participants from Murrells Inlet, Charleston, and Hilton Head. In Georgia, in April, we had four participants in Brunswick and Savannah. Then, during the Florida council meeting, there actually was an after-council-meeting that occurred in Fort Lauderdale, and there was five participants, and they actually gave us some very good feedback on what to do with the Keys.

The south Florida trainings you see here had to be rescheduled, due to the hurricane, and so those actually -- If you have been noticing, I have been running in and out, and that's because I am rescheduling it today, and so we will be going to Key West, Marathon, Islamorada, and Miami in the near future. The moment that those dates are put in stone, the website will be updated, and you will, of course, be getting an email saying that, hey, the mailing has gone out.

We were, however, able to conduct a radio show with Bill, and so we were able to get on the radio and get on the Coconut Telegraph to tell fishermen what's going on. I got a lot of calls afterward, and so I think that was a really good way of getting the word out, and then we will be going to mid-Florida October 15 through 18, Port Canaveral, Sebastian, Fort Pierce, and Jupiter. We already have five people RSVP'ing, and then I have a soft, yes, I'm coming from a few other captains that have just called me, and so I think we're going to be getting some good numbers from these.

As for the webinars, nine were offered in between March 12 and September 5. Since then, two more had to be canceled, due to the hurricane, and we had twenty-eight registrants total, and then future dates, of course, have been updated on the website, and so I'm still conducting webinars twice monthly, and I've only had to cancel a few, due to lack of registrants, and so that's been really good.

As for webinars for law enforcement, currently, I am waiting on the final rule. I have had talks with law enforcement about exactly what kind of outreach they would want with that, and I'm going to create a video for them to be able to watch whenever they want, and then I will also schedule webinars for law enforcement to be able to watch and have the Q&A with me, as well as I've gotten some feedback from certain states that they want me to try and go in-person, and so I'm going to do my best to make that happen.

Also as an update, NMFS has provided funding for some additional trainings, and these are NMFS informational sessions, and so, unlike the council trainings, where I'm going out and I have the tablets and I am able to show eTRIPS, this is just going to be information on the amendment itself. We're scheduling five pre-implementation, and we're hoping for October and November, and then five post-implementation, and those dates are still to be determined. There will also be five webinars, most likely two pre-implementation and three post.

Some future goals, like I said, I am currently scheduling the south Florida trainings, and so those should be on the books very soon. I am also hoping to be able to go back to North Carolina for at least four trainings in-person, and I'm hoping for during the council meeting in North Carolina, but I need to send out an email, and so don't be quoting me on that.

Like I said, we're going to be doing the post-implementation NMFS informational sessions, five webinars and five in-person, and then, of course, I'm hoping, for the law enforcement, to be able to do the webinars, the video, and the in-person trainings, as needed, but, like I said, I'm still waiting on the final rule with that. That's basically the update on my project. Do you have any questions?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Kathleen. Any questions for Kathleen? I can't remember when the grant runs through. Is it through sometime middle of 2019?

MS. HOWINGTON: I got hired on June 17, and so I think, technically, next June 16 is the end of the grant.

MR. BELL: So you're kind of getting positive -- A sense of that this is a cool thing?

MS. HOWINGTON: Depending on where we go and who I talk to, yes and no. I have been getting good feedback from fishermen that I think that they appreciate the fact that the council is taking the step to send people and to inform them of what's going on. A lot of fishermen don't necessarily like certain details about the amendment, but I'm getting some good feedback of this is great and we need better data. Once I can kind of sit down with a lot of these guys and explain to them that better data is better management, that's a really great selling point, and they understand that they're the best eyes out on the water, and so, once I get them to understand that, then more positive, but, at the beginning, they're still a little hesitant.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions for Kathleen?

MR. POLAND: Just refresh me. You have already done some in North Carolina, correct?

MS. HOWINGTON: Yes, I've done two sets of trainings in South Carolina, two sets of trainings in Georgia, one set in northern Florida, and then one set of trainings in North Carolina.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Just reach out to me, as far as scheduling those in December, and I --

MS. HOWINGTON: You will be receiving an email from me in a few weeks. Since the south Florida trainings had to be rescheduled, I'm a little bit behind on everything, but don't worry. You're going to be hearing from me very soon.

MR. POLAND: All right. Awesome. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions for Kathleen? Great presentation, and I love those pictures in there. Thank you for all your work, Kathleen. Next up, we have Amber on Citizen Science.

MS. VON HARTEN: Good afternoon, everyone. I am just going to give you a brief update about what we've been working on, since we didn't have a committee meeting this meeting, what we've been working on since June and a little preview of what you're going to be hearing from me in December, when we will have a committee meeting.

If you recall, at the June meeting, you all appointed our Citizen Science Operations Committee, which is the group that was tasked with helping us draft our SOPPs for the program, and so they did meet back in August. Again, the membership of that committee are the five A-Team members represented from each of the A-Teams. Someone from the Science Center, Rick DeVictor, came. I'm sorry. Erik Williams was the Science Center, and Rick DeVictor came from the Regional Office, and then also someone from the SSC. Unfortunately, Marcel was not able to attend. Then we also had Rick Bonney and Jennifer Shirk, our citizen science experts from Cornell and the Citizen Science Association join us, and that was really helpful to have them there for the discussions.

The goal for the meeting was to draft the SOPPs and also to talk a little bit further about the proposed organizational infrastructure for the program and transitioning these Action Teams, now that the work is slowly wrapping up.

Just a brief preview to what's in the SOPPs, we kind of structured the SOPPs based on these six items that you see here, and we did take a look at the original vision and mission and goals that we had set out to outline in the blueprint that we developed after the 2016 workshop, and we spent a good bit of time revising those. Again, we also talked about the program administration and oversight, to kind of further define the roles and responsibilities and membership and terms of each of those different groups.

They are proposing adding a program oversight board that would be a group of higher-level scientific and operational types of advisors, to help advise the program and make recommendations to the Citizen Science Committee at the council. We have a section there about program components, and these are the different aspects of the program or processes that were developed by the A-Teams, everything from how we do our research prioritization process and some other programs to provide project endorsement by the program and all the different aspects of the program, including outreach, volunteer engagement, and data management.

Then Section 4 is going to be talking about how the program will provide project support and recommending best practices under each of those areas, and so a lot of this is going to be referencing templates and inventories and source documents that the A-Teams developed on each of those different components. Then we have a little section about program evaluation and how we hope to do an annual kind of progress summary report for you all to highlight the progress of the program throughout the year and recognize our volunteers as well, and we'll be working with Rick Bonney on developing those methods, moving forward.

Then the appendices is going to be -- Right now, it's hosting on a Google Drive, but it's going to be all of the templates and resources that the A-Teams have developed, and that will be hosted on our website, once those documents are finalized, and we did -- The timeline of this is for the draft SOPPs to be circulated to the A-Teams, which has been done, and do all these A-Team webinars, which we did. Our last one was yesterday, and it was the fifty-fourth webinar since last August, with the Communications A-Team, and that's probably going to be our final A-Team webinar, and

we do plan to have a plenary with them, with all the members of the A-Teams, in December and January, to kind of wrap things up and finalize some of their work.

In October, the Snapper Grouper AP will get an update, and also they're going to have a chance to hopefully kind of alpha test our scamp app, which I will talk to you about in a minute, and then this will all come to you in December, at our Citizen Science Committee meeting.

I wanted to kind of just give you a quick little preview of the scamp app, recognizing that, again, this is even pre-alpha testing, and so bear that in mind, and, actually, this -- The app has actually changed even since I did this recording, but this is a video of kind of what the app will look like. Again, we're working with Harbor Lights to develop this app, using their expertise in developing eTRIPS. They kind of have designed it in a similar fashion, in terms of layout and colors.

You would enter a release entry by either starting with taking a picture, manually entering, or we also have this X here, which will be for no discards, or no discards were encountered, and then you establish your trip type, the date, the time of release, and then you can also record the length of the fish. Again, remember that's what we're really focusing on for this project, is just a couple of very simple data elements to collect that isn't too overwhelming, recognizing that this is going to be reaching commercial and private anglers as well as charter fishermen.

We'll have little pop-ups to remind them of how we want them to measure fish, and then there is some optional data elements that we will be asking for, because we're just trying to figure out how much information is too much and what anglers are willing to report. They can also put their location, using a map, or you can put your pin where you are fishing. You will also be able to manually enter your coordinates, if that's easier for you.

Then these are some of the optional elements afterwards, and we also are asking for depth that they caught the fish, and so we are asking for hook location, hook type, and then condition on release, and it's just a list of different things that they could select, any or all. Then they would hit the "upload" button, and then they could go back and add a picture if they wanted to at a later date from their photo gallery on the phone, and then they will be able to look at those entries, but, once they're uploaded, they can't edit them. This will list -- A lot of these APIs are still being developed, and we are also working with ACCSP to develop all of this.

Harbor Lights has worked with them for a long, long time, and has a great working relationship with them, and we've been having great conversations about how citizen science data may be a little bit different and adapting some of their data records to match what we are going to be collecting. This is how you can add a picture. This is me taking a picture of a scamp, and then, when you go back and access your record, the picture will show up, so you know that you have submitted it.

Again, some stuff has already changed. Our app developer just released a new update on Monday, but definitely, if you tune into the Snapper Grouper AP, you will see some new changes that we hope to be able to sit down with those guys and have tablets and have them actually play with it some, so they can give some more feedback.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Lots of hands.

MR. HAYMANS: Can you embed this into MyFishCount, so that there's not multiple apps out, but we're pushing MyFishCount, and, if you want to participate in the scamp citizen science pilot, you can go through MyFishCount to get there, which may also lead someone to help report everything else they've got besides scamp?

MS. VON HARTEN: I am looking to Chip, because I don't really know the answer to that. I mean, it's definitely something that we've already been in discussions with ACCSP and Harbor Lights, in terms of the for-hire sector. If the for-hire sector is going to be using eTRIPS, being able to have a module that they can select to participate in a citizen science project like this to report their discards and not have to report it twice.

We're also setting it up so that when they create user accounts that they have to provide certain information that will help us weed that out, so that we know this person reported under the scamp app, and they may have reported under their mandatory reporting requirements, so there is not duplicative data.

MR. HAYMANS: That was my second part of that. So, if the for-hire is getting to mandatory, most all of the elements that are being asked here are required to the for-hire, and whether it would be possible -- I mean, rather than asking them to participate as citizen scientists, they've got to report it, right, but maybe the additional data elements would be the picture. I mean, what else is there that --

MS. VON HARTEN: I don't think that length is going to be one of the required -- John is coming to the table, and I will let him explain.

MR. CARMICHAEL: One of the biggest reasons this is done different is that this is an entirely different direction and purpose than MyFishCount. MyFishCount is really intended toward monitoring catch levels and getting an estimate of the catch, ultimately, and that's where we want to go and certainly get more information.

The citizen science, and the scamp in particular, is directed at all sectors, and it's not in any way intended to give an estimate of discards. It is solely to get the size information on the discards and more details about the discards that can be used in the assessment, so that the discards are handled more accurately through the assessment, and so that's one of the reasons why it's going to be standing alone, but, as Amber said, by virtue of this going into ACCSP, they have certain standards. We want to be able to have a link to this into people who report a scamp, and then try to encourage them to give us this other information, if they can, and they see that as being something that they would fold into even for other species, as this starts to expand.

MR. HAYMANS: A follow-up, and then I will be done. So you see where I'm going with this, is we're going to wind up with -- We already have multiple apps, and it seems to me that, if we can narrow it to one app that is the portal for everything, you're a member of or a participant in MyFishCount, and, oh by the way, here's an opportunity to provide us with additional information on this particular species, and it all goes through the one app, rather than having -- I was just looking at my phone, and I've got the SAFMC app, which no longer works, and I've got the MyFishRules app, or the Fish Rules app, and I've got the MyFishCount app, and I've got -- Then I've actually got the Snook Foundation app, and we're going to be all over the place with them. Not that I disagree with the different, but maybe one portal to get to them.

MR. CARMICHAEL: One thing that's probably encouraging then to that is that, at ACCSP, there is a desire to have a more coordinated approach and to have one basic system that, if you went into it, it would, because of your log-in, and it would have access to the permits that you have that are active at that point in time, it could automatically adapt the questions that you get and the data that you're asked to receive based on the permits that you have and what you're reporting, and that's where they're trying to go with it, and so that would solve a lot of the commercial versus for-hire versus even, ultimately, someday, private, perhaps, type of things could all be handled in there, and so that is where the long-term direction is going.

What we're hoping is that, from the citizen science front, that when we have projects like this, and the scamp is really intended for a short-term, to really try to encourage people to get this going into this assessment. When we have kind of intensive things like this, where we're asking for more details, linking it with that system could trigger people. Today, it's scamp. Maybe, in a couple of years, it's red grouper, and they would say, oh, you reported some red grouper and can you give us some details on those fish, knowing that a lot of people aren't necessarily going to give you a lot of details day in and day out of every fish they catch.

We expect the citizen science to maybe go in lots of different directions, and so we're kind of viewing this as like a modular approach, where you could get this link out to something like this when you say, hey, I just caught a scamp and reported it, maybe on your phone with real-time catch reporting, and it could say, oh, by the way, collect this other information and link it all in, and then, if someone doesn't have to do any of this other reporting, maybe this is all that they really need. That's sort of, from the ACCSP perspective, and even talking to folks within the agency and stuff, everybody wants to kind of get to this one comprehensive thing, because they recognize all these different apps out there are really stacking up.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Amber, sorry if you already said this, but does someone have to establish an account in order to report, or can they just report anonymously or whatever without doing an account, and I'm not sure whether an account doesn't make them anonymous or whatever.

MS. VON HARTEN: They do have to create an account, and all of that is being managed through ACCSP's existing infrastructure. Ideally, what we're hoping is that, once the for-hire electronic reporting is in place, those captains can use their same log-in information, because it's linked to their same databases, and so they won't have to create a brand-new account at all, and keep in mind that this -- Like I said, this is targeting all sectors and not just recreational private anglers, but for-hire and commercial, and correct me if I'm wrong, Erik, but I know we've had the discussion about that these data are not being collected by any other program, in terms of length data on discards, except for a few observer programs, and so that's another way that we're not as concerned about duplicative data.

MR. BELL: To Doug's concern, and I understand that, I think we're at the phase now where we're sort of in the R&D phase, and there's a lot of innovation and a lot of companies and people trying different things, but, over time, that will -- You already have, on the receiving end of the data, you sort of have ACCSP as ultimately the data warehouse, if you will, but there is different things going on right now, new initiatives and all, and over time -- You don't want to stovepipe everything too early and stifle innovation and competition and that sort of thing, and so, I mean, that's just

where we are right now, but, yes, you don't -- Eventually, I think it will come down to some more simplified process.

DR. FRAZER: I just wanted to know if the account -- When you register it, is it linked to a vessel number?

MS. VON HARTEN: We're still working out those details. As you're aware, our for-hire permits don't have numbers, and so we're trying to figure out ways that we can use a common field, whether it's vessel name, vessel number, Coast Guard number, to be able to establish those accounts.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions for Amber?

MS. VON HARTEN: Just a couple more things. I was also with Kelsey at AFS, and we were in the same symposium, and we presented about the program and how reporting, electronic reporting, is a little different than citizen science, and we kind of set the stage for that discussion, and we are continuing to develop more partnerships, both fiscal partnerships as well as partnerships with some regional organizations, to build some projects, based on our research priorities.

We're also awaiting news on FIS funding for a project that will address our research priority on using historic fishing photos, and hopefully we'll hear from that soon, like Gregg said, and then we just found out that the Citizen Science Association conference is happening next year in Raleigh, and we submitted a symposium track, and it got accepted, and so we'll be working on that in the spring, pulling that together, and so that's it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All exciting stuff, and it sounds like you've done a record number of webinars lately. That was impressive.

MS. VON HARTEN: I was doodle-pollled to death.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Unbelievably, frankly. Thank you for that report, and I think we have Kim next up on our electronic newsletters.

MS. IVERSON: Thank you, and, just for the record, Amber was diligent in doing Federal Register notices for all of those webinars.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Wow, is what I would say to that.

MS. IVERSON: I have a very short brief on the progress we're making with the electronic newsletter. If you remember, and some of our new council members, you probably received some hard copies of our newsletters in the past. We printed quarterly newsletters, and we sent out about 5,000 copies, and, in an effort to cut back on some of our budget costs and printing costs and also to allow some additional flexibility in producing our newsletter and not restrict any amount of content that was available, and it's given us the ability to link to other sources of information and utilize our website, we making a transition to an electronic newsletter.

The last issue of the newsletter was the first time we have not printed it, and we heard back -- I put an insert, or a form, in the last printed version, in the spring issue of the newsletter, that people

could let us know whether they wanted to continue to receive hard copies, and we heard from eleven people that took the time to send in the form, and so, if those folks do want the hard copies, we decided it may be advantageous to print, in-house, eleven copies and send those out to those individuals that want to continue to receive those.

Meanwhile, we are moving forward to have an electronic version of the newsletter, and the next issue will be the PDF format that you are used to seeing. It is sent out via Constant Contact and then posted on our website, so you can access that. The council's Information & Education Advisory Panel is scheduled to meet in January, I believe the end of January, and we will be putting some options out to them for them to review, as far as formatting is concerned, whether we use like a blog posting or some other form of electronic online newsletter format, and so we will get input from that, and Cameron and I both will have some additional updates for you at the March meeting.

Meanwhile, again, I encourage you, if you have a format or you see something that you like, please forward it to me and let me know and say, hey, I like the way this looks. I am compiling a folder of those different various formats right now and looking at options for us to use, but, again, I really think it will allow for more flexibility for us to utilize social media, and for us to link to our YouTube videos, and to not be quite so restrictive in the wording that we're currently using in our newsletters, which restrictions sometimes are good, but does anybody have any questions?

MR. BELL: The link feature is a really, really cool plus, because you can get so much more out of that, and that's a good thing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Other questions or comments for Kim? Thanks, Kim. All right. Cameron, I believe you're up on the hurricane.

MS. RHODES: Hello, everybody. I do not have a very lengthy presentation, but I just wanted to give you an update on some of the efforts that we have underway out of the council office. As you likely remember from last year, I gave you a very similar update. This one is not quite as fleshed out as last year, but we are taking the effort to make sure that we contact our membership to try to gather as much information as possible. If we are asked by NOAA Fisheries or other entities for information, anecdotal information, about any damages that may have occurred as a result of Hurricane Florence, we will have some comments that we can refer to.

Much like we did last year, we used the same Wufoo form, which is the same software that we use for our public comment forms, and we generated this form, where we asked a series of questions, and we sent it out to our membership.

One thing that was a little challenging this year was that we know that this storm was particularly targeted, as opposed to Irma, which actually traveled up the entire length of our region, and so we made the decision to send the form out to everybody that is a part of our membership, just to make sure that, if there were any damages or any kind of impacts that may have occurred in the southern region, we would still be able to capture those, and so if there were delays in shipping routes, fish houses had delays, people cancelled their charter trips in Florida because they weren't able to make it, things like that, we wanted to make sure that we could capture all of that information from our membership.

I can send this form around to you if you would like, but just go ahead -- I'm going to scroll through this rather slowly, so you can take a minute and take a look at some of the fields that we're capturing from folks, and, again, I would like to reiterate that we are only sharing this with our membership, and we have not shared this with the public, and so this wasn't distributed via our Constant Contact, and it wasn't distributed on our social media platforms. This was all done in-house.

This is just giving folks an opportunity to weigh-in and let us know what's been going on. I will say that, based on the reports that have been generated from this, and we've only received five at this time, and three of those, I believe, are from Florida, and they reported no impacts, but we did get some folks from North Carolina, one in the New Bern area, and we did get some helpful information about leads, if we wanted to turn and try to collect some more information from folks, but we are planning to keep this open.

We recognize that people are still recovering from the hurricane, and they may not have access to websites, and they might not have internet access. We know that people are still trying to assess the damages on their own home, or to their property, to their businesses, and so we made a decision at the council staff level to go ahead and keep all of this open, and we will likely be delivering a more final report at the December council meeting, structured much the same as it was last year at that time, after Irma. We had a lot more information to share with you, and so, if you would like me to send around this report, I would be happy to do so, so that you can read the information that was provided to us by fishermen that are on our advisory panels, but, other than that, that's pretty much all I have for you today. If you have any questions or suggestions, please let me know.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any questions?

MS. BECKWITH: I just want to see the other four people, because 1 and 2 is the same person.

MR. BELL: Obviously there is probably people, as Steve would know, that are still having issues with power, having electrons floating through wires. I know, after Hugo, we were without power for three weeks in my neighborhood, and so it may take a while to hear from some people, and so I would keep it open.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions? Thanks for the -- Go ahead, Steve.

MR. POLAND: I was just going to say to maybe do a couple of follow-ups, and maybe even six months from now, because it's going to take these guys a long time to kind of really just get an idea of all the damage they have and maybe get time to do this.

MS. RHODES: I think that's definitely what we have in mind, and I wanted to see what your thoughts were as a council, if you're comfortable with us now focusing in on the North Carolina and South Carolina folks, rather than continuing to share this with Florida people, so they're inundated. Are you guys comfortable with us making that executive decision to just hone-in on the two states that we know are most likely impacted?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Definitely.

MS. RHODES: In addition to that, I just wanted to note that the North Carolina Fisheries Association is actively collecting information right now. There have been a number of articles that we've been sharing on our end, on social media, just to draw attention to that, and so there are some other competing platforms that we have been made aware of that folks might be getting inundated already, and so we don't want to create too much white noise over this issue, but we'll be sure to send it out a couple more times, to make sure that people are aware.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions? All right. Thanks, Cameron. We are going to back up to our MRIP presentation that we have on our list, and so, from MRIP, we have Kelly Denit, and she is the Division Chief for Sustainable Stocks and Ecosystems in the Office of Sustainable Fisheries from NOAA Headquarters. Kelly, do we have a copy of this presentation, or will it have to go around after --

MS. DENIT: I think we sent one in advance.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, there is one, and it went out in the late materials. We can also post this one as well.

MS. DENIT: All right. Good afternoon. My name is Kelly Denit, and I'm the Chief of the Domestic Fisheries Division at our Headquarters Office in Silver Spring. I am also the Co-Chair of the Fishing Effort Survey Transition Team with Dave Van Voorhees, and Dave couldn't join us today, and so we've got John Foster joining us through the ether from up in Silver Spring, and John is in charge of our recreational fishing data group up in Silver Spring.

We're going to be talking about the calibrated data that was rolled out over the summer and take a few minutes to go through a little bit of the history of that, and then John will step you through some species-specific results, and then I will wrap things back up on the next steps.

First, just a general reminder that we have two surveys that were used together to come up with our estimates for total catch. The first used to be the Coastal Household Telephone Survey, the CHTS, and it's now transitioned to the Fishing Effort Survey, the FES, to measure effort, and that's giving us the estimate of the number of angler trips, and then we have the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey, the APAIS survey, that are run dockside now by the states. That gives us the estimate of the number of fish caught per trip. That, together, is what allows us to get our estimates for the number of fish caught.

We're going to be covering -- The calibrations that we rolled out this summer covered both changes in APAIS as well as the fishing effort survey, and so I'm going to talk through both of those, and we're going to spend most of the time on the Fishing Effort Survey, because that was the more substantial change, in terms of the impact on the data, and so, just as a quick reminder, the Fishing Effort Survey is a mail-based survey, moving away from using landlines, and I will talk a little bit more about that in the next slide.

It uses the Postal Service database and angler registries to target folks. As a result, we're getting higher, and we believe more accurate, estimates of trips. I want to emphasize that that's focused on the shore mode and private boat modes, in terms of the Fishing Effort Survey changes, and that did not impact for-hire. Then the APAIS changes, these were done a few years ago to improve

our statistical design, in particular to get better time-of-day coverage as part of our sampling on those intercepts.

Specifically, to talk a little bit more about the fishing effort survey, we're reaching more anglers, and this is for a couple of reasons. As you guys likely remember, the CHTS used landlines, and there are very few households these days that still have landlines, and those of us that do, it's only our parents that call us on it, and we have this cool thing called caller-ID, that, if we don't recognize the number, we're generally inclined to not answer it, and so, as you can imagine, we've seen a degradation with the CHTS over time, in part because of that.

In addition, we're getting the survey into the right hands, and so, under the CHTS, whoever answered the phone was the person taking the survey, and that may or may not have been the angler in the household. Now, with a mail-based approach, that survey is actually getting to the folks in the house who are out fishing.

As a result, we're seeing a three-times higher response rate, and so we've gone -- I believe, in the last year, it was like 8 or 9 percent in CHTS, and we're up between 35 and 40 percent response rate under the Fishing Effort Survey, and the last one I really want to hit on under this slide is the more complete answers. You guys know, when you've been on the phone with folks and someone asks you a question, and you feel that awkward silence, and you're trying to answer as quickly as possible, as opposed to when you've got something in front of you and you can look at your phone and you can check your calendar or whatever it is that you use to keep track of things, and so we're getting more complete answers.

Both of these methods have gone through extensive testing and peer review, most recently by the National Academy of Sciences, which indicated that the Fishing Effort Survey method is a major improvement over the previous design, and essentially ditto for APAIS. I'm going to kind of plow through these a little bit, because I don't want to be the one standing between everybody and happy hour.

I do want to spend a little bit of time talking about the transition plan, and we formed a transition team. We knew that moving from this one survey approach to a different one was not something that we could do instantaneously, and we needed to take some time and make sure that we were doing it very thoughtfully. That team is composed of folks from NOAA Fisheries, the states, the councils, including the South Atlantic Council, and thank you, John and Mike, and the commissions.

We have been working, over the last three years -- 2014 to 2017 was that benchmarking period to allow us to compare the mail-based survey with the phone survey, running both concurrently. As a result, we were able to develop calibrations that allow us to convert the historic data to the same currency as the new survey, and then that data is what was made available over the summer, and it's what is starting to be incorporated into stock assessments and management decisions.

I will just quickly touch on the calibration models. If you have detailed questions, of course, John can help answer these. The short version is the Fishing Effort Survey uses the Fay-Herriot small area estimation model. It was developed with independent consultants at Colorado State, and the APAIS is using a sample weight adjustment method that was also developed with consultants from Colorado State.

We have conducted peer reviews on those specific calibrations, and the Fishing Effort Survey peer review was conducted last summer, and the reviewers have unanimously endorsed the proposed model, and, in addition, we, just this spring, did a peer review of the APAIS, and the initial reviews are positive. We don't have the final report for that yet, but it's certainly expected to be just fine.

This is one where we've gotten a lot of questions as part of our rollout of the calibrated data, was how is it going to work in 2018, and so, just as a reminder, all of our annual catch limits for everywhere along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts have been set using the CHTS estimates. This calibration allows us to convert the FES data that we're getting this year into that CHTS currency, so that we can make sure that, at the end of the year, we're comparing catch to ACLs in the same currency and we're not doing apples-to-oranges. With that, I will hand it over to John to talk you through the data specifically.

MR. FOSTER: Thanks for very much, Kelly. As Kelly mentioned, I'm John Foster, and I am the Chief for the Recreational Fisheries Statistics Branch here in Silver Spring at NOAA Fisheries Office of Science and Technology, and I'm going to walk through some slides presenting summary results for both effort and catch for several select species, sort of at an aggregate level, for the South Atlantic region.

Kelly, if you don't mind, these first couple of slides are for the Atlantic coast and Gulf coast, and let's just sort of step through them, and the next two slides are for the South Atlantic region, and so if we can just go ahead and advance through the animations on these two slides.

These two graphs will start with private boat fishing effort, and this is in angler trips, and it gives the total number of angler trips, again in the private boat mode, for each year for the South Atlantic region, and so North Carolina through the east coast of Florida, from 1981 through 2017. The blue series are the new calibrated estimates, and they have been calibrated for both the FES, the new Fishing Effort Survey, as well as the APAIS design changes. The orange, or yellow, series were the original estimates before the calibrations were applied.

We have sort of delineated the time series here into a couple of different sections, and these correspond to sort of the important aspects of the calibration model, and so the model took into effort sort of two basic classes of changes. One was that the overall switch, the effects from the overall switch from one survey to the other, the telephone survey to the mail survey, going from having an interviewer present to not having an interviewer, going from, as Kelly mentioned earlier, getting a cold-call, where someone was expected to come up with information sort of on the fly, versus the mail survey, where the respondents have more time to think about it and check, as Kelly mentioned, whatever they use to keep track of their day-to-day, and so all of those kinds of changes sort of went into kind of an overall set of effects that predicted the differences between the two surveys.

Then, from 2000 forward, there was another important effect in the model that was accounting for the increasing use of wireless phones, where essentially that effect was increasing over time, and so, by 2000, that wireless effect is essentially out of the model, going back in time, and then it continues to ramp up, going forward in time, and becomes a more important -- It contributes more to the overall differences we see in the calibration results.

Because of this, the differences in the estimates generally increase over time, and so, for the earlier part of the time series, differences are a little bit less than two-times an increase, or a doubling, at about 1.9-times increase, but, again, that increases over time to, by the last three years of the series, 2015 through 2017, the differences are closer to three-times, or a tripling, from the uncalibrated estimates to the new calibrated estimates.

That difference of about three-times is right in line with what we saw in terms of the actual estimates from the mail survey versus the telephone survey during the benchmark period that Kelly mentioned, where we conducted the two surveys side-by-side. That is the private boat effort, and now we look at the differences for the South Atlantic shore effort, and here the differences are larger, and so, again, the model for shore effort was set up the same way as it was for private boats, and we see that the differences are larger for shore effort than they were for private boats, but we see the general pattern, where differences in the earlier part of the time series are less than they are in the later years of the time series, and so, overall, there is about a five-times increase that starts at right about five-times in the earlier part of the time series, but increases to more than six-times for the most three years, 2015 through 2017, and, again, that six-times increase is what we saw when the two surveys were conducted side-by-side.

With that, we'll now switch gears to looking at catch estimates, and we will look at both harvest, in terms of numbers of fish, and then we will look also at total catch, which would include harvest and release catch, and so we'll start with black sea bass harvest. Again, these are, for the South Atlantic region, total numbers of fish harvested each year from 1981 through 2017. Here, you can see that the increases are similar to what we saw for the private boat effort changes, but perhaps a little bit larger, and that's because there is a substantial amount of harvest from the shore mode and it's not just limited to private boat mode.

Overall, for the entire time series, we see an increase there of about 1.7-times, but that increases over time until, in the most recent three years, the increase is about three-times from the uncalibrated to the calibrated estimates, but you notice that the overall trend though is still a decrease in landings, or in harvest, over time, and so that trend really wasn't changed from the calibration, but it's just that the absolute estimate numbers themselves, in general, increased.

Now we'll go to total catch for black sea bass, and so similar results here for total catch. Overall, there was more than a doubling of the total catch after calibration was applied, but that was less in the earlier part of the time series, an increase of about 1.7-times, which then increased and was a little more than a three-times increase from 2015 to 2017.

Now we'll look at dolphin, which here we're talking almost no, or no, shore component to the catch, and so this is all coming from boat modes. We see less of an increase overall. Overall, we have about a 1.4-times increase for the entire time series. That still increases over time though, and so it's lower in the earlier part of the time series, at a little more than 1.2-times, but then it increases to about two-and-a-half-times in the most recent three years, but, again, the overall pattern, the year-to-year pattern of estimates, is similar between the two series.

Now, looking at total catch, again, it's similar. We don't see quite as large of a change as we did for black sea bass, because this all coming from the boat modes. Overall, it's about a one-and-a-half times increase, but, again, it's increasing over time to about a 2.7-times increase in the most recent three years.

Next we have gag. Again, it's a similar story overall, and we have an increase for the entire time series of about 1.8, and that increases over time, from 1.6 in the earlier years to a little more than 2.7 in the most recent three years, and, again, that's harvest, and so next is total catch. Total catch, again, a similar story overall. It's about a 2.3-times increase, ranging from 1.8 in the earlier years up to almost 2.8 in the most recent three years.

Next is Spanish mackerel, and, here again, we have some shore catch, and so the increases are a little bit larger overall than for the species that are almost exclusively from the boat modes, and so, for Spanish mackerel harvest overall, an increase of 2.4-times, but that, again, increases over time to about a 2.9-times increase for 2015 through 2017. Then, in terms of total catch, a little bit larger increases in what we saw for harvest overall, about a 2.6-times increase, and then increasing over time, from 2.3 up to more than three-times increase for 2015 through 2017. That concludes the results, and so thanks very much, and I will hand it back to Kelly.

MS. DENIT: All right. Thank you, John. Just a couple more slides to go before we take questions. As you guys can imagine, we could not do stock assessments on every single stock that was impacted by this calibration all at once, and so the transition team, working through SEDAR and the NRCC in the Northeast, prioritized our list, and I will show you that on that next slide.

The next steps, of course, will be to incorporate this calibrated data into new stock assessments. The results of those stock assessments will then be what informs stock status and whether anything is overfished or if there's overfishing, and it will inform whether there is any changes to annual catch limits, whether that be up or down, and, of course, the data is also available to the councils, to inform any discussions around allocations.

Just a few key take-aways. We see a substantial increase in effort, especially in the shore mode. Therefore, those stocks that have a high proportion of catch from shore are more heavily impacted by this change. The changes in effort are generally larger in more recent years, and this is mostly driven by that wireless effect that we talked about.

I will emphasize for folks that 2018 catch will be back-calibrated to ensure that our catch and ACL comparisons are being done in the same currency, that apples-to-apples comparison, and that the stock assessments incorporating this new data is what will be used to determine our stock status and ACLs, moving forward.

Over the next few years, this is kind of what it looks like. We have some stocks that are being assessed this fall to incorporate the new calibrated data. For those stocks, there may be management changes as soon as 2019. For other stocks, as the calibrated data is incorporated into new stock assessments, which might occur in 2019 or 2020, then the management changes would flow following that stock assessment. With that, I would be happy to take any questions.

MR. BREWER: Welcome. It's good to see you. One of the problems that we've had, and one of our former council members, Ben Hartig, always was concerned about, are the rarely-encountered species intercepts. Essentially, what happens is you would have four hogfish show up on one trip and, all of a sudden, apparently you've completely blown-out your quota, just because you didn't see many hogfish come in. With the now increase in effort, I see some danger that that could happen with even greater effect, and so what steps have been taken to model out or ameliorate or

whatever word is correct these intercepts for rarely-encountered species, because that wreaks havoc on us.

MS. DENIT: John, do you want to take that one?

MR. FOSTER: Sure, and so the first thing I will mention is that we have a rare-event species project ongoing in MRIP right now. It has representatives from both GARFO as well as the Southeast Regional Office and members of both the Northeast and Southeast Fisheries Science Centers as well as outside statistical consultants for both sampling statistics, survey methodology, and just general statistics. We're working on ways that we can address that specific issue, both moving forward and also in the time series.

As far as the effects of the calibrations or specific methods in the calibrations themselves to deal with outliers, or potential outliers, we didn't have specific methods in the calibrations for rare-event species, and so it's still possible to have those kinds of outlier-type situations in the data, dealing, as you mentioned, primarily from just a data limitation perspective, where we don't have a robust number of intercepts with catch of a given species.

However, there are cases where the calibrations themselves did help with situations in cases where the intercept survey data, because estimates were originally produced from the intercept data not using sample weights, not using weights that reflected the complex design, there are some cases where outliers were reduced because of the application of sample weighting through the calibration, but, again, that is not always the case.

It's really dependent on the specific situations, and so, again, it is possible at this point to still have outliers in the calibrated estimates that likely were present initially in the uncalibrated estimates, and so we're working on solutions for that, and we hope to have -- We don't have a specific timeline, but, as soon as we can get solutions in place, we'll be distributing -- We'll let folks know and keep folks apprised and work towards getting those into both the historic time series and also applied to future estimates, as we move forward.

MR. BREWER: John, would managing -- I guess you would say -- Here, I'm only speaking, obviously, to the recreational sector, private boat and shore, and would managing on a multi-year basis help when one encounters or when these outliers are encountered, and I'm not talking about over a decade or something, but I'm talking about maybe a three-year period and sort of averaging out your results and what you're finding in the encounters and in the effort?

MR. FOSTER: Mentioning that, that's certainly one -- In terms of producing the estimates, I will speak to it kind of from the data side. That definitely helps, in many cases, to provide estimates that are either produced for an entire three-year period or are perhaps annual estimates, but they incorporate sort of a moving average, if you will, of say two or three or perhaps four or five years' worth of data.

The extent to which that helps really depends on how rare of an event encountering a given species is, and so, if it's marginally rare, you might see -- Well, I won't say dramatic, but you might see substantial improvements or stability in the time series through this kind of an approach, but, if a species is exceedingly rare, rare even among rare-event species, you may need a range of data

that's so long that it sort of becomes impractical to use that approach, and so that's sort of some of what we're wrestling with.

Is there a single approach that could work everywhere, or do we need multiple approaches that depend on sort of the rareness, the degree of rarity of the species, and can we develop -- If we have to use multiple approaches, can we ensure that those approaches are producing results that are still comparable among the different species, but the short answer is, yes, there are definitely cases where you see improvement in the estimate series using a sort of multi-year approach.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir.

MR. HAYMANS: Hi, John.

MR. FOSTER: Hi, Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Spud and I have some questions for you. We have heard these numbers for a while, and we're actually now seeing some of them, and so all of the increases is from the effort, and so, just looking at the charts, we're talking fifty-million shore trips per year, 137,000 per day. Okay. That sounds like an awful lot, but then I go and I look at the Georgia ones, right, and two-and-a-half to three-million shore trips per year in 100 miles of shoreline in the State of Georgia, and 1.4 to 1.6 million boat trips per year in the State of Georgia.

You have lived there, and you know that there is absolutely no way that that is even close to reality. That is just not. We fish it -- Well, I don't fish it every day, and I wish I could, and I would help contribute to those numbers, but there is no way, man. These things are tenfold higher than reality, and so I guess my question then is who is involved in helping -- I know the SSC looks at it, but where is it ground-truthed? These numbers are just extremely out of the realm of reality, at least in the State of Georgia, and, if it is in Georgia, I can't imagine that it's not in other states as well. Maybe there's a question in that, and I don't know.

MR. FOSTER: Well, I guess, in terms of -- The first thing I would mention, I suppose, are the reviews that have been done of the surveys. The National Academy's review, it was a review panel comprised of fisheries assessment scientists and fisheries survey methodologists as well as more general survey, population survey, experts, statisticians, and so it was -- They not only received presentations from us, but we had -- That panel convened meetings around the country to solicit input from anglers, private anglers, folks from the for-hire sector, state agency representatives, and so they did a thorough job reviewing it, and they provided a sound recommendation on the methodology.

Now, that's different than endorsing individual point estimates, I realize that, and so, at this point, we continue to develop pilots to try and explore the estimates. I can explain what we see in the data that drives the increases, and, essentially, what we see is that we don't see -- For households that report fishing, we're not seeing those households reporting more trips in the mail survey than we saw in the previous telephone survey. What we see is that more households report fishing, and so, if a household reports fishing, it's reporting fishing at about the same rate that it did under the old survey, but what we're seeing, again, is a greater proportion of total households in the state that are reporting fishing, and, again, the frame is covering all households, all residential households, in the coastal states.

It's not just the coastal counties, but it's all of the counties in a given state, or the entire state, and then we stratify that frame essentially by households that can be matched to the license list for a given state, so we know that there is a licensed angler in that household, and then it's a separate strata for households that don't have an angler, and so that -- Again, if we see differential response rates, and so that's one of the concerns that is often raised, is are people that report fishing -- Are people that have a license more likely to report than say people that don't have a license and are probably more likely not to fish?

Essentially, the data are weighted such that the households that have a licensed angler only represent the other households from the frame that have a licensed angler, and, likewise, households that don't have a licensed angler are weighted to only represent the other households in the state that don't have a licensed angler.

We have done extensive testing on non-response, to see if everybody that doesn't normally respond, if they don't take trips and somehow that drives the estimates up, and what we see, in the non-response testing, is that the people that don't respond are generally like the people that do respond. Some of them fish, and some of them don't, and it's generally about in the same fraction as what we see in the usual respondents.

Again, because of the increase, and we understand that it's unsettling, to put it kindly, and shocking, to perhaps put it more realistically, and we still need to dig in and keep exploring, to try to quantify exactly what it is that's driving the estimates up, and I know that's not really a satisfactory answer for you, and we haven't -- We don't have sort of projects ongoing right now that are trying kind of independently to ground-truth the estimates, and we're sort of working at projects that will tease into the survey data and perhaps -- For an example, we're developing web and app reporting options for the survey that can allow us to collect more detailed information and try to see if we can tease out where we see the increases, if we can tease out if it's more inshore, inland fishing versus offshore fishing or if it's residents closer to the coast versus residents more inland.

Also, if we can see if it's private access versus a public access issue and where we see the differential increases, and all of those things are studies that we have planned and that are ongoing, and we hope to be able, again, at some point to, in a very detailed way, quantify these increases, but we have a good idea about the sources of them and why we see the increase, but it's hard to sort of tease it out in a way that could make folks feel a little better about the increases or at least understand, sort of in detail, what sectors, if any, increased more so than others. Again, I know that's not a satisfactory answer, but, unfortunately, I think that's the best I can do for you at this point.

MR. HAYMANS: Sure, and I appreciate it, and I can appreciate the work that you've done, the math that you've done in this, but I have just got to say on the record that, at least for what I am aware of, which is Georgia, and I live in the second-most populous county on the coast, and I fish the estuary, and I can see, from where I fish, boats going in and out of the inlet, and there is no way that these numbers represent the truth in Georgia. If it's that way in Georgia -- I just am very hesitant to apply this science to any of our management options in the near future until I am convinced that they're closer to reality, but thank you, John and Kelly. I appreciate it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I've got a number of people in the queue.

DR. WILLIAMS: I will just be quick. I was going to let folks know that I am the Southeast Science Center representative on that rare-event species group that John mentioned, but, John, I was going to help you follow-up with Chester, because I know he raised one of the issues that's a common concern for us, is this what we always see as spikes in the landings or discards due to a few intercepts. Is it safe to say, with all else being equal, that now that you're getting basically a tripling in the response rate, that that phenomenon might be diminished a little bit?

MR. FOSTER: Well, in general, the source of those spikes in the catch estimates is almost always coming from the intercept data, and the increase in response rates that Kelly mentioned is on the effort survey side, and so, while that certainly improves the effort estimates overall, it is usually -
- The sort of spike increases in catch estimates are typically coming, again, from the intercept, the APAIS intercept, survey data, and so that is sort of a -- There is limited improvement, I think, there.

Either increasing sample sizes for the intercept survey or working to make the intercept survey more efficient for intercepting trips that are currently sort of rare event I think would be a good -- It would go a long way to helping with that issue, and we're working on that, too. In Florida, for example, we have implemented a new sort of stratification dimension, or set of strata, that target sites or the group sites that have sort of appreciable amounts of offshore fishing that we have seen historically at the sites.

Those are grouped into their own strata and sampled with their own -- They are given their own sample sizes, again to try to improve the efficiency for intercepting those types of trips. We are looking to expand that into other states, but we're limited to how -- Just to sort of wrap it up quickly, that's something that I think can improve things, but we're limited on our overall sample sizes as to how quickly we can roll that out to other states.

MR. CONKLIN: We don't know each other, and I'm Chris Conklin. I'm the South Carolina representative, and so you said that you mail it into a lot of like inland residents and stuff like that, and is there any chance those folks are -- I mean, I know every time that I drive inland that every bridge is full of folks fishing, especially -- They're fishing for panfish and catfish and stuff that is -- I mean, is there any chance these folks are reporting that they went fishing like that and they just are false reports and they don't even realize it?

MR. FOSTER: The way we get at that, that we tried to test for that, is we did a number of experiments with the questionnaire and the versions of the questions, and so we had versions of the questionnaire where we would sort of mention saltwater versus freshwater in different ways, to try to tease out if people were not reporting accurately and if they were including what we could call sort of out-of-scope or illegible trips.

We focused on three things, whether folks were reporting freshwater trips in addition to saltwater trips, whether they were reporting out-of-state trips, and we were only asking about trips in their state of residence, and also if they were reporting trips that were not either private boat or shore, if they were reporting charter trips, for example, and so, again, we did extensive testing of different versions of questionnaires, and we did testing with focus groups of anglers, to try to get at how they would interpret those questions.

We also do ask household-level questions that get at both freshwater fishing separately from saltwater fishing, and so I can't tell you that it's impossible and that no one ever would report a freshwater trip by mistake, but we have definitely done a serious amount of testing and development to try to minimize that or eliminate it, as much as possible.

MR. POLAND: John, this is Steve Poland from the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, and so I have a nuts-and-bolts question. North Carolina, in the past, had always broken out shore-based into beach-bank mode and manmade mode, and so to capture the fishing piers, and I frame this question for a few common pier species, like king mackerel and Spanish mackerel and cobia.

I'm looking at the new recalibrated estimates, and, really, I guess I've got two questions. One is why were the beach-bank and manmade modes collapsed into shore mode, and, two, applying the effort estimates for shore, and doing the expansions, is that still accounted for, because it's hard to believe that we would see a 700 percent increase in cobia landings from shore-based mode. Looking right here at Spanish mackerel, there's a few years where there is over a 1,000 percent increase from shore-based mode, and so I just want to know if the manmade mode is still considered and it's somehow scaled when that expansion occurs or not.

MR. FOSTER: Sure, Steve. In the Fishing Effort Survey, the questionnaire, it asks separately about private boat mode and shore mode, but it doesn't specifically break out manmade versus beach-bank on the effort side. However, on the APAIS survey side, the sampling is still stratified for manmade versus beach-bank, and the two modes that -- They are weighted representatively, so that the catch rates, which are now calculated for shore mode, are still being sort of weighted correctly, or representatively, for manmade versus beach-bank, the sub-modes, if you will, and that is consistent with what was done previously, before the calibrations were applied.

MR. POLAND: Just a follow-up. Why was that decision made when these were reported back to the public that they were just reported as shore-based mode and not broken back out to manmade and shore?

MR. FOSTER: The decision on the effort survey side was just to keep the questionnaire as simple as possible, because it was going to be sort of self-administered and without an interviewer present to sort of help explain differences in the sort of distinction between manmade and beach-bank, and so keeping the overall questionnaire as short as possible and also trying to eliminate any confusion that might lead to the inaccurate reporting, and that's sort of the primary reason for not including that level of detail in the mail questionnaire, but, again, that is something that we can, as we continue to develop sort of web-based and smartphone-app-based reporting options for the survey, we can build in additional levels of detail to the questions, and so we would be able to get that information, potentially, again, but, at this point, that's still all sort of in development as pilot tests.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any more questions, Steve?

MR. POLAND: I will let it ride.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right.

DR. FRAZER: John, I just wanted to follow-up on some of the questions I think that Doug asked, and those questions, to me, really dealt with the accuracy of the survey results and potential bias, and the answers you gave said that, really, how you might correct for that, if it exists, but, when I look at these graphs, these line graphs, there is no confidence intervals around them, and so my question really has to do with the precision of the estimates, and I'm just wondering if you can give me an idea of whether or not -- What the order of magnitude, I guess, might be around these estimates.

MR. FOSTER: In general, the PSEs, particularly moving back through time, getting into the older estimates, say prior to the 2004 or prior to 2000, the PSEs, the percent standard errors, will be generally larger than they are -- They will be larger in the new calibrated estimates than they were in the previous estimates, but not dramatically so, and so, if an annual PSE, sort of at the sub-region level, was probably less than 20 percent on the annual effort estimate, maybe even less than 10 percent, again at the region level, it might be as high as 30 percent, maybe 35 percent, with the calibrated estimates, but, again, not 60 percent or 100 percent, and it could even be closer than that, less than 35 percent.

Most of that increase, particularly for the older years, is coming from the fact that the original estimates were based, using in part, the intercept survey data that was unweighted and essentially underestimating the variance for the pieces of the effort estimates that come from the intercept survey, and so there are a couple of pieces -- Even though we talk about effort surveys and an intercept survey, the intercept survey does provide information that's used to produce the effort estimates, and so there is a coverage correction factor that comes from the intercept survey data, and so the old telephone survey only covered coastal counties. It did not cover inland counties in the coastal states, and it, of course, did not cover out-of-state anglers, and so the intercept survey was used to provide information to correct or expand for that coverage gap in the old telephone survey.

Again, because the data were unweighted originally, under the old MRFSS estimation, it was essentially underestimating the variance or overestimating the precision for the effort estimates, and so it's a bit of an apples-to-oranges comparison for those older historic years.

The situation is not much different for the more recent years. There is still an increase in the PSEs, or a decrease in the precision, for the calibrated estimates in the more recent years, but it's generally not -- It's not as large as it is compared to the older years, and so, if you had a PSE say at the annual level, region level, that was 10 percent, it might be 15, or maybe 20, percent, at the most, with the calibrated estimates now, but, again, I am just sort of -- It could vary considerably for any specific situation. These are just sort of high-level kind of aggregate numbers.

MR. BELL: I don't have a question, but, John, thanks for being here virtually, and Kelly in person, and I was the council-appointed rep on this group, and I was basically a fly on the wall a lot, and John and Mike participated a lot, and I understand folks -- How some of the numbers strike you, but keep in mind that this is a survey. It's a survey that generates an estimate, and it's not a census, and it's not like with the commercial folks that we've got reporting.

What I have been watching in the process, in terms of the changes we've made, is it's solid. You have got folks that know way, way, way more about survey design than I would ever want to know

and statisticians -- I mean, from a standpoint of the science, in terms of putting this together and then trying to improve the survey, I think they've done a great job.

From that standpoint, it's solid. Now, the numbers are the numbers, but it's a survey. It's an estimate, and it's never going to be -- This didn't -- If you go back in time, MRIP, or we go back to MRFSS, way back in time, these numbers didn't really have a direct impact on let's say day-to-day things that were involved in, closing fisheries, for instance, and dealing with ACLs.

When that came into place, all of a sudden, these numbers had real consequences, in terms of the things that we dealt with and the fishermen, and so, thus, the intense focus on the numbers, but it's always going to be an estimate. We can improve the estimate, and we can do things and bring in, for instance, through the for-hire reporting, if we get that onboard and take that piece out of the overall equation, and then you've got more of a -- It's along the lines of the commercial folks, but we will never have the ability -- We can do things, technologically speaking, with self-reporting and some of the stuff that we're trying, and that's great, but you're never going to -- For instance, for South Carolina, you're never going to have a direct reporting from 450,000 anglers. That's just not going to happen, and so it's always going to be an estimate.

Just for folks that may be listening, in terms of the science that put this together and the statistics and the design, I think it's solid. It is what it is. It's an estimate, and I think they've done a good job with it, and so I have been, again, watching this and thinking that rocket science is actually very easy. Particle physics is probably easy, but this stuff will blow your mind, but just keep that in mind.

Until we can do some other things, we're always going to be dependent upon these data, because they are the best data we have, from a standpoint of what the science supports in providing survey data, or an estimate, and, until we can use something different, or figure out how to use the numbers differently, as Chester kind of talked about, and maybe smoothing things over time, they're going to be what they are, and I agree, Doug, that some of the numbers are kind of startling, but that's what you get, but I am just speaking from somebody that's been watching this as it has gone along, and I think they have followed a solid process, and John or Mike can weigh-in at some point, but that's just my opinion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel.

MR. WAUGH: Thanks to you both for the presentation. A comment to Kelly. I think you mentioned 2018 and doing back-calculated values, but we're going to need that for 2019, and probably 2020 as well. Then, for John, I asked the same question on the SSC presentation, but have you all drilled down into the data and looking at the effort, and say in the Gulf, to where you can see a reduction in effort from the Gulf oil spill and from Katrina, when you have major events like that? Can you demonstrate that your estimate of trips is showing those events?

MR. FOSTER: I guess I can probably speak to both questions. We have the ability to back-calculate and produce estimates that are essentially scaled to match the old CHTS, or phone-survey based, estimates as long as is needed moving forward, and so it's not just this year. We can do it for next year and 2020 and however long it's needed.

The further away we get from the last year that we actually conducted the phone survey, 2017, there will be sort of a -- We will be relying more and more on the model, the calibration model, again as we move further away from the last year that we collected actual data from the phone survey, and so, the sooner the better that we can get to where we don't need to rely on it anymore, but we can continue to produce it as long as needed.

In terms of looking at effects of weather events or other external factors affecting effort in the fisheries, the answer is that, in some cases, we see it very well, but there are certainly instances where the calibration modeling, again because it has, in essence, a bit of an averaging or a smoothing effect, it can sort of moderate the effects of events like that, where we may have seen it making a larger difference in the phone data, or the phone-based estimates, and, after the application of the calibration, it may moderate those effects a bit.

However, moving forward, when we are using simply the mail-based estimates and we're not having any sort of a modeling calibration applied to them, then we should expect to see the effects of any kind of major event, like a hurricane or maybe a very large increase in the price of gas, things like that, or a large economic downturn or upturn, and we should expect to see that in the estimates, because we should expect to see anglers reporting their fishing based on a representative way that reflects the effects of those events.

MR. SAPP: John, a Florida representative here, and I think you're getting the idea that a lot of us are extremely concerned with these numbers and somewhat doubting them. A lot of friends and acquaintances in the fishing industry down in south Florida were near starving from 2006 through 2010 with lack of sales. They were doing absolutely nothing, and have yet set records since, and as I'm looking at the graph here, where my friends, and myself included, were struggling, it's showing the highest users, whereas we've been doing extremely well, the tackle shops and the bait distributors and charter boats and everything, where we've really been rolling and set year-after-year records, and it's falling like a stone. It doesn't seem real, and I just had to be heard saying so.

MR. FOSTER: Sure, and thanks for the comments. The calibration, there are limits to its -- It's certainly not a perfect solution to trying to adjust the entire time series of over thirty years, based on only having three years of overlap data, where we were able to conduct the telephone survey and the mail survey side-by-side. It certainly would have been better if we could have conducted that overlap for a longer period of time, but the reality is that we don't have the funds to do it indefinitely.

That said, obviously, we're going to continue the mail survey, and, as we collect more years of mail data, or data under the mail survey, it is not -- It would be possible to look at the calibration again, say once we have five years or ten years' worth of estimates produced using the mail survey, and see if it impacts the overall results of the calibration, specifically in the cases that you are referring to, but, until we have sort of the additional mail data, we're sort of in a data-limited state, where we had to produce something, because, if we didn't, we were going to see this gigantic sort of step increase in the time series that would have been incredibly disruptive, and that was the effect we were trying to account for, or adjust for, but I certainly understand that there are limitations with the calibration, and it is something that we will continue to look at, moving forward, and, as we have more data, it may become possible to at least re-run the calibration and see if makes any difference and then see if the differences line up with the sort of comments that

we've been hearing like yours, where the results just don't see in line with what folks have seen during the given years.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more questions for Kelly and John? Kelly and John, thank you so much for the presentation. Kelly, thanks for being here, and, John, thank you so much for attending remotely to give us this talk.

MR. FOSTER: Sure. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's take a five-minute break, and then we're going to come back and get some more presentations.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: Next up, we have a series of presentations from the NMFS SERO Office. The first up is the status of commercial catches versus ACLs for species that weren't already addressed at this meeting, and I believe it is Mr. Rick DeVictor.

MR. DEVICTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. This will be quick. Three species have not been covered for commercial landings, and Dr. Collier has it on the screen there, and so this is dolphin, wahoo, and golden crab. Dolphin, so far, through September 24, we have landed 500,392, and that's 33 percent of the ACL. You can see where we were around the same time last year. Then wahoo is 31,337 has been landed, and that's 44 percent of the ACL. Around the same time last year, it was 65 percent had been landed. We started added golden crab to these reports, and so the current ACL is two-million pounds whole weight, and 14 percent has been landed so far this year.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any questions? All right. Next up is the for-hire amendment status report.

MR. DEVICTOR: I will take care of that, also. Yes, we talked a little bit this week so far, and I think it was the Snapper Grouper Committee, about the status of the for-hire, but, real quickly, I will just go through briefly the timing, as I normally do during Full Council, and touch upon the SEFHIER process and then also go through some of the next steps, and, of course, for people that haven't been around, the SEFHIER process stands for Southeast Electronic Reporting Implementation Team.

Just going through some of the timing for the South Atlantic, the NOA published on March 14, and there was a sixty-day comment period on that, and then we published the proposed rule on April 4. There was a thirty-day comment period, and we received seventy-two comments on the for-hire amendment.

As we reported at the last meeting, the amendment was approved on June 12, and so, right now, we are working on the final rule and responding to those comments, those seventy-two comments, in the final rule, and, of course, that final rule, as it always does, will announce the implementation date.

I will touch upon the Gulf of Mexico for-hire electronic reporting amendment, also. They are a little bit behind us, because they have a GPS component to it, and it's a little more complicated

than ours, and so they published their NOA, Notice of Availability, on June 21, and they had a sixty-day comment period, and their amendment was approved a couple of weeks ago, on September 19, and so, right now, they're working on the proposed rule. Implementation, they're kind of thinking around April 1, and maybe the GPS portion may come later than that in the Gulf of Mexico.

That is timing, and just touching on the SEFHIER process, Southeast Electronic Reporting Implementation Team, there has been a lot of work done at our office, behind the scenes, so to speak, and there hasn't been a small list in working on this process, and we presented -- Dr. Farmer gave a presentation on the SEFHIER process, but, just real quickly, it was a group that was formed to have fifty-three or so people, and it wasn't just the councils or SERO, but it was ACCSP and GARFO and HMS.

The first phase was more of the information-gathering phase, and so we're sort of wrapping that up now and going towards more of a phase-two, which is the decision-making phase, and, of course, the largest decision that was made was to use ACCSP as the data warehouse, and so it's a smaller group, a more focused group, that we're working with for the SEFHIER process, but that will continue for the time being.

Just the next steps, the next step is to publish the final rule and announce the implementation date, of course, which we are working on right now. We will reach out to permit holders, either through email or mail, once this is finalized, if the amendment goes through, and, as Kathleen presented, there will be a series of webinars and in-person meetings, NMFS informational sessions is what we're calling them, and that will be happening soon, and then it will also happen after the implementation date, again if it is implemented, and then it's important to know that we'll also have a website that has the details and the requirements of the electronic reporting requirements and also how to download the app and such on that.

Finally, Karla Gore of our staff, she just presented to the Mid-Atlantic Council today, and she wanted to go over the background of the amendment, but also talk about those that have both Mid-Atlantic permits and South Atlantic permits, and so she walked them through that. That concludes my report of the for-hire amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any other reports for us, Rick, before we move to Jennifer Lee's report on protected resources?

MR. DEVICTOR: Just real quick, you have me down for SBRM, which stands for standardized bycatch reporting methodology, and we need, of course, to have SBRMs, which we do have, and we need to look at these by February 21 of 2022 and do a review of them, and so that is something that is ongoing right now. We have an IPT, and they will meet soon, and we already started drafting this report, and we will continue to work on that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Excellent. Chip, are we ready for Jennifer Lee?

MS. LEE: Hi, everyone. This is very brief. In your briefing documents, we really only have one new item, which is the Nassau grouper recovery outline, and we completed a recovery outline for the threatened Nassau grouper. The link is on your briefing document, and you also have the full outline in your briefing book, and so it outlines our preliminary strategies for recovery of the

species and recommends high-priority actions to stabilize and recover the species. The initial focus is to abate removal of adults from the spawning aggregations, and, if you want to look at the specific actions, just go ahead and review that outline.

The Endangered Species listing actions and other rulemakings, on your briefing document, it said we have no change, but I can report that we have a final rule back in our Headquarters Office as far as the sea turtle conservation and recovery actions related to the southeastern United States shrimp fishery. I do not have any news to report FMP consultations.

For Marine Mammal Protection Act actions and news, there is nothing new on the briefing document here, but I will add that the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team is meeting, and they have a very important meeting next week in Providence, Rhode Island. They are meeting to develop and discuss potential modifications to the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan to further reduce impacts of the U.S. fixed gear fisheries on large whales and reduce mortality and serious injury to below potential biological removals for right whales.

NOAA Fisheries, just this September, published a tech memo evaluating right whale recovery challenges that the whales face today, and the information summarized in the tech memo confirms that, after several years of slow, but steady increase in their numbers, the endangered North Atlantic right whale population has been declining since 2010, due to multiple factors, and so I think you all know, but just to reiterate, right now we are really at a crisis with right whales. If oceanic conditions remain unfavorable and the current rate of decline holds steady, I think it's estimated that the 160 females in the population could drop to fewer fifty females within the next fifty years, and so I just wanted to bring that to your attention as well, and that's really all I have for you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Are there any questions for Jennifer? All right. I don't see any hands up. Thank you for joining us on the webinar. Next up, we have NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science presentations, and first up is the status of the commercial electronic logbook program.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, and I will run through the slides. Dave Gloeckner couldn't be on the webinar, but I do have, on the line, Brett Pierce and Vivian Matter, that will help answer questions for the next presentations that I was going to run through real quick. There is just a few slides for these.

This is going to be real short. It's just to give you an update on what the progress is on the commercial electronic logbook reporting, and it looks like Dave may have indicated that they were hoping to have things done around June, but it looks like it's been delayed another five months, and so now we're looking at the November/December timeframe. Part of that delay has been the result of getting things set up at ACCSP, and you can see some of the notes here.

Here is some of the issues they're running into with -- They are making some infrastructure changes that are needed at ACCSP, and so that's been sort of the holdup at this point, from what I can tell, and so the Center is pretty much ready to go. We're waiting for ACCSP, and, basically, we're trying to make sure that we test the software fairly thoroughly, so we don't roll this out like other software companies like to roll software out and de-bug it after the fact. Hopefully we can get it de-bugged upfront, and so that's sort of where we are, and so, if anybody has any questions that I can't answer, hopefully one of the folks on the line can.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are there questions? No questions.

DR. WILLIAMS: I will ask Brett or Vivian if they wanted to add anything to that.

MR. PIERCE: No, I think that was pretty thorough. A lot of the delay is waiting on some infrastructure changes at ACCSP. A lot of it, we're still in discussion with just a few key variables that is going to require altering the API once the database is altered, but just a few key points is what's holding it up right now, and I think that should be good to go pretty soon, and pretty much everything else you covered.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thanks, Brett.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then, Erik, do you have another presentation on the status of MRIP conversions as well for us?

DR. WILLIAMS: Yes, and this one hopefully Vivian will be able to help me out with as well. As you know, the new estimates rolled out on July 9, and I won't go into too many details, because Kelly and John covered that fairly well. There is a few things that we do at the Center where we deal with that data sort of after it rolls out of MRIP that we make some modifications to, and so that's what the Center is kind of working on right now.

As Kelly indicated, we are going to have what we're calling CHTS-lite data, which are the files, and they're not in exactly the same format that we used to get them in, and so we're dealing with that. I know one of the issues we've had to work with is the new format for these files and some of the code we've had to process files has had to be modified, but the bottom line is, once we get everything up and running, we should be able to provide the same type of estimates that we provided under the old CHTS system from MRIP, and that's sort of the goal.

We have been slowly working on the list of upcoming species that are next in line to be assessed through the SEDAR process, and blacktip shark is one of them, and we've got Gulf of Mexico red grouper, greater amberjack, gray triggerfish, red porgy, and cobia are all on the hitlist, and that last bullet is always -- It's one of the things that we always have to deal with.

This is another reason we always have to sort of post-message the MRIP data, is we deal with the boundaries that aren't in the data itself, and so we have to, for instance, sort of almost manually separate out Monroe County and other things like that, and so that's why it's a little bit of a challenge for us at the Center to deal with some of those issues, and I will, again, open it up to questions, but I will first offer -- Vivian, if you wanted to add anything more to what I said.

MS. MATTER: Sure. From that first slide, just one of the big things was the charter calibration that we need to do here, and so we kind of re-looked at that, and that has been completed, and we're kind of rolling that into the SEDARs, as Erik mentioned. For the ACL files, we have completed two of the ACL files in the Coastal Household Telephone Survey units, and so the last one we did was August 9, and we have another one here to do soon, and blacktip is just about complete. We are just re-looking at some of the weights and some variables there, but it should be completed very soon.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any questions? No questions, and thank you, Erik and team, for those presentations and updates. Next up, we're going to bring up Steve Durkee, who is going to talk to us about the FMP for the management of shortfin mako sharks. Steve is with NMFS HMS Division, and he is located here in Charleston.

MR. DURKEE: Good afternoon, everyone. Again, I am Steve Durkee with the HMS Management Division of NOAA Fisheries, and we are going to talk shortfin mako sharks. This is Draft Amendment 11 to our HMS FMP. This presentation is the same presentation that we presented at all of our public hearings, and so it goes into quite a bit of depth, probably more depth than you're interested in here at this meeting, and so I'm going to breeze past a few slides, and maybe just touch on others briefly, and really just focus in on some of the more important slides, as far as what the draft amendment is doing.

Again, the purpose is to address overfishing of the shortfin mako shark stock. Shortfin mako sharks are internationally managed through ICCAT, Atlantic-wide, since their distribution does span across the entire Atlantic, across many different countries' EEZs.

A little bit of management history. Back in 2008, there was a stock assessment through ICCAT on shortfin mako sharks that found that, while the stock is not overfished, overfishing is occurring. In response to that, in 2010, we put out Amendment 3, which encouraged the live release of shortfin mako sharks, and there was some indication in 2012 that that was helping. The updated stock assessment in 2012 through ICCAT found that overfishing was stopped, and the stock was healthy.

That brings us to last year, 2017, and ICCAT updated the stock assessments with some data inputs and some new models, and it was not a good look for the health of the stock. It came back with the stock being overfished with overfishing occurring, and you can see, in third bullet up there, the assessment recommended reducing catch levels by 72 to 79 percent to prevent future population declines.

In response, ICCAT issued Recommendation 17-08 to try to find ways to maximize live releases, and in this recommendation were a few different options. One was, under retention, to only allow shortfin mako sharks that were dead at haul-back to be retained and to release any ones that came to the vessel alive. It also suggested some minimum size limits. For male, it was 180 centimeters fork length, which is about seventy-one inches, or, for females, 210 centimeters, which is roughly eighty-three inches.

This ICCAT recommendation came back in November of last year. In order to put this stuff into place as quickly as possible, we issued an emergency rule this past March to put in, in the commercial fisheries, a requirement that shortfin mako sharks can only be retained in pelagic longline fisheries when the shark is deal at haul-back. Then, in the recreational fishery, a minimum size of eighty-three inches, where the previous minimum size was fifty-four inches. That was put in place through an emergency rule to get it into place as soon as possible. However, that emergency rule can only be in place for up to a year, and so that will expire in March of 2019.

To get into the meat of the presentation, this is the proposed measures in this Draft Amendment 11. There are four groups of alternatives that we looked at: commercial, recreational, rebuilding, and monitoring. Starting with commercial, we have several different alternatives. Alternative A1 is the no action alternative, keep those non-emergency rule regulations in place. Then A2, A3,

and A5 -- I am going to present these a little bit out of order, because it just makes more sense for the presentation, but, under these three alternatives, properly permitted commercial fishermen could retain shortfin mako sharks if that shark was dead at haul-back and, under the Preferred Alternative A2, there is a functioning electronic monitoring system onboard to verify the disposition of the shark. When I say electronic monitoring system, I'm referring to the cameras that are on pelagic longline vessels in the HMS fisheries, and that camera could indicate whether or not that shark was dead at haul-back.

Under Alternative A3, sharks that are brought back to the vessel dead could be retained if the permit holder agrees to allow the agency to use that camera footage to verify the disposition of the shark, and then, under A5, the fishermen could retain shortfin mako sharks that are brought to the vessel dead, provided there is an observer onboard that could verify the disposition of those sharks.

Alternative A4 would allow the retention of live or dead shortfin mako sharks, provided the shark was at least eighty-three inches fork length and there was either an observer onboard or a camera system onboard that could verify the size of that shark before it was dressed and cut down to a smaller size. Then A6 would prohibit the retention of shortfin mako sharks in any of the HMS commercial fisheries. That's the commercial options.

Next are the recreational options. There is the first one, of course, that is the no action alternative, which would keep those non-emergency rule regulations in place. Then B2 through B5 look at some different minimum sizes for shortfin mako sharks, most of which have different minimum sizes based on the gender, for male or female. You can see, for male, most of the options are seventy-one inches, and that is equivalent to what's in the ICCAT recommendation 17-08, and there are some different female minimum sizes.

Under B2, that female minimum size is eighty-three inches, and that's equal to what's in that ICCAT recommendation. Alternative B4 is a minimum size for females of 108 inches, and this is about the size of maturity for female shortfin mako sharks, and then Alternative B5 would set a limit of 120 inches for females, which is a fairly large size. Most females don't reach that size, and so this would only allow mostly males, with a few trophy females in the mix, in the recreational fisheries.

However, we're preferring B3, which would require a minimum size of eighty-three inches for both male and female sharks, just to reduce the complexities of the recreational regulations as well as to address any kind of concerns of trying to identify the sex of a shortfin mako shark before it was harvested.

Alternative B6 and all of the sub-alternatives look at different seasons. The way these would work is that, within the season, there would be some sex-specific minimum sizes, and then, outside of the season, there would be that larger 120-inch minimum size for both sexes as well. This alternative and sub-alternatives were an outgrowth of some public comment we received during the scoping period, and we have chosen not to prefer any of these, because of the complexity involved with the seasons, as well as the fact that some of these options don't actually meet our mortality reduction requirements based on that stock assessment from last year.

The last few recreational alternatives, B7 would establish a slot limit for shortfin mako sharks. B8 would put a tagging program into place, where we would issue some tags to anglers at the

beginning of the season, and, any carcasses they retained, they would attach that tag to that carcass, and that would limit the number of sharks that any recreational angler could take in any one year.

B9 is a preferred alternative, and that would require the use of circle hooks in recreational shark fishing. As you may recall, currently, circle hooks are required in the recreational shark fishery anywhere below the line kind of near Cape Cod or so. This alternative would expand that requirement north of that line, to waters up north of Cape Cod, and then B10 would create a catch-and-release only shortfin mako shark fishery in the recreational fishery. There would be no retention allowed.

Moving on to monitoring alternatives, these are alternatives looking at reporting requirements, and we have preferred C1 in this case, not to change any of the existing reporting requirements in the commercial or recreational fisheries. One option though would be C2, to establish mandatory commercial reporting requirements through VMS, and then C3 would implement mandatory reporting requirements for recreationally-landed or discarded shortfin mako sharks.

Right now, we've got quite a few data collection efforts through the commercial fisheries, and so C2 is probably not needed at this time, and then, as far as C3 in the recreational fishery, we've got pretty good coverage in the LPS, the Large Pelagic Survey, system, and so we've got pretty good data coming in, and so we don't think it's necessary to implement a new reporting requirement at this time.

Then the last category is rebuilding alternatives. Alternative D1 is no action, don't establish a rebuilding plan for shortfin mako sharks. D2 would establish a rebuilding plan domestically and unilaterally and not through ICCAT and not through the international cooperation. The preferred alternative is D3, develop a rebuilding plan internationally, so that all countries are coming together to reduce catch of shortfin mako sharks.

Then D4 and D5 are in here in case ICCAT decides to do some shortfin mako shark recommendations next month, in their 2018 meeting. D4 would create a separate shortfin mako shark quota, and D5 would implement area management for shortfin mako sharks, and, again, this is if ICCAT implements those kinds of options next month. Then Alternative D6 would establish bycatch caps in all fisheries that interact with shortfin mako sharks.

The timeline, we are at the very end of the comment period, and it did close on October 1. We extended that comment period until October 8, I believe, to accommodate this rescheduled meeting, and then we're targeting an effective date in the spring of next year, before the emergency regulations expire in March. Then just a quick slide on how to submit comments, and, again, just note that that October 1 is no longer accurate. That is October 8, is the end of the comment period, and, with that, I am happy to take any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Steve. That was a great presentation. It was very informative. Are there questions?

MS. BECKWITH: Not so much questions, but I will share some comments, unless somebody else wants to jump in with some questions. Okay. Go ahead, Art.

MR. SAPP: A quick question. Any idea as to what caused the decline in the species so quickly from what appeared to be a rebuilding species?

MR. DURKEE: Good question. I don't think it's actually any changes in the water. I think it's the methodology of the stock assessment. It used some updated information, an update model, and some new tagging information had come into place, and so I think we just didn't have a good idea of what the stock looked like with our previous assessments, and this new one might be a little more robust.

MS. BECKWITH: In terms of comments on behalf of the council, I went to the HMS meeting, and I've heard this presentation a few times and listened to some of the comments that the HMS AP had to offer, and, in terms of the commercial alternative, the AP certainly supported being able to retain dead fish at haul-back. There were some concerns about the electronic monitoring, but the sense was that they sort of already had it on the boat, and so it is a tool that realistically is going to be used. I think this council could comfortably support that commercial alternative of having the commercial guys be able to retain that dead fish at haul-back.

In terms of the recreational limit, that was a little bit more of a debate, and probably something that we should have discussion on here, to properly put forth our comment as a council. The current preferred is eighty-three inches for both male and female. That is not the minimum requirement from ICCAT. ICCAT would require us to move forth with a seventy-one-inch male and an eighty-three-inch female.

The reason that I think HMS is moving forward with this is because there are some concerns about sex ID. Some of the comments that I have heard from folks is, if you are unable to differentiate a male shark from a female shark that you're probably also not going to be able to differentiate the species of that shark, because it's pretty easy, and so some of the comments was either to not go further in requirements than what ICCAT requires, which would be the seventy-one-inch male and eighty-three-inch female, or, if the ultimate goal is actually to protect the female reproductive ability, it would be to actually allow that seventy-one-inch male and that significantly larger female, therefore sort of focusing effort on catching only male sharks, which males, and you guys are a dime a dozen, but then still allowing for a world-record fish, if somebody were to catch one.

As far as I see it, the council's comments would fall between sort of one of three options. One option for us would be that we comment that we really don't need to go any stricter than what ICCAT is, and there were some questions of what was compelling the agency to be more restrictive than what ICCAT was requiring of us. Option 2 would be to accept this eighty-three inches for all the shortfin mako sharks, assuming that the sex ID is actually an issue for the recreational fishermen, or, if we would be more interested in actually protecting the female reproductive ability, that maybe B5 would be an acceptable option for us to support, which would focus the fishery on the males, but allow a potential world-record female. I will tell you guys what I think, but I'm going to let you guys discuss, if anybody has an opinion on what we should support.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tell me again the one that you're supporting, and help me understand that one a little bit more, Anna, and I'm still a tiny bit confused.

MS. BECKWITH: For the recreational, their current preferred is both males and females at eighty-three inches, and the reason they're doing that is because they think people can't ID the difference

between a male and a female shark. There was equal amounts of support for B2, which is what ICCAT actually requires, and so that would be what ICCAT is requiring all the countries to do, and that would, of course, allow someone to keep a smaller shortfin mako as long as they can identify it as a male.

There was some support given for the idea of B5, which would focus the fishery on the males, while protecting the females, but still allow a potential world-record catch to come to the dock, and so those are the three options that I would like some feedback on from you guys before we put forth what our recommendation as a council would be.

MS. MCCAWLEY: You're suggesting B5?

MS. BECKWITH: I am suggesting that we either go with the minimum requirement from ICCAT, which would be B2, because I've got some faith in our recreational fishermen that they can identify the difference between a male and a female shark, or, if, as a council, our conservation inclination is to protect the female reproductive effort, then B5 would be an acceptable option as well, because it would focus all that effort on just catching males. That is my suggestion. If you guys want to comment on it, or if we can take a vote by hand, but, instead of putting a letter forth, it would be easier for Steve to just carry back our opinion as a public comment, since we're so close to the end.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Comments on Anna's comment?

MR. BREWER: I will put out a motion. Okay. Well, I won't do a motion. I would suggest, though, that we support B3.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you give a little background on maybe why?

MR. BREWER: Well, from what I understand, the information that's there is -- I don't know whether there is a rebuilding plan in place or not at the international level. I am very seriously -- You can tell me, Anna, but is there something in place from ICCAT at this point?

MS. BECKWITH: He covered that in the last slides. They will be discussing it in November, moving anything else forward, but, right now, the requirement for all the countries is B2. We would be the only country going past what ICCAT is requiring.

MR. WAUGH: Being a little pragmatic, we got a lot of input that there is too many sharks out there, and so maybe you don't want to go with B5.

MR. CONKLIN: I am just thinking that, maybe on the northern end of our east coast here, where they show up all the time, they might be able to identify a male and a female, but I know the fellas who fish out of our port and on south, they can't tell a male from a female. The commercial guys have to -- If you want to take sharks like that, you have to take a class and all, and it's still hard, and I think eighty-three inches across-the-board is going to be your best bet for saving the females and killing the males.

MR. BELL: I would be inclined to just go along with them. They have given this a lot more thought, and, to Chris's point, I mean, you've got to see the right part of the shark, one way or the other.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Anybody else?

MR. SAPP: Since we've got an HMS guy here, will you please, please scream at everybody that all the other species of sharks need to be whacked on the head?

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so it sounds to me like our -- It sounds like the South Atlantic Council is supporting the preferred alternatives then, and that's our official public comment back to you guys.

MR. DURKEE: Cool. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more --

MR. WAUGH: Just to be clear, we're not going to send a letter? We're satisfied just giving them the input here, and you mentioned that on the recreational side, and, on the commercial, I guess the input is we're okay with the preferred to retain dead fish at haul-back? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Thanks, Steve, for the presentation. Now we're going to go into the Agency Reports, and I'm going to go around the table, and so I'm going to start with the Coast Guard and turn it over to you.

LCDR MONTES: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you for the warm welcome. I know I've been selected as the representative to represent at the time, and at first was Rear Admiral Buschman, now Vice Admiral Buschman, the Atlantic Area Commander, and now Rear Admiral Brown is the District 7 Commander, and so, on behalf of Rear Admiral Brown, thanks for having me here, and I'm glad that I finally made it, after a year. I apologize for the scheduling conflicts, the storms, and all of the complications that come with my job.

I did submit, and everyone should have received, an email with a 7th Coast Guard District Enforcement Report, and it captures June, July, and August activities throughout the 7th Coast Guard District, excluding, to the best of my efforts, excluding our sector in St. Petersburg that falls under the Gulf Council and our sector out in San Juan that falls under the Caribbean Council. Just going through this report real quick, we did 393 -- There were 393 boardings conducted, and only two violations noted, and so I will say, if everyone can see it up on the screen right now, my staff's ability to do match correctly is a little bit lacking. It's not 0.01 percent. That's the raw number. It's actually less than 1 percent. It's about 0.7, or 0.5. I will go back and make sure that my staff of one, which is me, will learn math better next time, and I will go back to -- What is that, like fifth-grade math or something like that, and so I do have a college degree.

Of note on here, you can see the increase of around forty boardings, when you compare it to the same timeframe last year, and I'm going to comment on that a little bit here. You can also see the decline with fisheries violations, from seven during the same time last year to only two this year, and so our observed compliance rate is going up, as well as our boarding numbers, and that is kind of mirrored as well when you go down to the fiscal year, and so these numbers don't include

September or October, because I didn't have the total of September's numbers when I generated this report, and obviously --

I didn't have September's numbers when I generated this report, and so our entire fiscal year numbers are a little bit off, and, similar to what was just discussed with Monroe County and the Keys, some of these boardings do happen north of the Keys in the Gulf Council, and so the numbers are a little bit off. They're not perfect, but approximately 912 boardings were conducted in the South Atlantic region, with sixteen violations, with an observed violation rate of 1.7 percent, or, on the sunnier side of things, 98.3 percent compliance rate for those, which is more boardings and less violations, again, from the same time in Fiscal Year 2017.

This increase in boardings is coming almost strictly from the Keys. We have had a reorganization of our mission focus down there, and I know I've commented off the record with a couple of people, but we were -- We had a problem with illegal migration up until about 2016, and we spent the year of 2017 trying to figure out what those guys were going to do for their primary mission, if you will, and we have a statutory requirement for eleven missions in the Coast Guard, one of which we don't do in District 7, which is icebreaking. If we're breaking ice in District 7, then we've got some bigger issues, but they were able to refocus and, over the year, get themselves trained up to have the expertise to go and work with some of our law enforcement partners, including FWC and NOAA OLE, in order to do more boardings in that area, and so that resulted in increased boarding numbers.

Some other interesting facts that I know I've talked about with some folks, particularly with shrimpers north of the Keys, and I know it's outside of our region here, but a lot of blatant disregard for the rules was observed up there when our fellows started going out and doing the boardings.

We're looking to keep increasing these numbers. Where we're also falling short is just our own internal problems with data. We are not recording our boardings correctly, and so, when the systems pump out what we're doing out there, it's not accurately telling me all the hard work our guys are doing, and so I would say that our observed compliance rate is probably even higher, in the 99 percent region, because people just are, internally to the Coast Guard, incorrectly reporting their information.

Violations summary, and I will move on a little bit in my report, and the violations summary is just two small violations during this three-month time period. The first one was a shark finning case off of the Keys, and Station Islamorada conducted the boarding and found mutilated sharks. They were not kept in whole form, and there were shark fins onboard as well.

Then the second case, and I apologize for the dates, and those are not correct, and I will yell at my staff again for that, and the Cutter Cormorant, which is based here out of Charleston, conducted a boarding, and they found a bunch of jacks onboard a vessel that were not kept in whole form. They were filleted down.

Commercial fishing vessel safety efforts, this doesn't compare year-to-year. This is just a strict report, and so 117 dockside exams conducted during the fiscal year, and eighteen in Quarter 3, with forty-eight new decals issued, and there were two safety terminations during that time period, for a total of twenty terminations of commercial fishing vessels. This is the entire district AOR,

and so this also includes Sector St. Pete and Sector San Juan, and so I was not able to extract their data from it, and so it's for the entirety of this of the Coast Guard district.

Then the final page is our search and rescue highlights. There were three significant cases encountered during this time, and two disabled vessels that were assisted by the Coast Guard and then one vessel that had a grounding during the time period, and this does also include the first half of September in there, and that way we could have more to report for everybody. We went from two to three, and that concludes my report, pending any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any questions?

MR. POLAND: This is just because this is the first time that I have received one of these reports, and I was just curious -- I have two questions. Are these boardings just in the EEZ or boardings in the EEZ and in state waters? Then, two, are these boardings where you were targeting vessels that were fishing or actively fishing or looked like they were fishing or just all vessels in general?

LCDR MONTES: I am going to go with the lawyer answer of it depends. To answer your first question, that one is actually pretty definitive, and it's everywhere, and so it's inside the baseline and outside the baseline and in the EEZ.

My guidance, and this is where the "it depends" comes in, and whether or not they were targeting or overtly fishing when we got onboard, it kind of doesn't matter, in my opinion, with my guys, because, especially down in south Florida, you've got a lot of recreational traffic that is moving back and forth between the Bahamas, and we do a lot of Lacey Act kind of enforcement down there as well, and so they could go onboard a boat that is just transiting, and everyone has got a fishing pole on their boats, and we just jump onboard, and my guidance to them right now is, if you look at a fish, it's a fisheries boarding, even if everybody onboard is drunk and you end up issuing a boating under the influence for everybody, it was still a fisheries boarding, because you looked at fish. Some of that reporting is still not correct internally for us, but --

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Go ahead, Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I just wanted to say thank-you for the tow. My vessel, the Can Do 2, lost all power, and it was taking on water offshore, and Sector Charleston flew a gasoline pump out to my guys, and they were able to keep them pumped, and then they -- They couldn't get them under power, and so they towed them into Charleston, and dropped us off, and we got them on home, and so thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Excellent. Any more questions? All right. Thank you for that report, and I'm glad that you could finally join us. Steve, anything that you want to report out from your state? We'll come back to you. Let's go to Mel.

MR. BELL: I don't have a lot. Remember that the last meeting we were dealing with an interesting beginning to the shrimp fishery. In fact, we actually opened up while we were at the last meeting, but we had a poor start to the shrimp fishery this year, due to the freeze that we had. Recently, landings have picked up really nicely, and that may be in part with shrimp moving out, due to being flushed out, and I don't know, but we do seem to have some pretty good numbers of white shrimp out there right now, and so that's good.

Kind of summarizing what had happened previously, we found ourselves looking at our fishing year as a fiscal year, and we were at about minus 54 percent, and so we had some discussion with perhaps the Governor's office approaching the Secretary about that, and we sent the information, and then the hurricane kind of distracted everyone, and so I'm not sure where that is right now, but it's quite possible that, given that particular twelve-month period we were looking at, we might qualify for some sort of a fisheries disaster type of thing, and we'll see how that plays out.

Cobia, we're moving along with cobia with the ASMFC process, and we'll see how all that lands. It looks like it's coming along, as we move cobia out of our realm and into the state realm. I have heard from a number of folks that the cobia fishing seemed to be pretty good, offshore anyway. Our waters are still an issue down south, in that distinct population segment that we refer to, but actually some pretty good numbers of cobia recently, and I just found out that I guess the headboat survey people are collecting data, and so we had some cobia come to the dock last week on a headboat, and the agent that intercepted those basically took the fins and otoliths and DNA and lengths and all, and so that's good. There is a lot of efforts to get data, and particularly genetics data, for those offshore fish, and so that's good. There's a lot of folks working on cobia now.

MARMAP is moving along. MARMAP is under way, as we speak, I think, still, and one issue with MARMAP, and I know Erik is aware of this, and Clay probably is as well, and Clay is not here, but we've got some uncertainty about some of the SEFIS funding moving over into MARMAP, which is making Marcel a little nervous, and I get it, but we are -- To do the work that we need to do, and we have been doing, we are highly -- We need that SEFIS money that comes through us from the Science Center. Hopefully that will work out. Otherwise, we'll have some issues to deal with later in the summer.

Also, speaking of MARMAP, we had discussed briefly perhaps at this meeting maybe having sort of a come and meet MARMAP kind of session or something, and maybe we can do that next year. We've got new council members onboard, and we might be able to do something where we can go out to the boat or go ride the boat, and we've got a year to figure that out, but Marcel and MARMAP would love to be able to show folks what they do and how they do it, and you will find it interesting. They are kind of out there on the edge of bringing in all this data for us to use.

Then, of course, we talked earlier about Florence and the impact, and we really dodged a bullet down here in South Carolina related to our marine fisheries, and it's very unfortunate what North Carolina had to go through, but, of course, while the fleet, and it seems like the fishing industry that we surveyed did okay, then we had the water to deal with afterwards, and you heard about that, and our law enforcement guys are still working on that.

There's a lot of water coming down the Waccamaw and Pee Dee drainage basins, and, of course, then that is now flushing out into the ocean, and so you will be able to see some pretty cool pictures probably from NOAA satellites for these plumes out there, and I have talked to some fishermen that have -- We have seen it now, and we saw it in 2015 and, every time we have a hurricane, there's a lot of plumes going out there, and so there's a lot of nutrient loading in the ocean, and so maybe that will be a good thing in the long run, but it does definitely impact the system, and so that's sort of it for us right now. There's nothing else, unless somebody has a question.

MR. CONKLIN: One note is we did tag a speckled hind that was already tagged, and we descended it about three weeks ago off of our coast, and so maybe there is --

MR. BELL: There's one.

MR. CONKLIN: There is one double-tagged one swimming around there, hopefully, still, and so I figured you all would like to know.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Nice. Any more questions for Mel? Let me give you just a couple of updates from Florida. We are having a lionfish summit this week in Cocoa Beach, and we're bringing together people that are creating new gears and new types of traps and ROVs, and we're bringing together research scientists and others to talk about what's going on with lionfish, not just off of Florida, but in the Gulf and the South Atlantic.

If you haven't heard, we're having some severe red tide events in Florida, and so lots of concern and lots of national and international media all over the various red tide events, and we have three main red tides going on, one in southwest Florida, one in the Panhandle, and one now in the Atlantic coast as well.

MR. SAPP: It showed up yesterday in Hillsborough Inlet, and you all put a thing out, and I've got buddies telling me about all the dead fish that are in place that it's never been before, that I know of.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That is true, and so, yes, red tide is one of our big things that are happening right now. Back to the Atlantic red snapper season, we had lots of FWC staff that were onsite for our Atlantic red snapper season, sampling those fish and doing boat counts. A couple more things of note. Goliath grouper, you remember that FWC was looking at possibly allowing some type of limited harvest opportunity in state waters.

Ultimately, they decided -- This was, I believe, back at the April commission meeting, that they weren't going to do harvest immediately, but instead directed staff to come back to the December commission meeting, which is the week after our council meeting, and talk about additional research and management goals and how soon we might look at this again to possibly consider some other type of limited harvest, and so we'll be talking to them about that in December.

I can also note that there have been a number of red tide off of southwest Florida that have been -
- A number of goliath off of southwest Florida that were killed because of the red tide, and we are trying to sample every one that we can, sending staff over to the landfill even to sample all of the goliath and get those otoliths and sizes, so that we'll have those samples.

One more thing that FWC is working on, and I've talked to you before about how we were doing some shore-based shark fishing workshops, and so, at the upcoming December commission meeting, we will be talking about a suite of regulations, looking at possibly creating an endorsement or permit system for people that are going to be shore-based shark fishing, and so they would have to have, in addition to their Florida recreational fishing license, they would have to have another type of permit on top of that, and also looking at the tournaments that are doing shore-based shark fishing. That's all I'm going to highlight right now, unless there is questions.

MR. BELL: Just on the shark thing, there would be criteria they would have to meet or something?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, so there would be an educational component, and so, before you were issued the permit, you would have to take a little online course, and we're still working on what does this rule look like. Are we looking at what types of gears or are we looking at things like no chumming from shore and things of that nature, and so we're still working out the specifics. The only thing we know for sure is that this would be an add-on to the license, and there would be an educational component that would go along with this. I am going to pass it over to Tom Frazer, who has been here all week with us, from the Gulf Council, the newly-elected Gulf Council Chair. Go Team Florida.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks for allowing me to sit in on your meeting. I always appreciate it when you guys come to ours as well, and so I think we prepared a liaison report, and I'm not going to read that verbatim. I think I will just hit a few things that I think you guys might be interested in. We had our council meeting in August, and it was in Corpus Christi, and we talked a little bit about the Spiny Lobster Amendment 13, which you guys discussed today, and so I think we're in the same boat there and choosing to align the federal and state regulations, and so we look forward to working with you guys to get that moved forward to the Secretary.

We also -- Well, we're working on a framework action dealing with cobia. As we talked about, we have some problems over there, some concerns, about the status of that particular fishery, and so there is two actions in there. One involves essentially a size increase limit, and a vessel limit as well, and so that framework, I guess, is going to come back at the October meeting, which is in a couple of weeks, and hopefully we'll be able to take some final action on that document in October.

We also took final action on a coral amendment, and so we designated a number of locations in the Gulf that were designated as habitat areas of particular concern, and so a long time to get that moving through, but I think we're in good shape with that one as well, and I guess you guys have some coral things coming up too, and so it will be interesting to talk to you over the next year or so on that.

With regard to the red snapper harvest levels, we took some final action on that one as well, to modify the harvest limits, because the most recent red snapper stock assessment allowed us to increase the ABC and the ACLs, and so it's a pretty significant increase coming up, about a million-and-a-half pounds, and so that's a good thing.

I think everybody knows that we've got some state management plans in the works. We've got some exempted fishing permits right now, and this will be going into the second year of those, but the council continues to work on amendments, state amendments, and hopefully we'll make some progress there in trying to pick some preferreds and see if we can get those moving. That's probably one of the more controversial things at our council. Then, finally, we also had a recent assessment for hogfish in the Gulf, and we had to reduce the ABC there to avoid some overfishing issues, and so a little concern with that fishery too, but I guess that's probably all I've got, and so I'm happy to take any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any questions for Tom? All right. Moving around the table, Mr. Haymans for Georgia.

MR. HAYMANS: A couple of quick things. Since our last meeting, back-to-back, July and August, we had requests for vermilion snapper state records, which we didn't have, and, in an effort to be angler friendly, we added a ladies record for Alli DeYoung, with a three-pound-ten-ounce vermilion, and for Scott Funderbunk with a three pound-eleven-ounce vermilion, about half of what the world record is, but those fish were caught roughly -- One was roughly forty miles offshore, and the other one was about seventy miles offshore, and so we don't have a whole lot of anglers, but they sure go a long way to go fishing.

Although it's not currently under the council's purview, it may one day fall there, and so our oyster season -- We closed through the summer, because of high water temperatures, and we typically reopen the end of September, and we're currently extending our closure. Our water temperatures in the southern part of the state were about eighty-five degrees as of this past Friday, and eighty-one is that magic temperature, and so we're still closed on oyster.

Shrimp season is going okay, and nothing to write home about, and so I asked Chip to throw that picture up. The last thing I've got is this is a recent deployment, about three weeks ago. This was actually two deployments of about 3,000 to 4,000 pounds, estimated, of concrete. Tons. Not pounds. Add some zeroes to the end of that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's hard to get good help these days.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, and so the guy who won the bid, Steven Stowing, and, Mel, you guys know him well, I'm sure, and so that's a 250-foot barge, and they thought they could do it, what we had piled up, in one barge load. It took them two, and so that's the single -- Aside from the New York City subway cars, those two barges deployed at the DRH Reef are the single largest deployments we've done at one time, and that make a really nice rubble field. It's \$180,000 to put those loads out there, but partnerships is where it's at.

Sapelo Saltwater Sportfishing Club and the Coastal Conservation Association of Georgia and the Building Conservation Trust and Fieldale Farms and Claxton Poultry and the City of Brunswick, and, I mean, it's just a bunch of donors that go together to put a load of concrete like that together and material, and so, anyway, that's pretty much what I've got.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Moving down the table, anything from SERO or the Southeast Fisheries Science Center that we haven't gone over so far?

DR. CRABTREE: I have nothing more to report on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica, anything?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, I pass. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Then I'm going to come back around to Steve.

MR. POLAND: My apologies, Madam Chair. The fellow sitting beside me that hasn't spoken all week decided to be a comedian in the last ten minutes, but a lot is going on in North Carolina in

the last three months, or really the last two weeks, with the hurricane, obviously, and so a lot of impacts to our fishermen, recreational and commercial.

Ahead of the storm, the Division went ahead and did some precautionary shellfish area closures, as well as recreational water quality advisories. I think most of those have been lifted now. Staff have been able to get out into the field and do water testing and everything like that. Mel, I'm sorry that you're getting most of our slime, effluent, and coal ash, because a lot of our flooding was in southeastern North Carolina, and a lot of those rivers flow in the end into South Carolina.

Other things to note, the last three months, our commission -- We have new commissioners right now, and we will be getting new commissioners at the next meeting in November, and there's really nothing to note that they have taken up recently that would affect the council.

The southern flounder stock assessment, I just mention that because it's a regional assessment, and I think everybody sitting at the table has contributed data to that. That is getting completed, and what's interesting about that is one of the big questions in southern flounder biology is where do those fish go once they leave, where do they go and spawn, and the prevailing theory is that they go offshore, way offshore, off the shelf break, and so we're trying to start some tagging work to maybe answer that question.

Back to the world out there in the EEZ off of North Carolina, we have kind of seen an uptick in our artificial reef program. We were kind of in a holding pattern, waiting on some federal permits, and we finally got those, and we did sink a ship the week before Hurricane Florence. I have not talked to our artificial reef staff since the hurricane, and I don't know if they've checked to see if it's still there or not, but I am sure it at least rolled over.

We've got a strategic plan, a new artificial reef strategic plan, where we're going to focus on adding to current reefs in that three to fifteen-mile zone off the coast, and we have split the state into three zones, and we're going to focus in each zone over that five-year period, and so one zone is this five years and the next five years and another zone and another zone.

Two state records have been certified in the last three months, one for gag grouper, and that was forty-eight pounds landed off of Morehead City by Louis Guzman, and a mangrove snapper, and we have not certified a state record for mangrove snapper, and this is the first one. It was about twelve pounds, and it was caught by Angler Mark Davis, who I think is actually a South Carolina resident, and so I don't know how I feel about you guys coming up here and getting our state records.

Other than, we're just dealing with the aftermath of Hurricane Florence, and I know the division staff is working on compiling as much information on effects to the fisheries, and so physical and biological effects as well as socioeconomic effects, and I'm sure, over the next year or two, we'll be putting out reports detailing all of that, and I don't have anything else.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Steve. Any questions for Steve? All right. Is there any other business to come before the council today? If not, I am going to turn it to Gregg to give us a brief overview of our upcoming meetings.

MR. WAUGH: This shift in two weeks makes the rest of the year even a little busier, it seems. The week after next, we've got our SSC meeting the frontend of the week, and then the Snapper Grouper AP, and the Gulf Meeting, and Tim will be attending that, and we've got the ASMFC meeting.

Then, into November, and you've got this material, and it's Attachment 12, but, the first week in November, we'll have the Habitat AP here, and we've got MREP, and then new council member training is the 14th through the 16th, and we've got our people lined up to go to that, and the briefing book -- You will get the briefing book posted on November 16 for the December meeting, and so it's a real quick turnaround. There is one correction on the calendar that you have. In December, the SEDAR 60, which is red porgy, that was moved to February 5th and through the 7th, and so that's one shift there, and that's it, Madam Chair.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any questions about the upcoming meetings?

MR. HAYMANS: If we can do it in four days for this week, we can do it in four days in the future.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Technically, it wasn't four days. I don't know if you remember, but we were here on Sunday.

MR. HAYMANS: But that wasn't actual council business. We started Monday at one o'clock, and we're done.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, everybody. This concludes our meeting, and we'll see you in North Carolina in December.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on October 4, 2018.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
October 12, 2018

2018 Council Members

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

✓ Acting Chair

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

✓ Acting Vice-Chair

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OPEN AT-LARGE SEAT

Dr. Jack McGovern
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Erik Williams
Dr. Tom Frazer
Step Grimes
Rick DeVictor
Erika Burgess
Frank Helles
Tracy Dunn
Kelly Denit
John Foster
Brett Pierce
Vivian Matter
Jenny Lee
Steve Durkee

Council Staff

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

Executive Director

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

Deputy Directory-Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
John.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director-Management

✓ Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
Myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Kathleen Howington
Kathleen.howington@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
Cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
Kim.iverson@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Kimberly Cole
Kimberly.cole@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
Roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

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

Outreach Specialist

✓ Cameron Rhodes
Cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
Mike.collins@safmc.net

Accounting

Suzanna Thomas
Suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

Outreach Specialist

✓ Kelsey Dick
Kelsey.dick@safmc.net

Citizen Science Program Manager

✓ Amber Von Harten
Amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fishery Social Scientist

✓ Christina Wiegand
Christina.wiegand@safmc.net

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
John.hadley@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

FULL COUNCIL – ROLL CALL VOTE

Date:

Meeting Location: Charleston, SC

Issue: SG VISION BLUEPRINT RA 27 (COMMERCIAL)

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MS MCCAWLEY	✓		
BELL	✓		
MS BECKWITH	✓		
BREWER	✓		
CHRISTIANSEN	✓		
CONKLIN	✓		
DR CRABTREE	✓		
GRINER	✓		
HAYMANS	✓		
POLAND	✓		
SAPP	✓		
WOODWARD	✓		

FULL COUNCIL – ROLL CALL VOTE

Date:

10/4/18

Meeting Location: Charleston, SC

Issue: MOTION: DIRECT STAFF TO DISCONTINUE WORK ON
SG AMENDMENT 47

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MCCAWLEY	✓		
BELL		✓	
BECKWITH		✓	
BREWER	✓		
CHRISTIANSEN	✓		
CONKLIN	✓	✓	
CRABTREE		✓	
GRINER	✓		
HAYMANS	✓		
POLAND	✓	✓	
SAPP	✓		
WOODWARD	✓	✓	
	7	5	

FULL COUNCIL – ROLL CALL VOTE

Date:

Meeting Location: Charleston, SC

Issue: SG ABBREV. FMWK 2 (VS + BSB)

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MS. MCCAWLEY	✓		
MR. BELL	✓		
MS. BECKWITH	✓		
MR. BREWER	✓		
MR. CHRISTIANSEN	✓		
MR. CONKLIN	✓		
DR. CRABTREE	✓		
MR. GRINER	✓		
MR. HAYMANS	✓		
MR. POLAND	✓		
MR. SAPP	✓		
MR. WOODWARD	✓		

FULL COUNCIL – ROLL CALL VOTE

Date:

Meeting Location: Charleston, SC

Issue: CMP FMWK Am b (KM TRIP LIMITS)

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
ms. MCCAWLEY	✓		
BELL	✓		
ms. BECKWITH	✓		
BREWER	✓		
CHRISTIANSEN	✓		
CONKLIN	✓		
Dr. CRABTREE	✓		
GRINER	✓		
HAYMANS	✓		
POLAND	✓		
SAPP	✓		
WOODWARD	✓		

FULL COUNCIL – ROLL CALL VOTE

Date:

Meeting Location: Charleston, SC

Issue: SPINY LOB. Am 13 (MBMT PROCESS + BULLY NETS)

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
MS MCCAWLEY	✓		
BELL	✓		
MS BECKWITH	✓		
BREWER	✓		
CHRISTIANSEN	✓		
CONKLIN	✓		
DR. CRABTREE	✓		
GRINER	✓		
HAYMANS	✓		
POLAND	✓		
SAPP	✓		
WOODWARD	✓		

September council mtg webinar - Day 4 - 10/4/18

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Bard	Dave	bluefishbard@yahoo.com
Bard	Dave	david.bard@noaa.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Brame	Richen	dbrame55@gmail.com
Buck	Kari	kari.maclauchlin@gmail.com
Buckson	Bruce	bruce@buckson.net
Burgess	Erika	erika.burgess@myfwc.com
CLARKE	LORA	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Conklin	Chris	conklinsafmc@gmail.com
Cox	Jack	dayboat1965@gmail.com
DeVictor	Rick	rdevictor@yahoo.com
DuBeck	Guy	guy.dubeck@noaa.gov
Fenyk	Cynthia	cynthia.fenyk@noaa.gov
Foss	Kristin	kristin.foss@myfwc.com
Foster	John	john.foster@noaa.gov
GENT	TACTICAL	sean@marsec4.com
Gloeckner	David	david.gloeckner@noaa.gov
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@gmail.com
Gore	Karla	KARLAGORE@GMAIL.COM
Hart	Hannah	hannah.hart@myfwc.com
Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Johnson	Denise	denise.johnson@noaa.gov
Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net
Laney	Wilson	wilson_laney@fws.gov
Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov
Lee	Jennifer	jennifer.lee@noaa.gov
Matter	Vivian	vivian.matter@noaa.gov
McGovern	John	John.McGovern@noaa.gov
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Moss	david	david@smoss.com
Neahr	Todd	todd.neahr@myfwc.com
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Pianka	Karen	karen.pianka@noaa.gov
Pierce	Brett	brett.pierce@noaa.gov
Pugliese	Roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
Pulver	Jeff	Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov
Ralston	Kellie	kralston@asafishing.org

Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Rudnay	Kayla	rudnayk@dnr.sc.gov
Sapp	Art	artsappsafmc@gmail.com
Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@ncdenr.gov
Shipman	Susan	susanshipman@att.net
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov
brewer	chester	wcbsafmc@gmail.com
malinowski	rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
t	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov
Brennan	Ken	Kenneth.Brennan@noaa.gov
Cody	Richard	richard.cody@noaa.gov
Geer	Pat	pat.geer@mrc.virginia.gov
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@noaa.gov
Howington	kathleen	kathleen.howington@safmc.net
Iberle	Allie	aboltz1@jhu.edu
Poff	Craig	Craig.Poff@Avangrid.com
Rhodes	Ray	rhodesr@cofc.edu
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@gmail.com



June 8, 2017

Chairwoman Duval and South Atlantic Council Members:

Federally permitted vessel owners in support of limited entry permits in the for-hire indust

Vessel Name	Vessel Number	Owner Name	Owner Signature
RELAKS	FL 7492NS	Ira LAKS	
Samana 1	991370	JASON CARDINALE	
Samana 2	1124677	JASON CARDINALE	
Tom Cat	FL6871NS	Tom Schuler	
BLACK DOG	1166399	William Taylor	
MYSTIC ROSE	1210978	Jay York	Jay York
Country Club	12109117	Jim Boeth	
"	00664117		
Native	FL 7292HE	Gary C Sture	
Miss Blue Horn	693651	Ryan Nitzel	
Blue Horn II	957158	RYAN NITZEL	
Johnny Cake	1251490	RYAN NITZEL	
		RICARDO NAVE	
Fish Trap	FL 0956JN	Trevor McMahon	
Pure Hell	FL 9468GA	Tom Heisler	



June 8, 2017

Chairwoman Duval and South Atlantic Council Members:

Federally permitted vessel owners in support of limited entry permits in the for-hire indust

Vessel Name	Vessel Number	Owner Name	Owner Signature
RELAKS	FL 7492NS	Tea Laks	
Samana 1	991370	JASON CARDINALE	
Samana 2	1124677	JASON CARDINALE	
Tom Cat	FL6871NS	Tom Schauer	
BLACK DOG	1166399	William Taylor	
MYSTIC ROSE	1210978	Jay York	Jay York
COUNTRY CLUB	12109117	John Booth	
	00664117		
Native	FL 7292HE	Gary C Sture	
Miss Blue Horn	693651	Ryan Nibel	
Blue Horn II	957158	RYAN NIBEL	
Johnny Cake	1251490	RYAN NIBEL	
		RICHARD NABER	
Fish Trap	FL 0956 JN	Trevor McPherson	
Pure Hell	FL 9468 GA	Tom Heister	