

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

LAW ENFORCEMENT ADVISORY PANEL

**Town & Country Inn
Charleston, SC**

February 10, 2022

TRANSCRIPT

Law Enforcement AP

Capt. Scott Pearce, Chair
Col. Bruce Buckson
Capt. Chris Hodge
Jamal Ingram
Captain Garland Yopp

Lt. James Bruce
Alana Harrison
Lt. Pat O'Shaughnessy
Capt. Michael Paul Thomas

Council Members

Mel Bell
Spud Woodward

Trish Murphey

Council Staff

Myra Brouwer
Cindy Chaya
John Hadley
Kim Iverson
Ashley Oliver
Suz Thomas

John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
Allie Iberle
Kelly Klasnick
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Christina Wiegand

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick DeVictor
Ira Laks
Willow Patten
Wes Wolfe

Frank Helies
Nikhil Mehta
Alex Pumo, USCG

The Law Enforcement Advisory Panel of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Town & Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on February 10, 2022, and was called to order by Captain Scott Pierce.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Good morning, everybody. This is Captain Scott Pearce, Florida Fish and Wildlife. I want to welcome everybody back, everybody online, and thank you for chiming in. I know it's been quite a while since we've had a chance to get together, especially in-person, and so it's really good to get everybody back together and discuss all these topics, but, just to get the morning started, because it's been a little while, we're going to go around the room and kind of do some introductions, and so, again, my name is Scott Pierce, and I work for Florida Fish and Wildlife, and I'm Captain of the Division of Law Enforcement. We'll just work our way around the room here, and then we'll hit everybody online that's on the panel, but I will go ahead and start over here with Captain Michael Paul Thomas.

CAPTAIN THOMAS: Yes, sir. Thanks for having me. Michael Paul Thomas, South Carolina DNR, Captain on Region 4 on the coast down here.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Good morning. It's great to be here. Lieutenant Pat O'Shaughnessy from the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, and I supervise all the EOs on the east coast South Atlantic area.

LT. BRUCE: Good morning, everybody. My name is Lieutenant James Bruce, and I am the Commanding Officer of the U.S. Coast Guard's Southeast Regional Fisheries Training Center. Thank you.

MS. HARRISON: I'm Alana Harrison, and I am here on behalf of commercial fishing, and I live in Hatteras Village, on the Outer Banks, and I'm a new addition, and so I'm sorry if there's a learning curve to me, and so thanks for bearing with me.

CAPTAIN HODGE: Good morning, everyone. Captain Chris Hodge from Georgia, and it's my first meeting here, and I've been back on the coast for about three years now, going on three years. I started my career on the coast, and I supervise the Coastal Region of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources Law Enforcement Division.

CAPTAIN YOPP: Good morning, everybody. Captain Garland Yopp with the North Carolina Marine Patrol. I work for District 3, which is our southern half of the State of North Carolina.

MR. ROBERSON: Kevin Roberson from Hilton Head, South Carolina. I'm a citizen advisory member, I guess.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right. I guess I will move on to -- Bruce Buckson, are you online?

COLONEL BUCKSON: Yes. Good morning. This is Bruce Buckson, and I am actually retired FWC Law Enforcement, and I'm also -- I spent about three years with the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, and I'm glad to be back connected with you all.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Good to have you, Bruce. Jamal, are you there?

MR. INGRAM: Yes. Hello. I am Jamal Ingram from the Office of General Counsel Enforcement Section, and I am the newest member to that shop, and, if you've got any questions for me, or you need anything, and I don't know the answer right away, I will track it down for you. It's great to be here. Thank you.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Yes, sir, and it's good to have you, and I'm sure we'll have questions as we go. That's everybody we have online and in the room, and so we'll go ahead and move forward with the agenda. What I would like to do first is if we have anybody who -- Is everybody okay with the agenda as written? Okay. Then we'll go ahead and approve the agenda and move forward.

As far as the minutes from our meeting in February of 2021, is everybody good with the minutes from that meeting? So I'm going to go ahead and approve that, and we'll move forward, and now we're going to move into our morning session open public comment, and so I will turn that over to you.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Scott. Are there any members of the public, either online, or I guess we have one person in the audience, that would like to offer any comments to the advisory panel? If so, please raise your hand. We have no hands, and I will note, Captain Pierce, that there is also an online public comment form, where folks can submit comment for the AP to consider in their discussions, and we checked this morning, and there were no comments submitted.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Okay. All right, and so we're going to go ahead and move forward with Spud Woodward, and do you have comments for us this morning? Our committee chair, Spud Woodward, is having some issues with connectivity, and so, if he comes back in, we will give him an opportunity to speak to the group, and so now we'll just move forward with our amendments.

MS. BROUWER: This is basically just a little summary that we put together, and part of what we want the advisory panels to do is to kind of get a feel for what the council has been doing, and so this is a very quick summary. Well, maybe not quick, but it just highlights some of the amendments that the council is working on, and then we are going to be posing a few questions to the advisory panel, things that the council has requested and things that -- Basically, just to make sure that you guys don't see any enforcement issues and sort of alert the council to things they may want to consider as they move forward in developing these amendments.

This is Attachment 1a in your briefing book, and the first amendment that we are going to go over, and I will shortly here invite Christina Wiegand to come and tell you about it, has to do with Atlantic king mackerel, and this is CMP Amendment 34, and so I'm going to get Christina to come up here and tell you about that.

MS. WIEGAND: Thanks, Myra. Like she said, this is the Atlantic king mackerel amendment, and, just to sort of orient you guys, I will very quickly go over why we've started working on this amendment. It's a response to the SEDAR 38 update assessment, and so one of the things it's doing is updating catch levels based on that assessment, but there was a significant increase in the acceptable biological catch coming from our SSC, and so one of the things the council did was went to their advisory panel and asked if there was anything that could be done, in terms of regulations, to help increase harvest and make sure we were using this stock optimally.

The AP came up with a number of ideas, and the one that I would really like to focus on with you guys today is their request to allow recreational fishermen to keep cut or damaged fish that meet the minimum size limit, and so this provision is already on the books for the commercial sector. Commercial fishermen are allowed to keep cut and damaged king and Spanish mackerel, so long as that chunk of fish that's left meets the minimum size limit, and so the AP and the council would really like to see this provision applied to the recreational sector as well, but there have been some concerns, in terms of law enforcement, one being that many state laws require that fish be landed with heads and fins intact.

My understanding is that the law requiring that was originally put on the books to keep fish from being cleaned or filleted aboard the vessel, and so one of the questions the council would like this AP to discuss is how this issue of landing fish intact can be resolved from an enforcement perspective, to allow recreational fishermen to possess those cutoff or damaged fish, and the intent is that this would help with issues related to shark depredation and barracuda depredation, which are pretty prevalent in the mackerel fishery, and the council has heard a lot of input from stakeholders about this being an issue.

With that, I will sort of turn it over to the AP, in hopes that you guys can have some discussion on the best way the council can sort of word this to allow recreational fishermen to possess those fish without causing any enforcement issues, in terms of fish being cleaned or filleted at-sea.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right, and so I will open the floor for any discussion from the AP panel, anybody online or in the room. I will start with the conversation that I've had with our fisheries biologists and our game wardens, is that what we've always done is, if somebody has a fish in their possession that has been mutilated, as long as that carcass still meets the minimum size, we have just -- I wouldn't say overlooked it, but we've always allowed that. From a commonsense perspective, I wouldn't want them to throw a fish back that they could otherwise legally keep, if they can meet the requirement.

I know some of our folks even say, well, I can tell the fish is obviously mutilated, but, at the same time, commonsense always prevails in the enforcement world, and so, if we've got a carcass there that we can tell was mutilated, which is usually obvious, as well as meets the minimum size limit, we have allowed that for several years anyway.

CAPTAIN YOPP: I agree, and that's what we have done. We use just commonsense on that. If we can identify the fish, and it meets the minimum size limit, we educate them what the law says, but, generally, we allow them to possess it, and so that's kind of what we do.

AP MEMBER: It still counts toward the catch limit?

CAPTAIN YOPP: Yes. that's the way we treat it.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I would say, in Florida, the discretion of the officers is -- When they see things like that, obviously, we use that discretion. Some of the things we were wanting to talk about though were, if this were to move forward for recreational, would there be any issues, if you had to make any rule changes within your state, to accommodate this? I know, in Florida, again, discretion is one thing, but, when it comes down to whether the regulations in Florida would allow it, for us, we allow direct transit, and so, if this practice was happening in federal waters, then we

could allow them to transit with these fish, in that situation, but they could not stop and fish in Florida. That's the technical side behind it.

The question would be, moving forward, would there -- It sounds like the discretion, that the states would work with these folks, but, if you had to make any rule changes to accommodate it, would that be an issue for any of you all, but the other question I have was, moving forward, and this is for Spanish and king, and, obviously, shark predation is a big issue, but is there a chance this could start carrying over into other fisheries and things like that?

That's something that I wanted to just be conscious of, because, depending on the fisheries, it could get -- Down the road, we could have more issues with more fisheries wanting to participate in this, and, for some species, it may be harder for you to do this with, depending on size limits and things like that and being able to identify the fish after they've been mutilated.

The other thing is clearly being able to tell the fish was a predation issue, and like, in one of the conversations, if somebody were to -- If the shark were to hit it, and then they were to cut it, where it was a clean cut, and put it in the cooler, would that now be an issue with us being able to clearly identify if this was a predation issue or was this not, and, again, the carcass is going to meet the size requirement, but we want to make sure we're consistent across the board, to make sure that we can clearly identify this was a predation issue, and, again, for us, they would have to be in direct transit, but, again, discretion typically rules the day here, when we see these situations and we can clearly see what was going on, and the remaining part of the fish meets the minimum size requirement.

MS. HARRISON: My question would be, if you have half of a king mackerel, on the recreational side, would you report that as a whole king mackerel, and so that would be counted as one fish, and it's not going to be, well, he had two halves, and so now is it going to be one, because you could easily take advantage, I feel, of that situation.

Also, from a commercial perspective, when you are keeping shark-bit fish, it's really a gamble on the quality and how long the fish has sat in the water, what the water temperature was, the method of harvest, and so like, if you're trolling for king mackerel, and the shark bites it, but you have your lines out for another twenty minutes, that fish is -- The quality of the meat is going to be very sub-par, and so I wouldn't even want to keep that fish. I would throw it back and say the sharks can have the rest of it. We see that a lot in the tuna fishery. Guys will bring shark-bit fish back and then get no return for it, and so they should have just thrown it to fish, but then it becomes dog food, and so it could have been shark food.

MS. WIEGAND: Just a note about whether or not the hunk of fish left would count as one fish or half a fish, the intent is that it would be subject to bag limits, and so whatever, for lack of a better phrase, hunk you have left would be one fish.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I see, online, we have Jamal and Bruce, and so, Jamal, I will go ahead and let you go first. You had your hand up first.

MR. INGRAM: Thank you. While leaving it to officer discretion is great, again, it's up to officer discretion. In order to write the -- Just throwing out some options, the easiest and cleanest way is honestly for the states to change their laws to mirror ours. However, because of process, that may

be more difficult for some states than others. The other option would also be if we write the rule to say that, yes, you can keep a hunk of king mackerel, or Spanish mackerel, but, if you intend to land in a state which could have more restrictive rules, you must comply with that state law, and so that's two options that you could look at, depending on how you want to word this, if you do not want to pass this without having conflicts with the states.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thanks, Jamal. Bruce.

COLONEL BUCKSON: Thanks, Captain Pierce. I appreciate it. First of all, let me apologize for not being there. It's always much easier to be able to have face-to-face and chats maybe offline about some of these things, especially somewhat controversial issues, and it doesn't seem like this is, overall, a huge issue, and I agree -- I understand where we're coming from, and I appreciate it, and I'm glad he spoke first.

Technically, you still are going to have state violations, and using -- This is how my mind works, and it's somewhat regimented, in certain respects, my mind is that is, but, if you've got a conflict in law, you're asking the officers to ask somebody to violate the state law and to be able to, when they use their discretion, which I understand there is always officer discretion in these cases, but, in one where we're actually having the discussion about it, we're actually encouraging officers to use their discretion, instead of following what the state law might be, which is somewhat challenging, I would think, for the officer, you know, and what do I really do that's not going to get me in trouble.

I just wonder if the state -- I like the direct transition that you mentioned, Captain Pierce, and there's probably the same situation in all of the states, but my dilemma is I don't know how to offer a suggestion to have that as actually being part of the regulations, therefore allowing the officer to no longer have discretion, but clearly understand that, if they're in direct transit, it's not a violation, and so hopefully that didn't add a bunch of worms to this can. That's all I had. Thanks, Captain.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, Bruce, and I would say just -- I agree that the discretionary part is an important part of what we do, but, when you look at the regulation that's in place, obviously, there's a conflict there, and so I guess the big question here for law enforcement is, moving forward, would each state be able to work with this over the long haul, because discretion, over many, many years, can change and can get lost in the historical background of how you do things, and so, again, for us, it's always best, especially with a large agency, to have things set up where we're meeting the standard of the regulations that we're dealing with. For us, that direct transit would probably be something we would stand on pretty strong in Florida, unless we adjusted those regulations in state waters to accommodate the activity.

I guess, moving forward, we can make a recommendation to the council to just consider the states, and this would be in direct conflict -- If everybody agrees, direct conflict with the state laws and regulations on what we call whole condition in Florida, and I'm sure that everybody kind of refers to it the same way, and so each state would have to accommodate this in their own way, if we allow this to happen in federal waters and allow them to bring it back and land it in the state. Is everybody good with that, or does anybody want to add to it?

MS. WIEGAND: I'm just curious if anyone -- Given that this provision is already on the books for the commercial sector, and it's possible that commercial fishermen aren't regularly cut and

damaged fish, for some of the reasons that Alana mentioned, but I'm just curious if the states have a matching law for the commercial sector or if there's also that conflict for the commercial sector and if there have ever been any issues, to you guys' knowledge, with the commercial sector and this provision, given that it's already allowed.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: For Florida, I can say we use the direct transit, and we allow for direct transit from federal waters. Jamal, do you have your hand raised?

MR. INGRAM: Yes. Thank you. To the law enforcement guys, how difficult do you believe it would be to change the law in the respective states? Is that something they would have an appetite for, and, if so, as the process got started, you could write the regulations to say that you can keep the cutoff fish. However, you must -- If you land in a state that has more restrictive language, then you can keep the fish, and then, once that state pulls back that language to mirror ours, then it wouldn't be an issue.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thanks, Jamal. I know that, for us -- One of the big concerns for Florida, with changing the regulations, would be, if we changed the regulation to accommodate the king mackerel and Spanish mackerel, it puts more emphasis on the stakeholders to want us to change the regulations to accommodate more, and we've got to be careful of that slippery slope, because we don't want to create a situation where we're moving so fast on other things that we don't consider all the options and all the effects that can take place, and that's a bigger conversation, and that's the biggest challenge we have.

If we do that there, then we open the door for more stakeholders wanting us to change regulations in other areas to accommodate other species, but I want to kind of go around the room with the states though and maybe get it on the record, and is this a -- Without the element of discretion, would this currently be a conflict with your state regulations for each state? We'll go ahead and go around the room, and I will start with you, Chris.

CAPTAIN HODGE: Georgia's Natural Resources Board has the authority to regulate fishing rules, and so, in Georgia, it would not be an issue, but I honestly don't even see it going to the board. We could create an OIR for our guys to understand how to enforce this, and it's pretty simple for us, and it's an Opinion and Interpretation of Rules, for those that don't know OIRs, but I see no issues moving forward in Georgia at all.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right. Thanks, Chris. Go ahead, Yopp.

CAPTAIN YOPP: In North Carolina, it would be -- We would have to change our rule, and that takes longer than -- You know, we either have -- It's got to go before our commission, and that is just a little lengthier process. Our director does have proximation authority, and so, if it was something she determined what we wanted to move forward with, that would probably be how we would address it, for something quick. Other than that, it would be a lengthy process, or could be.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thanks.

CAPTAIN THOMAS: Just like you were saying, for us, we adopt this -- As federally-managed species, we'll adopt the federal law, and we have a law on the books that says that, and so we could adjust pretty easily to it, and it would just depend on the species. Like you said, if you start with

this one, then it may get bigger and bigger and bigger, and that would, obviously, be a concern for us, but we could definitely adjust and adapt to that, and then, you know, we allow direct transit on other species as well, in our southern zone, for like cobia or whatnot, and so that's the way we would probably treat these as well.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Okay. Thank you. Pat, did you have anything that you wanted to add?

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: The only thing I would add is, if we do go through with this, there's got to be some educational outreach. We see it sometimes in the tuna fishery, and with the mackerel fishery, and they hear they can keep shark-bit fish, and they lose that part that the remaining piece has to be of the legal size, and so we often hear, and I have heard it myself, and you're on a boarding, and you have a shark-bit fish, it's two inches short of what's legal to keep, but you can tell, if the whole fish was there, it would have been two feet larger, and they say, well, you can tell it would have been a legal fish, and so we just have to do that outreach. They will hear that you can keep shark-bit, and you'll start seeing fish that are two, three, four inches short, and so that's something that's a little further down the line, but we've got to make sure that we get that out to the public, so that they don't make that mistake.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Again, going back to the discretion, I always talk to my folks about it, and it's something that, in this situation, you can't provide the public direction based on discretion, and so you have to go by what the books say and what the regulations say, and that's something that I want the council to consider as well, moving forward. Although the states can use discretion, and we do, in the given situation, but it always falls back on what the regulations say, and you can't -- You have to pretty much provide the public what that regulation is and what they have to abide by, because, ultimately that's -- They can be held accountable.

MS. HARRISON: So if I'm -- Like, hypothetically, if I'm an angler, and I have a portion of a fish, and I get boarded, and you're telling me that, if you had that entire fish, it would be undersize, but then how -- Can I just play ignorant? How do I know? I don't know the size ratio of a fish, and how am I supposed to estimate? I've never caught that fish before, and I don't know how long the body is to the tail, and just like I would have no idea how to go about kind of like measuring my fish once -- Like if they were shark bit, and, on the commercial side, like I said, you just really like throw most of them back, unless it's like a really big tuna, and you're like, well, that might grade out, and we'll keep it, but, from like just an average person, who doesn't spend that much time on the water catching all these species, how do you tell them to measure it now?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Based on this recommendation, the remaining carcass would have to meet the minimum size limit of that species, and so the big thing is can you clearly identify the species that you're dealing with, which, for these two, it wouldn't be that hard, but then the remaining portion of the fish would have to meet the minimum size requirement.

MS. HARRISON: So then that would hold up in like court, you giving me a ticket for an undersized fish, and I wouldn't be able to go and fight it and say, well, you don't have the fish, and I wasn't able to -- Do you know what I mean? I just want to know like if there's a way to actually -- It's not just another regulation and that we can actually say like, no, this was undersized.

CAPTAIN HODGE: Just a comment, real quick, and I think what you're misunderstanding is the fact that the fish is already in violation of the law anyway, because it's not heads and tails intact.

In Georgia, it would be, and so we're trying to be more lenient with allowing you to keep that fish, so long as that fish still meets the minimum size requirements, and so a portion of the fish being gone is really irrelevant, as long as the fish meets the minimum size requirements. That's where I think you might have misunderstood that.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: As Chris was saying, if, for some reason, you didn't meet that minimum size, then it would be a whole condition case, and it wouldn't be a size limit, and it would be possession not in whole condition.

MS. HARRISON: I am just -- It's very complicated, and from a perspective, especially of somebody who is just going out fishing like one day a month, and then, if you open -- In my mind, it's like, if you open this door, then what about like I catch a shark-bit golden tile, or a shark comes up and -- It feels like Pandora's Box, I guess, and it is kind of like how would -- It just is very complicated, measuring shark-bit fish.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, Ms. Harrison. Your comments are really important to this, and that's the perspective that we need to hear.

MS. WIEGAND: I just wanted to say thank you, guys, for that input. That's been really valuable, and we'll pass it along to the council.

MS. BROUWER: I guess I should clarify that the council is going to be meeting the first week of March in Jekyll Island, Georgia, and so some of the recommendations and discussions that you guys have here today will go to the council to help them finalize -- For example, the amendment we just talked about, the council is going to be considering that for submission to the Secretary of Commerce, and so it's at the very end stage of its development, and I will walk you through at least one more that is also at that stage. It looks like Bruce has his hand up. Go ahead, Bruce.

COLONEL BUCKSON: Thank you. I understand we're kind of at the close of this thing, and I apologize for being a late kind of hand up there, but I think some of the things that Lieutenant O'Shaughnessy said were actually very critical, as far as the education portion goes, and, again, back to Captain Pierce and trying to stay focused on what the real issue is, and I think he made a good point at one place, where he was talking about the discretion issue is a very difficult thing to train, and that makes it a challenge from the law enforcement perspective, I believe, for the boots on the ground anyway, and it can ultimately be a challenge there. Maybe a question that I have is I'm curious as to how much of an issue this is actually with the recreational fishery for king mackerel, because I believe that what's your addressing now, is for the --

MS. WIEGAND: We certainly don't have any quantitative information on how prevalent it is, but I would say, just based on public comment and input we've gotten from the AP, shark depredation is incredibly prevalent, particularly in the king mackerel fishery on the recreational side.

MS. BROUWER: Ira, go ahead.

MR. LAKS: Hi, guys. I just wanted to weigh-in on this conversation, and I'm the chairman of the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel, and we had several discussions about this, and I understand all the conversations and the impacts on law enforcement, but this is already legal, as has been said before, and there already has to be provisions that are made for the commercial fishery, and, to

me, it's just the matter of a fact that you have to kill another fish that gets eaten, and so, if a fish gets cut off on the last part of a king mackerel's tail, that's not really a useable part of the fish anyway, for me to have to throw that fish back and kill another one, on a charter, is kind of wasteful.

Again, I can't get past the fact that this is already legal for the commercial industry, and the commercial king fishery is not a fishery where you would leave fish in the water for a long time. These fish are caught pretty much one at a time, and so it would be similar to a recreational fish being landed, and it's quite a common practice to bring in cut kingfish on a king mackerel commercial trip.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, sir. I appreciate that clarification.

MS. BROUWER: Before we move off of this, I would like to be able to capture any recommendations or comments, and so I've put up a draft recommendation up on the screen. As I said, the council meeting is coming up very quickly, and so I'm going to have to turn around and get a report ready for the briefing book, and so I want to make sure that this group's recommendations are being captured properly.

What I have up on the board is to recommend to the council that the proposed federal regulation would be in direct conflict with state regulations and that each state would have to accommodate with this regulation in their waters. Is that in fact what the Law Enforcement AP would want to pass along to the council?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: If anybody would like to change this, please feel free to chime in. Again, keep in mind that we're not saying that we won't work with it, and we're not saying that we can't work with it, but we're just saying that they need to know that there would have to be some form of accommodation that would need to take place. If everybody is good, if you all could give me a -- All good? All right. Bruce, are you good with that?

MS. BROUWER: All right, and so, moving along, the next amendment we wanted to talk a little bit about -- It looks like we've got Spud on the line, and so I'm going to pass it back to you, Captain Pierce.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Good morning, Spud. I know you had some problems connecting, but we'll open the floor to you for any comments you may have for the AP panel.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, and I was a victim of ill-timed Microsoft updates, it seems like, and so I apologize. Yes, I just wanted to welcome everybody to the advisory panel meeting and, again, express my thanks, and the thanks of the council, for your willingness to serve. As you all can tell by the agenda, we've got some challenging issues to deal with, and we certainly want to make sure that, whatever we go forward with, it is going to be as enforceable as possible and as clear and understandable to the fishing public as possible, and we certainly depend greatly on you all's advice, and we take it very seriously, and, again, thanks for you all's willingness to serve.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, sir. We appreciate that.

MS. BROUWER: All right, and so, moving along then, the Snapper Grouper Amendment 50 is next on the list, and this one addresses red porgy, and so this amendment has been under development for over a year, and it responds to the latest stock assessment, which indicated that red porgy are overfished and undergoing overfishing. The council needs to put in measures to end overfishing immediately and put in place a rebuilding plan, within two years, to address the overfished determination for this species.

Because the new catch levels are so far below the current ones, the council has proposed changes to the management measures for both sectors, as well as changes in the accountability measures, and so the one thing the council wants the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel's input on has to do with the reduction in the bag limit, and so, currently, the bag limit for red porgy is three per person per day, or three per person per trip, whichever is more restrictive.

Council members want to know if the regulation could be changed to per person per trip per day, to just make it a little simpler, and so I have the document that I am showing to you guys, and the input from the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement representative on the team that is putting together this amendment, and so his advice was that removing this language would not really impact current enforcement officers, but he did point out that, if the language is changed, that would necessitate adjusting this other regulation that has to do with possession limits for red porgy.

For red porgy, for-hire vessels that span more than forty-eight hours still cannot retain more than one daily bag limit, and so, for other snapper grouper species, this is different, and so he just wanted to point that out, that that would have to be adjusted as well, and so this is another amendment that the council is scheduled to approve in March, and so this is kind of the last little bit of making sure that it's good to go, and so, if the AP has any input for the council, now would be the time.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right, and so we'll kind of open the floor for discussion here. Any comments at all? The key point, here again, Myra, and I'm probably repeating some of the stuff you already said, but we're just trying to clarify that red porgy, if you're on a multiday trip, whether it be one, two, or three days, that, once you reach that bag limit on that first day, that's the bag limit for the entire trip, and that's what -- The language is clarifying that, correct?

MS. BROUWER: Well, so that's part of the regulation. The actual bag limit language is where the council is requesting, potentially, changing that, to simplify it, and so, currently, it is three per person per day, or three per trip, whichever is more restrictive, and so that was put in place to address the for-hire landings, but, now that they're going to reduce the bag limit to one, they want to know if we still need to keep this per trip, whichever is more restrictive, or can we just make it one per person per trip per day?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I think that -- I think the simple change you're making doesn't really affect that ability to regulate that, and I think it still kind of says the same thing, if everybody agrees, and this is just a more simple way of saying it, and so I think it works just fine the way it is, but any other comments, or any other thoughts? I guess I should clarify. I think, if they were to change it to one per person per day per trip, that would meet the standard, and we could enforce that without a problem.

MS. HARRISON: Just for clarification, that would mean, if I went out on a three-day trip, I could keep one fish for each of those days, if I had my receipts proving -- Well, I think that would be -- Personally, that would be more enjoyable for me, because what would I do the next two days, if I couldn't catch fish?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I think I am confused now, because I thought that meant that the daily bag limit would apply -- Like, if you went out the first day, on a three-day trip, and caught one red porgy, that would be the only red porgy you could possess for the three days you're out there, because the trip -- It's one per day per person per trip. If the trip is a three-day trip, that's your one fish for that trip, and do I have the right understanding?

MS. HARRISON: If they had said per person per day per trip, then you would be correct, but I think they are wording it as per person per trip per day, and it's suggesting that the trip could be longer than a day. It's very confusing, but then I am assuming, based on the other possession regulations, because it says a person aboard a charter vessel that spans more than twenty-four hours may possess no more than two daily bag limits. Oh, of species other than red porgy.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I guess we just need to know what the correct interpretation is.

MS. BROUWER: I guess the intent would be to simply the regulations, and obviously, there's a pretty substantial reduction in harvest that's needed, and so, if the regulation is more restrictive, as far as possession then that meets the intent of ending overfishing for this species.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: So I kind of go back to my interpretation, again, was, the way the language is, that you're allowed one fish, either per person, and I will separate each part of that. It's not -- To me, it doesn't matter how they fall in, but each one is separate, and so I'm allowed one per person, and I'm allowed one per day, and I'm allowed one per trip, and so that's one fish. If I'm on a three-day trip, that's only one fish that I can have, and is that correct?

MS. BROUWER: Right. I mean, that's the logical interpretation, and so I think what our law enforcement OLE representative was pointing out is that, if the council were to want to keep it that way, there's going to have to be an adjustment made to this other portion of the regulations that allow -- Not allow, but that address multiday trips, and you're going to need to clarify that, in fact, the possession limit for a multiday trip of red porgy would be just one, whereas, for other snapper grouper species, it is a daily limit.

CAPTAIN HODGE: I think what could be done there is just take the per day completely out of it. If you're considering a trip a three-day trip anyways, or a two-hour trip, take per day completely out of there, and it's just one fish per trip, no matter if a trip is three days or three hours, and it stops the confusion that she brought up. That's just a suggestion that I have, because it is confusing, when you try to read through, and are they talking about a day -- Because, when you mix in per trip and per day together, what she did is what the average public is going to do, and they're going to say, what are you talking about, a day or a trip? That's just -- Taking "per day" completely out of the phrase I think would help to simplify it.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Ms. Harrison, just so you know, I had to read it three or four times to get my head wrapped around it, and so you're exactly right, Chris. By removing day, is there any other scenario where day would apply, because I agree that one per person -- I am not an expert

on the red porgy fishery, but is there any other situation where you wouldn't be on a trip and you could still harvest red porgy, from a pier or something like that? By eliminating day, would that affect that in any way whatsoever? Jamal, I see your hand up. I will let you go first, and then Bruce after that.

MR. INGRAM: I think, just to touch on what you just stated, if you remove the day, it is possible that you could take two trips in one day. However, it's not likely that you will be boarded twice in one day, but that's -- It still leaves a loophole, if you take out the day, I think. As far as the Part 2, down in 187, Part 2, I reviewed a draft the other day of this, and it has been changed to read, as follows: (2) A person aboard a vessel may not possess red porgy in or from the EEZ in excess of one per day or one per trip, whichever is more restrictive. I think that would cover it, and, that way, even if you change it to one per person per day per trip, the possession limits -- You can still only possess one, if you make that change in Part 2, like I believe has been -- I know it's been suggested. I hope my rambling made sense there.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, Jamal. Bruce, go ahead.

COLONEL BUCKSON: Thank you, Captain. I don't know who spoke before Jamal, and I apologize, but I think changing the one day -- Leaving out the trip issue and just making it a daily bag limit, that probably covers it, but I guess -- This is probably going to sound silly to some, but, to those of you who know me, you won't be surprised by that, but I wonder why it's even needed to be changed, because the original language was not that confusing. It was either -- It basically handled the whole situation pretty clearly. Even though it's a reduction in the bag limit, the total number is the same as it has been before, and so, without changing it, people who are familiar with the regulation seem to be able to comply with these, and that's all. Thank you.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, Bruce.

AP MEMBER: Any idea on how many headboat recreational multiday trips there are? To me, that doesn't seem like -- That's a small subset.

MS. BROUWER: We talked about this a little bit with the advisory panel, last time they met, and I think it was in October, and my recollection is the majority of trips that span more than twenty-four hours are probably off of North Carolina, and that's a longer distance out there, and the AP didn't have a very clear recommendation for the council, and they basically said, yes, it may affect some of the headboats up there, and it may -- It wouldn't affect folks in Florida, and so it's pretty split.

MS. HARRISON: I have a question. I'm not familiar with the red porgy fishery, and we don't really target those in Cape Hatteras, but, if it is close enough to the shore, it would be possible, especially on like a high-speed outboard, to run two trips a day, which, I mean, even for offshore groupers, you can do that in a slow-moving commercial vessel, and so, if this is a fish that is like, in my opinion, like really in danger, then you may want to keep the per trip, just to close that loophole.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I think, like you were saying, like Bruce brought up, the day would cover - - That would cover that multi-trip aspect of it, but I also -- Is that Paragraph 2 that I am seeing, is that the original language? That one is the original, and so a person board a vessel may not possess

red porgy in or from the EEZ, and it's going to go to one fish, right, and so we'll throw the one fish in there, and so a person aboard a vessel may not possess red porgy in or from the EEZ in excess of one per day or one per trip, whichever is more restrictive. To me, that is pretty clear. Spud, did you have something you wanted to say?

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, Scott. Myra, the goal here, I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, is to limit the harvest to one red porgy per day per individual, and is that not correct, the way that the bag and size limit analysis is being applied?

MS. BROUWER: Yes, and the analysis for this amendment was conducted with the current regulations, and so I didn't personally do the analysis, but the three was simply substituted with one, and so it's one per person per trip.

MR. WOODWARD: So we're not trying to limit the harvest to one per multiday trip, but we're just trying to limit it to one per twenty-four-hour day, and so, again, I think, the way the language is in that Number 2, if it was changed to one, we really could -- I mean, if it was one per day, that should cover it, but I guess you could have one per trip, and, really, it seems redundant to me. It seems that one per day would cover it, and, if you have a multiday trip, then, obviously, the burden falls on that person to provide proof that they were on a multiday trip and did not exceed one per day. Anyway, that's just --

LT. BRUCE: I just want to clarify, with the language, because I am picturing that this regulation applies to the individual, and the reason I say that that is I'm picturing, if we have three people aboard a vessel, and we just read the language here, and it's one porgy per person per day, meaning they can only catch one fish, right, but, if it's a multiday trip, and the trip being defined in 50 CFR 622.2, where a trip is basically port to port, and you're on a multiday trip, with the more restrictive, it would be one fish per trip, meaning that, of those three people aboard this vessel, if Person Number 1 catches a porgy, that's the one fish per trip.

If I think about it from the boat perspective, with multiple people, it's one fish per trip, no matter how many people are onboard, but, if I think about it from the individual perspective, it's one fish per day or one fish per trip, and so is there -- I say all of that to say is there language that denotes that this regulation is applicable to the individual and not -- If my interpretation is correct, that it's the individual person and not necessarily like the vessel, regardless of how many people. Thank you.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Just to clarify, what you're saying is, when you break it down like that, you would almost consider that to be a vessel limit and not a person limit, and so the intent is for it be per person, correct, Myra? Again, I want to go back to something that Spud said, because I think it's important to note to the council that we've gone back and forth through this a couple of times, because my interpretation is just what we said, that this would limit you -- If you're on a trip that spans over twenty-four hours, that's one trip, whether you're gone one day or three days or four days, and that's one trip.

If you catch a red porgy on the first day of that trip, you cannot possess any more red porgy throughout the duration of that trip, and so you could not catch another one, or keep another one, over the next two days, if it was a two to three-day trip, and so you're only going to get one for that trip, and so the way it works is, if I'm going out just for the day, I can go out and catch one

porgy that day, and I can come back to the dock, and that was my trip for the day, and I'm done. I can't go back out and catch another red porgy, because it applies to the per person per day per trip.

If I am going out for two days, and, the first day of the trip, I catch red porgy, I cannot catch any more -- Or possess any more red porgy for the duration of that trip, and that is the interpretation that I have for that regulation.

I do think, and this is just for Florida, I think that the Number 2, a person aboard a vessel may not possess red porgy in or from the EEZ in excess of -- Let's go down to a little bit further down. Paragraph 2 on this one is a person aboard a vessel may not possess red porgy in or from the EEZ, and, right there, we clarify a person, and so we're talking about a person, aboard a vessel, and so I think that isolates it to the individual, may not possess red porgy in or from the EEZ in excess of one per day or one per trip, whichever is more restrictive, and, to me, that's the most clear way to say this, and I just want everybody else's feedback on that. Would you rather go with that, or would you go with the one per person per day per trip? Jamal, go ahead.

MR. INGRAM: I just want to clarify something I said earlier. I thought you said that you would take out "per day", and that would open up two trips in -- I am talking about multiday trips, and so that means you could get one for each twenty-four hours that you were out, if you take out "per day". If you take out "per trip", then it opens up two trips in a day, and that's what I was saying, and that's just to clarify.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I think we understood you, Jamal. I think you were pretty clear on that, and so we're tracking with you. Bruce, go ahead.

COLONEL BUCKSON: I apologize for making so many comments today. If there was like a thumbs-up button when a speaker is speaking, I could actually give you a thumbs-up, and you would understand. Either that or I could have made sure that I made it to the meeting, so you could actually see me shaking my head yes. Captain, you did a good job of explaining that, and I think you were on track with what the regulation says, because I was reading along with you, and I think that is probably the easiest way to leave the language to make it work, and so I will figure out a way to give a thumbs-up somehow or another, so I don't bother everybody so much. Thanks.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: We always love to hear you talk, Bruce. I guess I will say, if we get everybody -- What are your thoughts on recommending to the council that we go with that Paragraph 2 as our recommendation for law enforcement? That will be the clearest -- If you all feel that way, would this be the clearest for interpretation, or for the public, for law enforcement in general, and just, around the room, if we can get an approval. Have we got thumbs-up? All right. Christina, have you got a question? Go ahead, Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I just want to make sure that I understand this, because I think, the way you explained it, I understand it, but what this does mean is that, if you make a multiday trip, you will only be allowed to have one red porgy, regardless of the duration of that trip.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Yes, sir, that is correct.

MR. WOODWARD: That would be the more restrictive of the two. I just want to make sure, and, Myra, does that match up with the intent of what we're trying to do, to constrain the harvest on multiday trips to only fish, regardless of the duration of the trip?

MS. BROUWER: Yes, Spud, and this is actually the way that it is currently written in the amendment, and so it does match what you guys have been discussing.

MR. WOODWARD: Okay. Then I'm good. Thank you.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, Spud. Go ahead, Pat.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I would just like to point out that we had a lot of discussion here, but the only thing we've actually changed is from three to one, and all the wording has stayed the same, and so we've reduced three to one. A lot of discussion, but the wording has stayed exactly the same, and only the number has changed.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right, and so, if everybody is good with that, I think we can move on.

MS. BROUWER: Next up is greater amberjack, and, if you will indulge me here, I'm just pulling up my little cheat sheet, and I am not the person putting together this amendment, and Mike Schmidtke is, and he couldn't be here this morning, and so I'm going to give the overview for him.

This is another amendment that is responding to a stock assessment. For this one, the news was good, and amberjack are not overfished, and overfishing is not occurring, and so the catch levels are actually going up, and so, right now, amberjack are at a current total catch limit of about 1.9 million pounds, and the proposed catch level for the 2022/2023 fishing year is going up to 4.3 million pounds, and then it goes down from there over the next five years, to remain at 2.7 million pounds in 2026/2027 and thereafter, until the council changes it.

The council is also looking at sector allocations and if any revisions are necessary for that. Currently, for amberjack, 41 percent of the total ACL is allocated to the commercial sector and 59 percent to the recreational. They are looking at changing the size limits for both sectors. Right now, for the recreational sector, the size limit is twenty-eight inches fork length, and it is thirty-six for the commercial sector, and so the council is actually considering bringing that consistently -- I believe their current preferred is thirty inches, and so one of the things we wanted to know, from law enforcement, is are there any issues with the council making those changes?

The other action they're considering is changes to the spawning season closure, and so, right now, the current closure prohibits the purchase and sale of greater amberjack and limits the commercial sector to the recreational bag limit, which is one fish per person, for the month of April, and so the council is considering prohibiting all possession for both, and so both sectors would be prohibited from retaining amberjack for that month, or removing the closure altogether, and so there would be no additional restrictions for either sector during April relative to the rest of the year. The council hasn't selected preferreds for this one, and so what they're wanting to know is are there any enforcement issues?

The other thing they're looking at is changing trip limits, and this is mainly just for your information, just so that I tell you everything that's going on with this amendment. Currently,

there is a split season for amberjack, and there is different commercial trip limits for each of the two chunks of the season, and so, right now, there is a 1,200-pound, and that is either whole or gutted, in the first season, which is March through August, and there is a 1,000-pound trip limit for the remainder of the fishing year, which is September through February.

They are looking at increasing the trip limits, in the first season, up to possibly 2,500 pounds, and, also, they are looking at a range between 1,200 and 2,500 pounds for that second season, and so the council can mix-and-match those values, which that's currently what has been put in place, and this split for the commercial season was actually just implemented, and I think it went into place in 2020, and so any enforcement issues that you guys see with any of those regulations, and, if there aren't any, then that's great.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Any discussion at all? I think we're good.

MS. BROUWER: The next amendment, you get to hear Allie's voice for a little bit, and so this deals with snapper grouper, and so I'm going to let her come up here and tell you about it.

MS. IBERLE: All right, and so I'm going to get us started with snowy grouper, and so this amendment is pretty early on in the process, and it is in response to the most recent stock assessment of snowy grouper, which indicated that they are both overfished and experiencing overfishing, and so there is about an approximately 35 percent reduction needed in the harvest to achieve these new catch levels, and so the council has reviewed this amendment several times, and they have discussed the following, and so they will update the ACL and allocations, to include the FES landings and in response to those updated catch levels.

Then, to achieve those reductions needed in the harvest, they have discussed reducing the commercial trip limit, which is currently 200 pounds gutted weight, and they have talked about establishing a commercial spawning season. Currently, the commercial season for snowy is split into two, with Season 1 running from January 1 to June 30, and then Season 2 running from July 1 to December 31, and peak spawning, from the literature, is noted as May through August, and so they're talking about closing during those months, possibly.

They have also talked about modifying the recreational season, and so shifting that away from peak spawning, because, currently, the recreational season is May 1 through August 31, and so kind of right during that peak spawning, and then, finally, they have discussed modifying the accountability measures for the recreational sector.

Again, this amendment just went for scoping, and so we just gathered some public comment that the council will review in March, but, for this group, what I guess we will stop here and discuss is if there is any issues that you guys foresee as this amendment moves forward, from a law enforcement standpoint.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Any comments on snowy grouper? No hands, and I think we're good.

MS. IBERLE: Okay. I guess I will just keep going with golden tilefish and blueline tilefish. This is not one that I am the lead for, but I will try to do my best. This amendment is in response to an assessment for golden tilefish, and so it's going to adjust catch levels and allocations for golden tilefish only, and that stock is not overfished or experiencing overfishing, and so there can be an

increase up to 18 percent, and so, again, this amendment is in the same stage as snowy, and so we're really early on in the process. We just took this amendment out for scoping.

Other than adjusting those catch levels and allocations in response to the assessment, the council has discussed modifying blueline tilefish accountability measures. The recreational sector for blueline tilefish has been exceeding their ACL, and so the council does need to review the accountability measures for the rec sector. They have talked about adjusting the recreational bag and possession limits and having different limits for captain and crew, or seasonal limits, and adjusting the length of the recreational season, and so, Myra, anything else you wanted to add on tilefish?

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Allie, for covering that, and so, for blueline tilefish, that is one thing that I just wanted to spend just a little bit more time explaining, and so, right now, there's that four-month season, right, and so it's May through August, just like for snowy, and, when the council put that in place, the input that we received from fishermen was that those two species were caught together, and it was better to have a season for both of them that matched, and it's a deepwater species with high release mortality and all that.

Now, it turns out that it's such a short season for blueline that the data on the estimates of the recreational landings are not coming in in time for the in-season closure to kick in, right, and so we have all these overages that have been occurring over the last six years, an average of 188 percent over the recreational limit. This has been brought to the council's attention, and there is some language, actually, in the National Standards that state that the council needs to revisit and reevaluate their system of accountability measures when there has been overages for four years in a row.

One of the things that they are looking to do, obviously, is does that season need to be adjusted, so that the catches don't keep going over, or does there need to be more restrictions put in place for the recreational sector, and so that's where they are, and I will say here -- I had to step out of the room, and so I don't know if Allie mentioned it, but we did conduct scoping for snowy and gag, and she's about to talk about gag, but golden, blueline, and what I included in your briefing book as well is the scoping document for those three amendments, and so, if you had a chance to look at it, it's very general.

We held scoping webinars last week, and it seems like a lifetime ago, but I think it was last week, and we got a lot of input, and Allie is going to tell you about the things that came up, and it was very focused input and had to do with gag, but I will let her tell you about all that, and so I just wanted to give a little bit more background there on blueline, and, as she said, we're still very early on in development of these amendments, and so a chance for law enforcement to flag anything that the council needs to spend a little bit of time considering, in terms of enforceability, and, if there's no questions, I will pass it back to Allie to tell you about gag.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Are there any discussion items for blueline tile or golden tile? The one question I have is it says different limits for captain and crew, and so are we talking about eliminating a bag limit for captain or crew or having a reduced bag limit for captain and crew?

MS. BROUWER: I think what the council was thinking here is could maybe not allowing retention by captain and crew help alleviate this issue of overages, and so, right now, it is allowed for all

snapper grouper species, and one thing they put out there to maybe consider is limiting captain and crew, and they did that a while back, and I believe vermilion had a restriction, and they took that away when that stock was doing better, but, yes, that's what that would mean.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Okay. Any comments on that at all? Okay. We're good.

MS. IBERLE: All right. Moving on to gag, like Myra noted, this amendment is really early on in the process, and it was in response to the most recent gag assessment, which indicated that the stock is both overfished and undergoing overfishing. There's about a 50 percent reduction in harvest needed for this fishery, and so, in December, the council reviewed the start of this amendment for the first time and discussed the following items, and so they will establish a rebuilding plan for this species. Go ahead.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I am sorry, and I didn't mean to cut in, and I was looking at this, and I know we're going to talk about the spearing part of this, and I think that might get a little -- We might have discussion, and so I was going to -- I hate to do this to you, but I was going to recommend that we take a quick break now, and then we'll come back and we'll jump on grouper, because I think that will bring on some discussion.

MS. IBERLE: I think that's a great idea.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: So ten or fifteen minutes. We'll take fifteen, and we'll be back. Thanks.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. IBERLE: All right, and so we went over the assessment, and, again, we need that 50 percent reduction in harvest to achieve those updated catch levels for gag, and so I am going to launch into kind of what's been discussed thus far for gag, and so the council will establish a rebuilding plan, and they will adjust the ACLs and allocations in response to that stock assessment, and then some management measures to help achieve those reductions, and so, for the commercial sector, they have discussed reducing the size limit or creating a slot limit, and, currently, the minimum size limit for gag is twenty-four inches, and they have also talked about reducing the commercial trip limit, and that's currently 1,000 pounds gutted weight, with a step-down to 500 pounds after 70 percent of the ACL is met.

Then, for the recreational sector, they have discussed a vessel limit, not to exceed the current bag limit, and they have talked about a one to six-fish vessel limit, and, again, not to exceed that one gag per day bag limit, and they talk about this for all recreational vessels and then for private recreational only, excluding charter and headboat, and then, finally, they have talked about increasing that minimum size and creating a slot for the recreational sector as well and removing or restricting spear gear for both sectors during the rebuilding plan, and spear gear would include bang sticks. Then they have also talked about that for certain times of the year.

Then, finally, modifying the accountability measures, and, also, and I'm sorry, but I breezed right over this one, but they have discussed modifying the recreational spawning season closure, which currently runs from January 1 to April 30, and so, as Myra mentioned earlier, we just took this amendment out to scoping, and we received a lot of feedback, most pertaining to spearfishing, and

most in opposition to spearfishing, and I guess I will pause there and let you guys discuss any issues you see moving forward with this amendment.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Okay, and so the bullet points you just went over are right there, and so reduce the commercial trip limits, and are there any comments or any thoughts on that? Okay. Then increasing the minimum size limit for both sectors, and any comments on increasing -- I mean, this is all enforceability, and I think it's all pretty good, and then the one I am really interested in, and I would like feedback on, is creating a slot limit for both sectors.

I mean, I feel like we can create a slot limit, and, enforceability-wise, it's a slot limit, and we enforce a slot limit all the time. My greater concern is that I just don't -- For that fishery, I don't know if that's -- Then again, I am probably out of my scope, but that seems like it's something that could be really challenging, and, again, we're going to get into spearfishing in a minute, but like for spear fishermen and things like that, but any thoughts on the slot limit?

MS. IBERLE: I will say that the slot limit discussion came up -- So, when talking about spearfishing, the concern was the efficiency of the gear and the fact that spear fishermen were potentially removing large individuals from the population, and so the slot limit was kind of geared towards protecting those large individuals, and, from the comments that we received from spear fishermen, many said that they would be able to gauge a slot limit underwater.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Any idea on what that slot limit would look like?

MS. IBERLE: I would have to -- My apologies. I would have to look for you, really quickly, and I can do that, but we've based it off of -- I believe we based it off of the sexual transition of the species.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: So now we'll go into restricting or prohibiting spear gear during the rebuilding plan, and, for enforceability-wise, is there any discussion or any thoughts on that, for enforceability on how -- I mean, we don't really know what the restrictions they're talking about would be, and so it's kind of hard to say, but do we have any clarification on that?

MS. BROUWER: Was that for -- Are you talking about the spearfishing? The council hasn't really discussed any details of that, and so, basically, everything we've put out on the table to obtain scoping comments from the public was could a seasonal restriction on spearfishing be something palatable, something to consider, and some of you, I know, attended these scoping hearings last week, and the response from the spearfishing community has been pretty loud in opposition, and so clearly there's a lot of issues there, and I think there is some indication that, off of North Carolina, there is a concern, as Allie mentioned earlier, and the perception is that larger individuals are being removed from some of these nearshore reefs and habitats very efficiently by spearfishing gear.

I don't know that we have the information to be able to zero-in on that, and the data to analyze whether this is actually happening and to what extent. A couple of years ago, 2018 and 2019, something like that, we kind of took a more in-depth look at spearfishing gear in the snapper grouper fishery, and we sort of did a summary by state, the prevalent species that are targeted with that gear, and it indicated that it's a very small percentage of the fishery that is targeted with this gear, and so that's where the council is. They are going to get the summary of all those scoping

comments, which were three-hundred-and-seventy-something online, most of them relative to this potential restriction.

MS. IBERLE: I have those options that we're going to present to the council for the size limit, and so it would be increasing it to twenty-eight inches total length, thirty inches total length, and then the slot would be from twenty-four inches, which is the current minimum, to thirty inches, and, again, these are what is being taken to the council, and so they may modify that.

Then the other thing I wanted to note with spearfishing gear is we did see some suggestions for prohibiting with scuba gear only, and we heard some discussion on rebreathers, and so, currently, spearfishing with scuba gear and free diving is allowed, but you are not allowed to use rebreathers, and so I just wanted to put that out there as well.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I will open -- Does anybody want to bring up any points or key points for discussion on that?

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I just had a question. Restrict or prohibit spear during the rebuilding plan, is that commercial and recreational, or are we only looking at commercial?

MS. IBERLE: That is for both sectors at this point.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I would just say, looking at this, and knowing that we don't have a lot of input on what type of restrictions -- I mean, they're really still discussing this, but I think, for us to really chime-in, from a law enforcement perspective, to give them direction on whether it's enforceable or not, we really need to know a lot more about what those restrictions would be.

I mean, if you have just simply prohibit spearing for gag, for all intents and purposes, it should be easy to tell when you're on a boat, if you see fish are speared and the gags aren't, and I brought up one issue, and I don't think it's really an issue, but the only time I think -- This would be more in the prosecution base, but, if somebody claimed they were using a gaff, which we typically can tell the difference between a gaff and a spear, but that could be something that somebody brings up as a defense mode, and so that could be challenged, but that's -- As far as boarding a boat and seeing whether fish are speared or not, that's pretty easy.

The other part of this would be would this also trigger us to do similar regulations in state waters, and that's a bigger discussion for the council, but that's something that could be -- That we would have to deal with there, and then, in south Florida, with the gag grouper regulations, the specific regulations to gag, we do have a lot of confusion with gag and blacks in south Florida, and so we would have to contend with that in Florida, as far as the different regulations and people being confused about what they're doing.

I mean, they're pretty explicit, when you look at the two fish, but people still get them confused, and we deal with that a lot, but that's really my only input for this, but I do think that we need to have bigger discussions with the Law Enforcement Panel when they figure out what those restrictions would be, and I guess we can make a recommendation that says we would like to have the opportunity to discuss those restrictions, and is everybody good with that?

MS. IBERLE: Any other questions on gag? All right. I am going to hand it back over to Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Okay, and so the next one, and I think this one may be the last one that I have for you guys, and so it's mainly a heads-up of where the council is, and so this is everybody's favorite fish, red snapper, and so this is an amendment that would respond to both the new recommended catch levels for red snapper that are a result of the latest stock assessment and also a vehicle through which the council would attempt to address the issue of the number of fish that are released dead, which is what is largely driving the overfishing and overfished determination for red snapper.

It's kind of, again, very early in the process, and the council is very much aware of the issue of discards, not just in red snapper, but fishery-wide, mainly in the recreational sector, and so this amendment would look at potential ways to reduce the number of fish that are released dead and increase survivability of those fish.

Right now, so far, they are considering actions that may include restrictions on gear, and they have talked about single-hook rigs, requiring single-hook rigs, and potentially something to do with leader length, maybe hook size, lines per person, and all these things have sort of been thrown out there as possible ideas to consider. We're doing a little bit of detective work, I guess, to try to see if any of these tools and approaches have been used in other regions, so that the council could have ideas for how other areas, other jurisdictions, have gone about implementing some of these things.

Also, area closures may be coming back up for discussion, maybe by depth or a specified area, and I know some of you on this panel have discussed that, and I know that law enforcement, in general, has had a lot to say about area closures and how they're defined, and there are also ideas about potentially a recreational season for the entire fishery, or other things like a recreational per-person weight limit for red snapper in particular, and so all of these are just very general.

The council is approaching this slowly, and we developed a scoping document that was put out for comment, and comment was solicited online, and so that's another of the attachments in your briefing book, is a very short document that basically illustrates what the problem is, very briefly, and puts some of these ideas out there, with the intent to gather public input. The council intends to have further scoping meetings as this amendment gets developed in the spring, and those would ideally be in-person, once they have a clearer idea of how they're going to move forward and the things that are going to end up being developed through this amendment.

We're bringing this to you guys, as I said, kind of as a heads-up, and these are conversations that the council is going to be engaging in this coming year, and so, any comments or encouragement or warnings or anything you would like to pass along to the council, I am sure they would be happy to hear it.

CAPTAIN YOPP: Just seeing some of the things like hook size -- Our commission was looking at that for some other stuff, and I would caution about using that. Every manufacturer, we found out, is different. A 2/0 by Mustad and somebody else is completely different, and enforceability would be a nightmare, I would think, on that, and, also, it just struck me with a per-person weight limit recreational, and none of us carry scales.

I think that would be very hard for them to judge, and then for us, and you would basically stop a boat, and then you have to follow them back somewhere for a certified scale, and that would just

not be doable, and that's just some of my comments, looking at -- I know they're in the very early stages, but some of them would be very hard to enforce.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, Garland. Anybody else?

CAPTAIN HODGE: I will just say, just for the record, that we concur with what he just said, because those things are going to become an issue, and getting them to court is easy, but, when you get to court, what happens then, and, once one person sees it, you have no way to enforce that, and then your rule just becomes nothing anyway.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I would just like to say as well that I agree 100 percent. Any time you start talking about gear as a means of regulation, for enforceability, you've really got to keep it in the most simplest form of that, because, when you're asking officers to become experts in certain areas, it can be very hard to do, with the industry changing and gear types changing, and, like he said, hook size, and you almost have to go back to a method where you can choose a way to measure a hook, versus going by like a 2/0 hook or something like that, because there's so many different variations.

Those things get very complicated, and so gear is something that we definitely have to communicate on, moving forward, and then, also, I agree with the weight limit. The weight limit would virtually be unenforceable on the water, because, again, you have to -- In order for that to hold up in court, you have to have certified scales, and we can't carry that stuff on the water, and we don't carry it, and any time we can move away from a weight limit as a means of gauging a quantity of fish, we need to get away from that, because it's just really hard to do on the water, and it's really only something that you can do dockside. I will give it up to anybody else that has any other comments.

MS. HARRISON: I have a question. How would you measure if a commercial limit is seventy-five pounds for red snapper? If I'm boarded, how do you -- If you don't have a certifiable scale, how are you gauging my limit?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Typically, commercial, when you're talking about commercial weights, that's all done at the dock.

MS. HARRISON: So you're going to escort me back to the dock and finish the boarding there?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Not necessarily, and I'm not going to speak for everybody, but I know, in Florida, typically, if we board a commercial vessel, we're looking for -- Predominantly, offshore, we're looking for where you're fishing, permits, the certain gear types, things like that. If we have a reason to believe that there is an issue with the weight, then we'll either make contact and arrange for somebody to meet you at the fish house when you're landing, and I know, in the Gulf, it works out well, because we have IFQ, and so we don't have to interrupt that, and we can just figure out when your IFQ landing is, and we can meet you there. There's a lot of things like that that we try to do it the smart way, because, again, we can't gauge it off of it, and so we have to do it, but we're really not going to end a three or four-day trip, commercial trip, to send you back in several hundred miles to weigh your fish.

MS. HARRISON: Well, for me, it's a seventy-five-pound daily limit, but, going off of what you said, I read this -- What I read is commercial has that, and commercial has that, and commercial has that, and so sure you can't do a hook size, but aren't they still using j-hooks, and so we could do a circle hook mandate, and that would be -- That would help a lot, especially with dead discards, because they're not going to be dead by the time they get in the boat, and so that's my comment.

I think, personally, I think anytime you could enforce a per-weight limit, it would be great, and I understand that you don't have that kind of dual accountability system in place that you have for the commercial, but they do have certified scales at the docks, to get citations, and they do have weigh stations, and, maybe not today, but maybe in five years, it could be a thing, and maybe they could have a trip ticket at the weigh station as well, because they have -- The for-hire has a reporting system, but there is no check and balance, and so I think that there is a lot of room for improvement.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I just want to clarify, when I made that comment about getting away from weights. When you're doing that, when you're on the water, when you have fisheries where predominantly an inspection is occurring on the water, recreationally, for the most part, and that was recreational, the weight limits are hard to deal with, because we're not going to meet the recreational boat at a fish house to do certified weights.

Commercially, we already do that, and we already utilize those scales, and we already meet those folks there, and we actually try to do all that in the process of offload, so we don't interrupt their process, but we capture that information, and so there's a lot of things that we already do with the commercial fleets that accommodate them and get us what we need for the weights, but, when you're talking the recreational fishery, all that is pretty much done at the point of boarding, and that weighing fish at the point of boarding is not something we do.

MS. HARRISON: I understand, and I appreciate your comments, and I would also just like to reference the blueline tile situation going on, and, if that is not a call for action in recreational reporting and accountability, I don't know what could be, because it's -- I mean, red snapper -- Like I haven't had one, and my dad hasn't brought one home for dinner, since I was five years old, and, I mean, I hate to be just another person crying on the red snapper train, but, I mean, there really is -- From a seafood retail perspective, the amount of times I have had to show my customers the North Carolina dealer landings and say, look, in North Carolina, there were zero red snapper landed this year, last year, the year before, the year before.

The people telling me that that's fresh North Carolina red snapper are misleading you, and so it's like if we limit the fishery, but then we don't limit -- I know that's not the -- I don't know, and maybe law enforcement is the proper place for that conversation, with mislabeling, but I think that's part of the reason the red snapper fishery has become such a hot topic, and so it's really hard to manage. Thank you.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you for the comments. Bruce, I see you have your hand raised.

COLONEL BUCKSON: Yes, sir, and I will make this brief. Thank you. I agree with the enforcement concerns that were raised already, and I will throw in one other, and the area closures, which is obvious to all, but the area closures normally require an onsite enforcement effort, which can be challenging at times, depending on where they are, but it's just something to keep in mind,

that, should that happen, there's going to be an expectation that there is some sort of enforcement in those areas, to be able to ensure that there is not harvest in those areas.

The one other thing, and possibly, Myra, offline, or through an email, it might be corrected, but I'm just curious as to where the dead release data comes from, and, like I said, I don't need an answer right now, but it's just something I am curious about, how that is actually obtained, and that was it.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Thank you, Bruce.

MS. BROUWER: Thanks for that question, Bruce. Just real quick, the discard information for the recreational sector is going to come from MRIP. For the commercial, there is different avenues, and that is self-reported information for the discard logbooks for the commercial fishery, but, for recreational, it does come from the MRIP.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Just a couple of things to point out. One, it was briefly mentioned about the closures due to depth, and we have been on the record before against them, and I just want to highlight that again, as far as an enforcement perspective. The depth-type closure is unenforceable, and it greatly limits the ability of law enforcement to assist the council in trying to enforce something that they might put in place, and, similarly, and I hate to bring it up again, but area closures are good, and we have the MPAs offshore, and we have more SMZs, but, again, until we put some type of VMS system in place, creating more and more area closures is sort of a feel-good-type correction, in my mind.

The Coast Guard is limited in their vessels that they have, and a lot of these are far offshore, and I know I have spent a considerable amount of time on the thirty-six-foot boat that we have, trying to get out sixty, seventy, eight miles, and VMS greatly assists that, and I have a lot of time in the Gulf of Mexico, and everybody has heard my VMS push before, but, if we're going to do more area closures, they look great when you're writing them up, and we've done more, but we really haven't done anything, particularly ones that are offshore, and so I, once again, would do a push for some type of VMS. If you truly want to make an area closure that is enforceable, VMS is an outstanding tool.

MS. BROUWER: Thanks for that, Pat, and I guess I just want to clarify that, as far as VMS for the recreational sector, that would be a very difficult, if not impossible, thing to require, and that's -- I think the council is aware of the importance of vessel monitoring systems for enforcing area closures in the commercial sector, but, for recreational, it would be a lot more difficult.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Spud, I see you have your hand raised.

MR. WOODWARD: I wanted to follow-up, and I think, and I just want you all to verify this, that, when we're dealing with --

CAPTAIN PEARCE: We lost you. Spud, we lost you. If you can hear me, I think you're talking about terminal gear, and I would be really interested to hear what you have to say, if we can get you back on, or you can maybe send an email with your comments.

I just would like to reinforce again what Pat was saying about the closed areas. Again, in the Gulf of Mexico, VMS has been critical in being able to maintain and enforce those areas, and then, again, with depth, that's another one that makes enforcement very difficult, if you're dealing with contours or something like that, and you're always better off if you just establish a hard line at a certain point offshore, or wherever you're going to go, but, again, the area closures are probably going to be your most effective tool, but it would be most effective with VMS. Is there any more comments?

I think I just want to add one more thing to the council, and that would be that, as they move forward, and I know this is a long -- They're still working on this, and it's going to be over a period of time, but, as they start to discuss these things, these gear restrictions or area closures or depth or things like that, I think it's imperative that they let us chime-in at that point, to comment specifically on what they're recommending, for us to give them the best recommendation for law enforcement and how enforceable these measures would be.

I think that open communication and continued communication and making ourselves available, if we have to convene for some special meeting or something to help them as they move along, but I think we really need to take a close look at each one of these proposals as they kind of go through it.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, all. That's all I had as far as amendments under development, and, as I said earlier, Captain Pierce is going to be bringing these recommendations to the council at their March meeting, and so I will turn it back to you.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right, and so I know we just took a break, and I know we've got some more things to go over, and so I was going to recommend maybe that we break right now for lunch, and then maybe reconvene at 12:30, and then we'll knock this out. Is everybody good with that? All right, and so we'll go ahead and break for lunch and reconvene at 12:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right, everybody. Welcome back for the afternoon session, and I hope that everybody had a good lunch, and so we're getting ready to get started, and did you say that Jamal -- That it looked like he had his hand up?

MR. INGRAM: I'm sorry. That was just to let you know that I was back.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right.

MS. BROUWER: The next item on your agenda is to discuss and talk a little bit about compliance with the for-hire electronic reporting requirements, and so this is a fairly new requirement, and the council requested basically just to get an update. This is something that we get updated during council meetings, every council meeting, but we haven't heard from the folks that are out there enforcing it, and so this is an opportunity to just touch base and ask you guys how things are going.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Myra and I were talking about it, and we're not talking about hard numbers or anything, and just the overall consensus of what we're seeing in the field, what our folks are seeing, and how things are going. I can start it off with what we've got. In talking to my guys on

the east coast, the guys and gals, for the most part, when we're talking about SEFHIER -- For the most, with SEFHIER, we're seeing a lot of trip reports coming in.

I mean, I went ahead and signed up to get all of them, just so I could kind of see how it was going to work, and so we definitely have a lot of trips from the east coast and the Gulf that are being reported, as far as letting us know they're going out, and letting us know they're coming in, what they're doing there.

When I talk to the folks on the east coast, they're still doing a lot of education, and I think what we've got in Florida right now is you've got the law enforcement folks working with our charter fleets to both kind of learn and understand what they're doing and what's going on, but, for the most part, what I'm getting back from the field is they're seeing -- They seem to be seeing a lot of compliance with it. We've had, I think, right now, in our offshore program, we have two warnings and two citations that are related to SEFHIER, since it got started, and so I think a lot of it has to do with the education part, but I think we are getting a lot of compliance, from what we see on the east coast. I will let you guys kind of go around the room, if you all want to talk about what you're seeing.

CAPTAIN THOMAS: In know, in talking to Amy Dukes, who does a lot of our reporting and statistics, she said that there's about 88 percent that are using it and reporting it, and, of that, like 80 percent are pretty much -- 78 percent or so are pretty much on time and not late, and so we're getting fairly good compliance out of it.

CAPTAIN YOPP: Compliance, from what I'm hearing -- I tried to request some data, but I haven't got any back yet, before this meeting.

CAPTAIN HODGE: I spoke with our data folks last week, and I will honest with you that I don't even know what SEFHIER is, but I would like to know, because, if I don't know, my officers obviously don't know it, but they didn't give me a statistic, but they did say that the reporting is at a high level, and so people are complying with it, for the most part, but I would like to have a sidebar with you about SEFHIER.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Absolutely. Between me and Pat, I can probably help you out, but I had a lot of the folks that run the program, and I can't remember her name, but she sent me a lot of good information, and there's a lot of it online, but get with me, and we'll talk about that. Go ahead, Pat.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: We work closely with the NOAA SEFHIER program, and I would say, in the last few months, we've started working a lot closer, and, over the last month -- I just sent out eighty-nine referrals that I got from the SEFHIER program for vessels that have not reported in any shape, way, or form, and so, as far as NOAA OLE is concerned, you will see my enforcement officers now showing up at the dock and talking to folks who have not submitted any reports since the program started, and we're finding a variety of things.

Some have permits that they are not using, and they're historical, and they didn't know that they had to be reporting, to the other extreme, where some people say they are never going to report, they have no intention to, and they are treated differently, but those out in the field will start seeing my six guys hitting the docks with those eighty-nine that I just referred out to them that have not

filed reports at all, but have the permits that require them to, and so, by and large, I would say the vast majority are complying, but there is that portion of the population that, for whatever reason, is not, and we'll be walking the docks now to pay those people a visit.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I would say too, moving forward -- Because, like you said, and it's probably an extended educational period, because there was a lot of pretext to this, before it ever kicked off, but I think we, as a state agency, have been giving them more of that education timeframe, but I think, once you guys start doing that, when we get more comfortable, I think you will probably see us holding them more accountable and working with you all, but I do agree that the majority are doing what they should be doing, and that's a good thing.

CAPTAIN HODGE: Scott, if I could, probably Patrick -- Because I know that Ben works for you, but I bet you -- I probably spoke too soon, and I bet you that my guys that are working with him constantly around Savannah probably have heard of it, but I just didn't know what it was, but Cindy did mention that her and Ben were going to check on some boats the other day, and maybe that had something to do with it, and so I know they work quite a bit together up there.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Don't feel bad, Chris, because there was a lot going on before I was even aware and started asking a lot of questions, and so don't feel bad.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Part of the reason that we've been doing a lot of outreach and assistance and education, and part of the program that's being designed for SEFHIER is there's a law enforcement application to it that has not been rolled out yet, and that will allow someone, before they even go onboard a vessel, to log-in and see if that vessel is up and current. That does not exist, and so, right now, we're left to respond to the referrals we get from the SEFHIER program. However, when that portion of the program is up and running, state partners, and our federal officers, will be able to log-in and see where a vessel is at and then go visit those that they need to visit, and so that's coming online, and I think it was told that, by the May/June timeframe, we'll have that capability.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Is that going to be a smartphone-based application?

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I just hope it's based somewhere, and so I can't answer that, but it will be better than what we have now, and so I would have to ask the SEFHIER program, to see if that's --

AP MEMBER: Was that for this year that you were talking about they were hoping to have it?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I do think, once all the state law enforcement folks are really comfortable with this, it will be a really good asset. The next item that we wanted to kind of get some feedback on was what type of -- Overall, what type of compliance are we seeing with the use of descending devices on the Atlantic?

Again, kind of just reaching out to my folks in the field, and talking to them, and then trying to look at if we had any stats available, really good stats, and so, for us -- I mean, the consensus that I'm getting back on descending devices, from some of the offshore guys that I spoke with and different feedback I've got, is we're probably around the 50 percent compliance rate. We've been doing education in Florida for a while, but we've just started issuing some citations and working

with the agents, and so, right now, I think we have twenty federal citations issued, since we've said, all right, we're no longer relying on education, and we're moving forward, and we've got seven warnings on the books.

We've had I think it was over -- Out of 131 boardings -- One group told me that, out of 131 boardings, they had issued twenty citations and seven warnings, and they felt like, in that group of boardings, they were about at a -- Because a lot of these boardings they said may not require the descending device, and they were just going for a period of time, and so they said, if you cut it down to the reef fish boats, the boats that were targeting those fish that require it, you're at about a 50 percent compliance rate.

CAPTAIN YOPP: We've done a good outreach of trying to get this message out. I don't have any hard numbers for you, but even our port samplers were having -- They got with industry and even had devices to hand out to those that were willing to take them, and they are purely voluntary, and you just have to give some minimal information on it, but we're seeing decent use and people knowing about it, and that's the first obstacle that we've had to overcome, is just knowing they needed the gear, but we've had very few enforcement encounters that I have looked up, at least in my section, for either warnings or citations on it.

CAPTAIN THOMAS: I don't have any hard numbers either, but I would say we're pretty much with North Carolina, and we're seeing some usage, and we've given out -- We've done some of that stuff, and we've given out descending devices, and we continue to do boat shows, or any time we're setting up our JEA booth or whatever, and so it's pretty much the same as Captain Garland said.

CAPTAIN HODGE: Like everybody else, we're seeing folks use them, and I think we have a warning, and maybe one case that's been referred to Patrick's folks, and both of those were at Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary, and so we tend to focus a lot of time there in the fall and the winter, but we did the same, and we had -- There was a box of them in my office when I came back to Brunswick in 2019, and I said what the heck are these things, and I told the guys to start giving them away, and that's what they were there for, obviously, but we passed out a lot, and you do see a lot of people using them.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: For us, I would like to clarify too that one of the messages that I got back is not so much the ones that are not in compliance don't -- Some don't have them onboard, and the majority of them will have a descending device, but it's not rigged and ready, per the regulations, and so we do a lot of education on that, to make sure they understand that part, because you have some people -- Because we have the DESCEND Act in the Gulf, which is different than what you do on the Atlantic, and so, if we get some people coming from the Gulf that are going to the Atlantic, they're going to probably interpret what they use in the Gulf would be in the Atlantic, and so we're having to educate all of them too on that.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Scott, we're seeing the same. Our folks are finding more people that haven't even heard what a descending device is, and so we do a lot of outreach and education. We have other people that have venting tools, and so they were trying to comply with some old rules, and we educate them, but I just did a quick query, and some of these are JEA-referred cases, but we had fifty-seven descending device cases, and twenty-two were handled with fix-its, or compliance assistance, and there were fourteen summary settlements that were issued.

Again, our guys are trying to do more of the education. However, if they have other violations, ten red snapper and then don't have a descending device, we're certainly charging those individuals. One of my guys had brought up that a lot of people -- We push the Fish Rules app, big time, and we're seeing more and more people live by the Fish Rules app, and it talks about the descending device, but it's after you go to the particular species, and then, if you hit "special gear", it then tells you.

We're really trying to push this, and what my guys are seeing is a lot of guys don't know about it, and if there's any way to talk to the developers, and, when they click on a particular reef fish, up pops did you know that you are required to have a descending device, and, since so many people are using the Fish Rules app, that might get more people to know about it, because a lot of people just open it up and see if the fish is open and what size they can keep, and they close it, and they don't hit that special gear option to find out that the third one down is a descending device, and so one of the options is to try to get that so it jumps up at you when you go into Fish Rules, since so many people are using that Fish Rules app.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: That's a good point, and, also, I wanted to let you know too that the cases we've made, obviously, were turned in to you all, but those were also cases that involved a lot of other circumstances, which is under the guidance of your agency, and so we haven't just written that by a lone violation, and it's usually involving a major fisheries case, and then they didn't have the descending devices, also. Anything else on descending devices? Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: Just a heads-up, in terms of Fish Rules, is it actually has been updated recently, and so the descending device requirement -- It's not a popup, but it has been moved sort of out of that special gear, and it's got its own little box that notes that you need to have a descending device.

Then I just had a question for you guys, and you may not know this off the top of your head, but I was just curious, in your experience, or your other law enforcement officers' experience, but what type of descending devices people have onboard, when they do tend to have them, and are they the commercially-purchased ones, or are you seeing a lot of guys sort of make their own descending devices, and I'm just sort of curious what your experience has been with that.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: That was the one question that I forgot to add to my request for information, and so I couldn't give an accurate answer to that for Florida.

CAPTAIN YOPP: My guys are seeing more of the store-bought versions, and my guys did outreach and actually went to some of the fish centers, fish houses, tackle supply places, and showed them the regs and rules, and some of those businesses turn around and then purchase large quantities and set them in the front of their shop, and so, when people walk in, they say, oh shoot, I need one of these, but we do have the creative guys that are designing their own, and, as long as they can describe this unique device and how it works, we're giving them a check that they're making an attempt.

CAPTAIN THOMAS: We've seen more of the rec crowd buying the commercially-available, and then the commercial kind of make their own, and that's what we've seen, at least down by me.

CAPTAIN HODGE: The same in Georgia. They're using the ones that you will find at Bass Pro, if they can keep them in, because I think they're having trouble getting them. I think that Ben and one of my guys actually went to get some of those seafood markets around Savannah, with those that I had in my office, and they passed those out to the fishermen, and she made a comment the other day that that's the ones that she sees them using, is the ones we handed out to them, because I bet we gave out 250 of them, or more.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right. What's our next item on the agenda?

MS. IVERSON: I was just curious if there is something, along the discussion for the descending devices, that we can do to help you in your outreach efforts, because, obviously, you're all doing a very good job at it, or continuing to do outreach, as far as compliance, but if there's something that we could help you with, at the state level, or even in NOAA OLE, as we move forward, because we don't want to become -- We want to help, and be helpful, and so, if you can't think of something right now, off the top of your head, and, if you do think of something, please let us know, so we can help you to improve that awareness, increase awareness.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: One of the things that jumps out at me is we put out a lot of stuff for the general public on information, but maybe, if you all wanted to generate a guide that's directed towards the law enforcement, that shows them all the different types, and maybe even some of the ones that can be homemade and things like that, so that we can have them for the officers, so, when they're out there, they can look at a descending device and say, okay, this is this kind and this type, and understand what they're looking at. That might be helpful, and that's just one thing. We can do some of that in-house, but it's really helpful when the people -- You folks probably know a lot more about the large spectrum of what we're dealing with, and so that would be helpful.

MS. IVERSON: Okay. That's a great suggestion, because I know that information is out there, in pieces and parts, but maybe like a fact sheet, a two-sided fact sheet, or a guide, and, again --

CAPTAIN PIERCE: Remember that we're law enforcement, and pictures are really nice.

MS. IVERSON: Pictures are always good.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: If we're going to do that, one thing we do see a lot is, hey, do you have your descending device, and they run to a tackle box, and so they open up their center console, and it's still in the packaging and sealed, and the rigged and ready portion needs to be prominent, and so we obviously don't write those individuals, and we assist them, and we help them to get it set up, and they're quick to show it, but some of it is still in the Bass Pro bag, and it's in the wrapper that it came from off the shelf, and so it's not exactly rigged and ready to be used, and so, if we do that, make sure that's evident in that.

MS. IVERSON: That's a good point, and readily available is loosely interpreted there, but at least out of the package and so that it can be available, and I think South Carolina DNR does a really good job with their demo, and they have rods and descending devices that are showing how easy it is to that available, and I know there are videos, and, again, Sea Grant has information, and individual states have videos, and we certainly have some on our website, but to be able to pull something together that would benefit not only law enforcement, but just the public in general, and have it as a cheat sheet.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I agree, and you could just think of it as a field guide, and it could be -- Like you said, I like the idea of making it where it could be for anybody, not just law enforcement, and that anybody could have that in the tackle box and take a look at what the other options are. If I left the dock today, and I forgot my descending device, do I have the stuff onboard to make one, those kinds of things, where people can just throw something together that works. I know we also did videos with marine fishery management, where we showed them how to make some, and so it was really good stuff, but that was just an idea.

MS. IVERSON: Those videos are really helpful, and they're short and concise, and they are good, but I like that idea of, hey, we need to do this, and, also, the other thing that we're really trying to emphasize is it works. You know, they work, and we're seeing that more and more with fishermen, but not just this is a regulation, but why, why it's needed, and why you need to use it, and so we're working on that, but I appreciate the input.

MS. WIEGAND: I just wanted to give you guys a heads-up, and you're talking a lot about the importance of outreach and communication with anglers, and we have recently started working with the Sea Grants within the South Atlantic region, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina, to work together, and, as part of a grant, we now have a reef fish fellow on staff named Ashley Oliver. She's actually listening into the meeting right now and getting all this input from you guys on descending devices, but one of the things, one of the major things, she's going to be tasked with is going to tackle shops and boat ramps and fish houses all along the coast to do outreach related specifically to best fishing practices and descending devices.

The input that you guys have on what really needs to be communicated to anglers is going to be incredibly helpful for the work that she's going to be doing, and I'm sure that you guys will see her out and about over the next or two, and so I just wanted to give you a heads-up that we were undergoing that effort as well right now.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I will add that, when she's doing that, if you'll let us know, through whatever route we can, if we can let officers know that, hey, they're going to be doing this training, it might be a good public outreach opportunity, and you guys can learn with the public and ask questions and hear the questions, and so anything we could do like that would be a help.

MS. WIEGAND: Absolutely. We'll be making sure that we're communicating with the state agencies and Sea Grants in the area, and we'll definitely make sure that law enforcement is being reached out to too, so we can offer training to law enforcement officers as well, and that would be great.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Spud, what have you got?

MS. BROUWER: Spud, you're not coming through, actually, and so I'm not sure how to handle this issue of your audio, at the moment. You're showing unmuted on our end.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Mel, are you online?

MR. BELL: Yes, and Spud just said his computer is acting up, and it may be a Go to Meeting problem. He can't raise his hand, and he can't ask questions, and so I told him that could relay through me, if he wants to try.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: We would like to hear what Spud had to say, and I don't know if it will work, but if we could get him on speakerphone or something, if that might work, but it might not go on the record, and that's the only problem.

LT. BRUCE: I can just add a couple of things. We have had a couple of cases, all of which have been descending devices and referred to NOAA afterwards. At our training center, we have incorporated descending devices into both the fisheries management plans and also like the role playing, where we go through mock boardings, and then, lastly, SRFTC, my unit, we've got an outreach and education booth at SEWE, the Southeastern Wildlife Exposition, next weekend, down here in Charleston, and so we're bringing a bunch of descending devices there too, for what it's worth.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: That's a good point too, and I will say that, at our academy classes going forward, we're going to incorporate examples of descending devices and videos and how you use them and all that kind of thing too, and so that's important to get on the record.

MR. WOODWARD: Scott, can you hear me?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Yes, sir. We've got you. Go ahead.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. I don't know what's going on. My computer and Go to Meeting are having relationship issues today, and so it might cut me off again. I was just going to sort of ask for feedback from the group, and, when you're checking for the descending devices, I am just curious if folks are securing the weights that you need to actually make them work, and so that's a big part of this, and I think what's where a lot of folks don't quite understand the principle of that descending device, is you've got to have enough weight to offset the buoyancy of the fish, in order to descend it properly, and so I'm just kind of curious about that.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Spud, I can tell you, from Florida, some of the direct feedback that I got from one of the patrol groups that I talked to was that that was one of the things they had to educate people a lot on, was they would have the wrong weight, or not enough weight, on the device, and so they would have to help them get it squared away, and so that is something that they're seeing from time to time, and it's probably one of those educational points, where we don't write any paper, but we just show them and teach them, but we've definitely seen that in Florida.

MS. BROUWER: The question I had is whether the officers -- If you're aware that they're getting any kind of inquiries, or maybe even pushback, as far as fish that are being descended being depredated by sharks. This is something that I think has come up that scientists are conducting studies, and I know there's been a lot of work done in the Gulf on that, to try to determine if that is in fact the case, and I think the research is showing that that is not the case. When a fish is being descended, that does not increase the likelihood that those fish are going to be depredated, but I was wondering if you all are encountering any kind of reluctance or questioning about the efficacy of these devices when it comes to encounters with sharks.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: During our last Keys op, we had some anecdotal information from fishermen who had the package with the descending device and said they had used it, and whatever they were sending back down took a huge hit, and then they brought up nothing but line, and so, in their mind, something had hit what they were trying to descend, because it took the descending device and the fish, and they just brought back up like a leader or snap swivel or something, and so, again, it's anecdotal, but we did have two or three of those, and that was our Keys operation, south of Key Large, where people were complaining about sharks.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I have heard the same stuff, but I haven't heard it where I can definitely say this is how many times it has happened, but I have heard that come up in conversations where that was a concern.

MS. HARRISON: I don't have any comment on that, per se, but, when you're doing your outreach, my advice is, if you know you're going to be descending fish, then don't gut any fish. Don't have any blood in the water, and don't throw any guts overboard, and try to educate the public with that. When you're done at that spot fishing, and you're done descending, then go off a little bit and start your gutting, about a mile away, so you're not encouraging the sharks.

MR. WOODWARD: Scott, let me ask something, and this goes back to the comment about the weight, that you really can't have too much weight and descend a fish too fast, and so it's better for people to err on the side of having a very heavy weight, even if they're descending small fish, because that means that fish gets to the bottom quicker, which can help get past some of those predators that are lurking on the surface, whether they be sharks or even bottlenose dolphin, and so, again, I think that's part of this ongoing education campaign.

I am chair of the council's Outreach and Communications Committee, and so I will certainly work with Kim, and we'll see what we can put together that will help you all in the field to give people the information they need to make sure that the descending devices are working the best --

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Yes, sir. That's good advice, and we'll make sure we share that as well with our folks in the field. Any further discussion on descending devices?

AP MEMBER: Would it help if -- I am just thinking about campaigns, and let's just have my descending device rod rigged and ready on the boat, so that it's easily seen, and you're setting that up for you go, and you know it's the requirement, if we're going bottom fishing, and then, if I do get checked, yes, sir, officer, it's right here, so that you're not putting it together out there, and you've already got it dedicated, and, with most of the boats today, there is eighty-seven rod holders, and you're going to have room for that, but maybe we can think about that as add-on to the outreach, and let's go ahead and add one more rod, or some program there.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: That gets back to the true concept behind this, and, on the Atlantic, it was rigged and ready, and that was the idea, is you would have it sitting there rigged and ready, so that we knew the potential for use was there. That's a good point.

MR. WOODWARD: Let me mention this, Scott, because this is something that you might come across. Some of the folks now are actually using their downriggers as their descending devices, and so what they're doing is they're connecting, whether it be a SeaQualizer or whatever it is, to their downrigger, because they're already sitting there with an eight-pound, or ten-pound,

downrigger ball, and so they may actually not have it -- You know, a lot of people use it on a rod-and-reel, but some folks, if they're using downriggers, commonly, they will have them rigged up and be on their downriggers which certainly works, and it works pretty well.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: That's a good idea, and a good point, and that's something we can share with people who aren't doing that that have that type of equipment. All right. I think that was a really good discussion, and I think, if there's no more comments on descending devices, we will move ahead, and I think our next topic is going to be discussing any -- Just the updates from the states, going around the room, and we can provide anything that you all want to bring to the table. I will just kind of go around, and everybody can just --

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I don't have a lot to add. A couple of things, and we purchased two new vessels that you will see with my guys out there. They were supposed to be delivered in March of 2021, and they just got their engines now, and so, in March of this year, twelve months later, we'll have two twenty-six-foot metal sharks that will be out and about, since my guys are located by themselves, we usually are asking for state partners or Coasties to go with us, and so you will see two of those out there.

Otherwise, Matt Walia is our Compliance Assistance Liaison in our office in St. Pete, and he's worked with the council staff, both the Gulf and South Atlantic, but he's available to help whomever, and I throw it out to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel, and, if there's questions, or issues, or things you need to coordinate, and sometimes getting us, as operators, or supervisors, out in the field, and we're not as timely as he can be, and so I will get his contact information to everybody. If you need something, he's a great reference to go to as well, but that's all I have.

CAPTAIN HODGE: A lot of what he mentioned there, we're focusing on in our JEA agreement right now, like some of us are, and I was just trying to get through -- I was just reading through some of the cases that Ben has sent me dispositions on, which amount to several -- I say several, but probably 25 or 30 percent are summary settlements, and, just the ones that I have received since I've been back in Brunswick, it's probably \$45,000 or \$50,000, and I know that isn't going to compare to Florida, and we look at the list every time it comes out, and say, hey we were second to Florida, and they had fifty, and we had two, but, I mean, the guys are out there working hard.

They are checking Gray's Reef very often and going to our more commonly-fished offshore reefs, manmade or not, but we go there, and one of the biggest cases -- Patrick, you're probably aware of it, but it had a guy who -- Catching him with red snapper out of season turned up an investigation where he was selling and purchasing, and there's no telling how many times he had gone fishing, but he has since received -- His assessed penalty is over \$50,000 right now, and so they've got a really good case against him, and, obviously, he has hired an attorney, and it's probably going to end up in the federal court system, but those are the kind of cases, and the two descending device cases that were made recently.

The anchoring cases at Gray's Reef, and you go out there, and those things turn to something out of nothing quick. I think it's probably going to be the last referral that we had to Ben, was the descending device and just seeing a red snapper floating on top of the water and trying to swim back down, and there is only one boat out there, and how unlucky could they be, you know, and so, when the questions started getting asked, and the folks didn't know they had caught a red snapper, and, well, you're the only person out here, and this fish is within a quarter mile of your

boat, and it just happens to be down current at the same time. They finally admitted that they didn't have any way to deflate it, nor descend it, and so I think he referred that as a case to Ben.

As far as the agency goes, numbers are up a little, and we're still hovering around 200 officers in the state. We've got thirty-one officers from Valdosta to Savannah, and all of those don't work our coastal waters, obviously, but we do pull from as far as Valdosta to put people in a boat to get our JEA hours out of the way, and it's just part of making sure it gets done, and so, other than that, all is well in Georgia.

CAPTAIN YOPP: Through some various grants, we've been able to finally get some metal Sharks that we've got ordered, and they will help in different areas offshore, of course, and also with ship escort. In the Cape Fear area, we do that with the Coast Guard, from time to time, and so we're looking forward to getting those. Like with everything COVID-related, we don't know when, but things have been ordered. The paperwork has gone out, and so that's a step.

We have acquired some UTVs off of grants as well to help us kind of with our mission, and we created, this past year, a swift water team, and so they're being recognized with state emergency management, and so that's good for us and the citizens of North Carolina and any groups that we can help out, and that's really taken off and gone well. They have done a lot of work with some different partners around us, the highway patrol and some others, and I think it's going to be very fruitful for the citizens of North Carolina. We also created an investigator position with us, which was definitely needed, and we're hoping, maybe in the future, for some more, but we're at least thankful that we got one and will move forward, and that's about it from North Carolina.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Good deal. Good stuff. For Florida, again, right now, just on the Atlantic coast, the JEA fleet is pretty healthy right now, and the crews are pretty stable. We are replacing two of our larger vessels in the Gulf at this time, and we're in the process of working through that. Since the last meeting we had, in last February, on the Atlantic side, we've had over 1,839 hours dedicated to JEA, and that's everything across-the-board, and that's your dockside, IUU, underway patrol, everything we have. We have had over 360 citations and another 147 warnings that were written, and, again, that's some state and some federal, things like that.

Within the agency overall, since the last time we had a meeting, Colonel Brown has retired, and so we have new colonel, Colonel Roger Young, and he's doing really good things and moving in the right direction, and then we have -- Obviously, when you replace a colonel, there's a lot of shuffling and shifting that takes place, and so we've had several positions change within our command staff and just around the state, and so, especially in the Atlantic, we have some new captains that are starting to get their feel for all the JEA stuff, and some of them have come from areas that may not have worked that before, and so we're doing some things there to get them up to speed, but the big boat crews somewhat handle themselves in that area, and they usually educate the folks, but, overall, things are really good, and we're moving right along.

CAPTAIN THOMAS: In South Carolina, we've been doing some hiring here in the past year-and-a-half, really since last February, and most of them are -- Most of the officers that we are hiring do get sent to the coast, and so we're up to sixty-seven officers in our coastal region down here, and then we picked up on a thirty-nine-foot Contender patrol vessel that we've been using, which obviously helps run MPA patrols and a little bit further out, and then we should be ordering, and I think the bid just closed yesterday, another big Contender, like the thirty-five or thirty-nine

foot range, and so that's our plan over the next few years, is to increase -- We got rid of some older boats, and we've got some older Fountains and stuff, and so we're replacing those with the Contenders and updating our larger boats, our over thirty foot, and so we're rocking along, and thanks for having us.

LT. BRUCE: I apologize that I am not armed with the U.S. Coast Guard's report, and so thank you.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: That's okay. We will give you until next time, but I know that the Coast Guard is doing outstanding work and great work all the time, and so you have nothing to prove.

MS. BROUWER: Mel, if you're on the line -- Let me just let the AP what's going on, and Mel was wanting to ask you all a question about spearfishing, and so we're going to see if his audio is going to work. Go ahead, Mel.

MR. BELL: Well, thirty-two years in the Navy, and I did work for the Coast Guard, and so I couldn't resist, and there goes that Semper Paratus thing, and I love the Coast Guard. I do. A real quick question, and this is something that was approached by a snapper grouper dealer, and he had been talking to somebody on the docks, and looking at boats, and I was just curious if you all have ever seen this, and it was explained to him that some of the spear fishermen, perhaps even the commercial ones, were utilizing chlorine pool tabs, like hockey pucks, to kind of flush fish out from under ledges and things, offshore, probably in deeper water, I would imagine. Have you guys ever seen anything like that? He swears he saw the boat, and they had a big -- One of those big containers of these hockey pucks in them, but I would -- I don't know that that's technically illegal.

I know for things like using chlorine in irritating lobster and things like that, that that's prohibited, but that's the first I had ever heard of that, and he was asking me about it, and I said, well, I have never heard of it, but have you guys ever seen anything like that, or evidence of it?

CAPTAIN YOPP: In North Carolina, no. That's brand-new to me, and so I'm going to have to do some asking, and I have never heard of anybody using that.

CAPTAIN HODGE: The same from Georgia. I haven't heard of it, but I will ask around.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: In Florida, I have never heard of that, but it does concern me, and so I think it's something that we can definitely put out some feelers on and try and get some feedback, to see if we're seeing it, and, even if we see -- The thing is we may not know what it's for, but you may see something on a boat, and they may tell us it's to use it for cleaning the coolers out or something like that, but it may not be the actual purpose, and so that's a good piece of intelligence, and we need to work on that and see if we can figure it out.

MR. BELL: I just kind of pass that along as a question and intel, and it's just one guy, but, I mean, as ingenious as people can become at times, and I know how, this way, we've got ledges up here, and the ledges can have some pretty deep recesses and things, but I just -- That sounds like a pretty dangerous practice, to me, from a standpoint of impacting habitat and all kinds of things, and I had just never heard of it.

MS. HARRISON: I personally have never heard anything like that, but I don't put it past them, because it would -- I mean, the chemicals would probably agitate the fish, right, and the fish would run away, but, from a dealer perspective, I would be curious, whoever you spoke to as well, and I would be concerned for that chemical to get into the protein of the fish and then me going and selling it to a consumer, and I would be very hesitant, and it would be very scary, and I guess that's the new mercury, chlorine poisoning. That's a bad joke.

MR. BELL: My guess is that the fish would react pretty quickly and just book, and I don't think they would probably -- I follow what you're saying, and I agree, but I think it would become a -- Because they can sense things a lot quicker than we can, and the idea would just be to cause them to move and flesh them out from the ledge or something, but I was kind of also thinking about some of our habitats literally burning and affecting soft corals or epiphytic growth and things like that, and so it just sounds like a bad thing, if it is going on, and I hope it's not.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Mel, I share your concern, but I agree, and I think the fish would probably not be as impacted as hard as like, in Florida, the corals and just the other smaller crustaceans and different critters that don't have the ability to flee, and so you're having a dramatic effect on them, I'm sure, and so it's definitely something we need to look into.

MS. HARRISON: That's not a chemical that you can easily like access. In my thinking, that would be something a pool cleaner would have, right, and that would be the only -- Because I can't just go to the hardware store and buy -- I can, of chlorine?

MR. BELL: Yes, and you can buy them on -- I checked it out, and you can get big buckets of them. I appreciate your input.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Okay. We can definitely call that Other Business. Go ahead, Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say that I appreciate your input, and I just thought that I would run that by you all.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Well, that being said, that kicks us into Other Business, and so is there any other types of business that we want to talk about? That was a good one to bring up, Mel. Myra just reminded me that, last February, I tried to see if I could -- It was all virtual, and I didn't do a good job trying to set up my vice chair, and so we want to take an opportunity today to go ahead and elect somebody to be the vice chair, in case I can't do something and they need to step in for me. I would like to nominate Captain Thomas, and I have spoken to him, and he said he's willing, and so, around the room, if everybody will agree with that, and I guess I can make a motion, if I can get a second.

AP MEMBER: Second.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: We've got a second, and so welcome to the team. I will just say, if there's not any other business that anybody would like to discuss or bring up, I think we can bring ourselves to a conclusion point, and so if everybody agrees. We have one announcement.

MS. BROUWER: Just a reminder, I guess, to be on the lookout for an email from me in the next couple of months to do the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year nominations and awards, and, as

you all know, or maybe some of the newer AP members don't, we do go through a process where the council, starting with the AP, nominates officers that are out there enforcing fisheries laws and deserve acknowledgement. I mean, all of them do, but there is this program that's been in place since 2010. Last year, this past year, Lieutenant Bruce was the recipient of the 2020 LEOY Award, and so be on the lookout for an email from me, and then we'll get that process rolling for the 2021 LEOY.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: All right. That being said, I think we're ready to reach a conclusion, and I just want to say thank you to everybody who is here today and everybody online who has been participating and providing great input, and, again, we look forward to seeing everybody, or hearing from everybody, moving forward through 2022 and getting ready for 2023, but I guess we'll go ahead and say meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on February 10, 2022.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
March 3, 2022

Law Enforcement Advisory

Attendee Report: Panel Meeting

Report Generated:

02/11/2022 04:24 AM EST

Webinar ID

327-637-811

Actual Start Date/Time

02/10/2022 08:26 AM EST

Duration

4 hours 60 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	Bell	00 Mel
Yes	Buckson	Bruce
Yes	Carmichael	John
Yes	Chaya	01Cindy
Yes	Collier	01Chip
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Iberle	01Allie
Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01Kim
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Oliver	01Ashley
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Schmidtke	01Michael
Yes	Wiegand	01Christina
Yes	Wolfe	Wes
Yes	Woodward	00 Spud
Yes	thomas	01suz

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
LAW ENFORCEMENT ADVISORY PANEL

✓ Captain Scott Pearce, Chair
FWC Div. of Law Enforcement
620 S. Meridian St., MS #1C
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850)617-9545 (ph); (850)528-4546(c)
Scott.pearce@myfwc.com
(Agency-FWC)

✓ Lt James Bruce
U.S. Coast Guard
SE Region Fisheries Training
Center 1050 Register Street
Charleston, SC 29405
(843)740-3178 Ext. 1 (ph)
James.C.Bruce@uscg.mil
(Agency-USCG)

web
* Colonel Bruce Buckson
821 Himalayan Run
Bradenton, FL 34212
(850)509-3053 (ph)
bruce@buckson.net
9/15, 10/18*; 12/21*
Retired Law Enforcement

Michael Freeman
122 Springwood Drive
Daytona Beach, FL 32119
(386)795-3664 (ph)
mike@twojerks.com
3/16*, 3/19*
Commercial/Dealer

✓ Alana Harrison
58129 Hwy 12
P.O. Box 522
Hatteras, NC 27943
(252)548-0342 (ph)
Alana@harborhousehatteras.com
6/21*
Commercial/Dealer

✓ Captain Chris Hodge
GA DNR Law Enforcement Division
One Conservation Way Suite 201
Brunswick, GA 31520
(912)264-7237 (ph); (404)694-1023 (c)
chris.hodge@dnr.state.ga.us
(Agency-GA DNR)

~~Nickey Maxey
50 Rose DHU Creek Plantation Dr.
Bluffton, SC 29910
(843)247-0001 (ph)
nmaxey@scdnr.net
12/13*, 09/17*, 9/20*
Recreational~~

*Unable to attend in person
medical reasons*

Didn't attend

✓ Lt. Pat O'Shaughnessy
NOAA Office of Law Enforcement
2234 South Hobson Ave.
Charleston, SC 29405
(843)740-1228 (ph); (727)244-7353 ©
patrick.oshaughnessy@noaa.gov
(Agency-NOAA)

~~Kevin Roberson
110 Oyster Reef Dr.
Hilton Head, SC 29926
(843)384-9620
playinthru2@gmail.com
3/18*, 6/21*
Recreational~~

Didn't attend

* web
Jamal Ingram
DOC-NOAA
OGC Enforcement Section
263 13th Ave. S. Ste 177
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
(850)258-2209 (ph)
Jamal.Ingram@noaa.gov
(Agency - NOAA OLE)

Unable to attend in person per myra

** Attended via web*

✓ Captain Michael Paul Thomas
SC DNR Law Enforcement Division
P.O. Box 12559
Charleston, SC 29422
(843)953-9307 (O); 843-521-7232(C)
Thomasmp@dnr.sc.gov
(Agency-SC DNR)

~~Captain Garland Yopp
NC Marine Patrol
Wilmington Field Office Dist. III
127 Cardinal Drive Extension
Wilmington, NC 20405
(910)796-7286 (ph)
Garland.Yopp@ncdenr.gov
(Agency-NC DENR)~~

In person Alex Purno - US Coast Guard

Authorized Reimbursement
SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS

2/10/2022
New Eng AP

* Mel Bell, Chair *unable to attend in person*
SCDNR-Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
217 Ft. Johnson Road ** Attended via web*
Charleston, SC 29422
(843)953-9007 (ph); (843)953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Judy Helmeley
124 Palmetto Drive
Savannah, GA 31410
(912) 897-4921
JudyHelmeley@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other

web Rick Devictor
Alex Purno - US Coast Guard
web Ira Laks
(in person)

web Nikhil Mehta
web Willow Patten
web Frank Helies
web web wife

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

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

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

*Unable to
attend in person*

** Attended via web*

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

Authorized a Travel Order for lunch

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

** web*
~~Deputy Director - Science~~

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

** Attended
via web*

~~Deputy Director - Management~~

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

in person

~~Citizen Science Program Manager~~

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net

~~Outreach Program Manager~~

Cameron Rhodes
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net

~~Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator~~

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

in person

** web*
~~Fishery Scientist~~

Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net

attended via web

~~Quantitative Fishery Scientist~~

Dr. Judd Curtis
judd.curthis@safmc.net

~~Citizen Science Project Coordinator~~

Nicholas Smillie
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net

** web*
~~Fishery Economist &
FMP Coordinator~~

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

*attended
via web*

** web*
~~Staff Accountant~~

Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

(attended via web)

~~Fishery Scientist~~

Allie Iberle
Allie.iberle@safmc.net

in person

~~Fishery Social Scientist~~

Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

*attended
in person*

~~Public Information Officer~~

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

in person

SEDAR

~~SEDAR Program Manager~~

Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net

~~Administrative Officer~~

Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

in person

~~SEDAR Coordinator~~

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

~~Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist~~

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

** Ashley Oliver - attended
via web*