

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COBIA COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

**Marina Inn at Grande Dunes
Myrtle Beach, SC**

September 14-15, 2016

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mackerel Cobia Committee Of The Whole:

Ben Hartig, Chairman
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Anna Beckwith
Doug Haymans
Robert Beal
Dewey Hemilright
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner
LTJG Amy Hockenberry

Dr. Michelle Duval, Vice-Chair
Jessica McCawley
Chris Conklin
Charlie Phillips
Zack Bowen
Rob O'Reilly
Tony DeLernia
Dr. Wilson Laney
Mark Brown

Council Staff:

Gregg Waugh
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Dr. Mike Errigo
Roger Pugliese

John Carmichael
Dr. Brian Chevront
Amber Von Harten
Chip Collier
Myra Brouwer
John Hadley

Observers/Participants:

Erika Burgess
Leann Bosarge
Dr. Louis Daniel
Nik Mehta
Jocelyn D'Ambrosio
ASAC Jeff Radonski
Dr. Mike Denson
Jack Cox

Dr. Marcel Reichert
Rick DeVictor
Robert Boyles
Dr. Dave Gloeckner
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Jack McGovern
Bill Gorham

Additional Observers Attached

The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the Whole of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Marina Inn at Grande Dunes, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, Wednesday afternoon, September 14, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: We are hereby going to convene a committee of the whole of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Mackerel Cobia Committee. Just so that everyone understands who the committee members are, it's Ben Hartig, myself, Anna Beckwith, Mel Bell, Zack Bowen, Chris Conklin, Roy Crabtree, Doug Haymans, Jessica McCawley, Charlie Phillips, Robert Beal, Rob O'Reilly, Dewey Hemilright, our Coast Guard representative, our Fish and Wildlife Service representative, and so everyone is represented here. Ben, I am turning this back over to you to run. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you so much. All right. The next item of business is the Presentation on the South Carolina Distinct Population Segments of Atlantic Cobia and Mike Denson.

MR. DENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the invitation to come and speak before this body again. I guess it's been almost a year, but I'm glad to be able to have the opportunity to present some of the research that's been going on with cobia along the Southeast Atlantic Coast, primarily in South Carolina, but I will be touching on pretty much everywhere from Virginia on to Florida.

Just to clear it up, I work for the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources Marine Resources Division, and I serve as the Director of the Marine Resources Research Institute, but I conduct research on stock enhancement, some fisheries work, cobia. This is somewhat separate and different from our Office of Fisheries Management. We work very independently. We work closely with them when it comes to the interpretation of the data that we collect, but primarily the biology of the animal, the samples we collect, are what drives where we go.

You can see there is a large list of people underneath the institute there. This is just some of the people that are working primarily on cobia research and include the previous graduate students and collaborators from both Virginia as well as Texas, with John Gold and Mark Renshaw. The products from the institute and from the work that we do are primarily data for stock assessments for peer-reviewed literature and also for education and outreach.

Cobia research in South Carolina began back in 2000, when we acquired a federal grant, through the Sea Grant Program, to evaluate cobia aquaculture as a potential economic opportunity for South Carolina aquaculturists. In doing so, it involves a good bit of data collection that is also very important to fisheries. In the case of capturing some of these animals, you have to condition them in tanks, indoors or outdoors, or in ponds. Captive spawning allows you to close the life cycle in captivity and really understand what drives these animals. It also is important to understand larval rearing techniques, which includes their sensitivities and environmental tolerances, which are also applicable to the wild.

In addition to that, disease is another issue that we take into consideration. Anytime we work with a species for aquaculture purposes in South Carolina, we apply that technology and potential to stock enhancement. If the need should arise and management regulations aren't sufficient perhaps, stock enhancement is a tool that we have in our toolbox that we can direct towards rebuilding a stock or augmenting a stock.

As I mentioned, in doing the aquaculture, you collect a good bit of information on fisheries. We began doing really focused fisheries research, looking at tag recapture and movement and site fidelity, to understand sort of natal homing that occurs, at least in the distinct population segment that I will touch on later, as well as spawning, age-growth, reproduction, and population genetics.

We use genetics for a variety of purposes that I will get into in a second, in terms of genetic tags, structure, and population health. You can see there's a series of publications. Most of the products that we come up with go through the peer-reviewed literature or are applied directly to stock assessments, where, again, they go through a good bit of tire-kicking.

With this invitation, some of the questions that have been sort of circulating around about cobia and these distinct population segments and the population as a whole, and I was asked if perhaps I could address some of them, and so some of the questions are where does South Carolina get its cobia data? Cobia stock enhancement in South Carolina, is it a success or is it a failure? What is a distinct population segment and why is it important? Did stocking create this distinct population segment? Why are there conflicting reports in the literature regarding cobia stock structure? Are cobia along the Atlantic coast similar? What can we learn or apply from the distinct population segments in South Carolina to the rest of the coast?

Where we get our data is pretty straightforward. I did about eleven presentations up and down the coast, talking to fishermen and fishing clubs, and that's one of the questions they always pose to us, is the reason that you think that there's not many cobia is because you don't know how to catch cobia. In most cases, we collect most of our cobia samples and information from cooperating charter boat captains that range from Virginia all the way down to Florida.

We get a good bit of information from recreational anglers, and our biologists attend every cobia tournament that occurs in the State of South Carolina. Lastly, and sadly, our biologists spend very little time out actually catching cobia, but they do acquire a number of fish that are also added into the datasets.

One of the things that the Marine Resources Research Institute has focused on in the last ten years is developing a genetic library of multiple species. Currently, we hold tens of thousands of tissue samples from species. Some of these samples have even been taken from otoliths that have been kept in envelopes for twenty or thirty years, and so we have a good bit of information that allows us to get a real breadth, temporally, as to what populations look like.

The microsatellite loci data is very important and a wonderful tool to use to directly answer, at least for our purposes, three really important questions. One, from a stock enhancement perspective, if you want to release a fish into the wild, you want to be able to identify it, surely, when it returns. In some cases, you can implant them with external tags, but, if you're going to release very small fish, then you can't use a tag. You have to use a genetic marker, and so it becomes very important, in terms of understanding and in terms of accountability, the contribution that stocked fish make to a wild population.

In addition to that, and what has been used many times with this group, is identifying stock structure. I can think of red snapper and multiple other species that have utilized microsatellite data from our lab to determine the extent of stock structure. In addition to that, we use genetics and microsatellite work to understand genetic health of a population, so we can determine whether

it's a natural population or an augmented population, through stocking, as to whether inbreeding is occurring or whether the population is in any kind of trouble. We can also calculate the number of spawners that have contributed to that year class of fish.

Cobia stock enhancement in South Carolina, is it a success? Well, if you're asking a scientist whether their research is a success, the answer is yes. In all cases, the work that we do involves an iterative process that, as you well would expect, sometimes comes out with negative information that doesn't lead you down a productive path, and we'll expand a little bit on why I think this is a success. Most of the work that we have done is experimental stocking from a research scale. It's all hypothesis-driven research, and we use what is called the Responsible Approach to Marine Stock Enhancement.

This is a document or a set of guidelines that South Carolina DNR has adopted, which was developed by the International Stock Enhancement Research Community as sort of a best management practices or a Hippocratic Oath. If you're going to stock fish, make sure you do no harm to the wild population.

If you were to look at Stage II, that is mostly focused on research and technology development, the application of pilot studies, and so it's very important that if you're releasing fish that you understand what the best size of fish to release is and the best season to release in and be able to mark all the fish and identify them again in the creel later on, to look for disease, and apply genetics as well, to understand the health of the population. Most of the work that we've been doing is in this Stage II.

I will give you an example of the last several years' worth of research that has occurred at the Waddell Mariculture Center. The center is located on the Colleton River, which is in the Port Royal Sound area. They are very close, adjacent, and use the same water. We collect local brood stock. We spawn those brood stock in captivity, rear the larvae in an extensive culture system in fertilized ponds. The animals were then either -- If they were grown to a larger size, like the top-right figure, and you can see a fish that has a tag in it. Then the other two figures show very small-sized fish.

If you look at the different year classes that we stocked into, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, and 2010, they are small numbers of larger-sized fish. In 2007, a relatively larger number of small-sized fish, and those were about two to three inches in length. They really grew up in the ponds, on natural productivity, and they grew three inches in about thirty days. Then they were taken down to an adjacent boat landing and transferred into boats, where they were released into the estuary.

If you were to look specifically at that 2007 year class, 53,000 fish, you can see when the fish just began to recruit to the anglers' creels in 2009. 70 percent of the fish that were captured and sacrificed or produced by recreational anglers and charter boat captains. 70 percent of the population of that year class were from that hatchery stocking. You can see that bears out all the way through 2015, to really an average of about 50 percent of the fish released into the estuary. They returned annually and made up 50 percent of the population. In addition, we can use some of the information from stocked fish to calculate rough population estimates that allow us to understand how the population has declined over time within this Port Royal Sound estuary.

A success? I would say success. It demonstrated natal homing and demonstrated spawning, rearing, and transport and best practices. It identified best sizes at release. High contributions demonstrating stocked fish survival. It suggests low wild population size, which was a little added benefit to understand, using stocked animals, the health of the wild population. It demonstrated that genetic tags are effective and continue or persist, and it is a potential tool for aiding and rebuilding a population.

The next question was why are there conflicting reports in the literature regarding cobia stock structure? That's been a big question along the Atlantic coast and the Gulf coast. There is really two papers out there. There is a John Gold paper that his lab published in 2013, and then my lab, Darden et al. 2014, and then additional information that was provided in SEDAR 28, I think as a working paper.

The differences are really likely to two factors. What Gold found was that there is no structure between the Gulf and the Atlantic coast. He included some out-populations in Taiwan. What we think is that, likely, the differences are very small sample sizes to characterize a relatively large population, both on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, and the samples were collected when fish were not in spawning aggregations. This was something that we found is really important to understand fish populations, especially potentially identifying distinct population segments.

What you see here are the sample sizes to address that first question. Mississippi, Louisiana, and Taiwan are from the Gold paper, and it's just thirty-five or forty samples. The Darden paper is much larger numbers and more robust sample sizes, because we've spent so much effort and it's an adjacent estuary to where we're sampling. Then the information used in the SEDAR paper is mostly in the hundreds, except for that Florida offshore and west coast and off of Mississippi, but we have good sample sizes in Texas.

What are the results of that? What does it show us? It tells us that the population structure of cobia is much more complicated than we originally thought it was. It's not just simply a Gulf coast population and an Atlantic coast population. In fact, we have distinct population segments in South Carolina, in our southern high-salinity estuary of Port Royal Sound, and you see up in the Chesapeake also a distinct populations segment that is different from the other segments along that coast, other than North Carolina. It was very close to being different, but what we think happened is related to when the fish were sampled. It could have been out-migrating fish from Chesapeake that were then caught in North Carolina, and so it would be very difficult to pull apart or tease those apart. We will continue to do some work in collecting samples with charter boat captains and recreational fishermen to really nail that down.

Of note, of course, is, off of the east coast of Florida, where we see that the Gulf coast or the Gulf population wraps around, almost up to Cape Canaveral and back around to Texas. Those populations are genetically similar. There is a little hash line just north of that. That is an area between Cape Canaveral and really Savannah that we don't have any samples. There is no way to put that population into any kind of group, and so, again, we're focusing on collecting additional samples to get a sort of finer-scale difference.

The tag recapture work, and that information was also provided in SEDAR 28, corroborates the genetic findings, and we are fairly confident that this is where the population breaks up. We need,

again, additional samples to be able to tease apart exactly between Savannah and Cape Canaveral where the mixing zone is or where the population is split up.

What is a distinct population segment? I have used that term a couple of times. A DPS is a distinct population segment that is genetically different. It forms when a group of fish spawn only with other fish from that same group for many, many years. Usually spawning occurs in aggregations that are geographically or temporally separated.

Very little gene flow occurs for that DPS to persist, and, because of the separation, it's unlikely that fish from a different group will fill that niche, and so the Carolina DPS is genetically distinct from the just offshore South Atlantic population. It's unlikely, if that group of fish is fished out, that they will be repopulated by fish that will be spawning from the South Atlantic population.

This sort of explains it. If you look at the right side first, sample when fish are spawning, if the fish are aggregating and they're concentrating and ready to spawn and you collect tissue samples, you get a genetic structure that looks like that right graph. If the fish are in transit or migrating between estuaries or out of the area, you would end up thinking we have a mixed stock or one homogeneous population, and so that is part of what we think with the Gold paper. They sampled completely just during the summer, and so they may have missed any differences when the fish were in aggregations.

Did stocking create this distinct population segment? The answer to that, we think, is no. All the stocked fish were identified genetically. We use parentage analysis, again with microsatellites. We removed all stocked fish from the analysis before we conducted it, and so we know that these are just wild fish and they are of a different group. The DPS in South Carolina and Chesapeake may exist because, again, these are high-salinity estuaries. They are good habitat for eggs and larvae, and they are retained in that system for some period of time, perhaps imprinting, because the fish, again, return annually back to that estuary.

So far, these are the only two DPS's that we have identified along the coast, but, again, we're sample limited. The more samples we get, especially from charter boat captains and recreational anglers, where we can target exactly where the fish has been caught and the timing of when it was caught, so that we know they were in a spawning aggregation at that time.

What does this DPS in South Carolina tell us about the health of the cobia population? The South Carolina DPS is a small DPS. It's close to shore and there is very easy access to anglers. It's undergoing significant fishing pressure, or at least less now, while the fish are in these aggregations. Anglers know exactly when the fish will arrive, based on the temperature of the water. They know exactly what shoals and what banks that they can find them year after year. You will see dozens and dozens of boats sitting just over these specific areas, and they know exactly what bait to use. In addition, social media and emails and blogs don't help, because they provide -- It's no longer difficult to catch these fish. Everybody knows where and what they're biting on and when they arrive.

What we believe is happening, especially when you find fish in spawning aggregations, is this hyper stability concept, the illusion of plenty. There are decreases in abundance when catch per unit effort stays the same. We know, from other species that are similar in sort of habit, salmon,

for example -- If you compare salmon to cobia, in terms of their returning to the same estuary or the same river year after year, they are most vulnerable when they're in these aggregations.

Usually fishing appears to be very good and then, finally, there is just no fish to catch. It's really difficult, especially with a fish that is mostly pelagic but then returns to these estuaries, to have a fishery-independent sampling process. It's a very difficult fish to sample that way, and then you're also competing with lots and lots of fishermen who want to be in those same locations.

This is a graphic that I have used in my presentations to recreational anglers up and down the coast. If you were to look at the two people that are in those boats, their experience is that they're in known locations and there are plenty of fish, and they are catching them, but the population as a whole is continuing to decrease, yet their observation is there is plenty of fish here, and there is structure and they're always here, and you've just got to know how to catch them. Year after year, you see it, until finally there is almost no fish there.

We work very closely with a set of guides from the north end of Hilton Head Island. They have been working with us for many years collecting fish. They fillet them and provide us the racks, of which we use the tissue to use for fisheries information. What we have found with the samples that they have provided us is that it really wavered between 160 and sixty fish over the last several years, until, finally, last year, they could only catch nine fish. Although the effort wasn't continuous, because there were no fish to catch and some of them moved offshore, we just didn't see any fish, and so we feel like the bottom has dropped out on these animals.

With this South Carolina DPS, we have seen increased fishing pressure. We have seen decreased catch. They are harder to catch, in terms of fish per angler hour, and we have genetic metrics, in terms of health estimates, in fish that are spawning, showing the population has decreased. The most interesting part of the cobia story, for us, is that recreational anglers and charter boat captains have driven the research. They have provided the samples. They have pushed for legislation. They have pushed for better management, because they're out there and they want to see that their business or their recreation continues into the future.

You all know, and I presented last time, about how we are protecting this DPS with recreational and charter boat -- What recreational and charter boat captains primarily chose was a spawning season closure for half of the season and new boat and individual limits. They are hoping for us to do some supportive stocking, and we're going to continue to monitor the fishery and monitor genetics as well, to look for signs of inbreeding or any other negative factors.

What is next with our cobia research? We're continuing to collect that important life history information. We are working on a model, a mathematical model, individual-based model, to look at the effects of stocking and regulations on the genetic health of the population. We are working with researchers in North Carolina and Virginia also to address some of these questions about population structure and migration.

We, in addition, have funded a project that is using a series of acoustic arrays on the Atlantic coast. Fish are tagged in multiple locations, and then we're just beginning to see lots of pings that show us sort of a broader-scale movement of fish that are tagged, not only in the distinct population segments, but offshore as well. Hopefully we can elucidate whether the fish caught off of North Carolina or off of South Carolina are also the North Carolina and the Virginia fish, or are they

different fish? So far, what we've seen, mostly from tag recapture work, is that the fish never move north. They always move south. With that, I would be glad to take any questions.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Mike.

DR. LANEY: Mike, I guess the message that I'm taking from what you have said is, and I've been saying this for a number of years anyway with regard to anadromous species especially, is that, as management plans are prepared for these animals, you not only need to take in the geographic distribution and migrations, but now you really need to take the genetics into consideration as well, because I think we have a responsibility, from a population health standpoint, to definitely look at that aspect of it as well as all the other aspects of it.

MR. DENSON: I think that's a good point, and it's why South Carolina was motivated to move. As you well know, although these fish are genetically dissimilar, there are no morphometric differences, and so it's impossible to pull them out of the catch or the creel as being a DPS fish or a South Atlantic population fish.

DR. LANEY: I am interested in the natal homing aspect of it, and it sounds like, for sure, that the South Carolina stock definitely homes to Port Royal Sound. From your experience and from what you know thus far with regard to the genetics, do you think there are other estuarine-based populations that are doing the same thing? It sounds like Chesapeake Bay could possibly be a DPS, and so we would definitely characterize those populations as estuarine-dependent, I guess.

MR. DENSON: One of the limitations that we've had, again, is samples. The more samples we have, the better resolution we can provide. We have small numbers of samples and not many from inside of the large estuaries in North Carolina to be able to conclude that there is also distinct population segments there.

MR. BROWN: Years ago, when they were starting the South Carolina Aquarium, there was a fellow that was on the dock next to my boat there, and he caught one. It was a small one. It was only about twelve inches long, and they were coming and going out with me at different times and stocking the aquarium, and so I called and they came and got that fish. In one year, it grew to thirty pounds. Obviously it was in captivity, but what is the -- How big do they grow in the wild and how long do they live?

MR. DENSON: The longest-lived fish we've had is fourteen years of age, and, as far as size goes, I think that the record is ninety-eight or something like that, but it was also the oldest fish.

MR. HARTIG: I can take one more question.

MR. CONKLIN: Do the released fish breed with the wild stock? Have you guys found any evidence of that?

MR. DENSON: We assume they have. There is no real easy way to answer that question, because of the nature of microsatellites.

MR. CONKLIN: What about the genetic markers? Would that go with the cross-bred fish or would it show up as the wild one?

MR. DENSON: Just to be clear on the genetic markers, they're not something we do to the fish. They are genetic codes that exist in the fish. They go with male and female, one copy with each, to that next generation or progeny, and so we can detect them from that.

MR. HARTIG: Mike, thank you very much. That was quite a bit different than the last one I saw. I appreciate all the research you're doing and all the information you're providing for our management, and so thank you.

MR. DENSON: Thank you for the samples.

MR. HARTIG: All right. What do you want to do, Madam Chair?

DR. DUVAL: We have a public comment period that's scheduled at 5:30, and so I think we're going to have to just wrap up our business here and take a few minutes to set up for that. Then my suggestion is, given the amount of work that we still have on the agenda that we need to start at eight o'clock tomorrow. I'm sorry. I know folks generally don't like to do that, but I think, in order for us to get through this framework -- We have two frameworks we need to take final action on and I think one other piece of business under this committee. Given that we've had to boot a couple of things to full council on Friday and that one of our liaisons is only here through midday tomorrow, we really need to start early. I think, if everyone is okay with that, we will just take a few minutes, please, while we set up for public comment. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you.

The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the Whole of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Marina Inn at Grande Dunes, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, Thursday morning, September 15, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: We are going to reconvene as a committee of the whole for the Mackerel Cobia Committee. I am turning things over to you, Chairman Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Thanks, Michelle. The next item on our agenda is the August 2016 Public Hearing Comments and Kari.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: You have several attachments in here. Attachment 7a is the summary, which I am going to go over. This is a summary of the comments received as of August 19. Then you have the transcribed minutes from the in-person public hearings and the testimony there and our webinar hearing. 7c is some written correspondence, and so we have been using the online comment form, which is available to you, but then also, if someone has graphics or is submitting a letter with a header or something like that, then that is made into a PDF and was included in Attachment 7c. Also, we have 7d, which is the question log from the webinar component. We have our online form, which you can check on the website, and then we also have the online form for this meeting, in which people have provided some information.

From the public hearings, the overall comments that we got, summary of the comments, is the early 2016 closure had negative economic and social effects on the recreational fishermen, including the for-hire fishing businesses, and specifically for fishermen in North Carolina and

Virginia. We heard some concerns that it was unfair to the fishermen in North Carolina and Virginia.

There were a lot of folks that talked about the data used to determine the ACL and then also the data used to determine the boundary between the Gulf and Atlantic stocks and then the MRIP data. There was concern about that. Most of the commenters, they talked about the bag limit and supported a one-fish per person bag limit and minimum size limit of thirty-seven inches or thirty-six inches fork length. There was not a lot of support for a vessel limit. Either folks didn't comment on that or they opposed the vessel limit, but some folks did talk about a vessel limit of two or three fish.

Then some folks talked in support of modifying the accountability measures to remove the use of the three-year average. A lot of folks that spoke said that they did not want a closure at all, but at least that the season be open May through September or October or so, so they can have the opportunity to fish in the late spring and through the summer and into the fall. There were some comments that the recreational data collection should be improved and then comments that there should be more representation from Virginia on the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

I also summarized the comments that came in on the online form for this meeting, which you can check out and read all of those. They're on the council meeting webpage. As of yesterday at noon, we had fourteen comments specifically for cobia and Framework Amendment 4, mostly from Virginia. There was one from Georgia and a few from North Carolina. They were all recreational and then a comment from one organization, the Virginia Saltwater Sportfishing Association.

In general, there was concern about the data for tracking the ACL and for the stock boundary. Folks talked about the closure and the negative effects. People were in support of no closure or at least be open May 1 through September 15. There was opposition to co-management with the Atlantic States Commission and that Virginia should have a seat on the council. There was one comment about there should be no actions that would prohibit gaffing, that we need a new assessment, and then analysis of potential effects on the actions and to use data from 2005 through 2014. I want to speak on that for a minute.

You received, in your late briefing materials that were sent out, a couple of additional documents. One of those was some additional analysis and a revised analysis that Mike Larkin did. It came up at some of the hearings that the analysis of when -- When we were looking at the combinations of bag and vessel limit and minimum size limit, there were these tables that showed the combination, and they showed the estimated date when the recreational landings would hit the recreational ACL, so everybody could see how the different size limits and bag limits and vessel limits would slow the rate of harvest. For that, he used data from 2013 through 2015.

At the hearings, we heard a lot about that people felt like 2015 was an outlier and there were concerns about the MRIP data being used, because it was substantially higher than anything else that had been seen in the past ten or fifteen years. If you used a longer period and did not include 2015, that you would be able to kind of capture the variability in the landings of the recreational cobia fishery, and so we asked Mike Larkin if he would redo those tables that show the estimated date when landings would reach the ACL, using 2005 through 2014. We will go through those when we're going through the decision document, so you can see what that looks like. We made that available also to the public, and so some folks, after they've seen that -- Bill Gorham spoke

about it last night. They have talked about that they feel that that better captures the dynamics of this fishery, using that time period.

Under Action 1-1, bag and vessel limits, we had most people supporting a one per person bag limit. There were some folks that opposed any vessel limit. One supported a two per vessel limit and then a couple supported a six per vessel limit. Anyone who spoke about minimum size limits supported thirty-six to thirty-seven inches fork length. There were a few comments for accountability measures that were supporting using an AM that would reduce the bag or vessel limit first, instead of a reduced season length. Then there was concern about having one year that exceeded the ACL and triggering an AM and that maybe it should be a couple of years.

We did have some specific suggestions for an AM, and this came from Bill Gorham, who also spoke on the record last night, that, first, you would reduce the bag or vessel limit by one after one year of an overage if the ACL is exceeded by more than a specific weight. Then, in the second year, if it's exceeded again by more than 200,000 pounds, you put a boat limit of two per boat. Then a third consecutive year, if it's exceeded, the following year's season is to be shortened as needed, and so that was his suggestion for an AM system.

Then we had a couple of letters that stated this specific comment on AMs, that an AM would first reduce the boat limit by one fish after one year of an overage. Then, if the ACLs cannot be credited to or added to, so some kind of rollover, for years the catch totals are under the ACL, they should not be reduced due to one year with an overage. There was some concern that, just because there was one year, they would be penalized and that maybe you should see if it's more of a pattern of catch.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Kari. Any questions of Kari on the public hearing comments? Seeing none, that brings us right into the Framework Amendment 4, which is Attachment 8a and Kari.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I'm going to get right into the document itself. Here is the purpose and need. I do want to go over this. You have spelled out some of the things and then also changing Atlantic cobia and Atlantic migratory group cobia, and so we're going to be specific about this.

The purpose of the amendment is to revise the management measures for Atlantic migratory group cobia, which is the Atlantic cobia, to ensure consistent, stable, and equitable fishing opportunities for all participants in the Atlantic cobia component of the coastal migratory pelagics fishery. The need for the amendment is to respond to changing fishery characteristics for Atlantic cobia while increasing social and economic benefits of the coastal migratory pelagics fishery through sustainable fishing opportunities and harvest of Atlantic cobia.

We will get right into Action 1-1 to modify the recreational harvest limits. Your current preferred alternative is 2a. That's one fish per person per day, and then Sub-Alternative 3c, which is three fish per vessel per day.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move we change our preferred alternative from 3c to 3f under Action 1-1 and from 2c, thirty-six inches fork length, to 2d, thirty-seven inches fork length.** If I can get a second, I will explain my reasoning.

MR. HARTIG: I have a motion by Anna.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: You want to do the minimum limit at the same time? Maybe we should do them together and then, once you guys start your discussion, let me go over the tables that Mike Larkin sent with the new data.

MR. HARTIG: Is there a second to that motion?

MS. BECKWITH: I am looking for a six vessel limit of thirty-seven inches fork length.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, I second that. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Zack. Is there discussion?

MS. BECKWITH: Kari will be pulling up the new tables, but the one concern that we heard in North Carolina about thirty-seven inches, which I wanted to note was -- We had one fisherman that was concerned that they didn't make thirty-seven-inch yardsticks, but I feel like the tail hanging over the edge of the yardstick is probably okay. Thirty-seven inches is reasonable. We have it now and folks have gotten accustomed to it, and that combination, with the new tables, appears to project not having a closure, and so that's attractive.

DR. DUVAL: I think most of the comments from the public were either thirty-six or thirty-seven. There were several, and those comments came from both North Carolina and Virginia and South Carolina. I guess I had a question for Rob. I know the VMRC had sent in a letter with a preferred minimum size limit of thirty-six inches fork length, which corresponds to your forty inches total length, and I just wanted to get a sense from Rob how that might impact you all.

I mean I think I understand Anna's intent in putting this motion forward, because thirty-seven inches can gain you a little bit more, in terms of projected season length or projected timeframe under which the ACL would be caught, but I just want to get a little bit of input from you.

MR. O'REILLY: Thanks. As we were struggling with what would happen in 2016, it was pretty clear that, of all things, having a closed season was the worst scenario. At that time, before we had our public hearing, we had commission meetings in March and April as well, and I think most of the comments we heard were about the season.

I think the thirty-six arose, which we did a forty-inch total length. I think that that was part of the idea that there wasn't a knowledge about the season length. I know we're going to talk about the new table. It looked as if, with what Anna has recommended on the six-fish boat limit and a thirty-six, that was about an October 11 closure.

Moving to thirty-seven from thirty-six goes from October 11 to no closed season, and so I suppose -- There was a mixture, Michelle, of comments that this would be something that would be certainly looked forward to on the season aspect, and I'm not sure where this goes, if that's a forty-one-and-a-half or where that translates to a total length, but I know our law enforcement would rather keep a total length. I asked about a fork limit, and they said that they can handle a half-inch size limit as well, as we've done with summer flounder in the past, and so we probably would be sticking with a total length.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, I seconded the motion for discussion, but I have some concerns about the thirty-seven inch. I see the table, but when we would move from thirty-six to thirty-seven, we're taking approximately 70 percent of the females out of the biomass that we're fishing on. North Carolina and Virginia, I know it's cold up there in October and November, and I'm not sure how much fishing is going on.

We would have to probably look at the Wave 6 landings to really figure that out, as far as cobia, but I was, again, fully involved with the public hearings up and down the coast, and the gist that I got out of it was they would be okay as long as the season could go through September. At thirty-six inches and six per boat, it puts them through September. I am inclined to stick with the thirty-six inches. That's the way I'm leaning, just because of the biological standpoint of the fish and the gist of the public testimony that I heard up and down the coast.

MR. O'REILLY: I think, in June, Zack and I kind of shared the idea of once you move up in size limit that you have more females, but, after that, thinking about the promotion of MSP, percent MSP, as you're raising the size limit, and I don't know whether it's an equilibrium approach, but I don't know what exactly are the tradeoffs there.

For example, the conventional way of looking at this is if you're raising the size limit that you are promoting spawning stock potential below that size limit, that there is more fish lower on than there are higher up in the size limit, and so it would be good to hear from someone about that, because I think, in the document itself, that it talked about that a little bit, about promoting the spawning potential by raising the size limit. I think that that's probably one thing to look at.

The other is, and not to jump ahead, but we are sitting on 443,000 pounds right now, and we still have a wave to be accounted for, and so I imagine the discussion later, or maybe not, will be that what we see from this adjustment of 2005 to 2014 still we have a situation with the ACL pending as we move forward, and so that's part of it, too. What we see with a no closed season right now may not end up that way, based on what happens the rest of 2016.

DR. CRABTREE: Bear in mind that these types of projections are -- There is a lot of uncertainty in them, and the catches vary widely from year to year. Just because you barely get it into the no closure, it doesn't mean there won't be a closure, particularly when you're relying on a size limit increase. Most of the gain you're getting in the season is coming from the size limit increase, and that really depends on how good is the fishing. If they can just stay out and catch another fish and put the little ones back and get a bigger one, it may not slow them down at all.

I can tell you that I just came from a situation in the Gulf of Mexico where we had an early closure with greater amberjack. We raised the size limit from thirty to thirty-six inches and they closed even earlier the year we did it, because they all just brought in bigger fish. Apparently it wasn't all that hard to get a bigger amberjack and still catch your bag limit and bring them in. Now, I don't know if that will happen here or not, but I would be cautious about raising that vessel limit too much.

If you really want to avoid a closure, then these are big fish. Six fish, that's 180 pounds, on average, or more, and so it's not like they're not bringing in enough fish to feed everyone's dinner, but just be cautious about relying on size limits, because if they're able to just fish a little more

and get a bigger fish, you may not slow them down at all. In fact, the fish they land may in fact be bigger than what they otherwise would have landed and it could actually hasten the closure.

MR. BELL: I had some information related to the thirty-six versus thirty-seven. I think, going to thirty-six or thirty-seven, you're going to get maybe another spawn out of them, and so I mean that's a good thing. What it will potentially do is shift the ratio of males and females in the catch. We're looking at the data we had. At thirty-six inches, you're looking at a 58 percent female and 41 percent male. If you go to thirty-seven inches, you're looking at 62 percent female and 37 percent male, and so it would just -- The harvested fish would be more females, to the degree that that makes a -- You would be putting the fishery more on the females. There are other fisheries where we obviously fish heavy on the females, but that's just for information.

DR. MACLAUCHLIN: What Mel was talking about and Zack has talked about, Carl Dechert with the DNR, South Carolina DNR, had sent me this this week, which is the information from that study that shows the percentage there.

MR. BOWEN: I mean we've heard, up and down the coast, that this is basically a pulse fishery in May, June, July, and August. To Roy's point about being leery about going to six per boat, with all due respect, it's not about the people having enough to eat. From a for-hire perspective, I cannot book a cobia trip if a person cannot keep a fish. I feel like the boat limit should be six. That gives everybody a fish a person.

I've heard your argument before that how much does a boat really need or how much do the people really need. I feel like we probably should leave that up to the professionals that are carrying them fishing. If I've got a mom and dad with four kids on the boat from Timbuktu, Tennessee, and I carry them fishing, I know that they don't need a fish per person. They don't need six cobia, but if I also know that if I've got six guys that work at Gulf Stream that live twenty miles within my boat that go fishing with me frequently, they probably need a fish per person.

I cannot even book a trip if it's less than six per boat. We are not hurting the -- By the difference in the closure dates from three per boat, or the projections from three per boat to six per boat, that tells me that the recreational angler, they're not catching more than three anyway. There is only like five days' difference, and that's just my assumption, but that's what that tells me. When you look at six per boat, you're not negatively impacting anybody but the for-hire fleet. It's got to be six per boat, one per person. Thank you.

DR. CRABTREE: I understand and I see what your problem is, and I see how it could create some difficulties for you in figuring out how to divvy up the fish and explaining it to people, but if the fishery is closed, I guarantee you that you won't book a trip then. If the fishery is open with the three fish, you might have to do some explaining and some shifting, but it seems to me that you've got more likelihood of booking a trip with a three-fish vessel limit than you do if the fishery is closed.

You may be right, and I don't know. I am just fresh from -- I got burned on this in the Gulf. We raised the size limit for amberjack and they closed even earlier. It didn't work, and I had a room full of fishermen yelling at us about how bad we screwed it all up and you said we weren't going to close and all of these things, and it was a big mess. I guess that influences me, but I understand what you're saying.

MR. BOWEN: To that point, including the 2015 landings, the projections, and I am recalling this from memory and I don't have it in front of me, but including the 2015 landings, which may or may not be an outlier, the projected closure date for three per boat was July 20. The projected closure date for six per boat was July 15. For five days, I will take the chance of booking ten or fifteen or twenty trips during May and June, and I think I'm in the majority of the for-hire sector up and down the coast, from what we've heard in public comment and even last night.

DR. DUVAL: Roy, I appreciate you bringing up the greater amberjack situation. That wasn't something that I had considered. Obviously we were looking at size limit as a means of getting some savings, but it also, when your limits are a per-fish limit, that could actually get you closer to your ACL more quickly, and so it's all a balancing act, and so I might be inclined to stick with the thirty-six inches that we currently have as a preferred.

I think, in terms of the additional season length projections that were conducted using 2005 to 2014, there is a little bit more variability, in terms of five fish per vessel versus six fish per vessel, and it's all -- Each of these things is a piece of the puzzle.

We've heard that anglers would prefer to not have a shortened season, if at all possible, as an accountability measure, but we've also heard opposition to boat limits, but it seems like the dislike for a shortened season in the following year outweighs the dislike for a boat limit, particularly if we would prefer to have an accountability measure that would lower the vessel limit. Then you have to select a vessel limit in order to do that, and so each one of these things is a piece of the puzzle, and you have to be conscious of the vessel limit that you would select, so that it allows you a little bit of room to reduce that, should you go over.

I realize that we're trying to put together each one of these pieces to constrain harvest to the annual catch limit that we have and still provide equitable access for everybody throughout the range, and so it's all a piece of the puzzle. I think I would probably prefer staying at thirty-six inches, based on what Roy has said about their recent experience in the Gulf, and I will leave it at that.

MR. HARTIG: Let's go back to Kari and let her explain the tables.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: In Attachment 8b, this one uses data from 2013 through 2015, and so this is what we've been seeing. The highlighted is your current preferred of thirty-six inches and one per person and three per vessel. What this does is, with this one, and I do think it's still something you should consider, because it has 2015, and it's going to show you that if you have a big year that this is what we would expect to happen.

The information that was sent out later, in your late briefing book materials, that is in your briefing book under Additional Materials, and it's called "Revised Appendix H". What this shows, this uses 2005 through 2014 data, which are variable and can go up to almost a million. We have somewhere between 400,000 and almost a million pounds to capture that. It just doesn't have that 1.5 million pounds, and that was something that we heard at public hearings, that the analysis included this very much higher point in it and what would it look like compared to this longer period that didn't go quite that high. Does that make sense to everybody, what those two tables are?

MR. BOWEN: Chris and I are having a sidebar conversation talking about this, and this may be a little late to be brought, but it's an excellent point. Since he's not for-hire, I don't think he felt comfortable bringing it up, and maybe he wanted to throw me under the bus, but is it possible, just for discussion, is it possible or too late to put in that if you have a for-hire CMP permit that it could be six per boat and then the recreational angler have a two per boat? I know that probably needs some analysis, but it might be a way to get the reductions we need. I don't even know if it's possible, but it was just a conversation we had and I wanted to ask.

DR. DUVAL: We are scheduled to take final action. We can't include something that we already haven't taken out to the public and we haven't gotten any analysis for, and I think, based on some of the feedback that we've gotten in North Carolina for the actions that our commission took, which had different regulations for private anglers versus for-hire vessels, it's not something that I would advise the council to do. If you recall, that was also some of the public comment that we got, was to have the same regulations for private anglers and for-hire anglers.

MR. BOWEN: That's fine. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. BECKWITH: **Since we haven't read the motion into the record, I am happy to alter my motion, with the consent of the committee, to only change the vessel limit and leave the current preferred of thirty-six.**

MR. HARTIG: With the consent of the committee, and I see consensus around the table, and we will go ahead and change -- Anna changed her motion to thirty-six inches.

DR. CRABTREE: Can you read the new motion into the record?

MR. HARTIG: I am going to right now. The motion is to change the preferred alternative from 3c to Sub-Alternative 3f, six per vessel, in Action 1-1.

MR. BOWEN: Second.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Zack. Is there any more discussion? **Is there any objection to this motion? One objection. The motion passes with two objections.**

MR. BOWEN: Who was the other? I didn't see.

MR. HARTIG: Charlie.

MR. HAYMANS: There is objection.

MR. HARTIG: How many objected to the motion?

MR. HAYMANS: Can I ask one more question, just to make sure I'm clear?

MR. HARTIG: Go ahead.

MR. HAYMAN: Kari, on the new revised Table 2, thirty-six and six is a projected closure of October 11?

DR. MACLAUCHLIN: With the table using 2005 through 2014 data, your preferreds with including this motion, that is a thirty-six-inch fork length minimum size and one per person and six per vessel, and the expected date when recreational landings would hit the recreational ACL is October 11.

MR. HAYMANS: And none for three per vessel?

DR. MACLAUCHLIN: That's correct, under that thirty-six inches minimum size limit. You have to consider that bag limit in there, and so it would be expected to occur, depending on your vessel limit, maybe late October, sometime in October or maybe not at all. It's hard to estimate when you have a bag limit as well as a vessel limit.

MR. HAYMANS: I understand, and, Mr. Chairman, just for the record, the State of Georgia's preferred option is to keep them the way they are and extend the season as long as possible, because we don't know whether 2015 is going to be a repeat or not. For that reason, I am going to vote against the motion as it is and stick to the preferreds that we have.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You are acting as a committee of the whole and so, Chester, you can vote. I believe Gregg yesterday read the members of the committee that can vote, and so you might want to take another vote again, to clarify the record, so folks who didn't think they could vote before, they can cast their vote now.

MR. HARTIG: That's a good idea.

MR. BREWER: I apologize for causing that confusion. I forgot we were a committee of the whole.

DR. CRABTREE: If I were you, I wouldn't pay too much attention to that table that's 2005 to 2014. That is not likely to be reflective of what's going to happen in the recent years. The table in your document that's 2013 to 2015, I suspect that's much more likely to be reflective of what's happening in the fishery, and it shows much earlier closures. You can discount the 2015 numbers at your own peril, but, in my experience, looking at the last few years, it's usually a much better guide of what the next couple of years are likely to do than going back over a decade.

MR. O'REILLY: I think that's really a good point, except that, for 2016, there has been constraints applied to the fisheries. For example, in Virginia, going from a thirty-three-inch equivalent fork length up to a thirty-six and a very small boat limit, and so we've already started to apply measures. North Carolina did the same and South Carolina has done that. I think it has changed a little bit, and, again, if we're sitting on 443,000 pounds as an estimate right now, the expectations are that you do greater than about 26 percent of the 2015 harvest the rest of the way in 2016 and you're going to be right at the ACL for the recreational fishery. If you are about 34 percent greater than 2015 from Wave 4 on, then you're going to eclipse the total ACL. At the same time, the magnitude of the 2016 landings do fall in place more with that variability from 2005 to 2014, I think.

DR. MACLAUCHLIN: Just quickly, Table 1 in Attachment 8b in the decision document shows the landings based on the MRIP and from the Science Center for those years, so you can see how that variability is.

MR. HARTIG: Rob, it looks like you've looked at these numbers every way you can, and so, based on last year, just last year, have you looked at just last year and the percentage of where we are now and where we should be after the next wave? What did you figure out would be the ACL that we would be --

MR. O'REILLY: The recreational ACL would be reached if the rest of the year 2016 harvest is a little over 26 percent of the same time period in 2015. The total ACL would start to be exceeded at about 34 percent for the same time period of last year, Wave 4, essentially. It is sort of a challenge, to say the least, because you can imagine, with Virginia ending August 30 and North Carolina ending September 30, yes, there were conservation measures that are going to help, but it's going to be tough not to get over that ACL, I would think.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and it wasn't only your state that took additional measures. It was other states as well.

MR. O'REILLY: Right. It was South Carolina as well.

MR. HARTIG: South Carolina and North Carolina, I believe.

MR. O'REILLY: Yes.

MR. BOWEN: One thing I would like for everybody to look at, if you haven't already, is the 2016 landings. Wave 3 of 2016, Georgia has got a whopping zero. We get a pulse fishery. We have caught the fish and they've already moved up the coast, and MRIP did not intercept one doggone pound of cobia caught off of my coast. To sit here and say that we're probably going to exceed the ACL -- In 2015, we showed 67,000 pounds. In 2016, we showed zero. That just bugs the heck out of me that that's how it fell, and I didn't hear Doug a while ago to hear his rationale on what he wanted to do as far as the regulations. I am curious to hear it.

MR. HARTIG: Curious to hear what? I'm sorry.

MR. BOWEN: Doug had an input a while ago as far as preferreds, and I didn't hear what it was, and I wasn't sure if he knew about the 2016 landings for Georgia being zero. I didn't know if that would affect his opinion.

MR. HAYMANS: I am pretty aware of the zero number that's in there, but the agency standpoint is we would like to see the season stay open as long as possible, because a lot of the late season stuff is opportunistic, and we would like to see an individual be able to bring one in if they happen to see one, and so, from an agency standpoint, we want to keep the preferreds where they are.

MR. BOWEN: Regulations where they are meaning --

MR. HAYMANS: The preferreds in the current document that we're looking at of one-fish per person, three per boat, and thirty-six inches.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. We've had a vote and we've had more discussion, and so now we're going to take another vote, because everyone wasn't aware of the committee of the whole. Now they are. Everyone can vote that is in this room, actually, at this table, as far as I know, except for

Monica and Jack. Well, I will take that back. We have read the people who can vote. Michelle read it earlier. **All those in favor of this motion, raise your hand, seven; all those opposed. The motion passes seven to six.** I am not going to vote on this one.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I abstained.

MR. BEAL: I just wanted to say that I abstained as well. I think I'm going to probably abstain on a lot of these, just because the states are still trying to figure out where they want to go, and it's clearly split among the states and where they want to go. While I have the mic, I am trying to rack my brain on how these decisions will interact with what the commission does down the road and some of the -- Part of this, to me, seems like a ceiling, to some extent. In other words, if the six-fish per vessel limit is set, maybe that's the maximum that everyone is allowed. Then the states can voluntarily go down from there, through the commission process, if that's what they decide to do.

I think it would probably be helpful for the council members to sort of keep in mind what's the next step that they envision that the commission -- What is this going to look like when it goes to the commission and what would this council want the commission to do as kind of the next steps for allocation or dividing up the available ACL and those sorts of things? The bottom line is I will probably stay out of it, but I think if there are interactions down the road that need to be talked about, I think it's a good time to do it.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that, Bob. That's something to keep in mind, because we have heard that that would be a great way to do the AMs, in numbers of fish, and be able to decrease those as you were getting closer to your -- If you had a problem.

MR. O'REILLY: We're looking at that situation for 2017, as we did for 2016. Yesterday, I related that, in Virginia, the last two years have been 94 percent state-water fishery and 100 percent in the most recent year. Obviously it's really good that this set of documents made it clear, maybe a little clearer, I thought, that this is including all the state data, state-water data, as well as federal-water data. When it comes time to make a decision, having a six-fish vessel limit is really something that our commission in Virginia will have to look at along with other measures, and I do expect that by the time that let's say April of 2017 is here and there is public hearings, that our commission will have to weigh these various options. Starting them at a maximum of six fish, whether or not that ends up that way, is, at least for 2017, going to be a challenge for the states, I think, that have pretty large state-water fisheries to make those decisions.

MR. HARTIG: You could actually look at Wave 1, or the wave going into your cobia season, and could you have that in a time fast enough to actually make decisions on that or not?

MR. O'REILLY: No, and I mean there is still that lag of at least a month-and-a-half, if not more, for the data. I think that probably one thing to look at with these data, and I don't know whether everyone is aware of this or not, and I'm sure many of you are, but there was sort of an intervention, I will call it, that was done by MRIP back in June. New York has some very unusual recreational bluefish landings, and it was to a point that it was almost unseen before.

Questions were asked, and I know that MRIP, Gordon Colvin and MRIP, promoted a look at the data and, in a simple way just to say that, for sampling, that was really on the smaller scale. They

recalculated the information for the landings that way. It was also done for cobia in Virginia, and I don't know where else, and there was a modest deflection of the landings.

There was a rather good deflection, realistic deflection, for bluefish, and so there is two situations. One, Georgia mentioned that it had the zero, which is something that is problematic with the sampling. On the other end, the data themselves probably should be looked at, if someone can make that request, the way they were for 2015, and look back through the past to see how many of these times there was an expansion of the effort and the catch rate, but it was based on so few data that it really needs to be reassessed. I know that MRIP is challenged in many ways to do a lot, but that is something that probably is, for cobia at least, is something that would probably be pretty good to look into.

DR. LANEY: Rob, if I understood you correctly, the VMRC may well elect, in terms of managing the fishery in state waters, to select different alternatives, and so somebody remind me. If these measures are in place in federal waters and the captain is operating with a federal permit, what does it mean if we have different regulations in state waters?

MR. O'REILLY: It makes it awkward. We went through that with summer flounder for years. It puts a real strain on enforcement to handle that, but I mean, again, it's a situation where if you have so few -- At least the trend is in Virginia that you have so few vessels out in federal waters doing this that it may not be a big problem in Virginia, but it could be in another state. In any event, you want to avoid contrasting regulations, if you can.

DR. DUVAL: I haven't looked at the regulations in a bit with regard to permitted for-hire captains in the coastal migratory pelagics fishery, but does it contain the provision that federally-permitted captains must adhere to the stricter of state or federal regulations if operating in state waters for a particular species? I don't recall if that provision is in there.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't recall either, but I will look at that. I just had one other thing. I know this is in the document, but to make it clear for anybody who is listening that you have a per-person limit and then a vessel limit, and it's the more restrictive that's going to apply. If you had eight people onboard a boat, you would only be allowed to have six cobia on the vessel, but just to clarify it for the record.

DR. DUVAL: Conversely, if you only had four people on the boat, each of those people would only be able to have one, four fish. It's one fish each for a total of four on the vessel.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's right.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. Moving right along.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: The next action was to modify the fishing year for recreational. However, we cannot make changes to the fishing year through a framework procedure, and I apologize for letting you know that later than we should have, but we did take it out to public hearing. You had a preferred alternative to start in May and a couple of alternatives to start in June and April. We do have the analysis that is in this document that shows the combination table, so people could see how all of that would interact.

If the council decided to address this in a future amendment, they could. However, you have to remove this action from Framework Amendment 4. Then you can talk about what to do with it. If you do want to move forward with this, we have all the information that already been out to public hearing, and it is penciled in on the Gulf Council agenda. You could select a preferred alternative and we will have the Gulf Council review it and select preferred alternatives and take final action and bounce it back to you guys in December. It would be a little bit behind, but only three months behind, but it would still go through the federal part of it as well. However, we could move it -- It won't move quite as slowly as most joint plan amendments.

MR. HARTIG: Is everybody straight on Kari's explanation? Seeing so, Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a motion that we remove Action 2 from Framework Amendment 4 and ask council staff to develop a plan amendment to change the fishing year for Atlantic cobia with May 1 being the preferred start date. I know that's a lot, and if I need to break that down into a couple two or three motions, I will be glad to.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, we would have to.

MR. BOWEN: All right. **The first one is just make a motion to remove Action 2 from Framework Amendment 4.**

MR. HARTIG: Thank you. That will be cleaner. We have a motion to remove Action 2 from Framework Amendment 4.

MR. O'REILLY: I will second it.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Rob. Is there discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: This is discussion.

MR. HARTIG: That's fine.

DR. DUVAL: Certainly a May 1 start date could potentially buy a little bit of extra time, I guess, in terms of -- I think I will just go back to what Bob said with regard to changing the start date of the fishing year at the federal level and then what the commission might want to do in there as well. I would just encourage folks to think about that, that's all.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and I mean we did separate these motions out, and so this motion is only removing Action 2 from Framework Amendment 4. I am sorry that I didn't explain that very well, but that's okay. **Is there any objection to the motion removing Action 2 from Framework Amendment 4? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

MR. BOWEN: **I would also make another motion to ask council staff to work on a plan amendment to change the start date for the fishing year for Atlantic cobia.** I can get into alternatives if they would like, or, like Kari said, it's already gone out to public hearings. For the record, I sure would like May 1 to be the preferred alternative. My rationale is from the public testimony that we've had up and down the coast.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Do I need to add the preferred alternative in here, in the motion?

MR. BOWEN: I would leave that up for discussion. It's my preferred, but, again, it's up to the rest of the council, I guess. Keeping in mind that May 1 is the start of a wave, and so I sure don't want to split a wave up. MRIP might be a little more confusing than it is already if we do that.

MR. HARTIG: We've got a motion and a second by Chris. The motion is to ask staff to work on a plan amendment to change the recreational fishing year for Atlantic cobia. Is there any discussion on this? **Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Zack, did you want to make another motion for a preferred or did you want to wait until we bring it to a plan amendment or what do you want to do?

MR. BOWEN: No, sir. I can wait. That's fine. I think that they will give us an array of options, as long as May 1 is included in one of them, and I think it will be.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Depending on how fast you would like this to move, and if this is the only action in this plan amendment, we can move it pretty quickly, since we have everything already. However, the Gulf Council would need to review it and approve the action and select a preferred and give approval for formal review in October.

I would recommend that you go ahead and select a preferred alternative, so they know, unless there are additional alternatives that you would like to add at this time, which that's going to slow it down, but, if it's the way it is now and you're just moving it into a plan amendment, I would recommend selecting a preferred alternative before it goes to the Gulf.

MR. BOWEN: Okay. **To that point, taking under consideration of our highly-intelligent staff, I would make the preferred start date May 1.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Zack and second by Chris. That motion is to select the preferred start date as May 1, which would be Alternative 2, May 1 through April 30. Is there discussion on this motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: I think Bob was talking about how the start dates, if they weren't the first of the year, might have made some difference, and could somebody kind of explain, if there is a difference on how regulations might be fleshed out?

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I'm sorry, but what is the question again?

MR. PHILLIPS: If we don't have a January 1 start date, would it change anything, like the Atlantic States or does it not matter at all?

MR. HARTIG: Bob, I think he's asking if the start date would change any deliberations at ASMFC.

MR. BEAL: It would just sort of change the start date. In other words, it would change when the chunk of fish that is available to the states, when they start their fishing year and when they want to start dividing up those fish. Theoretically, if it started January 1, but the states really didn't want to start fishing until June 1, they could -- The states could go through the commission plan

and start their fishery on June 1, or, if it started in the federal plan on May 1, the states could still start on June 1.

It's kind of hard to say what the best start date is for the states without really knowing where they want to go, but I think anywhere early in the year, January through May, is probably similar for the states. In other words, once they start allocating those fish, beginning in early May, I think that -- The states still probably have enough flexibility to work with, and anytime from January to May, I would think, but it's kind of hard to say without knowing where the states are going.

MR. O'REILLY: I just think, with the amount of change that is undergoing in the stock and the fishery that it would be good to see this output, what it looks like as far as how it may be utilized, but really, I think, as I said yesterday, that we're in a situation where we have to have the flexibility. We have to be able to adapt, and I think the worst thing would be, and I heard a little bit of this in June, the idea that there is definitely interest in different start dates, but they're all predicated on what's been going on the last few years.

I think, as we go forward and the ASMFC has a role in assisting with the state fisheries, it may be that start dates need to have flexibility. I don't think this is a situation where -- If you look down the road with May 1, there is a possibility, if there is another big fishery, that that shortchanges someone else. In 2016, it was Virginia and North Carolina in that situation, and I think that's what we all want to try and avoid. How do we avoid that, and so it would be good to see this, but I still think the flexible seasons approach is what we should end up with at some point.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say, at this point, I don't see the need for us to specify to this degree of what we want. That option is already one that's been discussed. We will kind of work through this, and particularly as we work out the details of complementary management. I just don't see the need right now to select a preferred. We're going to work through that.

DR. LANEY: It seems to me that maybe the fundamental question is what's the probability that a whole lot of fish or that some fish -- That some state would be disadvantaged by a May 1 start date? Do we have landings by month or by wave that we could look at that would show us how much has traditionally been landed, or at least through the period we were looking at of 2005 forward? That may speak to that question of whether or not additional flexibility is desirable.

MR. BOWEN: To Mel's point, the reason we picked a preferred is so the Gulf would -- I mean they have to decide, and so I was kind of following what staff kind of guided us to do there. That's the reason I picked the preferred of May 1.

DR. DUVAL: Rob, I was trying to figure out, from what you said, if you were supportive of an action to change the fishing year start date at this time or not. I guess my sense is it doesn't make a lot of difference. We did hear some public comment that if there was a change in the start date that May 1 seemed to be fairly acceptable, but we didn't get a whole lot of public comment on the start date.

I do think that exactly what you're talking about, in terms of how states might want to configure their seasons is something that's going to be a conversation around the ASMFC table. I don't know that this does a whole lot. I can't think, off the top of my head, of any of the other ASMFC/council complementary or joint plans that have different start dates except for, of course,

North Carolina. We start our offshore striped bass season on December 1 instead of January 1, but we don't have striped bass anymore and so it doesn't really matter. I guess I'm just wondering about the utility of this action at this time, but I am curious to know, Rob, if you are supportive of that, that's all.

MR. O'REILLY: I am supportive of the process that leads to some output so that this question can be finalized and everyone can see what's involved. I think Wilson made a good point, which is we really need to dissect the data a little bit and maybe look through 2005 to 2014 and really see if there are impacts that really are on one area, one state, one geographical location, compared to another. That is my interest, more than thinking -- I agree with you, Michelle. We have talked about it, and we don't think it's a game-changer to change the season like that.

MR. BELL: I appreciate if this is a matter of doing something that will expedite this, and I would like to expedite it, but I was just -- Since we're talking about something that's from the Georgia/Florida line up, I don't know why the Gulf would have a problem with anything we would particularly pick.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: It's not that I anticipate that this -- It's about the timing. If the Gulf doesn't select a preferred and take final action on their end in October, so that the South Atlantic could do it in December, then you have to wait until the Gulf's next meeting for them to approve it. It's more of a timing thing and not that the Gulf would have that, and so it's just -- I mean obviously there will be somebody from the South Atlantic at their October meeting that can convey it. Charlie can convey it, but it's not a motion that's been approved by the council as the preferred. It's just Charlie telling them what the preferred is, and usually they will track the South Atlantic's preferreds if they have the preferred already. That's why, Mel. It will just delay it.

MR. PHILLIPS: That was my question, Kari. If we delay it for another Gulf Council -- I don't think it's going to matter, because I don't think we're going to have the start date for this year, for this coming May, and so if we delay it a month, it's probably not going to make a difference for the following year. I just want to make sure that I'm right on timelines.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to clarify, and Kari said it, but I just want to add on that the Gulf's next meeting, after your December meeting, is the last part of January or early February. If you picked a preferred at this meeting, the Gulf would look at it at their October meeting and agree with you or not, and let's assume they agree. Then you could, theoretically, take final action in December, if that's what you wanted to do.

If you don't pick a preferred now and you want to think about it more and deal with it in December, you could do that. Then that would kick it to the next Gulf meeting, which is late January or early February. The timing, of course, if you wanted to get the fishing year start date as of -- Let's say you went with the preferred and wanted to go with May 1. It's theoretically possible, if you took final action in December, to get a single-action amendment maybe implemented by May 1. It's a little close, because you need a sixty-day public comment period on the amendment. I guess it's a weighing of what you want to do, but I just wanted to make clear especially that the Gulf's next meeting then is very late January or early February.

DR. LANEY: To my question, I think Mike and Kari have put on the screen the average cobia recreational landings by state and month for that period of 2005 to 2015, and it does appear there

are some landings in April in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina. I would look to those states to say whether those landings are of significant concern to them, in regard to switching to a May 1 start date.

MR. BOWEN: To Wilson's question, definitely I'm not a state agency, but I am a fisherman, and our fish -- Fifteen years ago, the fish started showing up in April. They don't show up in April now, not on the northern side of the coast. They haven't in several years, and the reason I would want to go May 1 instead of April 1 is I'm trying to keep from splitting a wave up. That is not what I want to do, and so that was my rationale, Wilson.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. We've had a lot of discussion on this. Is there any more discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? The motion is to select the preferred start date as May 1. That's the motion. Is there any objection? I need to call for a vote, because there is an objection. **All those in favor of the motion, raise your hand, nine in favor; opposed, one; abstentions, six. The motion passes.** The next item is --

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Action 3 is to modify the recreational accountability measures for Atlantic cobia. We have the current, which is if the stock ACL is exceeded and the stock is designated as overfished, the following year's recreational ACL will be reduced. The next is if landings exceed the recreational ACL, the RA evaluates the overage based on the most recent three years of landings under that current ACL and reduces the length of the following fishing year.

Then there is a recreational ACT. It is 500,000 pounds whole weight. You have selected a preferred Alternative 2. The IPT has a few language changes for you to approve in the alternatives that are highlighted and with a strikethrough. Alternative 2 is that if the landings exceed the recreational ACL that the RA will reduce the length of the following fishing season, and you have some sub-alternatives in there. Your preferred, Sub-Alternative 2b, is that this will occur if the stock ACL is exceeded.

Alternative 3, we also have some suggested changes there highlighted for you to approve. If the recreational landings exceed the recreational ACL, the following year's recreational ACL will be reduced in the amount of the overage. Then there are three sub-alternatives for the conditions of only if the species is overfished, 3b is if the stock ACL is exceeded, and 3c is both if the species is overfished and the stock ACL is exceeded.

Alternative 4 would establish an in-season closure, and so the RA would publish a notice to close the recreational sector for the remainder of the fishing year once the recreational landings reach or are projected to reach the recreational ACL, with two conditions in the sub-alternatives, if it's overfished or regardless of the overfished status of the species.

Then Alternative 5 is if recreational landings exceeded the recreational ACL, the RA would reduce the recreational vessel limit for the following fishing year to ensure that recreational landings meet the recreational ACT, but do not exceed the recreational ACL, based on the landings from the previous year. The recreational vessel limit will not be reduced if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction is unnecessary. Then you have the three conditions in 5a through 5c, if it's overfished, if the stock ACL is exceeded, or both of those. First, I would need you to review and approve the highlighted deletions in Alternatives 2, 3, and 5.

MR. HARTIG: I need a motion to approve the IPT edits in Alternatives 2, 3, and 5.

DR. DUVAL: **I move that we approve the IPT edits in Alternatives 2, 3, and 5.**

MR. HARTIG: Second by Anna. Any discussion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I do want to go over the public input for this. There was, again, just to remind you, support in modifying those AMs to remove the use of the three-year average, just so, if there is a year with exceptionally high recreational landings, that that does not carry over and potentially penalize them for the next couple of years whenever there is an evaluation of an overage.

There was a lot of opposition to anything that would close recreational harvest. Folks would rather have another measure in place as the AM, such as reduced harvest limits, than they would to have the season closed. It was imperative that it was open at least May through September or October, and then also the Virginia Marine Resources Commission recommended the sub-alternatives to AMs be applied in this specific order. If there is an overage, that first there would be a reduced vessel limit. If that did not help to keep recreational landings from exceeding the recreational ACL, then there would be a reduced ACL. Then, last, there would be a reduced season length.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. We have a preferred.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move that we also select a second preferred of Alternative 5b.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Anna and second by Michelle. The motion is to select Alternative 5, Sub-Alternative 5b as the preferred.

MS. BECKWITH: The only thing I would add to the intent of this is that it would be reduced to a minimum of three, and I'm not sure if that's something that Roy would have to weigh in on. For Alternative 5b, the additional accountability measure that would reduce the vessel limit, if we wanted to sort of set the intent that a vessel limit would not be reduced to less than three per vessel, is that something that we just sort of put into the intent or --

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You need to give the Regional Administrator, I think, unless you wanted to take that out again for public comment, when the Regional Administrator was reducing this vessel limit, you need to put some, I think, a little more definitive thoughts on what you want him to do. For example, right now, 5b says he will reduce the vessel limit for the following fishing year only if the commercial and recreational ACL is exceeded. Reduce it to what? You have already said you want six, I think, per person, and so what do you want him to reduce it to? I think some discussion would be very good. I almost kind of think, in the past, when we've given him that kind of authority, you have set it up so that if this, then that. Otherwise, you almost have to go out again with a proposed rule and take public comment on it, which I think that isn't your intent. Maybe we could have your thoughts on that, what do you want him to reduce it to.

MS. BECKWITH: As the accountability measure, we would like the vessel limit reduced to no less than three, as needed, as a first step. Then a secondary -- Up to. I mean the minimum of three.

If you go over a little bit, maybe you can reduce it to five or four, but no less than three per vessel. Then, if that doesn't work, then you would go to a season shortening.

MR. HAYMANS: The way I look at is if we're in a situation where we're about to go over the ACL, that puts us into the Table 2, as printed in the document, and the difference between six and three is a week. I know there's not a whole lot of weight that we're putting on any of those tables, but that reduction doesn't seem to do much in extending any season. If we're at that level of going over the ACL, to me, you would go from six to one. That's the only way you're going to get another month out of a season, based on the table.

DR. DUVAL: I think the idea is to try to order these similar to how the VMRC suggested. I think my suggestion would be to start with a lowered vessel limit followed by a shortened season. I'm not sure there's much of a difference between reducing the ACL and shortening the season, because the effect is going to be pretty much the same. If you reduce the ACL, you will have a shortened season.

I agree with Anna that you might want to set a vessel limit, below which you wouldn't want to go before applying a shortened season as a next step, and so if you lower the vessel limit to no less than three fish and then apply a shortened season, in order to constrain your harvest to the ACT.

MR. O'REILLY: That's the type of situation that I think if -- I was concerned that if we had two preferred alternatives and which one gets triggered first, and definitely Virginia is in support of having 5b looked at first, and I kind of agree with the situation that Doug has outlined that there is not much difference in the vessel limits, but a lot of that is the sampling that is unable to be made, and so we hope, in 2016, some of the fuller trips that are there can be sampled, and that might help a little bit.

Then, after that, 3b is talking about the ACL being lowered, which, yes, I guess that once that is that you have to look at the season anyway, and so, if that's the progression, that would be our preference as well, to do it in that manner. Again, I think, for 2017, it's going to be different than 2018 in state waters, because the state jurisdictions are still going to be faced with making these choices, just as they did in 2016.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Here is one thought, just practically speaking. This would kick in only if the stock -- I misread this before. You will reduce the limit only if the stock is exceeded and not if it's overfished and overfishing. That isn't applicable, and so -- All right. If you do put these kinds of things in here, like no less than three per vessel, that's kind of an action. It's part of the alternative, in effect, and so what I would suggest is, if you do that, maybe you take a brief public comment on this. You had public comment last night. Last night, this wasn't part of what the public had before them, in terms of how much you would reduce the vessel limit, and so I would think maybe, before you go into full council and vote on this, that you see if there is any comment that the public might want to make on this, just to make sure that we're following the Act, and then go ahead with this.

I will offer just that suggestion, and never mind my practical speaking, because this isn't overfished and overfishing. My thought was you're going to have this come before you again if it's overfished and overfishing, in terms of actions to deal with cobia, and you could address it then, but I will take that back and go ahead.

MR. O'REILLY: I guess the situation in Virginia is we wouldn't want to lose that flexibility on the vessel limit. We've had a two-fish vessel limit this year. The most concerning part of any fishermen's thoughts in Virginia are to have the season be as open as possible, and I do think that if we capped this at three fish, at the bottom end, that would create problems, based on the data that we've seen, where 2014 and 2015, we didn't have any vessel that had more than three fish anyway. They certainly did, but the data aren't verified in that, and so that would be a problem, yet going to two fish is a savings, is a reduction, and, when we started talking about this in March, the idea, from many, was do anything you can, but just keep that season as open as possible, and so I think the three would not be something I could support, despite the situation that's been presented now.

MS. BOSARGE: I just want to make sure I understand it all, in case the Gulf has any questions as we go through this. You all struck through the yellow part in Alternative 5 that said during the following fishing year, but then you added it somewhere else, and so this is a measure that will take place the following fishing year, right?

I want to make sure that I understand. I heard the for-hire, via Anna, say that don't go down lower than three, and is that because you're hoping that maybe a three-fish per vessel limit that you might could book that trip and still get somewhere with it, rather than if it's a one-fish per boat limit, that you probably are dead in the water at that point? I just wanted to make sure, so I can explain it to the Gulf.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: To Leann's question, if reducing it lower than three wouldn't work, then you would apply the reduced season length instead, correct?

MS. BECKWITH: Or in addition to.

DR. MCGOVERN: So the Regional Administrator would then choose if the following season is going to be shortened or if the bag limit is going to be reduced? I am kind of confused about that. Also, I'm wondering -- You're going down to three fish per vessel, and does the Regional Administrator choose four or three? Is that up to his discretion? Also, what happens the following year? Does it go back up to six? I guess all of that I'm not clear about.

DR. DUVAL: We talked about some of that at the last meeting, I think, that -- First, to get to what Doug was asking about, the reduced vessel limit would be applied before a reduced season length. That would be the order. I think if Rob has concerns about three still per vessel still removes some flexibility, I would certainly be willing to go down to two per vessel. I understand Anna's concerns about being able to book a trip. You're trying to balance access to the resource with a length of a season.

To answer Jack's questions, I think, yes, how far to reduce the vessel limit would be at the discretion of the Regional Administrator. We could say no lower than two per vessel or three per vessel and set that floor before a reduced season length would be applied, to try to constrain harvest to the annual catch target.

At the last meeting, we did discuss -- The way it's worded is allow harvest to meet the annual catch target, but not exceed the annual catch limit. If you meet those constraints with those

measures, then, the following year, everything resets to what it was previously. I think that was how we had discussed it last time.

DR. MCGOVERN: It just needs to be explained in there somewhere. I don't know if it's in the text of the document. Maybe it is now, but that's not clear, by looking at the alternatives, that that is how it would work, to me.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Yes, it's in the document. What it says is, specifically for the description of Alternative 5, is the reduced vessel limit would only apply for the fishing year following the year with an overage. After the year with the reduced vessel limit, the vessel limit would return to the permanent limit, as determined in Action 1-1, unless recreational landings continue to exceed the recreational ACL. If this occurs for more than one year, there could be multiple years with a vessel limit lower than the permanent vessel limit specified in Action 1-1.

MR. BOWEN: Just for the record, to Leann's point and to Anna's, maybe North Carolina fishermen are a little different than Georgia, and, even though MRIP says that historically we catch 20 percent of the cobia in state waters, which I think is an inflated number, at three per vessel, Georgia is not going to sell any fishing trips, cobia fishing trips. They won't. They will not go. I just want it on the record that a three per vessel limit -- I understand what we're trying to do, and I'm in agreement with Anna, but we won't sell any fishing trips at three per vessel in Georgia at all.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. Time is not on our side. We need to go ahead and vote. Go ahead, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I would say, in this direction or clarification that Kari has on the screen, I think if we could replace three with two, that might address Rob's concern about having additional flexibility. Monica, you're suggesting that we, based on this discussion that we've had here, ask if there are any members of the public who would like to provide comment on this right now, before we take a final vote on this selection of Alternative 5, Sub-Alternative 5b, as a preferred?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think you have some options. I think that, if you select it as a preferred, before you go into full council, which will be right after committee of the whole, to vote on it, at that point you could ask the public, or you could ask them right now. That would be fine, but it was -- That 5b went out to the public. I don't have any problem with that. Now we're putting more parameters on it, that the Regional Administrator can't choose an amount less than two or whatever, and that's fine. I just think it would be appropriate to see if anybody has any public comment. You are flexible on when you request it, as long as you do it before the council takes final action.

MR. HARTIG: What do you want to do?

DR. DUVAL: We might as well get any public comment right now, I think, and then we can vote on the motion with the clarification, as needed.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to comment on the discussion that we've had in the changes in the accountability measures for cobia? Mr. Gorham.

MR. GORHAM: Bill Gorham. If we're going -- For North Carolina, I would like to see four fish, and that's just given the price of a trip, because of the vessels that are being used. If you go down to two, that's a hard, hard sell. I think Virginia, it did not seem to be a problem, but, for North Carolina, that's tough. That's really tough.

DR. DUVAL: Bill, I think what we're trying to do here is make sure that if we have to reduce a vessel limit that we're still providing access throughout the region. That is North Carolina and Virginia, and I understand that, if we were in a situation of having to go down to two per vessel to provide that access, that that would not necessarily be palatable, and so it's a tradeoff of having access and a lower vessel limit -- A higher vessel limit, but a very short season, and so you're reducing the access. It's definitely a struggle.

MR. GORHAM: I know, universally across the board, the charter captains for northeastern North Carolina said that they lost trips even at four, primarily Hatteras. It's just the geographical location and the travel. Again, the states -- We're using bigger boats in the Outer Banks. It's a higher cost. It's six people. I understand the tradeoff. I think, if you're up against the wall, if you can keep it open, that's a plus, without this shortening of the season. I would prefer and support the two per vessel over a closure.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Bill. I appreciate that. Were there any other members of the public who wanted to comment on the AMs? I do not see any, and so that brings us back to a vote on this motion. **All those in favor of the motion, raise your hand, twelve in favor; all those opposed, one opposed; abstentions, two abstentions.**

MR. PHILLIPS: A point of order. Don't you need to read it, since we changed it, to make sure it's read into the record?

MR. HARTIG: You're keeping me straight, Charlie. Thank you so much. The motion is to select Alternative 5, Sub-Alternative 5b, as preferred. The AM would be a reduced vessel limit to no less than two per vessel and only if the stock ACL is exceeded. Reducing the vessel limit would be applied before a reduced season length. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thanks for entertaining my questions, but, just to make sure, I believe I heard discussion that there could be a reduced vessel limit and a reduced season in combination. Council members are nodding their heads yes, and so I believe that's accurate. However, you would want the Regional Administrator to first look at a reduced vessel limit before any reduced season was contemplated, in a sense.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I think that the discussion that Kari highlighted that's in the amendment document clarifies that.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you. Are we good now? I see our Chairman nodding, but our lawyer isn't. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I wanted to answer a question that Michelle asked earlier, before you go into the trip limit discussion. You asked if the for-hire permitted folks have to abide by the more restrictive regulations, regardless of whether it's in federal or state waters, and, no, that's not in the regulations. However, in the regulations, there is discussion that you cannot combine a

federal commercial trip limit with a state trip limit, and so I just wanted you to know that before you went into that discussion.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Monica. That takes us to Action 4, commercial trip limits, I believe.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: I just want to be sure. In the AMs, the system that you're setting up, you have Alternative 2, which is the reduced season length, and Alternative 5, the reduced vessel limit, as the AMs, with Alternative 5 being applied first. By not selecting Alternative 3 as the preferred, you are removing the AM that would reduce the recreational ACL, if whatever conditions that were specified were met. I just want to be clear that it's removing that one.

MR. HARTIG: For the public, we had some sidebars, to make sure that the council was okay with that. It looks like, by the nodding of heads that we are. Okay, Action 4, establish a commercial trip limit for Atlantic cobia.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Okay. The current possession limit for cobia that are sold is two fish per person per day. Alternative 2 would establish the commercial trip limit, and so this is just a regulatory language change for Atlantic cobia of two fish per person per day with a step-down to one fish per person per day when 75 percent of the commercial ACL has been met.

Alternative 3 sets it up as a vessel limit with six per vessel per day, with a step-down to three per vessel per day when 75 percent of the commercial ACL is met, and Alternative 4 is a combination of that, in which it would be two fish per person per day and no more than six per vessel, with a step-down to one per person per day, no more than three per vessel, when 75 percent of the commercial ACL is met. That trigger, for 2016 and subsequent years, will be 37,500 pounds.

We have a table in here that shows you the month when it, based on the actual Atlantic cobia commercial landings, would have reached that 75 percent of the commercial ACL and triggered a step-down and then also when landings would have reached the current ACL. You also received, in your late briefing book materials, a document called "Additional Analysis for Action 4". Mike Larkin somehow pulled off some more detailed analysis for you guys, to have a little more information, more specific times, based on the actual commercial landings from recent years, of when it would have triggered a step-down. Usually a step-down would either not occur or maybe it would occur in the fall months, and then when the ACL was met, and it's usually later in the year. In 2015, those landings were higher, now that we know, and so the ACL was met a little earlier, probably in September or October.

Then he also looked into the number of trips that would be impacted, and this analysis was limited, because, right now, the commercial possession limit is in numbers of fish. However, when reported as sold on their trip tickets, it's in pounds, and so, if there was a trip and they sold fifty pounds of cobia, it's not clear if that's one cobia or two cobia, just because the size varies so much, and so we weren't able to really give you a lot of information on the number of trips this would have impacted by limiting the vessel limit or something like that. Mike was able to provide a little information about how this would work, kind of, and the number of trips that would be impacted in there, but it is a little limited, and the pounds there from those impacted trips.

We didn't receive really much public comment on this action and if it was going to affect people. There were a couple of people who said two fish per vessel, six per vessel, and so I think it's just kind of up to you guys.

DR. DUVAL: I see Mr. Conklin with his hand up as well, and so I will just throw something out there for discussion. Maybe Chris had a motion, but I think, in talking to some folks, we felt like it would be less confusing to do Alternative 3, which was six per vessel per day, and then decreasing to three per vessel per day when you hit that 75 percent trigger. I think, in Alternative 4, we were trying to combine two per person per day with no more than six per vessel per day, and I just think that gets confusing for fishermen and then having a decrease to one per person per day with no more than three per vessel per day. I understand you're trying to accommodate how many crew might be on the boat along with the vessel limit, but I just think that's confusing, and I think Alternative 3 is probably the way to go, but I would like to hear from Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: That wasn't a motion, but that was just for discussion. I wouldn't be in favor of that. We exceeded the commercial ACL this year. It's an open access anybody can get a permit kind of thing. I would just be inclined to leave it alone and to select Alternative 1, no action. If you want me to make a motion, I sure will. **I would like to make a motion that the committee of the whole select Alternative 1, no action, do not modify the possession limit of two fish per person per day.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Chris and second by Zack. Is there discussion?

MS. BECKWITH: This is a question for Monica, really. I am curious. If we wanted to do a two per person vessel max of six, without all this step-down scenario, would we be able to move forward with that, because it's within the range of alternatives that was sort of considered or would that be different enough?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: For example, tell me what --

MS. BECKWITH: It would be conceivably a new alternative that would have a vessel maximum of six without any step-downs. The end result would be two per person per day with a maximum of six per vessel with no step-downs.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My first thought, and I will think about it more, but my first thought is that you did take out a six per vessel per day, but that was for the recreational sector and not the commercial sector.

MS. BECKWITH: No, we have it right here in Alternative --

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You mean in Alternative 4?

MS. BECKWITH: Correct. In Action 4, Alternative 3 and 4 both discuss a six fish per vessel per day, but add to that a step-down. I am wondering if, legally, since it is within the range of alternatives that has been considered, if we could move forward with just a six fish per vessel per day maximum.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: With no step-down?

MS. BECKWITH: With no step-down.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I would ask Kari. Kari, do you think that you have adequate analysis in the document that considers a straight six per vessel per day? That wasn't exactly one of the alternatives, but I am thinking that perhaps the analysis showed what a six per vessel per day does.

MR. HARTIG: It was tough. Because the fish are so big, it's hard to get a number in the commercial fishery, since they're all weighed together. You really don't have a number of fish to correspond to a weight, in some cases. That's the problem, even in the analysis for the ones we had.

DR. MACLAUHLIN: Yes, I would say that we have enough analysis. Commercial cobia is tricky, because some of the sales are incidental catch off a commercial trip for something else and then some of the sales are off charter and recreational trips, where that is allowed. I mean I understand, again, that it would be consistent with what you set up for the recreational. I guess it's just do you want to differentiate the commercial component of this from the recreational or are you still okay with it kind of being all blended together? In a way, I feel like setting up the commercial trip limit with a step-down and everything like that kind of differentiates it, but, back to your original question, I think that there would be enough information.

MR. CONKLIN: Just to the fishing boats that fish for me, there is two or three guys, four at the max, but rarely do you ever see four and rarely do they actually go and target cobia, at least for the bandit fishermen. The enforcement in our area knows that it's two per person per trip. If there is two men on the boat, then they can have up to four. There is not a boat limit, but our guys aren't going to put six or eight head on a boat to go out and maximize their cobia catch. That's what I was speaking to, but I certainly don't want to open it up to more with us running over the ACL already and to create a directed fishery, where people can get the permit and go out and target them and sell them when we're already working on a real low quota to begin with.

MR. HARTIG: There isn't a permit, but the thing that gets me, and I fish for cobia, and not in the Atlantic group, but in the Southern group, and I would love to see six per boat, but it would increase the number of cobia caught dramatically in our area, because we only fish two people or, a number of times, one. I mean I would go and target six cobia. There isn't any doubt in my mind that I would go do that, and so that's something to keep in mind.

MR. BELL: I had something to that and then a question as well. What Chris is describing has been our traditional commercial fishery associated with cobia, which is primarily snapper grouper guys that are bringing in a couple, but, recently, what we're seeing is a directed fishery, which is, because there is no federal permit. If you obtain a state commercial license, you can go out and land cobia in South Carolina from federal waters.

What I think folks are starting to do, and it's particularly during the spawning season, when they're aggregated even offshore, on some of the artificial reefs and areas, is a directed effort for multiple commercial fishermen to go out on a boat and bring in, right now, their two per, and however many guys you can load on a boat times two is how many cobia you're bringing back.

We are seeing a bit of a directed fishery now, and it's perfectly legal, because they also will sell to a federally-licensed dealer, and so it's all on the up-and-up, but there is a little bit more of a directed

fishery, and it is early in the season and they are taking advantage of the fact that these cobia are aggregated on sites offshore, and so that is occurring right now. If we don't take any action to kind of hone down that a little bit, you are going to see a lot more commercial landings, particularly earlier in the season. Also, kind of tied to that, is the size limit then would still be thirty-three inches for the commercial fishery as well?

MR. HARTIG: That's a yes.

MR. BELL: That makes it even easier to load up the boat.

MS. BECKWITH: To Mel's point, I agree, and my intent is to have a two per person with a max of six per vessel, because I do know that we have a lot of dually-permitted charter for-hire in our area, and I do believe that we will have them running a commercial trip with four cobia for the higher limits if there is not a higher vessel limit. I think we're going to be encouraging a problem.

MR. CONKLIN: I wouldn't mind what Anna is saying, as long as we go with whichever is more restrictive.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. That changes the dynamics of the motion, as far as I understood it.

MS. BECKWITH: The intent would be to have a two per person with a max of six per vessel, whichever is more restrictive.

MR. O'REILLY: I am following the bouncing ball.

MR. HARTIG: Exactly. It is bouncing.

MR. O'REILLY: But I think that's probably a little more restrictive than what Virginia has. What we have might be a little different, and I don't know. We have a commercial hook and line fishery that they're the serious cobia fishermen and they're the ones who have a trip limit of six right now, and so that was instituted about maybe a year-and-a-half ago. It's not a big fishery overall. Those who just have two per day on their commercial license, they account for about 14 percent of the total harvest, which ranges from 9,000 to 25,000 pounds, total.

I think it probably is a good move forward to cap it at six, and we will have some fishermen now who are out with just two, and some who are with three, but the idea of loading up a boat probably is to be avoided. I agree with that idea that was said before, and so I think you went about this pretty well.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: What is the present regulations for the for-hire selling of fish, of cobia?

DR. DUVAL: There is no restriction on sale of for-hire-caught fish for cobia. We eliminated bag limit sales of king and Spanish mackerel in Amendment 20A, but there is no such limitation on cobia, and that's partially because there is no required federal permit for cobia.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Basically, if you go charter fishing and somebody gives you a fish, you can go enter it in the commercial market if you have the necessary permits and stuff like that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to the point, to circle back to Anna's original question of could you do this today, yes, I think you could. However, I would, again, encourage you or advise you to take some public comment on this, because it's slightly different than the action outlined, and I would suggest you do that before the council itself votes on final action on the amendment to move it forward to the Secretary, just like you did for the previous action.

I have looked at the document and the analysis in there, and so, really, what you may not have exactly -- You certainly have a table showing you when landings reach 75 percent of the ACL, and so this would then not have that 75 percent trigger in there, and the trip limit, I guess, is meant to perhaps lengthen the commercial season. That's really why you're doing it, roughly, and so I think you have enough before you in the document to take this as a preferred if you wanted to.

MS. BECKWITH: **I will offer a substitute motion to establish a commercial trip limit for Atlantic cobia of two fish per person per day with no more than six fish per vessel per day, whichever is more restrictive.**

MR. HARTIG: We've got a substitute motion. Have we got a second on that? Second by Charlie. Any more discussion?

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think we need to add "whichever is more restrictive", because it's clear that it's two per day or six per vessel.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I want to be clear and understand that, because this appears to be simply the first half of Alternative 4, which I would have thought said the same thing, and maybe I am just reading it wrong, because Alternative 4 is establish a commercial trip limit for Atlantic cobia of two fish per person per day with no more than six fish per vessel per day. I mean is it not automatically implied or construed that whichever is more restrictive applies, but I guess we need to make sure that that is clearly stated or understood in that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think you can put that in the discussion even. I think you could leave the same first sentence of the current Alternative 4. That's what you want, and I think it can be in the discussion. If you want to keep it in the actual action or alternative, that's fine, but I agree that it should be understood that the more restrictive applies. We are just making sure, when we ask those kinds of questions on the record, that everybody understands that's what that means.

MR. O'REILLY: Certainly we understand, but I definitely, in a regulation, would probably include the strictness factor, because we have enforcement that just needs to see that.

DR. DUVAL: I would say that in proclamations that we issue that that's exactly the verbiage we include, is "whichever is more restrictive". I just want to make it abundantly clear to everybody that that is exactly the point, that we don't want to encourage targeting of cobia, and I am concerned about exceeding the ACL again.

MR. HARTIG: How much is this different from the other Alternative 4? Is it just more clarification?

DR. MACLAUCHLIN: Just from how this is going to change the document and what we're going to have to update, I would prefer to just have to add an Alternative 5. That way, all we have to do

is add the description and analysis of Alternative 5. We don't have to take anything out or change Alternative 4's analysis. The language is fine. It's clear that it's two per person or six per vessel, whichever is more restrictive, which is what your regulation writers will need to make that codified.

MR. GRINER: The idea here, with the cobia, is to try to extend the seasons. Commercially, we're bumping up against it. Everybody is bumping up against it, and so why not just leave it back at Alternative 4? Leave the step-down in there and go to the two per person per day or six fish per vessel limit and step it down when you get to 75 percent? This is great, but it doesn't do anything to help extend the season when you're bumping up against the ACL.

MR. PHILLIPS: It depends on when you hit the 75 percent. If you hit the 75 percent in late November, then you're not going to catch your quota, and that's the problem, when do you hit the 75 percent? Then if we go back to try to figure out is there a date trip for 75 percent, with all the uncertainties, it just makes it too convoluted to put the 75 percent in, which is why I like Anna's new one better.

MR. GRINER: I am not sure that even stepping it down that you're not going to meet the quota. If you're meeting it in early November or late October, I don't think you will get there, and I think you will always meet it. I just don't see that that would leave fish in the water at all.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I kind of like the step-down approach. Also, when you're looking at the for-hire industry, it is a directed fishery on cobia. It's not incidental, because you've got to cast a rod to that fish, so you know you're catching it. You have a directed fishery that has a chance to sell fish, and we're trying to extend the season for the commercial for something that's incidental. To me, I would be in favor of the step-down approach, which I would think would help it, if that's what you're trying to do, is extend the season.

I worry about, with the cobia, more the charter for-hire fish getting into the system with this right here, and I just think it extends the season. You do have a directed fishery for the for-hire that has a chance to sell their fish if they have the necessary permits, and this is one way to extend the season, and this is what this about, is looking at the language here to extend the season out. That way, you have a chance, if you incidentally catch a fish while you're gillnet fishing in November or some other type of thing, bandit boats or bottom fishing, you can sell that fish.

MR. BOWEN: Until today, I was not really aware of that. I don't want to jump ship too quick or move around, but maybe we should take a look at this. From what I've heard just in the last little bit, as a for-hire operator, I can take that family trip that I talked to Roy this morning about from Timbuktu, Tennessee and catch six cobia, even though I know they don't, quote, unquote, need those fish, and now I can go sell them. This is something I feel like we probably should take a look at, as long as I have state commercial permits, which I do. I can sell them now, from what I understand, and so I think we probably might want to take a look at this, if we're trying to reduce harvest.

MR. HARTIG: Doug, did you have something?

MR. HAYMANS: I did, about the state permits, but then Zack answered it. Then I think about the fact that the kids from Timbuktu, Tennessee, the kids can't buy commercial permits, and so

there is a technicality there, but he answered the question, because he would have that state license, although I don't agree with that, and I think at some point we need to go back and address it, because we need to do away with all for-hire sales.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, and I don't agree with it either. That's the reason I want to bring it up. I think maybe we should really take a hard look at this and do something about it, because May 1 will be here soon, and those people from Timbuktu, Tennessee will be back on my vessel.

MR. O'REILLY: Just the for-hire in Virginia is just like any other recreational situation. You can't sell. You have to come it at some point, even if you go to federal waters, which there aren't that many that do, but you can't sell it, but I wanted to comment on the step-down. Yesterday, I don't know how many or how much of the 21,000 pounds that came in late or was discovered late was Virginia, but quite a bit of it apparently was from sales to state dealers.

Again, I want to know what can be done and if anything needs to be done by Virginia to make sure that those data are available, because, if you have to do projections for the 75 percent and there is already trouble getting the year-end data, it's going to be trouble to get the data that you need for projections, and, in other words, to forecast when that 75 percent is reached. It's just a thought, and maybe someone will get in touch and let me know what role we can play in that process, and I will just leave it at that.

MR. HARTIG: I think, basically, once those dealers were identified, they are going to be targeted in the future for cobia landings, as far as -- That just seems like a logical progression. It's the way we've done it before when we've had problems with dealers that didn't have a site. When we found those that had enough sales to actually impact the quota, then we made sure that we contacted them. Once they're identified, and we have gone through and identified those numbers and where those dealers are, I would think they would become part of the -- Of course, Bonnie is not here, and so I can't guarantee you that that's going to happen.

MR. O'REILLY: We have mandatory harvester reporting. We don't have dealer reporting for all our species. We have dealer reporting for some of our species. We do require dealers to report certain species, like American eel, channeled whelk, and a few others as well. We require striped bass. We have a harvester-based reporting system, and if there is need of help with the buyers or the dealers, we certainly can furnish that information.

It almost seems that it might be a call for us to implement a buyer reporting system like we do for other species, so that, at the least, there would be monthly reports. I leave that, again, for maybe someone to follow up with me and let me know what's desired.

MR. HARTIG: All right. We have gone around in a complete circle. We are going to vote on the substitute motion first, vote that up or down, and then we will go from there. The substitute motion is to add Alternative 5, establish a commercial trip limit for Atlantic cobia of two fish per person per day or six fish per vessel per day, whichever is more restrictive. **All those in favor of that motion, raise your hand. All right. Now that becomes the main motion, since it passed.**

That motion is to establish a commercial trip limit for Atlantic cobia of two fish per person per day or six fish per vessel per day, whichever is more restrictive. **All those in favor of the main motion, raise your hand, eleven in favor; opposed; abstentions. I didn't see any opposed, but**

there were three abstentions that I saw. That motion passes. That brings us to the end of this amendment.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move we select Alternative 5 as our preferred.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Anna and second by Charlie. Is there discussion? Is there objection? We've got one objection. **All those in favor, raise your hand, ten in favor; opposed, one opposed; abstentions, four abstentions. That motion passes.** That will be our preferred alternative.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This is a good point at which you could take any public comment on that alternative, because it wasn't brought out to the public before.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to make comment on the commercial trip limit Alternative 5 that we just approved as a committee of the whole?

MR. COX: Good morning. I have always wanted to sit over here. With the cobia, any time we talk about commercial -- I wish we could get away from per person, because I think, when we think of per person, it's like a bag limit for recreational. It should really be vessel, and it's easier for enforcement to pull up to a commercial vessel and look and see how many cobia are on the boat. I think it gets complicated when you try to do per person and then the vessel maximum limit.

Anyway, it's hard to say, because I think this alternative may work, but it's just going to be hard to say, because I know we're going to see an increase in the fishery. I mean the fish are worth about \$3.50 a pound. They're expensive. It's a high-value fish now. That's ex-vessel price, and so, to me, it seems a little high. I like the step-downs, but I think time will tell, because we just don't -- There are a lot of variables here. We just don't know how many participants are going to be in the fishery. I would support it and just kind of see how it goes, but I think step-downs are good. It gives you an indication of where you are, and it allows you -- Commercial fishing, if we're going grouper fishing, like we were last week, and we have a couple of fish that swim up to the boat, our fishing is still -- We're still interacting with the fish, and so it's nice to have those fish late in the season. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: Thanks, Jack. Louis.

DR. DANIEL: I have always wanted to sit over here, too. Hi, Roy. Louis Daniel. I don't even know who I'm representing here, but I just want to make sure -- I want to try to put together a briefing for the commission on actions of the council, and so I just wanted to make sure that I understood a couple of things here.

Two fish per person per day, is that per -- Do you have to have a commercial license for each individual to fish, or does that mean that I can just bring two extra people with me and now I get six fish? That raises some questions, I guess, about changes in how the for-hire sector may operate. It probably might raise some concerns if that is an increase in the actual allowable harvest, but I just wanted to make sure, for my report back to the commission, what you mean by that, because I know, under certain circumstances, and I am trying to think of the fishery, but if you're under a for-hire, you're limited to a certain level. I think it's in mackerel. If you've got more than three

people on the boat, you can adhere to the commercial limits, whereas, if you're under charter, you have to abide by the recreational limits.

I don't know if you've had any of that discussion. I don't recall having seen any of that in the documents, but I just raise it as a point that we might want to deal with later, and it might be an issue that comes up during the commission's deliberations on this issue, too. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that, Louis.

MR. GORHAM: Ben, as I was listening to the discussion, that same thought came to my head, and I didn't know, and I didn't want to appear stupid by asking.

MR. HARTIG: There aren't any commercial permit requirements, but state licenses to sell -- If you have a state license to sell, one person on the boat has one, does it cover the rest of the people? It does? Okay.

MR. HAYMANS: In the State of Georgia, it does not. If it's a commercial venture, if the product is going to be sold, everybody on the boat has to have a commercial license. It's twelve-bucks if they're a resident, but that's where that technicality of the Tennessee people -- We can't sell a commercial license to a kid, and they can't be on the boat, but everybody participating in the commercial trip has to have a license.

MR. O'REILLY: I think it's a good idea to compare notes and then, at some point, to take Louis up on his suggestion to look at this a little more closely. That's a good idea. We have commercial fishermen registration licensees. They are licensed for commercial fishing, or we have seafood landing licensees. Those are the only two ways that you can bring in cobia. In the latter case, it usually means it's from outside our jurisdiction, but, when they come in, each one will have to have that seafood landing license.

MR. BOWEN: If I'm out of line or this is not the time, then I'm sure that my fellow council members will make me aware of it, but is this proper for me to make a motion to ban the for-hire sales of cobia at this time? Can I make a motion or is that something we want to get into? Is it the wrong timing? Anna, please don't slap me. I think that would end the confusion that's going around the table.

MR. HARTIG: I don't think we can stretch that into the realm of what we've considered that has gone out to the public, and so that would have to be at a later date.

MR. BOWEN: Can we add it to the new plan amendment that I made a motion for to change the start date?

MR. HARTIG: Then you complicate that whole amendment, and we're trying to get that in a time-certain fashion to go to the Gulf, so we can actually have it implemented for the next fishing year. That would be very problematic, because that's going to be very controversial, and it's going to take a lot of discussion. I would ask you to wait, and, the next time we have a mackerel amendment, to bring that up.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir. Thank you very much for taking my questions.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you.

MR. CONKLIN: I won't take too long, but just one of the public comments is -- Right now, our preliminary landings, as of September 2, in the commercial fishery are 51.72 percent of the commercial ACL, and we're in September. I don't know if a step-down would do us a whole lot of good, or at least this year it wouldn't.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that update. Thank you. Okay. Where in the world are we? We have a motion that was approved, and we are now back to approving the amendment to go forward, and so I need to go to Michelle at this time.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Ben. That was a difficult and protracted discussion, but I think it was very productive.

(Whereupon, the meeting went into session in Full Council on September 15, 2016.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
September 23, 2016

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COMMITTEES (continued)

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Mark Brown, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chester Brewer
Michelle Duval
LT Tara Pray
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Ben Hartig
LT Tara Pray
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

MACKEREL COBIA

- ✓ Ben Hartig, Chair
- ✓ Michelle Duval, Vice-Chair
- ✓ Anna Beckwith
- ✓ Mel Bell
- ✓ Zack Bowen
- ✓ Chris Conklin
- ✓ Roy Crabtree
- ✓ Doug Haymans
- ✓ Jessica McCawley
- ✓ Charlie Phillips
- ✓ Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
- ✓ Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Rob O'Reilly ✓
- Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Dewey Hemilright/
- Tony DeLernia ✓
- Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

PERSONNEL

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

PROTECTED RESOURCES

Wilson Laney, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice-Chair
Mark Brown
Zack Bowen
Michelle Duval
LT Tara Pray
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Chip Collier

SSC SELECTION

Charlie Phillips, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Chester Brewer
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR

Michelle Duval, Chair
Chris Conklin, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP

Charlie Phillips, Chair
Mel Bell, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Chip Collier

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

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

VICE-CHAIR

Charlie Phillips
Phillips Seafood/Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

Robert E. Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
703/842-0740 (ph); 703/842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

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

Mel Bell
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Zack Bowen
P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

W. Chester Brewer
250 Australian Ave. South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
561/655-4777 (ph)
WCBLAW@aol.com

Mark Brown
3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)
capt.markbrown@comcast.net

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

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

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

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

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

Doug Haymans
Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
doughaymans@gmail.com

✓ Dr. Wilson Laney
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617
(110 Brooks Ave
237 David Clark Laboratories,
NCSU Campus
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617)
919/515-5019 (ph)
919/515-4415 (f)
Wilson_Laney@fws.gov

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

~~LT Tara Pray~~ LTJG Amy HOCKENBERRY
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
305/415-6765 (ph)
tara.c.pray@uscg.mil

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

DR. JACK MCGOVERN
DR. MARCEL REICHERT
DR. LOUIS DANIEL
ROBERT BOYLES
LEANN BOSARGE
ERIKA BURGESS
RICK DEVICTOR
NIK MEHTA
DR. DAVE GLOECKNER
JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO
ASAC JEFF RADONSKI
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
DR. MIKE DENSON
BILL GORHAM
JACK COX

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

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

Deputy Director – Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

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

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
Julie.Odell@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

Timestamp	Full Name	Email	Mailing Address (If your address is already on file, just type "on file")	How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply)
9/14/2016 8:08:05	Walter Bublely	bublelyw@dnr.sc.gov	217 Fort Johnson Rd, Charleston, SC	Government
9/14/2016 8:08:49	Joey Ballenger	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov	on file	SCDNR
9/14/2016 8:10:24	Gary Jennings	gjennings@asafishing.org	514 Sawyer Shores Lane, Windermere, FL 34786	Private Recreational Angler, Non-Governmental Organization
9/14/2016 8:13:02	Leda Dunnmire	ldunnmire@pewtrusts.org	205 Taylor Lane, Morehead City, NC 28557	Non-Governmental Organization
9/14/2016 8:14:49	dean foster	dfoster@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/14/2016 8:20:49	Robert Lorenz	rlorenz@ec.rr.com	On file	Private Recreational Angler
9/14/2016 8:23:13	Lora Clarke	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/14/2016 8:30:52	jim freeman	cfreeman23@bellsouth.net	122 springwood dr daytona beach fl 32119	Commercial Fisherman
9/14/2016 8:39:52	Gary Zurn	gzurn@bigrocksports.com	on file	Seafood Dealer/Wholesaler/Retailer
9/14/2016 8:42:11	Russell Dunn	Russell.Dunn@noaa.gov	on file	NOAA Fisheries
9/14/2016 8:42:55	David Bush	davidbush@ncfish.org	on file	NCFA
9/14/2016 9:20:19	Rusty Hudson	DSF2009@aol.com	On file	Fisheries Consultant
9/14/2016 9:30:22	Celeste Leroux	celeste.leroux@noaa.gov	on file	NOAA Fisheries employee
9/14/2016 10:22:35	Mary Conley	mconley@tnc.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/14/2016 10:26:23	rick hawkins	rick.haawkins@uscg.mil	file	uscg
9/14/2016 10:27:47	david la	david.la@uscg.mil	721 medical center drive wilmington, nc 28401	Private Recreational Angler, Charter/Headboat/For-hire, Commercial Fisherman
9/14/2016 10:38:56	trip aukeman	taukeman@ccafflorida.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization

Timestamp	Full Name	Email	Mailing Address (If your address is already on file, just type "on file")	How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply)
9/14/2016 11:53:56	wayne mershon	kenyonseafood@sc.rr.com	on file	Commercial Fisherman, Seafood Dealer/Wholesaler/Retailer
9/14/2016 13:09:20	William Gorham	getbowedup40@gmail.com	ON FILE	Private Recreational Angler, Charter/Headboat/For-hire, LURE MANU
9/14/2016 13:29:03	John O'Hern	johncohern1@gmail.com	2731 Euston Road Winter Park FL 32789	Fishery Observer
9/14/2016 14:00:00	Steve Shelley	ssmsmollied54@gmail.com	on file	Commercial Fisherman
9/14/2016 14:28:21	Tony Constant	awconstant@gmail.com	on file	Private Recreational Angler
9/14/2016 15:04:33	Robert Boyles	boylesr@dnr.sc.gov	on file	Government
9/14/2016 15:47:18	davis turner	tideridefishin@hotmail.com	1231 ladys island dr. port royal sc	Charter/Headboat/For-hire
9/14/2016 15:58:15	Captain Eric Heiden	e.heiden@aol.com	1041 Blue Stem Drive, 37A, Pawleys Island, SC 29585	Charter/Headboat/For-hire

Timestamp	Full Name	Email	Mailing Address (If your address is already on file, just type "on file")	How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply)
9/15/2016 8:02:02	Dean Foster	dfoster@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 8:03:19	Rusty Hudson	DSF2009@aol.com	on file	Fisheries Consultant
9/15/2016 8:03:57	Lora Clarke	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 8:13:22	Bill Kelly	fkcfat1@hotmail.com	On file	Commercial fishing representative
9/15/2016 8:35:44	david bush	davidbush@ncfish.org	on file	NCFA
9/15/2016 9:19:18	jack cox	dayboat1965@gmail.com	file	Seafood Dealer/Wholesaler/Retailer
9/15/2016 9:54:14	Robert Boyles	boylesr@dnr.sc.gov	on file	Government
9/15/2016 10:02:32	Russell Dunn	Russell.Dunn@noaa.gov	on file	NOAA Fisheries
9/15/2016 10:29:07	david westfall		3904 A Flagg St Murrells Inlet SC 29576	Commercial Fisherman
9/15/2016 17:05:42	Leda Dummire		on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 17:05:59	Dick Brame		on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 17:06:13	Allison Johnson		on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 17:06:33	Rusty Hudson		on file	Commercial Fisherman, DSF
9/15/2016 17:06:53	Bill Gorham		on file	Charter/Headboat/For-hire
9/15/2016 17:08:09	Trip		on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 17:08:27	Dean Foster		on file	Non-Governmental Organization

WEDNESDAY

9/14/16

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Ashton	Brandon	bcashton@gmail.com
Aspinwall	Alex	alex.aspinwall@mrc.virginia.gov
Aukeman	Trip	taukeman@ccaflorida.org
Austin	Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu
Ballenger	Joey	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
D'Ambrosio	Jocelyn	jocelyn.dambrosio@noaa.gov
Daniel	Jessica	jessidaniel44@gmail.com
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
DuBeck	Guy	guy.dubeck@noaa.gov
Dunmire	Leda	ldunmire@pewtrusts.org
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Firkel	Austin	austinfirkel@yahoo.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov
Freeman	Mike	mike@twojerks.com
GORHAM	WILLAM	billsreoservice@gmail.com
Game	Aaron	aarongame7@gmail.com
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Gloeckner	David	david.gloeckner@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Guyas	Martha	martha.guyas@myfwc.com
Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net
Helies	Frank	fchelies@verizon.net
Hemilright	Dewey	fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Henninger	Heidi	heidi@offshorelobster.org
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Hull	James	hullsseafood@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Jeffcoat	Deidra	dcjeffcoat@comcast.net
Jiorle	Ryan	ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov
Johnson	Denise	denise.johnson@noaa.gov
Kemp	Brian	kempbrian6971@gmail.com

Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
Laks	Ira	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net
Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net
Larkin	Michael	michael.larkin@noaa.gov
Levy	Mara	mara.levy@noaa.gov
Lindh	Ryan	nativetrade@bellsouth.net
Link	Patrick	Patricklink11@gmail.com
MacLauchlin	Kari	kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net
Mahood	Bob	rmahood@mindspring.com
Markwith	Anne	anne.markwith@ncdenr.gov
McCoy	Sherri	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Overall	Brandon	bmooverall@yahoo.com
Park	Paul	paulpark1988@yahoo.com
Park	Paul	pwall1988@yahoo.com
Perkinson	Matt	perkinsonm@dnr.sc.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Revuelta	Julian	iulianrevuelta51@hotmail.com
Shipman	Susan	susanshipman@att.net
Spanik	Kevin	spanikk@dnr.sc.gov
Swatzel	Tom	tom@swatzel.com
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov
Turner	Steve	steve.turner@noaa.gov
Walia	Matthew	matthew.walia@noaa.gov
Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov
cimino	joe	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
colby	barrett	bcolby3@cfl.rr.com
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
malinowski	rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov
von harten	bo	capt_bo@hotmail.com
wicker	edward	wickedinduck@yahoo.com