

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COMMITTEE

**Savannah Hilton DeSoto
Savannah, Georgia**

March 6, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mackerel Committee:

Ben Hartig, Chairman
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley
Doug Haymans
Anna Beckwith

David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Jack Cox
Dr. Michelle Duval
Pres Pate
Zack Bowen
Charlie Phillips

Council Members:

Lt. Morgan Fowler
John Jolley

Dr. Wilson Laney
Chris Conklin

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Anna Martin
Roger Pugliese

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Amber Von Harten
Dr. Mike Errigo
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Brian Chevront

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Phil Steele

Dr. Jack McGovern
Doug Boyd
Tracy Dunn

Additional Observers Attached

The Mackerel Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Madison Ballroom of the Savannah Hilton DeSoto, March 6, 2014, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: We'll bring the Mackerel Committee to order. The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? I have something under other business, but that is not a real change. Is there any objection to approving the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved.

The next item of business is approval of the December 2013 Mackerel Committee Minutes. Are there any changes, corrections, deletions to the minutes? Is there any objection to approving the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. That brings us to Mr. McGovern who is here to give a status of commercial and recreational catches.

DR. McGOVERN: We have updated commercial landings. They were updated yesterday by Sue Gerhart in our region and also Heather Balchowsky from the science center. We have king mackerel commercial landings that are through March 3rd. This table presents the landings cumulative for the fishing years 2008 and 2009 to 2011 and 2012; and then both monthly and cumulative for the last two fishing years.

If you look down, we have landings through the beginning of March; and for king mackerel about 30 percent of the commercial quota has been met. That compares to about 45 percent last year. The landings for this past fishing year are less than in previous years. Moving down to Spanish mackerel, the landings are presented in the same way.

Landings were about 93 percent of the quota through the end of February as opposed to slightly over the quota at the end of the last fishing year, the 2012/2013 fishing year. Then cobia; these are landing again through March 3rd. We're at about 9 percent of the quota cumulative thus far through really the end of February. It is about 10,000 pounds; a little bit less than it was in 2013. Then in 2013 about 84 percent of the quota was met.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions of Jack about the commercial landings information? Seeing none; recreational.

DR. McGOVERN: These again are updated information from what is on the website; and it includes data through Wave 6, so through the end of 2013. This is a presentation that was put together by the data branch in our region and also by the science center. The 2013 data don't include headboat landings, but we are expecting headboat landings this week. We might already have them, I don't know. The headboat landings will be on our website for the recreational probably very soon, maybe next week.

This shows 2013 landings through the end of December without headboat; and it is compared to landings through December of 2012 and also the final landings for the 2012/2013 fishing year. Again, the fishing year for king mackerel and for Spanish mackerel goes through the end of February.

For cobia, in 2012 73 percent of the recreational ACL was met and for cobia in 2013 about 85 percent of the recreational ACL is met, but that is without headboat data. For king mackerel,

about 26 percent of the recreational ACL was met during the 2012/2013 fishing year and through the end of December of 2013 – we don't have the 2014 data yet – about 16 percent.

For king mackerel, 54 percent for the 2012/2013 fishing year, and about 59 percent through the end of December; and you see that through the end of December it is similar to what it was through the end of December in 2012. This shows the breakdown of the landings by sector. For king mackerel most of the landings were from the private sector.

The headboat sector landings make up a smaller component. This shows the same information presented graphically related to the ACLs for recreational king mackerel; and we're well below that. For Spanish, again private makes up a large component of the landings; headboat a smaller amount. Landings look like they are higher for the past fishing year than the previous. We're still pretty well below the recreational ACLs.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions for Jack about the recreational information?

MR. BOWEN: Not that I have a problem with it at all, but why the lag in the headboat data not being incorporated in this; is it just not in?

DR. PONWITH: The headboat originally was collected – the data were collected on paper logbooks. Those paper logbooks needed to be keypunched QA/QC'ed; and then the estimates were made from those. This year we're happy to report that we set a new record for completing the preparation of those estimates; but we're still doing annual estimates.

Our first step in changing that was to obtain the data electronically. That has created a whole new way of being able to generate these estimates. We have the data electronically. We're rebuilding the databases that house those data into an Oracle data base. Once that is done, it will enable us to generate estimates with a greater frequency than annually.

The thing that will limit what that frequency is will be the availability of kind of the groundtruthed sampled data from the port samplers who intercept those vessels. Number one, they have an opportunity then to look at the catch and groundtruth the self-reported landings data from the electronic reporting. The second thing they do is they get biological samples.

Those biological samples; the lengths and the weights of those fishes help us convert numbers of fish into pounds of fish so that the recreational estimates are on the same units as the commercials are from the standpoint of being able to manage those ACLs. Getting enough samples of the weights of those fish are really important to be able to do a good job of making that conversion. We think that generating estimates at the same periodicity as the MRIP is going to be possible. Basically, we'll accumulate two months worth of data and then at that point we'll be able to generate those estimates. We're in the process of doing that conversion right now. As soon as the data bases are converted into Oracle, we'll be able to change our system for making those estimates, and you will have estimates on a two-month basis.

MR. BOWEN: The gist – am I understanding this correctly – 2013 was the year that we made the electronic reporting changes' and then after I guess these protocols get put in place, we will get the information in a more timely manner? Is that what I understand?

DR. PONWITH: That is correct; we're in the process of setting our systems up to enable us to generate estimates on two-month waves as opposed to the annual. We're in that process right now.

MR. HARTIG: Any other questions of Jack for the recreational information? Jack, I appreciate the timeliness of your update. I appreciate you being able to get us the most up-to-date information that you can; and thank you for that. The next agenda item is status of amendments for formal review.

DR. McGOVERN: Okay, I want to talk about two amendments. Amendment 20A addresses the prohibition on sales of bag limit caught fish as well as elimination of income requirements for permits. The amendment was submitted for secretarial review on November 26 of last year. The proposed rule package is under review in headquarters. It should publish soon. The Notice of Availability for the amendment published on March 3rd; and the comment period will end on May 2nd.

The second amendment is the Mackerel Framework that considers modifications to the restrictions on transfer at sea for Atlantic group Spanish mackerel, restrictions on the number of gill nets allowed for each Spanish mackerel vessel, and changes in the commercial trip limit for king mackerel in the Florida East Coast Subzone. This amendment was submitted for secretarial review on December 18 of last year; and the proposed rule package is under review in headquarters. We expect that to publish pretty soon.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions for Jack on the status of the amendments? Seeing none; thank you, Jack; we appreciate that as always. The next agenda item is Joint Amendment 20B; Gulf king mackerel trip limits, seasons, transit provisions, regional quotas, framework, cobia ACL.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: You have a decision document in your briefing book that I'm going to use to walk you through this amendment. This one has six actions; modify the commercial hook-and-line trip limits for Gulf king mackerel, fishing seasons for Gulf king mackerel, the transit provision for king mackerel, the regional commercial ACLs for Atlantic king and Spanish mackerel; modifying the framework procedure and modifying Gulf and Atlantic cobia ACLs and ACTs. The expected schedule has changed a few times, but we're hoping that you will take final action at this meeting and then it will go back to the Gulf and they will take final action.

When we get to the specific actions that we have to discuss, we can talk about that a little more. For the actions that you have and the Gulf and the South Atlantic are in agreement for the preferred alternatives; we'll just go by them; and if there is any discussion, Ben will lead that. The first one, Action 1 modifies the commercial hook-and-line trip limits for Gulf group king mackerel.

The councils have a couple preferred alternatives and options. Preferred Option A under Alternative 3 sets the hook-and-line trip limit at 3,000 pounds with no reduction for the western zone; and then Preferred Option B and C under Alternative 4, which sets the hook-and-line trip limit at 1,250 pounds with no reduction for the eastern zone, northern subzone and southern subzone.

MR. HARTIG: Just one thing on the commercial hook-and-line trip limits. Bill Kelly did send a letter – I'm sure you all received it – with a number of attachments, again reiterating his position on those trip limits. I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Action 2 is the one that is a little more complicated for a couple of reasons. The Gulf has a preferred Option A for the western zone to change that fishing year to September 1st through August; and then there is agreement on Preferred Option B under Alternative 3 except that there was an error in the decision documents that you guys were using in September and December that had different options under those alternatives.

What I would like to do with this, before we get into the Gulf decisions and your decisions and how you want to move forward, is fix what options were actually supposed to be in here. You have in your decision document this highlighted part that talks about what you saw at your December meeting was under Alternative 2; that there were just two options, Option A for western zone and Option B for eastern zone.

Well, in the amendment actually the eastern zone had been split, so there is supposed to be three options; A, B, and C, western zone, eastern northern subzone, and eastern zone southern subzone. First I would like to have the committee approve Options A through C under Alternatives 2 and 3, and then we will go to the next preferred.

MR. HARTIG: We need a motion to add Options A through C under Alternatives 2 and 3 for Action 2. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I move that we add Options A through C under Alternative 2 and 3.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle; second by Jessica. Is there any discussion on that motion? Housekeeping, there shouldn't be too much. Any objection to that motion? Seeing none; **that motion is approved**. Then we need to clarify that the South Atlantic preferred is Option B in Alternative 3. Is that the next thing we need to do, or are you going to take us there now?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Yes; what I would like, before we talk about the western zone, is under Alternative 3, the Gulf Preferred Option B would change the eastern zone, northern subzone seasons to start on October 1st; and currently it starts on July 1st. The South Atlantic preferred was that the whole eastern zone would change the season to October 1st; but the Gulf preferred, when they split those into the subzone options, actually the Gulf only wanted to change the northern subzone and to keep the southern subzones start date on July 1st. We would need a South Atlantic preferred if you want for the eastern zone, northern subzone.

MR. HARTIG: That would be under Alternative 3, Option B, the Gulf's preferred. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I would like to make a motion to choose under Alternative 3, Option B as the South Atlantic preferred, which would be for the eastern zone, northern subzone.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Jessica, seconded by David. Is there any discussion on this motion?

DR. DUVAL: It's not really discussion; more just clarification from Kari. Because we've modified the wording under these alternatives as requested to reflect what should have been in

the decision documents originally, there is not any other kind of little housekeeping that we need to do in terms of deselecting anything that we had previously for this just because of the way the options were structured previously? I just want to make sure we're not leaving anything in there that doesn't need to be in there; that is all.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Gregg or Monica; the South Atlantic had Preferred Option B under Alternative 3 under the assumption that was all of the eastern zone. Now that we have the correct options under there, would we need to deselect the old Preferred Option B; or is it okay that Jessica specified that this was for a Preferred Option B for the eastern zone, northern subzone?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This is kind of confusing, I agree. Right now let's just talk about the elephant sort of in the room, because I think it has an effect. Under Action 2 your preferred alternative has been Alternative 1, no action; correct?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: No, the South Atlantic had one preferred and that was 3B. However, the South Atlantic understood that was for the whole eastern zone, because of what I presented in the decision document. By not selecting anything else, then they also have a preferred no action for the other zones and subzone; but the only actual preferred the South Atlantic had was 3B, but not the same 3B as the Gulf had.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just so the record is clear, under Alternative 3, Kari, it says change the fishing year for Gulf group king mackerel season to October 1 through September 30th for the eastern zone, northern subzone. That is this council's preferred alternative and the Gulf Council's preferred alternative. No? You are nodding your head that, yes, it is this council's preferred alternative.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Not yet; this is the motion now. We had a South Atlantic preferred 3B, but it was just for the eastern zone. Now that we have the three options, we are basically selecting a new Option B.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right, I understand that. This only goes to Preferred Option B is to the eastern zone, northern subzone. What I'm asking for my clarification is, is the only preferred under Action 2 that the Gulf has chosen; is that Alternative 2A? Did the Gulf choose a preferred under Alternative 3?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Yes; the Gulf currently has two preferred, 2A for the western zone and 3B for the eastern zone, northern subzone.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, so I think Michelle's question then, as I understand it, if the South Atlantic chooses Alternative 3B, is there anything this council would need to deselect because the council just chose Alternative 3B. I think not necessarily, because what I see is that you have chosen – for the northern subzone of the eastern zone you have chosen to have the Gulf group king mackerel season begin October 1 and end on September 30th. For all the rest of the area, right now you have chosen for the fishing year to begin July 1 through June 30th. I think you are okay. You are okay if you want to stay with no action, Alternative 1. You don't need to deselect anything else if you choose Alternative 3, Preferred Option B.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, thanks, I just wanted to make sure that because we changed the language of the alternatives to reflect what should have been in there originally as they were structured; that we didn't need to deselect anything else as any kind of housekeeping, just to make sure we weren't leaving some floating thing out there that after we approve and send things on we have to come back around and correct later. That was the basis for my question.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right; and I just wanted to walk through it to make sure. I think we're okay.

MR. HARTIG: Anymore discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to this motion?
Seeing none; the motion is approved.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: The next thing that you have to discuss a bit is that the Gulf has a preferred 2A, which would change the western zone fishing season to start September; right?

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: The South Atlantic is not in agreement with that preferred Alternative 2, Option A. You have in the decision document you got in your briefing book this little thing that says what's next and the different ways that this could go; but then we received some guidance from Monica about the South Atlantic can't take final action at this meeting and then submit it.

They can't submit it without preferreds that both councils agree on. You can track the Gulf preferred under Alternative 2, Option A so that you're in agreement with all your preferred alternatives and options. Then it would be finalized and submitted to the Secretary of Commerce after this meeting because the Gulf already took final action; or you could continue with no preferred alternative for the western zone.

Then what you can do is you can send this back to the Gulf Council – their meeting is in April – possibly with some kind of suggestion for a joint meeting to resolve this. That could be at one of the meetings in June and the Mackerel Committee could meet together; or you could remove the western zone from Action 2, like remove Option A.

That way if it goes back to the Gulf and the Gulf agrees, and they take final action also; then we can submit the amendment and the change for the northern subzone, which you just selected as a preferred, can move forward and you can address the western zone fishing year in a later season. Those are the options for how this will work; otherwise, it will just bounce back and forth.

MR. CUPKA: I would like to make a motion that we select Alternative 2A as Action 2 as our preferred alternative.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by David; second by Charlie. Discussion? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I'm not going to vote in favor of this motion. I think we had considerable discussion about this on the record last time and the economic ramifications in our region on the South Atlantic side of moving forward with a change like this and the cascading market impact. I am very sensitive to those concerns for North Carolina, so I am afraid I am going to have to vote against this motion.

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm also going to vote against this motion for the exact same reasons that Michelle has said. I would like to stick with the South Atlantic preferred that we've had this entire time, which is the no action alternative. I've heard the discussions that occurred at the Gulf Council, and I think that I would prefer to stay with the no action alternative. I'm going to vote against this.

MR. COX: After further review and looking at what Michelle has brought to my attention, I am also going to have to vote against this motion.

MR. HARTIG: It would solve the problem of moving the amendment forward; but it won't solve the problem for the fishermen; and that is my main concern is for the fishermen involved. This impacts our fishermen as well as the business plans of a number of fishermen – most of the fishermen in the western Gulf.

I went to the meeting. I made our plea to the Gulf Council. I brought the different reasons if you remember in that letter; long-winded letter as usual, that I wrote about why we shouldn't do this. There are a number of things, economics, and biological concerns of the later you get into the season in that western Gulf you have more, larger fish. You could possibly have some biological implications on that when you do that.

Right now in the season that they start in July, the trips usually last three days. These fish, as you move into fall, they get in known locations in larger, denser schools and can be much more easily prosecuted, which was why the Gulf at least was the reasoning that they chose to go ahead with that.

It would be easier to prosecute the fish, but there are other economic concerns with easier prosecution; glut markets, competition with other market shares. There are a number of things that fall into that. I would not be in favor of this motion as well. I think we have a way forward to send it back to the Gulf; and hopefully they will see some rationale in what we do. I think we should send – if this motion fails – a very detailed explanation of why we are choosing the options we are.

I think that is a pretty reasonable thing to expect to come out of this council. The other thing is we have an assessment on the horizon; it is being worked on now. The assessment workshop is at the end of this month. To me it would be prudent to wait until the end of this assessment before you start moving these zones around. Because you may have a number of more fish to deal with in the Gulf, you could deal with this issue in a number of ways, split seasons and things of that nature. That is it for me. All right any other discussion? All those in favor of the motion raise your hand, **one in favor; all those opposed. The motion fails.** Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I would like to make a motion to remove the change to the fishing season for the western zone; remove it from this amendment.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Jessica; second by Michelle. Is there any discussion?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I just wanted to clarify on the record that you are wanting to remove Option A under Alternative 2 and 3?

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes, that is correct. I'm making this motion in hopes that we can get this amendment moving forward. I still think ultimately that we might need to have a joint meeting of the Mackerel Committee in June or either wait until after the assessment is finalized and bring the Mackerel Committee together as a whole.

I literally think we're just going to keep ping-ponging back and forth if we try to pick another preferred and then just send it back over to them. I would rather just take this out, so this amendment that both councils have worked so hard on can move forward.

MR. HARTIG: Monica, Kari gave the explanation; does this fit on the legal ramifications of what we're doing here?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You mean pulling it out and putting it in a separate amendment?

MR. HARTIG: I can't hear as well today.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Are you asking whether it is legal for you to request that those actions be pulled out of this amendment and put in another amendment and then move forward with 20B?

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, I think that is an option that you have. Now, 20B will have to go back to the Gulf and they will have to agree with that approach.

DR. DUVAL: Just clarifying it is not removing – okay, I understand it is just removing Option A from both Alternatives 2 and 3.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Would it be better to remove the entire Action 2 into another amendment? Maybe you don't want to do that because you have decided. At least for the eastern zone, northern subzone you have the same preferred option that the Gulf does. I'm just asking you to think about whether it would be good to move the entire action into another amendment.

MR. HARTIG: Well, that is a good point, because functionally it would allow the change for the eastern zone, northern subzone. The only other alternative that we're dealing with or option in Alternative 2 is the western zone. Yes, you could remove Alternative 2, I think, and accomplish the same thing if that was a cleaner way to do it.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: No; I think she means the whole action, right?

MR. HARTIG: The whole action? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Before I amend my motion, my goal here is to get this amendment moving forward and finalized and so whatever makes that happen. The reason that I didn't just make the motion to remove all of Action 2 is because we had that agreement on that eastern zone, northern subzone. But if it is cleaner and we think that the Gulf will approve it and we want to pull out

this whole Action 2 and put it in another amendment; I'm fine with that, too, but I would like to hear more discussion from other folks around the table before I amend the motion.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think you could go either way. I wasn't trying to push you to go one way or the other. My question was just do you want to deal with all the fishing year actions together in one amendment? If you want to take all the fishing year actions out of this amendment and deal with them holistically in another amendment, that would be one way to do it. But it is just as legal, and you are allowed to go ahead with leaving Alternative 3B in here, since you both decided on it. I just think maybe you should think about it and discuss it and decide which way you are going to go.

DR. DUVAL: I am struggling with this, because like Jessica I would like to see this move forward. Both councils have spent a lot of time on it. I think where we have agreement it would be great to move forward on that. But by the same token, looking at the big picture of what starts when is also appealing. I'm showing my inner-Gemini this morning and just waffling back and forth.

MS. BECKWITH: I was going to suggest it makes more sense to me to remove Alternative 2 but leave Alternative 3 in there rather than taking out the western zone. I still think clearly the western zone is a reasonable option because they keep picking it. I'm not sure that we should be removing a reasonable option from the document. I guess if I had my druthers, I would probably just remove Alternative 2 and leave Alternative 3 and let that move forward.

DR. DUVAL: I guess, Anna, to that point; I guess I would disagree with that in a friendly fashion, of course, because the problem area is the western zone. I would have the same issue with an October 1 start date for the western zone as I would a September 1 start date for the western zone in terms of the cascading economic impacts to fishermen in this region. I think that is why Jessica originally moved to just simply remove that western zone option.

MS. McCAWLEY: I think I would like to amend my motion to instead of removing just the western zone, I would like to remove all of Action 2 from this document and take it up in another amendment.

MR. HARTIG: That is a new motion? How does that work, where are we?

DR. CRABTREE: We never voted on that motion.

MR. HARTIG: No, we didn't.

DR. DUVAL: We have not voted on the motion, and I guess I would like to hear from Chairman Boyd maybe before we talk about amending the motion, if that is okay.

MR. BOYD: Well, from the discussions at the council meeting, I think the council is pretty adamant about the September 1 date. I'm not sure how they are going to respond to this. I think it is appropriate. I think it works to have it in a separate amendment and then we can deal with it separately and move this along; but I'm still not sure what we're going to accomplish.

DR. CRABTREE: My impression is that – and I’m not sure what the Gulf will do, but I think they would be more likely to go along if we just removed the Option A, western zone, and left the shift in the eastern zone that they want to do; that we’re in agreement with in there; but it is hard to predict. It is one of those deals where they are kind of regionally divided in the Gulf.

MR. BOYD: Just as a followup to that; there is discussion between the different regions is what Roy is saying. The different states have a different opinion on it. It makes it more difficult, kind of an internal issue.

MS. McCAWLEY: I really think no matter what we do here, whether we remove Action 2 or just remove the western zone, I really think that we need to bring the two Mackerel Committees together in June. Otherwise, whichever one of these things we choose, I still think it is going to ping-pong around. I just don’t think we’re going to be able to accomplish anything without bringing the two councils’ mackerel committees together at the next council meetings.

MR. HARTIG: That is a rational point; that makes a lot of sense if we can accomplish it. We talked about it some, trying to do that. It is going to be tough to do in the short timeframe between the two meetings.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes; I agree with that, but I just don’t see any other way to ultimately move this amendment forward. Even though we’re trying and we’re trying to guesstimate about what the Gulf Council is going to agree to; I just think that they still might not agree to even pulling these things out or pulling partial items out of this amendment. I still think that we need to bring the committee back together to talk about this.

MR. BOYD: Just kind of a procedural question; would it be inappropriate for us to just call together the two committees rather than do it during a council meeting?

MR. HARTIG: To that point, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes; recall at the Gulf Council meeting, though, the committee voted to not change the western Gulf and agreed with the South Atlantic and then in Full Council it changed. I’m not sure; we might work it out as committees but that doesn’t mean the council will go along.

MR. BOYD: That is right.

MR. MAHOOD: Kind of to that point; we’re looking at scheduling a joint council meeting with the Gulf in June of 2015. If we pull that out and move the amendment ahead as we have it now, we would have an opportunity to work through this. We’ll have a number of issues and we hope we’ll have the South Florida issues developed by then for the two councils to look at. I think as Ben has seen and we’ve seen in the past, a lot of times getting the committees to agree on something doesn’t really mean a whole lot.

When we go through the process today in Executive Finance to talk about how we hope the South Florida Committee to work, it would not be going to any other committees. It would go from that South Atlantic Committee, which is joint with the Gulf and the South Atlantic in the state of Florida – it would go directly to our full councils. We’re hoping we’ll be able to work it

out in June of 2015. We will be together to deal with those issues, and this would certainly give us the opportunity to get that straightened out. It would be a little longer time period, but it is probably to our benefit.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, but there is some important actions in this amendment that we need to move forward; that is the problem.

MR. MAHOOD: I wasn't talking about the whole amendment; I was just talking about this one issue.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. I'll go to David because he is right to this point.

MR. CUPKA: I would think that what we would do would be instead of pulling the whole action, just pull that one alternative, because there has been a lot of work done on this by both councils. We did agree on the eastern northern subzone. I would hope that the Gulf Council would take into consideration the fact that we have worked on this for a number of years.

There are a lot of things in here that are of interest to both councils, and this would be a way to move it ahead and resolve that one issue perhaps at a joint meeting next year. I think if you start removing a whole action, they may look at it a little differently; but again as Roy says it is hard to predict sometimes what is going to happen. I think we ought to just remove that one alternative rather than the whole action and try to get them to move ahead on the thing, because it would benefit both councils considerably to do that rather than leave something in there where the whole amendment isn't going to move.

MR. BELL: To what David said, I think you need to capture what you've got now that you agree on, what has already been done, take that, bank it and then take the piece out that is problematic. I like Jessica's idea about sort of getting the principals together and hashing it out. I don't know how successful that might be; but take what you've done that we can agree on at this point and run with it and then pull the piece out that needs to be pulled out and then deal with that separately.

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm really open to either one of those ideas, whether we pull the whole action or we pull just the western zone out; but I'm wondering since we would just be changing the fishing year for one area and not changing for others; I just can't decide if it is better to just look at the fishing years after the assessment and thus pull the whole action out. I'm really open to either one.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I agree with David, I think we should just pull the western Gulf option, and that is the motion we have on the board. My suggestion is – and I call the question – let's vote on it.

MR. HARTIG: All right the question has been called. We are going to vote on this option. The motion is to remove the change in the fishing season for the western zone from the amendment. All those in favor raise your hand; all those opposed. **The motion passes without objection.**

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Moving on in 20B, like I said for the actions that the councils are in agreement for the preferred alternatives, I am just going to run through quickly unless someone

wants to bring up something. Action 3 establishes the transit provisions for travel through areas that are closed to king mackerel fishing.

The councils are agreed on Preferred Alternative 3, which allows transit through areas closed to king mackerel for vessels possessing king mackerel that were legally harvested in the EEZ and in an opened area. Moving on; for Action 4 we just have a quick language change in there. This is the one to establish regional commercial ACLs for Atlantic king mackerel and Spanish mackerel.

The IPT is recommending changing use of the word “ACL” to “quota” for Actions 4.1 and 4.2. The reason is that we are establishing a northern zone quota, a southern zone quota and it is all under the commercial ACL; and the ACL is attached to the accountability measures for these two stocks. It is just to make that language change.

DR. DUVAL: I move that we accept the IPT recommended language changing “ACL” to “quota” throughout Actions 4.1 and 4.2.

MR. BOWEN: Second.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Zack. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; **that motion is approved.**

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Action 5 modifies the framework procedure; and the councils are in agreement with Preferred Alternative 2, Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. Then Action 6 modifies the Gulf and Atlantic cobia ACLs and ACTs; and the councils are in agreement on Alternative 3, Option D. If that is all with 20B, there is a draft motion in the decision document to approve for review.

MR. HARTIG: The only question I had, Kari, on Page 18 in that small table at the bottom, you had current ACLs and ACTs highlighted; do we need to do anything with that?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: No, those are just reference FYI.

DR. DUVAL: I move that we approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 20B for secretarial review and deem the revised codified text as necessary and appropriate; give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text; and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and redeem the codified text.

MR. HARTIG: Is this a roll call vote? No, it is not; thank you. We have a motion by Michelle; second by Charlie. Is there any discussion about the motion?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to make the record clear, Amendment 20B is modified at this meeting.

MR. HARTIG: Keep us straight.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Ben is shaking his head, yes, correct?

MR. HARTIG: Can you say that one more time?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You are approving Amendment 20B as you have modified it at this meeting.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, as modified. Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; **that motion is approved without objection.** All right; thank you. That is 20B again hopefully for the last time. That takes us to Agenda Item 5, Coastal Migratory Pelagic Framework Amendment 1, Spanish Mackerel Annual Catch Limits.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, you have a decision document for this amendment, also. First I want to explain the title of this one. We decided that we've had framework adjustment, framework actions with a year attached and regulatory amendments. I think it is Attachment 4C. To have consistency between the two councils in what they call framework amendments, we decided we would start with the very first actual Framework Amendment 1.

From now on they are going to be numbered, and this will be for both while we have a joint management plan and both councils. This one just has two actions in it to modify the ACL for Atlantic Spanish mackerel and then modify the ACL for Gulf Spanish mackerel. We had our scoping meetings in January. The Gulf Council reviewed this in February.

You will select preferred alternatives and then consider final action. Then in April the Gulf will also consider final action. Then we will submit it and hopefully it will be implemented soon. Again, here is the purpose and need that you approved at the last council meeting, if everybody is still okay with that.

The purpose of this amendment is to revise the ACLs for Atlantic migratory group Spanish mackerel and Gulf migratory group Spanish mackerel based on the results of recently completed stock assessments. The need is to ensure the annual catch limits are based on the best available and most recent information and ensure overfishing does not occur in the coastal migratory pelagics fishery.

The first action would be to modify the ACL for Atlantic group Spanish mackerel. You have your no action alternative, which would keep the ACL at 5.69 million pounds; and then the councils are in agreement for Alternative 2, which revises the ACL and sets it at 6.063 million pounds.

We do have one action for the committee is that originally when we wrote the language for this alternative; we only had the numbers for 2014 and 2015; but you are actually setting the ACL for 2014 through 2016 when we got the projections from the science center. We just need to make a quick change to add 2016 in there.

In the February meeting, the Gulf Council selected Alternative 2 as a preferred, so you are in agreement for that preferred. Then at the public hearings we had just a few commenters, but everyone supported Preferred Alternative 2. The only thing really that I need you to do is just to revise the language in Alternative 2 to say "2014 through 2016".

MR. CUPKA: I would like to make a motion that we revise the first sentence in Alternative 2 of Action 1 to include 2016.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by David; second by Charlie. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; **that motion is approved.** Kari, I will ask you one thing. Have we approved in Action 2, Alternative 2, the Gulf's preferred alternative?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: No, not yet. You wanted to wait until the Gulf reviewed it and selected their preferred. That is what we're going to next is Action 2, modify the ACL for the Gulf Spanish mackerel; and at the Gulf meeting they selected Alternative 2 as a preferred.

MR. HARTIG: We would need a motion to choose Alternative 2 in Action 2 as the preferred alternative.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we make Alternative 2 in Action 2 as our preferred.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Charlie; second by David. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; **that motion is approved.** Now we would need a motion for secretarial approval. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Framework Amendment 1 for secretarial review and deem revised codified text as necessary and appropriate; give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the documents codified text; and give the council Chair authority to approve the revisions and redeem the codified text.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Michelle. Is there any discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; **that motion is approved.** Thank you all for being so efficient today. The update on SEDAR 38 data workshop; I'm going to wait a little bit to do that. We'll go right ahead with Joint Amendment 24 allocations. That is Attachment 6. We have scoped this. This went to scoping in January, very broadly.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: We took this out to scoping and you have Attachment 6; it is a PDF portfolio, and it has four different files in it. One is a comment summary, which I'm also projecting. Then you have the scoping document that we used during scoping. Then you have written comments and then the minutes from people who spoke on the record at the meetings.

I included from discussions for 24 and 26 in your comment summary, this document that I'm projecting, things that people spoke on the record, things that people wrote in, and then when we were just talking in the rooms with staff and council members, just things that people talked about with looking at the allocation for Atlantic Spanish mackerel. Basically I would show people this is what the council is thinking about.

Here are the landings and how much of commercial ACL has been met over the years and recreational ACL has been met so that the public understood why the council was considering moving some recreational ACL to the commercial ACL so that you can meet the total ACL; and then had some trigger questions about reallocating or other ways to reach the total ACL.

There was some support for reallocating and specifically moving some of the recreational ACL to commercial ACL. There was concern about the recreational data, the MRIP data so people would say are you sure that the recreational catch has been that low and that is why they haven't been meeting their ACL and maybe they've been meeting it.

We did talk about kind of the in-season mechanism that would move part of one sector's ACL to the other if a certain percentage hadn't been met at a certain time of year. That was an idea that came up at your last meeting. There were some people that thought that sounded like something to look into, because it would be flexible and it would give both sectors a chance to hit the ACL, but still be able to move some and let it be used.

Some people talked about the variation in the recreational and commercial landings in the different zones and subzones for Gulf and king mackerel. I did have all the information for the Gulf king mackerel commercial and recreational landings. Some people did talk about that, especially in Florida.

It did come up with the value of leaving fish in the water instead of reallocating some of that recreational ACL to the commercial ACL. Then I kind of broke it down by each place. There weren't a lot of commenters on this, but we did have some good discussion about it. Here is the scoping document that I used.

I wanted it to be really broad and just provide information and then let people talk about it. I specifically said the council would like your input on should these be changed, why or why not; and then how would we do that; using a long time period, a short time period or other ways to consider allocation; which we didn't get a whole lot of specific comments on how it should be done or what kind of method.

In the PDF portfolio in Attachment 6 you have the scoping document that has all the information about the percentage of the ACL that has been landed by each sector and then the total ACL landed for both of these and then a little bit of the history of allocations, at what point our Atlantic Spanish went to 55 percent commercial/45 percent recreational. That was set in a framework adjustment in August 1998.

Then for the Gulf king mackerel, the current allocation was set actually in Amendment 1; and then just some ways that we presented to folks that they could talk about if they wanted to, about how you could make a decision about allocations; landings, ratios, et cetera; then other ideas about what you could do with the rest of any excess quota for a sector.

Then I also presented in Table S-3 the actual landings in pounds and then the percent of the total landings. If there was a consideration of using landings' ratios, that is the information that you would look at for both Atlantic Spanish and Gulf king. Really, before I get more into this, because I have kind of a discussion guide to get information about how you guys want to proceed with this; the Gulf did pass a motion at their February meeting that they wanted to wait to move forward on this one until the king mackerel stock assessment results were finalized, because theirs is just considering Gulf king mackerel.

That is something to consider when we talk about timeline and everything, but we can go ahead and get started on a discussion. If you guys are ready to move forward with development of this,

then I'm just going to get direction from you for what actions and alternatives you want in there. The analysis for looking at allocations could take some time, so we can at least get started on kind of putting that together, but it is not going to be a quick analysis.

Even for Atlantic Spanish mackerel, this is still going to be something that takes some time to look into. Depending on how complex the actions and alternatives are that you want to consider, this will take some time. I don't think this one will necessarily be quite ready for June, not with like complete analysis, but we can go ahead and get started.

MR. HARTIG: Basically, the Gulf is going to wait until they get their catch level recommendations vetted from their SSC for king mackerel. We have our catch level recommendations for Spanish; so we have those. We can move forward with Atlantic Spanish independent of what the Gulf timeline is. Doug.

MR. BOYD: Yes; I just might also add that the council asked to get socio-economic information also in this allocation decision. It has kind of been referred for two reasons or deferred for two reasons; excuse me.

MR. HARTIG: What do you guys want to do? Do you want to separate Spanish out from this? Do you want to move forward with this? Do you want to wait for the Gulf? That is another ways away. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I have a couple questions for Kari. Ben, I'm sure you could elaborate on this as well. If one of you could sort of give me a cliff-notes version of the previous framework procedure that was in place to include a 10 percent shift in sector allocations and so that went away, I guess, and what was the – I'm just curious the process that was outlined in that framework amendment for allowing this, because it seems like it is exactly the same kind of thing that we may be considering here as some kind of adjustment that could be considered on an annual basis but would not permanently alter the sector ACL. I wanted a refresher on that.

Then I guess it is just a procedural question in terms of if we wanted to continue to move forward with addressing this issue for Spanish mackerel, I guess; how does that work? Do we sort of eventually meet back up with the Gulf and include this all in a framework amendment or do we do our own?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, as far as the refresher on how we had that framework action for Spanish; at one time we could shift it 10 percent in either direction. Unfortunately, we lost that ability in a – and I can't remember. Monica would probably remember maybe Roy. Kari knows; do you remember how that was eliminated from our framework procedures?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: It was in Amendment 18.

MR. HARTIG: It was in Amendment 18 when that was eliminated, and I don't remember quite the rationale why it was, but it was. That is a relatively easy way to do that. There are certainly other ways. I think we needed to have a discussion about how we want to proceed generally with an allocation change. I think the fluid part of it and addressing it in a much more timely fashion and maybe not making it forever; that makes is a lot more appealing to me than what we've done in the past.

Although I made the comment yesterday that we probably shouldn't use those specific years for long-term allocation decisions when the economy, the country was down, I think you could use those years in a short-term type analysis to try and get optimum yield more closely approximate optimum yield in the short term; but with the realization that if the recreational fishery or the commercial fishery gets back to those levels of harvest, that you could shift that back as well.

I think in this whole evolution of the allocation process, it makes a lot of sense to me to look at these more frequently, to keep them more fluid and not permanent. I think from the perspective from the fishing community; I think you might get more buy-in from those types of actions doing it that way other than the way we used to do it in stone. I think that is a much better way to approach it.

DR. DUVAL: I guess knowing that; I think it might be helpful for me and maybe some other committee members, because we have some newer council members around the table, to perhaps bring back up for the next committee meeting that procedure that we used to have for this more fluid and frequent kind of adjustment and take a second look at it.

Because, it would not be permanent and it would allow for more frequent examination of allocations to deal with issues that may be episodic; and see if we want to modify that. I think that would probably be less time consuming for staff at this point in terms of just refresh our memories on what we used to have. You know, history loves to repeat itself; so perhaps that is where we should start.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: When it was changed in the framework procedure so that the framework adjustment could do that 10 percent shift, it was only for Atlantic Spanish, but they only did it once. I think it was set up to be where you could do it, but that was when you were doing framework adjustments almost every year and you could kind of respond to things happening in there; but then they didn't really use it. Then framework adjustments became less and less frequent. We could talk about and include an action at least when we're putting this together to modify the framework procedure. We would have to put that back in, I think, the framework procedure.

DR. DUVAL: Right; and so that is why I'm saying a lot of us didn't know what that was and sort of how it operated in the first place. I think to see the actual language of that for me at least would be really helpful.

MR. BOWEN: I absolutely like that idea, love it to death, but my question that comes to mind is you brought up the idea, but in your mind do you have a specific timeframe before it would be up for reallocation again? Is there something that comes to mind, because you have a great idea to me?

MR. HARTIG: Well, to me I think you monitor landings; and if recreational landings start getting close to where you would close the fishery, you would jump right in and try and reallocate some of that back so you don't impact the recreational fishery adversely. I think you need to keep your historical allocations in mind when you do that.

But if you're taking from either group, I think you need to watch how the catches move over time. Then if you have taken from one sector, and then all of a sudden they are approaching

their allocation, you may want to give some fish back to make sure that doesn't happen. In Spanish I have looked at it a little bit differently, because I'm looking at what we have now, what our ACLs are now and what level of harvest.

I went back and looked at the level of harvest of Spanish based on what the recreational allocation is now. I looked at it historically. Instead of just trying to use a percentage of average landings or anything, I took the three highest landings, averaged them together and then just looked to see how that would work in the fishery.

Basically, there is one year where they have high landings; but if you take the third highest, you never get to the highest level they've ever had. You could shift X amount, it is about 500,000 pounds, to the commercial fishery without ever impacting the recreational in the last 12 seasons. That is a way to do it.

I think having some options to come before you at the next meeting on how you would like to look at that; and I think we can look at it a number of different ways without having these percentages. Like I say, the fluidity of it I think is pretty appealing to me. I think some in the fisheries will like it as well.

MR. BOWEN: If I'm not mistaken, I think the way this is set up – and I think we discussed it yesterday or touched on it yesterday a little bit – if the recreational sector gets close to or exceeds their ACL, I don't think that fishery closes. I think we pull some from the commercial sector. Isn't that correct?

MR. HARTIG: Yes; that is correct, you are absolutely right, on a fishery that is not in a rebuilding plan. You would have some time to be able to look at that and to adjust accordingly.

MR. BOWEN: I like the way this is going with the reallocation idea that you have; thanks.

MS. BECKWITH: Just to clarify; I find the idea of the flexibility of the framework being able to shift back and forth very attractive, but Zack just referred to it as a reallocation. This is a way of avoiding officially reallocating. This just offers flexibility. If we were going through allocations every five years and people got accustomed to that as the process, that is one thing.

But I think it is very attractive to be able to shift these back and forth as needed without the angst of the sectors feeling that level of ownership and stress that it is now something that they have to achieve or it will be taken away; and this is a nice way of avoiding that. I like this idea and I would be happy to see us move forward and just explore that rather than even really moving down the line of trying to figure out the reallocating. I would maybe concentrate on just this first and see how it goes.

DR. DUVAL: To that point; I totally agree with Anna that obviously based on our discussion yesterday, the topic of allocations is a very sensitive and contentious issue. Chairman Boyd has pointed out some of the conversations that they've had in the Gulf regarding this.

I think until we've had an opportunity to have a broader allocation discussion that would allow for consideration of multiple tools to inform those kinds of decisions – I mean, obviously we're considering input from the visioning process for the snapper grouper fishery. But, I am betting

that some of that input could be applied to some of our other fisheries for how we look at allocations that stay in place for some period of time. This is a tool that is really – I would call it an ACL shift, not a sector reallocation.

MR. BOWEN: To touch on that; it is my opinion that when a fishery doesn't close because we've met the ACL and we just pull it from another sector; it goes over a lot better with the fishermen, whether they be commercial or recreational. When somebody says reallocation, they automatically think, well, if we don't get the percentage and our fishery closes, then that is the reason they don't like it. But with this scenario, the fishery wouldn't close; we would just get our poundage from the other sector. I think the word reallocation is not as bad as it has been perceived.

MR. HARTIG: I agree. Where does that leave us, Kari? What do you really need now? Basically, we're talking about allocations of Spanish. The timeline; we're going to separate out the Gulf. Do you want to put Spanish into the allocation amendment or do you want to move forward with an independent amendment for Spanish?

DR. DUVAL: Yes; I think if we're talking about a tool to ensure that we're not having unnecessary closures for either sector when there is total ACL available; then I think we can proceed down the road of having this conversation. It might be that maybe – just depending on the timeline when the Gulf gets catch level recommendations and the other information that they've requested for Gulf mackerel, we may be able to meet up in the same timeline and combine it all into one framework; but it doesn't sound like we have to wait in order to continue to explore this on our end.

MR. HARTIG: Basically, the committee would like to see some options based on this new way of shifting poundage's between the two sectors. Okay, that is pretty clear. You would also like to see a way to do it in poundage and possibly percentages? I mean, you asked to have that review.

DR. DUVAL: I think for me it would be helpful to see what was in place before and the method that was used there. I think that will help the committee make some better decisions about how to do it in the future.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I agree with what Michelle is saying; I need to hear more about the old way and see some examples of how it worked before I can make an informed decision going forward.

MR. HARTIG: Do you have enough direction to move forward?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: No. I have a few things. I guess there is some stuff that I would like to have the committee discuss a little bit on the record for moving forward with this. I guess one of my first questions is that at this time all you want to look at are some options to shift the ACL in season. Okay, so we're not going to look at permanent allocation changes? Okay, that kind of changes the topic of Amendment 24, because it is not really reallocation.

The objective is that you are trying to reach the Atlantic Spanish ACL, total ACL to achieve OY, because that is how you define OY. Okay, so just on the record so that we can include this as we're developing the amendment and we have the discussion; we need to kind of talk about are

there other ways that you could reach a higher proportion of the total ACL, which mean that you would need to.

Are there any obstacles for the recreational sector that you could address instead that would allow them to meet their ACL, bag limit, et cetera, or any other way to use the unused recreational ACL to meet the OY; just to have the discussion on the record a little bit. If anybody needs to know, the bag limit is 15 a day.

That is consistent with all the South Atlantic states and most of the Mid-Atlantic States. There are two that have 10-fish bag limits. The recreational minimum size limit is 12-inch fork length set in the original FMP; and I think the spawning size is like 11 inches or something, so you don't have a lot of leeway with that.

DR. DUVAL: I am not sure I totally agree with the intent is to reach the ACL. I think the intent is to allow the opportunity for the ACL to be harvested. It is a limit. That doesn't mean we're trying to hit it every time. We want to allow both sectors the opportunity to access the ACL, to access the fish and the opportunity to reach it, not we're trying to get there.

It is a subtle point, but I just want to make sure that is clear for the record. I do agree that there are other options that we could look at particularly for the recreational sector. Maybe those are some things we should include for the next time the committee meets, like an increase in the bag limit; what might that look like?

I don't think we can do a whole lot with the size limit. We could look at an 11.5 inch size limit. I feel like going down that road is a little convoluted. I'm trying to think of – I mean it has been a year-round fishery. I have to give that some thought. I mean, obviously increases in the bag limit are certainly one way to allow greater opportunity to harvest the ACL for the recreational sector.

MR. HARTIG: For the bag limit, we had these discussions when we increased it from 10 to 15. When we increased it to 15, there hasn't been anymore participation. We haven't seen the landings react to increasing the bag limit when we went to 15; so increasing the bag limit isn't really going to do much as far as participation goes.

We had people actually – especially charter captains tell us leave it at 10, because 15 is a lot of fish to deal with for the people that I take fishing everyday. A lot of the boat limits are 10 anyway now. I think it is counterproductive to – well, you are not going to get what you want, I don't think, from increasing the bag limit.

I don't think you're going to get an increase in participation from that, per se. The size limit, it is already a very, very low size limit and decreasing that, biological implications perhaps, but how much spawning a 12-inch Spanish mackerel does is up for debate, anyway. I don't see a size limit change is increasing participation in the fishery either.

DR. DUVAL: To that point; I think that this is good discussion; it is good to hear this. I think it demonstrates that we're trying to look at other ways to allow for increased opportunities to harvest the recreational ACL. I agree if there hasn't been that increased participation in terms of meeting the bag limit since it has been raised from 10 to 15; then it is probably unlikely it is

going to occur in the future. I think it is important to note that we have considered that as another means of allowing for that opportunity. I'm saying just on the record here, not that staff needs to necessarily spend a lot of time and effort other than noting that the committee has had these discussions. That's all.

MR. BELL: Michelle made some good points. I think it is imperative obviously that the overall ACL has to be preserved. If you have flexibility to do things within the two sector ACLs, that is great, but I would avoid just doing things to try to push the ACL in a sector or maximize it in the recreational side.

If you are going to make any changes, they need to be changes that add value to the fishery, add efficiency to the fishery, and add benefit to the fishery. That kind of comes from the fishery. It is just like you're talking about, well, maybe 10 might be more appealing than 15 in some areas and things. We just need to be careful we don't just do things to try to allow them to max out the ACL or something. Whatever we do just needs to be for reasons that make sense and have benefit.

MR. BOWEN: A bag limit of 15 – and I'm a charterboat recreational fisherman myself – I think the bag limit of 15 is very generous. I'm recalling from memory, but the graph we saw a while ago I think the commercial side is right at their ACL or it was this past year. As Mel mentioned, we need to figure out a way that these fish will benefit us economically.

It is of my opinion that I think that the commercial side should get what is left, per se, of the recreational ACL. I think that at this point that is where the most economic benefit would be. I don't think there is – and if there is, maybe I'll probably get some e-mails over it, but I don't think there is a recreational fisherman out there that really wants more than 15 Spanish mackerel per day per person. I just see the economic benefit going to the commercial side if we could do that. Again, just throwing it out there and I want to be on record for an idea.

MR. WAUGH: As we talk about this, it seems one aspect that we have to figure out how we crank in is on the recreational side the incentive is not to land their portion of the ACL. On the commercial side, their incentive is to land it and sell it. On the recreational side, you want that standing stock to get very high, so that recreational fishermen like me have a better chance of interacting with a fish. You want to catch and release the fish; you want to bring back a few to eat.

Not landing the recreational ACL is not necessarily a bad thing. We need to figure out how we measure that recreational experience and how that factors into our OY. Otherwise, we're always going to be chasing this, well, the recreational never landed their full ACL; but it is never their intent to.

DR. DUVAL: Just to that point; I think it is just ensuring that the reason the recreational sector is maybe not landing or achieving their entire ACL is not because there aren't opportunities that are being constrained by management. That is the point that I was trying to get across. From the discussion we've had here, it does not sound like the management measures currently in place are constraining that opportunity. That is all; I completely agree with what you said.

MR. HARTIG: Just to that point, Gregg, if you look at it stock by stock and you look at the spawning stock biomass of Spanish mackerel continuing to increase and is substantially above MSY now; how much fish do you want in the water? Where do you draw the line? Our charge is to try and approximate OY.

That is one of our charges; but then as you mentioned, you may define OY for the recreational fishery in a different context. I don't know what that is. You've explained it as ability to catch fish, which I understand; but then if you keep it in the context of where the stock is, how many fish does that translate into? Where do you make that jump, where is it easiest to catch a fish; is that at MSY? Is it way above MSY? I don't know, but some way to try and feed your goals based on those types of considerations. Zack.

MR. BOWEN: I am going to let Chairman Boyd go first, and then I'll follow him if that is okay, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOYD: To Gregg's point; I just want to say that you have just scratched the surface of the allocation discussion. Everything that is being said here is magnified exponentially not times two. The discussions of are fish more valuable if they're left in the water versus killed, if you want to call it that, the recreational objective is to maximize the fishing experience.

The commercial's objective is to maximize the catch and the profit. Both of them are honorable. We need to cultivate both of those things for the good of the nation. You are scratching the surface of the whole allocation discussion. It is as much an economic discussion, a policy discussion, and a scientific discussion as it is anything. You all are on your way.

MR. BOWEN: Gregg; that is how you look at it but there are different views. I'll be very honest; when I leave the dock everyday, my intention is to catch every fish that I'm allowed to catch legally. That is just the business end of it from the charter/headboat side. There are different perspectives from different people. You gave yours and I just wanted to give mine, but my intention is to catch my daily limit of every fish that I can catch.

MR. WAUGH: I'm not advocating that as my position or that it should be your position. I'm just saying that needs to be factored in to our definition of OY; because you are absolutely right, the for-hire sector, their motivation is different from the private recreational. Each sector, we need to talk about what their motivations are and what is optimal for each of those subsections.

MR. BOWEN: There is nothing wrong, in my opinion, of either one of those motivations, nothing wrong with either one of them.

MS. BECKWITH: As usual, I am the ying to Zack and he's the yang; but for the recreational fishing it certainly is about fishing opportunity and trip satisfaction, but in my view this potential framework shifting wouldn't be 100 percent shift. We would be looking at options to shift maybe a 10 percent or 20 percent of left quota; but it would still allow some retention of uncaught quota.

As we try to achieve a balance of all factors, we want to be able to have a little bit of flexibility for the commercial, but still recognizing that it doesn't have to achieve the full ACL, because there is a value for those fish left out in the environment. We can show that by putting into a

potential framework action the option to shift 5, 10, 15, 20 percent, depending on what is available to be shifted, and not necessarily shifting the entire unused quota over to the commercial so every last pound is caught. There is balance that we can achieve.

MR. PATE: When the staff does its analysis of the pros and cons of creating a plan that will allow shifting of the ACLs, I think it would be helpful to canvass the other regions to see if anybody has used that approach before. I am not aware of any; but if there are some, we might be able to get some idea of the attitudes of the different sectors in having that flexibility. It sounds like a good idea; but as Chairman Boyd said, you are just scratching the surface of reallocation.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you, Pres, and that is good advice to see what other areas have done. Kari, isn't there a bluefish shift that goes on in the Mid-Atlantic? Michelle knows; there is that bluefish shift that occurs. We will pull that up and add that in.

MR. PHILLIPS: We need to keep in mind that it is not necessarily a shift from recreational to commercial. We're moving some resource to a commercial that actually ends up giving more of the non-fishing and fishing public access to this resource. This fish doesn't just stop with the commercial.

It enters where a lot more people have access to a resource that is not being used. It is not just money. It is like Gregg says, you've got a value of being able to go catch fish; but you also have a value that is probably intangible of having access to this fish; and by moving this, then we make it where more people have access to this fish.

MS. MacLAUCHLIN: Just to throw this out; what about a stock ACL like for the Gulf Spanish? That was just another idea if you guys want to discuss that. It came up on my discussion with my counterparts.

MR. HARTIG: What Kari is saying – and, Doug, you have single ACLs for a number of stocks in the Gulf. You have it for cobia, for Spanish. I think for your deepwater grouper complex as well; I think you have a single ACL for the recreational and commercial. That is what Kari is asking; how would that work as an option? Is it something that you want to consider or not?

MS. BECKWITH: I'm trying to think how that would work, because, of course, our commercial we do by the trip tickets on our commercial – I mean our recreational by MRIP. I'm not sure how are they tracking a single stock ACL?

MR. HARTIG: They're tracked the same way they are tracked now; they would just be combined. Everything would be in one ACL. In some species that are rare, you probably wouldn't want to do it; but in species like Spanish that has pretty consistent landings over time you could.

To me it is a way that you could accomplish what you're trying to achieve, by getting closer. I think based on your comments earlier, Anna, and I share some of those, that you don't want to probably shift everything over based on what Gregg said earlier about OY and the recreational fishery. I think you can strike a balance with what we were talking about earlier. I think that

flexibility in that other way looking at it may be a better way to do it than a single ACL; but it is certainly an option. It is an option and if you want to explore it, fine. Zack.

MR. BOWEN: I am all for giving the commercial fellows a little bit, but I'm not all for giving them everything. I'm not so inclined I like the single ACL; but again I would look at the options. When you first said that it kind of like, whoa, I don't know how that would fly for my recreational constituents. Again, I would like to give you a little, but we don't want to give you everything.

MR. COX: Zack, just keep in mind we taught you all how to do it.

MR. BOWEN: I can't even throw a cast net.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Ben had asked me at one point to write this up. It was like how is in-season – I'm going to write in-season ACL shift. Is that okay that we call it that?

MR. HARTIG: From the legal side; is that okay? Can we call that an ACL shift or do we have to call it an allocation?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: We're so early in the process; we can call it an ACL shift.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: This was just kind of trying to think about how we would even make this into actions and alternatives. It maybe would have to be split up into separate actions to deal with each of the things. The way that I was thinking about it was that there would be an alternative that would designate a period during the fishing year at which the shift could occur and then you would have options; the last six months, the last three months, the last two months; like you wouldn't shift until a certain point that you felt confident in.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, I think this is where we probably need to stop until we see the old way of doing it. We'll spark some discussion once we've read – we might just be reinventing the wheel that clearly worked the last time.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I think there was – the thing that they had, the 10 percent shift, like they just did it in a framework amendment. All they did was in a plan amendment change the framework procedures to allow a 10 percent shift in a framework. Then they did it once and it was just like a regular – it wasn't a mechanism that changed when the RA published a notice or something like that. I can pull up the language that was in the document, but I really think this is the first time something like this will be used for mackerel to my understanding.

DR. DUVAL: I think it would still be good to see what the intent was behind that.

MR. HARTIG: Kari has got one way of looking at it. You look at it within a year, and you shift within a year based on what the recreational wave. Whatever wave you choose to shift it at, you would have to base it based on when that wave is available to look at. Then you could shift within that ACL either way. I think you can also look at it – for Spanish in particular you can look at it just based on the amount of the fish that the recreational fishery hasn't caught in 12 seasons.

You can look at that and then gauge the amount of fish you want to shift over to the commercial side on a yearly basis. You can do it two different ways. You can do it within season and before the year starts; at least the way I look at it. For some species like Spanish that have a long history of not being caught, you are probably pretty safe in choosing some kind of level to shift for that year.

For snapper grouper species, where we've seen for some of our more important species vermilion and gag, where the recreational fishery hasn't been catching their allocation; in particular years they may get closer and you may want to just shift within a season near the end of the commercial season, more towards the end. I see value in doing it both ways. I think we should have both of those options to look at.

MR. BOWEN: One thing to keep in mind when we're talking about Spanish mackerel; the commercial side has been catching more of their ACL, of course, than the recreational side; but when we look at getting the landings data, the commercial had that so much quicker than we do the recreational.

But let's think forward for a minute; what happens when this is reversed, when the recreational side tends to catch more of their ACL and then we need some from the commercial side? Our data is a wave or two behind at minimum before we have our landings. I don't know that putting in there getting 10 percent when six months of the season is left will work because of our recreational data being so far behind.

Do you see what I am trying to get across? It is not late; it is just we're so much further behind on our data collection than we are with the commercial side. Yes, for Spanish mackerel, in this scenario it may work; but when we get to another species where the recreational side is catching their ACL at a faster rate than the commercial side, we know that a little too late because we're a wave or two behind on the data.

MR. BELL: I was picking up on his brain waves that were emitted, because I had the same thought is the commercial data track along a lot quicker. The recreational, there is always a lag. We're trying to improve that, but you are always going to have a little bit of a lag in terms of where you really are. As long as there is plenty of room to move, it is not an issue.

But if you get towards the end of the season or something, you just want to be real careful when you start talking about adjustments or something; that you don't really have the exact picture. At the same time you might have a clear commercial picture, the recreational picture is always going to be behind a little bit in terms of how we're doing it now. We just need to be sensitive to that in adjusting the methodology for doing this. Like I said, it is our goal to improve that but right now that is just the way it is.

MR. HARTIG: Kari, you had some concerns about –

DR. MacLAUHLIN: No, I was just trying to think of things to make sure that the info I have for you guys at the next meeting. Maybe that is one of them, like really talking about feasibility of the monitoring.

MR. HARTIG: I agree, Zack; but even if you're going to shift in-season to commercial, you are going to have to wait for the recreational numbers. Yes, I guess you could make an informed judgment based on so many years and look at the information and shift a portion of that either way for either sector.

It is going to take some thought and some looking at different options. Then like you say, how the timing and all is going to tie into how you are going to be able to shift and when. I've had great discussion. I think we've given some direction to Kari. How much more she needs, we'll have to find out.

MR. BOWEN: I think mandatory electronic reporting in some kind of real-time way, whether it is iPhones or whatever, would greatly help us in this scenario; but we're a little ways away from that right now. Again, just more thought.

MR. HARTIG: Is there anyone here currently that is familiar with what changes MRIP is contemplating? Are they actually looking at less than two-month waves yet? Are those types of considerations being thought on how a bit more timely and informative this could be?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, there have been discussions about that. They've looked at going to one-month waves and increasing the turnaround. All of those things are possible, but they are expensive. As you shorten the turnaround and do shorter waves, you have to up the sampling effort and the number of dockside intercepts or the precision estimates change. They've looked at it and I think there is a lot of need to go in that direction; but it is a funding issue.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I think at the June meeting for the committee I have some information to make sure I bring back to you guys about the old framework adjustments, how that recreation data availability would affect this. Do you want to look at an in-season shift or doing it at the beginning of the year? Are there examples in other regions, looking at that? I guess what I need to know is are you wanting like an options paper with some actions and alternatives to look at and consider and see what the language looks like for June; is that where we're at?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I think probably an options paper is appropriate. I mean, we're not ready to do anything more drastic; we're just in my mind in the exploratory phase right now.

MR. BOWEN: To that point exactly, I agree. We don't have to have a real specific option paper, but maybe some generic options would go a long way, yes.

MR. HAYMANS: Just one reminder with regard to king mackerel; there was some discussion about reallocation of some of the recreational ACL to commercial due to tournament sales or tournament donations. Somewhere in the record we at least want to make sure that we acknowledge that; and then if we do move some recreational to the commercial side, that at least part of it is due to tournament requests.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I had forgotten about that. What was the year – how many years were we going to look at; four years? I can't remember, but I know we put X amount of years in there that we were going to look at the average of the tournament sales and then try and address that problem at that time. Anyone else? Okay I think we've got pretty good direction. I see an inquisitive look on Kari's face.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, I will have an options paper with lots of things for you guys to consider and see what actions and alternatives would look like for the things that we discussed and then all the information that you guys requested for the next meeting.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, that should be enough for Amendment 24. The next item agenda is Amendment 26.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: You have Attachment 7. That is a PDF portfolio, and it has the summary, all the scoping comments. You have a comment summary, the scoping document that was used and then all the minutes and written comments. This is the amendment to look at. I was given direction to scope very broadly and just get some input on how people were feeling about splitting up the permits into different regions.

There was some support for separating the permits primarily at the Cocoa Beach meeting so that the councils could address specific problems in their region without impacting the other region. There was some opposition to separating the permits, because fishermen that work in both regions, impact on new entrants who want to work both regions.

Then there were some attendees that wanted to remove any king mackerel permits with no or low level landings so that the full-time mackerel fisherman could have access to that ACL. That was primarily at the discussion in Cocoa Beach. We did hear opposition to any action that would take away king mackerel permits.

People said the council should not be taking away permits. Then in Key West someone noted that a higher trip limit would increase the number of active permits; and so the council should consider increasing the trip limits before taking any action to address the latent permits. There was some opposition and some support for a two-for-one requirement like we have in the snapper grouper; some support for an endorsement in the king mackerel mixing zone.

Specifically that area called the mixing zone may change after the king mackerel stock assessment is finished; but in general what they're talking about is the area around Cocoa and Canaveral. If the permits are split into different regions, there is support for qualifying for both permits; if the permit holder has landings in both areas, use a very recent control date.

Then we were talking about me going down to meet with the mackerel fishermen in Cocoa Beach/Canaveral to talk about options for them in that area specifically. I used again very broad – I just had some trigger questions in the scoping document; you know, should we separate Spanish mackerel; should we separate king mackerel?

If so, what would be the requirements? What about an endorsement program; and then are there any other issues with the current permit system that you would want to address? Then I just provided some basic information about the king mackerel commercial permits and Spanish mackerel commercial permits. Then there are some things to consider if you are going to separate the permits.

Should there be a limited entry for Spanish mackerel, any kind of permit reduction while you're doing this, and endorsements? Not a lot of comments; there were a few written comments that came in a little bit later, too, about not taking away any king mackerel permits, because you have

some new entrants coming in; and just the characteristics of the fishery how they migrate and that affects people's access to that in the landings.

This is one also that the Gulf Council passed a motion at their February meeting to wait until after the king mackerel stock assessment is finished. That is all; I would just need guidance from the committee for timing and what you would need if you want something at the June meeting or if you want to wait also.

MR. HARTIG: One additional comment we got in Bill Kelly's letter, when he was talking about pushing for the higher trip limits, one of the last sentences was "Additionally, we would like the council to consider making king mackerel permits regional-specific or at least separated Gulf and Atlantic, which will better address concerns of those in neighboring counties about early closure." That is an about face from his last comments during the scoping, so they've changed.

That was precipitated by what happened this season down in their area. The fishery was the shortest it's been probably ever. There were a number of fishermen that came and participated in that fishery from other areas. Many of the Key West guys didn't even get to participate, and it was caught six weeks early. That was one of his concerns.

Pleasure of the committee, what would you like to do in 26? It would probably be appropriate to give the report on SEDAR 38 now since we're talking about king mackerel. It was held in Charleston. One of the most disappointing parts of the data workshop was there has been very little new scientific research conducted to inform the major assessment inputs for king mackerel such as natural mortality, fecundity, size and age at maturity, spawner-recruit functions.

There was some information that precipitated a lot of discussion from Dr. Peter Barile's paper. He had submitted a working paper which documented weekly landings by Florida county to discern migratory patterns for Atlantic king mackerel in the mixing zone off the Florida Coast. Essentially he tracked the fish coming down the coast by county over a number of years and showed the different patterns and how in cold winters they were different.

It really started the assessment team talking more about what really is Atlantic and Gulf stock. It got them focused; they took it to another level. They traced fish on a weekly basis all around the Gulf and the Atlantic. It was really cool. Unfortunately, all the areas aren't open so you can't see the real migration for some areas, especially in the Gulf; because once that western Gulf group closes and the fish start to migrate to the wintertime area mixing zone down towards the Keys, you can't see that because none of those areas are open.

They were convinced that in common this methodology, in combination with the otolith microchemistry, the otolith shape analysis, the genetic work that has been done, was enough to separate the stocks out at a new mixing zone boundary. Instead of the Flagler/Volusia county line, which is way up in the north central area of Florida, they moved the mixing zone boundary line to the Dade/Monroe county line.

All the fish that have been caught previously in the mixing zone will now be considered Atlantic fish; and it won't have any Gulf component any longer. It will have impacts – well, there will be substantial impacts on both Gulf and South Atlantic stocks. How this all works out remains to be

seen. King mackerel will be apportioned to the respective stocks based on the genetic otolith and shape and migratory time/area function.

We'll have to wait and see how that works out. There was significant discussion concerning declining landings of Atlantic king mackerel. Both commercial and recreational landings certainly are declining – we've seen from Jack's presentations even further this year. It is not all bad news.

The age structure of the catches indicates that age structure is still relatively good, so it is an interesting dichotomy. It is not a normal overfishing situation where you are fishing down the stock in sizes and age. It is really a missing age class that supports the majority of the fishery. The major trolling gear in this fishery and the selectivity of that fishery is based on younger aged fish.

Once those fish avoid the gear; those fish move out of being targeted by the predominant gear; and those fish are available and are in the population. There are still a fair number of them there, and, of course, the fecundity of those animals is very high. We still have significant spawning stock potential left in the stock.

Be advised the landings information is pretty tough to look at; it is going down. One of the things that did happen in the conference call that I was on earlier this week or the webinar was that after they had looked at the new indices – and they've got the new indices which includes the mixing zone catches in the Atlantic – then they looked at old Atlantic – and they had indices for it – the question was whether we should use the indices for the old Atlantic or the new Atlantic. They both show the same pattern.

The mixing zone fish that they approved as Atlantic fish aren't showing as much wear and tear as the bulk of the Atlantic stock. There are a lot of smaller fish still in that population. There is some recruitment signals in there that aren't in the bulk of what occurs in the Atlantic. It is bolstering the Atlantic up a little bit, but the decline is still there.

The decision was made to use the new index instead of the old, which should help a little bit. One of the other interesting things is the assessment team discussed the environmental parameters. The model they used, the SS3 model, can incorporate the changes in stock based on environmental parameters, mainly temperature, related migratory shifts; and that is still being looked at.

I'm not sure if is going to be incorporated in this assessment or not. They've done a lot of work. They looked at a lot of data, a lot of NOAA temperature data throughout the Atlantic to see how these migratory shifts are occurring with temperature. If it is not used in this assessment, at least it was brought forward as a potential, and then data can be collected in the future to make sure we have the data to look at that.

Working with the assessment team, I think Anna would agree was very productive. The assessment team was very professional, very accommodating in the questions we had and in trying to bring Peter's work to the forefront, to be able to use that. I was very, very impressed and Anna could probably second that as well; a very great team to work with.

I'm very confident that whatever comes out of there, they are very thorough in their analyses; not to say that Beaufort isn't; but these guys, they are just different on the webinar. There is much more discussion, much more back and forth between the analysts. They all don't agree on everything; and that is when I learn, when they all don't agree.

But they work it out and that is critical. That is it; any questions? Seeing none; how do we want to proceed with this splitting the permits out? The Gulf has asked to wait until after the assessment. It is going to be incumbent on this to deal with the Gulf. We really can't move forward until the Gulf is ready to come onboard on this. Okay; I'm seeing concurrence.

DR. DUVAL: I think the only thing I would say is just that swirling around maybe in the back, while the assessment is going on, I agree with the Gulf's motion that in order to do this we're going to need the information from the assessment. I think methods of how you would go about separating those permits can probably be given some thought and a little bit of brainstorming so that we're not in this lag period. Once we get the information from the assessment, we are then in a situation; well, let's hurry up and try to figure out how to do this. That's all.

MS. BECKWITH: During the workshop, at one point the Life History Committee had debated actually splitting it down by the council jurisdictions, because they reduced the mixing zone so much. Ben and I were sitting in a corner holding high hopes that they would come to that conclusion, recognizing the ease that that would facilitate for management, but, of course, that was not to be. I agree; methods are probably a good way to move forward.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; I see some concurrence on waiting, but I also see value in what Michelle said. I think if we do have time, Kari, that we could look at some options on what we may think about. I don't know when you want to see them, but certainly not any time – some time in a meeting or two before the assessment is presented to the SSC.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Sue had suggested a white paper on methods and then for the September meeting maybe – or would you want that in June?

DR. DUVAL: I think whenever you all want to do it. It is not a rush if we're not going to be getting the assessment back soon. You guys have plenty of other work to do, I know.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; at least by September would be great. We don't need any motions. That is direction to staff; we're good. I'm seeing Kari nod her head. Everyone around me, I saw concurrence and that was the way to move forward. We're good on 26 and that brings us to I believe other business, if I'm not mistaken.

When we went through the Spanish mackerel deliberations; we dropped out the trip limit changes because we didn't want to do those until after we saw the results of the assessment. We've got some trip limit stuff that pertains mostly to Florida. Where we had an unlimited season, we wanted to get rid of the unlimited season; we wanted to change the poundage in the different step downs based on what came out of the assessment basically. We've got a number out of the assessment now. I think it would be helpful to go back in a framework and look at the adjustments in the trip limits. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Basically bring back those actions that we removed from the framework kind of verbatim, because I recall we had had some discussion about modifying them, and we had actually worked on that quite a bit, so maybe bring those back to the committee in a separate framework?

MR. HARTIG: Yes; that was the intent. The other thing is what level had those actions been vetted? Had they been through scoping yet? I don't know; that is why we need to find that out. I can't remember where we were when we dropped them.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I can tell you that. This is what it looked like. It was actually Action 4 in the Framework Action 2013. The action was added in March 2013 and then in June is when it was removed for a later amendment. It had several alternatives under Alternative 2, different ones to remove the unlimited on the weekends; to stop using the adjusted ACL and only use based on just the commercial ACL percentages for when there was a step down; and then the AP recommendation of Alternative 3.

These were all the ones that were in the framework action as you guys had approved until you removed the action for the future. We can just use all of those unless somebody wants to add anymore.

MR. HARTIG: Okay; so with the concurrence of the committee we will proceed with an additional framework document. I see heads nodding.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Is that going to be in a motion?

DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I move that we bring back the previous trip limit actions from our original framework document back in a separate framework action for consideration.

MR. HARTIG: We understand what it is; the motion is bring back the previous trip limit actions from the original framework in a separate framework action for consideration. Motion by Michelle and seconded by Charlie. Any more discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; **that motion is approved.** Is there any other business to come before the Mackerel Committee? Seeing none; the Mackerel Committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:54 o'clock a.m., March 6, 2014.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
April 1, 2014

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2013 - 2014 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

Ben Hartig

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Dr. Michelle Duval

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

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

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

Anna Beckwith

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

Zack Bowen

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

Chris Conklin

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

Jack Cox

2010 Bridges Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/728-9548
Dayboat1965@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

David M. Cupka

P.O. Box 12753
Charleston, SC 29422
843/795-8591 (hm)
843/870-5495 (cell)
palmettobooks@bellsouth.net

LT Morgan Fowler

U.S. Coast Guard
510 SW 11th Court
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

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

John W. Jolley

4925 Pine Tree Drive
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
561/732-4530 (ph)
jolleyjw@yahoo.com

Deirdre Warner-Kramer

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

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

Charles 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

MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
BONNIE PONWITZ
JACK MCGOVERN
DOUG BOYD
PHIL STEELE
TRACY DUNN

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2013-2014 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Ben Hartig
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

Ben Hartig, Chair
Zack Bowen
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Doug Haymans
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Chevront

DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
John Jolley, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
David Cupka
Doug Haymans
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Doug Haymans, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Anna Martin- CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
David Cupka
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wilson Laney, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

David Cupka, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
John Jolley
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
John Jolley
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

✓ Ben Hartig, Chair
✓ David Cupka, Vice-Chair
✓ Anna Beckwith
✓ Mel Bell
✓ Zack Bowen
✓ Jack Cox
✓ Roy Crabtree
✓ Michelle Duval
✓ Doug Haymans
✓ Jessica McCawley
✓ Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
✓ Mid-Atlantic Liaison (Pres Pate)
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
LT Morgan Fowler
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

PERSONNEL

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Michelle Duval – Vice Chair
Mel Bell
David Cupka
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Michelle Duval
LT Morgan Fowler
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair
Mel Bell
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR

Ben Hartig, Chair
Zack Bowen
Jack Cox
Michelle Duval
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP

Charlie Phillips, Chair
Mel Bell
Roy Crabtree
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Anna Martin

(Continued)

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

✓ Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Staff Economist

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

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

SEDAR Admin/Outreach

Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council March 2014 Meeting – Savannah, GA

Mackerel Committee Meeting:

Thursday, March 6, 2014

<u>NAME & SECTOR or ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP</u>
Rusty Johnson SFA CCFs	386-239-0948	rusty2009@aol.com	32120-9351
Leda Dummire	305-393-0934	ledadummire@peachstate.org	

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405
843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10

MARCH MTC DAY 4

80	L, I	captaindrifter@bellsouth....	424 min
76	klostermann, joe	grkifk@comcast.net	378 min
67	O'Shaughnessy, Pat...	patrick.oshaughnessy@noaa...	88 min
65	DeHart, Hayley	hayley.mills.dehart@gmail...	415 min
64	MacLauchlin, Bill	billmac@adtrends.com	468 min
64	Mealey, Christophe...	cmealey13@gmail.com	165 min
63	Fey, Kasey	info@keyskeeper.org	225 min
52	Lamberte, Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov	525 min
49	Frede, Robin	rifrede@gmail.com	177 min
49	Mehta, Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	476 min
45	burton, michael	michael.burton@noaa.gov	316 min
44	Gerhart, Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov	457 min
42	Lapointe, George	georgelapointe@gmail.com	74 min
41	holiman, stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov	417 min
41	rindone, ryan	ryan.rindone@gulfcouncil....	400 min
40	Michie, Kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov	433 min
39	Brogan, Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org	0 min
38	DeVictor, Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	444 min
38	Raine, Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov	698 min
36	E, A	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov	660 min
36	Brennan, Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov	62 min
35	AUSTIN, Tony	redress@ec.rr.com	456 min
33	Bademan, Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com	208 min
32	Hudson, Rusty	dsf2009@aol.com	449 min
30	Clemens, Anik	anik.clemens@noaa.gov	449 min
29	sandorf, scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	390 min
29	Meyer, Cynthia	cynthia.meyer@noaa.gov	411 min
29	Byrd, Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	405 min

29	Iverson, Kim	<u>kim.iverson@safmc.net</u>	368 min
29	gore, karla	<u>karla.gore@noaa.gov</u>	450 min
29	Neer, Julie	<u>julie.neer@safmc.net</u>	306 min
28	Takade-Heunacher, ...	<u>htakade@edf.org</u>	23236002 min
26	Abeels, Holly	<u>habeels@ufl.edu</u>	509 min
26	Baker, Scott	<u>bakers@uncw.edu</u>	384 min
24	Martin, Gretchen	<u>martin1639@ec.rr.com</u>	134 min
20	Giguere, Cate	<u>cathleen.a.giguere@uscg.m...</u>	1 min