SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COBIA COMMITTEE

Webinar

June 10, 2020

Committee Members

Steve Poland, Chair
Spud Woodward, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Anthony Delernia
Tim Griner
Dewey Hemilright
Jessica McCawley
Art Sapp

Council Members

Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Dr. Kyle Christiansen
LCDR Jeremy Montes
David Whitaker
LT Robert Copeland

Council Staff:

Myra Brouwer
Julia Byrd
John Carmichael
Cindy Chaya
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Dr. Chip Collier
Dr. Mike Errigo
John Hadley
Kathleen Howington
Allie Iberle
Kim Iverson
Kelly Klasnick
Dr. Julie Neer
Roger Pugliese
Cameron Rhodes
Suzanna Thomas
Christina Wiegand

Observers/Participants

Shep Grimes
Dr Jack McGovern
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Clay Porch
Martha Guyas
Dr. Genny Nesslage
Rick DeVictor
Erika Burgess
Pat O'Saughnessy

Other observers and participants attached.

The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Wednesday, June 10, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Steve Poland.

MR. POLAND: Let's go ahead and get started and convene the Mackerel Cobia Committee to order this afternoon. The first thing is I will run through committee members, real quickly. It's myself, Spud Woodward is Vice Chair, Bob Beal, Anna Beckwith, Mel Bell, Chester Brewer, Chris Conklin, Roy Crabtree, Tim Griner, Jessica McCawley, Art Sapp, and then our two Mid-Atlantic liaisons, Tony DiLernia and Dewey Hemilright.

The agenda is in front of you on the screen, and are there any modifications or additions to the agenda from the committee? Hearing none, the agenda stands approved. The next item is Approval of the March 2020 Committee Minutes. Are there any additions, deletions, or modifications to the committee meeting minutes? All right. Hearing none, the meeting minutes stand approved. In the interest of time, we're going to go ahead and receive the king mackerel stock assessment presentation from Matt, and so take it away, Matt.

DR. LAURETTA: I will try and keep it brief, because I know it's the end of the day, and I know you guys have a lot on your plate, and so let's just dive right in. Here, I just want to start off by highlighting the main findings from the update of the SEDAR 38 model. Just real quick, the terms of reference called for a strict update of the SS3 approved base model that was completed in 2014, and the objective was to add five years of additional data to the Stock Synthesis, and that would be the fishing years 2013 through 2017, ending in February of 2018, and so just about two years in the past is the terminal end year. The model was peer reviewed by an expert committee and accepted for management advice at the end of 2014.

The current stock status was determined to be not overfished, and the current fishery status is not overfishing, and this was consistent with the stock status that was determined during SEDAR 38, and, since then, all fishery indicators have shown an increasing trend, including both recreational and commercial fleet landings, catch per unit effort, as well as the juvenile scientific survey, and I will show you those results in just a couple of slides.

The estimated biomass is trending up since the terminal period of SEDAR 38, and so a fairly steady increase over the last five years, and the exploitation rate on the stock, measured as a proportion removed by numerical abundance, has been fairly steady since 2010, at around 4 to 5 percent per year. The average recruitment estimates are just under ten million age-zero fish hatched each year, and the equilibrium landing estimate at the defined exploitation target, which is also the fishing limit for overfishing, of about 14 percent year, was 18.3 million pounds at the equilibrium rate under those about ten-million per year average recruitments.

Then there was a period of high recruitment estimated during the terminal period of the time series between 2013 to 2016, and this is in stark contrast to what was found during SEDAR 38, where we found a low recruitment cycle occurring between 2008 through 2012. The overfishing limit projections from the model are thirty-four million pounds in 2021, a distinct increase over the current fishing rate and reaching some of the highest landings on record, with a decreasing trend to twenty million pounds over the five years, decreasing towards equilibrium by 2025, and this is tracking those recent high recruitments that are entering the fisheries as of fishing year 2019.

Let's dive a little more into the details of the assessment, and, here, we're looking at the fisheries landings, and the figures on the right show commercial landings on the top, measured in millions of pounds yield, and the figure on the bottom shows the recreational landings measured in millions of fish caught. The two colors on the top, the dark blue represents the handline fleet, and the turquoise represents the gillnets.

The two vertical lines show the SEDAR cycle periods from SEDAR 16 and to SEDAR 38, which occurred in 2014. Then, on the bottom, we have the charter/private in green being the majority of landings, followed by headboats and tournament fleets. What we noticed was this sharp decline that was observed in landings during SEDAR 38, and, since then, we've seen a rebound in both sectors, a fairly steady increase in landings since then.

When we look at the catch rates, we see also positive trends since SEDAR 38, and so, when we look at these figures, they are the different sectors, the CPUEs for each major sector, and the SEAMAP juvenile trawl survey, and the red line shows the standardized index as was used in SEDAR 38, and the black line shows the 2019 updated index, all standardized to a relative mean. Then all indices show this positive trend since that terminal year of SEDAR 38, and we see that there was good replication in the data time series index overall, across the board, and we see this observed recent peak in the recruitment index in the upper right that we hadn't seen in over a decade, and that was true for the last couple of years, and so some of the highest points since really 2006 or 2007.

We see this sharp positive turn in the headboat CPUE, which was at its all-time low at the end of SEDAR 38, and we also see a similar turn in the charter/private sector. Although this was not modeled in SS3 directly, I thought it would be informative to see the comparison.

One of the other tasks for the terms of reference was to evaluate the effects of the Fishing Effort Survey on the stock assessment, and that is the transition from the Coastal Household Telephone Survey to the fishing effort, and this changed the entire time series of landings, for recreational landings, specifically charter/private.

What we observed was an overall increase in landings estimates, about 38 percent, on average, across years, and this resulted in increased estimates of recruitment as well as a scaling up of the biomass series accordingly, almost parallel lines across the two time series. As you can see in the figures on the upper right, SEDAR 38, the dark line, and it's sort of hidden under the gray line, were the two treatments that were affected by this, the increased charter/private landings, and that shows the effect of the red line on recruitment estimates on the left figure and on SSB estimates on the right figure, and so you can see everything got sort of scaled.

There was a slight decrease in the headboat discards estimates, as they are estimated as a proportion of the recreational fleets, and so, when charter went up, those went down, and we see that that had a relatively minor effect on the stock assessment. The overall net change was an increase in average recruitment estimates and spawning stock biomass series. Roughly, mean unfished recruitment was approximately 5 percent higher and about half-a-percent lower when you include the new discards, overall somewhere around a four-and-a-half percent change in the productivity estimate. The SSB benchmark is also scaled at the same percentages, and so it's not a real change

in relative status, but, notably, the F target, which is the F limit at F SPR 30, did not change substantially.

Now let's look into some of the results from the model here on the updated full time series, and these next set of graphs will show two figures, and the upper figures will show the estimates from SEDAR 38, and the lower one will show the updated model with the extra time series with the five years added, and the first thing to note is the -- Here, we're looking at age-zero recruits times 1,000 on the X-axis, and you will see it's the same scale, approximately, for both SEDAR 38 and its update.

We see consistent scale and time series trends, and so nothing really changed in the historic time series estimates, and that's always good, and we noticed particularly two recent estimated recruitments that were some of the highest on record for estimates, and that's 2015 and 2016 age-zero, and so really entering the fisheries beginning in 2018, but really ramping up into the fleets in 2019 and 2020 and beyond.

The stakeholder feedback during SEDAR 38, as was documented in Amendment 28, indicated high juvenile abundance compared to previous years for those, and that was right around the time when this was being reviewed in 2015 and 2016, and so the model -- That provided some validation of the model trends that we're seeing estimated now, years later, and it showed a similar signal to the reported observations on the water.

Looking at stock biomass, again, the SEDAR 38 results are shown on the top, and the updated model is shown on the bottom. Here we see, again, consistency between the scale and trend between the two, the update and the previous assessment, and the stock was determined to be not overfished during SEDAR 38, and we've seen an overall total and spawning biomass increase steadily since then. The current estimate of spawning stock biomass was about 1.7 times the SPR 30 percent productivity target, egg production target, and, therefore, the stock is determined to be not overfished.

Here, let's look at those relative to the defined targets, which, for F, is the overfishing limit, and that's F SPR 30, and, for the spawning biomass benchmark, that's the biomass at -- That's equilibrium biomass at that fishing rate, and the upper plot shows the relative biomass, where the red line shows the target of one, if biomass was right at that SPR 30 target, and then the lower one shows the fishing exploitation rate, and so what we see here is that the stock was really never estimated to be overfished, or even hit the defined management target, across the whole time series.

The highest exploitation occurred in 1998, and the stock still remained above the SPR 30 biomass level, and so this provides some evidence that the fishery has been in a good status the entire time and has not led to overfishing, as defined in the model here, and so this would be some inquiry as that the state of the fishery was well in 1998, and there was never a problem. Here we see, on the bottom lower, the plot that shows the trajectory. As you reach the sort of grid there, that's the -- If you were fishing right at the management target, you would hit the intersection of the ones on the X and Y-axis, and, when you're in the green, stock biomass is higher in it, and F is lower in it, and so you can see that it marched its way towards the target to 1998, and then it's going back towards the green quadrant since.

A quick overview of the determinations from the Stock Synthesis is the current fishing mortality estimate is about 4 percent annual exploitation rate by numerical abundance to define limit, and the fishing limit is 0.14, and so the current exploitation estimate would be just under a third of the fishing limit, with a 95 percent confidence interval of about 0.2 to 0.4.

Recruitment in the equilibrium unfished is 9.8 million fish, slightly up from the last assessment, as I mentioned, due to increased recreational landings estimates. Spawning stock biomass in the unfished equilibrium state is 8.1 billion eggs produced. At the fishing limit target, it's 2.4 billion, and the current estimate is 4.2 billion, and so we can see that the current SSB over target is about 1.7, and so not overfished, with a confidence interval of about 1.6 to 1.8 above the target or limit.

Current yield was estimated around 9.5 million pounds, and the equilibrium yield, again, is 18.3 million. Optimal yield is defined from SEDAR 38 as 75 percent FSPR 30, 16.7 million pounds, and so you can see the yield is considerably under. Stock status, again, is not overfished, and the fishery status is not overfishing.

Looking at stock projections now, switching gears just a little bit, we looked at four different constant exploitation projection scenarios, looking at the upper figure there, and it's on the legend, we can see that the dashed-blue line is no fishing, F equal to zero, and the red-dashed dotted line would be fishing at the fishing limit, SPR 30, and the dashed gray is fishing at 75 percent of that limit, and then the bold black would be the current fishing exploitation rate, around 0.04, 0.045.

What we see is that fishing at the F SPR limit results in a sharp increase in the projected landings, followed by this gradual decline towards the equilibrium yield, and so you can see that red-dashed line sort of spiking up from our current level at the terminal year of the model and then tapering down towards the equilibrium yield at 18.3 million.

Of course, fishing at zero drops the landings to zero, and, if you look at the lower spawning biomass panel, we see that it sort of rapidly builds towards the unfished equilibrium, and it almost gets there within the next decade under no fishing. Fishing at the current level keeps yield and biomass right around its current level, which seems to be about where the stock has been over the last couple of years, as far as the fishing level, and then the recruitment, of course, leads to these projected higher yields.

Then the fishing at the 75 percent limit also significantly increases landings, but it leads to lower equilibrium yield, 16.7, I believe, instead of 18.3 million pounds, but we have this higher long-term SSB equilibrium about equal to its lowest point estimated for the time series, and so one of my main points here is that the current overfishing limit suggests to push the stock down to a state lower than it has been estimated in the whole time series, whereas the 75 percent of that limit pushes it down to about its lowest observed point, and I think that's important to know.

Here are the projections by year, and I just want to spend a little bit of time on this, and I think we're right around our fifteen-minute mark, and I believe this is my last slide, and so the gray distribution shows the level of uncertainty around the projected annual yields from SS, using a parametric probability distribution, a normal distribution, for the estimated landings and standard error, and so you can see, starting with 2021 as the upper panel, the gray distribution says the uncertainty is about twenty to fifty million pounds with a 95 percent confidence interval around 25 to 45 or so.

The dashed lines show the different P* values of the distribution, and, with the 0.425 requested by the SSC to overlay there, and so you can see the solid black line would be the overfishing limit, and those are marked in the text on each figure, and then, as you start to go to the lower quantiles, it drops it accordingly, and you can see this.

If we look at the change in overfishing limits, it jumps it up there to thirty-four million, and then it slowly tapers it towards the 18.3, as those strong recruitments move through the fishery, and, of course, the assumption is mean recruitment into the future, and so forecasted yields in the next five years are much higher than the current yields. The large increase is a result of this high-recruitment period, up to 2016, plus the fact that the current exploitation is considerably lower than the fishing limit, and then these catches are projected to decline each year, as that strong cohort moves through the fishery.

Here is that same information in tabular format, and this is millions of pounds shown, and so, for reference, each of those -- What represented those dashed lines of quantiles are now shown as TAC estimates for each of those probabilities, and you can see, overall, that each one of them is higher than the current yields.

Again, just a quick review of our main findings. South Atlantic mackerel are determined to be not overfished, and the fisheries are not overfishing. The current exploitation rate is much lower than the defined target of F SPR 30, and that is a limit of fishing exploitation, and SS 3, as configured, proves stable in its long-term trend estimates, yet responsive to the current data, as seen by the cyclical change in recruitment estimated by the model, but yet consistent long-term scale and trend.

Here we have seen that the recruitment is estimated to have cycled from this five-year low, right up to SEDAR 38, to this four-year high period recently, from 2013 to 2016, and this high recruitment leads to a large increase in near-term catch projections. If fully exploited at the fishing limit, landings in 2021 increase sharply, followed by a steady reduction.

Here, I would just like to thank all the collaborators across the state and federal agencies that worked really hard to put this together, and it's certainly no easy task, and I am happy and proud to represent all their hard work. Thank you for your time.

MR. POLAND: I really appreciate that, Matt. That's good to get some good news about a stock. All right. Does anyone on the committee have any questions for Matt? All right. I am seeing none. Again, Matt, thank you, and thanks to everyone that you acknowledged for their hard work on this. We appreciate it.

DR. LAURETTA: I'm happy to do it.

MR. POLAND: All right, and so it looks like we've got about ten minutes to four, and next is to receive the SSC report. Genny, do you think ten minutes is appropriate, or would you be willing to hang around until after public comment?

DR. NESSLAGE: I think I could probably do it in ten minutes, but, if there's questions, maybe not, but I am happy to stick around and do it after public comment. That's fine.

MR. POLAND: Okay. If you're fine with that, I might go ahead and suggest that we break now for public comment and just ask that the committee stick around afterwards and stay, and maybe we can get through Agenda Item 2, and does that please the committee?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sounds good.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you. Stick around for public comment. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. POLAND: I will call the Mackerel Cobia Committee back into order. Before we broke for public comment, we received a presentation on the stock assessment from Matt Lauretta, and so next up on the agenda is to receive the SSC report from Genny Nesslage.

DR. NESSLAGE: Thank you, Steve. The SSC was pleased to review the king mackerel update assessment, and I am happy to report that the SSC agrees that the assessment appropriately addressed the terms of reference as best scientific information available, and, thus, it provides an adequate basis for determining stock status and supporting fishing level recommendations.

We were asked to comment on factors that affect reliability of the estimates of stock status and fishing level recommendations. As was indicated during public comment, the SSC had a few concerns, and the first is that there was one model diagnostic that indicated that some of the parameters are not well estimated, because they are likely highly correlated, and I will elaborate on that in some of my later slides, and then, as was brought up by Ben and Rusty as well, there is a good deal of uncertainty surrounding how the winter mixing zone landings are assigned to the Gulf versus Atlantic stocks, given there is quite a bit of spatial and temporal variability in how that mixing occurs, and the dynamics of the fishing fleet can vary annually, which also contributes to the difficulty in assigning landings to the mixing zone, and so that's something that could be affecting the overall stock status and fishing level recommendations.

Regarding the risks and consequences of assessment uncertainties, as I mentioned before, the was one model diagnostic, the max gradient, that indicated that the assessment model might be having a little bit of difficulty estimating all the parameters well, and it's likely that the model configuration is probably not ideal, given the available data. However, modifying the model's configuration was really kind of outside the bounds of an update assessment within the SEDAR process, and the SSC respected that.

We really just don't know whether the impact -- What the impact of this would be, and it could be quite minor, but, without more information on what exactly is going on under the hood of this model, we really can't be more explicit about what those potential risks and consequences would be.

We were asked if the methods of addressing uncertainty are consistent with our expectations and the available information, and we agreed that the methods were consistent with the available information, but we noted that the parameter uncertainty wasn't characterized quite as fully as it is in other Southeast Center assessments where the Monte Carlo Bootstrap Method is used, and, therefore, we adjusted the Tier 2 uncertainty score used in setting the ABC, and we lowered that to a medium, and I will elaborate on that in a later slide.

Regarding factors that contribute to risk and impact the stock status determinations and future yield projections, again, we just wanted to raise this model convergence issue, which just couldn't be explored during the update assessment, and so, the degree to which these factors are impacting stock status, we just can't really say at this time, and I will talk a little bit about that when I get to research recommendations, and then, again, there is uncertainty surrounding how those mixing zone landings are assigned to each of the dolphin Atlantic stocks.

We did encounter one particular issue with regard to applying the ABC control rule. Once again, the SSC struggled a bit with the MRAG recommendations for the productivity and susceptibility risk score, and the MRAG report indicated that king mackerel was a high-risk stock, and we didn't agree with that determination, given that the stock, according to this assessment, has never been overfished and has not undergone overfishing, and there is no evidence of age or size truncation, and that the species matures quite early, at about age-two.

We ended up recommending the Tier 4 score be changed from high to low, such that the -- Well, I will talk a little bit more about that in the next slide, but it seems that we keep coming across this issue where we disagree with the PSA risk analysis, and so we recognize that this will be part of the changes that will hopefully be considered during the ABC control rule amendment, and we would just reiterate that we would recommend that work continue on this as expediently as possible.

I will just run you through our ABC control rule determination recommendation, and so, for Tier 1 assessment information, we gave it a Level 2, which is typical for a statistical model that uses proxy reference points. For Tier 2 uncertainty characterization, this is where I mentioned earlier that we assigned it a medium score, given that the full uncertainty is not carried forward in the projections.

For Tier 3, stock status, it's thankfully not overfished or overfishing, and so there was no adjustment there, and then, again, for Tier 4, we assigned the stock a low-risk score, which resulted in no adjustment, and so the total adjustments, if you count up Tier 1 and 2, make 7.5 percent, and so the SSC recommends that projections at a P* of 50 percent be used to set the OFL and a P* of 42.5 percent be used to set the ABC.

If you are interested in seeing how those turn out into OFL and ABC recommendations, take a look at Table 3, which can be found on page 15 of our report, and there's one thing that the SSC wanted the council to realize. When you're looking at this table for the OFL and ABC recommendations, as Matt mentioned, the stock is currently well above the biomass target of SPR 30 percent, due in part to this unusually high recent recruitment from 2013 forward, and so, if you end up fishing at the recommended OFL, that would result, essentially, in a three-fold increase over current fishing mortality, and thus higher landings, and so what you see here for the OFL recommendations begins at a higher level than current catches and then decreases over time, as the stock approaches the target.

Some folks on the SSC were concerned that people would see this decline over time, but, really, what you're seeing is a good situation, where you're way above the target, and, if you fished at the ABC, you would end up bringing it right back down to the target as the stock declines down and that strong cohort passes through the fishery.

We were asked if there are any metrics that should be monitored for this stock, and one thing that the SSC discussed was that, previously, there had been extensively sampling of the commercial handline fleet off of North Carolina, but then folks pointed out that there had been a series of, unfortunately, many hurricanes in recent years that had disrupted that sampling program, and so we were hopeful that perhaps, if the weather cooperates, that that sampling could resume, because it was important to the assessment.

Then, if it's found that the model is sensitive to this mixing zone composition, we suggest that the mixing zone be monitored more closely for the relative contribution of Atlantic versus Gulf of Mexico fish, and then, finally, we recommend that folks continue to monitor the SEAMAP index for future recruitment signals.

With regard to research recommendations, the SSC concurred with those listed in the assessment report, and we added a few of our own, the first being, again, that folks take a look at exploring the model's sensitivity to the mixing zone catch ratio in the next assessment, and also that there be some work done, hopefully ahead of the next assessment, to identify the source of the poor model convergence criteria, the max gradient, and that that information be communicated to the SSC, for reasons that I will explain in my next slide.

We also suggested that model sensitivity be explored to the start date of the assessment model as well as the choice of the estimation technique for method for estimating natural mortality and that a little bit more sensitivity be explored in how the indices are fit within the model. Then, finally, our take-home from all three of these assessments that you've seen this week is that, once the South Atlantic Climate Vulnerability Assessment comes out, that any of the findings that are specific to king mackerel be taken into consideration in the next assessment, as appropriate.

With regard to timing of the next assessment, the SSC recommends waiting to see the results of what might be going on with this model diagnostic issue prior to recommending the venue or timing of the next assessment, and we're hopeful that this is just a minor thing, a small tweak, and maybe a short TOR adjustment, and this could be done in a very simple framework, but, if it does require major model configuration changes, then, of course, the timing and the venue for the assessment -- What we would recommend for that would change, and that's my report, and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Genny. I appreciate that. Does anyone from the committee have any questions for Genny on the SSC report? All right. Thank you again, Genny. I think Matt is still on the line, and so, if anyone has any lingering questions from the assessment as well, please raise your hand. I am seeing no hands raised. What is the pleasure of the committee? We received ABC recommendations from the SSC, and we've already done this twice already this meeting, and so I assume we'll probably put forward a very standard motion, much like we did with amberjack.

MS. WIEGAND: I've got a draft motion up on the board, Steve, if that helps, and you will notice the language is almost identical to what you did for greater amberjack.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Christina. **The draft motion on the board is to direct staff to bring back an options paper to the September meeting, including consideration of sector**

allocations and catch level adjustments, based on SSC recommendations and the recent stock assessment update.

MR. BELL: **Mr. Chair, I would be glad to make that motion at this time, if you would like.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel.

MR. BELL: I can even read it, if you need me to.

MR. POLAND: I just read it, and I think we're fine. I see Spud has his hand raised, and I'll assume that's a second.

MR. WOODWARD: That is correct. I second the motion.

MR. POLAND: All right. Is there any further discussion on this motion? **Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** All right. We're done with the Atlantic king mackerel stock assessment update. Again, thank you, Matt and Genny, for your presentations and everyone's work. Go ahead, Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Just a question, and I'm not sure how this was handled in amberjack and dolphin and wahoo, but will there be an analysis based on the same time series that yielded the existing allocation formula?

MS. WIEGAND: That's certainly something that we could include in the options paper that we'll bring you in September. We will bring you a suite of options to consider for allocations for you to discuss, and one of those can include the current allocation and what that would look like if we kept the years and percentages the same.

MR. POLAND: Thanks for that, Spud, and it sounds like the direction to staff is clear on that.

MR. WOODWARD: Just a follow-up, and the reason I bring that up is because I think, if we're going to discuss possible changes in allocation, we need to be sure how the allocation, current allocation, ratios would have been changed based on a simple update of the same time series, and I assume that's going to be done for the other stocks as well, amberjack and the dolphin wahoo.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Spud. Yes, I'm on the same page with you, and I assume that would be something that we would look at in this information paper and the others, and it seems like staff is clear on that. Any other comments before we move on from king mackerel? All right. With no hands raised, we'll go back to the Mackerel agenda.

We didn't receive a status of amendments under formal review yet, and I do not see Rick on my list of participants, and so, if there's anyone else from the Regional Office that could give us that update.

MS. WIEGAND: I think Rick is still here.

MR. DEVICTOR: Yes, I'm here. There's not too much to report here, but just that we did publish a proposed rule for CMP Framework Amendment 8, and that's open for comment right now, and so comments are due by June 18, and that basically increases the trip limit.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Rick. Any questions for Rick? I am not seeing any hands raised. Now we'll move on to a discussion on COVID-19 impacts. Christina, take it away.

MS. WIEGAND: The presentation hasn't changed, and this presentation is still the same one that Myra gave you during the Snapper Grouper Committee that sort of summarized impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic by industry, or by sector, and, if there's anything that you guys wanted to review in that, I can flip back to some of those slides.

What we really wanted to spend time doing now is letting you guys have a little bit of time to just briefly brainstorm what you might want to consider for an emergency rule, in terms of mackerel and cobia regulations, and then, of course, you will be continuing that conversation during Full Council tomorrow, and so, Steve, I will leave it up to you, and you're welcome to have some people brainstorm now, or we can wait and have this conversation during Full Council tomorrow. It's whatever the committee would prefer.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Christina. I will just pose the question or opportunity to the committee, and does anyone have any thoughts right now? Most of these stocks, king mackerel and Spanish mackerel, are not overfished, and overfishing is not occurring, and I know, at least for the Spanish mackerel, the commercial component does typically reach its ACL, but king mackerel has been under, but we've also taken action to kind of liberalize bag limits through certain seasons, to catch a little bit more of that, and they're still coming under, and so there might be some wiggle room there, in king mackerel. Does anybody have any thoughts, or do we just feel like we kind of want to wait until tomorrow, when we have this broader discussion, and after we receive the presentations from the state reps on state-specific COVID impacts?

MR. WOODWARD: We can certainly wait until tomorrow to get into the details of it, but I know the issue that has been brought up in some of the materials presented to us about this ongoing discussion of increasing the bag limit from two to three, and I would like some feedback, I guess, from the folks that are most familiar with whether that would be a benefit and possibly help mitigate some of the loss of business on the for-hire sector, if that would draw some customers back that might have been lost.

I know, just from a personal standpoint, our mackerel fishery didn't really start until I guess mid-May or so, and we had no restrictions on the for-hire sector, in terms of preventing them from operating, and we had a lot of recreational, private recreational, boat activity, and so, anyway, I think that might be some low-hanging fruit that we can ponder, is if there's a benefit to be accrued by bumping up that Florida bag limit, and we can certainly talk about that.

MR. POLAND: You're talking about the recreational bag limit, and so the three fish, or Florida is still at two fish, correct, and the rest of us are at three?

MR. WOODWARD: Right, and that's been discussed in the past, about bumping it up if the stock is healthy and can stand it, but we could certainly use a lot of feedback from folks like Ira and all that could tell us whether that would be beneficial.

MR. POLAND: Yes, I think that's definitely something to carry forward tomorrow, when we have this discussion, and I know we've also -- I received input from the Mackerel Cobia AP on considering increasing the recreational bag limits throughout the region, and so bumping it up to potentially four. Anybody else? I know, if we look at the Spanish mackerel side of it, it's already at fifteen, and I don't know if more than fifteen mackerel -- If that would add any benefit, as far as increasing interest in a trip and that kind of stuff, but the recreational Spanish mackerel is also chronically underharvested as well, and so that's a potential option, and I'm not saying that I am advocating for it one way or another, but that's also out there.

MS. WIEGAND: Steve, if you believe it would be helpful for the committee, like you did mention, the AP recently discussed changes to the recreational sector that could be made last October, and they did talk about king mackerel and Spanish mackerel bag limits, and, if it's helpful, I can have that advisory panel report sent back out to council members, so you can review it before the conversation tomorrow.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Christina. Yes, I think that would be very helpful. All right. Does anybody else have any additional comments or ideas for CMP species? Seeing no hands raised, now we'll move on to Other Business. Does anybody have any other business to bring before the Mackerel Cobia Committee? I am not hearing any, and so, with that, we'll go ahead and adjourn the Mackerel Cobia Committee for the June 2020 council meeting. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 10, 2020.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
7/20/2020

SAFMC June Council Meeting
Attendee Report: (6/8/20 - 6/11/20)

Report Generated:

06/11/2020 07:43 AM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time
714-501-819	06/10/2020 07:49 AM EDT

Last Name	First Name
Addis	Dustin
Barr	Brice
Beal	00Bob
Beckwith	00Anna
Belcher	00Carolyn
Bell	00Mel
Bianchi	Alan
Blum	Catherine
Bonney	02Rick
Bonura	Vincent
Brennan	Ken
Brouwer	01Myra
Bruce	James
Bubley	Walter
Burgess	Erika
Byrd	Julia
Carmichael	01John
Chaya	01Cindy
Cheshire	Rob
Cheuvront	01Brian
Christiansen	00Kyle
Clarke	Lora
Conklin	00Chris
Copeland	00Robert
Cox	Derek
Craig	Nico
Crimian	Robert
DeVictor	00Rick
Defilippi Simpson	Julie
DiLernia	Anthony
Dunn	Russell
Errigo	01Michael
Exley	Gary
Finch	Margaret
Fitzpatrick	Eric
Foss	Kristin

Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
Glasgow	Dawn
Gore	Karla
Grimes	Shepherd
Griner	Tim
Guyas	Martha
Hadley	01John
Harrison	01BeBe
Hart	Hannah
Hartig	Ben
Haymans	Doug
Helies	02Frank
Hemilright	Dewey
Henderson	Chanse
Howington	Kathleen
Hudson	Rusty
Iberle	01Allie
Iverson	01Kim
Jepson	Michael
Johnson	Denise
Johnson	Alison
KELLY	BILL
Karnauskas	Mandy
Keener	Paula
Klasnick	01Kelly
Knowlton	Kathy
Kolmos	Kevin
Kramer	Rob
LARKIN	Michael
Laks	Ira
Lam	Elliott
Laney	Reid Wilson
Lauretta	02Matt
Levy	Mara
Long	Stephen
Malik	Joan
Martinez	Jackson
Mask III	Tad
McCawley	00-Jessica
McCoy	Sherylanne
McGovern	00John
McPherson	Matthew
Mehta	Nikhil
Merrifield	Mike
Montes	Jeremy
Moss	David
Musick	Susanna

Nee	Shannon
Neer	Julie
Nesslage	02 Genny
O'Shaughnessy	Pat
Palmer	Vince
Peterson	Cassidy
Pfleger	Mariah
Porch	00Clay
Pugliese	01Roger
Pulver	Jeff
Ralston	Kellie
Records	David
Reichert	Marcel
Reynolds	Jonathon
Rhodes	01Cameron
Roberson	Kimberly
Rock	Jason
Sagarese	Skyler
Sapp	00Art
Schmidtke	Michael
Schueller	Amy
Sedberry	George
Seward	McLean
Sinkus	Wiley
Smit-Brunello	Monica
Smith	Duane
Soss	Alison
Spanik	Kevin
Spurgin	Kali
Sweetman	CJ
TRAVIS	MICHAEL
Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Thomas	Janie
Vara	Mary
Waters	James
Whitaker	David
Wiegand	01Christina
Williams	Erik
Willis	Michelle
Woodward	00Spud
Wrege	Beth
Wyanski	David
bennett-martin	paulita
brewer	chester
collier	01chip
crabtree	00Roy
crosson	scott

geiger	george
kraft	todd
poland	00steve
sandorf	scott
sminkey	thomas
thomas	suz
walter	john