

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COMMITTEE

**King and Prince Hotel
St. Simons Island, GA**

March 5, 2015

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mackerel Committee:

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

Mark Brown
Jack Cox
Dr. Michelle Duval
Charlie Phillips
Zack Bowen

Council Members:

Chester Brewer
Lt. Morgan Fowler

Dr. Wilson Laney
Chris Conklin

Council Staff:

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

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

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Roy Williams
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Marcel Reichart
Erika Burgess

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Iris Lowery
Sp. Agt. Tracey Woodruff
Pres Pate
Dr. George Sedberry

Additional Observers Attached

The Mackerel Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Sidney Lanier Ballroom of the King and Prince Hotel, St. Simons Island, Georgia, March 5, 2015, and was called to order at 8:30 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: We're going to go ahead and convene the Mackerel Committee. The first order of business is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved. That brings us down to the approval of the December 2014 minutes. Are there any deletions or corrections to the minutes or additions? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. That brings us to Dr. Jack McGovern who will bring us up to date on the status of the commercial and recreation catches.

DR. McGOVERN: These landings are found at Tab 9, Attachment 1. This is presented the way it has been the last couple of meetings. They provided by Sue Gerhart; and she got it from Heather Blachowski at the Science Center. It shows monthly landings for the March through February fishing years for king mackerel in this case from the 2009 fishing year through the 2012 fishing year and then the 2013 and 2014 fishing years the landings are presented monthly and cumulative.

Most recently we have landings through February 19th and 37 percent of the quota has been met. The landings are a little bit higher than they were last year but lower than in the previous years. Moving down to Spanish mackerel, the landings are presented the same way. We're at 94 percent of the adjusted quota; 81 percent of the quota. Landings are lower than they were last year. We exceed the quota last year by 10 percent. Moving down to cobia, the fishing year is the calendar year and we were right at a hundred percent of the quota and we've met 5 percent of the quota so far this year.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions for Jack? One thing I'd like to say what Sue put into the announcement about when we went to 75 fish on king mackerel in the trip limit in the East Coast Subzone this time, which was I guess the 1st of March; she put a blurb in there about there are different regulations in state waters than federal waters because the state doesn't have the ability to change trip limits in that short a time frame.

The trip limit in the state waters remains at 50 fish. She put that blurb in there. I get questions about that every year and I appreciate her putting that in there because that is something that the fishermen need to be reminded of because the marine patrol does enforce that. No questions; do you want to go on to the recreational?

DR. McGOVERN: Okay, these are recreational landings for coastal migratory pelagics put together by Mike Larkin in our office and Dr. Ponwith's staff. It includes landings through Wave 5 of last year, 2014. We're expecting to get Wave 6 landings anytime now. It compares the landings from the 2013 fishing year and then the next slide is the 2014 fishing year.

Cobia, which is the calendar year, in 2013 79 percent of the quota was met, and then last year through Wave 5 72 percent of the recreational ACL was met. For king mackerel, 15 percent in the 2013 fishing year and through Wave 5 of last year 16 percent has been met. Then for Spanish 72 percent and thus far for this fishing year 28 percent of the ACL has been met. We

have the landings broken down by sector for king mackerel; and we see the private sector dominates the landings. This shows it graphically and we see we're way below the recreational ACL the last few years.

For Spanish, again the private sector dominates. The ACL went up this past year through Framework Amendment 1, and we're well below that in the past fishing year. We don't have the complete landings for this fishing year yet.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions for Jack on the recreational landings? That brings us to status of amendments under formal review.

DR. McGOVERN: We have a number of amendments. I'll start off with Amendment 20B. This modifies the commercial hook-and-line trip limits for Gulf Group Mackerel. It changes the fishing year for Gulf Migratory King Mackerel for the Eastern and Western Zone. It establishes transit provisions to travel through areas that are closed for king mackerel.

It has regional quotas for Atlantic King Mackerel and Spanish Mackerel. It increases the ACLs for cobia, and it creates a Florida East Coast Zone that has its own quota. It modifies the framework procedure. The final rule for this amendment published on January 27th and it became effective on March 1st.

Mackerel Framework 2013 allows Atlantic Migratory Group Spanish Mackerel harvested with gillnet in the South Atlantic in excess of the trip limit to be transferred to another federally permitted vessel that has not yet harvested its trip limit. The final rule for that amendment published on November 19th and became effective on December 19th.

Mackerel Framework Amendment 1, which I just talked about, increases the ACLs for Spanish Mackerel in the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. The final rule for that published on November 20th and became effective on December 22nd.

Mackerel Framework Amendment 2 modifies the system of trip limits for Spanish Mackerel in the Southern Zone, which is South Carolina, Georgia and Eastern Florida. That proposed rule package is under review; and I expect we'll get it up to headquarters fairly soon. That's it.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions about the amendments under formal review? I appreciate getting some of them done on the first of this month; so that's a good thing. That brings to a report from the Gulf Council Meeting, and that is Attachment 3 in your briefing book. Kari.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I'll go through it and Zack can answer questions.

MR. HARTIG: Before you get started, Roy Williams from the Gulf Council is here as well. Roy was instrumental in doing some of the very early tagging work for stock ID with king mackerel. He has a long history of working with king mackerel. I know he finds this interesting on the new boundaries and everything as well.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: The Gulf Mackerel Committee reviewed that renumbering of how we're going to do Amendment 26 and 28. They received their recommendations from the SSC on SEDAR 38. Then they reviewed the Amendment 26 scoping document and approved for scoping. They have the cities where they're going to go for the scoping. Then they went through Amendment 28 and talked about splitting the permits or two for one.

They're going to scope that when they go scope Amendment 26. They also are working on a framework amendment for the king mackerel gillnet fishery down in the Keys; to look at trip limits, accountability measures and latent permits. I know they met with the permit holders down there in January and are working on that. Since we've changed the framework procedure, the South Atlantic doesn't have to approve that. It will just go through the Gulf since the framework.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions about the Gulf Report? Seeing none; we'll move on to the scoping comments.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: You have the PDF portfolio document in Attachment 4. It has some written comments and then the scoping document that we used at the meeting so you can check that out. I also made a scoping summary. These scoping meetings; we had one in person, we had a webinar, and then we also asked for written comments.

It was for items for that were in Amendment 26. However, there were some broader mackerel-related comments, so that is why I'm doing it separately from Amendment 26 so you guys can hear all that. We had 16 folks provide public comment at the Cocoa Beach Meeting, and then we had a scoping webinar where we had one comment. We received three written comments; and you also received a comment I think this past week that I'll include in there.

This summary is just Mackerel Amendment 26 even though the Cocoa meeting did include some snapper grouper comments, but those went under the Snapper Grouper Committee. Overall what we heard that was support for the ABCs under high recruitment and medium recruitment; ACLs set at the ABCs; support for updating that stock management boundary.

We didn't find support for endorsements in the Florida East Coast Subzone or really any other subzone. They wanted to leave those all available and open for everyone who has a king mackerel permit. Reconsider allowing bag limit sales of fish for the for-hire trips on the dually permitted vessels like they have in the Gulf; support for the bag limit sales in the shark gillnet fishery.

There was concern about how the 20B zones were going to work with this new ACL, but I have that in Attachment 5A. I will be going through that when we get to Amendment 26; how the 20B zones are going to be recalculated and how that is going to look under the different ABCs. We will go through that.

Specifically for Amendment 26, the commenters noted abundance of small fish and high recruitment period and supported setting the ACL at the highest level possible under that high recruitment scenario ABC. There were two comments to support medium recruitment ABC.

One commenter felt the OFL should be much higher due to high recruitment during several non-hurricane years that we've had.

We also got a recommendation to roll over to the next year any unused quota. One comment was concern about lack of information of the dynamics of stock mixing in SEDAR 38. We did get support for updating the stock and management boundary in the mixing zone based on SEDAR 38. We had the comments about the 20B zones. They were concerned about how this was going to work when it was included – when all those Florida East Coast winter landings were included.

There were some individuals who did not support a separate northern zone quota. Then there was some concern about how the Gulf Zone reallocation was going to work when they update their ACL; and I'll go through that, also. They had some comments specifically about the Gulf zone allocations; that Florida West Coast Zone. The Northern Subzone around the Panhandle should have the largest proportion; and then also some comments about on how a trip limit would work there.

We had support for the bag limit sales of king mackerel in the shark gillnet fishery but with strict enforcement and then a specific small number that can be sold. We did not have support for the endorsements because this would affect traveling fishermen. They were not supportive of any kind of endorsements for the zones or subzones.

Also, some of the commenters noted that they thought that would be a step towards catch shares; and they were opposed to that. We asked about a sub-quota for the Florida East Coast Subzone and got one support for that. And then moving the subzone boundaries from what it is now, adjusting that area; and we will go over that.

Then we had a commenter say wait until the new ACLs are in place and then we can address management measures in the Florida East Coast Subzone; and then a recommendation for changing the fishing year. We did have a lot of commenters talk about bag limit sales and allowing the charter vessels to go back to selling bag limits of king mackerel as long as they were dually permitted.

They felt like that was a much-needed income supplement and reduce the waste that it would be consistent with allowing the shark gillnetters to sell bag limit caught king mackerel. They even recommended moving a part of the recreational ACL to the commercial ACL to cover that or creating some kind of quota specifically in the recreational ACL for bag limit sales.

We had some interesting comments in support of the bag limit sales. For example, if you have a king mackerel permit you were using for bag limit sales only and then you weren't allowed to use it for that, you may start taking commercial trips which could increase the catch of king mackerel; and then how bag limit sales can keep the supply in the fish house even if commercial harvest is slow; and then importance of that income and bag limit sales for those guys.

Then we went through the 20B zones, and I'm going to dig into that when we get to Attachment 5A and explain how that is going to work with these new ACLs. Then we had a few other

comments. At the Cocoa meeting we had a big discussion and I took notes during that. We had several discussion comments who did not support splitting the – I mean, persons who did not support splitting the permits into separate Gulf and Atlantic commercial permits.

We did have one supporter of separating the permits or the FMP. There are a lot of folks who are interesting in putting in some kind of two for one like for snapper grouper, using a two for one to reduce the number of king mackerel permits over time. And then a comment about the three-person limit for commercial trips for mackerel compare to our four-person limit for snapper grouper. Then we had some comments that opposed catch shares for king mackerel in the CMP.

MR. HARTIG: It was a lively hearing in Cocoa, to say the least. I think one of the problems with the fishermen, most fishermen have a fear of change and there are a lot of changes with the zones on our side, with the new assessment, with what is going to happen where they had been catching their wintertime fish over the years.

There was a lot of fear and that came out in the discussion; and I don't blame them; I understand. It has taken some of the fishermen time to think about everything in total. They were real concerned of what are the numbers going to be? As we go into this, how is this all going to work out? That was the other unknown; we didn't have any numbers to show them at that time.

I think since that time there has been some simmering down. Some people who have taken the time to look at where we are now have settled in more or less into looking at this. The East Coast Subzone; they didn't know whether they wanted to keep it or not initially, but I think in the evolution of that I think at several of the ones – the high-profile ones that spoke a lot and I talked to; that they think that is probably pretty good idea going forward. It is always tricky when you deal with a lot of changes in a relatively short period of time, but we're going to get through it. I think we have some options to do that. Mark.

MR. BROWN: Ben, do you see a lot of new guys getting into it, younger guys getting into the mackerel fishery?

MR. HARTIG: It has been a general progression. There are not a lot of new guys getting into it, but there is some. They're still dominated by the older fishermen – I mean, younger than me but 50, probably, 40, 45, 50-plus. The one thing I did want to talk about as far as the scoping comments go was the sale of for-hire caught king mackerel.

Generationally in this fishery – and I have been in it a long time – there was always – the fishermen didn't want to see that sale happen. But looking at the next group of fishermen coming up and how they have gotten into the fishery, in the for-hire fishery in particular in that area of Cocoa, they didn't – you know, they want to stay in fishing, but they're looking at how the king mackerel fishery is being prosecuted.

If you're a king mackerel fisherman, you fish in that East Coast Subzone and then you've got to go to the Gulf. Really, when you look at your family life, it is a lot of time away from home. Some of these guys have in their business plan, the for-hire guys, younger guys, been in it ten or

twelve years and some of the ones who have switched over from commercial and for-hire – and there have been a number of those that I've known long term in that area – their business plan was to be able to sell that bag limit caught king mackerel on their trips.

That's the business plan they had. I hadn't really heard that before. Once Jim Bussey, the dealer, started saying this is an important part in that particular area of my business of buying fish from those recreational fishermen, and then I saw the support for it – it wasn't unanimous but there was quite a bit of support for that for-hire sales. It seems to me that maybe we ought to relook at that issue at some time.

There is some action behind the scenes. The Southeast Fisheries Association, Bob Jones has taken it upon himself – he doesn't have an objection, but he wants it to be done right and have the HACCP Regulations that the commercial fishery are subject to; also the recreational sale be subject to that and how that happen.

I don't think that's a problem because the recreational guys have a permit; therefore, they would be subject to the same HACCP Regulations that we are, it seems to me. But they want to hash that out, and they're going to have a meeting outside of our process, bring some people together and talk about options and what species may be included.

I think you'll see something come before us probably by our next meeting, maybe, about some options that they're going to throw around and talk about. There is a lot of interest. Ray Rosher wants to sell dolphin and he is thinking about South Florida and how commercial fishing has gone away in South Florida; starting to look at all these things based on what is happening in some of these regional areas where you don't have any commercial dolphin production any longer.

Those types of things where those guys are on the water every day; that was an important part of supplying local markets for dolphin. If you remember, John Jolley was a pretty strong supporter of that. I've read all these e-mails and things and it may be something we want to look at. Certainly, if you read the public hearing minutes from that – what was that man's name? I can't remember the guy's name, but he gave a long set of comments about why – you know, laying out the business plan and why it is important to him.

The other thing is if someone makes that decision and wants to stay in fishing and doesn't want to go into the commercial sector, on a daily basis they're not having the mortality impacts that the real commercial fishermen are. That was something else I thought about. If they have six people, they're allowed 12 fish in that area.

If he was on a commercial trip, he would be catching 50; so you kind of try and balance that out. That was another thought that came up. It was an interesting meeting, to say the least, and I will leave it at that. If you want to read the minutes, we have them. Jack.

MR. COX: So you were saying the for-hire guys have the permits; so they have king permits; is that what you're saying?

MR. HARTIG: Yes; they have both the king mackerel permit and charter for-hire permit. All the comments that I heard was the only people that would be allowed to sell in the for-hire would be people who had the commercial and the for-hire permit. You narrow your universe of people down quite a bit by that. Some of these guys as well in your area go commercial fishing when they don't have charters. A portion of the year when things are slow, they do commercial fish. Any other questions about the scoping comments? Kari, that brings us to Amendment 26.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: The Gulf Mackerel AP met yesterday I think and I just received kind of a summary of some of their comments, and I want to go ahead and put them in with this report while we're kind of talking about kind of broader issues. For 26, they just had a couple of comments and one would be supporting allowing bag limit sales in the shark gillnet fishery as long as the vessel had the federal king mackerel commercial permit and the commercial season is open wherever they are.

Also, they support setting the management boundary for king mackerel at Dade/Monroe so that the Gulf would manage all of king mackerel in the Keys. That would be in part for the gillnet fleet. They would have a consistent set of regulations across the Keys and then also for the gillnetters working in the Keys. It would also match the king mackerel boundary with the Spanish mackerel boundary.

Then under Amendment 28, they discussed looking into separating the king mackerel permits. They were supportive of that and supportive of exploring the two separate FMPs. Then they actually gave some very specific conditions to consider when deciding who gets the permits, if you decide to split the permits, like qualifiers, the pound qualifiers during a certain period. Reducing the possessing limit for cobia from two to one in the Gulf of Mexico recreational fishery; and then the AP recommended that the councils explore implementing an IFQ for the commercial hook-and-line Gulf king mackerel.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions about the information from the Gulf AP? I appreciate that, Kari; I wasn't aware they met right there. That is hot off the presses information. One of the things that I have been talking to Kari as we look at that mixing zone; I was concerned about the gillnet landings and where they occur and if any of them do occur within the mixing zone.

The landings don't show it. If they are occurring, they don't show up in the landings. Somehow if some of those landings do occur and we had management of that, they wouldn't be allowed to be able to do that, at least the way I remember the regulations. They would be limited to the bag limit within the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction or in the southern part of the area. I may be wrong, but that is the way I remember it back in time. Anyhow, the next item of business, 26.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: The way I think I'm going to do this, because there are a lot of actions, is you have Attachment 5, and that is your decision document. What we're going to do is go through – and some of the actions and alternatives that you directed to put together, we're going to review the language that we had provided and make sure that captures what you want and we have all the alternatives that you want.

And then there are some other actions in there that you may need to give us some guidance on what alternatives you want; but then there is also an attachment that went out last Friday. We called it Attachment 5A, and Mike Collins sent that to you. It is also posted on the website if you to pull that up. This is examples of how the ACLs will look with the 20B zones and the mixing zone.

What I'm going to do is go through the first couple actions in the decision document; and then when we get to the ABC parts, we will have a discussion about the different ABC alternatives. Mike Errigo is going to come up here and talk about that and maybe get some more SSC input. Then we get to the option about the ACLs, I'm going to switch to that Attachment 5A and work through that document and make sure everybody is understanding how this is going to work. Does that good?

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: We're going to start with Attachment 5. We have the potential action items we scoped and the direction you gave us the last time. The first would be to modify the management/stock boundary based on the SEDAR 38. Then we're going to begin to revising the biological parameters, the ABC, OY, ACL, ACT for Atlantic group; talk about the bag limit sales of Atlantic king mackerel in the shark gillnet fishery; the sub-quota for the new mixing zone.

We can also talk about a sub-quota for the Florida East Coast Subzone. Then we have the Gulf actions to revise their ACL for SEDAR 38; revise the zone and subzone commercial quotas. They are also looking at their recreational and commercial allocation of Gulf king mackerel. Here is a proposed modified timeline for how this may work we're thinking right now.

We scoped in January/February. You guys are reviewing your scoping comments, actions and alternatives. Then we will send that over to the Gulf. Their meeting is at the very end of March into April. They will review that and they'll revise their actions and alternatives. Our AP meets in April and they will be able to work through these and provide some recommendations for you guys.

The SSC meets at the end of April, and so they can review anything that you guys need them to review and give some recommendations. Then in June we'll all be in Key West, and I think the plan is to have a joint meeting so we can work through some of these actions and approve for public hearings. Those will be held in August 2015.

Then you will review in September. We have the current schedule as you approving all actions in September and then final review in December. We would need to complete this if you wanted to get any updates to the ACLs for the 2016 years. Then the Gulf would review and take final action in October.

This is an ambitious timeline; and there a lot of actions in there and so we just want to let everybody know that the more actions we add, it could slow it down. If there are actions that you're interested in but you want the ACL and updated management boundary to move through

quickly; you may want to consider moving some actions to another amendment just to not slow down the ACL.

A little background just to review with everybody; we had SEDAR 38. At your last meeting the SSC went through their recommendations for the ABCs and they provided several different options for that, and we'll go through that. We also have an item to consider allowing bag limit sales of Atlantic king mackerel for folks participating in the small coastal shark fisheries and drift gillnets.

We did have a recommendation to just not specify that this is the small coastal shark fishery; just the shark fishery gillnetters. They're not allowed to sell that king mackerel under their federal king mackerel commercial permits because just gillnet is not an authorized gear; so they would have to sell it as a bag limit. This would set a provision for them to be able to do that.

Then we also talked about the Florida East Coast Subzone. There had been some concern about the effort there and then also how that is going to be managed now that we're switching that over to Atlantic king mackerel. I went through the scoping comments so I'm not going to go through those again. We can talk about those when we get to the actions.

Potential Action 1; this is going to modify the management boundary for Gulf and Atlantic Migratory Groups of King Mackerel. In SEDAR 38 they used an approach that designated the stock boundary shown in this Figure 1. They designated the mixing zone down here in this purple area. Previously the mixing zone had gone all the way to the Flagler/Volusia Line up the east coast when the boundary shifted in the winter.

We have some actions and alternatives. Alternative 1 is no action, and we have Figure 2 and Figure 3. Those show you what the current management boundaries are and how the king mackerel boundary shifts in the winter. Alternative 2 establishes a permanent year-round boundary so it wouldn't shift back and forth.

The mixing zone would be designated as the area south of the Florida Keys and the Dry Tortugas, which is the council's jurisdiction in the Keys. In Figure 4 is that area just south and east of the Florida Keys with the stripes in it. The South Atlantic Council would be responsible for management measures in the mixing zone.

The way this would be accounted for the landings in the winter, November 1st through March 31st, king mackerel landings in that mixing zone would be counted 50 percent Gulf and 50 percent Atlantic. The rest of the year it would just be counted Atlantic. This alternative would give the South Atlantic Council the management responsibility throughout the whole year.

None of these are set in stone. These are ones that are IPT recommendations so you guys here are to select which ones you want to proceed with, put in the document to be analyzed and everything. Three would establish the year-round boundary at the Dade/Monroe County Line; so this would give the Gulf Council management of king mackerel fishing in the Keys.

This is what the Gulf Mackerel AP supported so that it would be consistent with the Spanish mackerel boundary and then also they would have consistent regulations for the king mackerel gillnet fishery down in the Keys. You see in Figure 5 we have the mixing zone with that kind of gray dotted line at the Monroe/Dade Line. That would be the management boundary.

The fourth one would set the year-round permanent boundary at the Monroe/Collier County Line; so that would give the South Atlantic year-round management responsibility of Monroe County. In Figure 6, you can see here it is over here on the west coast of Florida, and that would be the permanent boundary.

The committee actions would be you could approve the range of alternatives or modify the language. I just need to know which ones you want to keep in, which ones you want to take out and if you want anymore, you want to tweak language. Once we get that, we will proceed with analysis and everything.

MR. HARTIG: Kari, we talked a little bit about how much landings occur in that mixing zone. You can't give us the numbers, but can you give us a relative amount of catch that occurs in that area?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: So in SEDAR 38 the landings for the mixing zone of king mackerel, no specified stock, are actually confidential. I had to get them from our SEDAR folks and then add them into with the rest of the Florida east coast to be able to show them to you in any way. They are actually relatively a small number of landings. This is just the area south of the Keys and that is in the very small mixing zone that we're talking here.

MR. HARTIG: So the difference in those two alternatives; one is the Monroe/Collier County and then Alternative 2 is essentially what came out of the assessment for the mixing zone as far as where you draw the line between the Gulf and Atlantic for the mixing zone; that very southern end of it?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Yes; Alternative 2 is the boundary that SEDAR said, but what it would do it is going to split management in the Keys at the council boundary. There could be different management measures on each side of Monroe County.

MR. HARTIG: In talking about this, Kari and I talked about what the regulatory actions would be in the mixing zone. Essentially if it stayed in the South Atlantic, to me logically you would just take whatever is used for management in the southern zone and just apply it to that small area. Then in the Gulf, I would think if the Gulf gets jurisdiction – Monica; I'll stop.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You don't have to stop for me; I just have a question when it is appropriate.

MR. HARTIG: I think the intent of what I was going to say went through. If the Gulf manages it, then their regulations would apply in that zone. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: If you could help me under this, the action is to modify the management boundary for the Gulf and Atlantic migratory groups of king mackerel; and in the different figures, which are very handy and I appreciate which kind of set forth what it would look like, there is a southern subzone.

I think the southern subzone that we're talking about is part of the Florida west coast subzone. In the figures it looks to me like there is changing boundaries for the southern subzone. Like in Figure 5, it differs – the southern subzone looks like it gets a lot smaller in Figure 6. Was that the intent to also change the boundary of the southern subzone and where those people could fish?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Well, when you set the management boundary, it is going to make that southern subzone bigger and smaller because it is a Gulf subzone. In Figure 6, that sets the management boundary at that Collier/Monroe County Line, which is over on the west coast, and it makes the southern subzone very small. It is really just one county; it is just Collier County. If it set on the other side, it is going to make that southern subzone go all the way through the Keys, and that would be considered the Gulf southern subzone.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, then, for example, under Alternative 4 – because that is just one I'm looking at on Figure 6 – it would be the South Atlantic that would be responsible for management through Monroe County waters up to the Collier/Monroe County Line?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Yes.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And so I guess we would have to – at some point we'll have to look at also how this would affect those folks who now fish in the current southern subzone and would you think you're going to continue to allow them to fish potentially in the same geographic area they fish now if, for example, Alternative 4 goes through – you don't have to answer this now, but I'm just thinking we need to think about maybe those kinds of things for those groups, and maybe you already are thinking about it.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: So Alternative 4 – we are presenting a range of alternatives just so you guys can talk about it – that one is probably one that you want to consider not including because it will totally change the way that the king mackerel gillnet fishery in the Keys is managed. That is managed by the Gulf, so that one is one of those where we have it in there for you to consider including, but it is probably one that you don't want to include.

MR. BREWER: Because of the Joint Florida meetings, for the consistency rather than using the Monroe/Collier County Line, you might want to consider using Shark Point just for the sake of consistency. I just throw that out there. I know next to nothing about commercial king fisheries; but just for the sake of consistency, I think the joint Florida folks kind of were getting settled in on that Shark Point Demarcation Line. Perhaps for the sake of consistency, it might be good to consider it here.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that Chester. I'm not sure that is going to work in this situation where we just talked about that southern subzone that Monica brought up; and it is something I

brought up to Kari trying to make sure where that gillnet fishery is prosecuted and to make sure – because if we take jurisdiction of that area where they fish, we don't have that as allowable gear in that area.

That would be very problematic for the gillnet fishery, so we want to make sure we get this straight. Maybe what their AP said may be the best to do it; let the Gulf take care of that so we will never have that problem of South Atlantic – if we took care of the mixing zone and if gillnet landings had to occur there in one particular year, they would be allowed to under the Gulf scenario. I'm glad you brought forward because that is a very important that we've been talking about behind the scenes and trying to figure out – to make sure that we don't impact that fishery. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Kind of following up on Monica's question, in Figure 2 it looks like that southern subzone from April 1st to October 31st is already only Collier County pretty much.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: It is actually during the year very small.

DR. DUVAL: And so Gulf Council regulations are applied in that southern subzone, correct; and so then from November 1st to March 31st when currently the mixing zone shifts as in Figure 3, do those same Gulf Council regulations apply throughout the Keys?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Yes; and the way that the king mackerel gillnet fishery works is that it opens right after MLK Day in January and it usually only lasts – it is pretty short; maybe eight weeks tops. The gillnet fishery only happens in that winter period when the boundary goes all the way around.

MR. BELL: I'll admit I'm having trouble tracking what is what, which tells me, if I put on my law enforcement cap, that Alternative 4 I wouldn't think would be particularly popular, if I'm following this right, from an enforcement standpoint or ease to understand maybe for the fishermen if it is creating a change in the fishery and confusion. Anytime you start having multiple lines or you start having tinier boxes, it makes enforcement much more difficult and it makes understanding to the fishermen more difficult. I would think, if I'm understand 4 correctly, 4 wouldn't be my pick, either.

MR. WILLIAMS: Ben, I do know quite a bit about this fishery. I tagged king mackerel back in the mid-seventies, and for two years we tagged king mackerel off of Key West, from straight south of Key West on to what they call No Man's Land, which is 35 or 40 miles west of Key West. In my opinion, based on our tagging results, that is not a mixing zone.

All of those fish that we tagged at Key West in the wintertime – and there is really only a lot of king mackerel in the Keys in the wintertime. They are there other times of the year, too, but they're very abundant in the wintertime. All of those fish went into the Gulf of Mexico. A few may have drifted up as far as Fort Pierce during the summer months, but those fish went into the Gulf of Mexico.

When we tagged fish up in the Fort Pierce area where there is another big commercial fishery, that was mixed. Those fish may have shown up in the Gulf of Mexico, they may have shown up in North Carolina; but by the time you got to Key West in the wintertime, they were all going into the Gulf of Mexico. I don't really know how SEDAR 38 – I know it was based on some kind of otolith analysis, but those fish at Key West are going into the Gulf and I think they're coming out of the Gulf, too.

I'd be interested in finding out how they were partitioning those Key West fish into 50/50, because I just don't think that is true. I can present you data from tagging studies that show from 30 years ago, but they're going to show those fish almost entirely went into the Gulf of Mexico.

MR. HARTIG: And the assessment used a number of different techniques for trying to separate those out. To be honest with you, the Dade/Monroe County Line, we should have thought it would be farther north. But based on the way the data is collected, you would have had to go back and reconfigure the whole data streams for the entire fishery over the entire timeframe if you use something other than Dade/Monroe. It is just a little bit farther south than we would have had it anyway, so we made that change.

MR. WILLIAMS: So were landings from Key West; they were partitioned – for the assessment purposes they were partitioned between Gulf and South Atlantic?

MR. HARTIG: Yes. A lot of that was done on the otolith shape and microchemistry analyses.

MR. WILLIAMS: I wish I had been there because I would have strongly argued against that.

DR. ERRIGO: There was a lot going on during that SEDAR and the discussions about the mixing zone. Part of the discussion; they looked at all the studies, tagging, otolith, microchemistry, over time. One of the things that they talked about was a shifting of the mixing zone over time or apparent shifting of the mixing zone; that it wasn't static; that it looked like it had moved some.

That might explain why all fish tagged in the seventies off the Keys were Gulf fish, but perhaps 30 years later or the studies done later showed that there was splitting between Gulf and South Atlantic. That might explain part of that. In terms of the partitioning, there was discussion on that as well. They could not determine what percentage of fish should have gone to the Gulf or South Atlantic; so they just split it 50/50 because they didn't know what else to do. That is where the 50/50 came from.

MR. HARTIG: And that has been used in the past. That was used in the last assessment as well in the partitioning of those fish. It is not a lot of animals in that mixing zone. There is not a lot of catch there.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, the entire gillnet catch comes from there, though.

MR. HARTIG: And even that has been shifting farther west on a yearly basis.

MR. WILLIAMS: Farther west?

MR. HARTIG: Farther west and north up the coast.

MR. WILLIAMS: But not as far as Collier County. They're landing there but they're not caught there.

MR. HARTIG: Some of that is getting pretty close. Tom Marvel is fishing in his backyard now when he is trolling pretty much. The guys in the Keys have to go a long way to catch their fish now, basically. Yes; I mean it is dynamic. As you know, as long as you've worked on stock, there were dynamics. Some years the fish showed up heavily on the east coast and some years they don't. Over time the dynamics has been really constrained.

Now, 2009 and 2010 we did have Gulf fish on the Atlantic side, but those are the only two years that I've seen that happen in quite some time. Tracing the fish on the east coast, it was elegant in its simplicity as they tracked them on a weekly basis on where the landings occurred. They went and did this throughout the Gulf and the Atlantic.

They actually looked on a weekly basis on where those landings are occurring, and you can actually track the migratory pattern of those fish. As they leave the Carolinas, you can track them all the way down the east coast. They pretty much show up around the Cape and Daytona for most of the winter and haven't even come down into Jupiter like they used to.

We used to have both groups that would mix in Jupiter. You would have the Gulf that would get pushed out of the Gulf; and then when the weather got real severe, all the east coast fish would mix all together in that mixing zone off of that Jupiter area. That only occurs in – like in 2009 and 2010; those are the only two years that I can remember that happening.

In the Keys it is mostly Gulf stock now most years with that little bit of mixing. Frankly, you may be right about who is whom in that mixing zone as far as the percentages; but as Mike said, what do we really do with this? They had some analysis that was able to split it out to some degree but the fallback was we're just going to leave it at 50/50 until things change, until information changes.

I think what would really help us, Roy, is an acoustic tagging program for king mackerels. I think you could outfit the vessels themselves with the pingers and you could actually – in a relatively short time you could sort out what is going on with these fish on any given year.

MR. WILLIAMS: The rub in the end is going to come in the Keys; and I'm not going to comment on the Upper Keys, where they would lie or where they should be. Maybe they are 50/50. By the time you get to Key West, I just don't believe that those fish are running up the Atlantic coast. Maybe this otolith shape analysis would support it, but the two years of tagging data that exists certainly do not.

You talk about being able to track these fish with landings, but I also – and some of stuff is coming back to me – I also remember that one summer we tagged off Murrells Inlet, South

Carolina, and Linda Mercer tagged off of North Carolina as well. Those fish do not show up in Florida in the wintertime. You remember that, I'm sure.

They show up in Florida in May and June and into August, probably moving against the stream for the purposes of spawning so that the larvae – if they spawn off North Carolina, larvae are probably going to be swept out into the Mid-Atlantic, so we always figured that they move south to where their larvae would have a – if they end up off the Carolinas, they've got shrimp to eat all summer.

I'm not going to dispute some parts of this otolith analysis, but some of it flies in the face of existing tagging information, I'll tell you that. You're going to have a hard time convincing me that the fish caught off Key West have anything to do with Carolina or east coast of Florida. I don't believe there is any basis for it.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; and as we go forward with management, maybe the Gulf just manages that whole portion from Dade and Monroe County south so we never have a problem with the gillnet fishery. That was my concern going into this; that if the South Atlantic took over management, there could be at some time and some winters where it was extremely cold possibly fish show up in the normal years where they caught them, which probably would be in that mixing zone portion of that stock.

That may be a way to solve that problem of potential interactions with that Gulf group. The dynamics of the movement of the king mackerel; I'm glad you brought that up because it is the observation we've seen in the Gulf as well as the South Atlantic. In the Gulf you have a motion portion of the stock that migrates down to that southern zone in the wintertime; and you have a group that stays off of Louisiana, predominantly bigger fish, all winter.

The same thing happens in the Atlantic. As your tagging indicated, some of the bigger fish tend to stay off the Carolinas and move east and west with temperatures. They stay off the Carolinas and then they make that spawning migration in the spring down to Jupiter to spawn. Just like you said, those older fish have that migratory pattern and the younger fish tend to spawn later in the season. Fish are passing each other in April.

You have big fish coming from North Carolina to spawn in Jupiter; and then you have the wintertime fish that some of them are still hanging around in April; they're going to the north. Then we see those in Jupiter until the August/September timeframe, and they're the last to spawn of the stock. The biggest fish spawn first. Those dynamics are important because you have to realize that everybody doesn't do the same thing. There are discrete groups of fish that have different behavioral patterns and migratory patterns.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes; I will concede to any of that. The only thing that I'm going to be consistent on is by the time you get to Key West those fish are going into the Gulf of Mexico. They're not running up and down the east coast.

MR. HARTIG: All right, we got off on the king mackerel migratory lesson, but it is important.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: If we can look through the alternatives and make sure the language is what you need; then you guys could just tell me what alternatives that you would like to keep in Action 1 in a motion; that will be perfect.

MR. HARTIG: Do you want to start with removing Alternative 4?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Well, you can just have discussion of what you want and then we'll do one motion says have Alternatives 1, 2 – you have some hands up.

MS. McCAWLEY: I would make a motion to add Alternatives 1 through 3 of Action 1 into the document.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Jessica; second by Charlie. Any discussion? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I was just going to suggest right before Jessica made that motion that if you do remove an alternative that you've already got in this document, if you would just give a – you've already had some discussion, but it has kind of been discussing a lot of different things; so if you want to give a little bit more rationale for the record to make it clearer as to why now after your discussion you're deciding to move it; it would be helpful.

DR. DUVAL: I think just based on the discussion that has occurred right now between you and Roy with regard to tagging information in that particular area, with those fish appearing to not move into the Atlantic area of jurisdiction at all, it doesn't seem like it would be reasonable to then include an alternative that would extend South Atlantic Council management jurisdiction into an area where the fish, clearly based on the scientific information, don't necessarily belong to the Atlantic stock. That would be one reason.

MR. BELL: And I guess from a practical standpoint, it would just seem to be a more complex solution and easier – it would be more difficult for folks to basically understand, and it would also be more difficult to enforce with multiple lines and things. That is a practical consideration.

MR. HARTIG: And potential impacts on the fishermen in that area that may occur. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes; that is what I was going to say, the impacts to the fishermen fishing that gillnet fishery. I think we don't want the alternative because of the negative impacts it would have on those fisherman.

MR. HARTIG: Does that help, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Those all sound like very reasonable decisions to me and rationale.

MR. HARTIG: We've got a motion and a second. Anymore discussion about adding the three alternatives? **Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, scrolling down to Action 2; you will just need to add Action 2 to the document. This revises the MSY, MSST, MFMT/OFL, ABC, OY, ACL, ACT. We break it

down into some sections. This is how it was done in Amendment 18. For the MSY, MSST, MFMT, you don't have to have actions. We're just going to have language in there.

We have the example from Amendment 18 that just specifies what MSY, MSST and MFMT are. Then we have new language for Amendment 26, which updates those values based on SEDAR 38; and the recommendations in Table 1 that came from your SSC. Everybody okay with that?

MR. HARTIG: I see some heads nodding.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, and then we also have the same thing where we're just going to have language that is included in the amendment to specify the OFL. That is Table 2 and those are the recommendations and so you would just be including the language into the document; so I think just a motion to approve the language for those would cover that.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; so a motion to approve the language for Action 2. Jack.

MR. COX: I'll make that motion. I will make the motion that we add Action 2 in CMP Joint Amendment 26.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, could you add to this motion just to approve the language for MSY, MSST, MFMT and OFL?

MR. COX: Yes; okay, that we add the language of MSY, MSST, MFMT and OFL from SEDAR 16.

MR. HARTIG: All right, the motion is to add Action 2 in Amendment 26 and add language for MSY, MSST, MFMT and OFL. Seconded by Charlie. Is there anymore discussion? Is there any objection. Seeing none; that motion is approved.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Now we get into the good stuff. Action 2-1; this is revising the acceptable biological catch for Atlantic king mackerel. We show in Table 3 the ABC recommendations from the SSC. We have five and we took all of these out to scoping and got some input on those. You have three ABCs under a high recruitment scenario, medium recruitment scenario and low recruitment scenario.

Then you have deterministic equilibrium yield and then 75 percent of that. In October 2014, in the SSC report they recommended that the council use the projection at the long-term equilibrium yield, F at 30 percent SPR as the ACL, to reduce the risk of overfishing given the high uncertainty in future recruitment. Now we can probably have Mike come up here and speak about these.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; because it was confusing to me before we went to scoping on what options we actually had available to us. The P-star that came out, basically that has been run through the ABC high, medium and low values, so to me it seemed like we could choose any of those scenarios, but I'll let Mike explain it.

DR. ERRIGO: Our SSC Chair is here, so if I say something erroneous, he has instructions to bean me in the head with an apple. I will attempt to figure this out for you guys. The official ABC recommendation from the SSC comes from the ABC Control Rule, which is the P-star analysis. The P-star is right here, 0.325.

What came out of that P-star analysis is ABC high, medium and low. That has to do with the different values of recruitment used for projections. Due to the amount of uncertainty in the assessment and the amount of what recruitment should be, there were three levels of recruitment calculated for the projections; and that is where the high, medium and low come from.

It was decided that we would try to gather more information on what current recruitment is in order to help determine which one of these scenarios should be chosen. That is like the SEAMAP Trawl Survey, which surveys the small king mackerels, perhaps some of the size frequency information from the TIP sampling and things like that to try to get at what is recruitment now compared to what it was in the previous three years or over the long-term average to help choose which one of these scenarios is the most appropriate to use for the ABC.

The SSC further suggested to the council that they may want to use one of these deterministic equilibrium yields as the ACL to further reduce the probability of overfishing given the amount of uncertainty in the assessment.

That uncertainty comes in because they were unable to produce actual MSY estimates because they couldn't estimate the steepness parameter in the stock-recruitment curve; so they just set it at a particular value and used SPR proxies instead of MSY estimates.

There was a lot of uncertainty there. The SSC also felt that in the P-star analysis there wasn't enough of the uncertainty captured in that analysis that went into the ABC, so they suggested that the council may want to use one of these long-term equilibrium yields. That is where all these numbers come from, but the actual ABC recommendation is one of these numbers up here.

MR. HARTIG: So the ABC high, ABC medium and ABC low; my recollection of where those came from was we had low recruitment over the last five years of the time series. They bound the recruitment based on – their ABC high is actually average recruitment over the time series. Then ABC medium, I can't quite remember what –

DR. ERRIGO: The ABC high is average; ABC low is the average recruitment for the last I don't know if it was three or five years and the medium is the average between those two recruitment values.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have a question. The National Standard 1 guidelines do say an SSC may recommend an ABC that differs from the results of the ABC Control Rule calculation based on factors such as data uncertainty, recruitment variability, declining trends and population variables and other factors, but must explain why.

I know in the past the SSC I think from king mackerel has frequently given you a range for ABCs. They calculated an ABC based on the ABC Control Rule, but then they also gave you –

because of uncertainties that you were just discussing, they also gave the council a range of ABCs.

DR. ERRIGO: They calculated a P-star and then these different ABCs are simply from the different recruitment values, because it was uncertain which of the levels of recruitment is the most probably going into the future. They were hoping that updated information would help inform which of these would be the most appropriate to use.

MR. HARTIG: And I will why this was put in there. If you look at king mackerel over time, there are these big – and Roy had explained to me this 25 years ago is that you get a year class and you fish on it about eight or nine years. Your recruitment usually isn't that good during this eight or nine years; and then you get another big recruitment spike.

You could see these sign waves move through the fishery over time. There is periodicity to these recruitment patterns of some degree. Now, they're going to be different in how many years they were apart, but they occur and sometimes they occur in a couple of years together and you get a big recruitment.

The problem is, if you look at the assessment when we did it the last time, we had a high recruitment level, so you're going to get an assessment based on a high recruitment level. This time we did it in a valley. We were at the low recruitment level. If use the lowest recruitment of the last time series, then there is no way if recruitment in the next year turns back upward that you have any way to be able ameliorate that change.

Certainly, this fishery is driven by recruitment. F is lower than it has been now. I mean, as this fishery has declined, and it has declined, and as we haven't seen recruitment in all the years that went into the last assessment, those five years, there was a lot of concern. But then you have to go back and look at the long time series because if you don't, we'll get into this situation where, bang, the stock has crashed.

F is lower than it has been in 20-plus years now because the F goes down based on the availability. People just drop out of the fishery, so F has already declined. I guess you could close the fishery if you wanted to in order to really reduce F, but it is really, really substantially reduced now. You're in this kind of a pattern in king mackerel where even though we had set ABCs in the past, sometimes we approached it – many, many years we didn't and based on that availability in those year classes and things of that moving through the fishery.

This scenario was put in there to try and allow the council – well, maybe not allow the council, but to me I think you need some way to go back to the SSC. If you see a high recruitment year, Mike talked about MARMAP sampling and how you see that recruitment in that and then you could also use your TIP sampling to inform how many small fish are coming into the population in any one time.

Now, having said that, there has been substantial recruitment in the fishery in the 2012 year class, which wasn't in the assessment because the SEAMAP Trawl Survey missed that group of fish. Why they missed it was when those fish spawned off in that Jupiter general southern

Florida area, that year for three weeks the Gulf Stream was eight miles off of Palm Beach, which is unheard of. Usually it is right there and all those eggs and larvae get carried to the north, and usually those juveniles show up in that trawl survey. That same year in our area in October we saw the May fish that were already about ten inches long. We saw very large numbers, which was very unusual. We've never seen that before that far south.

The recruitment happened; it didn't get to where the SEAMAP Trawl Survey was, but it is showing up now in the fishery. We're trying to guide some kind of evidence of recruitment and have the council make a determination based on the recruitment patterns we're seeing now. Where do we go now? I think based on your landings' information that you look at – both recreational and commercial on the Atlantic have trended down substantially.

How big is this year class? We don't know that. You could bound your uncertainty – you could level off your uncertainty a little bit by looking at the small fish that are coming into the fishery now, which we have some information on that. Peter Barile put together a working paper for the assessment that showed a relatively large amount of small fish coming into the population, which allows you some idea the recruitment is increasing.

I mean, you have options to pick. You could pick what the SSC said to be conservative. You could go to a medium or low – medium possibly recruitment scenario. I think we have some leeway in this, which is something different. This is different than something we've ever done before. Roy, I think I need to let you chime in here.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm trying to remember what I was going to say. (Laughter) I think I was going to ask Mike do we have the SSC Report in our briefing book with this stuff in it?

DR. ERRIGO: I don't it is in this one.

DR. CRABTREE: Could someone send that out to us.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; we can get it. I reviewed the SSC minutes and it didn't help me anymore than – I went through the whole thing trying to find if they did pin us down to the deterministic yield at 30 percent SPR; was that their recommendation? That was my thought coming out of the SSC, but then they did have a P-star and it does go through all these different recruitment scenarios.

DR. ERRIGO: I went back through my notes and pulled out – so the P-star with the three different levels, that was their ABC recommendation, but then they were saying due to the uncertainty they just were saying it can't hurt so let's just suggest to the council that they want to be more conservative.

DR. DUVAL: I was at the SSC meeting and that was my recollection. Yes, they did the P-star because it fits within our P-star approach for a Tier 1 stock; but in my mind there was a lot discussion around providing the council with a range of options for how they might want to set their ACL. It was my understanding that they were giving us a range from which to choose.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes; I'd say exactly, and I think it is in accordance with you guys establishing your level of comfort of the risk that you will accept in this. You can see the outcomes; you see the different levels. As you said, you take their recommended ACL, which is not binding to you, if you choose to be conservative.

Now, if you choose to accept a higher level of risk, you can see the consequences for, say, if you the ABC high and you set your ACL there; then if it turns out the recruitment is not as good and we really don't know what it really is; but if it is not as good and the stock doesn't perform as well as we hoped, then at some point you have to rein the fishery, you're the guys who make that decision and you'll have to face the fishermen on that and answer for why we made this assumption and it was wrong. That is where I think really effectively you guys dealing with your risk tolerance, maybe this is kind of how it should work out. You get to choose.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And that's really good discussion and it helps me. I do note that you do have a very ambitious timeline on this amendment, as Kari said. The SSC then meets again next October and theoretically they could look at this amendment as to what you had decided at that point and maybe chime in on that if they had any concerns. I know that they will, but they will see this.

MR. HARTIG: Well, they could look at what we decided today in April, in another few weeks.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right, but you might change your mind by the time you take final action; but, you're right, they could, absolutely.

MR. HARTIG: This gave us some flexibility and it gives you flexibility to just – I mean, what we decide today may not be what we decide three years from now; and so that would give an opportunity to revisit it in between assessments and that's the critical here. To me, the appropriate thing to do would be bring it back to the SSC; not let us make the decision, but bring it back to the SSC what we think and why we think we should change it, get their opinions, and then we'd have a scientific basis for doing a different catch level recommendation based on the flexibility we have to do it.

I think this is a – for mackerels in particular where you have some selectivity patterns where certain gears are only able to catch certain ages; and then once they get to be a certain age, they move out of that – they're not available to that fishery, like trolling which catches the majority of the fishery. I think we're at the point now we want to see if the stock is going to move back into the spawning stock. We may want to be conservative now; and then once we see that, if that translates into the spawning stock in the next few years, then I think we could – you know, in the next couple of years we could make a tweak to it and possibly allow higher catch levels. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: What I'm hearing sounds logical and certainly there becomes a risk evaluation when you see uncertainty in the data. The thing that seems important to me is if you're going to take that trigger approach that you've thought through very, very carefully what are the parameters you're going to watch. Do you have a reliable source for those parameters and have you thought through in advance what situation would trigger a reconsideration of the decisions you're contemplating now.

We've spent some time talking in this meeting about adaptive management, and adaptive management can be a very successful thing when it is well planned, which the industry – the expectations are managed, they understand that things can change. It is less stable; it is by design things can change. I think the real key is to have a very careful plan almost like a framework or the way the council functions so that you know what you're watching and you know what will happen when the parameters you're watching walk past some threshold.

MR. HARTIG: Thanks for that, Bonnie. This is in the early stages. This is something that I think we may like to investigate. I guess the Mid-Atlantic has a rumble strip approach where they look at a couple of different things, but all that does is it lets the SSC to weigh in on what is happening in a particular species at any one time. It is in the document farther along the line about if the council wants to proceed down this path, so we'll see.

MR. BROWN: Ben, you and I talked about this other night about that recruitment with smaller fish that we – and I told you about how many we were seeing here off of Charleston, but the last couple of years – and it was always that August, September and October timeframe right there. They showed up in great numbers.

You'd see acres and acres of them and they were mixed with Spanish, too. You'd be catching both of them at the same time like 20 miles offshore and not right on the beach like you'd normally see the Spanish up on the beach. Sometimes they were further offshore. Mel and I were talking about a lot of the complaints, too, about not seeing the bigger kingfish. That is what we've been seeing off of Charleston, anyway.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that, Mark, and I've talked to a number of people up and down the coast who had seen these small fish moving down. Of course, they settled in the wintertime down off of Florida and our fishermen got to catch them. Their question was the same thing. We're catching these three to six to seven pound fish, but there is nothing in the middle.

There is nobody in the middle and that's why you may want to be a little more conservative now to make sure that some of these do move to the middle so you don't catch too many of that particular year class, because we don't know how big it is. We just don't. We know it is there, but we don't know how large it is. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And for the record when you're talking about small fish; you're talking about young fish?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, in king mackerel in particular at about that small size. You can see cohorts in the fishery at that time. You can separate them out fairly well. Now, once they get a little bit older, now the ages start to spread. You'll have small fish that could be old and you have large fish that could be relatively young. There is a difference once they get to be a bit older, but you can see these moving in. We have got some information from Peter Barile that went into the stock assessment as a working paper that shows some of these smaller fish moving into the fishery.

MS. BURGESS: I think moving forward with – just looking forward into the document with Alternative 4, which I think should be Alternative 3, I'm most familiar with the bluefish stock

assessments and the parameters for setting the annual catch limits in the Mid-Atlantic and with the ASMFC.

What they do is they look at a three-year time series of a juvenile abundance index of five different indices up and down the coast, so they're not linked to one indices. They've got multiple indices, which I think is valuable. I don't know if we have that breadth of indices for mackerel. My concern would be if we're tied to one or two indices if we move forward with adaptive management and switching between ABCs, high, medium, low recruitment, which they do on an annual basis.

They review the indices annually, look at the average in the time series for the last three years based on how these indices compare for the average over the three years; the average of the entire time series, they select an ABC that they feel is most appropriate for that season. Our concern would be if we're limited to one or two indices and those indices are not able to capture the juveniles that are based on the distance of thermocline from shore, as you identified as a problem with the SEAMAP; that may not allow us to set an appropriate ABC for that current year.

MR. HARTIG: That may be a good example for us to investigate when we look at this further down the line and how they do bluefish. Mike.

DR. ERRIGO: Marcel just reminded me just to remind everyone that in December he did show the SEAMAP Index, which did show an uptick in the small king mackerels, a small uptick, and he has that slide if you guys did need to see it.

MR. HARTIG: Do you all have enough information of what we've talked about to pick how we determine the ACL? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I'm guessing you're looking for a motion from the committee to at least approve whatever range of alternatives we want for this action, whether or not it includes Alternative 3 that is labeled as Alternative 4, and then potentially select a preferred.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and potentially select a preferred.

DR. DUVAL: I like the idea of a trigger analysis but just knowing that we don't have a lot of information that we could choose from to do something like that and with the striped bass example that is given here as well; that is a trigger that works in conjunction with other triggers. It works in conjunction with the current F rate in the fishery, what the status of the fishery is, if it has been in a state of overfishing or overfished.

It works in conjunction with other management triggers; so if this JAI is triggered and something else is triggered, then the management board shall take action to reduce harvest in the following year, et cetera. Just looking at this one trigger, the technical committee makes recommendations and their recommendation may be, well, no action may be necessary at this time; so I just want to make sure that everybody is aware that it is in conjunction with other triggers that are set up through that plan.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; and my sense what it was is to trigger when the stock was going down. To me you'd need one that goes both ways, hopefully, to be able to increase somewhat when you see changes and then decrease when you have concerns. That is how I see if we develop this trigger mechanism how that would work.

DR. DUVAL: And just as a follow-up, I think that may be something that we might want to ask the SSC about in the future if they could make some appropriate recommendations for that kind of trigger mechanism that would allow for flexibility in ACLs on an annual or every so many years basis.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; or when the council would ask them to do it. I don't think it has to be an annual basis, but when we see something and we have enough flexibility to change a catch level recommendation. We could ask the SSC at their next meeting, whenever that occurs, to review that. I don't think we have to set it up annually. Go ahead, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: So with that, I would make a motion that we approve Alternatives 1 and 2 for inclusion in the document.

MR. HARTIG: I've got a motion by Michelle; second by Charlie. Is there anymore discussion?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just a question; I'm sorry if you mentioned this because I just stepped out. I see Alternative 1 and I see Alternative 2 with a number of subalternatives; and then I see Alternative 4. Is there an Alternative or was that just a –

DR. MacLAUHLIN: No, that was incorrect; it should be Alternative 3.

MR. HARTIG: All right, is there anymore discussion? Mel.

MR. BELL: We're not including three labeled four. We just took 1 and 2, right, so do we need to kind of like explain that for the record again like we did for the last time?

DR. DUVAL: I guess that's what I was trying to do was to state that the example that is included here is an example of a trigger mechanism that works in conjunction with other pieces of information within the Striped Bass Fishery Management Plan. I'm not sure we have those pieces of information, and I think that's a request we would want to make of the SSC rather than the council doing this right here. It seems like it more appropriate – it is a much more appropriate exercise for our scientific experts to develop a trigger mechanism or mechanisms. We could certainly follow up with another motion to direct them to do that.

MR. BELL: No, that is great; it is just clearer for the record of why we're going down that road. It makes sense.

MR. HARTIG: We could do that in a motion after this that we request the SSC to develop some kind of trigger mechanism; lay out an outline of how we could see it happen and then get their input on it. We've got a motion and a second. Do you want to select a preferred in this motion or do you not?

Okay, is there anymore discussion this motion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; this motion is approved.** Would like to select a preferred alternative or not? I would say if you don't; that you're going to get all your comments coming back to you, which we've seen before, ABC high, ABC high, ABC high so far. We did have a couple of guys that actually went to the medium level. Mike.

DR. ERRIGO: If you do select a preferred for your ABC; I also suggest you select an ACL preferred just because you say we think the ABC should be this, but you're thinking we want a buffer for the ACL, but you don't tell anybody that; they're going to assume you're going to set the ABC equal to the ACL because that is the typical way we've been doing it for most of our species. If you do select a preferred for ABC; I suggest also you select a preferred for your ACL.

DR. DUVAL: Isn't that the next action, though, because this action is just ABC.

DR. ERRIGO: Yes, I was just –

DR. DUVAL: Okay, sorry, I'm confused.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, we've got a motion and that one passed and that takes us to our next action unless you would like to have a motion to have the SSC – go ahead, Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I would like to make a motion that the SSC – I don't know how to word this – look into the specifics of what is listed in Alternative 3 slash 4. I don't know how to word the motion.

MR. HARTIG: Either a rumble strip or a trigger mechanism to be able to – does that get at what you want to do?

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. HARTIG: All right, a motion by Jessica; seconded by Michelle. Is there any further discussion? The motion is direct the SSC to look into the specifics of a rumble strip or trigger mechanism. Marcel.

DR. REICHERT: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be good to specify whether you're specifically asking the SSC to look into this for king mackerel or more in a general sense.

MR. HARTIG: Well, if we get the flexibility to look at it in some other species, it would be nice to look at it in a suite of species. How about "where appropriate"?

DR. REICHERT: And I think that would be good, and I think the SSC has already started their discussion about the rumble strip. I believe maybe not in the meeting but we had plans to look at how the Mid-Atlantic SSC is approaching that.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, the motion is direct the SSC to look into the specifics of a rumble strip or trigger mechanism where appropriate. Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved. Now we'll go to the ACL.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Action 2-2; this would revise the ACL for Atlantic king mackerel and recreational ACT. It would revise the ACL in all of the commercial and recreational in the northern zone quota and southern zone quota. So, really, I just have the no action alternative and then Alternative 2, which is ACL equals OY equals ABC; and then Alternative 3, which would be ACL equals 90 percent ABC; Alternative 4, ACL 80 percent ABC. These are just some suggestions.

We just had no action and then actions to update the ACLs, so you can't have two alternatives and we would be able to explain that. What I want to get into next is that Attachment 5A that you got so we can talk about how this is going to work using some examples. Does everybody have that document? It was e-mailed out to you and then it is also on the webpage under the briefing book. We have a couple copies in the back if people need it.

I picked two ABC values from the table. One is Subalternative 2A, which is the ABC recommendations under a high recruitment scenario, because we got a lot of recommendations during public comment and our scoping meetings for that one. Then I picked 2D, which is the ABC recommendations for the deterministic equilibrium yield at F 30 percent SPR, because that was the SSC recommendation for you guys to look at long-term equilibrium yield.

We have two different examples. The outline of this document is I have commercial and recreational landings of Atlantic king mackerel under the SEDAR 38 south boundary and mixing zone. What I've done is gone and got the SEDAR 38 data of what SEDAR 38 considered Atlantic stock king mackerel and recalculated the landings; what they should look like.

Here we have the commercial and recreational landings. The northern zone, those stay the same because those have always been Atlantic stock. The southern zone adds in the Florida East Coast Subzone winter landings – those were previously considered Gulf stock. In this they're considered Atlantic stock – and then those portions of the mixing zone landings; so in the winter 50 percent and then the rest of year are considered Atlantic.

Then I have the recreational landings here calculated the same way. Then I have a graph here for you guys to see. We'll bring these back up because we're going to compare them to what the example ACLs will look like. First I want to talk about northern and southern zone quotas and make sure that everybody is on board and understand and agrees with how we're going to do the 20B zones.

In 20B, which was just effective March 1st, you selected Preferred Alternative 3, and that created the quotas for the northern zone and southern zone quota for Atlantic king mackerel with that boundary at the North Carolina/South Carolina Line. You picked Preferred Option B which specified the way the proportions of the ACL for the northern zone and southern zone quotas would be calculated is the average of the proportion of landings in those zones from the 2002/2003 season through the 2011/2012 season. Your preferred was a time period.

Now, when we calculated that based on what we had at the time when you guys were making the decisions, we were using a smaller pot basically because the Atlantic king mackerel landings didn't consider all those Florida East Coast winter landings. The way that it is calculated now under this current scenario is 33 percent northern/67 percent southern.

What this is doing is once you guys go through and you put in your new ABCs and ACLs for king mackerel, this is what it is going to look like. What we did was we took the proportion of what we now consider Atlantic king mackerel landings in that time that you selected as a preferred and recalculated those. What it gave us is the northern zone would get 23 percent of the Atlantic king mackerel commercial ACL; the southern zone 77 percent.

The northern zone landings are the exact same as we used in 20B. They're all the Atlantic king mackerel commercial landings north of that North Carolina/South Carolina Boundary; so North Carolina and all the Mid-Atlantic landings. That is what it was in 20B. The southern zone landings are the Atlantic king mackerel commercial landings south of that boundary to the Dade/Monroe County Line plus your Atlantic king mackerel landings in the new mixing zone from April 1st to April 30th plus have half of the landings in the new mixing zone from November 1st to March 31st.

When I say new mixing zone, I'm talking about that little area south of the Keys with the stripes on the map. Then I have a table in here that shows how these proportions were calculated so that everybody can see what they look like. Over here on the screen, the green columns, these are proportions of the total landings for each year and then the average, 23/77. That is what it I going to look like once you get all these through.

Then I took that high recruitment scenario ABC, which is a range, and plugged those in; assuming also that you select ACL equals ABC; that would give you a total Atlantic king mackerel ACL that you have here. It starts with 17.4 and it drops down; and then that last year, 11.54; the commercial ACL in this next column and then the recreational ACL.

This is all depending on if you selected the ABCs with the high recruitment scenario. Then breaking it down to the northern and southern zones and what they would look like; considering the northern zone would get 23 percent/southern zone 77. You have those poundages here. Then I bring the table back down with the commercial landings if you want to look at the numbers; but then I also have these figures in here.

Figure 2 is the northern zone. You have the dotted line that says northern zone landings over these past years, since the 2002/2003 season through 2012/2013. Then what you have what we would expect the northern zone quota to look like. Starting with the red is the 2016 and then it drops down. You can see you had a period where the North Carolina landings did exceed what we would that northern zone quota to look like; but primarily they're under and even in more recent years have had a lot of wiggle room there; not exceeding those quotas.

The same thing for the southern zone; these last dotted lines shows the southern zone landings or Atlantic king mackerel; and then we have the 2016 – all these different years what the southern zone quota would look like, primarily not going to exceed that expected quota, but there could be

years, which is typical of king mackerel. You're probably going to have a year or two where you have to shut down early.

Moving on, the next example I used was the deterministic equilibrium yield at F at 30 percent SPR. What that example assumes is that you selected ACL equals ABC equals 12.702 million pounds for all the fishing years. This is the ABC recommendation that – the ABC doesn't change this 12.702.

I have in this first table how it breaks down into commercial and recreational ACL based on those allocations. In the next one I break I down by northern zone, 23 percent of that, and southern zone 77 percent of that. Then we go to Figure 4 and Figure 5, which shows the same thing. We have the dotted line that shows the northern zone commercial landings of Atlantic king mackerel. The red line is what that quota would look like, so you can see how that's going to work.

In Figure 5 we do the southern zone, and you can see how that is going to look for the southern zone compared to their landings in recent years. I did also include in this document the recreational ACL using that high recruitment scenario; so that is going to start out with 10.97 million pounds for the recreational and then drop down to 7.26 million pounds by the 2020/2021 year.

I have the recreational landings' estimates from the MRIP that were used in SEDAR 38 in Table 3, so you can compare those to the expected recreational ACL compared to the recreational landings. In Figure 6, recreational landings is the dotted line; and then we have these different color lines for the different year of recreational ACL.

The next example uses the deterministic equilibrium yield at 30 percent SPR. That would give the recreational ACL at about 8 million pounds. Then we can compare that in Figure 7 to recreational landings from MRIP over the past 12 years or so. Does that make sense for everybody about how the 20B quotas are going to be recalculated based on your selected time period that you selected in 20B?

MR. HARTIG: I see heads nodding. Any questions for Kari about that? That was well done.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: So going back to our decision document in Attachment 5, in your Action 2-2, we had four alternatives that we've provided for you to consider. I just would need a motion to add Action 2-2 and the alternatives that you would like to add. This is all contingent down the road when you guys select your ABCs that you want. All this is doing is adding alternatives for where you would set your ACL, if you want a buffer between your ACL and ABC or if you were going to want to see ABC for ACL – ACL equal to ABC.

MR. HARTIG: Michelle, looking at those zones and the changes and the potential impacts on North Carolina and the southern – I mean, it seems like the same impacts occur on each area based on the way Kari has presented those two.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; and I think the graphs were really helpful as well. I have no concerns. This was my assumption all along that based on the new stock boundaries, we would simply reapply the same formula but with those Atlantic group landings included in the appropriate place. This is nothing that I wouldn't have expected.

I think the graphs really help to demonstrate based on the different landings' streams and what the options are for selection of an ABC and how things might look compared to what they've been in the past. I think in either case there is the possibility that you may end up closing early at some point; maybe not anytime soon. It almost makes the equilibrium yield option look a little bit more palatable in some way.

MR. HARTIG: What options do you want to see analyzed in this? Didn't the decision we made previously enter into this one as well? If we're analyzing all those options, wouldn't you do the same for this in this or not; that's what I'm asking? Wouldn't you do it for high, medium and low and wouldn't you do it for the five different scenarios we have?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: As long as you have those alternatives for ABC in that last action in there, we will analyze them for this action as well. They will go together, whatever you have in there.

DR. DUVAL: I would make a motion that we approve the range of alternatives for Action 2-2.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Jack Cox. Anymore discussion on this particular motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, now we'll get into bag limit sales. Do you want to break first?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, we need a break. Let's go ahead and take a ten-minute break. All right, if you want to come back, we'll go ahead and get started. The first thing I'd like to do, Mike wanted to come up and just explain one portion of the landings' scenarios that we need to have straight in minds going forward – catch level scenarios; excuse me.

DR. ERRIGO: I was talking with Marcel and I want to get this on the record and be very clear about the ABC recommendations from the SSC and how it works. There is the P-star analysis with the three recruitment scenarios. Then there is the two long-term equilibrium yield scenarios; one at F 30 percent and one at 75 of F 30 percent SPR.

Each of those is a viable ABC alternative put forth by the SSC so the council is free choose one of those long-term equilibrium yields as the ABC and have it in place for the full five years instead of one of the P-star alternatives. The SSC gave all of those possible recommendations as ABC. That was actually in Marcel's presentation at the December meeting, so that is why I consulted with Marcel and we talking about it.

The reason why they did that was because of all the uncertainties in the assessment and this and that. Those actually are all viable ABC recommendations from the SSC, and each one is a viable

alternative for the council to choose as ABC. I wanted to get that on the record and to be very clear that the council is free to choose any one of those.

For the recruitment scenarios, they said you need to have some information about what recruitment actually is in order to be able to choose one of those or you can just choose one of the long-term equilibrium yield scenarios instead which have less risk associated with them. If there any questions, I can try to help answer if you need anymore clarification.

MR. HARTIG: I don't see any; thanks, Mike. We're ready for our next action item.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: The next potential action is Action 3, which would allow bag limit sales of Atlantic Migratory Group King Mackerel caught in the Small Coastal Shark Direct Gillnet Fishery. We can change this language to just be "Shark Drift Gillnet Fishery" is everybody is okay with that. It will kind of encompass all of them.

We have a no action alternative currently that bag limit sales are prohibited in the Atlantic. The practice of selling the incidental catch from the drift gillnet fishery is not allowed right now. Alternative 2; this is some suggested language for this: "Allow the sale of Atlantic Migratory Group King Mackerel caught with drift gillnet as incidental catch in the drift gillnet portion of the commercial sector of the Small Coastal Shark Fishery for any vessel with a valid shark directed or shark incidental commercial permit and valid federal king mackerel commercial permit.

"For shark vessels fishing in the Florida EEZ, no more than two king mackerel per crew member can be sold" – that is the bag limit in the Florida EEZ – "with a maximum of [X] king mackerel per vessel, on each trip. For shark vessels in the EEZ north of the Georgia/Florid Line, no more than three king mackerel per crew member can be sold with a maximum of [X] king mackerel per vessel, on each trip. The king mackerel must be sold to a dealer with the southeast federal dealer permit."

That includes the specifications about the bag limit. Just to clarify what that would be, there are not crew size restrictions for HMS trips; so you may be interested in putting in a vessel limit as well. Those are just some questions if you guys want to tweak that. Then you can add, remove or revise the language. I just will need a motion if you are interested in putting this in there, including this action and the alternatives.

MR. HARTIG: The fishery operated before without a maximum number of king mackerel per vessel. Do you actually want to add that; do you think it is necessary? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Do we have a sense of how many fish were caught on these shark drift gillnet trips? Our guys use mostly sink nets, so it is not the same type of issue for us.

MR. HARTIG: Kari went back and looked at the numbers. They're relatively small landings that come from that particular gear type. We don't know the crew sizes now to the degree that I think we could put a number per vessel in there unless you actually want to. I don't have a problem with leaving that language out and leave it pertinent to crew size. The vessels in Florida

have gotten much smaller over time. There is no longer those great big boats that we used to have doing this. They're 35- or 40-foot vessels at the most. Jack.

MR. COX: That fishery crew runs between two and three on the 40-foot boats, if that gives you any idea.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; that will help. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: So you're saying that you don't think it would be necessary at this time to have the language regarding a maximum –

MR. HARTIG: A boat limit, yes, essentially.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, a boat limit.

MR. HARTIG: The maximum number of king mackerel per vessel; I don't really think we need to complicate it with that unless you do. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I was simply going to say that by Georgia law it is illegal to land any fish that we manage that has been landed with a gillnet no matter where it was caught; and therefore based on our position, I would care not to have Action 3 in this amendment.

MR. BELL: Well, I was going to make a motion.

MR. HARTIG: Well, go ahead and make a motion.

MR. BELL: I would move that we not include Action 3 in the document. That is kind of consistent with where I've been coming from before.

MR. HARTIG: Doug seconded. Discussion? Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, the only difference I see with this particular action is they are on a commercial trip and it is a gear conflict issue. I feel like we've gone through the discussion about bag limit sales with the for-hire guys or recreationally caught fish. You know, to an extent that I would like to not necessarily have to repeat those discussions for dolphin; but I think in this situation I could go with it if that was the desire of the committee because it is a commercially caught fish. It is just a gear conflict between what they're allowed to catch king mackerel with.

MR. BELL: And I realize this one is a little different in that at least it is commercial, but probably my strongest objection would be from it makes things rather complicated for law enforcement. This came up at the Law Enforcement AP, and they weren't too keen on it, I think. But just in terms of enforceability I guess, there would be some challenges, but it is a little different from some of the things we've talked about related to sale off of charter vessels and all. At least it is a commercial trip, granted. It is not really an issue for South Carolina because we don't have that fishery. We don't allow the shark gillnet fisher, period.

DR. DUVAL: Well, the issue is really turning what would dead discarded fish into landed catch. The fish are going to be caught anyway. It was something that was allowed previously. I think people are getting a little bit tied around the terminology that we're using, which is bag limit sales. I think it is just a very limited limit for that particular fishery.

MR. COX: They have the appropriate permits. Everything they're doing is legal. It is commercial; it is a little bit of a bycatch they're just trying to get some yield out of. I would support it.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; it addresses accountability and waste. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I see they've got listed a shark directed or shark incidental commercial permit. What would you be gillnetting with only a shark incidental permit?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I contacted HMS to ask what permit they would have. I thought it was just shark directed, but I was told they could gillnet with either one of those so I added those. I can verify that for the language of the alternative.

MS. BECKWITH: Could we not change the terminology from "bag limit sales" to "limited exception trip limit of three mackerel"? Isn't there another way of terming it to be commercial catch rather than bag limit sales?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I think it would be tricky because gillnet is not an authorized gear for commercial king mackerel except in the Keys with that gillnet fishery.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to comment on the reduction in regulatory discards. The bag limit is three from Georgia to North Carolina; so if you had a crew of two or three, you're six to nine fish, I think you're still going to have a fair number of regulatory discards. It won't really cut them down that much.

MR. HARTIG: Do you have a fair number of discard limit?

MR. HAYMANS: Michelle's comment was that it gets at the bycatch issue, right, the dead discards. The bag limit – which is what we're talking about, bag limit sales is three fish from Georgia through its northern range; and so if you've got a crew of two or three, you're really only talking about six to maybe nine fish, right, so you still have a fair number of dead – or at least discards from that fishery, I would think. I don't know it that well. I don't know that you're necessarily reducing dead discards by that great of a number.

MR. HARTIG: Well, the evolution of the fishery, the boats have gotten much smaller over time. They're not fishing as much gear. A lot of times it is a stab-net fishery now. They've made a number of strides to be able to stop catching king mackerel in particular and just catch the small coastal sharks.

The small coastal shark; actually the fishery itself has gone through major changes. They only want X-amount coming in from our fishermen, so these guys aren't staying out there all night on

a normal evening. They're tending their nets; and when see about what they need, they pull their gear. The quality concerns about the sharks have gone up over time as well.

Your sharks have to be good quality to go on the market now. That market has constrained the time they actually fish. This is something but for these few guys is an important part of a trip for them; because since they can't sell as many sharks, whatever bag limit they catch – and the average price of king mackerel during that time when they fish is between three and four dollars, so it is not insignificant even at six fish. That is a part of their trip costs that could pay for their fuel, anyway. Mel.

MR. BELL: I'll admit what I'm hung up over is the recreational bag limit in effect or the bag limit. I can understand you have some bycatch there that you don't want to waste. I appreciate that and the value of it to them, but the reason we can't go that route is just because you can't – the restrictions on the use of a gillnet, so we're sort of stuck into the only allowable gear. That's the only way to accommodate those guys in this case, I guess, without changing a whole 'nother law or something.

MR. PHILLIPS: And just because you can't sell them does not necessarily mean they're a discard. They can still be given away and used in some other way. Again, we can't do it in Georgia, not that we have that fishery either, anyway, so I'm kind of torn with this one.

DR. DUVAL: Well, could really retain the recreational limit of king mackerel on a commercial shark gillnet trip? Is that allowed? In other words, if you catch these fish in their driftnets and they bring them on board and law enforcement stops them and they say, "Well, you know, I have my recreational limit"; I mean is that allowed. Charlie is saying that they could keep the fish and give them away or something; can they actually keep the fish? My question is wouldn't they be forced to discard them anyway because it is not an authorized gear type in the fishery?

MR. HARTIG: That is a good point and I hadn't thought about that as well. They probably wouldn't be able to; they would have to discard them based on the gear considerations or not.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Well, I think that it is an unauthorized gear for commercial kings, right, or are they authorized gear for recreational? Your king mackerel commercial permits just allows you to exceed the bag limit. I guess it comes down to if it is an authorized gear – if it is an unauthorized gear for recreational in the regulations. I don't know.

MS. McCAWLEY: Gillnet is not an authorized gear for recreational.

MR. HARTIG: All right, we've got a motion and we've had a lot of discussion. **All those in favor of the motion, raise your hand, six; all those opposed, five. It was six to five. Any abstentions? I didn't see any. The motion passes.** That brings us Potential Action 4, establish a sub-quota for the new king mackerel mixing zone.

DR. CRABTREE: We should revote.

MR. BREWER: Somebody can check, but I don't think I am a member of this committee and I voted.

MR. HARTIG: All right, let's go back to the vote again.

MS. McCAWLEY: Can you read who is on the committee again?

MR. HARTIG: We've put it on the screen. I'm sorry I didn't catch it; that is my fault. Chester, that is my bad. **All those in favor of the motion; five in favor of the motion. All those opposed, six. The motion fails.** Pres Pate voted; that is the difference. Jack.

DR. McGOVERN: One thing I believe this action; Sue sent me a chat saying that the Mackerel AP talked about this yesterday, and they had a recommendation that the small coastal gillnet fishery in the South Atlantic be allowed to harvest and sell the recreational bag limit as long as the vessel had a federal commercial king mackerel permit and the king mackerel season was open. So just for the committee to realize that.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: And that was the Gulf AP.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Kari, if this is going to stay in the document, Alternative 2 has a couple of different actions. I might put 2A would be shark vessels fishing in Florida EEZ and then 2B could be those vessels fishing north of the Georgia/Florida Line. That way the council – it would just make it a little more clearer for everybody to see.

DR. DUVAL: I move that we include Action 3 and its alternatives in the document.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle; second by Jack. Is there anymore discussion? Objection? The motion passes with two objections. This is Potential Action 4.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: It is coming in from the Regional Office that gillnet is not considered allowable gear for recreational sector for Atlantic king mackerel, so you may need to allow the gear; make that an authorized gear for Atlantic king mackerel, recreational.

MR. HARTIG: Why would you do it because you're talking about a recreational bag limit? This is where we got stuck a little while ago talking about how do we separate the fish out. Before we allowed it as a recreational bag limit to be retained.

Now we're getting some additional information that if you allow it – and this is just my train of thought and I don't know if that's what their train of thought is; that if you're allowing a recreational bag limit on a commercial vessel, do you have to allow gillnet gear in the recreational fishery?

DR. CRABTREE: I'm not sure what we need to change to do this, but this is a commercial gear. These are commercial vessels. This is better called a trip limit for vessels with these permits that they have. I don't know what that entails, but I think we're getting screwed up because we're trying to characterize this as recreational and there is nothing recreational about this.

MR. PHILLIPS: Don't we want to just call it a commercial bag limit that is equal to the recreational bag limit and that might just clean it up?

MR. HARTIG: I don't know that you have to really call it – you know, we can allow X fish per person on that vessel. I don't how you solve it with allowable gear. We're not going to solve it today. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My sentiments exactly. I was going to suggest that you let the IPT maybe come up with some wording and get back to you. You wouldn't have to solve it today.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; that would be my suggestion as well. I don't want to get wrapped around the axle on this one any more than we already have. The next time you see this, it will come before you in a different format. You guys' concerns about the recreational bag limit part is out of it, so maybe that will help.

DR. DUVAL: Just one final point; so when those were allowed previously under, quote-unquote, bag limit sales, gillnets were still not an allowable recreational gear, so I guess I fail to see where the confusion; but I agree, let's let the IPT work it out. I think it is clear what the intent is.

MR. HARTIG: And I do, too, so let's go on to Potential Action 4, establish a sub-quota for new king mackerel mixing zone.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: When we went through the scoping items in December, you approved a motion to include a scoping item and an action in this document – and we brought back to you – to establish a sub-quota for the new king mackerel mixing zone, which is the very tiny area just south and east of the Keys.

I went back and I looked at the minutes, because really this would be – first of all, I can't show you those landing because they're confidential, so that would make it tricky about how you're going to allocate. It kind of depends on what you decide to do in Action 1. If you guys to set that stock boundary to where the Gulf is managing the whole of Monroe County, it really would be a sub-quota for that new mixing zone that would be this tiny proportion of the Atlantic ACL that would go. I'm not really sure how we could do this.

Then looking back at the minutes, I think this maybe was a wording mix-up or maybe misunderstanding on my part where you were actually talking about looking at a sub-quota for that area that we now call the Florida East Coast Subzone. However, right now they have a quota of the Gulf ACL for their winter and that is what they fish on. They have their own trip limits and AMs for that quota.

I would like to first say are you guys interested in exploring a sub-quota for the new mixing zone, which is the little tiny part in the Keys. That is going to be a proportion of the ACL. Are you interested in looking at a sub-quota for what we now call the Florida East Coast Subzone, which is Volusia/Flagler to Dade/Monroe? That's two questions.

MR. HARTIG: So logically in this one it seems to me, Roy Williams, that whoever manages that zone would manage that small portion in the mixing zone based on your regulations you have throughout that major portion of your fishery. In that sub-zone you'd have the same regulations for that fishery.

When we changed now, that was the only question I had. When you change winter versus summer and we had Atlantic fish in that zone, since it is so small, I don't think it really matters, anyway. That was the only thing that showed up to me is when you changed April 1 and you changed the zone designations.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I don't have an opinion as to whether it should be its own sub-quota or not. Historically, there has been a very significant commercial fishery within that sub-quota, but really very little of it was in the Upper and Middle Keys. It was Key West and on into the Gulf. They were landed in Key West and Marathon and Naples. Well, it was registered in Naples.

I don't really have an opinion as to whether there should be a sub-quota for them. The really significant fisheries, the gillnet fishery and the hook-and-line fishery, are already managed by quotas. Somehow we're going to have to pick those up in all this change and make some provision for them. The rest of the commercial fishery – and I'm sure there is commercial fishing up the Keys, but they're not huge fisheries. The recreational fishery is probably no different there than it is anywhere else other than the charter fleets are going to be big during the winter months.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; they do catch king mackerel throughout the year in the charter fishery in particular. There is not much of a commercial fishery based on the landings we can't see, but obviously the number is relatively low. I think you could probably fold it into any region who manages that area, fold it into their regulatory structure and you wouldn't have any big impacts on anyone. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Kari, is this confidential because of harvesters or dealers?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: It didn't specify. It is not satisfying one of those; that's what the SEDAR folks –

MR. HAYMANS: If it is harvesters; I mean, you're almost a catch share if it is one, two or three harvesters.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I can tell you it kind of ranges between 50 and 175,000 over many years. That's the level you're looking at and we're talking about a commercial ACL of 4 point something million pounds. It is a little tiny sliver.

MR. HARTIG: Any thoughts on this one? This one might be something – I'm talking ahead, but we may actually get together with the Gulf in June and we could have some kind of action here that may change in June when we talk to the Gulf on how they want to manage it and who is going to manage it, really, is a big question. Whether or not the public sees value in whichever council manages it, that's another thing that enters into it as well.

There are a lot of unknowns in this one. I don't know that we necessarily have to include this right now. If we do make a change in June and the Gulf says, yes, we do; then we could, but I don't think we necessarily need it in here at least based on what I have thought over time. Go ahead Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; I would agree with that it is truly going to depend on our conversations with the Gulf and what is selected as a preferred alternative under Action 1. I guess to get to Kari's question number two about whether or not you want an action to consider the specifics of quota for the East Coast Florida Subzone, that chunk between I guess Flagler/Volusia and the Monroe/Dade Line, it seemed like there was some public comment on that.

MR. HARTIG: Do we need a motion for you Kari not to establish a sub-quota for the new king mackerel mixing zone?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I kind of feel like this is something that as we develop Action 1 and look into what it is going to look like if one council is managing all of Monroe County; that it will kind of be folded into that. I think that you could probably take this action out right now; and then if that is something, then it will kind of go into management of Monroe County under Action 1 and explain how that will work.

MR. HARTIG: I'm comfortable with that part of it. Number 2 was should we establish an East Coast Subzone allocation out of the Atlantic group mackerel. That is one that I think has potential. It is the way this fishery has been managed over time. There are biological and economic considerations for that. Biologically, this area is primarily a trolling area. The fish are smaller.

When we get to a point – and as the fish age, they escape out of that trolling gear so there are selectivity issues. When we get to a point when we have a healthier stock and you could actually allow a little more harvest in a particular year based on a year class; I think you could actually go into the area and North Carolina as well because it is a trolling fishery and a gillnet fishery.

You could actually take advantage of that potential year class in those earlier years for mackerel that escapes that type of gear at a certain time. As it is growing, as it is aging, you may want to do that. This is longer-term stuff I'm thinking of, but this area, these guys have been under this type of management for a long time. I think it makes some sense to use that East Coast Subzone.

As we go through this and as we go along, it may fall out. For now I would like to see us look at that East Coast Subzone and continuing to keep that sub-zone as a management unit within our new definition of the stock. It could fall out in the future as we go through this, but I think now it would be a good option to retain.

DR. DUVAL: So you need a motion to add an action; so I move that add an action to the document to retain the Florida East Coast Subzone.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle; seconded by Charlie. Any other discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: And just for direction to staff, when we are looking at this Florida East Coast Subzone and retaining it, we're going to look at some sub-quota options for them and can bring those back to you in June.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; that would be great; looking at the level of harvest of that area; looking at the catch levels we have now. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Kari, you had included a number of different things here from public comment like potentially moving the subzone boundary, so I assume those are all things that the IPT would look through.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: And we can bring those back to you when you look at the county level landings so you can see where it is kind of concentrated, which is a little more in the northern part. You can make a decision about changing the boundary or splitting it up even more or something like that.

When we brought that up at the scoping, a lot of the people that came were a little more focused on other items that they were discussing; and so we didn't get a lot of feedback on wanted to do; if they wanted a quota, if they wanted to change anything about the way it is set up. We could present some ideas in June of changing the boundaries of it or something like that, but we didn't get any public input on it at this point. I can bring it up with the Mackerel AP and some input from them about it.

MR. HARTIG: And that would helpful. That AP input is going to be critical to moving ahead as well. There may be some talk about seasons, changing the season as well in that area. I did hear that. I've heard one or two people talk about that. That brings to Potential Action 6, which is revise the annual catch limit for Gulf Migratory King Mackerel.

The rest of these options in this document pertain to the Gulf and we do not have to go through them. We will be relying on the Gulf to bring us their recommendations based the remainder of the options in this document. Having said that, Kari, what do we need additionally from you?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I would also like to see if you guys would make and approve a motion to allow staff to move the organization of the actions and alternatives around. We may need to do that and we will bring that back to you and you can see it, but I just want to make sure everybody is okay with letting us do that.

DR. DUVAL: I move that we allow staff and IPT and reorganize the document and actions as necessary.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Zack. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved. All right, that brings us to 28, Kari, which is talking about separating the permits between jurisdictions, possible jurisdictional separations. What attachment is that?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Well, we put together a decision document in Attachment 6, but I think that we should let Monica lead the discussion about this and then we can go into the decision document and see what direction you want to move in.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you; I think that is a very wise order of business.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm going to give you a brief overview of what it would take to get divorced. So many jokes come to mind, and I just really have to work on bringing them up in terms of counselling and all that sort of stuff. This is a joint FMP and under the Magnuson Act, under Section 304(f), it discusses fisheries under the authority of more than one council.

It states that the Secretary can designate a council to prepare an FMP for that fishery or may require that the plan and amendment be prepared jointly by the councils concerned. That is what you have; you have joint management with the Gulf. It does say that no jointly prepared plan or amendment may be submitted to the Secretary unless it is approved by a majority of the voting members present and voting of each council concerned.

I think the better way to do this procedural wise would be to have a joint amendment with the Gulf in which you would separate out your two FMPs, if you will. Kari included as Attachment 6 for Amendment 28, the decision document, some background on what happened when you split the Coral FMP back in '94 or so between the Gulf and South Atlantic.

You had a joint Coral FMP; and for various reasons you requested a split of that. The Gulf ultimately agreed, so there was a proposed and final rule that did split the two FMPs. Just briefly, I'll read a little bit from what happened there. When you requested that it be split, you did send a letter to the Secretary outlining your rationale as to why you wanted the split. I believe there was one amendment going through at the time.

The Gulf was taking longer on their portion, and you thought that there were biological reasons to implement the South Atlantic portion sooner and so ultimately you asked the Secretary to split it. In that letter you said the South Atlantic Council believes; one, the habitats in the Gulf and South Atlantic are different; two, the resource does not move between the South Atlantic and Gulf; three, it should have authority, it being the South Atlantic, to coordinate all habitat concerns and policies in the South Atlantic; four, there are additional management needs in the South Atlantic; five, the councils have different management philosophies; and, six, the separate FMP will improve timeliness of the management adjustments and reduce constituents' cost.

The Gulf concurs in the South Atlantic's request. Then in the final rule there was a response to comment that addressed essentially and stated "and the public may benefit due to decreased travel cost for attending council meetings. Members of the public who use the resource under the jurisdiction of only one or the other council will only need to attend the meetings of one council.

It does appear that there may be increasing divergence between the management regimes of the two councils. Obviously, this isn't coral; mackerel isn't coral. Mackerel moves around and

that's one of the reasons you had a joint FMP I assume in the first place because you thought at that time it must have been one stock; and now we've figured it might not be one stock.

There is some background and history for this all being done before. I would suggest that you look at the National Standards when you're developing your rationale for why it is appropriate to split the FMP into two FMPs. There are some good things here in the National Standards. For example, conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, minimize cost and avoid unnecessary duplication.

They should allow for variations among and contingencies in fisheries, fishery resources and catches. There are a number of national standards but National Standard 3 jumps out to me the most right now, because it says to the extent practicable an individual stock of fish should be managed as a unit throughout the range and interrelated stocks of fish should be managed at a unit or in close coordination.

Then the guidelines for National Standard state that there can be many different reasons for having a management unit that may not go for the full range of the stock, and that and be included biological, geographic, economic, technical, social. What I'm saying to you is you should use the national standards as rationale for why you want to manage these different fish differently than the Gulf.

A few other things to consider is would that rationale be different for your different stocks. You've got king mackerel, Spanish mackerel and cobia and the boundaries aren't the same for all those different fish between the Gulf and South Atlantic. Then you've got the Florida Keys issues where you've got a South Florida Committee that is meeting to discuss management for at least those fishermen that is consistent between the South Atlantic and the Gulf. You've got those issues.

Then you've got the permit issue. Right now there is one king mackerel permit and there is one Spanish mackerel permit that spans the South Atlantic and Gulf areas; so we need to figure out – I would assume we would need two separate permits for each of those stocks or species, I should say, for Atlantic and for Gulf. We're going to figure out how to split that.

Anyway, those are the kinds of things that we need to work on when we develop Amendment 28. I certainly think that you might be able to develop an adequate record. It is going to take a little bit of time, but these are issues you've thought about before. I dusted off my divorce file from my filing cabinet, because it has been brought up in the past.

I wished I was more thorough in that file now and have everything at my fingertips; but, no, I had to go look at some more things, but that's fine. This is certainly something that each council has brought up before and you've had a long history of occasionally these things bubbling up. If you want to go through with this, I think that we need to develop Amendment 28 along the national standards and see where that leads you.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that. Bringing the other species into it, sometimes you get focused on one particular species and you need to look at everything in totality on this and how we separate this out between the Gulf and the South Atlantic. Thoughts from the committee on

proceeding forward. I think what you'd probably need to see is a breakdown of all the species and how we manage those. For cobia, the Gulf manages all the way up through, where, to the Florida –

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: It is in the document.

MR. HARTIG: All right. I missed it.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: In that Attachment 6. We can go through it and I have the maps for the boundaries and everything. But Figure 5 for cobia specifically, the stock boundary is at the Georgia/Florida Line, but the South Atlantic manages all the way to the council boundary. That is the management boundary for cobia. It is just that Florida East Coast Zone has a portion of the Gulf ACL. I can walk through these.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, go ahead, please do.

MR. WILLIAMS: When was that Florida East Zone for cobia created? I don't remember that.

MR. HARTIG: Just recently.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: It was in 20B.

MR. WILLIAMS: And that is managed as part of the Gulf of Mexico Group?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: The South Atlantic manages it, but there is a portion of the Gulf ACL is what they are fishing on. It is considered all the way through Florida East Coast to be Gulf cobia.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And that was based on a stock assessment, Roy, where it said that those stocks split, they thought.

MR. HARTIG: Roy, over time, if you look at the genetic work and who is saying what when; it is one stock, it is not, it is one stock, it is not. We've jumped back and forth and finally we just made a determination based on all the information put together that this was the best way to manage the stock now; not to say that it won't change in the future.

MR. BELL: And that northern line there was really derived from genetics' work, so it is pretty confident, I think, in terms of looking at a number of fish. That's how that came to be.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; Mel is correct. There has been extensive work in South Carolina about the genetics and the migratory patterns there. They've really a lot of ground-breaking work on identifying – because they actually have in their estuaries almost resident stocks of cobia that go to these particular estuaries every year during the spawning season. There has been a lot more information coming out in the recent past than we hadn't looked at before. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, if staff is going to make a list of the species; could they kind of make us a little cheat sheet of expected advantages/disadvantages. Then we can decide if our marital discord is to the point of divorce or not.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: I think it is a good idea.

MR. HARTIG: I'll let Kari go through this so you get a better idea of what we're talking about.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: We put together this kind of to give a background on what you would have to think about if you separate the FMPs and then kind of a little overview of how everything is managed right now. Starting on Page 2 with king mackerel, I have the current boundaries in there and we just went through how this is going to change and possibly you could select to set your management boundary at the Monroe/Dade Line for king mackerel, in which case the South Atlantic would manage north of the Dade/Monroe Line and the Gulf would manage the Keys and all the way through the Gulf.

Currently you have in Figure 1 and Figure 2 what the king mackerel seasonal boundaries look like just for reference. Here we have Figure 3 which shows our mixing zone. These are things to think about. Then you have one federal commercial permit for king mackerel that allows you to sell the catch and to sell two mackerel from Texas all the way through the Mid-Atlantic.

Currently there are about 1,300 permits. It is limited entry. There is also a king mackerel gillnet endorsement and there are 19 of those. There are separate CMP for-hire permits. There is a Gulf CMP for-hire and Atlantic, and those cover king and Spanish and cobia. In the Spanish mackerel the management boundary is a fixed boundary at the Monroe/Dade Line.

We have it set up here you can see in Figure 4. We have our northern and southern zone that was set up in 20B. All the Spanish mackerel harvested in the Florida Keys are considered Gulf stock. There is one commercial permit for Spanish mackerel for both regions, but it is open access. It kind of varies, but right now there is about 1,700 permits. They fall under those separate federal CMP for-hire permits.

We have cobia which we just talked about; so in Amendment 28 we established the stock boundary at the Georgia/Florida Line based on the information used in SEDAR 28, which found that is where that was a distinction between the stocks; so Gulf stock all the way up the east coast of Florida. What 20B did was it gave a proportion of the Gulf ACL to that Florida East Coast Zone ACL so Florida has its own ACL for cobia.

But then 20B also specified that the South Atlantic has management jurisdiction over cobia all the way to the council boundary in the Florida Keys. That whole striped area; they're fishing on Gulf stock. We have a proportion of the Gulf ACL for that, but the South Atlantic Council manages that whole area. There is no federal commercial permit requirement.

You guys considered that in 20A or 20B at one point but decided that you didn't want to have a commercial permit requirement. There is just a two cobia per person per day bag limit and possession limit. Then next we have that background information on the coral amendment that

split the Coral FMP in '94. After you have a discussion, you just want to give guidance to staff if you want to start developing this for your June meeting, your joint meeting, and what will go into it.

MS. McCAWLEY: I think it would be my opinion that we don't need to develop this any further. I thought that originally we had gotten some support for this from the Cocoa Beach area, but then at the recent public hearing I thought that people changed their mind and they were opposed to doing this. It was my impression from the Gulf Council meeting that they didn't want to do this. They were just kind of taking it out to scoping because they thought we wanted to do this. I feel like the initial push that pushed us in this direction in the first place is kind of gone.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; it depends on how long you've been around, but I'm willing to go any way the committee wants to go on this. That is not a problem. What you said is exactly true. We had some discussion about separating permits and we had discussion about endorsements. That conversation was that, well, if we do it, then they're going to do it in the Gulf and then we may get pushed out of the Gulf. That is what they had said; you've probably read the minutes. I think they were amenable to doing this if the Gulf had initiated it first. What are the other opinions on the committee? Roy, you've got something?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I was just going to agree with Jessica in my preference. We've got enough other things going and I don't think we need to deal with this now.

MS. McCAWLEY: I would make a motion that we discontinue work on Amendment 28.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Jessica; second by Charlie. Discussion? Charlie, did you have something?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes; I was just going to say that if we don't really need it, we've got enough work to do and concentrate on what we need to do.

MR. HARTIG: Any other discussion? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I haven't been around here very long, so I'm still coming up to speed on all of the old mackerel wars, I guess. I guess maybe I'm just a little confused by the Gulf Council Report because I read the council's concerns in the past over Gulf-specific permit issues, including how to address effort in the western and northern Gulf zones from traveling fishermen.

The committee recommends and I so move to move forward with scoping hearings on CMP Amendment 28 at the same meetings as CMP Amendment 26. It sounds to me like there was support from the Gulf for that. I guess the other thing I would just say is in regards to potentially looking at one of the benefits of separate FMPs, it seems like the administrative logistical stuff of going back and forth might be easier for both councils. Obviously, the administrative effort associated with developing two separate FMPs or having an amendment to do that is not insignificant. I would love to see the IPT pros/cons for each of the species still.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: In the Gulf AP they did – when they just met, they supported separate FMPs. I don't know if Mr. Williams wants to speak on the Gulf's position on that.

MR. HARTIG: Let me get Jessica while you're thinking about if you want to talk about it or not.

MS. McCAWLEY: It was my impression from what Martha said happened at the Gulf; that it was a reluctant we're going to take this out to scoping, because they hadn't seen it since we started work on it. I guess the way that the Gulf staff presented it was the only reason we're even bringing this up to you is because this is what the South Atlantic wants. It was my impression from the discussions with Martha that it was a very reluctant, okay, we will move forward and look at this, but her impression was that the council didn't really want to do it. That's what I'm going on.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm not on the Mackerel Committee on the Gulf anymore, so I'm not sure what their thinking is. I know that there will be a move to try to keep the Florida East Coast fishermen out of the western and northern Gulf. Realistically, they probably have the votes to do it somehow, and I think that this is tied into that in some way.

They've talked extensively about – well, they've talked some about trading an endorsement on the king mackerel permit and you would only be allowed to – the endorsement would have an area associated with it and you'd have to choose where you wanted to fish and you could only choose one of them. I really have no feeling as to how the Gulf Council feels about this.

My guess is there is not a lot of enthusiasm for it other than – as Michelle point out, it does create an administrative burden when it is a joint amendment to have to go back and forth. You guys do something and you still have to wait until we meet again to okay it and probably we don't have any objection to it if it affects just your area of jurisdiction and vice-versa. It does create an administrative burden and some wasted cost; but it is going to be a real burden to divide these things, too. It is not going to be easy. I don't have anything else to say; I don't know what I just said.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, we could still ask Kari to give us the cheat sheet. If we want to come back and look at again and we get a different viewpoint from the Gulf; still just because we're not going to do it today it doesn't mean we can't start it in June or something.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I'm just going to make a smartass comment that in 20B we've gone the route of state-by-state quotas. Florida would have its own mackerel quota and you could manage all the mackerel mess in Florida all yourselves.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, what is the pleasure of the committee?

MR. HAYMANS: Call the question.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, we have a motion to discontinue work on Amendment 28. Anymore more discussion? Doug called the question; no. **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Do want me to include the pros and cons cheat sheet in the timing and task for the next meeting?

MR. HARTIG: Is there any other business to come before the Mackerel Committee? Seeing none; you guys get nine more minutes for lunch.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:50 o'clock a.m. March 5, 2015.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
March 25, 2015

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

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

W. Chester Brewer

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

Mark Brown

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

Chris Conklin

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

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

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

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 POWERS

JACK MCGOVERN

IRIS LOWERY

SP. AGT. TRACEY WOODROFF

MARCEL REICHART

PRES PATE

ROY WILLIAMS

ERIKA BURGESS

GEORGE SEDBERRY

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2014 Committees

AD HOC SOUTH FLORIDA COMMITTEE (NEW)

Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Chester Brewer
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood and Gregg Waugh

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Ben Hartig
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
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
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
Chip Collier - CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Acting Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

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

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

✓ Ben Hartig, Chair
✓ Anna Beckwith
✓ Mel Bell
✓ Zack Bowen
✓ Mark Brown
✓ 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
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES

Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Michelle Duval
LT Morgan Fowler
Ben Hartig
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

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

(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

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

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

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@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

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

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Mackerel Committee Meeting
Thursday, March 5, 2015

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:	EMAIL ADDRESS:	MAILING ADDRESS:
Russell Anderson SAFES DSF	386-239-0948	DSF2009@aol.com	32120-9351
John Summers			
James Morley		J.M.Morley@ntgcs.edu	
Emily Henricus Pew	514-670-3397	ehenmic@pewtrust.org	
Alvaro Almeida	561-906-0002	transports@yaho.com	
Georse Selberry 11044			
Leba Dunne Pew			
DICK BAUME	LCF		
Holly Binn Pew			
Lora Clarke Pew			

3

- My Webinars
- Schedule a Webinar
- My Recordings
- Webinar History
- Generate Reports
- Settings

My Webinars Manage Webinar Registrant List

Registrants for "SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)"

Registration Report

Enter part of a name or email address

	Registrants	Email Address	Registration Date	Time
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wheatley, Thomas	tomwheatley24@gmail...	Mar 05, 2015	3:57 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	kloster..., joseph	grkjfk@omcast.net	Mar 05, 2015	3:44 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hanson, Chad	chanson@pewtrusts.org	Mar 05, 2015	3:38 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hildreth, Delaine	delaine_hildreth@gad...	Mar 05, 2015	3:33 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Knowiton, Kathy	kathy.knowiton@gadnr...	Mar 05, 2015	2:36 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	gregory, doug	doug.gregory@gulfcou...	Mar 05, 2015	2:28 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brennan, Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa...	Mar 05, 2015	1:42 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clarke, Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	Mar 05, 2015	1:38 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Malinowski, Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa...	Mar 05, 2015	1:30 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larkin, Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa...	Mar 05, 2015	1:20 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brogan, Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org	Mar 05, 2015	12:41 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Williams, John	john@shrimpalliance...	Mar 05, 2015	11:18 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	cardin, bobby	finchaser357@aol.com	Mar 05, 2015	10:57 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	hull, jimmy	hullsseafoos@aol.com	Mar 05, 2015	10:20 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lee, Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	Mar 05, 2015	10:10 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gore, Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	Mar 05, 2015	10:05 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	rindone, ryan	ryan.rindone@gulfcou...	Mar 05, 2015	9:27 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alvarado, Nicolas	Nicolas.Alvarado@noa...	Mar 05, 2015	9:22 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Takade..., Helen	htakade@edf.org	Mar 05, 2015	9:17 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bubley, Walter	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov	Mar 05, 2015	9:00 AM EST

46 Selected | Deselect All Registrants

1-20 of 46 

Cancel Registration Resend Confirmation Email

My Webinars

Schedule a Webinar

My Recordings

Webinar History

Generate Reports

Settings

My Webinars Manage Webinar Registrant List



Registrants for "SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)"

Registration Report

Enter part of a name or email address

	Registrants	Email Address	Registration Date	Time
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DeVictor, Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.g...	Mar 05, 2015	9:00 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bailey, Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	Mar 05, 2015	8:59 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Package..., Christina	christina.package-wa...	Mar 05, 2015	8:58 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lamberte, Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.g...	Mar 05, 2015	8:38 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neer, Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	Mar 05, 2015	8:33 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ballenger, Joseph	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov	Mar 05, 2015	8:25 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bresnen, Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfw...	Mar 05, 2015	8:22 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c, m	mec181@yahoo.com	Mar 05, 2015	8:19 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gerhart, Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.g...	Mar 05, 2015	8:18 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bademan, Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc...	Mar 05, 2015	8:18 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	holiman, stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa...	Mar 05, 2015	8:17 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Erwin, Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com	Mar 05, 2015	8:04 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Raine, Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov	Mar 05, 2015	7:58 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laks, Ira	captainira@att.net	Mar 05, 2015	7:35 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MacLau..., Bill	billmac@charter.net	Mar 04, 2015	10:04 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DuBeck, Guy	guy.dubeck@noaa.gov	Mar 04, 2015	2:43 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	vara, mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	Mar 04, 2015	10:10 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karp, Fran	francine.karp@gmail...	Mar 03, 2015	1:27 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Foreman, Allan	acforeman1@hotmail.c...	Feb 26, 2015	12:49 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Binns, Joe	joebinns@gmail.com	Feb 23, 2015	2:46 PM EST

46 Selected | Deselect All Registrants

21-40 of 46  

Cancel Registration

Resend Confirmation Email

- [My Webinars](#)
- [Schedule a Webinar](#)
- [My Recordings](#)
- [Webinar History](#)
- [Generate Reports](#)
- [Settings](#)

[My Webinars](#) | [Manage Webinar](#) | [Registrant List](#)



Registrants for "SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)"

[Registration Report](#)

Enter part of a name or email address

	Registrants	Email Address	Registration Date	Time
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Herndon, Andrew	andrew.herndon@noaa....	Feb 13, 2015	8:16 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Byrd, J	julia.byrd@safmc.net	Feb 12, 2015	10:05 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FARMER, NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov	Feb 11, 2015	12:39 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mehta, Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	Feb 11, 2015	11:54 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	sandorf, scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.g...	Feb 11, 2015	11:48 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clemens, Anik	anik.clemens@noaa.gov	Feb 11, 2015	11:47 AM EST

46 Selected | [Deselect All Registrants](#)

41-46 of 46  

[Cancel Registration](#) [Resend Confirmation Email](#)