

**PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION
JEKYLL ISLAND, GEORGIA
MARCH 4, 2026**

DR. RUNDE: Good afternoon. Brenden Runde, with the Nature Conservancy. I would like to make a comment about the special spawning management zones that were discussed this morning. I was part of a team that evaluated the three natural bottom SSMZs off the South Atlantic, and I appreciated the discussion this morning and the willingness of the council to extend or remove the sunset provision on these areas to continue their protection.

I would like to comment on the matter of future data collection. The justification for considering extending the sunset, as compared to removing it, is that having a deadline is a strong motivation for performing science and collecting data. Certainly this is why our team was able to collect high quality information on these areas over the past couple of years, and we're grateful to the council and to the NOAA Fisheries Cooperative Research Program for joining the Nature Conservancy's donors in funding this research.

As we heard this morning, there is need for additional science on these areas, but the source of funding for that research is not a foregone conclusion. While in the case of our recent study, an NGO was able to make ends meet to execute sorely-needed scientific research, we may not always be so lucky. I urge the council and NOAA Fisheries to consider identifying the means of funding for future research on these areas well in advance of any future sunset.

As a replacement or supplement to funding external research on the future of special spawning management zones, I would like to make a suggestion regarding data collection for these areas. We heard a little this morning about how the Southeast Reef Fish Survey and the South Atlantic Deepwater Longline Survey both have pre-existing stations inside some or all of the three natural bottom SSMZ. However, these areas are not automatically sampled each year, as they're part of the broader group of stations that are randomly selected.

The Science Center and their partners at South Carolina DNR MARMAP could adjust their sampling frame protocols to institute fixed perennial sampling of stations inside the closed areas, and could perhaps carefully select some stations adjacent to and outside the closed areas to serve as controls. We heard several council members raise the point this morning of how the data collection that we conducted over the past couple years was only inside the areas, and we had no control, and this is a route to collecting some data in a non-closed area. Abundance information and biological samples collected during these efforts would equip the council to consider more specialized refinement the next time these closures are discussed at the table. Thank you.

MS. GUYAS: Hi, everybody. Good afternoon. Martha Guyas, with the American Sportfishing Association. First, I just want to say thank you to the states for developing some very innovative exempted fishing permits, and they hopefully, I think, are going to get everybody to a better place on red snapper management, and I'll just leave it at that.

Back to the South Atlantic topics, regarding the value-risk matrix that was discussed yesterday, we very much appreciated the conversation, and really the recognition that, you know, we aren't actively managing many of the species that are, you know, quote, unquote, managed by the council, and there is a need to narrow the scope and strategically prioritize.

However, I do have some concerns about the estimated values of recreational fisheries in this region. I think they're vastly underestimated and leave it leave some gaping holes in the recreational supply chain, and, really, my concern is that that's going to mean, once again, the South Atlantic, and the Southeast region as a whole, will continue to be left behind and not get its fair share of resources for managing fisheries, and so I encourage the council and the SSC to really dig into those numbers and make sure they are representative of the real world.

Thank you for the discussion yesterday on the shark proposed rulemaking. Overall, we're supportive of what HMS is trying to achieve, but support the suggestions that came out of your discussion yesterday.

On the snapper grouper innovation plan, we very much appreciate that the council is working on this. We hope it can help frame up some of the challenging discussions and decisions that the council faces. I love the Genio quote. It's really good. It's a great way to kind of set the stage. Just one reflection on the discussion on yield, and, I mean, this is one of the glaring issues with MSA being written for commercial fisheries, but applied to everyone, right, and so there there's been patches along the way to try to account for recreational fishing, but it creates real challenges for councils.

Efficiency is another one of those cases where it doesn't really fit the reality of how recreational fishing operates, and so thank you for recognizing that, in recreational fisheries, yield is more about access and opportunity, and just trying to think through this, and that just, again, thank you.

I like the Discard 101 action item. We definitely support removing developing this sector allocations based on total catch from the document, because, I mean, we don't have the ability to do this, and I felt like that, compared to the rest of the document, which is really a broad guide for how the committee operates, and how you make decisions, and that was more of a policy directive of what the future committee should be doing, and how they should set regulations, which certainly isn't appropriate, especially when we don't have information to make those decisions.

Good progress also on Amendment 61 this morning. One other thing I will touch on is the snapper grouper MSE that you all will talk about I think tomorrow, and I would take those survey results with a grain of salt. It's certainly not representative of the wider angler opinions, based on my experience in communications with the recreational industry and anglers. I was on the stakeholder working group, and some of the management options offered in the survey are pretty irrelevant at this point, and missing nuance and background information, and leave out viable options. Thank you.

MR. HORTON: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the council. I'm Chris Horton, Senior Director of the Fisheries Policy for the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, and I'm going to be pretty quick today. I just want to start off with a huge thanks to the states for stepping up with the EFPs, to get us out of this red snapper management box that's just been nonsensical for the recreational fishing community.

While I certainly understand that there's some apprehension around the table, and change is different change is hard, but I simply ask you to give it a chance. We saw similar apprehension in the Gulf, but, in Alabama, where I fish most frequently, we went from a three-day federal season, nine years ago, to a season that lasted seven months last year, on the same stock of fish.

When the Secretary of Commerce arbitrarily extended the season for thirty-nine days in 2017, there were some NGOs, and a few commercial fishermen, that felt like the sky was falling, that we were going to overfish the quota, or ACL, by 600 percent. Well, guess what? That didn't happen. We basically took the effort that was compressed into those three days and spread it out over the summer, and these are expected -- These EFPs are expected to basically do the same thing here, while also converting some fish that we already count as dead simply into harvest.

Finally, the South Atlantic is starting off in a much better position than the Gulf was, in that the recreational data collection has been coordinated amongst the states from the very get-go, and so that's going to be a big layup. You know, in the end, anglers and the resource are going to benefit from more reliable data.

Secondly, I just want to say that I really appreciate the council's discussion on the snapper grouper innovation plan. It's the first time that I've really seen a council try to address the fundamental differences between commercial and recreational fishing. You know, as Martha mentioned, MSY is a commercial, and not a recreational model, at least relative to how NOAA defines yield, and so I disagree with Clay a little bit, in that yield cannot be considered in the context of opportunity.

It's mentioned in MSA twenty-two times, but yield is never defined. Webster's defines yield at least seven different ways. From a recreational fishery -- Certainly you get it from a commercial fishing perspective, that you want to maximize the number of pounds of fish that you can harvest, as quickly as you can harvest them, or to maximize profit, and that's certainly understandable.

From a recreational perspective, it's just the opposite. We're not looking for economic efficiency. It's just completely the opposite. We want time to spend on the water with family and friends, and that time comes through additional opportunities, and so I do think you can define yield as time on the water, but, anyway, I just -- I really applaud this council for tackling this issue, because it's a big issue, and this council is the only one doing it, and so thank you.

MR. GENTNER: Good afternoon. Brad Gentner, CCA, Southeast Conservation Director. I appreciate the opportunity to make comments today, and I would like to first express my continued support for the full implementation of the state red snapper EFPs, and I'm really proud of the states for their efforts to meet this challenge. It's been really amazing to see.

I'll turn now to the innovation plan. We generally support the innovation plan, but we have to be more careful about the use of the word "efficiency". The definition of "efficiency" in the plan needs to be defined more precisely, as it seems to bounce around from macro concepts like economic efficiency to micro concepts like management efficiency, business efficiency, and trip-level efficiency for commercial guys.

Commercial trip efficiency and business efficiency concepts do not apply to recreational fishing, but economic efficiency does, because economic efficiency is simply the maximization of value. They're the same terms. We can't support this current open-ended definition for a concept that is well defined in practice, but I'm glad the council is going to revisit this. I think that's great.

We also generally support the prioritization of management funding as a way to improve management. The risk-value matrix is a step in the right direction. However, the agency needs to go past the funding question and figure out how to do better more responsive and flexible management with the dollars they have. I'm baffled however by this risk-value matrix process, the processes use of economics, however. If you're going to use economic impacts, which is entirely inappropriate for this setting, in my opinion, don't call it value, because it's not. It's economic impacts.

Second, economic impact metrics are positive metrics. Economic value, on the other hand, is a normative metric. I'm not going to spend time explaining those things, but, for making policies and decisions, you need to use normative metrics, and that's my first point, and that's been codified in MSA, NEPA, and in the courts. Value is only consumer surplus on the recreational side, and producer surplus, or profit, on the harvester and commercial side.

My second point is NMFS needs to show its work. I personally developed the recreational and commercial economic impact models that are used by the agency today. This just doesn't smell right. From FES in 2023, the recreational value added to the GDP for the South Atlantic and the Gulf fisheries was \$78.3 billion, and that's including trip and durable expenditures.

While it is difficult to estimate direct and durable good expenditures, for a lot of reasons, it doesn't mean those expenditures don't matter or shouldn't be counted. The data is there, but set that aside for a second. If you limit it to just trip expenditures, like Clay explained, the total in FY U.S. 2023 was \$6.3 billion, and that includes all species. It does, however, make the \$3.7 billion very suspect, and it confuses constituents.

It looks as if the agency did everything they could to drag the recreational numbers down, which I think is shooting themselves in the foot, from a funding perspective, in order to preserve their commercial bias, while pushing the commercial numbers up. To have any credibility going forward, the agency is going to have to show their work.

Using language this sloppily sets a dangerous precedent. I've worked my entire twenty-seven-year career trying to explain how to use economics correctly, and this isn't the correct use. It is entirely inappropriate to use positive metrics instead of a normative metric to make these decisions, and I'll stop there, because I've run out of time. Thanks, guys.

MR. MALLORY: Good afternoon. I'm Ryan Mallory. I'm a commercial fisherman in the Florida Keys, and I would like to speak about the notion of the Amendment 60 with the SG 1. It really boils down to what the council's intention is, if they intend to rebuild the fisheries or if they intend on doing away with it to give access to the permits that we currently have.

If you look back at 2006, to the ACLs and the number of permits, versus what we have today with the ACL and the number of permits, you know, somebody is not going to be happy, but

they're going to live. We have to focus on the rebuilding here, and it's just -- If we do consider going to just a single SG 1, I would like to see it to where the permit holder is on the boat.

These fisheries -- You know, these permits were never issued for somebody sitting at the house, at the mailbox, waiting for a check to come in on a lease. The permits were issued by participation, and they had to show X amount of years and financial participation in the fishery, and so that's pretty much all I had to say about the SG 1 and with that. Thank you.

MS. STEPHENS: Good afternoon, council. My name is Haley Stephens. I am the owner-operator of a charter-headboat out of Ponce Inlet, Florida. We continue to support the state-led EFPs. We've seen real success in the current program, and believe one of the greatest benefits will be moving away from the derby-style seasons and towards a model that spreads effort out more reasonably and, more importantly, safely.

Over the past few years, we've seen our passenger numbers decline. Many of our guests have chosen to fish in the Gulf, where they can retain red snapper. That's business that's leaving our Atlantic ports. A more flexible, locally-led approach may help us regain some of that lost opportunity.

Regarding tomorrow's discussion on Attachment 7, recreational angler attitudes, which ties into the Snapper Grouper MSE Working Group I participated in, I just want to offer some candid feedback. I have tremendous respect for the brilliant leaders leading this effort. However, I myself attempted to complete the survey on multiple separate occasions, and found it difficult to follow, and even challenging to complete. If someone deeply engaged in this process struggled with it, I can't help but wonder if other anglers may have as well. Clear, accessible input tools are critical if we want meaningful participation and reliable results.

I sent a letter last night for consideration of the HMS letter from the council from a headboat perspective, and I believe that's posted on the council website. It's hard to believe that it's been three years since I stepped into this room for the very first time to bring forward the issue of headboat vessel limits. Since then, our fleet has continued to operate under the highest level of accountability and provide some of the most consistent and reliable data available to this council.

I want to add that that level of transparency is not a burden to us, but it is something that we take pride in, and we truly appreciate the motion to move forward with an amendment addressing the grouper vessel limits for headboats. We fully support the one fish per six paying passengers. This modest adjustment will work within the numbers and finally feel workable on the water. Gag are what matter to us. Headboats don't have the means to target deepwater grouper, and I really appreciate the council's consideration to hear some public feedback, and we are totally okay with removing snowy grouper from that consideration.

I really hope this works out, but, regardless, either way, I view this whole thing as a success. It demonstrates why good data matters, and it shows that, when stakeholders engage constructively, the council listens and evaluates the issue seriously.

I want to sincerely thank the council staff, the SRH team, and each of you. We brought forward this issue that's important to our fishermen and business, and you didn't dismiss it. You worked through it thoughtfully. That, my friends, is how this process should work, and, at the end of the

day, I am here because I believe in this fishery, and I believe in the responsibility that we all share to protect both the resource and the communities that depend on it, and I will continue to show up, do the work, and be a part of the solution. As always, thank you for your time.

MR. COWDREY: Hello. My name is Michael Cowdrey. I'm a lifelong commercial fisherman from Sneads Ferry, North Carolina. I'm one of the, for my age I guess, earliest landers of sea bass from our area. I submitted a letter earlier, yesterday I guess, that I hope many of you got, and I said a lot of things in there that I'm glad I put in that letter, because it's not really easy to talk this morning, or this afternoon.

First, I would like to speak on my own on-demand experience, and I'm speaking on Amendment 56, as far as opening the sea bass. You know, in the amendment, they're speaking of opening the whale closure, but I'm here to speak on opening period, of any kind, that we could have in the black sea bass pot fishery. My experience with on-demand fishing has been -- I believe, as far as I know, I'm one of the earliest developers, innovators, of the fishery, and I spent a couple years just doing development, trying to get the gear to where it actually worked and would be efficient. "Efficient" is the word of the day, I suppose.

For three years after that, I fished the gear full on. The first winter, I made a thousand deployments, and I misplaced seven pots out of that thousand deployments. After the season was over, we went back in the ocean and spent a day, and I retrieved five of those pots. We lost two pots of gear, ultimately, that first season. The on-demand gear, it does work, and I've used it quite a bit. I've caught quite a bit of fish with on-demand gear.

Starting about three years ago, and I better wind this up, and I'm already in two minutes, but the first meeting we had about making on-demand gear legal was met with a lot of opposition, from a lot of different areas, and a lot of it had to do with the stock assessment, and how bleak things were looking from the stock assessment.

I would like to make a statement that this gear is efficient in catching fish, and the importance of inefficiency that I've heard spoke about today, as far as fisheries management and slowing down fishing, and making sure we don't catch too much, doesn't necessarily have to bleed into these men's boats. I can be extremely efficient in the way that I catch these fish and still apply to you all's inefficiency.

You could take a person with a hook-and-line trip of 300 pounds, and you can give him ten pots, and he can catch these 300 pounds without killing himself. Inefficiency, as far as fisheries management, does not have to be punishment to the fishermen. We can make it where these men could go out catch 300 pounds in a very easy, easy way, a very natural way, that has been proven, going through bycatch mortality in the pot fishery, to be very, very successful. Our fishermen, when we have to throw fish back, they have a -- I've went over. I've went over my time already.

One of the things that's been brought up is allocation by gear type, and I would like to speak on that more than anything else. The historic black sea bass pot fishery, prior to black sea bass pots being closed, was 90 percent landings of black sea bass pots, and 10 percent of that -- 10 percent of the landings was hook-and-line, and, if it comes to a time that you guys decided to divide this up amongst gear, I hope that you would not look at the last ten or fifteen years of landings and

decide that pot fishermen are only going to get X amount of pounds, because they were closed over the last fifteen years.

I think, if you're going to decide what historic landings are, you're going to have to go prior to 2010, and look at our landings, and look what the fishery was. The landings over the last ten years have been dictated by the rule of law, laws that were put in place specifically to slow down us from catching fish, because we had a six-week season, and that was considered a derby fishery, and so a whole list of rules were put on top of us to slow us down from catching fish.

Then, within two or three years, we got to a place where we had quota, and we couldn't even catch not even 40 percent of our quota, and I think we caught 44 percent of our quota, and it was closed down. We spent ten or fifteen years closed six months out of the year, with a trip limit, and a pot limit, a catch limit. Six months out of the year, we can't use pots, and all this mess was put in place, and this whole pot endorsement thing, where only thirty-two people were allowed to go pot fishing, and that was all put in place to slow us down, because we had a six-week derby fishery, and then we went ten or fifteen years, or twelve years, or how many -- I'm getting excited talking, and I'm sorry, guys, but we went an entire decade fishing under a whole list of rules put in place specifically so that we couldn't catch our quota very fast, and I'm sorry.

MR. STEPHENS: Good afternoon, council. My name is Nic Stephens. I'm the owner-operator of the Sea Spirit Fishing Headboat out of Ponce Inlet, Florida. First off, I want to say thank you for your hard work and support for changing the vessel limits for gag and black grouper for headboats.

I can't speak for -- I can't speak for other headboats, but, for our boat, and the surrounding headboats in north-central Florida, I can confidently say that we do not catch or target, or whatever, target, snowy grouper. Gags, blacks, scamps, reds, and graysby, yes, but definitely not snowy.

Yesterday, when listening to the HMS report on proposed recreational shark regulation changes, they mentioned the possibility of a vessel limit of four sharpnose sharks per vessel. This vessel limit would not work for headboats. Us, and other headboats, rely heavily on the current allowable harvest of one sharpnose per person. A vessel limit of sharpnose would be a devastating blow to the headboats in our region. I have not seen any sign that this species of shark is in trouble in any way. They are seemingly very plentiful.

I'm a strong supporter of any and every possible artificial reef program. I have seen firsthand how our county's artificial reef program dramatically enhanced our fishery, by providing habitat and spreading out our fishing effort. I'm strongly against new special spawning management zones on any pre-existing natural or artificial reef. I am strongly in favor of new spawning management zones only if it is new artificial reef brought out for that reason, and that could be beneficial to all areas up and down the coast.

Yes, fish definitely 100 percent spawn on artificial reefs. We catch many fish with signs of spawning off artificial reefs. I've been lucky enough to visibly witness mangrove snapper actively spawning in clouds behind the boat a couple different times while anchored on top of artificial reef, although, the last time I witnessed this occurring, the snapper were quickly

dispersed and interrupted by a school of sandbar sharks, which chased and ate the snapper until they were they were gone. They did not commence their spawn after this shark event.

If there is anything at all, and I do mean anything, that this council can do to persuade or motivate the HMS to do something about sandbar sharks, please, please do something. It's hard to express in words how bad the sandbar shark problem is, bad for our fishery, and bad for our business. It's literally a nightmare dealing with these animals everywhere we go every day. All I ask from the South Atlantic Fisheries Council is a conversation, a conversation amongst yourselves, to try to solve the impossible task of sandbar sharks. There has got to be a way, and maybe it's through EFPs, or maybe it's something easy that we haven't thought about. Either way, let's start a conversation. Thank you.

MS. AINES: Hi. I'm Alex Aines from Oceana. I'm speaking in support of the on-demand gear action that is part of Snapper Grouper Amendment 56 and request the council move this action on an expedited pathway, given its importance and urgency. Approving the use of on-demand gear in areas seasonally closed to conventional black sea bass plot gear would represent a rare win-win opportunity, advancing protected species conservation while providing fishing access and economic opportunity for fishermen.

This action is supported by fishermen, coastal businesses, conservation organizations, and members of Congress. Years of testing by fishermen under exempted fishing permits demonstrate that this gear is reliable, enforceable, and practical. More than 6,000 deployments have occurred, with retrieval success exceeding 99 percent. However, there is currently no active EFP in place, meaning fishermen now have no pathway to use on-demand gear in nearshore closures, critical areas where this gear can most meaningfully reduce whale entanglement risk, and progress using this gear in the South Atlantic has effectively stalled.

Permanent regulations are needed to create predictable access, encourage investment, and allow this technology to scale. Scaling this technology does not mean increasing harvest though. The total allowable catch for black sea bass is fixed, and how that TAC is harvested does not change the biological outcome. Gear type does not alter the quota.

What the on-demand action does is allow fishermen to pursue their portion of that catch using gear that significantly reduces entanglement risk to protected species. Our understanding is that Amendment 56, as discussed today has a very long road ahead before it would even see the rulemaking stage. Getting this on-demand gear action approved is a critical step towards protecting marine wildlife, while supporting resilient fishing communities.

There is clearly an urgent call from my diverse array of interested parties to approve on-demand gear in the nearshore seasonal closures for black sea bass, and so we ask that the council think about separating this on-demand action from the larger Amendment 56 and move it forward on an expedited pathway, potentially through a framework amendment.

Because the action does not alter allowable catch, it could be evaluated and advanced independently of, and more quickly than, the updated stock assessment. Approving on-demand gear builds on years of collaborative work and growing momentum, demonstrating that innovation can reduce risk to whales, while restoring fishing opportunity. Let's not lose that momentum. Thank you for your attention and for allowing me to comment.

MR. ZALES: Good afternoon. Bob Zales II, Executive Director of Southeastern Fisheries Association, representing the commercial fishing industry in the Southeast. First off, ropeless gear we support 100 percent for the sea bass thing. The allocation issue, we support maintaining the historical allocation for the pot fishermen.

Multiple gears on vessels, we fully support that, because clearly efficiency is the key here, that, if a vessel goes fishing, if they can catch the different species with different gears, they should be allowed to do that, rather than making multiple trips to accomplish the same goal. We support the bag limit for the headboats, whatever Haley and her husband have talked about, and the industry the -- For the vermilion snapper, we recommend a 2,000-pound trip limit for both seasons on that, and now I'm going to get into the controversial part of my thing, and you all have seen my letters.

First off, I want to apologize, and I don't intend to offend anybody with my comments. My goal here, because I've already offended by our governor in Florida, but our goal here is to represent the commercial sector and express the concerns that these commercial industry people have with these EFPs.

We don't care what the recreational fishery does, as long as it doesn't have an adverse impact to the commercial fishery, and, right now, this program -- There's no guarantee that that won't happen. You're looking at a wide-open fishery, and we don't know how many people are going to be fishing, and we don't know what they're catching, and we don't know anything that needs to be done.

When you look at what happened in the Gulf of Mexico, and I was part of that whole process in the Gulf state management process, that process took several years to do. There was a lot of work put into it. This EFP has been done in less than a year, and it's politically motivated. It has got a lot of issues that are there.

Years ago, the Marine Fisheries Commission in the State of Florida, before they went to the Fish and Wildlife Commission, and it was moved because they contended there was too much political influence on the MFC. Going to Fish and Wildlife, that political influence would go away, and it clearly has not, and so that's part of our concern here. You cannot manage a resource by politics. It has to be done with science, and we fully support that, and we fully support the efforts to maintain everything that's there.

We've worked with the recreational fishery, and part of the EFP we have suggested for a long time. The data reporting process, we've recommended that over and over again, and we fully support that, and we will do everything we can to help them move along, but, as long as that fish -- As long as these EFPs have the potential to adversely affect the commercial fishery, we cannot support that, and so, like I said, I hope I haven't upset anybody any more than I did the governor, but, you know, that's life, and that's what we do, and so thank you very much.

MR. ALTIERI: My name is Tony Altieri, and I've commercial fished out of Mayport for the last twenty-five years, and I'm here to address the vermilion snapper trip limit. It is currently a thousand pounds, and it needs to be at least moved up to 2,000 pounds, to help out for the distance we have to run every trip, which is in between -- The low end is seventy miles, and the

high end is 120 miles, just to get a thousand pounds of fish, and with a three-man crew, it's just not much money to be spread out, and the 2,000 pounds would really help out a whole lot on that and it would low actually be life-changing for all of us, all of us in the crew, and so that's about it. Thank you.

MR. FISH: Hello. My name is Andy Fish, and I'm a commercial fisherman. I've held a grouper snapper permit for thirty-five years. I'm an owner-operator, and I'm primarily a spearfisherman, but I also commercial kingfish. My range is from Sebastian, Florida to North Carolina.

I'm here to comment on Amendment 60. I am against removing the two-for-one. If the intent is for a new entrant, the permits need to be managed differently, or I don't think anything will change. I don't think uh the new permits -- If you do away with the two-for-one, they should not be allowed to be leased. I think it should be an owner-operator that works this permit.

Not allowing to lease will allow the newer, younger participants that we seem to be after, and lacking, while stopping the investors from now buying cheaper permits, and then eventually just driving up the price again, with the way the economics of fishing and permits seem to be working presently.

Commercial trip efficiency, I am all in for allowing multi-day trip limits on multi-day boats. I think that the bigger, slower-style boats that actually pioneered these fisheries, and these fish that we're all here managing today, are being penalized with the smaller trip limits, which favor the smaller, faster, niche-style fisheries that have been created through the smaller trip limits.

I don't know how to prove multi-day trip limits without a VMS. Although I hate the sound of the VMS, me, and a couple of my peers I've talked to, would entertain a VMS if it meant allowed that I could go for two or three or four days and have two or three or four days corresponding to my actual days at sea. I think the VMS's accuracy could be tuned down to secure the intimate nature of some of the fishermen's secret spots.

I support multiple-gear vessels, and I am also in favor of a larger beeliner permit, due to the nature of the distance that these guys go fishing, eighty or ninety miles offshore. If the fishery can sustain it, and it's not going overfishing, I think the fishermen need to be allowed to keep their anchor in the water, keep their engines off, and stay and fish, rather than just return back to the dock just to put more ice, food, and fuel and return back to the same area they were. Thank you.

MR. OSBORNE: Scott Osborne, a commercial fisherman out of Sebastian, Florida, for forty-two years. I've seen a lot of changes in the fishery over the years. I've been a snapper grouper fishermen from the get-go, as well as king mackerel. The two-for-one, I am not for at this time, but, if we do decide to go that way moving forward, I would like to see those permits attainable to new entrants in the fishery, that can legitimately attain a permit and be their own fishermen. I guess I'm saying I would like to see a cap on the Wall Street end of commercial fishing permits, and no lease going forward.

Multiple trip limits on multi-day boats definitely would be a very good thing economically, and just all around less stress on a fisherman, long hours, and returning to the dock with a seventy-

five-pound trip limit of snapper, when you're also trying to catch king mackerel at the same time, and don't even get to finish your day, because you're worried about getting back to the dock and unloading seventy-five pounds of fish, just to come back the next day and do the same thing over again, and, if we could figure out a way to document 100 percent that you've made a multi-day trip, which would be a VMS, which I'm not for, but, if we could accomplish that goal, I would do it, and, the incidental retention, definitely not. That shouldn't even be considered. You're just going to have directed incidental catches. Thank you.

MR HAGEN: My name is Dave Hagen, and I would like to thank the council for giving me the opportunity to speak. I'm here to say that I am definitely against changing the two-for-one. If you can't afford a freaking permit, work and earn it, and put it up, or get this fish house to buy it for you and pay it through that way.

Permits are expensive, but not like they are in Alaska. You can go buy an open-access scallop permit for \$8 million up in Maine, and there are approximately -- As of yesterday, there are 119 leased permits. If you do away with the two-for-one, and that was put in place originally because there were too many permits, and there's still too many permits, and it's almost impossible to be a full-time commercial fisherman. I already know, and, if you think I don't know what I'm talking about, I own or lease twenty-one vessels that fish in this industry, and I'm so stupid that I bought another one last week.

There are about 480 permits out there, of which I could not find out through the Freedom of Information Act how many are active and how many are not active, but let's just assume they're all active. Well, it's still too many, and I lease out twenty-one permits, and that supports thirty-four families, and over fifty children, and they said, oh, we don't like the fact that you can lease a boat and put your permit on it. Well, I didn't make that law, but I just abide by it, and, if you don't like it, it's up to the council or somebody else to change it.

Then you can go on and there are -- As of twelve o'clock today, there are eight South Atlantic SG 1 permits up on Facebook to be leased for about \$8,000 to \$8,500, and these boys behind me will tell you that \$8,000 is -- That's just one good trip, one or two or three-day good trip, and, you know, you would be out your fuel, your gas, and whatever, bait, but, you know, you can make that payment in a one, two, or three-day trip, and, the rest of the year, you get to put that money in your pocket.

The reason I think they want to go do away with the two-for-one is because it's they're too expensive. Well, let's see. I just looked at this U.S. Code 1851 National Standards for Fishery Conservation and Management, which you all are all supposed to adhere to, and Number 5 says conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, consider efficiency in the utilization of fishery resources, except that no such measure shall have economic allocation for its sole purpose.

To me, that's exactly what the two-for-one would be about, and I see my time is up, but I would just like to tell you that, in all my years, and all my coming up here to these council meetings, the council has finally done what I never thought they could do, and that's joy of fishing out of it. Thank you.

MR. MARINKO: I'm Jeff Marinko, spearfisherman out of North Carolina, commercial, and I was -- I have a big, old, slow boat, and I'm all about multi-day limits. I know the Snapper Grouper Subcommittee is now talking about raising some limits, and not making them crumbs, as I've heard recently, because most of these limits are crumbs for old, slow, efficient multi-day boats.

I was on my way here, and I was thinking that I don't know a single part-timer that has a big, old, slow boat, because we're in here for the money, and, I mean, we love it, but we have to make money to keep doing it and support our families, our crew's families, and everything else, and, if we had a fast boat, we're just paying the fuel bill, and that's all we're doing. This is the traditional way.

I also want to talk about -- Well, since I'm talking about the Snapper Grouper Subcommittee, I was thinking hogfish could go to 750. Red grouper should be at least 300, AJ at 2,000, red porgy at forty-five, and I think triggerfish should stay at a thousand. We've seen a decline in triggerfish in North Carolina, or at least I have. Again, I'm scuba diving, and I'm under the water.

In 2024, our first year where we had crumbs for gags, and it didn't last long, and we hit triggerfish hard. I'm not going to lie, and we got some limits, and we couldn't get limits anymore, and that tells me something, and so I don't think triggerfish should really move. I mean, I would say it could go down, but I'm not going to say that, because we'll never get it back.

I also want to mention that maybe the vehicle to put gags in is that subcommittee, and I know the ACL has been met the last couple years, because it was small, but it grows every year. That gag ACK is growing every year, and it's not going to be met this year, and, if we start it now, maybe in five years we'll have it done, and we'll be able to actually have some more fish. That's kind of along the lines of what I wanted to say, and I also wanted to thank the council for trying to get the Starlink thing approved. Nobody uses a sat phone anymore, and it's really getting a headache every time we got to find somebody to borrow a sat phone to pass our Coast Guard inspection. Thank you.

MR. SINCLAIR: My name is Russell Sinclair. I fish out of Cape Canaveral. I own my own commercial boat, and I've got the king mackerel, the snapper grouper, the sea bass pot endorsement, and the directed shark.

One of the things, the black sea bass pot, since I've had the permit, I've only really fished for them for one year, and it was -- There's no sea bass in Port Canaveral. Everybody knows that, I think, and you all should all now that, and so I am for the deployable, and that would let us fish through the whales zones, and the zones that we've had the release, and that would help. When they do show back up, that would help me be able to target them, and I'm on the southern end of that whole fishery, and so it's just been pretty weak down where we're at.

The incidental bycatch, that's just going to be abused, like Scotty said earlier. The allowable catch stowage, or the allowable different fisheries, and so having all the different permits, if I fish for sharks, and you have shallow-water snapper grouper species, and I use a small longline to catch the sharks, I'm not allowed to catch the red snappers on the same trip. Even if I could stow the gear and make it legal, that would be great. The odds of actually laying a longline and

catching snapper and grouper in today's ocean, compared to fifteen years ago, it's not going to happen. You're not going to have any bycatch. Years ago, they used to catch snappers and groupers, and that's not going to happen in today's ocean, due to the sharks.

The trip efficiency with the VMS to do multi-day trips, out of Port Canaveral, we fish a range of thirty to fifty miles. With the mirage of permits that I have, I could definitely use that, and it would help me be more efficient in my business, and not have to be on the water so many days. The biggest thing is the traveling. Some days we're traveling for eight hours in an eight-hour fishing day, and so it makes a sixteen-hour day, and, because of the small trip limits, we're easing back into the dock, and not running, due to the fact of fuel, because we do have to make a bottom number on expenses.

To raise the beeliner trip limit, it would probably make me a little more interested to get more crew to go follow Tony around and try to catch beeliners in another region, to spread out a little bit more from what we're doing. Thank you.

MR. GIBSON: Daniel Gibson, commercial fisherman out of Ponce Inlet, for nineteen years. I'm supportive of the beeliner limit getting increased, and I think we need 2,000 pounds. That would be a good number for us, and, if we doubled our limit where we're at right now, it doesn't mean it's going to double our ACL, that we haven't been meeting, and, you know, there's -- I know we spoke about a lot of permits that aren't active, and, you know, it may be create more permits that would be active, but that doesn't mean those guys are going to go out there and catch a limit of beeliners at 2,000 pounds.

The conditions are hard enough sometimes to catch a thousand pounds, and, you know, when they are biting, it would be nice to be able to capitalize on it. It's a long ride, and I'm fishing on a center console, and I'm traveling seventy or eighty miles sometimes, and, to turn around and go back, there's just not a big enough weather window, and, if we could capitalize when they are biting good, you know, rather than trying to search to catch something else, then that would be very helpful for me and the crew, and so that's all I've got, and I appreciate all you guys do.

MR. PARSELL: Good afternoon, council. My name is Steven Parsell. I'm a fisherman that fishes a lot on headboats, because it's convenient for me. I support the Atlantic EFP program. I have participated in many EFP trips. I live in Port Orange, Florida, and I often fish in Ponce Inlet, Florida.

If the Atlantic season was to allow more days, that would save myself and other anglers from driving to the Gulf coast, costing us more money and fuel and everything else, and support the local businesses in the Atlantic coast. These EFP trips provide real data, which is collected by the FWC professionals who collect the data on each trip, and I am grateful for the work that they do.

These headboats do a great job at utilizing the proper gear to release these fish safely. I also support the change for headboats to allow more gag grouper per headboat, because of the amount of people that fish on these headboats. I work all week long, and sometimes on weekends, and so, to have a longer red snapper season, and a better chance of catching and keeping a gag grouper, would mean a lot to me and fellow fishermen. Thank you for your time.

MR. LOCKE: Hey, guys. My name is Charlie Locke. I'm a full-time commercial fisherman here in Wanchese, North Carolina, and so my comment today is about the EFPs in the red snapper fishery. There's a lot of hype, and there's a lot of excitement about this on the recreational side, but, as a full-time commercial fisherman, this is distressing to me.

The reason I say that is, when I look at the 2026 quota for red snapper for this year, I see 102,000 pounds, and, when you all roll out the commercial quota, if we did the two-month closure off north Florida in the winter months, we were going to be looking at May 1 start date, and around a 360,000-pound quota, and a 150-pound trip limit.

You were basically telling commercial fishermen that, if we can eliminate the dead discard number by the recreational community, then we can give you this much quota, and you basically -- In my opinion, you dangled a carrot, in essence, to just snatch it back when you decided to not go with the bottom closed area off of north Florida, and so my question would, be if there is allocation available to get a thirty to sixty-day EFP window to fishing in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina, four states, you know, basically --

I don't know what potential of landings is, you know, but is this going to correlate the -- I know you say this is going to correlate the landings instead of dead discards, and I heard that in the discussion, which I'm understanding, and I'm trying to be onboard with the thought process of what you all are trying to do, and I am in agreement with trying something, but I want to let you all know that, you know, it's kind of a slap in the face to the commercial fishermen that are left in this industry that's been dealing with the dead discard issue.

You know, we're being constrained, and we're not being able to harvest red snapper, and, in my mind, if you're going to give this EFP to the states to do this, then there's not enough -- You know, there's enough allocation available -- If there's enough allocation available that's allowing for that to happen, then there's also enough allocation available to give the commercial sector what you were going to give us for the two-month closure.

It's kind of like what I heard Charlie and Jimmy mentioning, and it's kind of almost like a de facto reallocation if we don't get what you said we could get if we did the two-month closure, because it's like you're taking that and giving it to the recreational side for the EFPs.

You know, there's still a pending lawsuit coming out of North Carolina from fishermen. I mean, there's still litigation that is being, you know, forwarded, and everybody is looking at what's going to happen, and how the commercial industry is going to be, you know, treated in this, and so I'm just asking you all to be fair and equitable.

You know, I'm looking at 102,000 pounds for 2026, and I'm hearing all this hype about EFPs and that, and, like I said, it's just -- I'm trusting, I'm hoping, and I'm praying that you guys will do the right thing for the few of us guys that are left, you know, and I do appreciate the effort, and I do appreciate thinking outside the box, and what the EFPs are trying to and intend to do, but please, please, please do not let the guys that have been hamstrung by recreational dead discard be left out in this process. Thanks for your time.

MR. HARTIG: Hello, friends, associates, and those of you who don't know me, and my name is Ben Hartig. I spent fifteen years on the council, and over thirty-three years involved in council

management at some level, and so, with only three minutes, I'm going to just hit one highlight. You've got my comments on 60 and 61, and I was just saying, when you increase these trip limits for each respective species, be careful, and know why those trip limits aren't being met.

Use your SAFE reports. If you don't have them, make sure staff does them. They're critically important now, especially since you don't have the science, and, under this administration, things are getting worse and not better. You need AP consultation. You look at the fishery-independent trends in the in the science, the fishery-independent studies, interim reports, and any other thing you have to inform your change in trip limits, because the worst thing you could do is increase a trip limit in a declining fishery, and, the next assessment, the fishermen are penalized tremendously for that increase, and so just be careful.

The next thing, and I'm going to change gears completely here and go right to Spanish mackerel, because you guys -- We had a closure this year in our region. in the southern zone and, you know, that was impacted somewhat by the 335,000 you gave North Carolina out of this year's allocation. If you're going to do this, don't do it out of the allocation that occurs in in this year, and do it from fish that we didn't catch last year, and you can do that before March 1.

That would be the best way to do it, and, if you don't have that option in front of you, change the regulations if you want to continue to do this. It's important for us to have these step-downs, and they haven't been implemented as often as they should have been in the past. It's been rare that they've actually been implemented, and, this year, we blew through the 1,500 pounds at 75 percent and the 240,000 that we responsibly back out for 500-pound trip limit.

Basically, if we would have closed -- If we would have had the step-down, we wouldn't have closed the fishery, and we would have been able to fish under 500, and we wouldn't have had a closure, and we wouldn't have had any overages, and so it would it would have worked for the stock and the fishermen, and we wouldn't have lost probably, you know, close to \$400,000 or \$500,000, and so, like I said, let no good deed go unpunished. You all try to do something, you know, to see what's going on in North Carolina, and then just add in North Carolina -- Look at the effort, please, and see how things are changing in North Carolina.

They didn't catch their allocation originally, and go back and look at the effort, and do a SAFE report for Spanish, and look at fleet dynamics. I sent this this comment in, but I didn't see it in the comments, and so I'll get back with staff, and, if we don't find it, I'll go ahead and resend it later, but I'll see you all in June, so thank you.

MS. HARRISON: I think that the council should change their name to the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Council, because it seems the only thing you all want to discuss is snapper grouper, and you just heard from the previous commenter the struggles of Spanish mackerel in Florida, and I would like to quote you an email I got from a North Carolina DMF representative from the Atlantic States Marine Fishery Council.

Quote: "A Spanish mackerel management update is making its semi-regular appearance on the ASMFC Coastal Pelagics Management Board agenda. Basically, the board will be informed of the SAFMC's decision to postpone work on an amendment until revised recreational catch estimates are available and when another stock assessment can be completed. This is the ninth time Spanish mackerel management has been on an ASMFC agenda since late 2019, with no

meaningful management action taking place, because ASMFC continues to wait for the SAFMC to initiate a comprehensive amendment.” End quote.

I just -- It's so frustrating for the Spanish and king mackerel fisheries to be your most profitable fishery, and you all won't discuss it, and you won't do stock assessments on it, and you keep pushing them, and I -- Like I don't know where -- Like what is going to make you all care about those fisheries, and so I ask you this.

If, yesterday, you all logged into your retirement account, and the first position you checked during the sell-off, did you look at your position worth 100K, or would you look at your position worth \$10 million, and so when can we start to care about king and Spanish mackerel? That's all my comment today. I'll give you back the time I went over last time, even though I noticed people going over by minutes this time, which again is unfair, and so I hope you all have a nice dinner. Good night.

MS. BRUGER: Thank you so much, and good afternoon. I'm sorry I couldn't be there today, and thank you for the opportunity to comment. My name is Catherine Bruger, and I'm from St. Petersburg, Florida. I'm a Manager of Fish Conservation for Ocean Conservancy, where my work focuses on ensuring sustainable fisheries, recreational management, and data modernization.

I've spent the last seven years engaging in state management for red snapper in the Gulf, which is the focus of my comments to you today, the red snapper state EFPs. First, around the EFP discussion, I would like to clarify a few points of confusion. First, it's useful to understand that the concept of standardization is being used in multiple ways in these conversations.

Our comments focus on the application of the National Recreational Fishing Survey and data standards, which are a single set of shared guidelines that promote data quality, consistency, comparability, and transparency. The National Academies of Sciences conducted a peer review of these standards just this year and found them to be well designed. They have a webinar next Tuesday, March 10, which I strongly encourage you all to attend.

Simply put, despite some level of internal consistency, the data collection programs proposed in the EFPs do not meet these data standards. Failing to meet the data standards, as described in our letter, means that the data proposed to be collected under the EFPs may be entirely unusable for management. We've studied these data standards at length, and last week, at the World Recreational Fisheries Conference, presented on their application for ensuring strong data collection programs. If the states are serious about getting this right, start with the data standards. They are the pathway to new recreational data collection programs, and they've been entirely ignored.

Second, I agree that the council should be focusing on how to improve estimates and management of discards, as they are driving overfishing of the stock. Unfortunately, the EFPs do not solve this problem.

Next, in yesterday's discussion, several council members acknowledged that the intent behind the EFPs was to turn discards into landed catch, on the order of hundreds of thousands of red snapper. We agree that the EFPs will result in landed catch on the order of hundreds of

thousands of red snapper, but emphasize that the recreational ACL remains just under 23,000 fish, which means both the ACL and overfishing limit will be exceeded by the magnitude of this catch. This is illegal.

In conclusion, I emphasize with the difficult position managers are in with regards to managing this stock. However, I reiterate that the EFPs will not substantially improve data collection and are being used as a backdoor around sustainability requirements of the law. I urge you all to reconsider. That's all I have for you today, and thank you for your time.

(Whereupon, the public comment session was adjourned.)

- - -

Public Comment
Wed -3/4/26

**SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF**

✓ Julia Byrd
Citizen Science Program Manager
julia.byrd@safmc.net

✓ Myra Brouwer
Deputy Director - Management
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ John Carmichael
Executive Director
john.carmichael@safmc.net

✓ **Deputy Director - Science**
Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

✓ Christina Curtis
Fishery Social Scientist
christina.wiegand@safmc.net

✓ **Quantitative Fishery Scientist**
Dr. Judd Curtis
Judd.curtis@safmc.net

✓ John Hadley
Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator
john.hadley@safmc.net

✓ Kathleen Howington
Habitat and Ecosystem Scientist
kathleen.howington@safmc.net

✓ Allie Iberle
Fishery Scientist
Allie.iberle@safmc.net

✓ Kelly Klasnick
Administrative Officer
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net

✓ Dr. Julie Neer
SEDAR Program Manager
Julie.neer@safmc.net

✓ **Outreach Coordinator**
Ashley Oliver
Ashley.Oliver@safmc.net

✓ Emily Ott
SEDAR Coordinator
Emily.Ott@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net

✓ Nicholas Smillie
**Digital Media and Communication
Specialist**
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net

✓ **Meeting Coordinator**
Rachael Silvas
rachael.silvas@safmc.net

✓ **Staff Accountant**
Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net

✓ Meg Withers
Citizen Science Project Manager
Meg.withers@safmc.net

Public Comment - Wed - 3/4/2008

First	Last	Suffix	Affiliation
✓ Irish	Murphey		NC Division of Marine Fisheries
✓ Jessica	McCawley		Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Robert	Beal		Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
✓ Carolyn	Belcher		GA DNR Coastal Resources Division
✓ Gary	Borland		
✓ Amy	Dukes		SC DNR Marine Resources Division
✓ Judy	Helmey		
✓ Francis (Dewey)	Hemilright		
✓ James	Hull	Jr.	
✓ Kerry	Marhefka		
Tom	Pease		Seventh Coast Guard District
✓ Charlie	Phillips		
✓ Tom	Roller		
Robert	Spottswood	Jr.	
✓ Andy	Strelcheck		NOAA Fisheries Southeast Region
Deirdre	Warner-Kramer		Office of Marine Conservation OES / OMC
TBD	TBD		U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Representative

Johnny Marquez

Sonny Gwinn

Dr. Clay Poreh

Nikhil Metha

Kathy Knowlton

Kristen Foss

Rick DeVictor

March 2026 Council

Attendee Report: Meeting

Report Generated:

03/09/2026 07:34 AM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered
535-165-571	03/04/2026 07:51 AM EST	9 hours 22 minutes	206

Staff Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name
Yes	Not applicable for staff	Council	South Atlantic

Attendee Details

Last Name	First Name
Appelman	Max
Bailey	Adam
Bajema	Jordan
Barile	Peter
Barrows	Katline
Beal	Bob
Bernier	Quinn
Beyer	George
Bianchi	Alan
Blough	Heather
Bogdan	Jennifer
Borland	Gary
Brantley	William
Brogan (Oceana)	Gib
Brouwer	Myra
Bruger	Catherine
Bublely	Walter
Bunting	Matthew
Byrd	Julia
Clawson	Jessica
Cox	Jack
Curtis	Judd
DeVictor	Rick
Degan	Jacqui
DiJohnson	Alex
Dingle	Julie
Dubniczki	Hayden
Dukes	Amy
Dunn	Russell

Evans	Joseph
Farnell	Paula
Flowers	Henry
Floyd	Brad
Foss	Kristin
Franco	Dawn
Gibson	Daniel
Gooding	Elizabeth
Gore	Karla
Griffin	Aimee
HEMILRIGHT	DEWEY
Hadley	John
Hale	Robert
Hallas	Sara
Harrison	Alana
Hartig	Ben
Helmey	Judy
Hildreth	Delaine
Huber	Jeanette
Hull	Jimmy
Iberle	Allie
Kennedy	Todd
Kent	Russell
Kirkman	Rayman
Klasnick	01Kelly
Klibansky	Lara
Klibansky	Lara
Knowlton	Kathy
Larkin	Michael
Lazarre	Dominique
Lee	Jennifer
Lee	Max
Leonard	Eddie
Levy	Mara
Locke	Charles
Mackesey	Brendan
Malinowski	Richard
Marhefka	Kerry
Marquez	Johnny
McMahan	Trevor
McMullen	Ryan
McMullen	Ryan
Meehan	Sean
Mehta	Nikhil

Merrifield	Jeanna
Murphey	Trish
Newman	Thomas
O'Donnell	Kelli
Oliver	Ashley
Ott	Emily
Package-Ward	Christina
Palmrose	Kristin
Parsell	Steven
Pease	LT Tom
Phillips	Charlie
Records	David
Reed	Steven
Rindone	Ryan
Robbins	Megan
Roller	Tom
S	Emma
SAWICKI	KIM
Schmidtke	Michael
Seward	McLean
Shervanick	Kara
Shester	Geoff
Silvas	Rachael
Sinkus	Wiley
Smillie	Nick
Smith	Leah
Snyder	Dave
Spurgin	Kali
Starling	Savannah
Stemle	Adam
Stephen	Jessica
Stephenson	Sarah
Sweetman	CJ
Talia	Jenna
Thomas	Suzanna
Turley	Brendan
Vara	Mary
Vecchio	Julie
Vitiello	Matthew
Walia	Matt
Walsh	Mick
White	Geoff
Whitmer	Morgan
Williams	Travis

Withers	Meg
Withers	Cfraig
Wolfe	Jordan
colby	barrett
collier	chip
gloeckner	david
gwin	earl sonny
marinko	jeff
poholek	ariel
sandorf	scott
spottswood	00Robert
zales	bob
Agar	J
Atkinson	Seth
Barbieri	Luiz
Barger	Jeff
Bonura	Vincent
Brantley	William
Brewster-Geisz	Karyl
Califf	Julie
Carruthers	Tom
Carter	David
Cerny-Chipman	Elizabeth
Coffill-Rivera	Manuel
Crandall	Chelsey
Crosson	Scott
Crowe	Stacie
Cudney	Jennifer
Dancy	Kiley
DeFilippi Simpson	Julie
DuBeck	Guy
Dyar	Ben
Emory	Meaghan
Fango	Ginamel
Feldman	Lindsey
Finch	Margaret
Foor	Brandon
Gahm	Meghan
Garcia Moliner	Graciela
Gray	Alisha
Griner	Robert
Guyas	Martha
Hechanova	Riza
Howell	Scott

Hurff	Kieley
Iverson	Kim
Jones	John
Kellison	Todd
Keppler	Blaik
Kersting	Anne
Leach	Scott
Ledet	vicki
Lopez-Mercer	Maria
M Tornabene	Essence
Mackesey	Brendan
Merck	Nicole
Merrifield	Mike
Miranda	David
Morrison	Wendy
Muffley	Brandon
Murphy	Michael
Neer	Julie
Noay	Jamiah
Norcross	Jennifer
Peterson	Cassidy
Prada	Martha
Ramsay	Chloe
Reichert	Marcel
Reynolds	Kris
Richard	Andrew
Rothman	Carl
STARKS	CAITLIN
Sedberry	George
Seeley	Matthew
Smart	Tracey
Spratt	Paige
Stanley	Sydney
Stephens	Haley
Thomas	Michael
Walter	John
Wamer	David
Westwood	W
Whitten	Meredith
Williams	Erik
Wilms	Olivia
Wiseman	Alyssa
elder	todd
fredieu	brian

plessett

eric

PLEASE SIGN IN

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting

March 2-6, 2026

Jekyll Island, Georgia

NAME	AFFILIATION	ZIP CODE
mandy kobarian	GADNR	32250
Ryan Harrell	GADNR	31525
K PALMROSE	GADNR	32205
C. Kalinowsky	GADNR	31324
Alex Aines	Oceana	22201
Victor Lloyd	C.F	32233
Brian F. Lloyd	CF	32225
Andy Fish	Comm	32952
Toney Altieri	Comm	32228
Russel Sindair	Comm	32952
Scott Osbourne	Comm	32948
David Haen	Comm	
David		

PLEASE SIGN IN

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting
March 2-6, 2026
Jekyll Island, Georgia

NAME	AFFILIATION	ZIP CODE
Bob Zales	SFA	32405
Rich Malinowski	SERO	31520
Johnny Marquez	Gulf Council	39503
Chris Horton	CSF	20003
Brendan Rude	TVC	22901
Charles M'Guigan	Cultimar Technologies	33705
Martha Gural	ASA	32303
Ryan Mallory	Gulf AP	33043
Nic Stephens	Headboat	32118
Haley Stephens	Charter/headboat	32118
Tom Burgess		28460
Michael Cowdrey	Michael Cowdrey	28460
Chris Horton	CSF	
Gabbi Judy	GADNR	31525
Janden Klennelsen	GADNR	31520