

**SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**SNAPPER GROUPER COMMERCIAL SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Radisson Resort at the Port**  
**Cape Canaveral, Florida**

**June 9, 2025**

**Transcript**

**Snapper Grouper Commercial Subcommittee**

|                            |                    |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Jessica McCawley, Chair    | Trish Murphey      |
| Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair | Tim Griner         |
| Charlie Phillips           | James G. Hull, Jr. |
| Amy Dukes                  | Andy Strelcheck    |

**Council Members**

|                     |               |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Dr. Carolyn Belcher | Lt. Tom Pease |
| Gary Borland        | Tom Roller    |

**Council Staff**

|                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| John Carmichael    | Kim Iverson        |
| Myra Brouwer       | Kelly Klasnick     |
| Dr. Chip Collier   | Dr. Julie Neer     |
| Julia Byrd         | Emily Ott          |
| Dr. Judd Curtis    | Dr. Mike Schmidtke |
| John Hadley        | Suzanna Thomas     |
| Kathleen Howington | Christina Wiegand  |
| Allie Iberle       | Meg Withers        |

**Attendees and Invited Participants**

|                 |                      |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Rich DeVictor   | Monica Smit-Brunello |
| Shepherd Grimes | C.J. Sweetman        |
| Sonny Gwin      |                      |

**Observers and Participants**

Other observers and participants attached.

The Snapper Grouper Commercial Subcommittee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Radisson Resort at the Port, Cape Canaveral, Florida, on Monday, June 9, 2025, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're going to go ahead and get going here in the Snapper Grouper Commercial Subcommittee. Let me read the members of the subcommittee. Myself, Kerry Marhefka, Amy Dukes, Tim Griner, Jimmy Hull, Trish Murphey, Charlie Phillips, and Andy Strelcheck are on the committee, and our first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any modifications to the subcommittee agenda? All right. Any objection to approval? All right. We'll consider the agenda approved.

The next order of business is Approval of the Minutes. Are there any substantive edits to the minutes from March 2025? Tim.

MR. GRINER: I think it was quite clear, but I think, on page 7, there needs to make reference to a quote that needs to be attributed to Charlie Phillips, instead of Tim Griner. I believe it's page 7.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and we're taking some notes, and so the quote should be attributed to Charlie, and not you?

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. GRIMES: That was page 7, the last paragraph of the page. I've got one too, and I'll send mine.

MR. GRINER: I will note that I beat Shep that time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Any objection to approval of the minutes with all of these changes? All right. The next item that we have on our list here is Review of Updated Commercial Data Analysis, and I'm going to pass it over to Mike and Chip.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Before Chip comes up to talk about the updated report, I did want to note that we did receive two comments from Dewey Hemilright relative to the subcommittee. Those will be posted on the website, later on today, under the comments section, and they will also be emailed to you.

DR. COLLIER: Thank you, and so this is an update on the request that -- This was presented to you in December, and so this is an update on that presentation, and, in the paper, you'll see sections highlighted in yellow. That just means what was updated from last time.

One of the things that was asked for was really diving into the difference between SG 1 permits and SG 2 permits, and so we provide additional information there. There was a request to have additional species beyond the top-ten. I did not do that, just because it started to get pretty close to confidential for some of these species, and so I left that out, and you can see -- I'll just jump down to the tables.

Once again, the highest average landings, over this five-year time period, was yellowtail snapper, followed by vermilion snapper, and that was about a half of what yellowtail snapper we're catching, and yet about another half from there was greater amberjack, going down to golden tilefish, triggerfish, gag grouper, almaco, snowy, red snapper, and then blueline tilefish. That wrapped up the top-ten.

Going into annual ACL percentages, what I did was just pull this directly from the SERO website. They have a really good website. Over time, tracking how many ACLs were met, and the percentage of those ACLs that are met, and so this is that value here. If you see something in italics, that means that the ACL had changed, and so, for vermilion snapper, there's a -- Every year the ACL was changing. It was going down, but also the percentage reaching that ACL was going down. The one that probably stands out the most here is this 185 for gag. If you remember, in 2023, there was an ACL change for that. Go ahead, Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry to interrupt you. For golden tilefish, did you combine the two sectors, and did you see a difference if they were separated out? By two sectors, you know what I mean, the longline versus handline.

DR. COLLIER: I did not do it for this. I'm trying to remember back to the ACL. It's -- In general, the longline got pretty close, and I think the hook-and-line -- I can't remember how close they were getting. They were closing in some years, and so that means they were achieving their ACL. I would have to dive into that.

MR. GRINER: Going back to that 185, and maybe it's worth noting, but that 185 was also not just the result of an ACL change, but it was the result of the timing of the implementation of an amendment as well, if I believe, and that was the one where the season had already opened, and we were running up, but the season was actually being prosecuted as if we were still under one ACL. An amendment was finally approved, and we had already run over the new ACL, and so it was more than just a strict change. Thank you.

DR. COLLIER: All right, and so now, getting into Table 3, looking at the percent of trips that were getting to a trip limit, once again, looking at a trip limit, fishermen might change the behavior as they're getting close to a trip limit, and might start targeting the species at some point, and I'm assuming that they would stop it before 100 percent, and maybe not, and so I capped it at 90 percent of the ACL.

If something was at a 500-pound trip limit, I basically said they were reaching their trip limit at 450 pounds, and so just trying to make it something that wasn't maxing out on a trip, and, for the most part, you can see very few trips are reaching their ACL. The one exception is red snapper, at that seventy-five pounds. It's over 60 percent every year. Some years it's approaching 80 percent of the trips are achieving the ACL. The other one that had relatively high were Florida hogfish and blueline tilefish.

Then I've added Table B to this, and this is just for SG 1 permits, and we could go through this, but it is almost a mirror of the previous table. There's not much of a big change here. We also added the number of SG 1 permits, and all vessels reporting by state, and you can see, basically, in most states, you're seeing SG 1 permits decreasing through time.

I do want to point out that, as I was putting this together, I did combine a couple of different data sources, trying to figure out what an SG 1 permit was. There were a lot of landings that were coming in that were not necessarily able to be attributed to a permit type, and so those are left out, and that's why I have that all vessels submitting, because there is quite a bit that I could not determine if they were SG 1 permit holder or not, but, most of the logbook analysis that I was doing through this project, I was assuming that people were in compliance, because, if you're submitting a logbook, you don't necessarily -- If you're intending to do it illegally, you wouldn't necessarily be submitting a logbook, and so that's my thought process.

If one of the vessels -- Or if the vessel was ever reported as having an SG 1 permit, I assumed it continued to have an SG 1 permit through this time period as they were reported. There was one vessel that I saw that did change from an SG 1 to an SG 2 permit, but it was just that one individual. I'm sure there's others that were in this dataset. This isn't a perfectly clean dataset, but it is what it is.

I'm going to skip over Figure 1. That was just similar to the table. I'm going to go into Figure 2, where we're looking at percent of trip limits being met, just a graphical display of it. You can see red snappers increasing in A and B. B is just for SG 1 permits, but, overall, there's very little difference between these two. I do promise you there is differences between them. If you really squint and look, there's a few minor differences that you'll see in these graphs.

Then the other thing I did want to point out is the number of SG 1 trips reporting single or multi-day trips. Once again, this is not for all vessels, because I couldn't attribute all vessels to an SG 1 or SG 2 permit, but this is for the vessels I was able to classify, and you can see, overall, there's a decreasing trend here, and then, on multi-day trips, there's also a decreasing trend, and, if you'll give me just one second, I did a deeper dive this morning into the overall trends by number of days by state, and there were some interesting things I saw in there, but I had to write them down, because things leave my brain pretty quick right now.

In Florida, there was a decreasing number of trips that had two and three days. However, the trips with five-plus days were increasing over time, over this five-year time period, and now the two to three-day trips were about half what they were back in 2019, and so, in 2023, they were about half. In South Carolina, the three-day-plus trips were decreasing, or less than three-day trips were decreasing, and then four-day trips and longer were increasing.

Then, in North Carolina, there were very few trips over five days. Most trips were two days and less, but, overall, there was decreasing on those one and two-day trips, and a slight increase in the five-day trips, and that's all I have for you all on the logbook data and commercial reports. Please let me know if you have any questions on this report.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chip. Any questions? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Not so much questions for Chip, but I would love to have some discussion, you know, looking at -- If you can go back to the table that shows the percentage of trips that are being constrained by the trip limit or that are meeting the trip limit. Thank you. It's like you already knew.

Yet, we do end up getting -- So there's these low number of trips that are being constrained by the trip limit, yet we do still end up getting semi-close to the ACLs, and so I'm trying to wrap my brain, because I thought I had the solution for like thinking about how we make sure that we optimize reaching our ACLs every year, thinking that there were more times than is shown here that we're being limited by trip limits, which is not the case, and so it goes back to the last table.

Is that because we're having a shift in more boats making shorter trips, or so smaller -- Maybe what I'm trying to say is smaller boats, that have less capacity, and so they're making more trips, but taking -- I'm just, for other people who are operating in an area where I'm not, where I'm thinking about the big boats that would be limited by trip limits, and you hear that from like Chris. In Chris's area, you know, they talk about really being limited. If other guys that are here can give some insight on what they think the issue might be, because the data is confusing me a little. I believe it. It's just confusing, what I know of the fishery where I am.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chip.

DR. COLLIER: This is not an uncommon pattern at all. A lot of fisheries have a bunch of trips just catching a few pounds, and then, if you think about this as a multispecies fishery, they're catching a lot of species on the trip, and I think what it's showing you is there's very few trips that are specializing on a certain species, right? If I were to dive into the longline, that's probably getting close to -- A lot of those trips are probably getting close to the trip limit.

However, when you look at hook-and-line, they'll probably go out for just part of the trip and catch some golden tilefish, if they're biting. If they're not, they're going to catch a few and then move on to the next species that might be biting better, and so they're going to be optimizing, within the trip, on a variety of species that they could potentially catch.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and I can see that, but I think about certainly, and Amy can speak to this, but, in my area, where I think about the more traditional larger bandit boats, that have traditionally gone out and limited out on beeliner first, or gone out to deep water, gotten what they can get there and, on their way in, limited out.

I mean, beeliner is an example that confuses me. I don't know what to do, because that has always been -- Well, in my mind it's always been, but even in 2019, that -- It wasn't constraining, and so that's why I'm wondering if it's a state -- Like that's not happening in Florida, but that is an issue in South Carolina. Are those 15 percent of vessels that are limiting -- That are limiting out from the northern part of the fishery? I want to make sure we understand how the fishery is really operating as we talk about things we can do to make it better.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Kerry, you raised an interesting point, and I'm wondering, Chip, with your analysis, if, over time, the impact of lower trip limits, right, impedes essentially those higher catches to make the trip profitable, and so like you're pointing out, Kerry, the dynamics of the trips are changing, and kind of bearing out a little bit, but, if we looked at kind of the composition of the catch over time, and kind of the average composition of the trip limits, if that's also evolving

and changing over time, based on the target species, and so that ultimately doesn't necessarily affect an analysis like this, in terms of how much you're bumping up against the trip limit, but it does affect kind of cumulatively what you would have caught on that trip as a whole over time, and if there's any sort of trend there, in terms of cumulative landings for trips.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: What caught my attention, in your discussion here, was the fact that the two or three-day trip limit, or trips, are decreasing, in it looks like in all the states, but there's an increase in those longer trips, and I was kind of wondering what's your thought on why that may be, and is that they're maybe increasing their portfolio, and they may be catching fish in shallow water somewhere, or going out deeper, to get some different species, you know, and so I guess I'm getting it, since we were talking about trip efficiency as well, that I wonder if that's them trying to be more efficient by increasing their portfolio of fish fishing in different areas, and I don't know if you have any thoughts on that, or if any of the commercial guys have any thoughts on that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chip.

DR. COLLIER: I think my thought on that would -- This is probably getting into the point where it would be better to talk to the AP, and really get their feedback on, you know, how they operate, because that's going to give you the state perspective, and some of them have been fishing in that fishery for a while, and so that can give you also a time series as well. I just -- Diving into the numbers, I'm probably not going to be able to get into those kind of details, without getting into potentially some confidentiality, but also just some spurious data that could drive me off in a rabbit hole that might not be the best one to pursue.

MS. MURPHEY: I just thought that was a very interesting tidbit, but I think I saw Jimmy might have something.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jimmy, then Tim.

MR. HULL: Thank you. To chime-in on this, I mean, so, for me as a fisherman, to reach my trip limit on any given trip, and target species, the conditions matter, okay? If the fish are there, and they're available, and they're biting, and the tide is not running so hard, and this and that, and the weather conditions -- I mean, so all those factors play into these numbers, too.

If everything is just right, and there's a lot of fish, and they're biting, yes, I may be constrained by the trip limit, because it's like wide open, we call it, right, and so everything is good, and so those are considerations that I think play into a lot of these numbers that you see of, well, you know, this percentage here is so low, but it's conditions, you know? Conditions have to be right, and then, on a multi-day trip, as opposed to a single-day trip, you only have one shot on a single-day trip. If the conditions aren't right, you're probably coming home and regrouping. On a multi-day trip, you're just going to stay until the conditions change, which they will the next day, and then the bite is on, and so just throwing that in there from my perspective.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I was going to say a lot of what Jimmy just said, and, you know, it's really just a matter of what happens during the time that you're out there, you know, because, once you're there, you're there, and you only have -- You can't change what's happening when you're there, and you just have to deal with it, and so -- But, you know, for me, and for the guys that fish out of my area, that are fishing in the multi-day boats, one thing I would like to add is that, you know, you see these two and three-day trips in North Carolina, instead of the five and seven-day trips, like South Carolina, and it's because nobody wants to be out there by themselves.

When you're out there, and everybody has been there for two or three days, and they decide that they've had enough, then everybody comes in, just about, and so very rarely will guys stay out there, if you're out there for two or three days, and everybody leaves, because either the weather is getting bad, or the fish aren't biting, or the current is wrong, whatever the reason may be, and everyone tends to head in. I know, for me personally, I don't want to be out there with only twenty-four hours left of decent weather and be the last one in.

The other thing that I wanted to add to these, to this trip limit, or to this limiting-out discussion, is it truly is a portfolio of getting a little bit of everything, as we alluded to earlier, and, for my boat in particular, I can't hold a limit of everything, you know, and so I'm really limited not by the actual fishing limit, but I'm limited by how much capacity and ice I can carry, especially in the summertime.

Ice is a huge issue for me, and so, regardless of whether the fish are chewing or not, if I've got some very good fish onboard, and I'm starting to struggle with my ice situation, I have to leave, period, and that's it. You know, it's not about bringing fish to the dock that have been sitting in the heat, and so it really -- Ice is a consideration, and carrying capacity is something that needs to be thought about with these boats as well. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tim. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and, I mean, I hear you, because that's how we fish, but, to Chip's point about talking to the AP about it, if you go back and read the AP minutes from the last AP meeting, you're hearing, from Chris and the guys in Brunswick County, and, you know, northern South Carolina, and they very much -- The way I interpreted it, they very much are feeling limited by the trip limit, and so there's still a portion of the fleet out there that feels like they are, and so I'm just trying to figure out perception versus, you know, the numbers on this, in this presentation, because they've asked for, you know, the ability to be more efficient, aka catch more fish on their trip.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Good discussion. More discussion on this data, or more questions, or things that you saw in the data that you want to discuss with the committee? All right. I don't see any additional hands. Thank you, Chip. Now Mike is going to come back up here. We're going to go into the decision document next.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so, going into your discussion document, I'm just giving a brief recap of what happened in the last meeting of the subcommittee, and then also the council meeting that followed, to an extent. Last March, you took a look at the landings report, kind of similar to what Chip has recently updated, and you identified two major objectives that you wanted to address through an amendment, the first being commercial permit issues and the second being increasing commercial trip efficiency.

After your meeting, this then went to the Snapper Grouper Committee and the council, and, through the council, you all initiated an amendment to address these objectives, and that will be Snapper Grouper Amendment 60, and so we're going to be kind of getting that process underway as we go through this meeting.

The objectives for today's meeting, you've already reviewed the additional analyses. We've put together some potential actions that are in line with your discussions from the previous subcommittee meetings, potential amendment timeline, and we've also put together, along with those potential actions, some questions that you may want to have addressed in scoping, through public feedback, and we'll go through those, and you can add or edit those questions, as needed, and then ultimately consider recommending approval of this amendment for scoping.

As a reminder of process, the subcommittee would not approve the amendment for scoping. You all would provide a recommendation that the committee, and ultimately the council, approve the amendment for scoping, and so just making sure that everybody is clear on that process.

Going into the potential actions, first addressing that objective of making adjustments to the commercial snapper grouper unlimited permit. The first draft action was to revise the two-for-one snapper grouper permit policy, and so a couple of questions that we had, that would go with this action as we go out to scoping, and is this policy -- Does the public feel like this policy is still necessary? Should the two-for-one policy continue for a specific time period, or until a threshold maximum number of permits has been met, and then kind of having some discussion about what could potentially be appropriate evaluation criteria.

This is something that could be -- That you all may want to address through economic analysis with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. That may be something that I'm not sure whether that question is a public facing question, or whether that's something that you all need to look at a bit more information through the council process to evaluate that, but I'll turn this back to the subcommittee, to see -- Do you have edits, or information, that you would like, as far as these questions and the potential scoping process?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and just getting some clarification there, and so you might notice that these actions that are in this document are listed as draft action, Draft Action 1, Draft Action 2, and so one of the things we're going to do today is figure out which actions that we want in the document -- So turn it from draft into, okay, this is definitely an action we want in here, and then those questions underneath are a question for the subcommittee, and like what do we need additional information on, and then are there specific questions here, or do we want to add questions that we're intending to get feedback on from the public.

Like the first question listed there is, is the two-for-one policy for the commercial snapper grouper unlimited permits still necessary, and that might be something that you might want to ask the public, but there might be other questions listed in here that are more for the committee right now, and so just -- There's three things that we're doing here in this document, is figuring out what actions we want, what questions we feel like we need answered in the future, and then what questions we're going to ask the public. All right. Jimmy.



MR. HULL: Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, the two-for-one policy, I think it would be important to make the statement of why the two-for-one was imposed to begin with, when you're asking the question out to the public, so they understand this was put in place because the commercial sector was considered to be overcapacity, overcapitalized at the time, and now here - - Then you'll have the data for the public to comment, and show the number of permits that we had, and where we're at now, and what's able to be transferred, and where we're at, so they can see the lay of the land.

Obviously, I mean, just looking at it from commonsense perspective, I mean, we're aging out. We need to make it easier for someone to enter this fishery, and, with the two-for-one policy, it makes it very difficult for somebody to get into the commercial fishery for snapper grouper, and so that's, you know, one of the main reasons why I want to see this disappear, because, for the future, we need to make it easier, and it's not necessary. I don't feel that we are overcapacity, and so I don't know if any of that helps, but I definitely want to see this not just be a draft action. I want to definitely make this an action in this amendment, that we find a way to eliminate this two-for-one. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Sounds good, and so we've got some information down there, and it sounds like, and I'll look around the room, that we definitely want this action in the document, and so, yes, and I see people nodding yes, and I see hands going up. Kerry, and then Andy.

MS. MARHEFKA: Not so much -- I just -- It probably like goes without saying, but I just want to make sure that it's very clear that, while we're talking about getting rid of the two-for-one, we're not talking about limited entry. You know, just as long as that's very specified, that going for the two-for-one still means it's a limited-entry fishery. We all know that, but just in case the world doesn't know that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Andy, and then Trish.

MR. STRELCHECK: Regarding the second bullet, I mean, it's fairly prescriptive, in terms of what we're asking. We're not, obviously, suggesting that they weigh in on what the threshold would be, but, to me, overcapacity, overcapitalization, can be economically determined. It also can be based on the goals and objectives that we set for the fishery around this table, and determine, obviously, kind of an optimal number of vessels in the fishery, and so I think I would avoid, you know, mentioning the threshold, and really kind of focus in more on what people view as either the benefits or barriers to the two-for-one and how either maintaining or eliminating the two-for-one would benefit their businesses and their fishing operations.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That's good. Mike is trying to capture that. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, and this was actually going on Bullet 2, and I'm assuming this will actually come out in the amendment, but things to think about in doing this is, you know, will we have a phase-out plan for it? You know, will the fishers be able to sell that extra permit? Does it get turned in, and then what happens to those extra permits? You know, what about the guys with the SG 2 permits? How are they going to -- How is it going to play in for them, so that -- I would think they would be wanting to get the SG 1 permits, and so, I mean, those are just -- Those were just kind of ideas that came to my mind, when I was reading this, that may be discussion points in the amendment, or with the APs or whatever.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and we're trying to capture that. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and, to go along with the difficulty of new entries, if we get rid of the two-for-one, then people will -- Everybody will be buying permits, kind of like on a single basis, which is going to be much simpler, and probably a good bit cheaper than trying to buy corporate permits, and so permits will move easier, and I would fully expect the price to come down significantly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: While I understand what Charlie is saying. I wholeheartedly disagree about the pricing. I don't think the price will come down. I don't see how it could. The price is really reflective of how many permits there are. Getting a permit is a lot of work, and it's a lot of work. Getting rid of this two-for-one is really only going to change things for a small group of permits, in my mind. The permit is still going to be -- Instead of a single corporate permit dropping down to what the price of an individual permit is, those individual permits are going to rise to the price of a corporate permit now.

If you really look at the way these things are bought and sold right now, and we had this discussion when we were talking about the 225 permits, but these corporate permits aren't transferred. Everybody thinks they're transferred. They're really not transferred. The corporation changes hands. The shareholders change hands, and so it's really a -- It will really become a matter of all the permits will be in a corporation, and the shareholders will change hands, and the price will be reflective of that, but the price is really going to be reflective of what these ex-vessel fish prices are, and whether or not you can go out and cobble a trip together, regardless of the trip limits, but can you go out there and catch a little bit of everything and come back and make a profit at the end of the day.

We're down to -- We're whittling this down through attrition as well. I mean, regardless of the two-for-one, North Carolina has gone down 30 percent in its permits in five years. We've went from ninety-five permits to sixty. When that happens, the price of the permit doesn't go down. It's going to go up. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Charlie, and then back to Kerry.

MR. PHILLIPS: You know, and, Tim, I agree. I don't think it's going to go to a single. I think it's probably going to meet in the middle, is my gut feeling, just because some of these people that are, you know, leasing boats to their singles can actually afford to sell them then, where they can't now, and so I think it's going to meet in the middle, and, when I say significant, 10,000 is significant, and you're absolutely right, again, that the permit is worth what somebody can make with it. If you can't make anything with it, the permit really doesn't have much value. If you can make, you know, \$250,000, and I'm just picking a number, then the permit is going to have a value on that, and so it's all fluid, but thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I know this isn't the time to get down in the weeds of things, but it just struck me that there is going to be this overlap of there are a bunch of permits out there right now that either a broker owns or that are owned by someone who has only been able to obtain one permit, and not the second, that I would consider sort of latent, that's latent effort that's there. I know we're having issues with the permit database, but, at some point in the analysis, I think we're going to have to get a concept of how many that is, so that we understand what level of effort has the potential to come back into the fishery.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Mike is capturing that. Other things that we can think of under this first action? I think we've got a good list of questions there for the public. We have a good list of bullet points, which we might get some more bullet points, as we go through this document, of items that we need in thinking about this. Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GRINER: A quick question for Andy. Andy, if you buy one of those individual permits, and you're looking for the second one, can you hold that individual one permit and not -- Because you can't use it, and can you just hold it and renew it forever?

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't know the answer to that. I would have to look into it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We captured that on the list of questions. Anything else on this action?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Okay, and so the next draft action, based on your discussions, was to establish a maximum limit on the number of permits that may be owned by a specific entity, and so kind of the follow-up public facing question is there, shown in the bullet, asking should entities be limited to a maximum number of permits, and, if so, what maximum limits should be considered?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I can't remember the discussion on this one. I'm hoping someone can explain why we talked about this, because I couldn't remember why we went down this path. Can someone remind me? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know either, unless they're talking about permit stacking, so they can do multiple limits, and that's the only thing I can see that this might be talking about, and I don't think we were, you know, highly in favor of that, but --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I thought we had talked about it in terms of the sharecropping, or the idea of what was happening in the Gulf, where, you know, a corporation could come in and buy a large amount of the permits, and not fish them, and then lease them out at a rate that made it impossible for new people, you know, to get into the fishery, or to make money at it. I think, in my mind, I thought the idea was just not to let a corporation amass a large percentage, because we only have 500 permits, or whatever it is, and that you couldn't take over 20 percent of the market, or 10 percent of the market. If you let five companies take over 10 percent of the market, then, you know, the rest -- Everybody else is going to be on the outside looking in.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thanks. That was helpful. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Tim, I think the issue is them holding coupons and shares of things like red snapper, more so than the permits, and, again, a lot of these permits are in corporations, and so those are all separate entities. My gut feeling is we would be spinning our wheels to try to set a number there. If we had, you know, red snapper over here, you know, those -- Yes, then maybe do something, but I think we would be spinning our wheels here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: I think Charlie is absolutely right. I don't think you can get into the business of deciding what entity are related to what entities, and is a shareholder a shareholder of five different corporations, and does this corporation own that corporation, which owns that corporation, and, you know, that's just a tangled web, that I don't think this council can deal with.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I think we also talked about use-it-or-lose-it, or maybe -- So maybe that's another way to get to it, where you're not just having an entity that's not actually using a bunch of permits. I don't know. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I see what you guys are saying, and I really do agree with it, but I think that one of the things that -- In my history with this council, we've always thought of this commercial fishery as a primarily owner-operated fishery. In my mind -- Primarily. I'm not saying that that has to 100 percent the -- That the owner of the permit always has to be on the boat, but the concept of this is a fishery where people operating in it have a stake in the game, and they're not distant armchair owners, like the sharecropping thing, or whatever you're saying, and, ultimately, I do believe that is what is best for a fishery like this, as far as how you encourage responsible fisheries management.

I'm not saying this is how you get to it. I see all the pitfalls, and this may be something we talk about later in the week, when we talk about our big picture snapper grouper stuff, but, if you go back to discussions we've always had about this fishery, it is a small fishery, that is meant for people operating in it to have some true skin in the game, and so that's just my concern. If we get to a point where species are rebuilding, what you want is the people who have went through the pain -- That they get the gain, and it doesn't become this, again, armchair owner sharecropping out the permit, and so I think it was a way to get to that. There might be other ways to get to it. Maybe we can't get to it at all, but that is, in my mind, why it was there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: For that reason, it's probably worth going out and -- You know, letting it go to scoping, letting the public talk about it, but, you know, at the end of the day, corporations aren't going to want to try to take over the fishery in the South Atlantic, because it's a boutique fishery. We're talking about a couple hundred thousand -- The ninth-highest-caught fish was red snapper, and it's only open for six weeks, or five weeks, and it was 129,000 pounds.

No corporation is going to jump into the South Atlantic and think that they're going to take over a fishery for 129,000 pounds. It's not 12,900,000. It's 129,000, and so, you know, the ACLs, and the stock that we're dealing with in the South Atlantic, as it stands right now, is going to prevent any large corporate interest in the South Atlantic fisheries, in my opinion, but it's worth letting the public take a look at it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Jimmy.

MR. HULL: I agree with everything that you all have said, and I think that this question -- You should just eliminate it, and just take it out of there. I mean, if you're lucky enough to have a guy that has a couple boats, and he needs permits, I mean, and then you're going to maybe potentially say we're only going to limit you to one permit, and I heard what you say, and that's not 100 percent what you want, but, I mean, it's --

I mean, my own situation is I have several vessels, and, you know, I have to have access to the permits, to work the vessels, and that's one of the reasons why the two-for-one is so oppressive. I mean, it makes you have to go lease your own vessels to yourself, and do this and that. I mean, it's just a complicated mess, and we need to get rid of that, and so that's just my two-cents on that, but I agree. Ideally, you know, owner-operator would be ideal, but it's just there are people that have bigger ideas than just owner-operator.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so I've heard things on both sides, and so I get that we just heard don't put that question in there, but do we want this action to go out to scoping or not, and so I've heard some yes, and some no, and what do people think here? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I would be inclined not to send it out. I think it's going to just be too confusing for the public to really understand the nuances of what we discuss at this table, and I just don't think we can explain all of these things and get good answers. I really don't.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Folks, think about that, because I see some heads nodding, yes, you're good with taking it out. Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thanks, Madam Chair. I tend to agree with Charlie, not only from the understanding, but also managing this type of action, and how this council would go about figuring out how to manage this, and setting those expectations is going to be very cumbersome and difficult, and we've already seen, during the current operation, that there are already, quote-unquote, loopholes that folks are rolling through, and I think they're just going to figure out ways to circumvent this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I'm checking one more time to make sure we don't want this to go out. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I'm just kind of of the opposite opinion, that I feel like this is scoping, and we're early in the process. Let's just get some general feedback, and input, and, if people don't like the concept of, you know, capping the number of permits, then we'll hear that, and that will inform, obviously, our decision-making going forward. I heard, obviously, a lot of reasons why maybe we don't want to pursue this, but why not ask the fishermen in particular about this?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was actually thinking, you know, if -- I can go either way, but I was thinking you may be able, in Action 3, to kind of get some questions there that may help answer that, when

you're setting up requirements there. You know, within those requirements, it may address this issue of maximum number of permits, just in 3, but you would be framing it in a different way, to kind of get at the same answer, and so just to throw that idea out.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Andy, are you okay with that, with removing this draft action and instead asking them questions underneath Action 3? Is there a way to do it that way? Okay. I see heads nodding yes, and so then we're removing Draft Action 2 and instead asking some questions, to get to that same information, under Action 3.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so Draft Action 3 would look at revising the requirements to acquire or retain a snapper grouper commercial permit, and you've noted that you want to include, in your scoping questions, whether a maximum number of permits -- If that's something that the council should be looking into, and so that would go along with the requirements to acquire or retain.

What we included in here, based on some of your discussion at the last subcommittee meeting, are some examples of commercial income, or fishing activity requirements, that have been either used or considered in other South Atlantic fisheries, and so, for example, we have, for Snapper Grouper Amendment 4, there was the requirement that was noted, to qualify for a permit, an individual had to have at least 50 percent of their earned income or \$28,000 in gross sales derived from commercial, charter, or headboat fishing. This was chosen to maintain consistency with the Gulf at that time, and then there's kind of a whole list.

In Amendment 5, there was consideration, and not eventual implementation, but there was consideration of a requirement for wreckfish. There's an example within the Shrimp FMP. There's an example within the Spiny Lobster FMP, and then a variety of examples, or at least a process over time, of how income requirements and performance requirements have been used in the Coastal Migratory pelagics FMP.

I'm just kind of scrolling through, to show you the information that is there, and, at this point, that information would be used kind of -- You can look through it, and you can do a little bit of a deeper dive as we go through this process, on if some of these requirements, or considerations, are things that you saw as positive or beneficial for that fishery, potentially applicable to the snapper grouper, then we may be able to take pieces from those FMPs, and kind of modify them, use that as a bit of a basis, if you wanted to build something like that in the snapper grouper commercial fishery.

If that's -- If you want to just kind of make something that's completely different than what's been used in the past, then that's a route that you could go as well, but this is at least giving some -- Kind of some ground to potentially work up from in developing this type of action, and so I can turn back to the subcommittee to see -- Do you all have questions that you would like -- Would you like to continue considering this action in the amendment, and then do you have questions that you would like to pose to the public associated with this?

It sounded like, from the last discussion, we can ask about a maximum number of permits, but any other potential requirements that would change in order to acquire, or retain, the commercial permit, and, again, noting this is all relative to the SG 1. This would be how you acquire or retain an SG-1, and that I believe is the topic that we're looking at here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So, Mike, let me just make sure I understand, and so this draft action is basically, once the two-for-one goes away, what are the new requirements to acquire, or retain, a snapper grouper commercial permit, and do we need to specify SG 1? I'm just trying to make sure I understand what this action would do. Is that what it means, like, once you get rid of two-for-one, what does the subcommittee want the new requirements to be, and is that --

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes, and that's how I had interpreted the discussion surrounding this, is what you said, what are the new requirements for somebody to be able to acquire it or retain it?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thank you. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Well, it can't be acquire. It would have to be to retain, right? I mean, if you're brand new in the fishery, you don't have 50 percent -- You don't have any income requirements from being in the fishery, right, and so it can't be to acquire. It would have to be to retain, but, aside from that, my recommendation would be to drop any kind of income requirement whatsoever, and not even -- You know, take that off the table. It's a road you don't want to go down.

It's completely unenforceable. You're not going to be able to track people's tax returns and everything else, and, you know, people's income portfolio is so varied, and complicated, these days that, you know, you're not going to be able to tell a commercial fisherman that, hey, you can't -- Even though you've owned this dock space, and you rent it out to a lot of other boats, that, you know, you're going to have to drop your price on your dock rental, because you're making more than you are off your commercial fishing, I mean, or you're going to lose your permit.

So I just think the whole idea of trying to track income, and tie it to your permit, is going to be -- It's going to be something that you really can never actually accomplish. There's probably something else that you could tie to a requirement to retain, or acquire, but I don't think you really want to put any kind of, you know, hardship to acquire the permit. We're trying to make it easier to acquire the permit, so that, you know, we can have people that can enter this fishery. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I have a question. Your comment made me think of a question. Maybe there should be two separate actions, because can't someone, here on out, acquire the permit by purchasing it from someone else? Like how could you -- Or, otherwise, you just have these certain entities, and, once those people leave the fishery, then like the permits are phased out, and is that what we mean, and don't we mean SG 1 and SG 2? Like, so once you take off two-for-one, like how do you get the permit from someone else? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, like, when we leave, hopefully we'll sell it to someone who wants to enter, and so that's what would happen, and that person, presumably, and let's say it's a young person who wants to get into the fishery, would not be able to go, hey, I want to buy your permit, and hey, NMFS here's income -- Here's income proof that this is how I make my money, because they're new to the industry, and so they've never made their money that way.

I think Tim's right. I mean, I understand these all, whether they came from us or the AP, this suite of actions right here, I think the intent was to, again, keep our fishery sort of like the boutique, you

know, specialized fishery that it is, without any sort of speculation, and Tim makes a good point that if someone is speculating on this fishery, they're probably a bad investor anyway.

I've learned that the hard way, and I would also like to point out that we have to really now look at all of this in the lens of the new administrative environment, which is we're supposed to be being deregulatory, and, while getting rid of the two-for-one is definitely deregulatory, some of these actions could be considered more regulatory, and so I think I'm supportive of sort of taking out a lot of these complicated things. I think, at the end of the day, let's look at the -- Sorry to borrow this term early, but the goalpost of getting rid of the two-for-one is the important thing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I think I agree. In North Carolina, we've gone -- It's kind of a similar thing we went through. Our issue was trying to define a commercial fisherman, and you would think that would be easy, but it wasn't, and we discussed all the things that are in this list here, you know, and should there be an income requirement, and then the question was, well, what should the income requirement be, and then, you know, whether you're part-time, full-time, all that.

It just -- It got really messy, and that we just actually went away from that defining a commercial fisherman, and even the point of, you know, what to do with the latent licenses, you know, and there was things of, well, they should be taken away. Well, why should they be taken away? Some of them, they're renewed every year, so that they can pass them down to their children or whatever. I mean, it's just -- I think I'm agreement with everything, that just we need to kind of lose all that, because it just -- Like I said, we went through it twice, and we never came to an end of it. We gave up in that, and, granted, it's not -- It was defining a commercial fisherman, and not just dealing with permits, but, anyway, just from that experience, it was -- We had to drop it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy, and then Jimmy.

MR. STRELCHECK: A lot of great points have been made. With regard to the income requirement, we had this in the Gulf, years ago, and we ultimately eliminated it. It's very difficult to validate ways to circumvent it, and so I agree with dropping it. I think that maybe the question, for the commercial entities on the subcommittee -- Really the main issue here is we want to make sure that the permits are in the hands of the fishermen, right?

That's the reality, and so I get that this is a boutique fishery, that there's not a lot of speculative investors, but there are -- I'll call them brokers, right, and requiring a landing requirement, or some other fishing activity, still I don't think quite gets at them, because, if they're leasing the permit, right, those landings, or any sort of activity, is still going to go back to that entity for confirmation of fishing activity, but I wanted to just confirm that, because, if that's an area where we have concerns, then we need to be thinking about how to address that in this amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so I have more hands going up, but I'm going to ask my earlier question one more time, just because I don't think I was very clear, and I definitely need some more coffee, and so it's almost like Action 3 is two questions, and we need to figure out do we want both of those questions, actions, and one of them is what are the requirements to purchase a permit, and then, secondarily, what are the requirements to retain, or are there requirements to retain, and so why is this not two questions?



Why is it just one question, because it seems like we could be setting both. One of them we might not to set, and like we might not want to have requirements to retain it, but I'm just asking these questions over again, and so I'm going to go back to my hands. Jimmy, then Kerry.

MR. HULL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, I would support eliminating the income requirement, for one thing, and then, to Andy's point of, you know, you've got brokers that are holding permits, and, well, that's basically they're leasing them, or they'll sell them, transfer them, also, but, when we get rid of the two-for-one, it's going to affect those guys, and I think they may pretty much disappear, hopefully, but eliminating the two-for-one is going to change a lot of things. It's going to make things a lot easier, which is good, and we need to be able to have easier access, entry, into this fishery because we need some new talent, and it's too difficult now for a young guy to even jump in it, or a young gal, and so, you know, we're doing the right thing here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry, then Trish.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, yes, and I think Andy gets to the point though, that we need the answer to the question is, right now, if you are in a broker -- I think brokers are the reason all of these questions are here initially, but, right now, if you're a broker, or you're someone who has one permit, that's waiting to get the second, or you're the middleman of the two, what are the requirements for renewing that permit every year?

Can you just hold onto one permit, and continue to renew it, if it's one-half of a two-for-one, and then -- Which also goes to your question about what are the requirements to buy one. In my mind, maybe it's something like you have X amount of time after you purchase one to have it be actually assigned to a vessel. Like you can't just hold one and not have a vessel.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Trish, and then Andy.

MS. MURPHEY: I'm just going back to, again, how things work in North Carolina, at least for the state fisheries. You know, one thing -- So you have to apply for a license to get into the fishery, and you have to -- So it's participation in the fishery. If you have a crew or something, that, you know, you count it as participation in the fishery.

We also -- Which kind of, to me, might equal to the SG 2, and somebody like brand-spanking-new, who is not a family, you know, job or anything, but we have a shellfish license that any state -- As long as you're a resident of the state, you can get that license, and that also sets you up for participation in a fishery, and I'm not saying the snapper grouper fishery, or any kind of fishery, but participation in fishing, and so you may be able to kind of come up with some requirements kind of similar to that, you know, and what's the participation in these fisheries.

These SG 1 guys, maybe that might be a requirement to get the SG 2, or, you know, but I think that's how we do it in North Carolina, and participation is pretty broad, you know, be it a crew member, or captain, or, you know, working in a dealer, but there might be some tidbits in there to think about, as far as participation, and how much participation, and that might be something, but, anyway, I just throw those ideas out, too.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks. Andy, and then Tim.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess I'm thinking about this from a little bit different angle, and so, besides, obviously, us eliminating the two-for-one, you just have to essentially purchase one permit. The question, to me, would be should there be any new requirements to acquire a permit, or should we keep with the existing requirements, and then, to Kerry's point, I am cognizant of the seafood competitiveness executive order, and the deregulatory actions, and we want to be thoughtful, and careful, about, if we're going to require new requirements, how does that help with seafood competitiveness, right, because they would be viewed potentially as regulatory, but, in light of it benefitting the commercial industry, because it would help with competitiveness.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Maybe this is a question for Trish, and maybe I didn't hear everything correctly, but you were talking about the North Carolina commercial fishermen, the commercial fishery license, having participation requirements, and, well, the only requirement to obtain one is just to buy one, just like you can buy an SG 1. You can buy a North Carolina commercial fishing license without ever participating whatsoever.

MS. MURPHEY: Those rules changed. That's not in the -- That's not there anymore. I think you can -- If you're family, you can sell it to a family, but, for you just to sell it to me, I don't -- It's not legal anymore. You have to -- That got changed a few years ago, but you're right that, originally, it was. You're right, but now that has changed.

MR. GRINER: Well, I think it's still tied to a vessel. If you sell a vessel that has a commercial fishing permit, and it's tied to a commercial fishing permit, yes, and you can buy a skiff that has a permit with it, and you own the permit that goes with that skiff, is my understanding of the new rule, because they're being bought and sold all over North Carolina, and they're being bought and sold tied to a vessel.

MS. MURPHEY: I'm not the expert in how this works in North Carolina, but it's the license, and so any vessel permits may go with the vessel, but the license is on the person, and, if you have three vessels, you have three licenses.

MR. GRINER: You can have a commercial fishing license in North Carolina that is corporate, and that corporate can own a vessel, and, even if it's an individual permit, you can still sell that permit with that vessel, an individual commercial fishing license.

MS. MURPHEY: Well, I'll check out -- I can check that out more, and I don't want to tie up this conversation with this, but I'll check it out more, but, for the most part, you have to apply.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're having some internet issues here with the webinar, and can we please take a five-minute, and it could be a ten-minute, break. I have hands in the queue. I have Charlie, and then Kerry, when we come back.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Come on back to the table. We're going to try to go a couple extra minutes in this committee, and then we'll switch over to closed session, and then the plan would

be we would end Full Council, I believe around five-ish, and then come back into this subcommittee between five and six. Our chair has got a thumbs-up over there. That's the plan, and so we were supposed to adjourn at 10:00. We had internet issues, and so we're going to try to at least wrap up where we are on this particular action, and then we'll take a break, in order to get into closed session.

On that particular action that we were working on there, I feel like we've had some good discussion here. We've got two more people in the queue, but, before we go to those people, I would say, based on this discussion, we want this action to go out to public scoping, and so I would consider it probably not draft anymore.

I think it's fine to leave this action as one, instead of breaking it into two, and then we have some questions underneath there that I think that we can ask the public, and so you're really -- You're getting information on two different topics there. You're getting information on what are the new requirements for acquiring, or obtaining -- For acquiring or obtaining the permit, and then the other action, which would be -- Sorry, and someone else seems to have control of the main screen here, but the other action would be what -- Getting information about retaining the permit over time, and so you're collecting information about both of them. All right. I'm going to go back to my list of hands. Charlie, and then Kerry.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I need to kind of remind myself what my thoughts were, but I think Andy talked about maybe keeping things simple, and we, obviously, don't need an income requirement for new people, and I think it's just going to be probably -- Just listening to Trish and Tim talk about North Carolina, and it's just complicated, and they're experts, and so I'm -- I'm not inclined to, you know, try to get into weeds on making people jump through certain hoops to keep a permit.

If they've got a permit, and maybe they don't use it for a year, and they're losing money, and so most people don't do stuff to lose money. They're going to sell it, or do something else with, and, when one other question. When we come back, can we add some more drafts, because I've got another idea for another draft thing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We sure can, and so just remember we're trying to figure out what to go to scoping with. You know people are going to come to us with all their ideas, and so, even if you say no income requirement, you're going to get information on that either way. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It was before break, so I've lost my train of thought, but, basically, what I would like us to do is to be simple, so we can move on, okay? Get rid of the two-for-one, yes or no, and I don't think there's -- Maybe, like you're saying, because people are going to talk about it anyway, but, if we just have the draft action wording, and not -- Do you feel strongly, Mike, that we need to be prescriptive in our questions, or can we just say should there be revisions to maintaining or acquiring a permit and see what comes out of scoping?

MS. MCCAWLEY: He's typing that up. All right. We have three more minutes in this committee before we're going to take a break and switch over to closed session, and so, Charlie, do you want to go ahead and talk about that action that you're wanting to add here?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah, and, obviously, I'm making it up as I go, and so I'm going to need some help, but I've mentioned it to Tim, but we've got quite a few species that are well below ACLs, that are open all year, and not overfished, and not undergoing overfishing. Is there a method where we could just unilaterally lift those trip limits by 20 percent in the first half of the year, see where we are, and, if we're still on track to be below our ACL, leave them in effect, and, if we are getting close -- If it looks like we're going to get closer to our ACL at the second half of the year, we just go back to the original trip limits, some methodology like that. I think it would help us produce fish and not go over our ACLs.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So that's under the second objective, Objective 2, about trip efficiency, and that's fine, since we only have another minute here, but, yes, Mike could start typing something, and I saw hands going up, and so, Kerry, do you want to speak to that?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and, Charlie, I just thinking you're jumping -- I'm with you, but I just think you're jumping ahead. I would suggest that we wrap up this two-for-one, make sure what we have in this two-for-one, and this is what we were going to get out later, because I also have some thoughts on that, and I think this is going to be a -- We're all on the same page, but how we do it I think is going to be the issue, and so I think, for now, we just make sure we have two-for-one the way we want it, and get to this later.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That sounds good, and so that -- What we just talked about, which was Draft Action 3, it sounds like we're -- We want to go out to scoping on that, and that was the end of the actions under two-for-one, and so are we all good with that? Anything else about the two-for-one, which was the first objective of this document? Are we good with the two-for-one discussion and what's going to go out to scoping? So it was all three, or, well, not all, and we deleted one, but the one that we were working on -- There it is. Draft Action 3 is still in there. Possibly removing some of these questions underneath this action, and are we good?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just confirming that what I've taken from this discussion is Draft Action 3 would go out for scoping, and there would just be kind of a general question of should there be revisions to the process of acquiring, or maintaining, and so not including some of the details that were noted in a lower form, but make it more wide open for people to comment on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and it looks like that's nodding yes. All right. Thank you. All right, Madam Chair. I'm going to pass it back to you.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thanks, everybody. I guess we're going to take a really short break, just to switch over to closed council, and, everybody online, if you're still there, thanks for being patient. We're just going to try to be as flexible as we can, as far as meetings, you know, and keeping you guys online, and so just bear with us throughout this today, and we'll go ahead and go into closed session. Thanks.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're going to get going. We back in the Commercial Subcommittee. Let me review the membership of the subcommittee one more time. It's myself, Kerry Marhefka, Amy Dukes, Tim Griner, Jimmy Hull, Trish Murphey, Charlie Phillips, and Andy Strelcheck.

This morning, we went through Objective 1, and now we were already kind of moving into Objective 2, when we left off, and I'm going to turn it over to Mike. We're in the portion where we're focusing now on increasing trip efficiency, and so, just to remind people where we are, we're looking at all of these actions, and we're trying to figure out do we want it to be an action that goes out to scoping, and, if so, are there specific questions that we're wanting to ask the public about that particular action, or are there, you know, notes for items that we would like to see when this comes back to us after that scoping process. All right, and so I'm going to pass it back to Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so, next up, we have Draft Action 4. That is looking at a trip limit increases, if landings are below a threshold by a specified date in the season, and kind of the shorthand name that was developed for this is the step-up, as the converse of the step-down, where you get to a certain point in the season, and, if you've hit if you've hit a certain point in the landings, then you reduce the trip limit. This would potentially increase if landings have not hit a threshold by a specific date.

A couple of the questions that were developed potentially to ask to the public are should this policy be species-specific, or kind of a general policy for commercially-caught species, and should exceptions to this policy be established for rebuilding stocks, and this may -- Some of the discussion around this is it may not be one of the things that you all have wanted to put in for a stock that was in a rebuilding plan, but we can have discussion about what you would like to see.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, which was really what I was going on after when we were winding up earlier, but I think we might be better off, especially for species that are -- That we're getting 70 or 80 percent landings on, and go ahead and set it up from the first of the year. When you open the season, go ahead and give them a 20 percent, or whatever the number is, and then, when you hit mid-season, then decide if you need to step it back down, and, if you don't, then you keep those levels elevated, so you've got a better chance of getting to your ACL. Instead of trying to play catch-up, go ahead and frontload it, and, if you still haven't caught it, or you're still not on track to catch it, then leave it elevated. See what I'm saying?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is 20 percent -- Not 20 percent of the quota, but 20 percent of the trip limit?

MR. PHILLIPS: The trip limit, or some number like that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. PHILLIPS: You know it, and it might depend on how far we're missing the ACL on a three-year average or something.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think we're trying to get to the same place. What I would love to do is not be super concise here, because I do think, in some cases, the step-up would work, and in some cases to step-down would work, and I think both are effective tools, and I would really like to hear, from the public, as far as, you know, sort of what they would see is productive.

I think the main thing is, you know, we're saying increased trip efficiency. I think of it in terms of maximize reaching our ACL, is really, in my mind, what we're trying to do here, and what tool we used to do that I'm open to, and, I mean, I'm very open to what that looks like, but let's keep in mind that one of the things the AP has talked about, and this body has always talked about, is, you know, ultimately, we want to find the balance between having species open as much of the year as possible, so we maintain market access, but also reaching our ACL.

My other thing is, as far as the question about should this only be for rebuilding stocks, in my mind no, because, in my mind, the ACL is the ACL. How we take it, or when we take it is -- I mean, the ACL is predicated on the fact that that's a number that's okay to take and still be rebuilt, and so why would we not still reach the ACL? We're not going over it, and we don't -- We're not going to do anything different to go over, and we rarely go over our ACLs anyway, and so, in my mind, whether -- The status of the stock shouldn't matter, and this is just about the ACL.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Sorry, and just a verbiage comment, to make sure that we're doing this in line with kind of the values that Magnuson has established. We would typically be looking to reach the optimum yield, and that's what we're trying to do, rather than the ACL. The ACL is the limit that you cannot go over, and so this council, a lot of times, has had optimum yield aligned with ACL, but optimum yield is the harvest goal.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mike is trying to capture what you said, Kerry, about either step-up or step-down, but something about trip efficiency. Okay. While Mike is typing, Jimmy, then Charlie.

MR. HULL: I think the word -- In HMS shark management, we use "toggle", and so you toggle the trip limit up, or they toggle it down, depending on where we're at at the time and the length of the season that's left. I support this, obviously, and I think it's -- I support everything that's been said.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Kerry's point, I agree. I mean, whatever number we're shooting at, that's what we're shooting at, but I don't know, right off the tip of my tongue, what snowy grouper, for instance, or red porgies, and I don't see us bumping any of those limits, because we're hitting them anyway, but there may be some species that that might fall under that category.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, to that, I think that gets into the second part, as far as -- I don't know the correct verbiage, but whether it's incidental allowance or something, and, in other words, if you are on a pile of snowies, and we all know there's, you know, some dead discard, and, you know, that's a highly susceptible species to barotrauma, and so is there a way to build in -- You're on a pile of snowies, and there's a percentage allowance you go over to maximize the efficiency of the spot you're on, and it still gets deducted from the ACL, and so you're not -- You're not allowing an overage of the ACL. You're just understanding the dynamics of how trips operate, and so that's -- That's how I would picture some of those species with really low trip limits working.

The other thing I just wanted to say, real quickly, is, in my mind, it's massively important that what we're really doing is building a framework, so that it's fairly automatic, and easy for the region, right, and we need it to be almost automatic, and so whatever -- To the extent we can do that is important, I think.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a great point. All right. We've captured a bunch of notes there under this particular action. After Mike gets this captured here, we might be ready to move on to the other action, and so it sounds like we're definitely wanting this action in there, in the document, and people are saying yes. Okay.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So just one question that popped into my head. As you all have this discussion, something that may be useful from the public is if they have any level of preference of when to have that higher trip limit, and would they rather have it at the beginning of the season or at the end of the season.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I see heads nodding yes. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: If you're going to phrase it that way, you may need to rephrase how the draft action is listed also.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're going to move on to the next action under trip efficiency.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right. The next draft action was looking at establishing a non-target or an out-of-season allowance for species that are not overfished, and so this -- Some of the questions related to this are should this policy be species-specific or a general multi-species poundage limit, and just --

This isn't as much of a question as it is a note, that out-of-season catches, or non-target catches, however these are categorized, these would need to be included in the estimation, and in the monitoring for landings, as they're evaluated against the annual catch limit. In cases where out-of-season landings may happen, you know, after a season has been completed, that may lead to some shortening of the season, of the actual in-season harvest, to account for any out-of-season landings that may occur under this limit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and, also, Kerry, is this a framework to do something like this? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, I love the idea in theory, but, the more I -- The more my mind goes through it, the more I see pitfalls at a lot of different junctions. For instance, if you just think about the species that aren't overfished, right, so you say you take like a golden tile, which not only are they not overfished, but they close, and there aren't that many that aren't overfished and close, and golden tile is one of them.

It doesn't -- Or at least it closes for longline, but it doesn't close for hook-and-line, and you have to deal with that issue, right, and can the longline endorsement holders put it on their boat when they switch their gear, and now they can't, and it's starting to look like a little bit of a minefield for me about how that would work, and I'm wondering if others have thoughts on are we going to get the bang for the buck out of this, when the parameters are not overfished and the season is closed, and I don't know that we are.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Other thoughts? Do we not want to do this? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Maybe there's somebody out there smarter than me, and that's probably true, and I don't -- I'm like Kerry, and I don't really see how this is going to work, you know, very well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's fine. We don't have to keep this one in the document. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I was still thinking, and I think we need to leave it in there and let -- You know, get some comments on it. I mean, I'm trying to refresh myself here, but I think -- Maybe it's the overfished part that's throwing it a little bit here, because I -- So red porgy, for instance, and we've got a split season here, where the limits are different, right, and so we don't want to be throwing back a couple extra fish, because, in that part of the season -- Even though the second part of the season hadn't started yet, but now you're discarding fish for really no good reason, other than we had a lower limit in that part of the season.

We're not over the ACL yet, but now we're discarding fish, and we're really discarding them for no good reason, other than we split the trip limits, to try avoid a closure, but we don't want to just necessarily throw them back because you caught one or two too many, if that makes sense.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think so. We've got some hands going up. Trish, then Andy, then Kerry.

MS. MURPHEY: So, just to share something that we do, at least in our red drum commercial fishery, and it's really considered a bycatch fishery, and you're allowed -- I think you're allowed seven red drum, but, with those seven red drum, you have to have other fish, certain fish, be caught with them, and so I guess it kind of makes them more bycatch, but I don't know if Tom -- I know Tom is not on this committee, but he may know, and it's mullet -- There's -- I can't remember the --

MR. ROLLER: Southern flounder, mullet, and I want to say black drum, or no, and speckled trout maybe. It's the common fish caught in these multi fisheries, gillnet fisheries, though I am apt to point out that it is very controversial in how it's used in a lot of -- By a lot of fishermen.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, but I just wanted to throw that idea out, that that was something that we did, and it kind of, to me, maybe hits on that multi-species piece of it, and so there may be other things to work out, but just to throw that idea out.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy, then Kerry, then Charlie.

MR. STRELCHECK: Administratively, I see a lot of complexities with implementing something like this. I guess the way I was thinking of it is you would have really like a directed harvest catch limit, and an incidental take, or bycatch, catch limit, right, and so, once the harvest directed fishery has used up their portion, whatever it is it, and it may vary by species, then you go to an incidental quota, that's much, much lower, with regard to the catch limit, but allows for some retention of those fish that are going to be discarded, right, and the question would be whether that could get you through the rest of the year, or through some period of time where you would expect discards to be high, but it at least allows for retention under multi-species, you know, harvest.



The other thing I'll mention, and I don't see a place in it, and I apologize for not offering the idea in the first place, and we've talked a lot about Florida's idea for an aggregate bag limit on the recreational side, and is that concept possible, on the commercial side, for species that co-occur with one another, right, and so could you look at aggregate bag limits for certain groups of species that are commonly caught with one another, and increase trip efficiency, based on setting an aggregate bag limit that wouldn't necessarily force you to harvest a certain poundage of, you know, the species that are in the bag limit, or trip limit, and it would just be as a whole for the total amount of fish that you're harvesting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Would that be like for all deepwater species, and is that what you're saying? Like you would pick a subgroup? Okay. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm not opposed to any of that on its surface. I definitely would have to think through the caveats, but I think the big thing, in all of these ideas, that I still don't understand, is the language relating to species being overfished. In no part of this are we ever talking about -- In any of these items are we talking about exceeding the ACL, and so, as long as we're in the current ACL, what difference does it make if they're species that are overfished or not overfished? I would love to try to understand that.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So I guess the principle being as long as it's not exceeding the ACL, because, if it were overfished, and you exceed the ACL, then you're going against your rebuilding plan, and so I guess I'm having a little bit of trouble conceiving a situation where you have a season, and it's been closed, because you're projected to reach the ACL, and then, afterward, there's harvest, incidental harvest, that still continues, until what point, and then there's a shut -- A second shut-off of no more incidental harvest either, and is that kind of what you're thinking?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and it would have to work in sort of the manner Andy explained it, in that you would have your overall ACL, and you would subtract some as a set-aside for this situation, and, I mean, in my mind -- Obviously, we can't exceed the ACL, and, by the way, we're not close to exceeding the ACL on almost anything anyway, and so, in my mind, it goes without saying that we don't need to worry about overfished, and we're not going to be exceeding the ACL. We're going to find a way to do this while staying within our ACLs.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I've got a list of hands. Charlie, then Andy, then Jimmy.

MR. PHILLIPS: I could -- I can kind of halfway see you're targeting gags or something, and you catch 10 percent scamp or something with it, and you just can't have -- You don't need to -- You can't have more than -- But, then again, if you're not careful, you could use that incidental, and bump up against your ACL, and then everything becomes discards after that, and so you could be shooting yourself in the foot, really easy, if you're not very, very careful with how you do it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That's a good point. Andy, then Jimmy, then Kerry.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just back to Kerry's point, and, obviously, if we're setting the ACLs based on the scientific advice, and it's perfectly reflecting stock conditions, right, then we want you to be harvesting the ACL, and maximizing yield, right, and we all know that our advice for stock assessment science for setting ACLs can be pretty dated, or based on average landings, and so you

have some stocks where they're not doing well, and you're never bumping up against the ACL, and so you could be raising trip limits, and essentially increasing fishing mortality.

That's not the burden that the commercial industry by itself should be bearing, right, and so I agree with your point, but the reverse is also possible, too. You're bumping up against the ACL, and you're kind of being penalized, because catch limits aren't increasing fast enough, and we've talked a lot about this with carryover, right, that we don't want to carry over quota that's not going to be caught in the first place, and so it's kind of keeping those fish in the bank over the long-term. The hard part is really knowing why is the catch limit not being caught in the first place, and are the trip limits, or other factors, limiting harvest.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jimmy, then Kerry.

MR. HULL: I was just going to say I think that this is something that we should leave in the document for further discussion, and let's hear some more opinions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Just real quick, I wanted to remind everyone that we are accountable, because we do have a following season payback, if we were to ever exceed the ACL, and so it's not like we can exceed it and not be -- "Punished" isn't the right -- But not be accountable for exceeding it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I feel like we've got enough on this action, and let's maybe move to the last action, and that was from the AP.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes, and so the AP met in April, and you're going to kind of hear, throughout several of the agenda items that you'll that you'll address over the next few days, pieces of the AP report, and so one of their recommendations, that they made, and they actually passed a motion to this effect, was to recommend Draft Action 6 which would revise commercial trip limits to allow multiple days' worth of trip limits to be possessed on trips that last for multiple days.

They did clarify that that doesn't necessarily mean that the number of trip limits equates to the number of days. For example, consideration of, you know, maxing it out at say two days' worth of trip limits for a trip that may last three days. something of that nature, but they did want to have some form of consideration.

Some of the AP members did say that they may be open to some form of VMS, or hail-in and hail-out system, if that was necessary to validate the number of days, if this is what they were getting kind of as the end game for establishing something like that. Then staff noted, to the AP at that time, that consideration of this topic would also likely require some discussions about potentially shorter seasons, if this results in an increased rate of commercial catch, and so that's something that would be analyzed through the amendment process, but it is something that could be a consideration in this type of action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thoughts on this action? Do we want to include it to go to scoping? Tim.

MR. GRINER: My preference would be to not take it out in scoping. I think this is just a problem waiting to happen. You know, I don't see anything good coming from this, and I don't even think -- I don't even think you could really wrap your arms around how to even -- Even how to do it, you know, and, so, I mean, I just don't see how this would ever work, and so I don't even see the point of taking out to scoping. It wouldn't be enforceable, and you wouldn't know whether I'm out there for three days, four days, two days, how many days. There would just be no way to tell. I just don't see us getting anything out of this. That's my thoughts.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Tim. Other thoughts? I saw some heads nodding that, no, they didn't want to take it out to scoping. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm just trying to figure out what species it would apply to. I mean, guys that are trying to go get a thousand pounds of beeliners, they're already staying out four or five days to do that, and so, if they go stay four days, you're going to give them a limit-and-a half, or two limits, or something, when they're barely -- When they can't even catch one limit, and, I mean, I don't know how you get there from here. You could -- You might could get some double limits on red snapper, when it's open, but that's going to be gone so fast that it's going to be nuts, and so I don't know what species it's going to would help us with.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I suspect there are people who were probably speaking about like some of the deepwater species, because you're out there, and you're making those long trips, but darn, and those are species that you don't want to put one boat on there and hit four limits, for species like that, and that biologically makes me very nervous, and so I'm in support of removing this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It seems like we're good with removing that action, and so then that comes to the end of our list of actions that were under trip efficiency. I would also ask, and are there other ways to get it trip efficiency that we haven't covered yet, that we want to add as an action, that we want to get scoped here? Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Okay, and so this council has made it illegal to have snapper grouper species onboard a vessel with a longline, and so you could have a vessel that's multi-permitted to fish in the snapper grouper fishery, but also the shark fishery, with a longline, or a short longline, and so the trip efficiency part is, okay, I'm in the snapper grouper fishery, but, at the end of the day, I'm going to come inshore, and make a quick set, and try to top everything off with some sharks, and so -- But, unless I can longline them, it's not going to happen, and I can't have a longline on a vessel that has a snapper grouper onboard, and so that is a -- That is a problem for trip efficiency for some of us. Just a thought.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So we're trying to get some language on the board there to try to figure out - - It seems like it's something like consider existing gear restrictions, or something. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and so, when I started staff with the council, we were just fresh off of doing some of like the gear amendments, and, you know, multi-gear trips were very much a no-no, and and part of that was because, back then, the concern was, you know, there had been longlining for more than just the deepwater species before that, and part of the concern was were you really - I'm not accusing you, or anyone, but were you really -- Did you really catch those fish

hook-and-line, or did you bottom longline for them outside of where you were allowed to bottom longline. In my mind, the only way this could be allowed is if there was VMS. I don't know another way to do that without VMS.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: That also applies for somebody that wants to go golden tile, and has wreckfish permits. Again, it's same problem, and, I mean, you're right there. If the tilefish aren't biting, it would be great to go move, and vice versa, and you can't.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Just bringing it up for trip efficiency, right, and making us able to -- The executive order is less regulation, and they'll harvest more seafood, and so, I mean, it is an issue, and it has slowed me down considerably on some -- And others.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mike took some notes on that. Okay, and so we're getting that one on the board to go out to scoping. Are there others? In thinking about trip efficiency, other actions that we want to go out to scoping? I don't see any other hands.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so, just talking through what the next steps would be for this amendment, and so, again, this is Amendment 60. You all initiated it in the last meeting, and the way that this subcommittee was kind of tasked, and brought forward its actions, is you all have been making recommendations to the Snapper Grouper Committee, and you were kind of tasked to develop this to the point that it would become an amendment, and that the Snapper Grouper Committee would then take it over, and it would go through the normal process.

Unless there something else that needs to be specifically addressed by the subcommittee, this would be the last meeting of the subcommittee, and, from here on forward, Amendment 60 would be addressed by the full Snapper Grouper Committee in the in the normal council meeting process, and so we wouldn't separate it out here, and so kind of the next step for you all would be to make a recommendation to the Snapper Grouper Committee that they would approve it for scoping.

If that goes through committee, and it gets approved there, then we would conduct scoping over the summer, likely doing it in the way that we've done for the last few sessions, where we develop a presentation, a recording, and post it online, and we take comments that way. We would have comments come back to you in September of this year.

We would need a couple of meetings in order to develop some analyses and some draft language for the amendment, estimating that to come back to you in March of 2026 for approval for public hearings. Public hearings would be spring of next year, and the ultimate final council approval date would be looking at September of 2026, on the current timeline, and so that's kind of what we would be looking at as far as the timeline.

If you have any questions, or any places where you see some concern, or some pause, that we may need some extra time for the steps, then you can let me know. Otherwise, this is the draft of what we expect coming out of this process.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mike. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Mike, the timeline looks great. I think that my concern, and, with all due respect, I kind of think the best idea is to continue with the subcommittee format at this time, based on what we went through with wreckfish. These are very -- We're going to get into the weeds about some of this stuff, that is not going to be -- It's going to end up with a lot of people sitting here, and like four of us talking, and a lot of people not talking, or maybe only three, and I'll be talking a lot, and some people won't talk at all.

It doesn't preclude the other council or Snapper Grouper Committee members from coming, and it doesn't preclude them from commenting. It will still get reported out to the full committee, but I think, time-wise, and effectiveness, maintaining the subcommittee format, the way we did with wreckfish, and it seemed really efficient, and that's just my two-cents.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so just a point of clarification, and so, for wreckfish, we met outside the council meeting. Would you be okay with the subcommittee continuing to meet like early in the week, like we did this time? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and I think as long as that works with -- It's cost effective, but it doesn't subject everyone to us sitting here and -- Like we're going to just have to narrow down on some of this trip limit stuff, and it doesn't subject everyone to having to do that, unless they want to do it, which they can, and so that would just be my suggestion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I think I agree with that. Amy, did you have your hand up? Okay. Any other thoughts? Okay. I see heads nodding yes, to keep it in the subcommittee format. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So, just kind of knowing some of the workload that's coming with snapper grouper, and other FMPs as well, and we don't always have the flexibility to have Monday morning available for the subcommittee meeting, and so, if we run into a case where that's happening, is the subcommittee open to doing webinars, kind of like the wreckfish subcommittee did?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I heard some people say sure, and maybe we talk about this more when we look at the workplan, and that kind of helps us make that decision, in thinking about how many things can come to a meeting week, an in-person meeting week, because, in the beginning, we were concerned -- We did have one meeting that was via webinar, and it was -- We decided that we didn't like that, and so thoughts? Okay. Charlie, and then Kerry.

MR. PHILLIPS: I am not fond of trying to do this kind of thing over a webinars. Webinars to check boxes that we already know the questions to, but this kind of back-and-to is just not going to be very efficient over a webinar.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and I agree. I don't feel great about that, but another alternative maybe is at least three of us are already always in Charleston for the AP meetings, and it could be cost-effective to bring in the other a couple people that are interested to that, and that's twice, still twice, this year, or sorry. Once more this year, and once in the spring, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. So we need a motion to tell the Snapper Grouper Committee that we want to take this out for public scoping. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, if they'll draft something on the board, I will read it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Does that look like your motion, Charlie? Would you like to read it?

MR. PHILLIPS: Of course. I never get to talk at all. **Madam Chair, I make the motion we recommend that the Snapper Grouper Committee approve Amendment 60 for scoping.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Amy. Any more discussion on this? **Any objections?** All right. **The motion carries.** Back to Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Can Amy second that, since she's not on the subcommittee?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I looked, and she is on the subcommittee. I looked back. I thought she wasn't, but I looked back, and she's on it. All right. We are through the document. Do we have any other business to come before this -- Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: So I'm just -- I've got a question about -- I guess I'm not picturing how the subcommittee will continue work with the Snapper Grouper Committee, especially since we are recommending the Snapper Grouper Committee to go to -- For it to go to scoping, and so I'm kind of -- I'm having a hard time picturing how the subcommittee will work, now that we've kind of handed it over to the committee, and so I don't know if you guys can explain that better, but it just seemed like, to me, the next step would be just end the subcommittee, and go in the committee, and I'm not -- Just, you know, but so I guess I just want to hear a little bit more how that's going to work, because I'm not picturing it very well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So I think it would work -- Think back to wreckfish, and so, basically when you get into the Snapper Grouper Committee, you're getting a report from this subcommittee, and that's how we did it with wreckfish too, and so you're getting a report from the subcommittee, and you can look at all the actions that are in there.

Once you get to the document, you look at all the actions, and you look the changes that were made, and, ultimately, the recommendation comes from the Snapper Grouper Committee, but I believe, on wreckfish and I'll look at Kerry, since you were on that, and so I think, in wreckfish, it was like recommendation of the subcommittee, and then, ultimately, it came to the Snapper Grouper Committee, and so, yes, it made for a fairly efficient process. It didn't slow us down, really, when we got to the subcommittee, and you would get a report, kind of inside the Snapper Grouper Committee, of the work of the subcommittee.

MS. MURPHEY: All right, and now I understand. I just kind of forgot how wreckfish went, and so, anyway, you know, thanks. That's clarified to me, and I'm fine with it, and I just was trying to figure it out there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any other business to come from committee, or come before the Commercial Snapper Grouper Subcommittee? All right. Seeing none, I would say we're adjourned here in the subcommittee, and I'm going to pass it back to you, Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: All right, everybody. Thanks so much. We're actually -- We were going to -- We were shooting for 6:00, and we made 5:34, and so good job, and so we'll just adjourn for the day, and I'll see everybody at 8:30 tomorrow

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 9, 2025.)

- - -

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
July 28, 2025

SG Com Sub  
Mon 6/9

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**COUNCIL STAFF**

**Executive Director**

John Carmichael ✓  
[john.carmichael@safmc.net](mailto:john.carmichael@safmc.net)  
843-302-8435

**Deputy Director - Science**

Dr. Chip Collier ✓  
[chip.collier@safmc.net](mailto:chip.collier@safmc.net)  
843-302-8444

**Deputy Director - Management**

Myra Brouwer ✓  
[myra.brouwer@safmc.net](mailto:myra.brouwer@safmc.net)  
843-302-8436

**Citizen Science Program Manager**

Julia Byrd ✓  
[julia.byrd@safmc.net](mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net)  
843-302-8439

**Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator**

Rachael Silvas  
[Rachael.silvas@safmc.net](mailto:Rachael.silvas@safmc.net)  
843-571-4370

**Quantitative Fishery Scientist**

Dr. Judd Curtis ✓  
[Judd.curtis@safmc.net](mailto:Judd.curtis@safmc.net)  
843-302-8441

**Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator**

John Hadley ✓  
[john.hadley@safmc.net](mailto:john.hadley@safmc.net)  
843-302-8432

**Habitat and Ecosystem Scientist**

Kathleen Howington *web*  
[kathleen.howington@safmc.net](mailto:kathleen.howington@safmc.net)  
843-725-7580

**Fishery Scientist I**

Allie Iberle *web*  
[Allie.iberle@safmc.net](mailto:Allie.iberle@safmc.net)  
843-225-8135

**Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson *✓*  
[kim.iverson@safmc.net](mailto:kim.iverson@safmc.net)  
843-224-7258

**Administrative Officer**

Kelly Klasnick *✓*  
[kelly.klasnick@safmc.net](mailto:kelly.klasnick@safmc.net)  
843-763-1050

**BFP Outreach Specialist**

Ashley Oliver *✓*  
[Ashley.Oliver@safmc.net](mailto:Ashley.Oliver@safmc.net)  
843-225-8135

**Fishery Scientist II**

Dr. Mike Schmidtke *✓*  
[mike.schmidtke@safmc.net](mailto:mike.schmidtke@safmc.net)  
843-302-8433

**Communication and Digital Media Specialist**

Nicholas Smillie  
[Nick.Smillie@safmc.net](mailto:Nick.Smillie@safmc.net)  
843-302-8443

**Staff Accountant**

Suzanna Thomas *web*  
[suzanna.thomas@safmc.net](mailto:suzanna.thomas@safmc.net)  
843-571-4368

**Fishery Social Scientist**

Christina Wiegand *✓*  
[christina.wiegand@safmc.net](mailto:christina.wiegand@safmc.net)  
843-302-8437

**Citizen Science Project Manager**

Meg Withers  
[Meg.withers@safmc.net](mailto:Meg.withers@safmc.net)  
843-725-7577

**SEDAR**

**SEDAR Program Manager**

Dr. Julie Neer  
[Julie.neer@safmc.net](mailto:Julie.neer@safmc.net)  
843-302-8438

**SEDAR Coordinator**

Emily Ott *✓*  
[Emily.Ott@safmc.net](mailto:Emily.Ott@safmc.net)  
937-479-6171



SG Com Sub  
MON 6/9

**LAW ENFORCEMENT**

Carolyn Belcher, Chair  
Tom Roller, Vice Chair  
Judy Helmey  
Kerry Marhefka  
LT Tom Pease  
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

**MACKEREL COBIA**

Tom Roller, Chair  
Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Gary Borland  
Amy Dukes  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey  
Jimmy Hull  
Kerry Marhefka  
Jessica McCawley  
Trish Murphey  
LT Tom Pease  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Mid-Atlantic: Skip Feller  
Mid-Atlantic: Joe Grist  
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

**SEDAR**

Trish Murphey, Chair  
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Carolyn Belcher  
Amy Dukes  
Tim Griner  
Jimmy Hull  
Kerry Marhefka  
Charlie Phillips  
Andy Strelcheck  
Staff contact: Chip Collier

**SHRIMP**

Carolyn Belcher, Chair  
Amy Dukes, Vice Chair  
Gary Borland  
Jimmy Hull  
Jessica McCawley  
Trish Murphey  
LT Tom Pease  
Andy Strelcheck  
Charlie Phillips  
Staff contact: Allie Iberle

**SNAPPER GROUPE**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
✓Carolyn Belcher  
✓Gary Borland  
Amy Dukes  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey  
Jimmy Hull  
Trish Murphey  
✓LT Tom Pease  
Charlie Phillips  
Tom Roller  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Mid-Atlantic: Anna Beckwith  
Mid-Atlantic: Joe Grist  
Staff Contact: Mike Schmidtke

**SPINY LOBSTER**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Robert Spottswood, Jr., Vice Chair  
Tim Griner  
Kerry Marhefka  
LT Tom Pease  
Tom Roller  
Andy Strelcheck  
Staff: Christina Wiegand

Shep Grimes

Rick Davitor

Sonny Gwin

G.J. Sweetman

Monica Smit-Brunello - web

**Rachael Silvas**

---

**From:** Myra Brouwer  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 20, 2025 12:33 PM  
**To:** Rachael Silvas  
**Subject:** SG Commercial Sub-Committee

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

S.G. sub comm.  
6/19/25

- ✓ Jessica McCawley, Chair
- ✓ Kerry Marhefka, Vice-chair
- ✓ Tim Griner
- ✓ Trish Murphey
- ✓ Amy Dukes
- ✓ Andy Stretcheck
- ✓ James Hull, Jr.
- ✓ Charlie Phillips



Myra Brouwer, *Deputy Director for Management*  
[South Atlantic Fishery Management Council](#)  
4055 Faber Place Dr; Ste 201; N. Charleston, SC 29405  
(843) 302-8436

# SAFMC June 2025

## Attendee Report: Council Meeting

Report Generated:

06/18/2025 09:50 AM EDT

**Webinar ID**

494-531-643

**Actual Start Date/Time**

06/09/2025 07:56 AM EDT

**Duration**

2 hours 18 minutes

## Staff Details

**Attended**

Yes

**Interest Rating**

Not applicable for staff

**Last Name**

Council

**Last Name**

Baker

Bianchi

Blough

Borland

Brouwer

Buntin

Bunting

Byrd

Carrigan

Cox

Curtis

DeVictor

Dobbs

Downes

Dubniczki

Dunn

Flowers

Floyd

Foss

Garber

Gore

Gray

Gubler

Hadley

Hale

Harrell

Harrison

Helmey

Hemilright

**First Name**

Scott

Alan

Heather

Gary

Myra

Jesse

Matthew

Julia

Abby

Jack

Judd

Rick

Jeffrey

Athena

Hayden

Russell

Jared

Brad

Kristin

Chip

Karla

Alisha

Anthony

John

Robert

Ryan

Alana

Judy

Dewey

|               |           |
|---------------|-----------|
| Hoff          | Chris     |
| Howington     | Kathleen  |
| Hudson        | Joseph    |
| Huffman       | Mark      |
| Iberle        | Allie     |
| Iverson       | Kim       |
| Johnson       | Brad      |
| Kennedy       | Todd      |
| Keppler       | Blaik     |
| Klasnick      | 01Kelly   |
| Klibansky     | Lara      |
| Knowlton      | Kathy     |
| Lavine        | Craig     |
| Lazarre       | Dominique |
| Levy          | Mara      |
| Lizama        | Dellene   |
| Lorenzen      | Kai       |
| MCCLAIR       | GENINE    |
| Mackesey      | Brendan   |
| Marhefka      | Kerry     |
| Masi          | Michelle  |
| Mehta         | Nikhil    |
| Merck         | Nicole    |
| Meyers        | S         |
| Moore         | Jeff      |
| Murphey       | Trish     |
| Neale         | Rick      |
| Neer          | Julie     |
| Newman        | Thomas    |
| Ott           | Emily     |
| Package-Ward  | Christina |
| Parsons       | Kristene  |
| Pellicer      | Joseph    |
| Phillips      | Charlie   |
| ROLLER        | tom       |
| Ramsay        | Chloe     |
| Records       | David     |
| Reynolds      | Jonathon  |
| SCHLICK       | CJ        |
| Salmon        | Brandi    |
| Sedberry      | George    |
| Smart         | Tracey    |
| Smit-Brunello | 00Monica  |
| Spurgin       | Kali      |

Stephen  
Stephens  
Sweetman  
Turano  
Walter  
Webb  
West  
White  
Wiegand  
Wilms  
Withers  
Zapf  
collier  
ealahan  
gloeckner  
gwin  
laks  
marinko  
sandorf  
thomas  
vara  
vincent  
zales

Jessica  
Haley  
CJ  
Joseph  
John  
Greyson  
W  
Geoff  
Christina  
Olivia  
Meg  
Daniel  
chip  
maranda  
david  
sonny  
Ira  
Jeff  
Scott  
suz  
mary  
matthew  
bob