

**SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

**SNAPPER GROUPER COMMERCIAL SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Villas by the Sea  
Jekyll Island, Georgia  
March 3, 2025**

**Snapper Gouper Commercial Subcommittee**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair  
Tim Griner  
Amy W. Dukes

James G. Hull, Jr.  
Trish Murphey  
Charlie Phillips

**Council Members**

Robert Spottswood, Jr.

Tom Roller

**Council Staff**

John Carmichael  
Myra Brouwer  
Dr. Chip Collier  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
Kim Iverson  
Kelly Klasnick

Dr. Julie Neer  
Meg Withers  
Emily Ott  
Rachael Silvas  
Nicholas Smillie  
Suzanna Thomas

**Attendees and Invited Participants**

Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. John Walter  
Sonny Gwin  
Shepherd Grimes  
Bob Zales II

Rick DeVactor  
Kathy Knowlton  
Joe Spraggins  
Nikhil Mehta

**Observers and Participants**

Other observers and participants attached.

The Snapper Grouper Commercial Subcommittee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Villas by the Sea, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Monday, March 3, 2025, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're going to get started here in the Snapper Grouper Commercial Subcommittee. Let me read the membership of this committee. It's myself, Kerry Marhefka, Tim Griner, Trish Murphey, Amy Dukes, Andy Strelcheck, Jimmy Hall, and Charlie Phillips.

There's a separate webinar link for this subcommittee meeting, just to make sure everybody is aware. It's not the main meeting link, a different link, and there's a separate little webpage that you can click on that has the agenda and has all the materials.

Our first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any modifications or changes to the agenda? Any items for other business that people know about at this point that we can add to the list? All right. Any objection to approval of the agenda? All right. Seeing none, we'll consider the agenda approved.

The next order of business is approval of the November 2024 minutes. Any changes? Shep. I will note that, if it is just minor technical changes, if you wouldn't mind just getting with staff, but, if there is a substantive issue in the minutes, then please bring that up. Any substantive changes or modifications needed in the minutes? All right. Seeing none, any objection to approving the minutes? All right. Seeing none, the minutes are approved.

Next up is public comment. Do we have folks that are wanting to give public comment to the commercial subcommittee? I don't see any hands. Do you see anything online? All right. Dewey, I think you have your hand up. Would you like to provide public comment here?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes, and I was wondering if there's going to be opportunity at the end, if time allows to do that. Right now, I don't have any.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It depends on if we have time, is I guess what I would say, and so maybe is the answer.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. All right. The next order of business is review of requested commercial information. I'm going to pass this over to Mike, to give us a presentation.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. So, before I get the presentation pulled up, I do want to bring your attention to a couple of things within the agenda overview document, and so, if you scroll down in the agenda to the overview section, you'll see links for several of the documents that were referenced in the last meeting, that you requested information on, and those are kind of summarized within the presentation that I'll give, but, if you have any specific notes, or pieces of analysis, that you want to pull up from any of those documents that are linked there, then please let me know. We can pull those up, and we can look into those as we need to. There's plenty of time within this meeting so that we can address those as needed.

I will go ahead and get into the presentation now. All right, and so this initial presentation is going to be a summary of the historical information that you requested, and so there have been several analyses of the commercial fishery, different aspects of it, the policies associated that have gone on throughout the time of the management of this fishery, and so we're going to kind of walk through the timeline of those reports and give a couple pieces of information, and then we'll see if there are any questions or anything that you all would like to look into a little bit further.

So, again, this is a refresher of the previous reports, and I showed you where in the agenda overview each of those documents are linked, and so this all kind of goes back to Amendment 8. That was when there was some discussion, and analysis, of the fishery that looked at potential overcapacity of the commercial fishery, and, through Amendment 8, the two-for-one policy was established, which limited the number of commercial snapper grouper permit holders and resulted in that needing to acquire two to get one of the SG-1 permits.

This amendment also resulted in two different commercial permits. We have now the SG-1, the unlimited permit, where there's no overall poundage restrictions, aside from those that are species-specific with their trip limits, and there is transferability for the SG-1 permit, and then we also have the SG-2 permit, which is limited to harvesting 225 pounds of snapper grouper species, as well as subject to the individual species trip limits. This is intended to only be transferred to immediate family, or onto a new vessel under the same owner, but it was not intended to be a permit that would change ownership over time.

Next, in 2014, there was a report that you all requested last time. This one is not linked in the agenda overview, but, if you look at the meeting webpage for the commercial subcommittee, it is underneath additional materials. This was a report that John Carmichael developed for the council's visioning workshop, or one of the council's visioning workshops, and, in this report, it discussed the growth potential for the snapper grouper fishery, and it developed this concept called potential optimum yield, and so it's a bit of a back-of-the-envelope calculation, but it does provide some context about the ability at that time for the commercial fishery to be able to grow beyond the capacity that it was at.

It identified several species that had potential for growth in their commercial harvest, including red snapper, red grouper, and gag, at that time. The long-term trend of the sector was that overharvest occurred in the 1980s through mid-1990s, but, since the 2000s, the commercial fishery consistently had room for approximately two million pounds of growth, and this is totaling all species within the management unit, but of growth potential per year on that order, and so there was a potential indication of underutilization of the resource in this sector.

Next, moving to 2018, Kari MacLauchlin-Buck developed a socioeconomic profile, and this explored several aspects of the commercial fishery. There were a few points that were kind of pulled out of this that related to some of the information that you all requested that you wanted to consider as you moved through this process, and so the proportion of permits that are held by corporate entities at that point had increased since 1998, but most permits were still held by individuals, or families, at that time.

The estimated cost to obtain an SG-1 permit was roughly \$60,000 to -- It looks like there's a typo there, but it's above \$60,000, increasing from about \$40,000, which was the typical price in 2011. I can look into the report and get you that number, if we need it.

Leasing of permitted vessels was common, with a lease typically ranging from \$6,000 to \$8,000 annually, and there was noted, at that time, a 49 percent reduction in SG-1 permits, and a 67 percent reduction in SG-2 permits, since implementation of Amendment 8, which started that two-for-one policy and established the SG-2 permit. Just putting some numbers to those figures, the SG-1 permit, there were about 541 SG-1s at that time, and 110 SG-2 permits at that time, and it was \$60,000 to \$80,000. That was that figure that was noted before.

Just to put a visual to some of those numbers, and this actually overlaps with some of the permit information that was requested, and we communicated with the Permits Office, and the snapshot tool wasn't quite available yet, but they indicated that it should be available soon, and there should be an update coming later on this week on the availability of when more recent information can be provided, but some of the historical information was captured within this socioeconomic profile. That permit information is -- On the long-term scale, it's kind of indicated within the documents that are available, and then we can continue to work with the Permits Office for the more recent information as it becomes available.

Looking at a couple of these figures, and these are related to the SG-1, and so the unlimited permit. The first figure, it shows permits by homeport, or area that they're associated with, or the state that they're associated with. I brought this figure in more to see the overall trend of the number of SG-1 permits, and you can see how it has gone down over time, from the figure you see here at 1999, at just over 900, to, when it gets to 2016, it's at that number, and I think it was 541 from the previous slide.

The figure on the right shows the proportion of SG-1 permits that are held by individual owners, as opposed to corporate owners, corporate entities, and so you can see the blue indicates the individual, and the yellow indicates the corporate, and you can see the rise over time. Corporate ownership was, in 1999, at probably around -- Just over 15 percent, and, in 2016, it exceeded 40 percent of the permits that were held.

These figures show the SG-2 permits, the same type of information for SG-2 permits. Over time, there's been a decline in the number of SG-2 permits, starting at over 300 in 1999 and down to around 100 in 2016. In the figure on the right, you see the individual versus corporate ownership. There's not as much of a rise in corporate ownership percentage for the SG-2 permits, but there is somewhat of a rise, from about 15 percent to just over 20 percent over the course of that time.

Next, in 2020, there was an executive order that instructed the regional councils to submit a prioritized list of actions that would reduce burdens on domestic fishing and increase production for sustainable fisheries. The council developed a response to this, and, as part of that response, there was a white paper that was developed that looked into the two-for-one policy for the commercial snapper grouper fishery.

Leading up to the presentation of that white paper, there was a discussion, at the Snapper Grouper AP about commercial permits, and potential changes that were necessary, and concerns that they had about that sector of the fishery. Some of the notes that they had from that October 2021 meeting included the comment that new entry is difficult, and expensive, due to the scarcity and the cost of SG-1 permits.

There were concerns about continued loss of working waterfront, the sustainability of any additional commercial pressure, specifically noting the increase and the strong effect that recreational fishing has on the stocks. There was concern about the corporate loophole for SG-2 permits, in which it was described that permits that were owned by corporations would have -- The corporations would be sold from one owner to another, and so there would be an effective changing of ownership of those permits, even though the name that is associated with those permits does not necessarily change, and this kind of goes against the intent of the SG-2 permits when they were set up.

Potential considerations that they listed were for the council to consider a limitation on how many permits can be owned or leased by a single person, or an exemption of some SG-1 permits from the two-for-one policy, possibly those that have not had recent harvests associated with them, or those being acquired by fishermen in areas that do not have a local harvester. Overall, there were mixed opinions from the AP on the level of overcapitalization, and there was no clear consensus from them, as far as removing the two-for-one policy at that time.

Following this discussion, the council received a presentation of that white paper that I mentioned earlier. This was updated, at the council's request, also in March of 2024, and so there's been a couple iterations of this. In 2020, at that point, there had been an estimated 50 percent reduction in SG-1 permits since the implementation of the two-for-one, and a 77 percent reduction in SG-2 permits since those came into existence through Amendment 8.

The next couple of tables that I'm going to show you are from the 2024 update of that two-for-one white paper, and it just kind of shows the numbers over time of your SG-1 permits in this table, and so here we're looking at a couple different things in these columns. The first two are looking at the number, and the percentage of SG-1s that are assigned to leased vessels, and then looking over time at how many SG-1 permits have been consolidated, and so someone acquired two of those SG-1 permits so that they could get a new permit and they can get new entry into the fishery.

There have been a few instances over the years, averaging about seven times per year within that timeframe, of SG-1 permits being consolidated, and you see the associated SG-1 permits and SG-2 permits that were terminated over those years.

Next, this table is looking at the number of permitted vessels and those that are landing snapper grouper species, trying to get an idea of potentially inactive permits that are in the fishery, and so the first column you see is the total number of snapper-grouper-permitted vessels. Then you see the number of vessels that have landed snapper grouper species within that year, as well as the number of vessels that did not land any snapper grouper species, and then by percentage of each of those metrics. What we're seeing, overall, is that a little bit over 80 percent of the permitted vessels are landing snapper grouper species, and just under 20 percent are not landing any snapper grouper species.

That is the brief summary of information. Like I said, if, in your preparation for this meeting you saw anything that you want to look further into, as far as those reports, we can pull those reports up and we can look into it. We can take our time with this, as much as you all -- As much as you all would like to, and so I'll pause here and see if there are any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Mike, you said earlier -- You said that maybe later this week we'll get snapshot information, so we can get the number of permits updated to 2025 this week, and, if not, it seems like not a hard lift. I mean, even just the states, it seems, could just come back with it. I mean, we're talking 500, or probably now four-hundred-and-something, high four-hundreds, boats. It seems kind of crazy that we can't figure out how many there are in 2024.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So I think there may be an update from the agency on the availability of that, but I don't have a specific timeframe for when that will be available. When I talked with -- When I talked with Jessica Stephen, she said that it was close, and it may be around the time of the March meeting, but it might be a little bit after, and so I don't want to speak for the agency on when that information would be available.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, I'm just curious how -- How are things being enforced? How do they know who's doing their logbooks? It just seems interesting, to me, that the entire fishery can operate, but we can't tell you how many people are in the fishery right now, in a very heavily-regulated -- How are they pulling observers? I mean, there are still observer days, and how are they knowing where to draw that from? So like I can understand there are lots of cases in which data is complicated, and hard to find, and this does not seem that hard, for me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: When we say percentage of vessels that landed snapper grouper, we're using that as a proxy they're not fishing? I mean, the vessels that didn't land snapper grouper, do we assume they're just not fishing?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I don't know that that's the assumption necessarily that can be made. It's simply that they didn't land snapper grouper species. That wouldn't account for if they did any type of fishing for mackerel, or dolphin, or any other fishery that's prosecuted in their area, and so they may have the permit, so that it's an option for them to pursue that fishery, but, if there's something that's more lucrative, more of their specialty, then that may be the priority for that fisherman, and they only use their snapper grouper permit if they need to use it.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I got it, and so using it as a proxy, whether they went fishing for snapper grouper, is what I'm getting at.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Other questions about this presentation. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Not having, you know, been at the APs, I wonder how much discussion, you know, goes on around other factors, right, around this whole thing, right? I mean, price of fish, imports, so many other things I think weigh on whether or not commercial fishermen are targeting snapper grouper, whether they target other fish versus snapper grouper, and so I just -- You know, I know this is information we asked for, and then, when I looked at it, I was like, well, this seems to just really kind of start to just open up a bunch more questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Thanks, Robert, and correct. To that point, the AP does get into deeper discussions about the issue of, like you pointed out, are they fishing, and, well, what are they fishing for, if they're not fishing for snapper grouper, and what are the reasons, and they have lots of reasons. Usually it's environmental, or weather, or pricing, just like you mentioned, and there is an AP document, a bullet point of discussion, in here, that I was looking at earlier, and it kind of delves into some of that, but, yes, the AP definitely can provide insight into some of that, and a lot of those SG-1s are held by people that -- You know, it's insurance.

You know, I think of the example in the Keys, the lobster fleet, and so they have a hurricane that wipes out all of their gear, and they've got to resort to yellowtail fishing, to make enough money to buy gear, and so it's just something they hang on to, and they don't report it, and they don't use it, and so, you know, it's in the portfolio for whatever reason comes up.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim, did you have your hand up? Tim, and then Charlie.

MR. GRINER: Yes. Thank you. Yes, and that brings up a good point. You know, I think more importantly than, you know, maybe looking at how many vessels are leased, and how many vessels were landing snapper grouper, I think, more importantly, you need to focus on what percentage of the fleet did, and so we've got eighty-plus percent of the fleet is actually landing snapper grouper, which is pretty darn good.

Out of that 20 percent that's not being productive, so to speak, I think, if you really took a hard look at that, you would see that 20 percent break down to boats that are under repair, health issues, weather issues, and just, you know, 5 percent of this, 5 percent of that, 5 percent of this, and so it's not a lot of people that have this permit that don't want to use it, or are not intending to use it. It's just that individual circumstances for that particular year are keeping them from doing it.

In addition to that, if you go look at -- One of the things you can look at for with the permit office right now is you can go look at the status of your renewal, and, if you look at the status of your renewal, there's a lot of guys out there that are stuck in limbo, because they can't get the permits renewed, and so, you know, out of that 20 percent, there may be half of those guys that, during part of the year, they just can't fish, because their permit is in limbo. It has not been renewed yet, and that list is -- You know, when I look at that list, and I see when those permits were submitted, and I see that they're still in open cases, you know, it's for a variety of reasons.

Probably a lot of it is brought on by their own -- By themselves, by not having all their ducks in a row, and all their paperwork correct, but, still, that's why those guys aren't fishing, but, when you add all those things up, you know, 20 percent is probably a pretty good number, and I don't see that ever really changing. You know, I would think, with the aging of our fleet right now, and health issues alone are taking probably 5 to 7 percent off the water. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. I have Charlie, and then Kerry.

MR. GRINER: Tim kind of stole my thunder, because I agree with him. If I had to just pick a number, I would say 10 percent of the boats -- Because they're old. Most of these boats are probably close to forty years old. They're, you know, in the boatyards getting stuff done. I've got one in the boatyard getting stuff done, and it's slow picking.

Then, when you throw in health issues, and, again, the captains are very, very old, and so that right there is going to take up a big chunk of that, and then, like Jimmy said, if you've got somebody that has an SG-1 just as insurance, if you were to go look at something like Spanish mackerel, the percentage of people that catch Spanish mackerel that have that permit is probably minuscule. I would say it was probably more like in the 20 or 30 percent range, and so all of those things right there contribute to this number.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: That Spanish mackerel point was a really good point, because I think about - - I mean, we have one, and we never -- We just have it, right, and it's open access, and so we have it. I think, of all our fisheries, this is the one that is -- The numbers represent how it's utilized the best. I would like to make the point that, of that small percentage too, and this will be germane to what I bring up later, are people who are in the process of trying to enter the fishery, who have obtained one permit, but are unable to obtain a second permit, and so they're in limbo, and so, yes, I think that's all important.

You know, spoiler alert, and my intent is to -- I think what this shows us is we are at the correct utilization of this fishery, where we -- Even though it wasn't laid out, I think we're exactly where we intended to be in 1998, when we started this, and I think that it is time to consider removing the two-for-one and going for a one-for-one, hopefully very thoughtfully, because I do think there's going to be some gray areas, and some caveats, we need to think about, but I think that's what this number shows, is the fishery is at the right level of capitalization for what it can bear at this moment, and it does not need further reduction.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Other questions? Some of the items weren't linked on the agenda, on the webpage, and you had to actually click on the agenda, scroll down to the overview, and some of these older documents that Mike talked about in the presentation, the 2018 MacLauchlin-Buck report, the NOAA economics from 2018, the 2021 one commercial white paper, 2024 commercial permit white paper, a SERO presentation about the permits, and that's older as well, and it doesn't have the new numbers in it, and all of that is at the bottom. You have to click on the agenda, scroll to the overview, and it's in there, and not on the webpage itself, if that wasn't clear.

All right. Any more questions, before we dive into the issues? One of the things that I was thinking, and so, the last time we met, this committee met via webinar, and one of the things that at least two of you talked about, that were at the Florida commercial fishing summit, was that you wanted to meet in-person, partly because you wanted to do the sticky dot exercise that was done at the Florida commercial fishing summit.

What I'm hoping is that we can talk about the issues that we surfaced at the last meeting, see if we want to narrow down that list just a little bit, and maybe there's a couple on there that were just kind of food for thought, but it's not something that the council can actually affect, and then maybe we have other issues that we want to look at, and so maybe we can get kind of a better list, and then my thought was that we could then put those topics on flip charts, and then we could do the sticky dot exercise, and maybe people pick their top three, their top five, and then we could dive further into those issues, but, first, we've got to go back to the list that we talked about at the last

meeting and have some discussion about are those the right topics, and so I'm going to pass it back to Mike. Sorry. Just kidding. Mike has more information he's going to present first. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Well, so I have read the potential growth document, and so I had a lot of that for the context when we were going back through this presentation, and that raised a lot of the questions I see of, well, you know, it seems like we're underutilizing the fishery, based on the analysis I saw here, and I also didn't see in here really how much dead discards from current management practices are impacting --

You know, what the potential really is for growth and access to additional fish, for both the rec and commercial sector, and so I was kind of hoping there was going to be a little bit of discussion there on that. I know it's just additional material, but I thought that was a pretty good document, that indicated to me that at least there's some thinking that that there is -- You know, management practices, to some extent, have worked, and there might be some potential for additional opportunity.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Back to you, Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thank you. So, as far as the potential growth document, that might be something that can get discussed maybe a little bit later, and, if it needs to be updated, if that's something that would be helpful for a future amendment process, or something like that, then we can potentially look into updating that in some form.

We do have one more piece, one more document that, you all requested information on, and that was more related to landings within the commercial fishery, that I can go through now. I saw there was a hand up, and so I can pause before I go jump into that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair, and we don't have to discuss it now. I wasn't really planning to get into it in committee, but that 2014 document, the estimated potential growth, I mean, I think that definitely needs to be updated and vetted through the IPT. For one, we don't even have optimum yield for sectors. We do optimum yield for the fishery. It's the entire thing. It's the stock, and then we allocate an effort to achieve optimum yield, and then failing to achieve optimum yield in one sector, and not another, is probably -- It could easily be viewed as more of an indication of an ineffective allocation than a failure to achieve something in one sector, and so that -- I think a lot of what is contained in there will need to be vetted through the IPT, and the agency, especially the economists, it seems. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so, looking into some of the landings information that you all requested, basically what you wanted was kind of a profile of the commercial fishery, in terms of the species that are being landed, what are the important species, and then some of the breakdowns of how those are brought in.

The first table to look through shows you the top ten commercial species in the snapper grouper management unit. You see those listed out right here, with yellowtail snapper being the highest

poundage average. These are data from 2019 through 2023, and we include -- These are in pounds whole weight. There are conversions that are listed in the document to get from gutted weight, for those that are managed under gutted weight.

Table 2 takes a look at how the annual catch limits are being caught, or where landings fall relative to their annual catch limits, and so you can see that this table -- It kind of gives the breakdown of those top-ten species. Notably, Almaco jack is included in the jacks complex. The vast majority of those landings are Almaco jack, and so that's kind of used as a bit of a proxy there, but you can look through, and you can see there's bold italics for those numbers that are getting a bit -- I think it's getting a bit closer to the ACL. I'm trying to -- Chip, what was the bold italics for in this table?

DR. COLLIER: (Dr. Collier's comment is not audible on the recording.)

DR. SCHMIDTKE: It's changes in the ACL. Yes. Okay, and so those are species in which the ACL changed from one year to the next. That's what it was, and so it wasn't necessarily a constant number. Next, this is looking at the percentage of trips that landed at least 90 percent of their trip limit in the South Atlantic region, and so kind of the assumption, going into this analysis, is that, if a vessel hit 90 percent of the trip limit, at least, then there may be sometimes that they would dial back their effort, so that they don't exceed the trip limit, so they don't generate regulatory discards, and so 90 percent is kind of that assumed metric of they met their trip limit for that day.

These are the percentages of trips that are associated with doing that. We do note that golden tilefish is kind of separated out into the hook-and-line and the longline components, and so those are separate, since they have separate trip limits. We also have separation of hogfish in the different regions, since those have different trip limits as well, and giving some -- I can pause.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm sorry. Can you go back to that, Mike? This one was a little -- Can you go ahead -- Can you reiterate about the assumption about them? Just start over, slower, for those of us who Monday morning is hitting harder than others.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: No problem, and so I think possibly the confusion was at least 90 percent of the trip limit, and so a commercial trip might get close to the limit, and so say you're going for your 1,200-pound limit of greater amberjack on that trip. If you hit, you know, kind of 1,100, then there may be some dialing back of effort. You might finish that day with 1,150, and not quite hit the 1,200, but, effectively, you were being limited by your trip limit at that point.

You were maxing out as much as you could, even if you didn't hit 100 percent of that limit, and so, to kind of incorporate those trips that their effort was limited by the trip limit, even if it didn't hit 100 percent, we set the bar at 90 percent, and so, if you hit at least 90 percent, you were assumed to be limited by your trip limit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Real quick, to that point, because this is going to come up later, there are some options in there. Some of the feedback we've heard from AP members, and things like that, were this concept of like permit stacking, and, in my mind, the permit stacking was because the

assumption was people were limiting out on their fish, and I just wanted to bring that up, because this would suggest that that rarely -- That people are rarely limited by a trip limit. Am I reading that correctly?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes, and I would say so. It's more often the case for like red snapper, you know, and you would think that, with the low limit and abbreviated season, but, yes, they may not be limited by a species-specific trip limit for a given species on a trip, but Chip is here, and he might have something more to say on it.

DR. COLLIER: So, when you look at a lot of the distribution of pounds per trip that are brought in, quite often you get a skewed distribution, with many of the trips having very low landings, and a few of the trips having high landings, and so maybe it's I need to look at it on an individual basis, because individuals might be reaching this catch limit quite regularly, but the overall fleet might not be getting there, and so I need to think about how to do that, and then keep confidentiality as well.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry, and, to that, and don't get mad at me, but it would be interesting to see if you could do it by area, too. In other words, is a boat in North Carolina, or say South Carolina, more likely to limit out on beeliner, and that's what's constraining them, than a boat in a different -- Maybe we can't tease it out.

DR. COLLIER: Well, the boat you might be referring to quite often fishes along the coast, and so, not knowing where he's really going, he might -- They might fish from North Carolina down to Florida on a trip. It could be challenging, and so --

MS. MARHEFKA: I don't know about that has limited on beeliner in a long time, and so it wasn't this particular boat actually.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim, did you have your hand up, and then Charlie.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I think Chip is right, but, you know, I think that information is probably not that -- Not really all that valuable past a couple of years, because our management measures have changed trip limits, and so it doesn't make a lot of sense to compare whether we reached a trip limit, when the trip limit was a thousand pounds, and now it's 300 pounds. That doesn't really tell you a lot.

I think what's really important though is to look at these last few years, and see the makeup of this, and what this is really telling me is, regardless of whether there's some highlighters out there that are doing a whole lot better, and there are always going to be those guys. I mean, I don't care what industry it is. There's going to be 20 -- 15 to 20 percent of the guys are going to catch 80 to 90 percent of -- Or do 80 to 90 percent of the business.

That's because they're better than everybody else, whether it's real estate or anything else, but what this does allude to is that one thing we need to concentrate on is that this -- This snapper grouper fishery is made up of a little bit of this and a little bit of that.

These trips are put together by keeping what's what you're catching, a little bit of grouper, a little bit of grunts, a little bit of porgies, a little bit of every -- All these multitude of species that are in

this complex, which means that one of the things we've really got to think about is making sure that these species are all open at the same time, that we don't have species that are being discarded simply because they're not open while we're fishing, and so I like this. I just don't want to get caught going back in time, looking at whether or not we made trip limits, and how that affects what we do today, because I don't think that makes a lot of difference. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I agree with Tim and Kerry. I don't think anybody is even going to be trying to get a thousand pounds of beeliners in south Florida. They're just not there, and so it's just going to skew your percentages. You might could do a line from Georgia north, Florida, and you might could get a little bit of information, you know, for the beeliner fishermen, where the beeliners are, are they limiting out or not, but, again, all my boats, the same thing.

They may target beeliners, but they're taking triggers, and they're taking jacks, whatever is biting, and it's a portfolio fishing for sure, but then all the trip limits are changing, and the, you know, ACLs are changing, and so it's a moving target, and we're just going to probably have to use our best informed judgment as we move forward. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Anybody else, before we move on? Okay. Back to you, Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right. Thank you, and I didn't point out previously, but the -- I just will point out the asterisks. When you look at gag grouper in these tables, this is evaluating relative to the new trip limit, and so it wasn't the trip limit that was in place at the time of fishing. This is taking a look at how the fishing that occurred, without this trip limit in place, even before it was in place, would relate to the current 300-pound trip limit that is in place.

All right, and so, scrolling down, we have a few figures that kind of put some, you know, kind of a visual perspective to what we've seen in some of those tables, and so here we see the commercial landings over the course of the most recent five years of information for those top-ten species, and you can see the trends for each as we move through.

I kind of noted before that yellowtail snapper was on the -- It was the top species within the management unit, and then we have kind of an accumulation of all of the other species that are not in the top ten, and so you can see some perspective of where those fall relative to what you see in the top ten.

Next, moving down, this figure shows that meeting the trip limit in a more of a visual way over the last five years, and so you can see that, for each of those top-ten fisheries, top-ten species, with their respective sector or gear fisheries, if those are delineated, like for golden tilefish, and so you can see red snapper is well above all the other species, which would make sense, given its trip limit, the limited season, all of that.

You can see species like greater amberjack, that have a very high trip limit, are on the lower end of, of reaching that, and so that is the information that was requested, as far as landings and the species that are in the fishery and how those relate to catching trip limits and the annual catches. If there's any further questions, then we can take those now on this information.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Additional questions? All right, and so we finished one document. I just want to make sure -- So we've had a couple of comments since we showed this presentation this morning, and it is early on a Monday, and I just wanted to put up the AP discussion from 2021 again.

I think a couple of you mentioned this, and so I just wanted to give folks a chance to look at that one more time, about that there's mixed opinion opinions on the level of overcapitalization and removing two-for-one. There's also the issue of the corporate loophole for the SG-2 permits. I thought that they talked about permit stacking, but I don't see that on the list here, or if that was at a different meeting. Okay, and I just wanted you guys -- I know that at least a couple of people have asked about this. Any questions on this? All right. I'm going to turn it back to Mike. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and maybe we can refresh my memory. I remember the discussion that they had about -- Or I remember them talking about the SG-2 permits. Did they have any recommendations for how to, or what to do, with this SG-2 permit?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: As far as recommendations on how to stop the corporate loophole that they were referring to? Is that what you're asking about?

MR. GRINER: Yes, and not just the corporate loophole, but, I mean, I -- Personally, I think it's more than just a corporate loophole. I mean, you know, if you look back at the original, I guess, rules, it was family members only, and so it's not just a corporate loophole. There is just a loophole altogether.

I mean, if you look at how this should have played out over time, there should only be a handful of these, and they should be all related to the original person that was issued it, but that is not the case, not even close, and it's not just corporate, and so I was just curious, and did the AP have any discussion, you know, what to do with this permit whatsoever?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So, as far as I remember the discussion, there wasn't really a proposed solution. There was just a recommendation to the council to change it, and I don't -- I mean, the AP is certainly the body to recommend when they see the problem there, but I think that, at that point, that that's something that the council, and that the agency, would need to really pick up, as far as how to make that change. That might be kind of beyond the scope of the tasking of the AP, where they would identify the problem, but the council and the agency would work together to figure out what potential solutions are.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, and that was kind of what I remembered as well, and so I guess that really comes back to, you know, our charge here, and working with the agency is, you know, we've talked about this, and talked about this, and talked about it, and it seems like, for something that has so many -- So few participants, that it seems like something that we should be able to rectify, and hopefully we can make some headway on that, but I do think that that is something that's important for us to take a look at in this subcommittee and try to make some headway on it. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It's my recollection that the 225 was not -- It was not even supposed to transfer to family. It was supposed to die with the participant who got it, and so can someone find that information for me, because I'm almost positive, and I was around at the very end of Amendment 8, and the intent of that was for people who were fulltime commercial fishermen, but did not have enough poundage to qualify for the unlimited permit, but relied -- It was -- Particularly, it was very relevant in Florida and south Florida, and they were mackerel fishermen.

They were -- Ira Laks I've spoken to, you know, a fulltime mackerel fisherman who supplements with snapper grouper, and the intent was for those guys to still have snapper grouper be part of their portfolio, but it was supposed to be nontransferable, and gone with that person, upon their getting out of the fishery, or dying.

I think one of the things that I also want to talk about later, when we talk about the two-for-one, is I think we put a date by which -- Taking into account the age of the original participants, and most of these guys are in their sixties now, but we could make them -- Say they were in their forties, but I think we pick a date, and, by that date, the two-for-ones go away, because that's what they were intended for. They were never intended to continue on.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was trying to find the language. I couldn't find it quickly. I think Myra is looking it up. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I think they may have allowed it to go to like a son, or family member, but, how they're making a corporate out of it, I have no earthly idea, if that's what they're truly doing, and, just as another thing we need to keep in the back of our mind, this loss of working waterfront is going to be a game-changer.

I think we've lost two more shrimp docks in McIntosh County in the last couple of years, and those guys are calling around begging for a place to tie up, and there's just -- They're going to probably end up anchoring out in the river, and running skiffs back and to their boat, or something like that, but it is going to affect our industry, more so than it has in the past, and we -- You know, obviously, we can't do anything about that, but just economics, and I don't care if you're packing tomatoes or you're packing fish, and you have to pack volume to survive, and that's a lot of the reason the working waterfronts are going away, because there's nothing to pack.

There's no money in it, and so they're selling out to whoever, and so we -- We really do need to figure out a way to get some production for our commercial guys, and, just looking at those average catches -- Like, for beeliners, I think it was probably averaging 75 percent. You know, if that's what our average catch per year is of the ACL, it sounds like, to me, we could bump our catch limits by 15 or 20 percent and still stay under the ACL, and then -- Let those guys have those fish, and, again, then that's more fish going across working waterfronts, where people at the docks may not be so inclined to sell. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Just a quick comment. I agree with just about everything that's been said here, and I think that the -- You know, that the SG-2 really isn't something that I'm too worried about. I

mean, it's such a small percentage of the overall landings, and, you know, I think we have other bigger problems to worry about besides digging into that and trying to figure out a way to -- I mean, they -- Why they incorporated is probably for protection, you know, from liability.

As far as what, what the language says, we would like to see that, and maybe we have to correct that somewhere, but I'm not really too concerned about the SG-2s in the equation. They just don't amount up to that much. They do personally to the individual that has them. It's very important for them, but, in the overall snapper grouper management, and production, they're just not that high.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Anything else on that topic? Staff was over here looking for -- To make sure, and I found it in one document, but it was as noted by the AP, and I don't know that that's the final decision, but it looked like cannot be transferred to an immediate family member, but it did say that it could be leased, but, yes, I found that in one of the documents, that it cannot be transferred to immediate family, and cannot be sold to a new owner, but then what Tim is saying is if you, you know, establish a corporation, then it can be transferred, and that's how I think transfers were happening. All right. Rick.

MR. DEVICTOR: No, I'm, I'm looking into this, but I looked back at Kevin McIntosh's presentation a while ago, and he does say SG-2 transfers -- May request to transfer the permit to another vessel owned by the same entity. Okay, but I'm looking up in the regulations, too.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I think, from one of our last discussions, we -- The discussion came to there should have been language in there saying that you can't transfer the permit, or any portion of an entity that owns a permit, and that was kind of where we got to, and I think we were saying that was the fix that needed to be done to the language.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Are ready to leave this discussion and dive into the decision document? I see people nodding yes.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: All right, and so the discussion document is Attachment 2 for this meeting, and it just kind of initially lays out, you know, the background for this subcommittee, why it was formed, and we want to note some of the objectives for this meeting, and so we've already looked through the compiled information from the past reports and the requested analyses.

Next up, we'll be looking through the list of commercial issues that you all have developed thus far, and you'll have the opportunity to discuss any additional details, or any potential management actions, that could be developed in response to each of these issues. If there are other issues that need to be added to that list, then we can get those on as well.

What we're looking for out of this meeting today is some level of priority in direction for these commercial issues, and how they should be addressed, and so which ones are the ones that should be addressed most immediately, and possibly have some type of recommendation for a timeline on any amendment, or however you all would like to have those addressed.

Then, if there's any additional information that you need from staff, to be compiled or developed ahead of the next subcommittee meeting, to provide that direction, and so, next up, we will be looking into your running list of potential commercial management actions. This is what we came out of the last meeting with, and I'm not going to read through the entire thing, because you all developed it, and it's there for you to reference as we need to within the discussion.

What we would like to do is -- These main bullets, get some level of priority of which are the items that you all would like to see the most immediate action, the most attention to, and which may not need as much immediate attention devoted to them.

I guess, as a brief suggestion, as you go through your priority, it might be helpful to kind of delineate things in more of a high, medium, low manner, so that we're not necessarily ranking every individual item, but putting things into categories first, and then we can break down those categories as we need to.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so this is kind of the big list, and this is what I'm hoping we can have some discussion on, and then we'll put some subset, either all of these or some subset of these, onto flip charts, and then we'll do the sticky dot exercise, but you might want to have some discussion on some of these, to make sure you think it's still a viable option. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Not so much discussion, but I would love to have some guidance from staff, um, because it will change how I vote, if you will, or not vote, but dedicate my dots. Realistically, if we look at the spreadsheet of doom, which we won't do until the end of the week, realistically, if we came out of this subcommittee with the intent to begin development of an amendment for measures, some of the measures on this list, are we realistically in a position to be able to move it into the workplan in the near future, and what level of sort of workload -- How simple does it need to be, and how complex can we get?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Myra.

MS. BROUWER: So, generally, I think the simpler is going to actually, you know, have a better chance of becoming a regulation. There's a lot of uncertainty right now, given executive orders and whatnot, as to how many regulations we would be able to really seriously consider moving forward. We do have a line on the council's workplan dedicated to this amendment, and so it is part of the workplan.

It will all depend how many, and how complicated, the actions that are included, you know, how long it's going to take there. There's likely going to be reduced capacity, in terms of analysis, from the agency as well, and so, taking all that into consideration, I really couldn't begin to tell you how long it would take. I'll leave it at that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Myra. All right. Maybe folks want to have some discussion on some of our topics from the last meeting, and make sure they still think that they're relevant topics. The first one on the list here is the two-for-one commercial permit policy. Do we still want to keep this one on the list? Okay. I see heads nodding yes. Did you want to have any more discussion on it? Go ahead, Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Yes, and I'll start. Obviously, we're here discussing trying to create more opportunity, and potential yield, for the commercial sector, and so, you know, I believe that we are not overcapitalized, and we have reached -- We've reduced, since Amendment 8, 50 percent, and, even though they didn't say it, I think that was a pretty good spot to land, I suppose, and I think we have to say it now, okay, and we're there, and we now need to try to grow the opportunity for new participation and effort in the snapper grouper commercial fishery, and the two-for-one is limiting that.

It's just making it hard to enter the fishery, or to operate in the fishery with the permit, and so, obviously, I think that we need to either make a motion now to dig in, and it sounds like there's - **- You've left a line open in your workplan for, you know, these suggestions to evaluate it, and so I guess I would make the motion that the council develop an amendment to eliminate the two-for-one, for all the reasons I just stated.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We already have a motion. Let's get that on the board.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I guess, just noting that -- Given this is a subcommittee, it may be helpful to amend the motion to recommend to the Snapper Grouper Committee to initiate an amendment.

MR. HULL: I'm good with that, and you can put it that way, just as we would as an AP, with "advise", and that's fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're getting that motion on the board. Motion made by Jimmy, and seconded by Kerry. All right, and the motion, and, Jimmy, make sure this is what you intended, is to recommend to the Snapper Grouper Committee that they initiate an amendment to consider ending the two-for-one policy. Okay. Go ahead, Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Okay, and so recommend to the Snapper Grouper Committee or to the council? The committee? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and we're a subcommittee, and so you're going to recommend it to the actual committee.

MR. HULL: Okay. Yes, it looks fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Kerry, are you good? All right. We've had some discussion on this. We also had some discussion that there is a slot on the workplan, but, ultimately, we'll figure out kind of how fast this moves, what the vehicle is, later in the week. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Jimmy stated the rationale excellently, but I would like to say, to Myra's point earlier, this has the added benefit of actually taking away a regulation, and so, in theory, we're following higher orders.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that comment. Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thank you. Just out of curiosity, and I'm -- Just from a process standpoint, where is it going to be appropriate to really dive into this idea of the transfer and making sure that some

of those loopholes are separate. It's going to be as a secondary recommendation, and not necessarily here, or are they going to be built together?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's a great question, and so, you know, we're about to look at this list of, I don't know, fifteen items, and so I think that we could list that out separately as an item, and then, if it's something that the group wants to move forward, then maybe it goes into this amendment. Tim, and then Charlie.

MR. GRINER: Can you explain that a little bit better, maybe, and I'm not sure I understand what you're talking about. Are you talking about the transferability, if we did away with the two-for-one policy, or the current transferability, because I don't see that we would need to change the way that these are transferred, other than the fact that you don't have to have two of them now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Wait. I've got lots of hands going up. Amy, do you want to try to answer that question, and then Charlie, then Robert.

MS. DUKES: Thanks Tim. You actually might be right. I'm trying to process it. I'm trying to think of all of the examples of where a transfer of a two-for-one permit has gone down a road it should not have gone, and would that idea no longer be valid, and perhaps. I think that it's still worth a conversation, to make sure -- It's still worth a conversation, to make sure that somebody is not going down a path that is not going to be successful for them. I mean, these are -- These are valuable permits, and we want to make sure that individuals who are holding them aren't necessarily taken advantage of, and does that make sense?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim, to that point.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and kind of, but, I mean, technically speaking, right now, with the two-for-one, unless I'm mistaken, and maybe Monica can chime-in here too, but, technically speaking, the two-for-one doesn't really have anything to do with whether it's a corporate or an individual. Even the corporates are under the two-for-one mandate. The reason they get away from it is because it wasn't a transfer, and the corporation shareholders simply changed, and so nothing got transferred.

The same corporation owned it, and so, when you're talking about a transfer, it's different than talking about a corporation changing shareholders, in the eyes of the -- In the eyes of the agency, and so I hear what you're saying, but I think that's a separate discussion, and I don't -- I don't know that that really matters, you know, because all we're trying to do now is get to the point where you don't have to go find two permits, to consolidate them into one, and how you sell that, transfer that, is -- It's fine, and we want that to happen.

We want you to have the ability to let your permit go to somebody who is twenty years younger than you are, when you're seventy years old, whether that be that they take over your corporation, whether they start a new corporation, and that really is not the point.

The point is that we've gotten to a point where we think 541 can't even catch the quota that we've got, and we really need more quota, and so we've got to make it easier for these guys to get into this, and not have to -- Not have to go find two permits to turn into one, and it's really that simple, in my mind.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and that we got a list of hands. I also -- I thought that Amy was talking about the 225. I thought she was talking about the fact that people may be transferring the 225 permit, and do we need to try to look into that, and that's what I thought she was saying, and that's why I was saying that I thought that that might be a separate item, and then we can figure out later if we want to work on it, if it goes into this vehicle, but I'm going to go back to the hands. I have Charlie, Robert, and then Kerry.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I think I heard leasing at the first part of that discussion and, and I'm onboard with getting away from the two-for-one. I don't know that we -- We would have a really hard time stopping somebody from leasing a boat, and a permit, and, in one way, that's a really easy way for somebody to get into the fishery, and see if it fits them or not. It's a whole lot easier to cough up \$500 a month for a year than it is --

Let's say, if they drop the price of corporate permits, and the price of single permits will be all the same, because they're not a trade anymore, and let's say they dropped \$20,000, and they're down to \$70,000, and that's still a pretty substantial commitment, when you could possibly, you know, get into a fishery for \$500 or \$600 a month, to see if you want to stay.

That is a step-wise place for, you know, entrants to get in, in my book, and a lot of people -- Even if I own a boat, and I own a corporation, a lot of times, I may lease my boat to my corporation, for legal reasons, or tax reasons, or any other -- All kinds of stuff like that, or liability reasons, and so I wouldn't -- I wouldn't worry about the leasing so much, but, if you go get away from the two-for-one, it's going to clean up a lot of stuff. I mean, it really will.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I have Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I was going to ask about the timeframe for getting this amendment through, and passed, and then I was going to question bogging it down with anything else, because it seems that the discussion kind of can spiral a little bit, and so I think, if the intention is to get rid of the two-for-one, we should try to streamline that, even if it means running two amendments.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Good point. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: At some point, we are going to have to get into the nitty-gritty one, and can we amend the motion just to have it clear that we're talking about the unlimited snapper grouper, just so it's very clear, since we had that confusion earlier, and, two, we are going to have to have a discussion, sooner rather than later, to deal with --

Most of it is going to be cleared up with the two-for-one, but we're going to have a group of people who right now have those one permits, waiting to buy two, and so we're just going to need to figure out a little bit of the logistics of the date this applies to, if it's retroactive to people who -- You know, if they have one now, even though, in theor, they're supposed to have two, and that's all. Just there will be some semantics that are involved, but I think, once we do end the two-for-one, all -- You can lease no problem, and you can sell no problem, and it just clears up everything. It feels like -- It's just so clean, to me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jimmy.

MR. HULL: I appreciate the discussion, and I'm glad to see this, and, to Robert's point, I think we just need to concentrate on the motion, and making that be able to happen, and it's the first step that has to happen, and then everything else we can figure out down the road.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I'm hearing -- That sounded like two amendments, or two separate vehicles, but we do have a motion on the board here. Is there any more discussion on this motion? **Is there any objection to this motion?** All right. **The motion carries.**

Then we've got a lot of other things on the list from last time that I wanted us to go through, and, once again, we can do the sticky dot exercise after we, you know, refresh our memory on what all these topics are, or we could not, but I didn't want to just say, hey, we're doing two-for-one and then conclude this committee. I mean, we've got a whole commercial subcommittee to talk about these topics, and I figured that you might want to have more discussion, but Rick.

MR. DEVICTOR: One thing that stood out to me was especially Table 2, showing that, for some species, very important species, that we're not catching the entire ACL, and, again, we're looking at removing constraints, et cetera. What can this committee, and what can this council, do, right, to remove those constraints, and I don't know if we have improve biomass, or change the trip limits, but I want to dig into that more, and why aren't we reaching for triggerfish, for greater amberjack, and it's been going down over the years, reaching less of that ACL.

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

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I was going to just kind of piggyback on Myra's comment and maybe suggest that prioritizing these, you know, upfront would probably be a useful exercise. There are some of these in here that are, you know, are much bigger, overarching issues, like how do we, you know, increase biomass, and then some that are really specific, and so it might help us focus the discussion a little bit, because, if we go one-by-one, I think we're going to go down the rabbit hole on every single one of them.

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

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm not necessarily 100 percent yet onboard with the two-amendment plan, or the -- I think Rick is exactly right. I think it's important, and this still could be a vehicle to discuss -- Whether it's increasing the vermilion trip limit, or things like that, and it would make a lot of sense. The data that you have to analyze is often going to be very similar, and so I think there is utility in continuing that discussion for now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I was -- That was just what I was thinking, before Rick came on. We need to get closer to our ACLs, and we might need to probably -- Maybe direct staff to give us some options, and work with the Regional Office on how -- Can we just go up on the trip limits 20 percent, because if you -- Let's say vermilion, and we're at 75 percent. If you go up on trip limits by 20 percent, you're basically going up 15 percent, which is still going to be averaging 90 percent of the ACL. We're still not going to get to 100 percent, on an average.

Now, I understand things change, and recruitment changes, you know, and biomass changes, all that other stuff. You've got regime shifts, but what would be the vehicles on picking our trip limits up, and our ACLs up, so that we can get closer to our actual catch levels?

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Myra, then Tim.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, and, following up on what Charlie just said, I would encourage you to kind of do a broad view of the types of categories of things you want to do, right, and so we could have, you know, revise the permit structure, revise and modify, or something like that, and there could be several actions in a single amendment that accomplish that. You know, the same thing with the trip limits. You know, there could be a general direction to find ways to optimize trip limits for, you know, whatever species, instead of getting down into the -- You know, let us figure that out, at the IPT level, but, you know, just let's just stay up high.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I think -- You know, I think we really have to take a really hard look at some more data, to figure out why this is occurring, and, personally, I don't think it's trip limits. You know, yes, there may be some guys, on some trips, that, because they -- Because the trip just is one of those trips where, every time they dropped the bait, the fish were chewing, and they were chewing like crazy, and that they ended up having to leave spots, but I think, if we really can get some data, and we can look at it, that we're not going to -- We're going to find that it's not the trip limits that are keeping us from meeting these ACLs.

That's not the issue anymore. You know, the issue anymore is a combination of issues, and the biggest one I can think of right now is weather. The weather right now, in the last few years, has kept even the best fishermen, and I mean the very best, and they're at the dock, or they're cutting their trip short, or the weather is so bad that, once they once they brave enough to get out there, that you just can't hardly fish, and so we've got weather, and we have age, and those two things combined are keeping us from meeting these ACLs.

That's not to say that we don't need to take a look at these trip limits at all, but, you know, at the end of the day, I think the idea of the trip limits is very important for the overall health of this snapper grouper fishery and keeping it open for a year-round fishery.

That's very, very important, and we cannot lose sight of the fact that we have to have every one of these species available all year long, except for, you know, a spawning closure, so to speak, but, yes, and I just think, you know, we've got to have a way to dig into these trips, and figure out what's happening, you know, with the trips. Is everybody's trips like mine, that are down, you know, half the trips that -- You know, in 2011, I made twice as many trips as I did this year, you know, and that's for a variety of reasons, but the biggest one is weather, weather and my poor health. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I have a couple more hands up, and then I would like to take a break and kind of figure out a gameplan for how we're going to move through the items that we had already identified. Charlie, and then John Walter.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, and I agree with Tim. It's not just the trip limits, but we can't change the weather. We're going to have a hard time changing the ages of the captains. If the younger guys feel like, hey, I can make \$1,500 on a boat, because of the trip, and I might be able to catch X, versus \$1,000 if I catch , and it might help, or it should help us get some younger people in there to say, you know, I'm making enough money doing that, and I like doing that, and a lot of our commercial fishermen do it because they're passionate about it.

Moving the trip limits is going to help us maybe get some younger people, that say it works for them, number-wise, but we can only change what we have the purview to change, and trip limits is one of them. If there's some other things, I am open for it, but we can't change the number of permits, because we're not going back to open entries, and so -- But we can go to the two-for-one. That's going to let some more people in, that may try to go fishing, which may put some more fish across the docks, and so just figure out what we can do, and how we can do it, that, you know, makes sense. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. John.

DR. WALTER: I like all this. Thank you. I'm not a member of this committee, but I did want to provide a couple of comments and bring back what I thought was a really good point that Robert made about discards, and how we're making movements to try to turn those discards into retained catch.

I think that is something that a number of recent management actions are taking a harder look at, and I think that's probably a growth opportunity here, because, if we reduce discards, in any sector, that means there's more fish in the water, and that means the ACLs can go up, and so, by taking some management action that might benefit the fishery as a whole, we might be able to achieve some of that growth potential.

Also, I think discards, in some cases, might limit trips, in the sense that you may reach a trip limit for one species, and then have to discard for the remainder of the trip, and I think those are situations we can look at, with some of the new observer data we're getting in, to see if that's a limiting factor that could be, in fact, opened up.

I'm prefacing this that some of these actions are actually part of Amendment 59. I'll say that, and I think that's something that is something that is setting a precedent, if it does go forward, for how we could achieve some of this optimum yield, and I think that's something that this council should take a hard look at, and perhaps something to specifically put on the list here to how we specifically look at discards, discarding practices, whether it could be improvements made there that could achieve better gains in yield. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry, a point of order.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and, before we take a break, we do have a motion on the floor.

MS. MCCAWLEY: We passed that motion.

MS. MARHEFKA: The coffee is very weak. Did you notice?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and we passed that motion. Let's go ahead and take a fifteen-minute break.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. We're going to get going again, if everybody can come back to the table. All right, and so what we've done here is we've pulled some -- A bulleted list here of items that we had listed before that were in this decision document.

We also had some discussion about trip limits, but we also had a discussion about ways to just increase trip efficiency for the commercial sector, and so we were trying to make a list here of some things that we might want to consider when we get to the end of this committee meeting today, and hopefully we'll figure out next steps, the vehicles, et cetera, but we're trying to make a list of things that we wanted to consider, and then we can come back and prioritize that list, and so just trying to get us back to some of the items we talked about last time.

Some of those bullets are on there, plus the bullets that we talked about earlier, and we're trying to surface if there are other ideas of things that people want to consider, and then we'll come back and prioritize this list. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: So I was trying to see if this fits in with something we already had, but, specifically for the Florida Keys, for the last, I don't know, year-and-a-half, we've been going through the restoration blueprint and looking at habitat issues. The State of Florida has funded a fairly significant what we call habitat support structure, essentially artificial reefs, or manmade structures, and we're kind of at an impasse.

Several meetings ago, you know, I had asked, and artificial reefs were deemed to be essential fish habitat. The Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary is resisting, making it difficult for us to get structure in the water, and, as I look at this, and, you know, talking about how to increase biomass, how to increase opportunity, I think something we should be thinking about, whatever this body can do, is to look at the effects and impact of loss of habitat, specifically coral reefs, and what we can do to try and get guidance out to better support, or promote, you know, interaction and building habitat under the water.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, I support the idea. I don't support it for this vehicle. I've been through a lot of artificial reef plans with this body. The science is complicated, and the justification is complicated. We really, really, really just need to focus on the core things that the commercial industry needs right now, and, for me, this just isn't the vehicle for that.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: I'm sorry, and was this -- Are we still talking about under this motion that we just went through, or this is just generally the --

MS. MCCAWLEY: We've already -- This is just general topics that -- Some of which we had talked about at our last subcommittee meeting, and some of which we talked about this morning, to figure out things that we might want to do moving forward. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Looking at this list, I guess I'm still confused with this different permit usage, i.e. permit stacking and others. I don't know what the others are, but, to the permit stacking issue, I don't understand that issue, really, and I don't understand why we would spend a whole lot of time with it. If we're not meeting trip limits, and we're not meeting ACLs with one permit on a boat, what good is it going to do to put another permit on the boat, and so I guess I'm -- I guess that's what you were talking about, as far as permit stacking, is to take two snapper grouper permits and put them on one boat, so that one boat has a double grouper snapper limit, but, if you can't meet the single grouper snapper limit, what is the point of putting two on there? I guess I'm a little confused there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's how the AP had discussed it, and I know that -- I know that you were at the Gulf Council meeting when we had this last subcommittee meeting, but, yes, we had a little bit of discussion, because we were kind of bringing out what the AP had discussed. We didn't necessarily say that we were definitely going to go do it, but just trying to bring forward the ideas that we had heard from the AP, because that was one of the documents that we had for the last subcommittee. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I think what that is getting to is trying to make your trips more efficient, and more profitable, and I think there's better ways to do that than what -- The so-called permit stacking. I mean, that gets back to what Charlie is talking about is, you know, we've got to figure out what is the right trip limit, you know, and, as trips are decreasing, because of age and weather and whatever, and the opportunities to go meet these --

You know, what is the perfect balance of how many pounds per trip can you have, you know, so that we don't leave fish in the water at the end of the year, and that plays into something that John just touched base on is, well, you know, maybe, if we had more fish available, then the trip limits could get higher, and you could have more opportunity before you left the dock, and that would incentivize you more to leave the dock and stay a little bit longer.

That could come by, you know, recognizing the fact that we need -- That we're trying to turn discards into landed fish, whether they be, you know, recreational discards, that the commercial sector is getting thumped on right now, because they're coming off the top, and it's something as simple as taking those -- As John said, taking those discards that the commercial sector is being penalized for from the recreational sector, and they need to come off the top from the science, from the SEDAR process, so that the commercial sector is not being penalized for recreational discards. Therefore, their ACLs will go up. Therefore, their trip limits can go up, and, therefore, their trips can be more efficient, without the need to look at things like permit stacking. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so what I heard was that permit stacking maybe needs to come off the list, but I've got other hands over here. Mike, Robert, Charlie, Kerry.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I just wanted to note that, from what I remember, when permit stacking came up at the AP, it was really kind of to a specific fishery. It was related to golden tilefish, and so it -- It has come other times? Okay. Well, that that was the most recent time that I remember it, but it may have come up -- It seems it has come up times at that preceded me, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Tim, to everything you were just describing, and I've talked about it in the EFPs, but has there been discussion about aggregate limits for the commercial fishery? I mean, the earlier description, a little bit of this, and a little bit of that, and kind of looking at this, and, I mean, it would seem, right, if you're trying to promote the commercial fishery, it should be about efficiency, right, your time on the water, and bringing back as much catch as you can with the time you're spending out there, and so it seems like that's a tool that I haven't seen referenced here yet that we might want to think about.

Then, just jumping back quickly to the discard issue, I think the recreational sector is also being penalized. I mean, collectively, everybody in this room, commercial and recreational, and everybody is being held to catch less fish, because of the management structure that's in place. It's not about recreational or commercial.

I mean, we in this room set those rules, and that came to be because of the management plan we put out, and not because the recreational sector has -- You know, is taking advantage of anything, and they're just playing by the rules, and I think those rules have led to everybody being harmed by that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Charlie, Kerry, Jimmy, Tim.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I didn't know my hand was up, but I can always think of something, as you know, but, yes, as far as permit stacking, if it was to apply to say just longline golden tile, we might could put that in the golden tile amendment, when we're changing, but I don't think we really want to do that across-the-board for vermilion and other fish, but I would -- I would move that specifically to that fishery.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and it has come up other times. Laurilee brought it up for the central Florida neck of the woods for being able to do it with vermilion. It wasn't just golden tile. To that point, Charlie, I expect, at some point, the golden tile guys to come to us with a proposal of their own of how they want to manage the fishery, and so I think we -- That's another reason to leave it alone and take it off this list. I am in support of taking it off this list.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Jimmy, then back to Tim.

MR. HULL: Okay. Trying to stay on track, and so, after our motion passed, and we go down the bullet list, the permit transfers, you know, a lot of the problems that we have with permit transfers are going to be solved by that elimination of two-for-one, in my opinion. The other thing within permits would be, for me, is the leasing aspect of it, and, again, with the removal of the two-for-one, it should help reduce the need for leasing, in my opinion, and so we're tackling that.

I would still leave it on the list to discuss, the commercial 225 permit policies. Again, you know, it's not -- For me, it's not high priority to figure out a way to -- I mean, maybe we need to figure out and make sure that the intent of the SG-2, the 225 permit, that we're fulfilling that, that it stays within the family, even if it's in a corporate entity, which is basically just like a person, but it's in a corporation, and it needs to stay -- You know, if they transfer it to somebody in the family, they need to be that in that corporation, so to speak, right, and their family is -- It's a family corporation,

right, and so, you know, there would be ways that we could change the language in that, I suppose, without putting all that in the same amendment, and I don't know, and maybe not.

Then regional management, yes, and we've got big changes in the centers of biomass of these stocks, and, you know, you can't manage black sea bass off of Florida the way you manage it off of the Virginia-North Carolina border, where the center of abundance seems to be at. It's just not doable, but I know the Magnuson Act says we're supposed to manage these things as one unit stock.

Well, that's something that I think should stay on there, that we need to discuss, and, as far as -- You know, we need to be heading towards ecosystem-based management with these stocks, which means we got to have ecosystem-based stock assessments, so that we can get management advice that way, and the idea of an aggregate bag limit falls in line with that, in my opinion, you know, ecosystem-based. You know, this is what the ecosystem is providing to you, and you can harvest this much from the ecosystem, and leave enough seed there to repopulate it, and so I think those -- Regional management ties into that.

To trip efficiency, the aggregate would tie into that, and so that's what I've got to say for the bullet points there. I guess I didn't really eliminate anything, except for the commercial permit policies and the permit transfers in general. It's just going to already -- We handled that with the two-for-one, and everything is going to get so much easier, in my opinion, with that, and so that's what I've got.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to follow up, Robert, and maybe -- I'm sorry, and I just want to clarify a little bit, and maybe I maybe I stated that wrong. Yes, the recreational sector is being penalized for their discards. Both sectors are penalized for discards. However, the commercial sector is penalized for the recreational discards as well as their own, and so is the recreational being penalized for the commercial discards, because they're all lumped together.

What I'm saying is that each sector should be penalized for their own discards. That would help the commercial sector in their efficiency and their ability to harvest more fish. Right now, the council cannot influence that. We have no management measures that influence how discards are, number one, accounted for, nor how they are attributed to each sector.

That comes through the SEDAR process, and that's what needs -- That's what we need to look at. Right now, we do things different in South Atlantic than they do in the Mid-Atlantic and the Gulf. You know, our discards are taken off the top, and then the ACL -- Then our ACLs are given to us, and we can make management measures based off of that, but, if that were not the case, then those discards would be -- They would look very, very different, and the ACLs would look very, very different.

That's what I was -- That's the point I was trying to make, is that, yes, everybody's -- The discards are out there, and everybody is being penalized, because they're discards, but what needs to happen is each sector needs to be penalized for their own discards, and that's not something that can be done through a management measure. That has to be done through the SEDAR process. The only management measure we can do is to change the SEDAR process, which we which -- You know,

how do how do they look at what is a landing, and what is a discard, and how does that go into the assessment process.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I've got some hands up. I have Kerry, and then Robert, and then Amy, and then back to Jimmy, and then --

MS MARHEFKA: It goes without saying that I agree with Tim 100 percent. What I would like to do though is really focus us for a second, because, knowing that we're going to have limited help with analysis, knowing that this is something we would like to move forward in the workplan, I think we have to be really strategic about what goes forward, and so, saying that, in my mind, I think that regional management is complicated for this discussion.

I don't even -- We don't even really have an idea of what that means. We don't -- I don't think any of us could point to it, and not what it means, but what action, and do you have an action in mind that would go into an amendment, and that could get really complicated, and become very long, and I think it's a worthwhile exercise, but I just think it's going to bog this down, and I would put that in a longer-term plan.

I think that, for ways to increase trip efficiency, we need to consider the step-up that's in there, because that is a great way to -- You know, we get throughout the year, and we're not at 75 percent in Q4, and then we have -- The trip limits are higher, or go away.

As far as -- I can't quite figure out how aggregate commercial limits would work for the commercial fishery, based on the way we're managed. If you took something like scamp and gag, that co-occur, and that are caught together, that are both at, what, 300-pound trip limits, if you were on a pile of scamp -- So, in theory, you would be able to -- You would then get 600 pounds of scamp, and no gag, but what would happen is the scamp then would close earlier than gag, and gag would still be open, and you would still be -- You would still be catching them.

I think the way that it works now is efficient for the commercial fishery. I think it's just a different beast for the recreational fishery, but maybe I'm not thinking clearly, but I think the priorities for this amendment, in my mind, and I'm just laying this out there for how I'm thinking about it, is it needs to be the permits, and it needs to be step-up in trip limits, are what we deal with in this amendment right now.

Then I have a question. I think it's too complicated, and I just want to satisfy my own mind, but, Jessica, in Florida, you all have regulations that stipulate that the imports that come in need to be the size limits, correct, and is that even possible to do federally, and I suspect that's a huge lift, but I've always been curious about that, because that is on this list.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so let me talk about that just for a second, and so it's import minimum size limit, and so sometimes, for species, the minimum size limit in the Gulf is different than what's in the Atlantic, and so then the import minimum size limit for the species is the smaller of the two numbers, whichever one is the lower, and so we do have import, nationwide import, size limits for lobster.

That's one of the reasons why we have a federal fishery management plan for lobster, but maybe staff can speak to how easy it would be to do, but, yes, it seems like the states would need to get

involved, if it was in -- If you put that in place, but, yes, we do have that, those regs, in Florida, but I've got a list of folks, and I'm hoping that Robert can speak to that aggregate commercial limit, to Kerry's question too, and, Robert, you're next up.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: So I've just got to go back to this. I mean, the recreational sector is being told now we can't fish for bottom fish at all, period, for half of the state of Florida. I mean, I do think the recreational sector is paying for those dead discards. One season, one day of the year, I mean, it's -- So I think both sides of the fishery is being hurt by this.

I want to go back to, you know, Tim's point that we have no other way to deal with this, and so it's got to go to SEDAR, and I would ask John, and is there a way for this body to initiate, or start -- John, is there a way for us to initiate, or start, an amendment to look at aggregate limits for commercial fishing? I mean, we've danced around this.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The council can do that, but, as a subcommittee, I think you should do, as your other things, and you make recommendations for things the council to consider. Like you made a motion earlier that the council consider such and such, and so I think that's the same process that would you would do here, and then it's up to the council to decide do they want to follow through on this amendment, and then you think about when you're going to have the information, when is the timing, and how do you make it happen, but just getting that your intent is to explore that type of regulation, then, yes, you should make that recommendation, and you ask the council to look into that sort of regulation.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Well, then I would like to make a motion that full council consider --

MS. MCCAWLEY: You're not on this subcommittee. You're not on this committee.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Would somebody do that, please?

MS. MCCAWLEY: What's the motion, and so let me just try to bring us back to kind of what we're doing here, and so we were still in the surfacing ideas phase. I know that people are kind of getting caught up in what goes in this amendment that has two-for-one in it. You don't need to think about that yet.

We were just trying to surface a bunch of topics, and then prioritize them, but I know it's hard to not think about how fast we would want some of these items to move, or if they're going to be solved by the two-for-one, but we were still in the looking at the ideas we surfaced last time, and seeing if there were others, and so I felt like we were still in the, you know, bubbling up, brainstorming these ideas, and then we would come back and figure out what are the highest priority, and then what is the vehicle for that, and that's kind of the next part of the agenda, and so just I've got a lot of hands up. Do you want to go --

UNIDENTIFIED: (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. MCCAWLEY: We can, yes, but you guys are all about this is this going in this two-for-one amendment or not, and you keep -- I get it, and I love it, but, I mean, we're still trying to surface ideas, so that we don't get -- Like so let's say this subcommittee doesn't meet for a while, because we've developed an amendment, and then, six months from now, you guys are like, hey, I've got

these great ideas for commercial, and can we talk about this, and, well, now is the time to surface those great ideas, and then we'll figure out if we all think they're the highest priority and then what the vehicle looks like. Now is the time to surface the ideas. All right, and so I'm going to go back to my list of names. All right. Amy, Jimmy and then Myra.

MS. DUKES: Thanks, Madam Chair. I just wanted to, I guess, on the record, talk a little bit why the permit transfer information was really important to me, in particular. We had an individual who had an SG-1 permit and, unfortunately, passed away. For the process of being able to put that through his estate, somebody came in and purchased the SG-1 permit, and so there's a new owner of this SG-1 permit, but the new owner failed to register that permit under their name.

Rather than trying to register it under their name, they asked the estate for a power of attorney. This is an aging family, an aging fisherman. The fisherman said, if that's going to help you get this permit transferred out of my name, go for it, and literally handed them a power of attorney. The problem is that, really, the boat -- If the new boat was in violation, the permit never really changed names. It's still under the previous owner's name, and so that family is still going to be subject to that boat, that new boat, if there is any violations, and perhaps -- Perhaps a lot of that potential will go away with changing for the two-for-one, but I'm just thinking about our fleet.

I'm thinking about aging fleets, and I'm thinking about how people are going to handle this, moving forward, and so that's why I want to make sure we're at least having these conversations on the table, so that it is it is transparent that some of this is happening, and just think about it when we're making these suggestions for the two-for-one. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Yes, and I thought we were trying to eliminate some of the things on the list, rather than think about what we want to add to this amendment, because I think we need to leave the amendment as it stands now, alone, and let's get rid of the two-for-one. As you said, it may take two amendments, if we want to do these other things, because that's the key thing that needs to happen right now, and not burden it with further things added on to it, because we can just keep going and going with all the potential things that might help us in that.

Then, going to the aggregate discussion, you know, Kerry brings up the point, when she immediately went to the grouper complex, okay, and so there's a lot more things to think about in that, and, you know, you may have this -- A species, a grouper, that's being in a rebuilding plan, and another one that isn't, that needs protection, and then you're allowing much more harvest of one that we're trying to rebuild, and so there's more thought in that process, but I'm not totally opposed to it, but thinking about it further as we dig in and you get input on that, but, again, I thought we were just trying to prioritize further discussions for this committee, and we've already done the two-for-one, and it's going to happen, hopefully, and we're recommending that we find a way to make that happen.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and we're trying to think about other things, because I don't think that the two-for-one is going to really increase trip efficiency, or it's not going to do some of these other things that we've been talking about around this table that might be needed for commercial. Does it get us closer to OY for commercial? I don't know that removing the two-for-one is actually

going to do that, and so this is what this subcommittee is thinking about, and talking about, is are there other things that can be done.

Forget the vehicle, right this second, and just what are some other things, including -- You heard Myra say earlier that, if you think about big picture, like increased trip efficiency, or what can the commercial sector do to get closer to optimum yield, or those types of things, and we could send staff off on those types of rabbit holes, to research those things and come back and bring some ideas in a separate vehicle, Jimmy, in a different amendment, but. I mean, we --

I guess we formed this committee to try to think about is the commercial sector really achieving optimum yield, and what can be done, and I think that it's more than just the two-for-one, at least when we started the discussions, and so I'm just trying to let us, in this four-hour time period, when we're together in-person, to try to surface any other ideas, and then this body can prioritize them, to figure out what we might want to do next, and do we want to do it now, and so I'm going to go back to my list. Myra, Charlie, Tim. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Big picture, and it kind of goes back to this aggregate trip limits, you know, and Jimmy and I have talked about -- You know, Jimmy has told me, time and time again, let's catch what there's a lot of, and what there's not -- It's -- We've got high recruitment, low recruitment, all that kind of stuff, and I would think that, if you take a square mile of hard bottom, it's going to have a biomass productivity, across-the-board, of X number of pounds. Let's say you take sand bottom, or low relief, and it's going to have some productivity of biomass.

If we can start figuring out our productivity, and we just catch the biomass, or 90 percent of it, or whatever, then it -- It's going to let us work between what's there and what's not, and I know there's lots of twist in there, because we've got some things like scamp, that may be in a rebuilding program and stuff, but, if we go back and look at biomass productivity, and just try to, you know, work -- You know, catch that, it may be an avenue to let us have flexibility and catch what's there. You said you wanted thoughts.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I don't know how to write down something on that topic, but I appreciate the concept. That's some of the things that we're trying to think about today. Tim, and then Kerry.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. You know, Charlie, I like the way you were thinking there, and Jimmy as well, and, to my mind, and this is something I've thought about along -- I've always thought about, along those lines, and what really, in my opinion, needs to happen, what would really be very, very helpful, is a bycatch allowance.

What makes these trips profitable is to be able to catch what's biting, like you said, and what's available is what's coming over your rail. That's what's available, and, to throw these fish back, either because you're in a split season, where the porgies are low right now, but you happen to be catching them, instead of catching them next month, when you reload your trip limit, and, to me, that's where you start gaining efficiency, is where, every trip, there's a bycatch allowance, whether it's 15 percent, 20 percent, 10 percent, some percentage, so that if that --

Even if that is closed, even if it's -- Even if grouper opens in May, and you happen to be in the Carolinas, and you catch a red grouper, you know, as long as you're within that bycatch allowance,

you don't have to throw the red grouper back, but we need to establish some type of bycatch allowance, some way to prevent throwing fish back, even if you're over your trip limit, or if it's a species that that may not even be open at that point in time, but it has to be a small enough amount that you're not going to hurt the biomass, but, if you're catching it, then it's available.

It's part of the biomass that is available, and it should not be wasted, and this gets back to the discards again. You're changing discards to landings, and it's just a simple bycatch allowance. That is something that needs -- That we need to take a very, very hard look at. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Once again, you're like -- I didn't even think of it, but I think that is inspired, and I think that's exactly what we need to be thinking about. My original point was going to be to Charlie, and I think it's still germane. One of the things that I sort of struggled with, for a long time with the two-for-one is that -- Mike, can you put up that list of like on the other document, that had like the top thirteen or whatever species that are caught?

If you go down that list, as far as grouper, every grouper that we have available is overfished or overfishing, and we don't have a grouper that's not in a rebuilding plan, and so I don't think we have a lot of wiggle room there. Red porgy is in a rebuilding plan. I think the rest are fine. Red snapper, obviously, and so I think that we don't have a ton of wiggle room, but this idea of this bycatch allowance --

I would say we would probably want to be cautious about letting it happen during a spawning closure, but I would absolutely love to explore this concept. It's still getting accounted for, and it's still coming off the ACL. It's just you're -- You're almost robbing Peter to pay Paul, because you're on that spot, at that moment, catching it, and I think that is -- That is brilliant, and inspired, and there's another one in the books for you that will live in infamy.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, and that's a perfect way, and we just do bycatch allowance on species that aren't overfished, or something like that, and that can give us -- It will pick up the ACL, and our -- You know, our -- So, yes, that may be an easy way to start approaching this, and so, yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Talking about the bycatch allowance, I'm not -- We have something similar for our red drum fishery. It's a bycatch of -- I think you can take up to seven red drum as a bycatch, and it also has to be in an aggregate of other fish, to kind of say you're not targeting the red drum, but you're catching something else, and you caught a red drum, and so, I mean, that's -- You know, we're kind of doing that in North Carolina, in a quasi way, and so there's something to think about, and just how you aggregate that bycatch allowance with what you're targeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would avoid using "bycatch" in this context. Bycatch is defined in the statute as fish that are not retained. They're thrown back. You're talking about

retaining it. It's like an incidental catch allowance, or something like that, but I would avoid calling it bycatch, and that also -- Just I think, from what we saw earlier relative to trip limits, that the information we have available is that trip limits are not limiting, that they're seldom hit, and so it's hard to say, oh, you need this, because people are hitting trip limits, and, you know, that's what is constraining the catch. If they're not hitting the trip limits now, you know, what is constraining harvest, and it must be things like season closure, and stuff like that, but the information before us does not indicate that it's the trip limits. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, to that point, and, well, it's not necessarily the case for something like a vermilion snapper, or something that we have larger trip limits on. It's absolutely the case for something like a red porgy, where we have a low trip limit, and you might be on a spot when you're catching beeliners, and you happen to -- There happened to be a little mix of red porgy in there, and, again, you would be limited.

It's not going to -- It's not enough to change your whole trip, because it's red porgy, but it does allow for, again, the robbing of Peter to pay Paul. They're here today, and they might not be here next week. Put them on the boat now, since you're already catching them, and it's -- We're still accounting for them. They're still taken off the ACL, and so, yes, in most cases, you're not trip limited, but, in some of these species with much smaller limits, you are.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Shep, I would ask, and, if the trip limits aren't limiting us now, what would happen if we just took the trip limits off? You know, then, when you actually are on fish, you land them, and, when you're not, you don't. Like my boat came in the other day and said I'm not fishing for a basket a day. The water is green, and it's cold, and nothing is biting. I see the fish, but they will not bite, and then, the next trip, he may go out, but he goes out with enough bait, and enough ice, and he's targeting beeliners, and so that's what he's setting his trip up for.

He's not setting his trip up for 1,500, or whatever. He's setting his trip up, and his time, and his groceries, and his crew up for a thousand pounds, and so I think trip limits do limit us, because the boats are just loading up for that trip, because they're not going to catch -- They're not trying to catch more fish, but, if we had wiggle room, I think they would start changing how they fish, and maybe a lot of people don't do it. Maybe it affects 10 percent of the boats, but it still puts fish to the dock, puts fish to the customer, puts fish to the packing house, and I think it would make a difference.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Kerry, did you have something else?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and I'm sorry. I know I'm talking too much, but, Charlie, to that point, I think we need to be careful. The reason we have the trip limits, and the split seasons, right, is going back and thinking about we don't want a derby fishery, and we want what we've all -- We've created this complex system of these split seasons, so that we have a market all year long, and there's not a glut on the market, and all those things, and so, just to your point of what if there wasn't a trip limit, that probably, for me, would be a step too far. We're trying to balance both things, right? Just making sure we're on the same page.

MR. PHILLIPS: (Mr. Phillips' comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. MARHEFKA: Okay, and I wasn't sure. I've got you. I wasn't sure if you were suggesting we have that discussion, and okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so we have a list here of a few items. Do we want to use the sticky dots to try to figure out which ones that we want to you to do here, or do we have any other items that aren't on this list that we want to think about as a group? Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I guess, listening to the discussion, I would have a question related to probably even those first three main bullet points of permit transfers, leasing of permits, permitted vessels, and then the commercial 225 policies. It's been talked about that revising the two-for-one is something that potentially helps all of those issues, and so should they be thought about as separate topics, or should they be thought about in -- You know, as these are off-shooting effects of changing the two-for-one?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Rick.

MR. DEVICTOR: I kind of see, in my mind, and I like to bin stuff, and these are permit issues, right, and, if you change the two-for-one, it could have effects, as we're hearing around the table, to other permit issues, and so I kind of see it capturing it all together. The two-for-one, I think it's clear that it sounds like that that's a solution, possibly, to all this. The leasing, we may need some more information, and we don't quite know, and we've got to dig into it a little bit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So does that mean keep them all separated? I don't know. Amy.

MS. DUKES: The only other thing that's not on here, that the AP was really discussing, was the amount of permits that one person, and/or one corporation, can actually maintain, and so it's just - - It's not on the screen, and it could just be something that is also in these permit issues that is considered.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and it was -- I had some conversations, before this meeting, that there's some discussion about -- Whether it's income requirements, and, I mean, I know it gets sticky, but it has been brought up to me, or what are the -- Income requirements, and what else have we done? The use-it-or-lose-it provisions, things like that, so that there's -- The intent is so that people can't just buy up permits, and have them sit there, and thus slowing the capacity of the fishery.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so we just grouped a bunch of things under permit issues. Okay, and so, based on the fact that now we only have three main topics here, I don't know that we need to use sticky dots, but it also sounded like maybe we can try to figure out if we want to tackle one of those three main topics right now through some vehicle, permit issues, regional management, ways to increase trip efficiency. Based on what I've already heard around the table, it seemed like regional management is out, is off this list. Tim.

MR. GRINER: No, and I don't think we want to take that off this list. We already -- I mean, we already do regional management. I mean, how can you take it off the list? I mean, red grouper is

regionally managed, right, and so I'm not sure -- I mean, I think we need to explore regional management. That only makes sense, right?

MS. MCCAWLEY: But it's already, I guess, covered in -- Under other species, under species-specific amendments. We're trying to figure out maybe is there another commercial-type amendment, and I don't know. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I think, when it was -- When it was brought up previously, the discussion around regional management, in this context, was about some type of like broad sweeping change for regional management of the commercial sector, and so this isn't -- You know, removing it from this list isn't saying that there won't be regional management for species-specific needs. It's not taking away regional management that is already in place, but it would be the question of whether you all want to include, in your most immediate priorities, some type of broad sweeping regional management for the entire commercial sector in the region.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Does that help, Tim.

MR. GRINER: Very helpful. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So then, based on that, are we thinking that it's a lower priority than ways to increase trip efficiency, and all the permit issues, and what do we think? If we had to put these in the order of a one, two, three, what is the top priority here for these three big topics? Tim.

MR. GRINER: I mean, you know, the two-for-one, the permit issues, and then the trip efficiency, and, I mean, that's what this, really, subcommittee is all about.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and everybody is nodding yes, and so it sounds like permit issues is number one, ways to increase trip efficiency is number two, and are we thinking that this is two separate amendments, one amendment, or are we asking staff to bring back something and tell us their thoughts? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would definitely go to staff, Myra and Mike, and let them bring back how do we get there from here, and use their expertise? Absolutely.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That sounds good. Okay, and so another topic that we need to figure out, since we've narrowed down this list a little bit, and staff is going to bring back something on these topics, and then recommend a path forward, and that won't happen this week, and maybe at a future meeting, but when do we want to meet this subcommittee again? When do we want to see those items?

Of course, we'll look at the workplan later in the week, to see when we have time, but are we thinking -- When do we want to meet this commercial subcommittee the next time? Are we going to try to meet it before the June meeting, or are we going to meet it in June, or are we going to meet it after June? Jimmy.

MR. HULL: I would think that in June, just like this, before the next scheduled council meeting. It seems to work, or it looks like it works, and I think it gives enough time for staff, because they

work up everything before the next one, hopefully to have the information we need at that time also, and so that would be my recommendation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and just trying to figure out, process-wise, and when does it merge back into full committee? Like how long do we carry through this? It does seem like there will be a -- Based on what we dealt with with wreckfish, there's a lot of minutia in the permit details that that a lot of people just aren't privy to, or whatever, and so it would probably lose the interest of a lot of the committee, and so maybe I'm answering my own question, and that this -- Do we carry on in the same way we did wreckfish, the whole time?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I think so, especially, like you're saying for the permit discussions, because I think that you're going to want to get way down in the weeds on the permit discussion. I don't know that we need the whole Snapper Grouper Committee, or the whole council, for that, and so at least a couple more meetings of the subcommittee, and then we figure out the path. Is that what you are thinking, and, if possible, meet it early in the week, like on the first day, at the June meeting. Okay, and I see heads nodding yes, and I guess it kind of depends on how many slots there are available in June, or in June for everything we're going to put on the list, but the goal would be to meet like this during the council week, in-person. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and I'm fine with that. Another alternative, as we go through this, is, if we if we need to do work in between council meetings, and being respectful of budget and things like that, we do have those two AP meetings every year. It could be we met a half a day before the AP meeting, and, you know, some of us are already there, and so that's just another slot where we could potentially meet, if we needed to.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and we've got two in-person options there. I guess I would also say be thinking about if, in the future, depending on when we look at the schedule, and how many things are coming to June, September, et cetera, we might need to meet this subcommittee in between over webinar, and so just trying to keep that in the back of your mind when we look at the workplan list. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Sorry about going backwards here a minute. Could we go back to the bullet point list again, and when -- I'm looking at the bullet on efficiency, ways to increase trip efficiency, and points under that, and like we have the bycatch allowance, and would this be the appropriate place to put in something like to have more in-depth discussions of when and how to apply the new -- Like the ABC control rule, and, I mean, I think that's getting lost in the in the actual council and in -- What that does in regards to increasing efficiency.

I mean, that allows carryovers and things, and I mean, I think we're missing all that, and that -- To me, that's part of efficiency, is having that ability to implement, and to be aware, of some of these things that we've already done that, you know, are management measures that are actually in place right now that can make these trips more efficient. I mean, we're -- You know, somewhere along the line, we need to be talking about carryovers in this, and not just bycatch allowance, but actual carryovers.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thanks, Tim, and I definitely hear the concern about that, and being able to use that moving forward. I guess the place, in trying to think of it logistically with all of these other issues, there isn't really anything that is preventing the use of those provisions at this point. They're part of the control rule, and so that may be more of something for the council to keep in mind, as you all make your species-specific and your management plan decisions, as opposed to any type of policy change that would go into an amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are you good with that, Tim?

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I just want to take every opportunity to get it in front of this, as we talk about commercial fisheries, because I think we're -- I think it's easy to lose those tools that we've already got in the toolbox.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Tim. So, back on the timeline, it seems like our goal would be to meet at the beginning of the June meeting, and we would be looking at the items that we ask staff to come back with, which is not only the two-for-one, but it's other permit challenges and ways to increase trip efficiency. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, I just -- I'm sorry. Amy, did you want to go? I've been talking way more than you. My intent, and I can't tell if that's clear here, is that we are now clear that we're directing staff to begin an amendment, so that it is -- It gets properly put in the workplan, that the full committee understands that that's the intent of this subcommittee, and that the AP also understands that's the intent of the subcommittee, and so I'm not sure if we need to make a motion that subcommittee recommends to the full committee that we're ready to begin an amendment. Do you on a motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I think that that would be useful, and so if we could go back up to those topics. So we have initiate an amendment for the two-for-one.

MS. MARHEFKA: Right, and so a broader one?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and maybe so. Yes. Do you want to make a motion for that?

MS. MARHEFKA: Sure. **I move that we recommend to the full Snapper Grouper Committee that, I guess, they, or that the council initiates an amendment to -- The committee initiates an amendment that will address permit issues and trip efficiency issues. Sorry. Someone help me be more articulate in this moment. In the commercial snapper grouper fishery.** It can be edited in any way, and I don't care.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so let me try to read it again, to see if this is what you intended. Recommend to the Snapper Grouper Committee that they initiate an amendment that will address commercial permit and trip efficiency issues. All right. Is that -- Do I have a second to that? It's seconded by Jimm. Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Just making sure it's clear that the intent of this motion is that it would -- This essentially includes the two-for-one that was discussed earlier, and like this is all -- It could be packaged as one amendment, or two amendments, based on whatever staff recommends and the committee decides is going to be the path forward? Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I want to make it clear, and Monica brought this up to me earlier, as an aside, just so the AP knows, and everyone in the public knows, that the intent is this is still a limited-entry fishery. We are not changing the fact that that -- We are not having a discussion about this not being a limited-entry fishery. We are just changing the how you enter the fishery.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you for that. So, Kerry, would you like to read the motion?

MS. MARHEFKA: **I move that we recommend to the Snapper Grouper Committee that they initiate an amendment that will address commercial permit and trip efficiency issues. This may include changing the commercial two-for-one Snapper Grouper 1 policy, as previously directed.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and it's seconded by Jimmy. Under discussion. Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Yes, and, to that point, where -- It was asked of staff how long this would take, and so by -- You know, if you include, you know, the initial two-for-one elimination, and then start including these other priorities, I mean, is it still -- You have a line item opening, and, I mean, what is it -- Of course, staff will determine this, if it's doable in a reasonable amount of time to include these other things, because I think the two-for-one needs to be done ASAP.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mike.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thanks, and what we can do is we can bring back a couple of different timelines, at the next meeting, that show alternate paths that you can take, depending on what's included and not included in a given amendment. One thing to note is changing the two-for-one policy is going to require a full plan amendment. There is no shorter way of doing it, through a framework or abbreviated framework, and so, as I think Kerry brought up earlier in the meeting, when you go and you make those inquiries, those data inquiries, a lot of times, that data will overlap into something that can support several different types of actions, and so there may be some overlap in the data request that comes with the two-for-one that would possibly help for some of those other permit addressing issues, and so there may be multiple things that can be included there with some efficiency.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **Motion carries.**

DR. SCHMIDTKE: So, before moving completely off of the planning of the next meeting, I have noted here that we'll bring back those, you know, couple of different timelines, amendment formats that you can consider in addressing these, the actions that you listed earlier in the document. What other information might you need for us to be working on in the interim, because, going over timelines, I mean, we can -- If you all want to have a briefer meeting, then that's fine. We can address that probably within an hour, but, if there are pieces of information that you need in your decision-making process that we can be working on in the interim, then let me know that, so that we can structure the meeting and make the progress that you all want to make.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thoughts? Amy.

MS. DUKES: Well, the glaring missing piece of this puzzle is, of course, the permit data and being able to see what's happened from 2000 to current, and so hopefully a lot of that will come into play between now and then, but I also think looking at the overall effort, and perhaps shorter trips, less trips, I think would be also helpful.

It might loop back to that idea of increasing some trip efficiencies with potential action changes, and so maybe build upon what was started here, with the top-ten species, and think about it at a little bit more higher level, bring in a few other species. There's a couple in here -- Like I was surprised at black grouper even, and maybe looking at the trips that are coming in with ACLs that are more than 50 percent being met, or something like that, just to sort of help categorize that a little bit more.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Sorry, and, Amy, can you clarify what you're looking for with that one more time? Just I was typing in --

MS. DUKES: Sure. Absolutely. Over time, it would just be neat to see the number of trips through time, and if those -- If those trips are less in length, and so, for instance, I'll tell you that, for South Carolina, looking at the snapper grouper fishery, we are losing trips each year, and the trip lengths are also decreasing. I would like to see if that is consistent for the whole region.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Amy, does that capture it? Okay. Rick.

MR. DEVICTOR: Maybe something else for the list. I know we talked a little bit around this table about discards, and I know the logbook supplemental -- There's, you know, issues with that, but I just talking to John, and there's some observer coverage information that we may want to see.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Anything else? All right, and so we've already talked about the timeline. Tim, did you have your hand up? I'm sorry.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and just -- This is just more of an aside, Rick, and is -- Maybe it's a question for John, you know, because I -- I really like that observer program. I think that's -- You know, that seems to make the agency really happy, with the data that it gets out of that, and so, you know, I'm all for that. Is that going to maintain its current level, or is there any way that's going to increase, or -- Hopefully it's not going to absolutely go away, but is that still onboard for 2025?

DR. WALTER: Chair, thanks. I cannot speculate as to what our budgets are going to be for 2025, and so there is a strong potential that we get substantial budget cuts, which requires reprioritizing things across the multiple different competing priorities, and I think, even with the additional sampling we had, we still have low coverage, because we have a really diverse fishery, and so I do not see it increasing. If anything, there's a good potential that it might be decreasing. Thanks.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, and so I guess, in my mind, you know, we were always below that threshold, whether it was -- Where it was deemed to be absolutely useful information, as far as going into assessment, as far as data input goes, and so I guess what I'm hearing is that it's great to look at that for this subcommittee's purposes, but we don't really see it being useful for much other than that. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so we've already talked about the timeline, and so we're going to try to hold this meeting again at the beginning, maybe of the council meeting in June. Is there any other business to come before this subcommittee? All right. John.

DR. WALTER: I would like to bring up a concept that we've sort of been talking about, if you don't mind, and it's somewhat of a divergence, but we have been, as an agency, working to develop these recreational fishing exempted permits, and fleets, to study different fishing practices that might better achieve the objectives of the recreational fishery, and it seems like we're potentially missing an opportunity to similarly do something like that for the commercial fishery.

I'm speaking specifically of things like study fleets that would be able to evaluate fishing practices that might better achieve these combined aggregate trip limits. We talk that the state of Florida is working on the fifteen-fish bag limit for recreational, and is there something that would be similarly useful for commercial fisheries, and that could utilize either cooperative research monies or something like that, and I think that might be something that would be useful for this group to recommend that we continue to pursue as we try to get optimum yield out of the fishery as a whole. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any other business to come before this committee? Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Just on John's note of an, you know, EFP in the commercial sector in the snapper grouper, I think that's a good idea, and I think that it's something that is being looked at, and I've heard about like from, you know, Mote, and some others that have -- That would cooperate with that, and seeing if we could get more efficiency in the commercial sector, snapper grouper, with some type of a -- Similar to what the state of Florida is doing in the recreational sector.

So I don't know if we want to put that in here, as an additional thing to carry forward and talk about, and it's probably going to come up again anyway, and we'll have to look at it, but, you know, it goes -- For me, it all ties into, you know, the aggregate type thing, and also ecosystem-based management, which we all been talking about here too, and so it ties in, whether we list it here or not, but just -- I think it's important enough not to just hear it and move away from it, and we need to think about it and maybe discuss it some more.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and Mike is going to put it in the report.

MR. HULL: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So maybe we can have discussion in the future on this. This committee is supposed to adjourn at noon. We only have ten more minutes, but circling back to Dewey to see if you wanted to make public comment.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes, I would. Can you hear me?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Could you all put back up on the screen what was just discussed for your next meeting, please? Listening to the conversation today, it's been interesting. There's a lot of

comments, a lot of good comments, about the fishery. I think doing away with the two-for-one is long needed, and that needs to be expedited, to help people get out of the fishery, or permit changes, or people to get into fishery.

Something else is, similar to the analysis of what Amy was talking about, you know, a lot of these species that we saw on Table 1, because some of them are only caught in a few places, the majority of them, and so, if there was an analysis done by where -- What state the species are called at, and it would probably help show the picture, and the lay of the landscape, and somebody mentioned about a boat going from maybe North Carolina to Florida fishing.

Well, that probably doesn't happen a lot, and so like, for instance, and I'll use the blueline tilefish analogy, and probably 75 percent of the quota of blueline tile that's called is caught by ten boats in North Carolina, and they don't have other species to catch.

When you look at the -- I might be talking out of line here, but, when you look at the golden tilefish longline endorsement, I don't know how many of them do other things, and so if you got a -- If you got a good idea of where fish are landed at, you probably could get a good picture of where fish are caught at and representation of the fishery.

In some places, probably particular from south of Cape lookout down to South Carolina, and North Carolina, you have a mixed bag of fisheries, and so it's a little bit different, but not every place has multiple species of fish, and a further drilled-down analysis, and something else -- You know, we left 9,000 pounds of snowy grouper on the table, which is forty-five trip limits, and, you know, if we had e-logbooks, instant reporting, there should be some way for the Regional Administrator to change the trip limit based on, you know, what's been caught somehow, and so something a little different, but, as Charlie said, and others said, we need the maneuverability and the efficiency in our fisheries, and there's probably ways --

You know, when you look at the SADL work that's being done from Key West to the North Carolina-Virginia line, in forty-one to 200 fathoms, when you start looking at that data, you really see what's caught, and where it's called at, and so there's stuff out there to get a more of a representative lay of the landscape, but it's the digging part, both by staff and by the SERO data, that would probably help show a picture, and also trips, number of trips, length of trips, and all that, and the observer data that would show what is being caught and discarded in commercial fisheries, but I would ask that you look at more things like that, as I mentioned here, in a following picture of what's left of the snapper grouper fishery from Key West to North Carolina, and it's all different, as all of us know and experience, and so thank you for the time, and thanks for what you do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Dewey, and Bob Zales wants to comment as well. Is there a way that you can go to a microphone, maybe by, by Monica, or over there by Sonny? Okay.

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales, II, Executive Director of Southeastern Fisheries Association. I just want to support what you all have done. Clearly, I'm not real familiar with the history of this whole two-for-one thing, but, apparently at the time that it was created, there may have been a need for it, but that need has long since passed by.

I'm not aware of any commercial fishery anywhere, especially in the South Atlantic, that people are rushing to get into, and so, you know, the commercial fisheries, when you look at all the statistics that are out there, are clearly headed downward, and so we need to do everything we can to try to increase that effort, and try to increase the viability of the commercial fisheries, because, without commercial fisheries in this country, the consumer is going to have nothing to eat but imports, and so I just want to support what you all are doing. Thank you very much.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Bob. All right. Anything else for this subcommittee? Amy.

MS. DUKES: Can I expand a little bit on my expansion bullet there? Dewey, you made a great point, and I agree with you. We need to look at the data that we have in our pockets already, and so could we expand those trip limit analyses to include more species, and at least break it down by state? I understand that boats may be fishing in other locations, and that will have to come into our conversation, but I think, if you at least look at the landing state, it may give us a pretty good idea, at least. Then, also, I know we said number of trips over time, and lengths of trips, but in your parentheses are trip numbers and lengths, trip lengths decreasing, and so it's trip number and trip lengths, please, sir. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Anything else for this subcommittee? All right. We'll adjourn this subcommittee. Thanks for the great work today, and I'll pass it back to our chair. I believe we're coming back at 1:30 in, closed session, but I'll pass it back to Trish.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 3, 2025.)

- - -

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

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
April 10, 2025

SG Commercial  
Sub-Com.  
Mon 3/3

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

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

✓ **Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator**  
Rachael Silvas  
[Rachael.silvas@safmc.net](mailto:Rachael.silvas@safmc.net)  
843-571-4370

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

**Quantitative Fishery Scientist**  
Dr. Judd Curtis  
[Judd.curtis@safmc.net](mailto:Judd.curtis@safmc.net)  
843-302-8441

✓ **Communication and Digital Media Specialist**  
Nicholas Smillie  
[Nick.Smillie@safmc.net](mailto:Nick.Smillie@safmc.net)  
843-302-8443

**Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator**  
John Hadley  
[john.hadley@safmc.net](mailto:john.hadley@safmc.net)  
843-302-8432

w/b **Staff Accountant**  
Suzanna Thomas  
[suzanna.thomas@safmc.net](mailto:suzanna.thomas@safmc.net)  
843-571-4368

**Habitat and Ecosystem Scientist**  
Kathleen Howington  
[kathleen.howington@safmc.net](mailto:kathleen.howington@safmc.net)  
843-725-7580

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

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

w/b **Citizen Science Project Manager**  
Meg Withers  
[Meg.withers@safmc.net](mailto:Meg.withers@safmc.net)  
843-725-7577

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

**SEDAR**

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

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

w/b **SEDAR Coordinator**  
Emily Ott [Emily.Ott@safmc.net](mailto:Emily.Ott@safmc.net)  
937-479-6171

**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  
w/b 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

Rick DeVictor

Shep Grimes

Dr. John Walker

Monica Smit-Brunello

Kathy Knowlton

Bob Zales II

Sonny Cwinn

Nikhil Mehta

Joe Spraggins

SG Commercial  
Sub-Comm.  
Mon 3/3

## SAFMC Committee Membership and Liaisons Revised January 1, 2025

### **CITIZEN SCIENCE**

Kerry Marhefka, Chair  
Amy Dukes, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Carolyn Belcher  
Gary Borland  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey  
Jimmy Hull  
Jessica McCawley  
Trish Murphey  
LT Tom Pease  
Charlie Phillips  
Tom Roller  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Staff contact: Julia Byrd

### **DOLPHIN WAHOO**

Kerry Marhefka, Chair  
Tom Roller, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Carolyn Belcher  
Gary Borland  
Amy Dukes  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey  
Jimmy Hull  
Jessica McCawley  
Trish Murphey  
LT Tom Pease  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Mid-Atlantic: Skip Feller  
Mid-Atlantic: Scott Lenox  
New England: Mike Pierdinock  
Staff contact: John Hadley

### **EXECUTIVE**

Trish Murphey, Chair  
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair  
Carolyn Belcher  
Amy Dukes  
Kerry Marhefka  
Staff contact: John Carmichael/Kelly  
Klasnick

### **GOLDEN CRAB**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair  
Tim Griner  
Jimmy Hull  
Trish Murphey  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

### **HABITAT AND ECOSYSTEM**

Trish Murphey, Chair  
Tom Roller, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Carolyn Belcher  
Gary Borland  
Amy Dukes  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey  
Jimmy Hull  
Kerry Marhefka  
Jessica McCawley  
LT Tom Pease  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Staff contact: Kathleen Howington

### **OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION**

Tom Roller, Chair  
Gary Borland, Vice Chair  
Amy Dukes  
Kerry Marhefka  
Trish Murphey  
LT Tom Pease  
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

# March 2025 Snapper Grouper

## Attendee Report: Commercial Sub-Committee

Report Generated:

03/10/2025 08:50 AM EDT

### Webinar ID

107-772-515

### Actual Start Date/Time

03/03/2025 08:06 AM EST

## Staff Details

### Attended

Yes

### Interest Rating

Not applicable for staff

## Attendee Details

### Last Name

Alnes

Aukeman

Barrows

Brouwer

Bubley

Cox

DUDLEY

DeVictor

Dobbs

Evans

Finch

Foor

Gloeckner

Gore

Gray

Helies

Hemilright

Huber

Iverson

Klasnick

Knowlton

Kolmos

Lazarre

Levy

Masi

Merck

Murphey

Neer

Newman

Ott

### First Name

Alex

Trip

Katline

Myra

Walter

Jack

JEANNETTE

Rick

Jeffrey

Joseph

Margaret

Brandon

David

Karla

Alisha

Frank

Dewey

Jeanette

Kim

01Kelly

Kathy

Kevin

Dominique

Mara

Michelle

Nicole

Trish

Julie

Thomas

Emily

Pierce  
Reichert  
Roller  
Shervanick  
Silvas  
Sinkus  
Smit-Brunello  
Stephen  
Walsh  
Walter  
Webb  
Withers  
collier  
foss  
foss  
griner  
harrison  
laks  
sandorf  
thomas  
Harrell  
Schmidtke

Brett  
Marcel  
Tom  
Kara  
Rachael  
Wiley  
Monica  
Jessica  
Jason  
John  
Greyson  
Meg  
chip  
Kristin  
kristin  
tim  
Alana  
Ira  
scott  
suz  
Ryan  
Michael