

# Port Meetings for the Commercial and Recreational King and Spanish Mackerel Fisheries



## Decision Document

### Background

During their April 2019 meeting, the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel (AP) passed a motion requesting the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (South Atlantic Council) set up a series of port meetings to gather more information on the mackerel fisheries. The Council recognizes the importance of gaining a comprehensive understanding of the commercial and recreational king and Spanish mackerel fisheries and asked staff to bring back information for discussion at the September 2019 Council meeting.

#### *What was done for Snapper Grouper?*

In December 2012, the South Atlantic Council began work on a visioning project for the snapper grouper fishery to evaluate and refine current management goals and objectives. This was a transparent, stakeholder driven process which included a series of twenty-six port meetings aimed at collecting information about issues and solutions for the snapper grouper fishery. The South Atlantic Council used this process as an opportunity to improve stakeholder engagement, make use of the best management tools available, and develop a pro-active plan for the management of the snapper grouper fishery. Ultimately, the port meetings helped develop the four strategic goal areas contained in the Vision Blueprint (science, management, communication, and governance). Several amendments have addressed objectives of the Vision Blueprint including: Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 26 (Recreational Management Measures), Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 27 (Commercial Management Measures), Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 29 (Best Fishing Practices), and Snapper Grouper Amendment 46 (Recreational Reporting). The full 2016-2020 Vision Blueprint for the Snapper Grouper fishery and more information on the visioning process can be found on the South Atlantic Council's website.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://safmc.net/useful-info/council-visioning-project/>

## *What are the current objectives in the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP?*

Like all Fishery Management Plans (FMPs), the FMP for Coastal Migratory Pelagics (CMP) in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Regions (CMP FMP) contains a series of objectives to guide management decisions. The objectives should balance the biological needs of the fish stocks with human need, reconcile both present and future costs and benefits, integrate both private and public interests, and provide for a comprehensive approach to addressing problems within the fishery. Also, as the needs of a fishery change over time, fishery management councils are encouraged to regularly reassess the FMP objectives (50 C.F.R. § 600.305(b)). Amendment 6 to the CMP FMP (1992) was the last amendment to modify the objectives of the CMP FMP. In the original CMP FMP and early amendments, the objectives were linked to identified problems in the fishery. The problems listed in the CMP FMP were last updated in Amendment 9 to the CMP FMP (1998) (**Appendix A**).

## Objectives for this Meeting

This Decision Document is intended to help the South Atlantic Council choose how they would like to go about gaining a comprehensive understanding of the mackerel fisheries. The goal is to *begin* answering the **who, what, when, where, why, and how**.

### Decision 1: Why does the South Atlantic Council want to conduct port meetings for the mackerel fishery?

- The South Atlantic Council would like to gain a comprehensive view of the commercial and recreational king and Spanish mackerel fisheries because:
  - the objectives of the CMP FMP have not been revised since Amendment 6 (1992) to the CMP FMP and have not been reviewed/listed in an amendment since Amendment 12 (1999) to the CMP FMP,
  - recent amendments to the CMP FMP have been reactionary in nature illustrating the need to better understand the dynamics of the mackerel fisheries,
  - species moving northward in response to climate change is likely to impact future management of the mackerels via the CMP FMP,
  - others??
- Should the port meetings focus on just Atlantic migratory groups of king and Spanish mackerel or should the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Gulf Council) be involved in this process as well?
  - Focusing on just Atlantic migratory groups of king mackerel would involve stakeholders from the Mid-Atlantic region as the management unit extends north to the New York/Connecticut/Rhode Island line.
  - Involving the Gulf Council would allow for a “comprehensive” view of the mackerel fisheries. The Mackerel AP has indicated that involving stakeholders from the Gulf is important given the joint nature of the CMP FMP.
  - If the Gulf Council is not involved, some issues may not be adequately addressed. Additionally, any modifications to the CMP FMP objectives would require approval from the Gulf Council.

## COMMITTEE ACTION

- DETERMINE THE FOCUS OF THE PORT MEETINGS
- DETERMINE PORT MEETINGS WILL BE FOR ATLANTIC STOCKS ONLY OR BOTH GULF AND ATLANTIC STOCKS.
- OTHERS?

## Decision 2: What information does the South Atlantic Council need to have a comprehensive understanding of the mackerel fisheries?

- A thorough evaluation of current management objectives leading to a revised set of goals and objectives for the CMP FMP.
  - Evaluate objectives before soliciting input from stakeholders or solicit input from stakeholders prior to evaluation?
    - Evaluating the objectives first would be time and cost effective and allow the Council to gather specific information from stakeholders.
    - Soliciting input first promotes transparency and the Council's intent to involve stakeholders but may result in ideas that are not feasible or are outside the Council's purview.
    - Would allow stakeholders to bring forward creative strategies to meet objectives.
- A complete picture of mackerel fishery dynamics (such as stakeholders' perceptions of management performance and how stakeholders are using the resource) that leads to a strategic plan for future management of both the recreational and commercial king and Spanish mackerel fisheries.
  - What would this plan need to focus on?
    - description of current fishery dynamics
    - stakeholder views on current management
  - How far into the future would this plan apply?
  - How would the outcomes be measured?
- Others??

## COMMITTEE ACTION

- IDENTIFY KEY TOPICS TO BE ADDRESSED DURING PORT MEETINGS
- OTHERS?

## Decision 3: Who will be involved in the port meetings?

- Advisory Panel Members
  - AP members represent a wide range of stakeholder groups.
    - Only one member of the South Atlantic Mackerel AP is from the Mid-Atlantic region. May want additional representation from the Mid-Atlantic region.
    - Depending on the scope, the Gulf Council's Mackerel AP may need to be involved.

- AP members are familiar with the management process and the issues that the Council would be able to address via the CMP FMP.
- Time and cost effective.
- Other stakeholders may feel as though current AP members do not reflect their view of the fisheries.
- **Key Stakeholders**
  - How will key stakeholders be defined and selected for participation in the process?
  - Key stakeholders are often individuals who choose to serve on advisory panels.
  - Smaller groups of participants may result in a more focused discussion resulting in relevant input.
  - Time and cost effective.
  - Stakeholders that are not included in the process may become frustrated and feel as though their view of the fishery is not being represented.
- **Reach Out to All Stakeholders**
  - Depending on how information is solicited from stakeholders (Decision 4), this may be more time consuming and costly.
  - Giving all stakeholders an opportunity to participate would promote transparency and collaboration between the Council(s) and stakeholders.
  - Would provide the most comprehensive view of the fishery and result in creative ideas for future management. May also be more likely to result in ideas that are not relevant or feasible.

## COMMITTEE ACTION

- IDENTIFY STAKEHOLDERS THAT WILL PARTICIPATE IN PORT MEETINGS
- OTHERS?

## Decision 4: How does the South Atlantic Council want to approach meeting the above goal?

- **Appendix B** offers details the visioning process for the Snapper Grouper FMP as well as several options for king and Spanish mackerel fisheries.
- Does the South Atlantic Council want to primary rely on public meetings to obtain stakeholder input?
  - Mid-Atlantic Council found port meetings to be the most important and useful part of their visioning process.
  - Port meetings were a key process of the snapper grouper visioning process.
- Should public meetings be conducted in person, via webinar, or a combination?
  - Webinars are more time and cost effective, but it can be challenging to facilitate the discussion. Webinars may exclude those stakeholders that are less familiar with the technology.

- In person meeting are more time consuming and costly but allow for more engaging presentations and discussion and would likely result in better input from stakeholders.
- Webinars accompanied by listening stations reduce costs while allowing members of the public to have in-person discussion with their Council members.
- How does the South Atlantic Council want to refer to this process?
  - Vision Blueprint for the [Atlantic?] Coastal Migratory Pelagic Fishery
    - Concise
    - The public is familiar with the term from the snapper grouper visioning process.
    - If the intent is to conduct a “slimmed down” version of visioning, this name might be misleading.
  - Port Meetings for the Mackerel Fisheries
    - Vague, does not illustrate the intended outcome of the port meetings.
  - Evaluation of Management Objectives for the CMP FMP
    - Concise, makes the Council’s intent clear to the public.
    - Implies a focus on both Atlantic and Gulf stocks of mackerel.
  - Strategic Planning for the Mackerel Fisheries
    - Strategic planning is a concept familiar to many people.
    - Strategic Planning is a field with specific tools and approaches, which many limit the Council’s ability to be creative.
  - Others??

## COMMITTEE ACTION

- DETERMINE HOW TO REFER TO PORT MEETINGS
- DETERMINE WHETHER PUBLIC INPUT SHOULD BE GATHERED IN-PERSON OR VIA WEBINAR (WITH OR WITHOUT LISTENTING STATIONS)
- OTHERS?

## Decision 5: When and Where will port meetings be conducted?

- The CMP FMP covers a wide area including the Gulf of Mexico and Mid-Atlantic regions.
- If port meetings are to be held in person, what areas of the coast should be prioritized? If meetings are to be held via webinar should they be separated by region and/or topic?
  - Focusing on central communities that are dependent on the mackerel fisheries may decrease the number of meetings necessary. For example, focusing on ports with the highest number of CMP FMP permitted vessels (**Appendix C**).
    - This works for commercial fishermen and charter/for hire, but would not cover private recreational fishermen.
  - To save on cost, port meetings could be held in conjunction with already scheduled meetings (evenings after meetings or beforehand, depending on meeting length).
    - The South Atlantic Council could ask to collaborate with/use the meeting spaces of the Gulf Council, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council,

and/or the Gulf and Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commissions to extend the reach of meetings depending on their priorities (**Appendix D**).

#### **COMMITTEE ACTION**

- DETERMINE WHETHER PORT MEETINGS SHOULD BE HELD SEPERATELY OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH COUNCIL MEETINGS
- OR
- DETERMINE HOW WEBINARS SHOULD BE SCHEDULED TO ADDRESS NECESSARY AREAS OF THE COAST.
- OTHERS?

# Appendix A. Problems and Objectives listed in the CMP FMP

## Problems in the CMP FMP

Problems in the fishery as addressed previously in the amended FMP (last updated in CMP Amendment 9 (2000)):

1. The stocks of Spanish mackerel and Gulf group king mackerel are below the level of producing MSY, and spawning stocks have been reduced such that recruitment has been affected. The harvest levels of Atlantic king mackerel are close to their upper limit. Uncontrolled fishing would further reduce biomass. (Note: the Gulf group Spanish mackerel stock recovered above the OY level [30% static SPR] in the 1997-98 fishing year and continues to be neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing).
2. (a) Available recreational catch statistics were not designed to track catch for quota purposes. (b) Additional biological and statistical data on both the recreational and commercial fisheries are needed and economic information that assesses the impact of regulations and allocations is not available.
3. Intense conflicts and competition exist between recreational and commercial users of the mackerel stocks and between commercial users employing different gears.
4. The existence of separate state and federal jurisdiction and lack of coordination between these two make biological management difficult; since, in some instances, the resource may be fished beyond the allocation in state waters. (Note: in recent years, most states have adopted compatible regulations for bag limits, size limits, quota closures, etc. with federal regulations).
5. The condition of the cobia stock is not known, and increased landings for the last ten years have prompted concerns about overfishing.
6. Lack of information on multiple stocks or migratory groups of king mackerel that may mix seasonally confounds and complicates management.
7. Large catches of mackerel over a short period causes quotas and TAC to be exceeded before closures can be implemented; therefore, some users have obtained a share in excess of their allocation.
8. Closures of a fishery and reversion of bag limits to zero due to the filling of a quota have deprived geographic areas of access to a fishery.
9. Fish caught under the bag limit and sold contribute to the filling of both the recreational and commercial quotas.
10. Part-time commercial fishermen compete with full-time commercial fishermen for the available quota.

11. Localized reduction in abundance of fish due to high fishing pressure.
12. Disruption of markets.

### **Objectives in the CMP FMP**

The current CMP FMP lists eight plan objectives (last updated in Amendment 6 (1992)):

1. The primary objective of this FMP is to stabilize yield at MSY, allow recovery of overfished populations, and maintain population levels sufficient to ensure adequate recruitment.
2. To provide a flexibly management system for the resource which minimizes regulatory delay while retaining substantial Council and public input in management decisions and which can rapidly adapt to changes in resource abundance, new scientific information, and changes in fishing patterns among user groups.
3. To provide necessary information for effective management and establish a mandatory reporting system for monitoring catch.
4. To minimize gear and user grouper conflicts.
5. To distribute the TAC of Atlantic migratory group Spanish mackerel between recreational and commercial user groups based on the catches that occurred during the early to mid-1970s, which is prior to the development of the deep-water run-around gill net fishery and when the resource was not overfished.
6. To minimize waste and bycatch in the fishery.
7. To provide appropriate management to address specific migratory groups of king mackerel.
8. To optimize the social and economic benefits of the coastal migratory pelagic fisheries.



# Appendix B. Example Visioning Timelines



## SG Visioning Process (3 Years)

In December 2012, the Council began developing a plan for a visioning process which included extensive stakeholder engagement throughout the region and across all sectors in the fishery. This stakeholder-driven visioning process was then conducted for the Snapper Grouper Fishery.

The timeline below illustrates what went into the development of the 2016-2020 Vision Blueprint for the Snapper Grouper Fishery



### Three Key Components of the Visioning Process

Council Visioning  
Workshops



Stakeholder Port  
Meetings



Development of the Final  
Vision Blueprint



Develop Vision  
Statement

Develop  
Strategic  
Goals

Stakeholder  
Engagement  
Plan

Conduct Port  
Meetings

Discuss  
Identified  
Issues

Review Draft  
Goals and  
Objectives

Final Vision  
Blueprint  
Document

Date Complete for Snapper Grouper		
□	December 2012	Background information on strategic planning. Initial discussions on the desired product/outcome and the process necessary to achieve such an outcome.
□	March 2013	Determine how the Council will refer to this process, how existing objectives should be evaluated, which stakeholders would be involved and how stakeholders will be involved.
□	April 2013	Advisory Panel members review draft visioning process recommend revisions to existing objectives.
□	June 2013	Council formulates a draft vision statement and goal statements for the fishery and reviews existing management objectives.
□	August 2013	Public hearings conducted to inform the public of the visioning process, timeline for proposed port meetings, and how they can participate.
□	September 2013	Continued discussion of strategic goals and objectives, discussion of port meeting structure and topics.
□	November 2013	Advisory Panel tests and provides input on proposed structure for port meetings and pre-port meeting outreach material.
□	December 2013	Continued discussion of strategic goals and objectives and port meeting structure and topics.
□	January 2014	Pre-port meeting outreach, including a flyer mailed to all permit holders.
□	February 2014	Port meetings held in Murrells Inlet (2), Charleston, and Columbia, South Carolina.
□	March 2014	Port meetings held in Southport, Shallotte, Morehead City, Sneads Ferry, Wanchese, Hatteras and Raleigh, North Carolina. Port meetings held in St. Augustine (2), Titusville (2), Stuart, Lake Park, and Key West, Florida.
□	April 2014	Port meetings held in Marathon and Key Largo, Florida. Port meetings held in Savannah, St. Simons Island, Shellman Bluff, and Brunswick, Georgia. Port meeting held in Charleston, South Carolina. **

Date Complete for Snapper Grouper		
□	June 2014	Review of port meetings and state summaries and planning for the October workshop.
□	July 2014	Council staff retreat to plan for October workshop.
□	October 2014	Breakout sessions with facilitated discussions on key issues and solutions. Identification of next steps for the vision blueprint. NOTE: This was a special three-day workshop held outside of normally scheduled Council meetings.
□	December 2014	Review and discussion of draft strategic goals for management and communication.
□	March 2015	Review and discussion of draft strategic goals for science and governance.
□	April 2015	Advisory Panel asked to provide input on draft strategic goals and strategies being sent to public to collect input.
□	June 2015	Review draft vision blueprint document and approval for public hearings.
□	August 2015	Public hearings held to gather input on draft vision blueprint strategic goals document.
□	September 2015	Review public input on draft vision blueprint document and planning for the October workshop.
□	September 2015	Council staff retreat to plan for October workshop.
□	October 2015	Prioritize short term and long-term action items, discuss process for turning vision blueprint action items into amendments and next steps. NOTE: This was a special two-day workshop held outside of normally scheduled Council meetings.
□	November 2015	Advisory Panel asked to provide input on priority action items and amendment ideas based on prioritized items in the draft vision blueprint document.
□	December 2015	Review final vision blueprint document and approve prioritized items. Review evaluation plan for vision blueprint.

Note: As part of this process a Visioning Workgroup was created that met outside of the meetings detailed in this timeline to help guide the visioning process and develop necessary materials. The Visioning Workgroup included both Council members and Council staff.

Amendments to the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan that have addressed items in the 2016-2020 Vision Blueprint:

- Amendment 37 (management boundaries for hogfish)
- Regulatory Amendment 26 (recreational management measures)
- Regulatory Amendment 27 (commercial management measures)
- Amendment 46 (recreational reporting) – under development
- Regulatory Amendment 29 (best fishing practices and powerheads) – under development

Other projects that address items in the 2016-2020 Vision Blueprint:

- System Management Plans
- Citizen Science Program activities
- MyFishCount
- Fishermen's Forum
- For-Hire Electronic Reporting Trainings
- Socio-economic Characterization of the Commercial Snapper Grouper Fishery
- Outreach material on the Council's webpage and social media accounts.



# Full Visioning Process (4 Years)

Below is a tentative timeline for conducting a full visioning process for king and Spanish mackerel, including participation by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Gulf Council).



## Three Key Components of the Visioning Process

Council Visioning Workshops



Stakeholder Port Meetings



Development of the Final Vision Blueprint



Develop Vision Statement

Develop Strategic Goals

Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Conduct Port Meetings

Discuss Identified Issues

Review Draft Goals and Objectives

Final Vision Blueprint Document

### Tentative Timeline for Mackerel

□	September 2019 through June 2020	<p>Council Visioning Workshops</p> <p>South Atlantic and Gulf Council discuss the following during their respective Council meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to refer to this process</li> <li>• How existing objectives should be evaluated.</li> <li>• Decide which stakeholders would be involved and how stakeholders will be involved.</li> <li>• Review existing management objectives.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic and Gulf Councils develop the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft vision statement and goal statements for the fishery</li> <li>• Comments on strategic goals and objectives</li> <li>• Port meeting structure and topics.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic and Gulf Advisory Panels discuss the following during a joint meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft port meetings process.</li> <li>• Recommended revisions to existing objectives.</li> <li>• Input on port meeting structure and topics.</li> </ul> <p>Public hearings conducted to inform the public of the visioning process, timeline for proposed port meetings, and how they can participate.</p>
□	July 2020 through April 2021	<p>Stakeholder Port Meetings</p> <p>Pre-port meeting outreach, including a flyer mailed to all permit holders.</p> <p>Port Meetings held along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-Atlantic: Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, New York</li> <li>• South Atlantic: North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida East Coast</li> <li>• Gulf of Mexico: Florida West Coast, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas</li> </ul>

□	June 2021 through March 2023	Development of the Final Vision Blueprint
		<p>South Atlantic and Gulf Councils complete the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review port meetings and state summaries.</li> <li>• Review and discuss draft strategic goals.</li> <li>• Review draft vision blueprint document and approve for public hearings.</li> <li>• Review public input and final vision blueprint document.</li> <li>• Prioritize action items to be addressed.</li> <li>• Review and approve evaluation plan.</li> </ul> <p>Two workshops (separate from Council meetings) are held to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss key issues and solutions and identify next steps for the vision blueprint.</li> <li>• Prioritize short-term and long-term action items.</li> <li>• Discuss process for turning action items into amendments.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic and Gulf Advisory Panels discuss the following during a joint meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide input on draft strategic goals and strategies.</li> <li>• Provide input on priority items and review draft vision blueprint document.</li> </ul> <p>Public hearings held to gather input on draft vision blueprint strategic goals document.</p>

Pros:

- Including the Gulf Council will provide a truly comprehensive look at mackerel fisheries managed via the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery Management Plan (CMP FMP).
- Stakeholders have indicated that, due to the joint nature of the CMP FMP, it is important for Gulf fishermen and South Atlantic fishermen to understand the issues facing both groups.
  - Especially in Florida, Gulf and South Atlantic fishermen are known to interact and compete for price during certain times of the year.

Cons:

- Conducting a full visioning process throughout the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico will be very expensive.
  - Costs include but are not limited to: staff travel for public hearings (at least 4 staff traveled for each snapper grouper port meeting), Council member travel to select public hearings and additional workshops, hardcopy outreach material, meeting rooms.
- Conducting a full visioning process throughout the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico will be very time consuming
  - Extra time would be required during Council meetings for discussion of the visioning process, taking away from other priorities and/or requiring Council meetings to start earlier.
  - The Gulf and South Atlantic Council's will need to agree on the vision statement, goals and objectives, and the port meeting process. Disagreements between the two Councils could extend the timeline.
  - Council staff that work on the visioning project will have less time for other Council priorities.

Additional notes:

- The Gulf Council may not feel visioning for king and Spanish mackerel is a priority.



# Modified Visioning I (3 Years)

Below is a tentative timeline for visioning of Atlantic migratory group king and Spanish mackerel. In this scenario the Gulf Council is not involved, and all port meetings take place during a South Atlantic Council meeting or a Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Mid-Atlantic Council) meeting.



## Three Key Components of the Visioning Process

Council Visioning  
Workshops



Stakeholder Port  
Meetings



Development of the Final  
Vision Blueprint



Develop Vision  
Statement

Develop  
Strategic  
Goals

Stakeholder  
Engagement  
Plan

Conduct Port  
Meetings

Discuss  
Identified  
Issues

Review Draft  
Goals and  
Objectives

Final Vision  
Blueprint  
Document

### Tentative Timeline for Mackerel

□	September 2019 through April 2020	Council Visioning Workshops
		<p>South Atlantic Council discusses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to refer to this process</li> <li>• How existing objectives should be evaluated.</li> <li>• Decide which stakeholders would be involved and how stakeholders will be involved.</li> <li>• Review existing management objectives.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic Council develops the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft vision statement and goal statements for the fishery</li> <li>• Comments on strategic goals and objectives</li> <li>• Port meeting structure and topics.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic Advisory Panel discusses the following during a joint meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft port meetings process.</li> <li>• Recommended revisions to existing objectives.</li> <li>• Input on port meeting structure and topics.</li> </ul> <p>Public hearings conducted to inform the public of the visioning process, timeline for proposed port meetings, and how they can participate.</p>
	May 2020 through March 2021	Stakeholder Port Meetings
		<p>Pre-port meeting outreach, including a flyer mailed to all permit holders.</p> <p>Port meetings held during Council meetings in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Port meeting in Virginia Beach, VA (Mid-Atlantic Council Meeting)</li> <li>• Port meeting along FL east coast (pre/post South Atlantic Council meeting in Key West, FL)</li> <li>• Port meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mid-Atlantic Council Meeting)</li> <li>• Port meeting in Charleston, South Carolina (South Atlantic Council Meeting)</li> <li>• Port meeting in Riverhead, New York (Mid-Atlantic Council Meeting)</li> <li>• Port meeting in Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina (South Atlantic Council Meeting)</li> <li>• Port meeting in Baltimore, Maryland (Mid-Atlantic Council Meeting)</li> <li>• Port meeting in northeastern North Carolina (Mid-Atlantic Council Meeting)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Port meeting in Jekyll Island, Georgia (South Atlantic Council Meeting)</li> </ul>
□	June 2021 through September 2020	Development of Final Vision Blueprint
		<p>South Atlantic Council completes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review port meetings and state summaries.</li> <li>Review and discuss draft strategic goals.</li> <li>Review draft vision blueprint document and approve for public hearings.</li> <li>Review public input and final vision blueprint document.</li> <li>Prioritize action items to be addressed.</li> <li>Review and approve evaluation plan.</li> </ul> <p>Two workshops (separate from Council meetings) are held to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss key issues and solutions and identify next steps for the vision blueprint.</li> <li>Prioritize short-term and long-term action items.</li> <li>Discuss process for turning action items into amendments.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic Advisory Panel discusses the following during a joint meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide input on draft strategic goals and strategies.</li> <li>Provide input on priority items and review draft vision blueprint document.</li> </ul> <p>Public hearings held to gather input on draft vision blueprint strategic goals document.</p>

Pros:

- Only conducting visioning for the Atlantic migratory groups of king and Spanish mackerel is more time and cost effective than including the Gulf migratory groups and the Gulf Council.
- Holding port meetings during already scheduled Council meetings would lower the cost of port meetings.

Cons:

- The CMP FMP is a joint fishery management plan between the Gulf and South Atlantic Council. Ultimately, any changes to the goals and objectives in the CMP FMP would require approval by both Councils. Proposing changes to goals and objectives based solely on information gathered in the South Atlantic is not ideal.
- Only holding port meetings at pre-scheduled Council meeting locations may result in important areas of the coast being passed over.

Additional notes:

- The Mid-Atlantic Council must be onboard with letting us use their Council meeting space for port meetings.
- Participation by the Gulf Council could be added to this scenario, it would simply extend the timeline.
- Working with the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission may also be possible. Historically, they have had two meetings a year (March and October) in one of the five Gulf states.





# Modified Visioning II (2.5 Years)

Below is a tentative timeline for visioning focusing on only Atlantic migratory group mackerels. The Gulf Council is not involved, and all port meetings take place via webinar with listening stations in the relevant areas.



## Three Key Components of the Visioning Process

Council Visioning Workshops



Stakeholder Port Meetings



Development of the Final Vision Blueprint



Develop Vision Statement

Develop Strategic Goals

Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Conduct Port Meetings

Discuss Identified Issues

Review Draft Goals and Objectives

Final Vision Blueprint Document

### Tentative Timeline for Mackerel

□	September 2019 through April 2020	Council Visioning Workshops
		<p>South Atlantic Council discusses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to refer to this process</li> <li>• How existing objectives should be evaluated.</li> <li>• Decide which stakeholders would be involved and how stakeholders will be involved.</li> <li>• Review existing management objectives.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic Council develops the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft vision statement and goal statements for the fishery</li> <li>• Comments on strategic goals and objectives</li> <li>• Port meeting structure and topics.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic Advisory Panel discusses the following during a joint meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft port meetings process.</li> <li>• Recommended revisions to existing objectives.</li> <li>• Input on port meeting structure and topics.</li> </ul> <p>Public hearings conducted to inform the public of the visioning process, timeline for proposed port meetings, and how they can participate.</p>
	May 2020 through November 2020	Stakeholder Port Meetings
		<p>Pre-port meeting outreach, including a flyer mailed to all permit holders.</p> <p>Webinars with listening stations held throughout the South Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic regions.</p>
□	December 2020 through March 2021	Development of Final Vision Blueprint
		<p>South Atlantic Council completes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review port meetings and state summaries.</li> <li>• Review and discuss draft strategic goals.</li> <li>• Review draft vision blueprint document and approve for public hearings.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review public input and final vision blueprint document.</li> <li>• Prioritize action items to be addressed.</li> <li>• Review and approve evaluation plan.</li> </ul> <p>One workshops (separate from Council meeting) held to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss key issues and solutions and identify next steps for the vision blueprint.</li> <li>• Prioritize short-term and long-term action items.</li> <li>• Discuss process for turning action items into amendments.</li> </ul> <p>South Atlantic Advisory Panel discusses the following during a joint meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide input on draft strategic goals and strategies.</li> <li>• Provide input on priority items and review draft vision blueprint document.</li> </ul> <p>Public hearings held to gather input on draft vision blueprint strategic goals document.</p>
--	--	---

Pros:

- Only conducting visioning for the Atlantic migratory groups of king and Spanish mackerel is more time and cost effective than including the Gulf migratory groups and the Gulf Council.
- Holding port meetings via webinar with listening stations in each state significantly lowers the cost of conducting port meetings.
- Holding port meetings via webinar as opposed to in-person takes less staff time.
- Including listening stations with the webinars still allows members of the public to have in-person conversations with their Council members.

Cons:

- The CMP FMP is a joint fishery management plan between the Gulf and South Atlantic Council. Ultimately, any changes to the goals and objectives in the CMP FMP would require approval by both Councils. Proposing changes to goals and objectives based solely on information gathered in the South Atlantic is not ideal.
- It is challenging to have conversations with stakeholders and among stakeholders via webinar. Meetings would be less interactive which may prevent creative ideas from being discussed.
- Setting up listening stations in the Mid-Atlantic states might be challenging given South Atlantic Council members do not reside in those areas.

Additional notes:

- Participation by the Gulf Council could be added to this scenario, it would simply extend the timeline.



## APPENDIX C. SAFMC, GMFMC, MAFMC, AND ASMFC 2020 MEETING SCHEDULE

LOCATION	STARTING	ENDING	LOCATION	STARTING	ENDING
NEW ORLEANS, LA	January 27	January 30	SAINT PETERSBURG, FL	June 15	June 18
ARLINGTON, VA	February 4	February 6	ARLINGTON, VA	August 4	August 6
DUCK, NC	February 11	February 13	PHILADELPHIA, PA	August 10	August 13
JEKYLL ISLAND, GA	March 2	March 6	AUSTIN, TX	August 24	August 27
GULF SHORES, AL	March 30	April 2	CHARLESTON, SC	September 14	September 18
GALLOWAY, NJ	April 7	April 9	RIVERHEAD, NY	October 6	October 8
ARLINGTON, VA	May 4	May 7	GULFPORT, MS	October 26	October 29
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	June 2	June 4	WRIGHTSVILLE BCH, NC	December 7	December 11
KEY WEST, FL	June 8	June 12	BALTIMORE, MARYLAND	December 15	December 17

[illegible]

## Appendix D. CMP Permits by County

The following maps illustrate the number vessels holding one or more Coastal Migratory Pelagics (CMP) permits by county throughout the Gulf of Mexico, South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic and New England regions. CMP permits include the commercial king mackerel permit, commercial Spanish mackerel permit, South Atlantic charter/headboat permit for pelagic fish, Gulf of Mexico charter/headboat permit for pelagic fish, and the historical captain Gulf of Mexico charter/headboat permit for pelagic fish. Only unique vessels are included in the map, i.e. vessels holding more than one CMP permit were only counted once. 2020 meeting locations for the South Atlantic, Gulf, and Mid-Atlantic Councils and the Atlantic States Commission are included in the maps.







