

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **WRECKFISH SUB-COMMITTEE**

### **Webinar**

**February 8, 2024**

### **Transcript**

#### **Wreckfish Sub-Committee**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Tim Griner

Kerry Marhefka  
Andy Strelcheck

#### **Council**

Trish Murphey

#### **Council Staff**

Christina Wiegand  
Myra Brouwer

Dr. Judd Curtis  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke

#### **Attendees and Invited Participants**

Rick DeVictor  
Kristin Foss  
Karla Gore

Nikhil Mehta  
Monica Smit-Brunello

#### **Observers and Participants**

Other observers and participants attached.

The Wreckfish Subcommittee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on February 8, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Christina, I think we're ready to get going. Do you want to start, and are we starting in the decision document? How do you want to do this, Christina?

MS. WIEGAND: I think, because this is a like formal subcommittee meeting of the council, we have to go through and approve the minutes from the last meeting, which, now that I'm thinking of this, I didn't include, but so at least approve the agenda and then dive right into the decision document.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Will do. All right. We are calling to order the Wreckfish Subcommittee, via webinar, and we had our last meeting in -- Was that September?

MS. WIEGAND: It was September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and we don't have the minutes from the meeting, and, since that meeting, we talked about what we talked about in the September meeting at the December council meeting, and so, today, we will approve this agenda, and then we'll dive into the amendment document, and we'll do any other business, and so are there any changes to the agenda that you can see there on the screen? Any items you know that we need to talk about under Other Business today? I don't see any hands. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I just want to say that Tim is having trouble logging-in, and so I don't know if there's someone who can reach out to him, and, Christina, I just want to make sure -- As we go through these actions, will we get a little overview of sort of what the LEAP had spoke about last week?

MS. WIEGAND: Absolutely. When we get to those actions, I will go over what the LEAP discussed.

MS. MARHEFKA: That's all I have.

MS. WIEGAND: Myra, would you mind reaching out to Tim?

MS. BROUWER: Not at all. I'll take care of it.

MS. WIEGAND: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thank you both. Are there any objections to the approval of the agenda for today's meeting? All right. Seeing none, and no hands, we will consider this agenda approved, and, Christina, I will pass it over to you.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. I will dive us right into the decision document, which is Attachment 1a, and I'm not going to talk too much about the background, and I think everyone here knows why we're talking about this amendment, but it all sort of stems from that wreckfish ITQ review that was completed back in 2019, and so, as you can see, this has become a pretty lengthy amendment.

If you include subalternatives, there's about eighteen actions in this amendment, and this includes everything that the subcommittee added at their September meeting and then the council then approved at their December meeting, like Jessica was talking about, and so what we're really looking to do today is review the updated action analysis, select preferred alternatives for all of these actions, and then consider approval for public hearings during the June 2024 council meeting.

Just to remind you guys of the timeline we're on, the hope is that you guys will make those decisions here, and we'll bring those to the full Snapper Grouper Committee, and the Full Council, at the March meeting, for them to discuss and approve. Should they approve, we would be holding public hearings at the June 2024 meeting and taking final action in June of 2024, and so that's the current timing for this amendment.

Here's the purpose and need statement, and I will sort of quickly pause here for a second, to see if there are sort of any desired changes, but this has been pretty set in stone, for this amendment, for the last few meetings, but we'll go ahead and give it a brief pause, to see if there are any hands with concerns.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't see any hands, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so, moving on, I'm going to go ahead and go through all eighteen actions, and I know some of these already have preferred alternatives, and may not need as much discussion as others, but I still want to make sure that we touch on each one of them and that everyone on the subcommittee is on the same page, and so that starts us off with the sector allocations action.

Your current preferred alternative would modify the sector allocations from the current 95 percent commercial and 5 percent recreational to 98 percent commercial and 2 percent recreational. Again, just a little context, and it was originally a 100 percent commercial fishery. Back during the Comp ACL Amendment, you did shift 5 percent to the recreational sector, and that was simply to allow some retention in the case of bycatch of wreckfish, given the high discard mortality, and not to encourage a specific recreational wreckfish fishery.

I am not going to sort of go over all of the environmental consequences again, and these have not changed since last time you reviewed this document, but I will, again, sort of just pause and see if there's any discussion that you all would like to have here or if you are still comfortable with your current preferred alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Christina. I'm looking to see if we have any hands, and I feel like we've had a lot of good discussion on this particular action in the past, and, as you mentioned, we already have a preferred, and I don't see any hands on this particular action, and so I'm going to pass it back to you.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Moving us along to Action 2, this is the action that looks at implementing the electronic reporting system for the wreckfish ITQ program. Your current preferred alternative is to indeed implement that and move away from the paper-based reporting system. That electronic program would track ownership, transfer of quota distribution, transfer of annual allocation, and electronically record wreckfish landings as part of the coastal fisheries

logbook program, and so this is the amendment that will get wreckfish sort of with the e-logbook program, with the rest of snapper grouper that was done as the e-logbook amendment.

Again, I'm not going to go over the environmental consequences here, and they have not changed since the last time you all reviewed this amendment, and so just, once more, a quick pause here, to make sure we're still good with this preferred alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I just had a question for Andy, as we're kind of embarking on this electronic system, and, Andy, do you have an idea, from your staff, how quickly this program could be up and running? Is this something that could start later this year, so that it can go live say in January of 2025, and have you guys thought about that, or talked about that? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: You're funny, Jessica. The electronic system -- So keep in mind that, once the council takes action, and develops an amendment to submit to the agency, we have to go through a whole rulemaking process, and so we will begin electronic development of the system, but it certainly wouldn't be ready by the start of next year's fishing year, and so the question would be whether we could transition midyear next year, or whenever that system is fully developed, versus waiting for a clean transition point at the start of the next fishing year, but it will take some time to develop an electronic system and implement it, but we can get started once the council takes final action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. That was super helpful.

MR. STRELCHECK: While I have the mic, I guess one point of clarification, and so it says "and will electronically record wreckfish landing information as part of the coastal logbook program", and so, with the Gulf IFQ programs, we still require logbooks, but we also require landings to be recorded with the dealer, and so is that still the vision here? I just want to make sure we're understanding the preferred alternative correctly.

MS. WIEGAND: My understanding is that is indeed still the vision here, and our intent was to include some of that detail in the discussion of the amendment document.

MR. STRELCHECK: Great. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Kerry.

MS. WIEGAND: It looks like you're still muted on your end, Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I just sounded so smart talking to myself, too. I wish you could have heard it. My question is to Andy, and sort of asking about, you know, if it's going to be, you know, a little bit, obviously, to get the electronic system up and running, what does that mean in regard to all of the other provisions? Will they all come online at the same time, or will the other provisions in this amendment go through regular rulemaking and go into place, and then the electronic part will come on when it's ready, or will they all go into place at the same time?

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess I would want to look at all the provisions in the amendment and determine, obviously, whether it makes more sense for all of them to come on at the same time or some could start sooner, versus later, and we certainly have the ability to delay the kind of

implementation date for rulemaking, in order to allow everything to kind of coincide with implementation, but so I don't have a clean answer for you. I think probably we would want to try to line up any sort of new regulations that would occur, that are related to the electronic system, all happening at the same time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Any other questions, or comments, on this electronic system, or on this action? We've already selected a preferred here, and I guess, Christina or Myra, do we know if Tim was able to get on the webinar?

MS. WIEGAND: It looks like we've got him. Tim, if you want to test your mic, real fast. All right. We've got him on the list, but we're not sure if his audio is working. Myra, or Mike, can troubleshoot with him.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Sounds great. I don't know that we have anything else on this action, and I'm going to pass it back to you, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Then on to Action 3. This is the action that looks to modify the requirement to possess a commercial vessel permit for wreckfish. Again, this is one that the subcommittee, and the council, had quite a bit of discussion on. The original impetus for this was feelings that the requirement to possess two permits, that wreckfish permit and a snapper grouper permit, in addition to owning shares, was duplicative and unnecessarily burdensome. Additionally, sort of the language in there about the entity being an employee, contractor, or agent of the vessel, and it's pretty difficult, from an administrative standpoint, without requesting a lot of additional information than is typically required for permit applicants.

So you've got Alternative 1, which would still continue to require that wreckfish permit, and then you've got Alternative 2, which would still require the wreckfish permit, but it would remove that sort of agent and contractor language, and it would require specifically a snapper grouper unlimited permit. Preferred Alternative 3 would require that snapper grouper unlimited --

MS. BROUWER: Christina, your audio is not working currently.

MS. WIEGAND: I must have re-muted. How much of that stuff did you get? Any of it?

MS. BROUWER: Just the beginning. Maybe the last few seconds we didn't hear anything.

MS. WIEGAND: Okay. Then I will go back to sort of the different alternatives. Alternative 1 requires that wreckfish permit and has that sort of complicated agent of the vessel language. Alternative 2 would remove that sort of complicated agent language, but it would still require the wreckfish permit and a snapper grouper unlimited permit specifically. Your current preferred alternative, Alternative 3, would require the snapper grouper unlimited permit and for the permit holder to be a wreckfish shareholder, and so this sort of mirrors the system that's currently in place.

Then Alternative 4 would be a little bit less restrictive, and then it would only require the snapper grouper unlimited permit, and so one of the things that I want to note here is that the IPT has gone back and forth on this a little bit. Currently, the way the CFR is written, it does not specify whether it should be a snapper grouper unlimited permit or the 225 permit, and both would be acceptable. Our understanding is that the intent of the council was always to require the snapper grouper

unlimited permit, one of the main reasons being that it's not really cost-effective to try to harvest wreckfish with the 225 permit.

Currently, all of the shareholders in the fishery do have the unlimited permit, and so I just sort of wanted to bring to your attention here that Alternative 2, 3, and 4 would specify that it needs to be that snapper grouper unlimited permit, and so, with that, I will sort of turn it back over again, and you guys had quite a bit of discussion about this, and you have reviewed the environmental consequences before, and so I will just pause here again and see if there's any desire to discuss more or to revisit your current preferred.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It looks like Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks. Sorry, and I know we've gone over this several times, but I just had a quick suggestion. In the main wording of the action, it's talking about the requirement to possess the permit, where, in all the alternatives, it starts off with to commercially harvest or sell wreckfish, and, based on some of the actions we have later in the document, I'm wondering if it might make some sense to sort of add some wording to Action 3, at the end, that says, you know, sort of a commercial vessel permit for wreckfish, in order to harvest or sell wreckfish, and I'm not going to wordsmith it, but it flows better with how the alternatives are worded.

Then I just wanted to clarify that, in my mind, we absolutely only meant Snapper Grouper 1, and I'm not so sure that the economics of the 225 is the argument, because I -- You know, we would have to look at the law, but I think that's just for snapper grouper species, the 225-pound limit, and I wonder if, technically, if you had a snapper grouper 225, and you went wreckfish fishing -- I don't think you would be bound to 225 pounds, and so it could be sort of a backdoor way, and so just a thought there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry. That was interesting, and I hadn't thought about that. Christina, did you want to respond to anything that Kerry brought up, before I go to Andy? I see Monica's hand up, and Charlie Phillips' hand up, but I didn't know if you wanted to respond to Kerry's comment, and then I'm going to keep going down the list here.

MS. WIEGAND: I agree that some of that rationale for the SG 2 permit is something that we should include, and then I just wanted to be clear on how you wanted the language for Alternative 3 to be modified, and you wanted to move this to commercially harvest or sell to a different part of the alternative wording?

MS. MARHEFKA: No, and I'm sorry if I wasn't super clear about that, and I can always email you, and see if the IPT thinks that it makes sense, but, under the title for Action 3, it says, you know, modify the requirement to possess a commercial vessel permit for wreckfish, but, under each alternative, it starts "to commercially harvest or sell wreckfish", and so I feel like we need, in the main title of Action 3, to somehow mention to commercially harvest or sell wreckfish, because you have to -- On a glance, they're not saying the same thing. In other words, there could be a scenario, based on all of these iterations we have later in the document, if we chose -- I don't think we're going to, but, if we chose certain variations of requirements to get permits, I don't want it to appear like you could have a commercial vessel permit for wreckfish, but not the ability to harvest and sell it. Does that make sense at all?

MS. WIEGAND: That makes perfect sense, and the IPT can absolutely modify that wording. Not a problem at all.

MS. MARHEFKA: Okay. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, both. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Great catch, Kerry, in terms of the action title. Weighing-in on the unlimited, I agree, in terms of the intent for the snapper grouper unlimited permit, and I did want to note that Alternative 3 is also the most restrictive, and certainly, if that's our intent, right, then we would maintain it as the preferred alternative. 4 would be allowing, essentially, a non-wreckfish shareholder, but someone that essentially buys annual allocation of wreckfish from a wreckfish shareholder, and has that permit requirement, the ability to go out and catch wreckfish, and so I just wanted to note that. I don't really have a preference, or a recommendation, here, but, if the intent is to be less restrictive, then Alternative 4 would provide that. Otherwise, Preferred Alternative 3 is the most restrictive.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Thanks for bringing that up. At least for me, I like the more restrictive alternative, based on the discussions that we've had on this in the past and the discussions that the shareholders had, but certainly, if other people feel differently, then please raise your hand. I'm going to go to Monica, and then I see that Charlie Phillips, a shareholder, has his hand up, and so let's go to Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have done some research on whether you could use a 225, if the council would have allowed that, or an unlimited, and all that sort of thing, and my thoughts are that you could not -- If you were a wreckfish shareholder, and you had a 225-pound permit, you would be limited to that 225, and, going back through different amendments and those sorts of things, it's clear, to me, that the council meant that you had to have an unlimited permit, and so I was just going to say, initially, that I would like to work with the IPT, and we can have some more discussion in the document about that, on the council's intent, just to make it very clear, and then we would need a little bit more discussion, I think, as well as does this make much of a difference to the fishery, and not really, because, right now, all the shareholders hold an unlimited permit, and, you know, just that kind of discussion. Then, Kerry, I agree, and I like your idea about revising the title of the action to be more specific as to what the various alternatives do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Monica. Christina, it sounds like Monica has made some suggestions for the IPT, and are you good with all that?

MS. WIEGAND: Absolutely.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Sounds great. Let me go back to Kerry, real quick, and then we'll recognize Charlie.

MS. MARHEFKA: Sorry to belabor this, but, just because Monica asked for rationale, and needing additional rationale for the unlimited versus the 225, I just wanted to remind everyone that, you know, the council is in the process of looking at the 225s in general, and, no matter what we do with them, if you go back to the original intent of the 225, they just weren't intended for the

purpose of, you know, sort of fulltime commercial fishermen, which you would pretty much have to be to be in the wreckfish fishery, and so just a little more rationale for the IPT.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sounds great. Thank you, Kerry. Charlie Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just a point of clarification. You know, obviously, I've got multiple boats, and one of them catches most of the wreckfish, but I put a -- They're all corporations, which means the corporation owns the permit, even though I own all the corporations, but I've got a wreckfish permit on one of the boats that doesn't have allocation currently, and so I can send it to catch the rest of the fish, or he can maybe make a trip or two, when he's not doing something else, and, according to this, I may have to move some allocation over to each boat that I may or may not want to send offshore wreck fishing, and so is that how this is written, or -- Because I'm a shareholder, and I am the 100 percent shareholder of the different boat corporations, and can I move stuff around, and so how is that going to work?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that. Christina, do you want to try to answer?

MS. WIEGAND: I will say that Andy has his hand up, and I might let him take a stab at it first, but, otherwise, I'm happy to jump in, if needed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sounds great. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I will jump in, and then Jessica is also listening, and she may want to weigh in, and so, Charlie, there are, I guess, two options, I guess the way I'm thinking of it, and the first would be, under the current preferred alternative, you would essentially have to have a second shareholder account that is associated with your second vessel and snapper grouper permit, and then that would be consistent with the regulations.

The alternative to that is what I was discussing earlier, which is Alternative 4, which allows you the flexibility to move wreckfish quota from your shareholder account, and the permit that's associated with it, to another vessel that's also permitted, and so that provides broader flexibility than having to have multiple shareholder accounts under your name or corporations.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thanks, Andy, and that may be -- That may be a better plan, but I would like to hear from some of the other shareholders, to see what they think, because I'm not the only one that has another boat, you know, that may want to go, you know, participate in the fishery. I added up what I caught last year, and, between weather and some other issues, I left some quota on the table, and having a second boat will make me -- I should be able to catch, you know, my quota this year coming up, and so I'm just trying to figure out how to be efficient and still, you know, do what we need to do regulation-wise, and so it might be a good idea if some of the other shareholders, you know, tell me, but Alternative 4 might be a better plan, just quickly thinking off the top of my head, but, if I need to set up new quota around, and then move coupons around, it just seems like a longer way to get where we need to go.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Charlie. Let's go to Jessica Stephen and then back to Kerry.

DR. STEPHEN: I just wanted to make sure that we were clarifying not just another shareholder account, but you would need shares in it as well, under Alternative 3, and I think Charlie



understood that, listening to him speaking, but I wanted to make sure that was on the record, and so not just be having an account, but having shares in it as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Jessica. That makes sense. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: In my mind, the reason I believe we went with Preferred Alternative 3 was because what we were trying to avoid was having people hold -- I guess what we want is people who have the permits to be people who actually are fishing in the fishery, which, of course, Charlie, in your situation, that's exactly what is happening, and so I wouldn't want Alternative 3 to prevent you from being able to fish in the way that works best for you all, but am I mistaken, Jessica McCawley, and do you have the same recollection, that we picked Alternative 3 because we're just trying to avoid people having shares, or having permits, and not fishing, and just holding onto it, so that the fishery isn't sort of realized?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, that, and the leasing, and all of those pieces, and we were trying to avoid some of the pitfalls that are happening in the Gulf, and we had some lengthy discussions on it, and so yes to those things and more was why we selected Preferred Alternative 3.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm sorry to jump back in, but I'm just wondering, and could Charlie -- Like, in Charlie's situation, could he -- For one of the boats that he was just talking about, where he would move some shares over, is it -- Does it make sense to like have one share, if you will, like a small amount sitting there, so that, if you needed to move it over, and you still met these provisions of Alternative 3, or are we really shutting down that opportunity for you, Charlie, in Alternative 3?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: No, and I can -- I just need to figure out what the hoops are, so I know how to jump through them, and, you know, if I need to move 1 percent of the share over to the Running Rabbits, I can do that, and then it's there, and then, if for some reason they don't fish, I can move the coupons back to the other boat, and so I can do that, and, you know, considering the conversation that I've heard, and the protections that it gives the industry, I can live there. I'm pretty easy, when I'm not being a troublemaker.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Charlie. Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: I'm not sure if this suggestion is helpful, but one of the things we could do is sort of pause discussion on this action now and then maybe go through the rest of the actions that address participation and eligibility, because I think there's some stuff in those actions that may change how you want to think about this action, given that it addresses things like the ability to continue to maintain shares, the ability to get allocation from those shares, in order to even be able to harvest, and so I don't know if having those discussions first would be helpful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think it would be, but let's go to Andy first.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, certainly we can pause discussion, and my suggestion was just going to be to maintain the preferred for now, and I think we could have follow-up conversation with Charlie, and other wreckfish participants, and then maybe bring this issue to the March

meeting for a little bit more clarity and kind of explain what it means to operate under Alternative 3, versus Alternative 4, and in particular if you have multiple vessels that are harvesting wreckfish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy, and so, Christina, let's stop the discussion on this action, and continue moving through the document, and, if we need to, come back to this.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. That brings us to some of these newer actions, the first being Action 4, and this is looking at wreckfish ITQ online shareholder account eligibility, and so what you would need to have in order to even get an online account, and so, under Alternative 1, in order to get an account, individuals would simply have to be a United States citizen, permanent resident alien, corporation, partnership, or other entity that is eligible to own and control a U.S. fishing vessel, and that's required by Magnuson.

Under Alternative 2, individuals must, again, be United States citizens, et cetera, as well as hold a valid commercial snapper grouper unlimited permit, and so one thing to note here, again, is that all current shareholders do hold a valid snapper grouper unlimited permit and that, under Alternative 1, no action, NMFS is going to need to create a whole new sort of application form for wreckfish, to gather the necessary information, whereas, under Alternative 2, that information would already be provided through applications for the required permits.

Environmental consequences here, this is purely an administrative action, and so this doesn't direct affect the physical or biological environment. For the economic consequences, adding that requirement under Alternative 2 may provide an additional cost to the wreckfish fishery, if they don't already have the snapper grouper unlimited permit, but, again, of course, all current participants at least hold that permit. The social effects are very similar to the economic effects, noting that sort of that additional burden would be experienced by new entrants into the fishery.

Finally, Alternative 2 will have a higher administrative impact on the agency than Alternative 1, just with the need to cross-reference and check citizen status and permit status, but the costs can be minimized by using sort of the existing structure and methods that are in their current catch share system, and so, with that, I will turn it back to the subcommittee for discussion. We do need to pick a preferred alternative under this action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Christina. Thoughts from the committee, and, yes, we need to select a preferred here. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: **I would move that we select Alternative 2 as our preferred, my rationale being that I think it's more restrictive, keeping with what has been our common theme of we want everyone who has a permit, who has allocation, who has shares, to actually have the ability to harvest the species, and so, therefore, I feel like we need to be the most restrictive.**

Christina, real quick, under discussion, if you're retaining that for the council meeting, if you look under the third bullet, you mention Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, and I think it's just a copy-and-paste, but there is no Alternative 3 in this action, and so it's under the discussion.

MS. WIEGAND: It sure is a copy-and-paste error. I caught it when I was reviewing the document this morning.

MS. MARHEFKA: You already got it.

MS. WIEGAND: It's absolutely a copy-and-paste error from the last meeting, but thanks for noticing that, Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am just very guilty of that, very, very guilty of that, myself, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry, and so we've had a motion, and some discussion. Do we have a second?

MR. STRELCHECK: I will second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's under discussion. While we're under discussion, can someone give us an update on what's happening with Tim?

MR. GRINER: I think I've got it now.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Tim. So we're under discussion on this motion that has a second to select Alternative 2 as the preferred. Is there any objection? Well, first, any more discussion on that? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I was just going to say that I support Kerry's rationale. You know, it is certainly our intent to ensure that shareholdings are maintained by, you know, people that are going to be fishing them, and are in the fishery, and so it makes sense to, obviously, also have the snapper grouper permit associated with opening an account.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Andy. We've had good discussion on this. **Is there any objection to this motion?** Okay. **I don't see any hands, or hear anything, and the motion carries.** Back to you, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Next up, we have requirements for obtaining and maintaining shares within the online system, and so, under Alternative 1, currently, there are no requirements to obtain or maintain shares. Anyone can get shares within the online system, and anyone can maintain them. Of course, you would still have to meet whatever requirements were set in Action 3 in order to harvest them, but, currently, no requirements within the online system.

Alternative 2 would simply require all shareholder accounts to be associated with U.S. citizens, et cetera, again required by Magnuson, and Alternative 3 would require citizenship, and then you will notice that this language has changed a little bit from when we discussed it in September, to address that valid versus valid and renewable language, and so, in order to obtain shares, someone would have to have a valid snapper grouper unlimited permit, and then, in order to maintain shares, and so hold existing shares within a shareholder account, they must hold a valid or renewable commercial snapper grouper permit, and the reason the "renewable" language is included for maintaining shares is because it's possible that a fisherman, going through the process of renewing their permit, might sort of fluctuate in and out of between a valid and renewable status.

So how long between the end date of a permit, or a termination date of a permit, is something that we'll discuss in Action 6, which addresses share divestment, and so that's why that language

changes between obtaining and maintaining shares, and so, before I sort of go into the environmental consequences, I did want to pause and make sure that everyone sort of understood why that language had been adjusted and what it means for that alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. I feel like we had a good discussion about this at the last meeting, but let's make sure that everybody understands why this is in there. Monica, do you want to speak to this?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I wanted to speak to the wording of Alternative 3, and so, Christina, the last sentence says that a shareholder account is associated with a permit, if the permit has the exact same entities listed on both the shareholder account and permit, and maybe, the first time we use "permit" in that sentence, we state the snapper grouper unlimited permit, and I just don't want there to be any confusion, when the reg writers get this, or by anybody else, as to what we mean, and so that's just something to think about.

MS. WIEGAND: Absolutely, and we can certainly adjust that language.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica. Any other discussion on this action? Do people understand the whole valid and renewable concept here? We did have a lot of discussion about this at our meeting in September. I'm just checking for hands. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I don't know if Christina wants to go through the environmental consequences or not, but I'm ready to make a motion, if we're at that point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead with your motion, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: **That we recommend selecting Alternative 3 as the preferred.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Andy. Do we have a second?

MS. MARHEFKA: Second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Kerry. Andy, did you want to speak to your motion, and then we'll go into the environmental consequences?

MR. STRELCHECK: Sure. Certainly, to obtain shares -- Obviously, it would make sense that you would have to have that unlimited permit. We also don't want people to inadvertently lose their shares just simply because their permit becomes invalid and is in a renewable status, and so you do have the one year, obviously, to renew the permit. During that time, you're unable to fish the quota, until it is, obviously, valid, but it allows for, obviously, some time, in terms of a lapse in the permit, to continue to maintain those shares and that they remain valid.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Christina, do you need to talk about the environmental consequences before we vote on this?

MS. WIEGAND: I mean, I can go over them just very briefly, so that it's on the record, noting that, you know, there are no biological consequences here, and it's an administrative action. Again, for sort of the economic and social actions, it has a lot to do with what's more restrictive, with

Alternative 3 being the most restrictive, and then Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 being less restrictive, which, of course, you guys have discussed, and, just noting again, for the admin effects, that Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 will have higher administrative effects, compared to Alternative 1, because that online system will have to be developed cross-reference. As long as we're sort of utilizing the catch share system currently in place, that does lower the administrative burden slightly.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Christina. All right, and so we have a motion to select Alternative 3 as the preferred. Any more discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, and hearing none, the motion carries.** Back to you, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. That moves us into Action 6, which looks at share divestment for permit-required accounts, and so, because you guys have selected Alternative 3 as the preferred, this means that accounts, to maintain shares, have to have those permits. If they don't, there then needs to be a system in place for NMFS to sort of reclaim those shares, and so, under Alternative 1, there is no specific requirements for NMFS to reclaim those shares.

Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 address two different things. Alternative 2 addresses how long current shareholder accounts have to become in compliance once this amendment goes into place, and so Subalternative 2a would be, on the effective date implementing this amendment, they have to be in compliance with the requirements to maintain shares. Subalternative 2b would give them one year, and then Subalternative 2c would give them three years.

Alternative 3 addresses sort of, after this amendment has been implemented, if a shareholder is no longer in compliance with the requirements, how long they have to divest of their shares before NMFS will come in and reclaim them, and Subalternative 3a is one year following the end date on a permit, Subalternative 3b is three years following the end date on a permit, and, again, I want to pause here, and so staff changed this language a little bit to be specific, and it was perhaps a little presumptuous of us, assuming that Alternative 3, or a permit requirement, would be selected under the previous action, but, since that is what you guys selected, we want to go ahead and move forward with this conversation.

Right now, in the alternative language, it says the end date on a permit, and Monica and Jessica Stephen and I talked about this a little bit yesterday, and Jessica provided some really helpful information that I want to share with you all, and so the term "end date" is specifically a field that's in the permit system that can be tracked, and it means a permit is no longer valid for fishing, and it can be because of, you know, transfer, a vessel is sold, a vessel is leased, a lease agreement ends, the permit expires, et cetera, and there are a number of events that could trigger a specific end date in a permit.

There is also what is known as a termination date, which is when the permit can no longer be renewed, and that's typically one year after the expiration date, and so I want to sort of note here that there's a difference between the end date and the termination date. The end date is what we have now, and so I think it's worth the subcommittee having some discussion on what specifically they would like to see for these subalternatives. Is it one year following the end date on a permit or one year following the termination date of a permit, because those are two different things.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks. Christina, I want to make sure that I follow this. Currently, where we have like Subalternative 3a, and it's one year following the end date on a permit, what that means, based on your conversation yesterday, is -- One year following the end date is most likely also the termination date, correct, and, if we chose termination date, that technically could be as much as two years from the last day they were actually allowed to harvest fish, and am I understanding that correctly?

MS. WIEGAND: Correct. That is my understanding.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Kerry. A reminder that we need a preferred here, but I don't know, Christina, if you want to go through more of the consequences, or if people have other questions.

MS. WIEGAND: I don't see any hands raised at the moment, and so I can briefly go through the consequences. Again, no biological effects, and this is an administrative action. Again, for the economic effects, you know, Alternatives 2 and 3 allow NMFS to reclaim those shares, to make them available to compliant shareholders, which, you know, could help lead to better utilization of the available commercial wreckfish quota as a whole, and would, thus, increase overall net economic benefits. Similarly, with the social benefits, it prevents individuals from holding on to shares that they don't have the ability to utilize, and it would ensure that the social benefits are realized by fishing communities that have compliant shareholders.

Then, again, Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would require an increased administrative burden to the agency. They would have to track the accounts, and create an account to hold the reclaimed shares, and sort of create a method to transfer those shares, which we'll talk about in the next action, and then record the reason for reclamation. With that, I will turn it back to you all for discussion and selection of a preferred alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Christina. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: All right, and so, thinking this through, based on sort of what Charlie mentioned earlier too, and so, right now, everyone that is operating in the fishery meets all the criteria, right, and we know, via the discussion, that everyone already has a Snapper Grouper 1 permit, but, based on what we chose back in -- Or what we were talking about back in Action 3, some shareholders might have to do some finagling, if we stuck with Alternative 3 in Action 3, whereas they had to be a wreckfish shareholder, that vessel had to have wreckfish shares associated with it, and so some of these guys, like Charlie, with multiple boats, might need some time to get that set up, because, the way I sort of see it -- My rationale for all these decisions are we want to maintain the fishery as it is existing now, and I want to curb any speculation, and so that makes me want to be more restrictive, but not so restrictive that the folks that are operating now can't get it set up the way they need to.

That would make me -- That's my long way of saying I wonder if -- I'm torn between Action 2, Subalternative 2, or Action 3, Subalternative 3a, and I don't feel that we need to consider any of like sort of the three-year timeframes, because that just seems like a really long time, and I think that most of these guys are already in compliance, and those are just my thoughts on the situation.

MS. WIEGAND: I should note here that you can select, and I think the intent, with the way this alternative is written, is to select a preferred alternative under Alternative 2 and a preferred alternative under Alternative 3, with Alternative 2 addressing sort of shareholders that are in the fishery currently, and would have to come into compliance with these regulations upon implementation of the amendment, and then Alternative 3, addressing any sort of future scenario after that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for explaining that, Christina. I did not understand that. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I was going to say the same thing, and so thanks, Christina, for the clarification. From my vantage point, for both Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, I do see three years as just too long of a time period to come into compliance, and I'm torn between 2a and 2b, in terms of selecting a preferred. We do know, obviously, right now, that most shareholders are in compliance, and I can't say for certain if they're all in compliance, and so that kind of leads me to think that Subalternative 2b would be a preferred, and then Subalternative 3a, but I wanted to pose that, before making a motion, to see if Kerry or Tim or Jessica -- If you have other thoughts.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Where you were going, after I heard the explanation from Christina, I think that that's where we need to go as well, but it looks like other hands are going up. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. You know, I realize that three years seems like a long time, but one year is not a very long time, and I guess my concern, with the one year following the effective date of implementing the amendment, is that one year could be a very bad year for someone, and they could have health issues, or they could have boat issues, and there could be a lot of reasons why they could not -- Why they were not in compliance one year following, and so I think it's not the initial implementation, but it's what can happen down the road, and that's my concern with the one year.

I know that three years sounds like a long, long time, but, at the end of the day, it almost takes -- You know, it takes a half-year to do anything, legal-wise, and so, if you're talking about, you know, corporate work, or boat work, and there could be a lot of reasons why one year -- You could blow through a one-year period and still not be in compliance. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tim. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Tim, I mean, there are some good points there, and I think separating them - - If you look at Alternative 2, I could -- The only reason I could see going for three years is if someone needed to obtain two snapper grouper permits in order to be in compliance for the snapper grouper unlimited, because they do take a long time to find two, and to afford two. However, at this point, this is only for people who are participating in the fishery when this comes online, which means pretty much everyone that's already in the fishery that already has that, but I could give a little on that. I was very much leaning towards Andy's suggestion.

I feel pretty strongly about staying with Alternative 3, 3a, because, again, one year following the end date on a permit -- We could change that to -- So one year following the -- Again, the termination versus end date, and that's -- One year following the end date on a permit is potentially two years of not fishing, if I'm recalling that correctly, and so I think one year is fine, once the

plan is already in place. Do we need longer, while we are getting this plan in place, I think is the question.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Kerry. Thoughts from others here? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I appreciate what Tim is saying. I guess the way I'm thinking of it is as, you know, one year following the end date on a permit, which is essentially the renewal period, and so you're going to have to renew that permit, in order to maintain it anyway, if you have health issues or something else, and so then I think the only other compliance hurdle was making sure that you had shares associated with that permit, in order to maintain the shares, and so I guess I see this as not really a limiting factor, in terms of, you know, a high risk of losing shares, based on these requirements, even if it's a shorter period of time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Any more thoughts, or would someone like to make a motion here? Tim.

MR. GRINER: I was just going to thank Andy for that, and that helped me right there. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy, would you like to make a motion?

MR. STRELCHECK: Sure. **I will make a motion that we select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2b, and Alternative 3, Subalternative 3a as our preferreds.**

MS. MARHEFKA: I will second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. It's seconded by Kerry. Christina is getting this on the board there. We've already had some good discussion on this, and that discussion certainly helped me. I was a little bit confused about fishing versus, you know, one year following, and how long someone would have been fishing by the time this action takes place, and so that helped me a lot. Any additional discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **Seeing none, and hearing none, that motion carries.** Back to you, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: Monica has her hand up. Do you want to go to Monica first, before I move on, if it's to this?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Good call. Go ahead, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thanks. I don't want to be a broken record, but, on Alternative 3, both Alternative 3a and 3b talk about end date on a permit, and I think we ought to be specific that we're talking about the snapper grouper unlimited permit, and I think we ought to be specific, in the discussion, as to what we mean by "end date". I want everybody who looks at this to really understand what an end date means, and I think we could give examples.

You know, throughout, for all these different actions and alternatives, I think -- For some, I believe Jessica has given, I guess, presentations to the council, with text boxes and those sorts of things, and my suggestion is, if we can pull over some of those text boxes, which are examples of what these things mean -- I mean, this is a pretty complicated amendment, and one action, you know,



really intertwines with other actions, and those sorts of things, and so, as best we can explain those things to the public, through examples, and to other council members, and to shareholders, and to everybody, I think it would be really helpful if we could add some examples and things like that, and so that's my suggestion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That was helpful, and so I think I understand the text box example, but that was a really great point, Monica, about we need the snapper grouper permit, and so I do think that that needs clarification, and, Christina, can you clarify, one more time, what we mean by "end date", because now I might be confused.

MS. WIEGAND: So "end date" means the end date when the permit has ended, but can still be renewed, and I see that Jessica has got her hand up, and I will say the information I'm telling you is quoted from an email from her, and so we might go ahead and let her explain in her own words.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thanks, Christina. Go ahead, Jessica.

DR. STEPHEN: In our permits system, we have things like effective dates, expiration dates, end dates, and termination dates, and so it's something within the system. Any time, for whatever reason, if your permit expires, if you sold your vessel, or if the vessel lease agreement ended, anything that would move that vessel away from the permit, or not have it renewed, gets an end date, and so the end date covers a variety of situations, which means that, when you have an end date, that permit is no longer valid for harvesting.

It does typically follow where you have that entire year, and so, for example, if you have an expiration date, when that expiration date comes up, and you have not renewed your permit, the end date is the same as the expiration date, and then you have a year in which that time is to renew your permit, or your permit will terminate, and so there's a couple of different situations, which is why we didn't just say on the expiration of the permit, because there's other situations that would make that permit invalid for harvesting, and all of those have an end date populated at that point in time.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That was helpful, and so, just to make sure I understand, so an end date is kind of like -- I think it was Christina that said it, but it means that you can no longer harvest, but the permit can still be renewed, and is that right, Jessica?

DR. STEPHEN: Yes, that is correct, and so, under a variety of different circumstances, that permit can be renewed. It also will be there if you transfer the permit, and so, if you transfer the permit to someone else, then that's an end date, and I don't see that happening as likely within here, but it's another reason. If you transfer a permit, then, obviously, it's been renewed by someone else, and not by you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Got it. That's helpful, too. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So, Jessica, to -- You're not talking about then the expiration date on the permit, and I ask because does the permit holder know what the end date is?

DR. STEPHEN: So, under normal circumstances, with nothing changing, and they didn't renew it, your end date is also your expiration date, and we can make that very clear, I think, within the

document. If you do some other action, that would make that permit no longer valid for harvesting, such as you sold the vessel -- We normally see that because the vessel is now being applied for under a different permit holder, but, if your vessel lease agreement was given to us, and that end date occurs, then you have an end date because of that, and that was supplied by the permit holder to us at that point in time, and, if you transfer your permit, that also would then end the permit, and so it's a little bit broader than just the expiration date, and I think we can list out a lot of that for their availability, and I can check with our Permits Office, if we list any end dates on our FOIA pages, but we could probably add that fairly easily, so there could be a way for someone to search and see that.

MS. WIEGAND: I was going to say that I use the FOIA page frequently, and you guys do include end dates and expiration dates on the FOIA page.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That was helpful. I guess I would just ask -- Well, let me go to Monica, and then I will ask my question.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It was helpful, and just, you know, those are the kinds of things, if we can have it in the discussion to explain what we mean by that, I think it would be really helpful. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica beat me to it, and I was going to ask the same thing, because that discussion alone was helpful to help me understand exactly what we're doing in this action here. It looks like Christina maybe is going to add something about end dates here to the discussion. All right. Thank you, Christina. Christina, do you think we're good to go to the next action?

MS. WIEGAND: I feel like I have all the information I need for the IPT to move forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. All right. Back to you.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so next up, still talking about reclaimed shares, is how NMFS would redistribute the reclaimed shares to remaining shareholders, and so, again, under Alternative 1 right now, there's no requirement for NMFS to reclaim, or redistribute, shares of shareholder accounts that are not in compliance with those new requirements to maintain shares.

Alternative 2 would have the shares redistributed to shareholders equally, and Alternative 3 would have them redistributed based on the proportion of remaining shares held by each remaining shareholder. Alternative 4 would redistribute shares based on the most recent landings history, with 4a being the most recent five fishing year and 4b being the most recent three fishing years. One thing important to note, especially important for the wreckfish fishery, is that, in the case that a shareholder has met the share cap, they are simply not eligible to receive any redistributed shares, and so, again, this doesn't affect the biological environment in any way, because it's an administrative action. For the economic effects, Alternatives 2 and 4 would result in sort of net economic benefits, when compared to Alternative 1, because it would likely lead to better utilization of the wreckfish quota and an increase in the total net economic benefits.

For the social effects, similar to the economic effects, with a note that it's going to have a positive social effect on active shareholders overall, how that's distributed amongst the South Atlantic coast would depend on what communities current shareholders were currently residing in, and then, for

the administrative impacts, the impacts of all the subalternatives would likely be similar, with Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 having a higher burden than Alternative 1, but, again, this burden may be eased by modifying the existing catch share online system that's used for the Gulf ITQ program to accommodate the preferred alternative chosen for this action. With that, I will turn it back over to the committee for discussion and selection of a preferred alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Christina. I have questions, I guess, for the group. When I read these alternatives, and I looked at the one that was based on landings history -- So I think that the intent of that would be, if someone is not fishing, and so let's say someone did not have landings over the last year, or the landings were very low, and then, when the reclaimed shares are redistributed, they might not get any, or they would get a low amount, and so, in other words, the landings are indicating how active, I guess, you were in the fishery, and you're distributing the reclaimed shares based partly on activity, and is that how you would -- Is that what that means, by landings?

MS. WIEGAND: Yes, that's how I interpret it, and so, if a shareholder, for one reason or another, had comparatively low landings over that three or five-year time period, they would then be receiving comparatively less of the redistributed shares.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Thanks for that, and so, subcommittee folks, thoughts on this? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Christina, I couldn't find the minutes we had from that September meeting we had down in Florida, and do you happen to recall what the shareholders -- How they felt about this?

MS. WIEGAND: So this was one that the shareholders never really came to an agreement on. One of the things they discussed at length was sort of a unique way to handle this, or a pot that a given shareholder could dip into, or someone who wanted to get into the fishery could dip into, and then, at the subcommittee meeting that followed that, you all also sort of had a discussion about that possibility, and there was concern that developing a structure like that would likely delay this amendment a little bit, and so the thought was to move forward with one of these alternatives and leave that as something that could be talked about in the future, but I will also note that Mike Freeman is a shareholder, and he could certainly share his perspective of that meeting as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. Kerry, I'm going to go ahead and go to Mike, so that he can offer his thoughts on this. Mike Freeman, can you hear us?

MR. FREEMAN: There is drawbacks, I think, in every alternative on this, unfortunately. My only concern, and it's not necessarily for the current shareholders, but it's more of just a general outlook on incentivizing redistribution based on landings. That, unfortunately, would give a pretty valid reason for future shareholders to submit landings that were not actually landed, in order to hopefully receive a larger proportion of any potential reallocated shares. If you have two months left in the season, and you have 30,000 pounds that you don't think that you're going to be able to catch, I could see reason for someone to maybe inflate their landings, to ensure that they don't miss out on any shares, in the event that something were to be reallocated. I don't know how likely a scenario like that is, but I'm always hesitant to incentivize that kind of behavior in the first place.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mike. That was helpful. I hadn't thought about that, and so you said that there were kind of down sides to all of these alternatives, and do you want to speak to any of the other alternatives here?

MR. FREEMAN: I'm on my phone, and so I'm trying to read through them, but, even if the event of say an equal redistribution, we kind of run into the same problem, where what would prevent somebody from just opening up as many shareholder accounts as they had snapper grouper permits for? If I have a snapper grouper permit that I do not actively fish wreckfish on, I could transfer some baseline amount of shares into that company, and then, in the event of an equal redistribution, I would receive a larger proportion of the overall available share quota, and I think that's kind of one of the reasons that we were leaning towards potentially some form of novel approach to this, is because, unfortunately, just due to the nature of it -- It always kind of leads to a gamification of the system, as opposed to the shares going where ultimately they really need to go, in order to be properly utilized.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Mike. I'm going to go to Andy, and, Andy, is Alternative 3 how they do it in the Gulf? Can you remind us?

MR. STRELCHECK: We have NMFS-held shares right now, but those have not been redistributed, and so we actually haven't finalized a plan, in terms of how those get redistributed in the Gulf. A couple of comments, and so, one, and maybe it was mentioned, but we need to acknowledge that, if there is someone that's bumped up against the share cap, that they would not be receiving any additional shares under the redistribution.

My second comment, and I appreciate Mike weighing-in, and I was leaning toward a landings requirement, and I still think that, you know, what Mike was saying would be concerning, and you would essentially have to commit perjury, by making false statements, not only on logbooks, but submission to the electronic reporting system, and the dealer would have to be complicit, and, on top of that, you're going to end up paying cost recovery fees on any falsified landings, without the benefit of, obviously, receiving any money from those landing themselves.

With that said, you know, I've never really thought that Alternative 2 was all that viable, and I think Mike brings up a good point that, if you create many, many share accounts, right, you can benefit from equal distribution of shareholdings, and so I land on either Alternative 3 or 4b, I guess it would be, the three-year timeframe for landings.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. That was helpful. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: That was actually really helpful, and, I mean, there's going to be a way to game the system no matter what, but Andy brought up what I was thinking, and like, if they want to pay their 3 percent extra cost recovery share on the chance that, at some point, there might be shares to be redistributed -- I mean, we're not going to plug every hole, and so, with that said, I agree with Andy, and I think I would lean more towards Alternative 4b as our preferred, at the time, and I don't know how Tim feels, or anyone else, and so --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry, would you like to make that in the form of a motion?

MS. MARHEFKA: I am happy to. **I move that we select Alternative 4b as our preferred alternative for Action 7.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Kerry. Is there a second?

MR. STRELCHECK: Second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Andy, and, Andy, you also have your hand up.

MR. STRELCHECK: I will go to Kerry first, if she has anything more that she wants to discuss.

MS. MARHEFKA: No, and I think I said my rationale.

MR. STRELCHECK: Okay, and so what I would add is that I believe Subalternative 4b also -- "Reward" might be the wrong word, but, essentially, it benefits those that are actively participating in the fishery, and especially if you might be a smaller shareholder that is ultimately leasing quota allocation, on an annual basis, from a larger shareholder, and it also is going to benefit, obviously, shareholders that are fishing their quota, right, and so being able to distribute that reclaimed quota, based on landings history, really gets to, I think, the intent of what we're trying to accomplish, which is making sure the quota is in the hands of those that are fishing it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks for that discussion. **Is there any objection to this motion to select Subalternative 4b as preferred under this action?** I'm sorry. Tim, did you want to help discuss this, before we voted?

MR. GRINER: Yes, please. Andy brought up a good point there that made me start thinking, and so, if we go the landings route, are the -- The shares are then going to be reallocated to the shareholder? However, the guy that had the landings could have been leasing allocation, and is that correct? So he wouldn't -- Would there be a situation where you were responsible for those landings, but the shares did not trickle down to you, because you're just leasing the allocation?

MR. STRELCHECK: So, based on, you know, the preferred that we selected earlier, and certainly, Jessica, help me out if I get something wrong, but everyone that is going to be landing wreckfish is going to have to have a snapper grouper permit and at least some percent of shareholdings, right, and that doesn't then prevent them from leasing annual quota from other shareholders and increasing the amount that they could land in a particular year, and so, when quota is reclaimed, or shares are reclaimed, because someone is not in compliance with the program, we would then redistribute based on that landings history, and so a shareholder that may have leased out his quota to someone else would get disproportionately less of the landings relative to someone that may be leasing quota and actually landing more than what their shareholdings are, if that makes sense.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Before we vote, Mike Freeman.

MR. FREEMAN: Tim actually asked the exact question that I had, when Andy brought up the leased shares, and I just wanted to ensure that, in the event that a shareholder leases shares, and they land those lease shares, that, in the event of redistribution, those landings are calculated in

favor of the actual vessel that landed them, and not the shareholder account, and I don't know if that would need any additional considerations in how it's structured, but I would hate to see a scenario like the Gulf, where shares just get leased out, and landed by other vessels, and then, ultimately, the real economic benefit still lies with the shareholder themselves, even when they're not fishing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mike.

MS. WIEGAND: Jessica, if it's helpful, I will just note that one of the things that staff is working on is including, in the discussion of this amendment, sort of examples on how each of these alternatives would function, and so stuff like what Andy, Mike, and Tim just talked about is clear within the discussion of the document.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. That would be super helpful. All right. Any more discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **The motion carries.**

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so now we're moving on to talk about obtaining allocation, and so, just so we're sort of clear as we continue to go through, the previous actions we were discussing were all about what you need to just have shares or maintain shares, and the next two actions are going to talk about what you need to actually receive allocation from those shares, and then, of course, Action 3, that we talked about earlier, is what you need to have to then go actually harvest that allocation.

Action 8 looks at what you need in order to obtain allocation from shares specifically. Alternative 1, there is sort of no requirement, outside of holding active shares, in order to obtain allocation from those shares, and Alternative 2 would require someone to hold a valid or renewable snapper grouper unlimited permit in order to obtain allocation from shares, and then Alternative 3 would require an account to hold active shares and be in good standing with respect to collection and submission of cost recovery fees and wreckfish ITQ reporting requirements.

One thing to note here is that, if shareholders are not in good standing at the start of the year, when annual allocation is initially released, it can be released to them once they are in good standing with, you know, the cost recovery fees and reporting requirements, and you can also select multiple preferred alternatives under this action, and so, again, there are little biological effects here. This is an administrative action. For the economic effects, requiring that permit, again, represents a cost, if someone doesn't already have that permit, but, given previous requirements to maintain and obtain shares, they likely already have a snapper grouper unlimited permit, if they have shares, and then, for the social effects, sort of similarly. It may be an additional burden, especially for having them be in good standing with collection of cost recovery fees and reporting requirements, but, overall, that helps the long-term sustainability of the fishery, ensuring that long-term social benefits are achieved.

Again, it's administrative, and, for all alternatives, the agency is going to need to build-in sort of code to display to accounts that meet the standard for obtaining those shares, and it would require code that links the permit system -- That links the permit system to the ITQ system, but, again, that can sort of mirror what's already done in the Gulf. Alternative 3, with the cost recovery and reporting requirements, would require a bit more complex code, and, thus, would be sort of an

additional burden on the agency, and so, with that, I will turn it back over to the committee for discussion of those alternatives.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Christina. Are there thoughts on this one? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: In my mind, I would be leaning towards Alternative 3, based on the discussions we've had at every point that we've had to make a decision in this document, in that that is the way to ensure that the people that actually obtain annual allocation are going to fish it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and maybe another way to say it is that the person is valid in every way, but in the cost recovery fees as well as the reporting requirements, I think is maybe another way to say it.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, that's a much better way to say it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm going to ask maybe Jessica to speak to this, and so, with Alternative 3b, I think the struggle I'm having is what do we mean by "reporting requirements", because it is very ambiguous, and there's lots of different reporting requirements, obviously, as part of this system, and so what -- Would we be specifying that they have to meet every single one of those, and how do we determine kind of noncompliance with those, and how are we going to track that and be able to determine whether or not allocation should or shouldn't be issued, and so, Jessica, could you speak to that?

DR. STEPHEN: I don't think we've really fleshed this out. We talked about it briefly during one of the presentations, and some of the things that I would be concerned with, obviously, is the collection and submission of cost recovery, making sure that they're turning their landings in, and other reporting requirements might be ensuring that they're doing the prelanding notifications, if that is chosen, and that they're complying with where you're offloading. Then a final thought would be whether we would want to include complying with the coastal logbook reporting requirements, which would replace the original wreckfish logbook.

I think there probably needs to be a little bit more discussion here, and a little bit more fleshing out of the details in the document. Some of the things to consider is, if you're late reporting, does that stop you for good, and that seems kind of unusual, or, you know, how we would want to consider that, moving forward. I would say, for the collection and submission of the cost recovery fees, you would need to have all of your fees paid, but, if you miss one prelanding notification, I wouldn't want to penalize someone for that, but I also wouldn't want to give allocation to someone who has never turned in a prelanding notification.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Christina added a note there about how this action needs to include some discussion on what reporting requirements includes. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, you can't renew your Snapper Grouper 1, which you have to have for this, based on what we've done before, without having your reports in, and so, in my mind, that's already handled in that requirement. Jessica, tell me if I'm wrong, but I know that I can't renew my Snapper Grouper 1 unless all my logbooks are in, and so it seems like there's already a

mechanism for that. I would like to flesh out more of the prelanding notification action before we add that to that, and, I mean, I don't know if -- You know, are we using obtaining allocation as an enforcement tool, which if -- That's fine, and then that needs to be fleshed out in this discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jessica, did you want to respond to that?

DR. STEPHEN: Yes, and so I will say that you're correct in that you need to have all of your logbooks in in order to renew your permit, but, when your permit renewal is due may be a very different timeframe than when we're distributing shares from allocation, and so I would kind of consider those -- While similar, they might be slightly different, and it's definitely a potential idea to investigate how the different scenarios might fall out with a coastal logbook requirement. I agree that we really need to flesh out, probably from the IPT, which things are viable, and which things are not, for including in the reporting requirements, and then come back to you with some ones that we think are really the most well suited to this action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks. That's helpful. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess I would want to understand the administrative burden, in terms of being able to monitor adequately all these reporting requirements, and determine whether or not allocation should be distributed or not, but, ideally, what we would want to do is build in as much in the way of checks and balances in the electronic system, so that's automated, but I have some concerns that, if we follow these reporting requirements, that that might not be feasible to consider for all of them.

I guess the other thought, or comment, here is, you know, if you're out of compliance with a prelanding notification, failing to submit a landing transaction, you're late on your reporting, those are things that you're already out of compliance with regardless, and they need to be addressed from an enforcement standpoint, and so this really just then is an additional hurdle to not reward people that obviously are out of compliance with distributing allocation at that point, but I would think that there would have to be some sort of enforcement actions taken, if especially there's egregious violations of nonreporting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess -- I mean, we've had a lot of discussion on this, and I guess, since we're needing this additional information about the reporting -- I just don't know if we can pick a preferred on this one today, until we get a little bit more information on this.

MS. WIEGAND: Would it be helpful -- I think that's something that staff, or maybe not the full IPT, but the IPT leads can work with Monica and Jessica to sort of pull some of this information, and we could have this discussion in March, if that's something that the subcommittee thinks would work, and I know that the intent has sort of been, with the Full Council, to run through things quickly and use this committee for more detailed discussion, but also trying to consider sort of the timeline we're on with this amendment, if that's something that the subcommittee thinks could work, if we were able to pull this information for you by March.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, I think that's fine. My concern is that we're going to slow down again, and I don't want to slow us down again. I feel like some of this -- I wish we had known



that it needed to get worked out beforehand, but, you know, for your mental health's sake, Christina, we need to finish this in March. Just kidding, and not really, and you're going a great job, but that is my concern. As long as we can promise to get it knocked out then and move along with this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I am looking to the rest of the subcommittee. Are we good with Christina coming back with additional information on this, having the discussion at the March meeting, and then selecting a preferred? Andy or Tim, thoughts?

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm good with that approach.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy.

MR. GRINER: I'm good with that as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. All right. Let's -- Can we go ahead and take a ten-minute break, and then we'll come back and dive into Action Number 9?

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. WIEGAND: It looks like we've got all four subcommittee members here and ready to go, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Perfect. Then I'm going to go back to you, Christina, and I believe we're on Action 9.

MS. WIEGAND: That we are, and so Action 9 looks at the requirements to obtain annual allocation through transfer of allocation, and so, under Alternative 1, there's no limit on who can receive annual allocation through transfer in the online system. Alternative 2 would require that transfers could only occur to individual ITQ accounts holding shares, and Alternative 3 would require that transfer only occur to accounts associated with a valid snapper grouper unlimited permit.

Again, there is no biological consequences here, and this is an administrative action. For economic consequences, Alternative 2 is a bit more restrictive than Alternative 1, and it would add a cost to fisheries participants. Similarly, with Alternative 3, there would be an additional cost if they did not have the permit already. Social effects are similar. Again, with Alternative 2, an individual is going to have to find someone who is both willing to sell them some amount of share as well as transfer some allocation to them, which would mirror the current system, and, of course, Alternative 3 would require that permit, which is an additional burden if an individual does not already have the snapper grouper unlimited permit.

Similar to the other actions, for the administrative effects, while Alternatives 2 and 3 are more burdensome, because a code is required to be developed, if it is sort of modified, based on existing code from the Gulf IFQ program, that does reduce the administrative burden a little bit, and so I will go ahead and scroll back up to the alternatives, and, again, we would be looking for discussion and selection of a preferred alternative here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess my question is, especially based on the previous discussions we've had today, in order to fish this quota, you've got to have the snapper grouper unlimited permit, and can you -- How is Alternative 2 valid, because you could just be amassing shares that you're not able to fish, because you don't have the unlimited permit, and I'm not understanding how Alternative 2 could be valid here.

MS. WIEGAND: So this, again, is one of those complicated things that the actions tier off of each other a little bit, and so this is looking at specifically what you would need to have in order to receive allocation through transfer, and so, just because you receive that allocation through transfer, it doesn't necessarily mean that you can harvest it. What's required to harvest is what's addressed in that previous Action 3, and so Alternative 2 would require you to have shares in order to get any allocation through transfer.

That Action 2, your current preferred alternative also requires you to have shares in order to harvest, and so, while it seems redundant, it is sort of addressing two different things. One is just the ability to get that allocation through transfer, and that is this action, and the other is to then actually harvest that allocation, and so you could have a situation, and it would be an odd situation, but, in theory, it is possible that you could have a situation where someone could receive allocation through transfer, but then not have the requirements they need to harvest, and so one of the things, for example, if you are sticking with Preferred Alternative 3 in that previous action, and you wanted to make sure that anyone who was receiving allocation through transfer had the ability to then go harvest that allocation, you would need to select Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 as preferred, because those two things are required to then go harvest any allocation that you might be receiving through transfer. Does that make sense, or have I muddied the waters?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I think the thing that's throwing me off a little bit also is -- So, yes, you would have to have the snapper grouper unlimited permit to harvest it, but then, in Alternative 2, that individual couldn't necessarily harvest it, or is it assumed that, if you hold shares, that you can harvest, but it sounds like Alternative 2, unless I'm missing something, is the individual that could hold the shares, but may not have the other tools, in this case the snapper grouper unlimited, in order to harvest, and is that true, that Alternative 2 is like a person that could amass the shares, but maybe not intending to harvest, or they don't have a second SG 1 permit, and so they can't actually fish it, and is that right?

MS. WIEGAND: I guess -- I just want to make sure that I understand what you're describing correctly. I guess, to me, Action 9 doesn't address shares in any way, and it simply addresses the allocation from the shares, and so I think what Alternative 2 is addressing is a situation where maybe I have shares, and I have X number of shares, and I would like to harvest more than the allocation I have for my personal shares, and so what I'm looking for is another shareholder who is willing to lease me some of their allocation, so that then I can go harvest that allocation, so that I can harvest above the allocation from my personal shares.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so then the person, the recipient, in Alternative 2 is qualified to harvest, because, in theory, they already have shares, and, in theory, they have the other items available, and so they could harvest. I guess it's the whole leasing, and trying to avoid some of the pitfalls of the Gulf, and that's why I was asking questions about the difference between 2 and 3 and kind of making sure that I understood, but I would love it if someone else on the committee could ask some questions or offer some insight here. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. That threw me off a little bit too, and so, if I'm reading this, it almost makes it seem like you could open up a share account and have allocation, but not have a snapper grouper unlimited permit, but I thought you had to have a snapper grouper unlimited permit to even open up a share account, and am I mistaken there?

MS. WIEGAND: No, and you're correct, Tim, and so, again, some of this comes from us wanting to have the full suite of alternatives available for you guys to discuss, but you're correct in that, based on the preferred alternatives that you guys have picked today, in order to obtain and maintain shares, you have to have that snapper grouper unlimited permit, and so that's, under Alternative 2, transferring allocation to someone who already holds shares, and that sort of also assumes that they also have that unlimited permit, because, in previous actions, you guys set the requirement to have that snapper grouper unlimited permit.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It's definitely confusing, but I think, based on what I've heard, there is no harm in choosing Alternative 3. It's not necessarily necessary, because we've made that requirement at many other steps along the way, but that will just reaffirm, at every step, that what we're trying to say is, in order to obtain allocation or shares or a permit, you always need to have the ability to harvest, and so, in my mind, it's not necessarily necessary, but no harm, and so I would suggest that we consider Alternative 3. **I guess, for the sake of discussion, I will make a motion that we pick Alternative 3 as our preferred for Action 9.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Do we have a second?

MR. GRINER: I will second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim seconds. All right. More discussion on this? We haven't heard from Andy. Do you have thoughts on this, Andy?

MR. STRELCHECK: Jessica, I'm pausing because I'm confused by this as well, and I think, because of the intersection with some of the other decisions we've made, and, Jessica, can you weigh-in on this one?

DR. STEPHEN: I was just drawing it all out, so I can keep my head straight here, and so the primary action that intersects with this action was your Action 3, where you had chosen the preferred of shares and an SG 1 under Alternative 3, Action 3, versus Action 3, Alternative 4, which chooses the SG 1. If you choose Action 3, Alternative 3, you're already requiring shares and a snapper grouper to harvest, and you're requiring a snapper grouper to open an account, under Action 4, and so, for the ability to receive shares -- Here, your different two options are you require shares again, which are already required, or you require the SG 1, which also was already required, but, if you take Action 3, Alternative 4, which only requires an SG 1 to harvest, to open an account under Action 4 only requires an SG 1, and that's where this action then matters, whether you want someone who is receiving allocation to already have shares or just to have the SG 1 to continue. That probably muddled it more than made it easier, but this really matters if you choose a different alternative in Action 3.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy, do you want to -- Let me go to Christina first, and then I'll go back to Andy, but thank you, Jessica.

MS. WIEGAND: Jessica basically already said what I was going to say, that, under Alternative 3, you might allow someone who could have allocation transferred to them, that doesn't have shares, and so they wouldn't be able to harvest it under your preferred alternative, but, if you changed your preferred alternative under Action 3, it would be different, but Jessica covered that already.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's go to Monica, and then I might have another question.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So could you choose Alternative 2 and Alternative 3? Wouldn't that mirror what you did in Action 3, Alternative 3? That's assuming the council wouldn't change the preferred alternative, and, I mean, I'm trying to figure out whether Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 are such that you could only choose one of them, and it appears, to me, that you might be able to choose both of them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That was where I was going to go with my question, Monica, and thank you. I think they're both viable, but that's what I'm trying to understand, and maybe that's a question for Jessica.

DR. STEPHEN: I think you could choose both of them, and, maybe to help this out, I will take Charlie's example earlier. He has a vessel under a corporation that has an SG 1, but does not hold shares. Under the current set of preferreds, with Action 3, Alternative 3, he would have to split his shares, and then, for this action, because he already has to have the shares and the SG 1, there is no difference between Alternative 3 and Alternative 2, in the case of what's going on, but let's take it if we had Charlie's example with that vessel, and we chose Alternative 4, which just requires the SG 1, and then he would not need to transfer shares. In order to harvest, under Alternative 3 in this action, he could still harvest, but, under Alternative 2, he would not -- Sorry. He could still receive allocation, and, under Alternative 2, he would not be able to receive allocation, despite being able to harvest.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that helped me. Andy, did that explanation help you? Thoughts here?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and, I mean, the explanation helps me. I -- You know, because there is contingencies in terms of that previous action, Action 3 I think it is, with this action, my preference would be to align those, and we have -- Right now, what's our preferred alternative? If Kerry is offering Alternative 3, we could probably go to Alternative 2, or not select one until we make a decision, a final decision, in Action 3, and then we could capture that rationale as part of the discussion in future action by the Snapper Grouper Committee at a council meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, I agree with Andy, and I'm happy to withdraw my motion, if that's okay with Tim, because it is more complicated than I thought. Jessica Stephen, I think you -- You have such a grip on this that it's so hard for us mere mortals to follow, but I think you probably have heard us, you know, say, a million times, at least Jessica and I, how concerned we are about creating these loopholes, where basically what we're trying to avoid is people ending up with sort

of hoarding, or pulling back shares or allocation, without the potential to harvest, and so that was the only -- That's what I'm coming at each one of these actions with.

If we disperse with Action 3, and stick with our current preferred, which is having to have the snapper grouper unlimited and be a wreckfish shareholder, then it almost doesn't matter which one we choose here?

DR. STEPHEN: Yes, and so that's correct. If you stay with your current Alternative 3 under Action 3, requiring the shares and the SG 1 to harvest, it does not matter which one you choose here, and, I mean, we would still probably need to pick one, but either one of these would still kind of have both requirements of Alternative 2 and 3.

When we're trying to think about how to keep the fishery in the hands of the people fishing, which is kind of how we like to talk about it, allocation, remember, is just annual, and so we tend to go a little bit less restrictive in allocation, to allow someone to kind of get their way to buy into the fishery, and we get a little more restrictive with the shares, because we don't want the shares, under a shareholder, disconnected from those who are harvesting.

Under Action 3, either Alternative 3 or 4, in combination with either of these alternatives, I think you're still getting to the point where you're keeping the privileges within the hands of those who are harvesting, and there are probably just slight nuanced differences between those, but not large enough, and I will say that Alternative 4, in Action 3, does provide a little more flexibility for the example that Charlie described, and it creates a little less burden on the fishermen to go down that route, and then you could select, most likely, Alternative 3 here only for the allocation transfer.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would say I still come back to I still like Alternative 3 under Action 3, but, Kerry, thoughts here, as the maker of this motion? Do you want to withdraw this motion?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and I think -- First of all, thank you, Jessica, and that was really, really helpful, especially -- That's the first time, or at least it's registered in my brain, thinking about allocation as the annual allocation as needing to be less strict, because it's an annual thing, and so that was incredibly helpful. Yes, and I think that Andy had said, before I spoke last time, that maybe we not make a preferred right now, and, in March, we have this discussion, where we tie Action 3 and Action 9 together, and I'm fine with that, especially, you know, talking to other shareholders between now and then.

**I might suggest, and I'm sorry to put more work on the IPT, but if there's a graphic, like a little shadow shark situation, where, you know, you're like Boat A, or, you know, Shareholder A has two boats, and these are their permit situations, and, you know, if there's just a way to graphically describe this, and it's hard enough for those of us who have read this many times, and have been dealing with this for a long time, and I think it's going to be even harder when it's the group at-large, and so I don't know if there's a simple way to draw that out graphically, and that might help us get to the decision quicker in March, but I am fine withdrawing the motion, if Tim is okay with that.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. Well, I go back to it seems like we were all comfortable with our preferred alternative in Action 3, and we don't want to change that, and, I mean, that's -- Again, the whole idea here is to limit this fishery to the people that are doing the fishing, and, unless we're thinking that we really want to go back and revisit Action 3, our preferred alternative, I don't see why we can't pick one of -- Why we can't move forward with the preferred under this action.

As Jessica said, if we stay where we are now, and our previously picked alternative in Action 3, and 2 and 3 here do the same thing, and so why not just pick 3 and move on? I mean, it seems like -- I know it's a complicated thing, but, you know, it seems like we keep getting to a point in this document where we've got to pause, and we've got to look at it again later, and I don't -- You know, it just seems, to me, that this is something that's not very difficult. We want that, in order to receive allocation, you have to have the ability to harvest, and that's exactly what this does, and so I'm not sure what we're gaining by waiting any longer or by not -- What does it do for us if we don't pick a preferred? Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: I mean, I certainly don't want to speak to when the council, or you guys, should pick a preferred. I will say that, if the intent is to simply make sure that anyone who can receive allocation through transfer also has the requirements to then go and harvest that allocation that they were transferred, then it would be Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would both be -- Would be the two alternatives that you would want to select under this action, to then mirror your current preferred alternative in Action 3, which requires harvest to be done by a shareholder with an SG 1 permit, and so, if the intent is sort of to do what Tim is describing, those would be the two alternatives that you would want to select as preferred under this action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Christina. Kerry and then Andy.

MS. MARHEFKA: Tim, I think we just got stalled on Action 3 because we had heard from Charlie about sort of the issue that it would cause for him, and wanted to be thoughtful about that, and he was also pretty amenable to saying that he will make it work no matter what, and so another alternative to waiting would be to pick our preferreds now, make sure that the shareholders, you know, are aware, and, you know, we have a comment period before we finalize this, and so, you know, us picking preferreds may be more helpful, to garner some comment from them, and so I can go either way on it, and it's up to the committee.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Part of me just wants to say that we go ahead and pick preferreds, but let's go to Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I feel similarly. I think, you know, as long as we pick preferreds here that align with our decisions from earlier in the document, and I think, you know, the benefit of, obviously, getting more clarity on this is, you know, Jessica Stephen and team, working with Christina, can bring back some examples, and kind of show the intersections, and we can talk to the shareholders, and explain to the shareholders kind of how they currently operate, and how this might affect future ways in which they operate within the system, and, you know, what I don't want to do is have any unintended consequences here and inhibit an ability of someone to kind of operate effectively within the system, and so just providing that clarity, to me, is a benefit, without

significantly slowing down the process, but I'm happy to select preferreds today, if we want to do so, knowing that we can revisit this in March.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I would like to go ahead and select preferreds. Andy, do you want to make a motion?

MR. STRELCHECK: I do not.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry, do you want to make a motion?

MS. MARHEFKA: Sure. I will do it. Do we want to go back to Action 3, so that they sort of fall in line the way we want them to? Can we do that? Well, we already have a preferred for Action 3, actually.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's right. We do, and so --

MS. MARHEFKA: We had considered changing our preferred, and now hold on. I need a second.

MS. WIEGAND: So this is Action 3 that I have up on the screen right now, with your current preferred alternative requiring the SG 1 permit and for the permit holder to be a shareholder in order to harvest.

MS. MARHEFKA: So I do not wish to make a motion to change our preferred on this action then.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't want to make a motion to change our preferred under Action 3 either.

MS. MARHEFKA: So I'm happy to make a motion in regard to Action 9, based on that, but I don't want to jump in front of -- It looks like Tim might --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Let's go to Tim.

MR. GRINER: Well, I think we already have a motion on the table, right, Kerry's previous motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It was withdrawn.

MR. GRINER: Okay.

MS. MARHEFKA: I withdrew.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It seems like, to be consistent with Action 3, you would select Alternative 3 here, which was the previous motion, and then maybe, at the March meeting, we can figure out if we also want to select Alternative 2, et cetera, and I don't know, and I'm just trying to make some suggestions here.

MS. WIEGAND: So I want to clarify, real fast, and, Jessica Stephen, I might ask you to jump in here a little bit as well, and my understanding is, to be consistent with your preferred alternative in Alternative 3, which requires someone to have the SG 1 permit and hold shares, you would need to select Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, so as to not end up in an unlikely situation

where someone was transferring allocation to someone that only had an unlimited permit and didn't have shares, because, if they don't have shares, then they cannot harvest, but, Jessica Stephen, is that your understanding as well?

DR. STEPHEN: Yes, and so you did get that. Just one backstep to Action 3, and the reason we put Alternative 4 in there is that, currently, we have this agent of the shareholder language that we are removing within this document, and, by removing that, Alternative 4 would allow the fishermen that used an agent of the shareholder to continue fishing in the same way. If that's not desired by the shareholders or the council or the subcommittee, then Action 3 is probably the more appropriate way to go forward with it, and I will remind you that the agent of the shareholder has their own SG 1 permit, and so, when we were pulling landings history, and trying to get confidentiality, that confidentiality right went to that permit holder, and not to the shareholder, which is some of the reasons why we are removing that agent language, and it was very confusing.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I go back to what Christina said, because what Jessica Stephen said I think just sent me down another confusing rabbit hole, and so let me try to repeat what I think Christina was saying, and, if this isn't correct, maybe you could jump back in here, and so I think what you're saying, Christina, which was a question that a bunch of us kept asking, is, since we've selected, under Action 3, Alternative 3, we technically -- In order to stay with that gameplan, we need to select Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 as a preferred here.

MS. WIEGAND: Correct, and that's what I was implying. If you want the requirements to mirror each other, then you need to select Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 as the preferred.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: **I move that we select Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 for Action 9 as our preferred alternatives.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion by Kerry. Do we have a second?

MR. GRINER: Second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Tim. Any additional discussion on this motion? **Any objection to this motion?** All right. **The motion carries.**

MS. WIEGAND: All right. We made it through all of the participation and eligibility discussion, and so next up is Action 10, which looks at retaining annual allocation for a commercial ACL reduction, and so, right now, under Alternative 1, 100 percent of the allocation to ITQ shareholders is distributed on January 1 of each year. Alternative 2 would allow the Regional Administrator the authority to withhold the amount of annual allocation before distribution at the beginning of a year in which a commercial ACL reduction is expected to occur.

Any of that withheld allocation would be distributed to shareholders if the effective date of the final rule implementing that quota reduction had not occurred by either June 1 or August 1, depending on the subalternative, and so some things to note here is there's no stock assessment currently scheduled for wreckfish, and no council action that's looking at reducing the commercial ACL, and, if there were sort of to be any reduction in catch levels, that would still go through the



council's full SSC and amendment development process. This simply sets in place a process where we wouldn't be looking at sort of overharvesting in a year when we knew an ACL reduction was going to occur, because we had already sort of gone through the council's process, and the council had approved that reduction.

Biological effects, this is mostly administrative, but it is sort of important to note that there could be consequences if the ACL reduction were identified too late to retain that allocation and it would cause some negative biological effects.

Economic and social costs are similar, balancing sort of the short-term costs of a lower catch level, versus the long-term benefits of ensuring sustainability of the stock, and then, for the administrative burden, it's noted that Alternative 2 is likely going to reduce the administrative burden, compared to Alternative 1, sort of, you know, unless the expected ACL decrease did not occur, in which case NMFS would then need to redistribute the amount that was held back, and so, with that, back to the top, with the listed alternatives, and we're looking for a preferred here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: **I move that we choose Alternative 2, Subalternative 2a as our preferred.** My only rationale for 2a is that we are changing the fishing year to a January to end of December fishing year, and so June is sort of nicely in the middle, and I believe it's appropriate to give the RA this authority. If we're ever in this situation, I believe we would want him to have the authority, so that we don't exceed the ABC the following year.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry. I had similar thoughts. Is there a second for this motion?

MR. STRELCHECK: Second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Andy, and, Andy, you have your hand up.

MR. STRELCHECK: I agree with the alternative, and this would align it with the Gulf of Mexico IFQ programs, and we have used this provision periodically in the Gulf, when we have had quota reductions, and so it's a good, effective mechanism just to hold back, knowing that there might be a quota reduction occurring. The other thing I will add is, with the biological effects section, I think we need to make sure, with the rationale, that -- To me, Alternative 2 is a biological benefit relative to Alternative 1, because we are essentially holding back quota that otherwise would be released at the start of the year, and would be fished, and so we wouldn't be able to pull that back until the following fishing year, and so I just wanted to emphasize that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. Well, I'm kind of on the opposite end of this one. I don't really like the -- I don't like the unintended consequences of what could happen here, and I guess part of me thinks that -- I guess I have to go back and revisit the -- Now that we have this ABC Control Rule Amendment in effect, I think the Regional Administrator already has what he needs to do that, to protect a big overage, but I'm trying to wrap my arms around why would we ever do this in the first place? I mean, the whole idea here is to harvest 100 percent of the quota.

I don't see us doing a stock assessment, and so under what circumstances would -- Other than a stock assessment, under what circumstances would you ever have a reason to withhold quota on January 1? I can't wrap my arms around what could ever happen, and, if it was a stock assessment, well, a stock assessment takes time, and you're going to know that, and so that's no different than any other stock assessment for gag or scamp or whatever, you know, and, I mean, it would have been nice to have something like this in place back when we were dealing with this big overage in gags, but I don't see that happening here.

I really don't, and so, you know, the only thing I could see would be an assessment, and the timing of the actual submission of the amendment would be such that you couldn't get it done and have the new ABC in place by January 1, and I think that's just a timing issue, and so I don't really like the idea of being able to withhold quota at the beginning of the year, when you really don't have any concrete evidence that it's going to have a biological effect. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy, before you answer, I have another question. Christina, do you mind scrolling back up to where the alternatives are listed there? The thing that confused me, and I agree that the Regional Administrator needs this authority, and I thought that the Alternative 2 would have a percentage in it, to provide the Regional Administrator with the authority to withhold like X amount of the wreckfish annual allocation before distribution at the beginning of the year, and so I saw this as in order to account for these types of factors that we're discussing here, and this would be giving the RA authority to withhold not 100 percent of it, but to withhold an amount, and so there's nothing listed there, and I thought that something was supposed to be listed there, and so, Andy, do you mind talking about -- Was the intent to hold a percentage, when you also answer Tim's question.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Jessica, and so let me walk you through an example, and so, first, I would not be withholding quota just simply because an assessment indicates that there might be a lower catch limit that needs to be considered. That would have to be an action that comes before the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, go through the normal fishery management plan amendment process.

Once that amendment is completed by the council, and submitted to the agency, we then start rulemaking, and so envision a situation where the council has taken action, at their June, or maybe October, meeting, and we all know that the rulemaking process for NMFS typically takes around six months, and so we could have a wreckfish quota reduction that's recommended by the council in that June, or September, timeframe, where we're not able to implement the rule by the start of the fishing year.

Whatever that reduction would be, it would give me essentially authority to withhold, and so, if they're reducing the catch limit by 50 percent on January 1, the Fisheries Service would withhold 50 percent of the wreckfish quota. If we can't, for whatever reason, get that rule completed by June 1, then I am obligated to release the remaining quota back to the fishermen. Otherwise, the quota would remain in place based on that reduction that was expected from the amendment, and so I hope that clarifies things, and then, Jessica, what was your follow-on question?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, Christina wrote some notes there, and it wasn't clear, to me, the amount that the RA had the ability to withhold, and like it seems like it should be a percentage, but she is

making a note there that it's meant to say that it would be the equivalent to the decrease in the ACL approved by the council.

MR. STRELCHECK: That's correct, yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. All right. I'm going to go back to Tim. Does that help answer your questions, or do you have more questions, based on what you heard from Andy?

MR. GRINER: That helped a lot, and I'm still trying to digest why we need that in the wreckfish fishery, but we don't need it in the rest of the snapper grouper fishery, and so what is the difference in wreckfish and gag grouper?

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's because it's an ITQ. It's because you're giving a percentage of the quota to each of these shareholders, and so this is saying, instead of giving it out and taking it back, they're going to withhold that small amount upfront. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and, essentially, Tim, the wreckfish shareholders, if they knew the reduction was coming sometime during the year, but we released all the quota, they could make an effort to go out and fish all of it before that reduction occurs, and so, therefore, you're going to have an overage, and I see where you're heading though, because we obviously encountered something similar for gag, which is not under an IFQ program, and maybe there is something like this that could be considered for a fishery like that as well, but we would need to give some thought to that, but it's really the inability to reel-back quota once we've distributed it to shareholders.

MR. GRINER: Well, then so, along those lines then, and I think that's helpful, but, if that rulemaking did happen before June 1, then that quota is not going to get redistributed, and then, the following year, you would be on whatever that amendment -- Whatever the second year of that new ABC was, and you would be on the second year of that, and is that right? So the first year you took care of, because you withheld that. The second year, then you would be on the second year of that rebuilding plan, or whatever that new ABC was, and so, at year-two, what would be the difference in distributing all of it and then paying back the overage the next year and distributing 100 percent of that? What would be the difference?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, under an IFQ, presumably you wouldn't have an overage, and there isn't any sort of payback that we're contemplating here for the IFQ system, because you're constraining it to the catch levels based on the share ownership, but once, obviously, a rebuilding plan is implemented, this provision is null and void, because it's not needed by me on an annual basis, right, and it's only periodically needed when quota reductions occur. Similarly, if quota increases are going to occur, you know, we distribute those as soon as the rulemaking goes into effect.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Andy. That was very helpful.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. So can we go back to the motion, Christina? Then the motion would be, or is, and it's been seconded, to select Alternative 2a as preferred under Action 10, and, also, Christina noted that they would clarify what the amount is in the next iteration of the document.

We've had some good discussion on this. Any additional discussion? **Is there any objection? I don't see any hands, or hear anything, and the motion carries.**

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so next up is modifying the commercial fishing year for wreckfish. Right now, the fishing year begins on April 15 and runs through April 14, but, because the wreckfish program, once it's online, will be built into the existing Southeast catch share online system, that has a mandatory downtime period from December 31 at 6:00 p.m. to January 1 at 2:00 p.m., and so sort of aligning the wreckfish fishing year with the needed system downtime will help make it easier, so we don't end up in a situation where the system needs to be down to address wreckfish and the system needs to be down to address the other Southeast catch share programs.

Right now, your current preferred alternative is to adjust to have the fishing year begin on January 1 and end on December 31. One of the things you had asked for, at the last meeting, was a bit more information on the spawning season closure. Right now, there's a spawning season closure for wreckfish from January 15<sup>th</sup> through April 15<sup>th</sup>. That was established in Snapper Grouper Amendment 3, and it was put into place because fishermen participating in the wreckfish fishery were observing that wreckfish caught between that time period were often full of roe, and were spawning, and, also, some preliminary research by South Carolina DNR supported that as the spawning season, and fishermen were also noting that wreckfish appeared to be fairly aggressive at biting baited hooks during the spawning period, making it a pretty efficient time to be fishing for wreckfish, and so they ended up going with this January 15<sup>th</sup> to April 15<sup>th</sup> spawning season closure.

Staff sort of looked, and there's not really any new information on the timing of wreckfish spawning, and so sort of the reason you all were asking for that information is because, with this new fishing year, the fishing year would sort of start, and be open for two weeks, before closing for a spawning season closure and reopening on April 16<sup>th</sup>, and so I just wanted to note that we did sort of look up that information. The environmental consequences have not changed since last time you reviewed this action, and so there's no decision needed here, unless there's additional discussion or a desire to modify the current preferred alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think we actually discussed this earlier today, that this was our intent, to begin on January 1, because of this system, but I will just check with committee members to see if there's anything else that you want to add or questions here. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I mean, I think it makes sense. I mean, instead of thinking of it as there are two weeks, only two weeks, to fish, and then it closes for a couple of months, it's almost more of a continuation from the previous season, right, because they can still fish in that overnight period of December 31 and January 1, and someone clarify that, and then the other thing I will say is, market-wise, it could be a great thing also, because we moved the golden tile longline fishery start to January 15<sup>th</sup>, and so, while hook-and-line is open for golden tile, they, obviously, don't catch as much, and so then there's like a little bit more of that nice white, chunky fish on the market at the beginning of the year, which I know is really good for dealers and for end consumers, and so those are some of my thoughts on that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry. I would say it doesn't sound like we want to change our preferred here, and I don't see any additional hands, and so let me pass it back to you, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. That moves us to Action 12, which is the prelanding notification requirement for vessels participating in the wreckfish fishery, and so, right now, there is no requirement for wreckfish vessels to notify the service in advance of landing wreckfish. Under Alternative 2, the owner, or the operator, of a commercially-permitted, with that SG unlimited permit, a vessel that was participating in the wreckfish component of the snapper grouper fishery, would be responsible for ensuring the service is contacted at least three hours, but no more than twenty-four hours, in advance of landing, using a NMFS-approved method.

When providing that notice of landing, they would include things like the expected date and time of landing, the preapproved landing location, which I will talk about in the next action, estimated weight of wreckfish onboard the vessel, the dealer where the vessel is to be received, and the identity of the shareholder and of the vessel.

I will say there's a couple of things to note here. NMFS will sort of develop the specific details of how that notification system would operate, and it is then clear, by discussions that this group has had, and the council has had, and will be sort of included in the discussion of the document, that the intent is to have this be something like a twenty-four-hour call line and not VMS.

Then a couple of other things that you guys asked for information on at the last meeting, and one was how often wreckfish vessels are encountered. In talking to NMFS OLE, they don't record encounter rates at a specific enough level to tease out wreckfish vessels, and sort of there's no way for them to know if there is an issue in the fishery, because law enforcement officers don't have what they need to intercept those vessels. Over the last three years, observers have been put on two wreckfish trips, and staff is currently working to get more information on how vessels are selected to carry observers.

In terms of equipment failure, it was noted that there was a provision in the Gulf SEFHIER amendment, but that's sort of been removed, and, instead, they use sort of multiple options for notification, so that it provides fishermen with a back-up option, and it was noted, by agency staff, that sort of VMS is the most foolproof of options, and then, finally, NOAA OLE -- Those that are participating on the IPT noted that they would prefer to retain that three-hour landing notification lead time, and that's consistent with the Gulf program, and the purpose of that is that it allows officers to complete whatever they are currently doing and still travel to meet wreckfish vessels, and it was also noted that, if a state has a JEA, state partners also receive this prelanding notification, which increases coverage.

Next, I've got this note here that the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel did discuss this amendment, and that meeting was just last week, and so sort of the summary of what they talked about wasn't included in this document, because it had already been posted, but I do want to go over what they talked about in terms of a prelanding notification.

One of the things they noted is they felt like wreckfish is, for the most part, a self-regulating fishery, especially given its small size, and that enforcement efforts, particularly at the state level, often depend on guidance from NOAA and the council and what they feel is most important, and one of the things that's going to be important to remember is that law enforcement agencies have limited resources and must prioritize their efforts.

Requiring a prelanding notification would help enforcement and monitoring, as wreckfish vessels aren't currently being intercepted at the dock, because there is no way for officers to know when a vessel might be landing and offloading catch. They did feel like it would be helpful to have an estimate of the, you know, sort of weight, or number, of wreckfish onboard. That will give law enforcement officers an idea of how long they might be spending inspecting the vessel or monitoring any offload. They agreed with sort of the NOAA OLE comments that a three-hour prelanding notification does provide adequate time for law enforcement to respond and meet a vessel at the dock, and they wouldn't recommend shortening that time period.

Then sort of last, but not least, is reviewing the sort of Magnuson-Stevens language, and I can scroll back up to that. It's included here, this include an effective system for enforcement, monitoring, and management, and they did note that there has been no requirement that the wreckfish fishery be monitored by law enforcement, and the LEAP suggested that the council think of creative ways to monitor this fishery, and so that was the discussion had at the LEAP, and I will go ahead and turn it back over to the committee for discussion and selection of a preferred alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and I just had two questions. The first, and if someone can remind me the distinction, or the definition, of "landing" versus "offloading", because I know that came up before, and I just couldn't find it in my notes. Then, secondly, and this is, I guess, to Andy, or maybe Jessica Stephen, but, at the Gulf meeting last week, there was some discussion about the prelanding notification sort of reporting of weight, and how that somehow played into like if they overestimated their weight that went into the system, and it was sort of harder to correct that, and they would have to wait for it to be corrected to sort of get that poundage back, if I'm saying that right, and so it was very common for vessels to underestimate the weight on their boat, and that was administratively easier for them to do, and I wasn't sure if this is sort of setting up that same system, or this is just strictly just LE is going to know what their estimated weight it, and that will never go into sort of the reporting system of poundage for their allocation.

MS. WIEGAND: I guess I can note, quickly, the difference between landing and offloading at a preapproved landing site is when the vessel arrives to that site, and offloading is when the fish are actually removed from the vessel. Then I will let Andy, or Jessica, speak to discussions at the Gulf Council.

MR. STRELCHECK: I will defer to Jessica. Go ahead, Jessica.

DR. STEPHEN: So we are intending these prelanding notifications to have similar content to what we have for the Gulf programs, because that's helpful to make sure that they are landing the allocation that they have available. With particular discussion towards that, keep in mind that the Gulf program is much larger, and there is also a large variety in the size of boats, and what they can hold, and so we have, at one point, think about a percentage of estimate being different from the landing transaction, but 10 percent of a hundred pounds is a lot different than 10 percent of 50,000 pounds.

What we have noticed, in looking through the data, and talking with them, is that sometimes fishermen, on the prelanding notification, will underestimate, because they are looking for

allocation that they know that they have, and they just didn't obtain that at-sea, and then they typically do report accurately. With this being a smaller fishery, and not as much transfers of allocation, I don't think we're going to see some of the issues that were noticed with a few of the participants in the Gulf program.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: No further comments from me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Unless we're going to define "landing" differently, right now, in the regulations, and that's the general 600 regulations, 50 CFR Part 600, "land" means to begin offloading fish, to offload fish, or to arrive in port or at a dock, berth, beach, seawall, or ramp, to answer Kerry's question.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Monica. Kerry, do you want to go back to the discussion of this action here, and do you have more questions? Do you want to select a preferred? Just thoughts here.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm thinking through, and I do think that the -- With the shareholders, we had certainly discussed the prelanding notification, but I don't think that they've heard about this provision to call in your weight estimate, and that it is a weight estimate that then is used -- You know, I trust Jessica Stephen, and I agree that this is a much less complicated situation, but I'm just trying to wrap my head around that, because that's not something we've ever had in the South Atlantic, and so I need a little more time to think it through, and I don't know that I can pick a preferred, or -- Yes, I need a minute.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Well, I have another question, and part of what you said kind of goes to my question, and so there's a phrase in Alternative 2 that says, "in advance of landing using a National Marine Fisheries Service-approved method", and so I know that the Gulf uses VMS, and we have the VMS actions out of this document, and so I guess I would be seeking to understand what this National Marine Fisheries Service-approved method was, and is this like calling an 800 number with a satellite phone, or what does this encompass, and when would that be defined here? I know that we talked about this a little bit at the meeting in September, but could someone help me understand what that means? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: You hit the nail on the head, in terms of my comment, Jessica, and I feel like, because we're so generalized here, it would benefit the council, and others, shareholders, to understand what does that mean, and so you're correct, right, and VMS is not included in this action, and so I would not foresee VMS being something that would be an approved method for advanced landing. We do allow advance landing notifications through a call service, but that requires a satellite phone, or at least within cellphone range, and then certainly, and I will double-check with Jessica Stephen here, but I believe you can also essentially call someone onshore, and they could essentially do the prelanding notification through our online system, and I need to confirm that, but those are at least the two mechanisms that I was thinking of, rather than VMS.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That was helpful. Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: I will say that the IPT talked about this language, given that it does seem a little vague in the alternative, and the decision of the IPT was ultimately to leave that language in the alternative a little vague, provide some more details in the discussion, again being clear that this is -- One of those options is not VMS. In this document, the VMS action is in the Considered but Rejected appendix, with all of the rationale for why the council didn't want to move forward with VMS, and then sort of list the two options that Andy just discussed, so that it was clear sort of what was in the parameters of that NMFS-approved method without sort of bogging down an already complex written alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. Kerry, and then I will go to Charlie.

MS. MARHEFKA: I hate to get bogged-down in the what-ifs, but I'm just thinking, like in our situation, Mark's cellphone -- I don't quite understand it, because I don't go on the boat, but his actual cellphone also works as the satellite phone, and so, if his cellphone goes down, like if his battery dies, and it doesn't charge, or if it falls overboard or something, other than VHF, he is literally left with no communication, and so I don't know how -- Obviously, in the Gulf, I know there are all these procedures for if you have technical issues with your VMS, and will there be sort of -- Is it at the discretion of the law enforcement person?

If you can't get in touch with anyone, if you have communication issues, and you tie up your boat, and you call law enforcement right away, and sort of say like, hey, I'm sorry, and I couldn't have called you three hours before I hit the dock, because I had no way to do it, are we going to hope that there will be some discretion, or do we need to build-in sort of rules around equipment failure?

MS. MCCAWLEY: That was my concern as well. Let's go to Charlie Phillips, and then we'll go to Jessica Stephen.

MR. PHILLIPS: Two things. To Kerry's point, yes, our sat phones are not as dependable as we would like them to be, and most of the boats now are using Garmin, or ZOLEO text, and that seems to work a lot better, and not always, but it's better than the cellphone, and so, if the boat could text somebody that they're coming in, plus you can text all day long, and, once you pay your fifty-dollar-a-month fee, or whatever it is, you're done, and that seems to work very well. Actually, I think the observers use the same thing, and they've got some texts.

Knowing the exact weight, so the law enforcement can figure out how long they're going to need to be there, I don't know that that's going to be really accurate, because, a lot of times, boats get here, or maybe they show up at eleven o'clock, and the crew is fixing to go get lunch, and so they don't unload for an hour or so, or we've got some other stuff going on, or we might have some aquaculture stuff going on, or they could -- Like these boats that want to go pick a few wreckfish on a trip, but I don't have enough wreckfish quota for them to wreck fish all the time, and they may wreck fish a little bit, and they may go try to pick some golden tile on the way in, or beeliners or something, and so, if they call in and say that I've got 500 pounds of wreckfish, they may have another 1,500 pounds of something else, and so there's a lot of variables going on, but, yes, there's some wiggle room on how we, you know, get in touch with people, or who we get in touch with, and that would alleviate a lot of heartburn with the fishermen. Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Jessica.



DR. STEPHEN: I am going to address one of Charlie's points first, and then I will talk about the equipment failure, and so just keep in mind, when we are requesting the estimated, and it is estimated, weight, it is solely of just the wreckfish, and not any other fish onboard, and so, if that was not clear, I just wanted to make that clear.

With regard to how things operate, and so, in any case, if there's ever an emergency, we do not cite, or hold people accountable, for coming in without doing some of the requirements. When you're talking about the difference between the satellite phones and the texting, again, we would most likely have a call service, and so, if someone was better to able to text, they would text someone on land, who could then call it into the call service, or, if they had their authentication to log into the catch share system, they could go in and enter it that way as well, and so that does allow a variety of different ways to go through with things.

I would advise against starting to write specific language for equipment failure, because you get in the weeds really quick, and it gets really hard to distinguish what those are. Typically, also, if you call the catch share support line, and you're having trouble, we will also try and reach out to law enforcement officers, and they are generally very understanding of when things are going wrong, and that you're trying to comply. So, if you're trying to comply, and equipment failure stopped you, most likely there would be no penalty for that. If you have a pattern of behavior, where you're consistently not complying, that would be different than say an equipment failure that is occurring, and so I hope that kind of clarified that. Just by even the texting, while we don't have the capability to accept that directly, you could text someone who could then call the twenty-four-seven call service line or enter it into the system.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. All of that is very helpful, and I guess I would put it back to the committee, or the subcommittee, on what we want to do here with this action, and are we ready to select a preferred? Do people need to wait until March to select a preferred? Do they have other questions that they need answered? Just thoughts from the subcommittee. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I can go either way. You know, certainly my preference is to select Alternative 2 as the preferred, but, if people would like more clarity, and details, I'm happy to wait, and we could talk about this in more depth at the March council meeting, and fill in those details, so that people are comfortable with Alternative 2.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would, I guess, pose the question to Kerry and Tim. If we select the preferred now, without all the details, does that help us get feedback on this at the March meeting, and so is it better to select the preferred, and let people respond to it, or do you want to wait to select the preferred after we have more of these details about the method? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Actually, Jessica, you made a good point. I mean, I don't think it's any secret that I would like to choose Alternative 1, but I know that that's not realistic, and I don't want to give the impression to the shareholders, as they go into public comment, that that's probably likely to happen, and so it seems to make the most sense to go ahead and choose Alternative 2 as the preferred, in order to elicit comment, but, to the extent that we can have, you know, it more fleshed out in the document, so that they can see it before public comment, I think that would be important. I can't bring myself to make the motion though.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I appreciate that discussion. Would someone like to make a motion here? Tim.

MR. GRINER: Well, I'm not ready to make a motion, and I don't think I would get a second for it if I did, but, you know, I go back to the purpose of this action, and Kerry just kind of alluded to something that I want to make sure that I have a clear understanding of, and so the Magnuson Act requires that we include an effective system for enforcement, monitoring, and management of the program.

Are we saying that we don't have that now, and, therefore, we can't choose Alternative 1, or is Alternative 2 something that, by default of Magnuson, we have to do? I'm kind of confused here as to whether, you know, we're trying to fix something that is -- Are we trying to fix something that's not broken and in compliance with Magnuson, or are we out of compliance and something is not working? Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, to respond to Tim, you know, Magnuson doesn't explicitly state, you know, how we determine, you know, whether this is consistent, compliant, with, you know, the requirements for enforceability. That, to me, is up to the council, and the record and the rationale that you build here, right, and so, if we choose Alternative 1, which I'm not saying we are at this point, I think we would have to provide sufficient justification as to why we believe the program currently, as it exists, with no additional prelanding notifications, is being sufficiently enforced.

I do go back to -- You know, I've made these comments before, during past council meetings, right, that wreckfish, unlike some of the other, you know, snapper grouper fisheries that we manage, is a privilege program, right, and so with that comes additional requirements, consistent with the Magnuson Act, and so I am appreciative of concerns about the burden on industry members, and certainly the burden on the agency, as well as how we make enforcement efficient and effective, and so I do lean toward Alternative 2, for those reasons, but I certainly want to make sure that everyone fully understands what would be required under Alternative 2, and that it would minimize that burden on all parties involved.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I actually don't really have anything to add to what Andy said. I think he did a good job summarizing where we are now, and what the Act would require, and, you know, it does say "include an effective system for enforcement, monitoring, and management of the program, including the use of observers or electronic monitoring systems". I know we're not including, or requiring, observers on every trip, and we're not requiring some sort of electronic monitoring system, and so, to me, having this call in advance, I guess, is something we'll try to justify, that it would be an effective system.

I was kind of wondering how three hours is the only reasonable time period here, just in terms of NEPA, and so I think we need to discuss that too, and maybe that makes sense, given how far people have to go to catch wreckfish, and then how, you know, close to the coast they would be to

call in, or whatever, but, yes, I think Andy did a good job summarizing why this action is in here in the first place.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, both. I don't see people rushing to the table here to select a preferred, and, also, I guess, Christina, you noted that Monica suggested maybe something -- If three hours is the only alternative, or do we need to consider other options there, and maybe that's something that the IPT can discuss. While you're typing that up, I'm going to go to Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. A couple of things. I was going to say something about the three hours as well. I mean, three hours is still way out of range of any cellphone service, and so I think we should look at some different timeframes, but maybe we don't pick a preferred, and we gather some more detail, to kind of flesh out what does Alternative 2 really entail, and what are the details of it, and I think it might be helpful also to go back and look at some -- Look at Alternative 1 from the standpoint of have there been any OLE actions, and enforcement, that have taken place in the wreckfish fishery, period, ever, and that may be helpful, to know whether we really do have a problem there or whether what we are doing now is sufficient, and so I would just like to add that. If we're going to bring this back, and look at some more details on 2, I would like to look at Alternative 1 as it applies to any past OLE operations and enforcement. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Tim. Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: To sort of Tim's question about OLE and infractions, so we did sort of work with Matt Walia, at the agency, and my understanding, from him, is that they sort of don't have record of any, you know, specific wreckfish enforcement issues, and part of the problem that, you know, they have discussed is that they don't know when wreckfish vessels are coming in, and so they're hard to monitor, and so they don't really know the answer to that question, and they don't know if there is an enforcement issue in the wreckfish fishery, at least from a law-enforcement-specific standpoint, and, I mean, certainly you can talk about that in broader terms, and the Law Enforcement AP again sort of noting that this was a self-regulating fishery, considering its small size, but, from the information we've received from NOAA OLE, it's that there's no way to really tell if there is an enforcement problem in this fishery, because they don't have what they need to be regularly intercepting wreckfish vessels at the dock.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina, and so one more chance here to select a preferred, or have additional questions answered when we get to the March meeting. Otherwise, I suggest that we don't select a preferred and move on to the next action.

MS. MARHEFKA: Jessica, real quick, is it possible to do a pre-offloading notification, versus a prelanding notification? That might quell some of our concerns.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jessica Stephen.

DR. STEPHEN: Kerry, that could be possible. If you remember, I did a presentation that kind of compared those different mechanisms of notification, and so declarations, prelanding and offloading notifications, and most likely the same concern is going to be that, with the offloading notification, you would have to give it sufficient time for law enforcement to get there, and so the three hours was spoken to by law enforcement, due to the amount of geographical distance they cover and the time to make it there.

I can't remember, at the AP meeting, whether the shareholders felt that waiting with the fish onboard was more onerous than doing the prelanding notification, and I don't know if we can go back and look in the notes, but we had covered some of those different options, and I would be happy to present them again to the council, if we need more clarity.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry, would that help?

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, and, I mean, I think that just goes to like, I think, Tim's concern, and what is also my concern, is sort of like three hours is still well out of cellphone range, and that meant that you could -- You wouldn't -- The strictest would be prelanding notification, but, if you had a pre-offloading notification, you could still start the clock from being offshore, as soon as you got in cellphone range, I believe, unless the rule for pre-offloading notification is that you have to be tied to the dock when you send it, but, if there's a way you can give -- Make it be pre-offloading, and you can start that clock while you're offshore, that might solve some of the problems. I don't want to slow this down though, and let me make that really clear, that I don't want to slow it down.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Christina, what do you think could be brought back to the March meeting? Maybe I will turn it back to you about what is feasible.

MS. WIEGAND: I was actually just texting Myra, to try to talk about sort of timing for this, and us sort of needing to make sure we have this information ready for March, and how much time there is on the Snapper Grouper Committee's agenda in March to have some of these discussions, and so, just sort of summarizing what I'm hearing here, in terms of this action specifically, what the subcommittee is interested in seeing in March would be, again, more detail on those NMFS-approved options, information on whether alternatives -- Or having more discussion on that three-hour notification period, and then maybe seeing Jessica Stephen's presentation again, or a sort of condensed version of that presentation, to think about whether or not there are other options you would like to consider instead of a prelanding notification, such as an offload notification, and so I guess the first question is, is that correct, and that's what you would like to see, and then we can sort of discuss the best way to incorporate that, be it in March or some other way.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Only if it would be considered within our already accepted range of alternatives to change the language to offloading, and so, in other words, I don't want to have to, you know, delay it by going out to public hearing one more time, you know, and I don't want to mess with our NEPA role, and so, if we can do that without that, that might be interesting, and I just don't want to slow it down.

MS. WIEGAND: So, normally, I like to think of myself as pretty legal savvy, but I'm not sure that I know whether switching this to be an offloading notification, instead of a prelanding notification, if that's similar enough, and, again, like we don't have the exact language for that, to provide to you guys today, and hopefully we could get that in March, and then you would be able to then review it then and approve for public hearings with that exact language. We wouldn't have time for staff to do things like revise the analysis for that, and I would, I guess, boldly argue, as someone who only writes the social effects, the analysis would be very, very similar between

offloading versus prelanding notification, but, yes, there's some other intricacies in there that make it challenging for I feel like me to answer the question, and so I might ask if Monica has some thoughts about that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's perfect. She has her hand up.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do. My initial thought is that, as I read it before, the definition of "landing" is really broad, I think, under the general regulations, and it means to begin offloading fish, to offload, or to arrive at a port, dock, berth, beach, seawall, or ramp, and so I think my initial thought is that we could probably change that language, while still retaining much of what we have in the document. If you will kick it to the IPT, I will work on this more, but I kind of think that we wouldn't lose any time if we did change that, and I guess we could bring that to you in March.

MS. WIEGAND: I guess one thing I want to keep in mind, as we're talking about kicking things to the IPT, is I am not sure it's feasible, between now and the briefing -- I mean, we are trying to get the IPT together, and I haven't looked at scheduling, to see when we're going to be able to do that, and it might be tight to get the full IPT together before the March meeting, before the briefing book is posted, and we could get sort of a small group of people together, with, you know, expert knowledge in this, people like Jessica, for example, to talk about it, but I just sort of want to keep in mind the timing between this meeting and the March council meeting is pretty tight.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: How about kick it to Monica, and she'll get back with Christina, and we'll have a mini group here, and I can bring that back to you in March.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That sounds great. Kerry, final thoughts here?

MS. MARHEFKA: No, and I put my hand down. That sounds good to me.

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

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Next up, we have modifying the offloading site requirements and establishing approved landing locations for wreckfish, which sort of goes directly to the action we were just talking about, but, sort of right now, under Alternative 1, wreckfish have to be offloaded only at the fixed facility of a dealer with the GSAD permit, and, if it's not -- If wreckfish aren't going to be offloaded at that location, and it's going to be a different location, they have to let the NMFS Office of Law Enforcement know at least twenty-four hours prior to offloading. There are no landing location requirements for wreckfish currently.

Alternative 2 would remove the offloading site requirement for wreckfish and change it to be at an approved landing location, and landing locations have to be approved by the NMFS Office of Law Enforcement prior to a vessel landing wreckfish at those sites, and the only condition is sort of that landing locations be publicly accessible, via public roads or navigable waters, and no other condition impedes free and immediate access to the site by an authorized law enforcement officer.

Again, the Law Enforcement AP talked about this action at their meeting, and they noted that they felt like the language of the alternative should be publicly accessible via public roads and navigable waters, and they also noted that, in the Gulf, they've had issues with private residences being

approved as landing locations, and so their preference would be to completely disallow private residences as a preapproved landing location.

Then, again, sort of your environmental consequences here, and there are not many biological consequences, given that the commercial sector is constrained to the ACL and is currently operating under a well-regulated system, and then, for economic and social, just noting that preapproved landing locations would provide some increased flexibility in landing sites, and so it might reduce costs, if vessels have to travel a shorter distance, and it might be, you know, more convenient, and it would allow fishermen to adjust to different locations as sort of circumstances might require.

For administrative, Alternative 2 allows the locations to be approved by law enforcement, and so still allowing them to be selected, but it does provide more flexibility for fishermen, and it would just increase that administrative burden on law enforcement at the outset, but, overall, it would be expected to be minimal, especially as the program, you know, got set up and continued, and so, with that, I will scroll back up to your alternatives, and, again, we're looking for discussion and maybe selection of a preferred alternative here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Christina. Thoughts on this one from the committee? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess, as people are thinking about their thoughts, or questions, just for clarity, and, in terms of the offload location, so this has to be at a -- Sorry. This is a preapproved site, correct?

MS. WIEGAND: Under which alternative, and so Alternative 1 is not a preapproved site, and it's just a fixed facility with that dealer permit.

MR. STRELCHECK: Sorry. I was getting confused, and so Alternative 2 would be preapproved, and so what we've done, in the Gulf, is, you know, prepopulate that, so it's not a burden, and you're not creating sites, you know, on the fly, and it's just a list that you would be able to select from, through our system, or through the call service, to identify where you're landing, and then those would get approved in the system and ultimately -- You can always update them, if new sites are going to be added, and so there's some flexibility as well in the process, and so I just wanted to kind of share that, because I know there's been concerns, in the Gulf, in terms of kind of how that process works and what it looks like.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thoughts here, or is this another one that we're going to kick to March? I'm just trying to understand the thoughts of the committee here, and just a time check, and I believe we're set to go until 12:30 today, and I'm not sure if we can -- If we're allowed to go over that time period, but we have, I believe, fifteen actions in this document, and Action 15 has a lot of subactions, and so I'm just trying to make sure we get through everything we need to today. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think we should pick a preferred, if we can, or else we're just going to get bogged-down in March, and so, with that said, it sounds like the recommendation, from the agency and law enforcement, is Alternative 2. I'm fine with that. I am probably not okay, not for wreckfish, but in general, and I don't like the slippery slope of the private residence language that the LEAP has suggested, mainly because I think, as we sort of move down the road with a lot of

these fisheries, as I've said many times, we're having increasing problems finding places to land our fish, and losing working waterfront, and I'm not so sure there aren't going to need to be creative solutions to where that happens.

**I also wonder -- I forget, Charlie, and I think your house is not at your dock, but there are certainly places where both things happen, and so, with that said, I will make a motion to make Alternative 2 our preferred, but I do not recommend at least the language change that was suggested by the LEAP. I am fine with the "public roads and navigable waters", and I think you have to have a road, if you're unloading fish, from a fisherman's perspective anyway, to truck them out.**

MR. STRELCHECK: I will second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so motion by Kerry, and it's seconded by Andy. We've had some discussion on this, and we've heard from the Law Enforcement AP. Any final thoughts, or discussion, before we vote on this motion? All right. **Any objection?** All right. **The motion carries.**

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Next up, we have the offloading time requirements for wreckfish, and we've discussed this in a lot of detail at past meetings, and, right now, your current preferred alternative would be to modify the offloading hours to be 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. local time, and the environmental consequences have not changed since the last time you reviewed them.

The Law Enforcement AP did discuss this again and noted that their preferred alternative would be the 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. as well, as it would provide the sort of highest opportunity for law enforcement presence during offloading, and, again, just to note that I believe 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. mirrors the offloading hours required in the Gulf, and so I will just sort of pause here. There is no action necessary, but I wanted to see if there was any additional discussion or a desire to modify the preferred.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. I would like to point out that we've selected preferreds for I believe all of the remaining actions in the document, but, yes, is there any additional discussion or a desire to change this preferred? All right. I don't see any hands, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Then I will cruise us along to the last action in this document, and this is Action 15, which looks at implementing a cost recovery plan. There are four subactions underneath this, and one of the things that I want to note is that we have modified the no action alternative for Subactions 2, 3, and 4, and so the reason we did that is because Action 15.1 establishes that cost recovery plan, which is legally mandated.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 simply sort of set different, you know, elements of design for that program that the council would like to see, and so selecting the no action alternative under those actions isn't not implementing cost recovery, but it's simply the council not specifying how they would like to see cost recovery operate, in which case the agency would sort of make those selections on their own, and so just a quick note that that no action alternative language has changed. You have no selected no action for any of these alternatives, but I wanted to make that change clear.

Right now, you are proposing to implement a cost recovery plan in which the ITQ shareholder landing wreckfish would be responsible for collection and submission of the cost recovery fee. That fee would be collected in the last quarter of the calendar year in which the fish was harvested, and it would be submitted once per year, and then it would be based on the actual ex-vessel value of wreckfish landings, and so that's the system you've designed. The discussion, and the environmental consequences, for this haven't changed since we had the discussion in September, but, like previous actions, I wanted to go over what your current preferreds are and sort of pause and make sure that the subcommittee is still comfortable with what you selected in September.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. I thought we had a lot of discussion back in September, and a great presentation from Jessica on cost recovery, the ins and outs of it, and it sounded like we had a lot of great input from the shareholders, and so I think these preferreds are a result of that, and I'm comfortable where we are. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm comfortable where we're at as well, and I agree that we had a really good discussion at the last council meeting. One thing I will note is, by collecting the cost recovery fee in the last quarter of the year, we would essentially be going -- You know, after the first year, we would be collecting on kind of a non-calendar-year basis, and so it would essentially be like the last quarter of the prior year and the first three quarters of the current year in which fees are being collected, and so I just wanted to note that, because we wouldn't be able to collect all of the fees in the last quarter of the active fishing year.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Anything else here on this one? I agree that we had significant discussion on this, as did the shareholders, and we had lots of presentations on it. All right. I'm going to pass it back to you, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so the very last thing I need you all to do is we have a draft motion to approve this amendment for public hearings at the June 2024 council meeting. Given some of the discussion today, I don't know if you want to defer this decision until the March council meeting, but we'll sort of leave that up to the subcommittee.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just so I understand what will happen in March, and so we still have some items that don't have preferreds yet, and then this subcommittee would basically be reporting-out to the Snapper Grouper Committee, and is that how that would work? I get confused about this.

MS. WIEGAND: Yes, and so we'll have to think about how to structure this, and I think this might be something for staff to talk about on the backend, but, essentially, what would need to happen is we'll sort of review the decisions that this group made, and sort of pause and make sure there is no concern from those from the larger Snapper Grouper Committee, and then, when we get to like the prelanding notification action, we'll sort of stop, note that the subcommittee did not select a preferred alternative, because they wanted sort of X, Y, and Z to come to the March meeting, and we'll go over X, Y, and Z, and then the full Snapper Grouper Committee will select a preferred, and we'll just sort of work it that way, through a, I guess, untraditional committee report.



Then, assuming that the full Snapper Grouper Committee wanted to approve for public hearings, we would take all of that information, get this amendment in good working order for public hearings to occur at the June council meeting, and then we would be looking at final action at the June council meeting, unless, you know, something changes that would require us to push that a meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Christina. I would look to the committee, and part of me wants to just wait until the March meeting to make this motion to approve it for public hearings, since we don't have preferreds on every item, but I guess I will look to the committee, to see what they think, and what they would like to do here. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, I'm fine with that, Jessica. I think we can approve it in March.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I agree.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It sounds like we want to wait on this motion and consider that motion at the March meeting. Christina, what else do we need to do today?

MS. WIEGAND: That is all I had for you guys to do today, and so we'll take this, and we'll get you that additional information that you've requested in time for the March council meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you so much, Christina, and the IPT, for all the work here. I guess I would ask if there's any other business to come before this subcommittee, but I see Mike Freeman's hand up, and let's go to Mike.

MR. FREEMAN: Actually, I had a -- If you could scroll back down, real quick, but I had a question about the language in the cost recovery, and let me find the exact excerpt. So 15.1.1, Preferred Alternative 2, just the language for the transferable quota shareholder landing wreckfish would be responsible for collection and submission of the cost recovery, and I think the potential issue that I had in mind was already resolved by the selections of Alternatives 2 and 3 for the allocation transfer provision, but just the actual explicit language of shareholder there gave me a bit of pause, because I know that it was not a foregone conclusion that you had to be a shareholder to receive allocation. I am trying to scroll to find the exact action that it would have potentially been in conflict with.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. If Christina can't answer this right now, I might ask her to reach out to you at the conclusion of this meeting, because I know you're --

MS. WIEGAND: I think I understand what you're saying, Mike, and your concern is that, if the council were to select different preferred alternatives for the requirement to harvest, then you could end up in a situation where someone who is not a shareholder is landing wreckfish, in which case we would need to modify the language of this alternative. You're correct in that it only sort of functions now because the council selected a preferred alternative that would require someone to be a shareholder in order to harvest wreckfish, and so you're in a situation where it would always

be the shareholder landing wreckfish, but, should those requirements change, then we would need to reconsider how this alternative is written.

MR. FREEMAN: Correct, and that was my potential concern.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Mike, and thanks, Christina. Any other business? Jessica Stephen.

DR. STEPHEN: I just wanted to clarify that, when we're talking in the cost recovery actions, it is the shareholder account role that we're referring to, and so we probably need to go through and make that clean, and so, that way, the question asked isn't really relevant, and the person paying, and collecting, is the person who is making the landings based on their shareholder account role within that system and not whether they hold or do not hold shares, and I will make sure, when we go through, that we clear that up everywhere.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Great. Thank you, Jessica. All right. Any other business to come before this subcommittee? All right. I want to thank the subcommittee members today, and thank you, Christina and Myra and everyone that helped out with this meeting, all the folks on the IPT, and thank you, Monica. Thank you, Jessica Stephen. Anything else before we adjourn? All right. Thanks, everybody.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on February 8, 2024.)

- - -

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

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
February 21, 2024

## Attendee Report: Feb. 2024 Wreckfish Sub-Committee Meeting

Report Generated:

02/08/2024 01:02 PM EST

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered	# Attended
626-280-259	02/08/2024 08:31 AM EST	3 hours 59 minutes	24	23

### Staff Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Yes	Not applicable for staff	Council	South Atlantic	administrator@safmc.net

### Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Yes	99	Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
Yes	77	Bunting	Matthew	matthew.bunting@myfwc.com
Yes	52	Crosson	Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov
Yes	41	Curtis	Judd	judd.curtis@safmc.net
Yes	41	DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Yes	40	Foss	Kristin	kristin.foss@myfwc.com
Yes	97	Freeman	Mike	mike@twojerks.com
Yes	44	Glazier	Ed	Edward.Glazier@noaa.gov
Yes	39	Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Yes	99	Grinet	Tim	timgrinersafmc@gmail.com
Yes	43	LaVine	Britni	britni.lavine@noaa.gov
Yes	91	Marhefka	00Kerry	kerryomarhefka@gmail.com
Yes	83	McCawley	00-Jessica	jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com
Yes	43	Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Yes	55	Murphey	00Trish	trish.murphey@deq.nc.gov
Yes	99	Phillips	ALWTRT Charlie	ga_capt@yahoo.com
Yes	98	Schmidtke	Michael	Mike.Schmidtke@safmc.net
Yes	46	Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@gmail.com
Yes	88	Smit-Brunello	Monica	monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov
Yes	41	Stemle	Adam	adam.stemle@noaa.gov
Yes	65	Strelcheck	Andy	andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov
Yes	47	Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov
Yes	47	stephen	jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
No	0	DeBrango	Gregory	gdebrango@gmail.com