

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DOLPHIN WAHOO COMMITTEE

Webinar

June 8-9, 2020

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Chris Conklin
Mel Bell
Dr. Kyle Christiansen
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
David Whittaker
Rick Bellavance

Art Sapp, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Spud Woodward
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Steve Poland
Tony Dilernia
Dewey Hemilright

COUNCIL MEMBERS

LT. Robert Copeland

COUNCIL STAFF

John Carmichael
Julia Byrd
Kelly Klasnick
Cameron Rhodes
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson
Cindy Chaya
Kathleen Howington
Julie Neer

Dr. Brian Chevront
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Chip Collier
Christina Wiegand
John Hadley
Roger Pugliese
Suzanna Thomas
Allie Iberle
BeBe Harrison

OBSERVERS/PARTICIPANTS

Shep Grimes
Monica Smit-Brunello
Martha Guyas
Rick DeVictor
Pat O'Shaughnessy

Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Clay Porch
Dr. Genny Nessler
Erika Burgess

Other observers and participants attached.

The Dolphin Wahoo Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Monday, June 8, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Anna Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: I call the Dolphin Wahoo Committee to order, and I appreciate you all participating. Dolphin Wahoo can be a difficult committee in the best of circumstances, and this is not the best of circumstances, and so, with that, I will move, on behalf of the committee, to approve the agenda by consensus, unless there is any opposition to that. Is there any additions to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved.

The next item is Approval of the March 2020 Dolphin Wahoo Committee minutes. Is there any opposition to approving these minutes?

MR. GRIMES: I have some changes, if I can.

MS. BECKWITH: Certainly, Shep.

MR. GRIMES: I have three things. On page 5, the fourth full paragraph, the second line, “or” should be “are”. On page 6, second-to-the-last paragraph, second-to-the-last line, it should be “of”. The last one is page 7, the third line, in my paragraph on that page, the word “could” should be “would”, and that is all. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for that. With those changes, if there is no opposition, we will consider those minutes approved. Okay. The next item on the agenda is the dolphin wahoo catch level recommendations.

MR. HADLEY: With that, Dr. Genny Nessler will be giving the presentation.

DR. NESSLER: This is Genny Nessler, and I’m the new SSC Chair, and I just wanted to give you a brief review of our reconsideration of catch level recommendations for dolphin and wahoo. Just to reorient folks, back at our fall meeting, in October of 2019, the SSC had reviewed all of the unassessed stocks, in light of the new MRIP estimates that had come out, and set some new recommendations for ABCs, and, when we did that for dolphin and wahoo, we had recommended the third-highest landings from 1994 to 1997 be used to set the ABC.

The council then noted, when they reviewed our recommendations, that, for dolphin, this resulted in an ABC that was the second-lowest value in the time series, and so we were asked to reconsider the ABC, which we did in our April meeting over webinar.

The committee took a close look at the landings and catch time series, and, ultimately, we, after extensive discussion, we recommended expanding the timeframe for our ABC setting. Instead, we recommend that we use the third-highest landings from 1994 to 2007, and so, for dolphin, the ABC recommendation would be revised upwards, from a little over 18.3 million pounds to about twenty-four-and-a-half.

For wahoo, that ABC would also be revised upwards, from a little over 1.9 million pounds to a little over 2.8 million pounds, and, just as a side note, both of these ABC recommendations are based on the statistics that have been recalculated with the new Southeast Fisheries Science Center weight estimation procedure, which we also reviewed and approved at our April meeting, and

you'll be hearing more about that, I understand, in your next meeting, and it also, based on our previous decisions back in the fall, includes the catch data from Monroe County, Florida.

Just to give you a little bit of background on our discussions, we did consider ORCS as an alternative approach, but the SSC is concerned, in general, that this method has not performed well in recent studies, but have used it in management strategy evaluations, and so the SSC is recommending that we have the opportunity to review the ORCS methodology as the ABC control rule is being developed for dolphin and wahoo and for the snapper grouper species. In particular, we would like a chance to take a close look at and review the risk of overexploitation scalar that's applied when determining the ABCs via ORCS.

We would also like the opportunity to consider new research that has come out since the ORCS workshop, and I think that was back in 2012, perhaps, on various data-limited approaches and their robustness and applicability in various circumstances, and we would also like to review the applicability of ORCS to stocks for which the ABC is greater than the historical weight-based catches, and so, for instance, the jacks complex would be a good candidate, and so that's my short report, and I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Is there anyone that would like to comment? Seeing none, thank you for that. Before we move on, I do want to say that I did have the opportunity to sit through the SSC discussion on this topic, and I thought it was really well done and robust, and I know that the council had really wanted them to consider ORCS, and they certainly had some concerns about ORCS, and so I am happy with the results.

At some future time, I think I would like some discussion on if the SSC was uncomfortable with ORCS for these species, if it would have been possible for them to consider setting the ABC at the highest catch in that time series rather than the third-highest, and the way I'm thinking about this is it would have met the issue in the middle, where they would have provided a realistic ABC and set the ABC above most of the variability in the landings, but not gone as high as ORCS, and so I'm not suggesting that we send this back to the SSC, and I think these are manageable ABCs and that we can work well within these, but I just encourage, as the SSC discusses new ABC recommendations, that, instead of always going with what has been done in the past, if there is an opportunity for new methods or, in this case, having considered the highest in the time series, rather than the third-highest, in order to deal with some of that additional variability, and I would certainly encourage that.

MR. POLAND: I have got some reservations about even asking this question, and I might regret it once I ask it, but I'm going to go for it anyway, and so I as well listened into the SSC meeting, obviously, as the SSC liaison, and, Genny, I do appreciate your report, and the SSC did a fantastic job in going back and reviewing the available data for dolphin, and I know it was kind of a -- It could be perceived as a difficult thing to ask, at least from the SSC's perspective, and the council is basically asking you to go back and try again, more or less, but, during that discussion, the SSC spent a lot of time talking about ORCS and its performance relative to other metrics and looking at MSE evaluation and all that, and you touched on it a little bit, and I just -- I thought it was interesting that the SSC determined that they were not comfortable using ORCS to provide a dolphin ABC recommendation, and I can't remember, out of all the other unassessed species, from the last SSC meeting, or, really, I guess it was the one in October of last year, how many of those was ORCS used.

Given the same concerns raised for dolphin, could we have the same concerns for all of those other unassessed species, and I'm certainly not saying that we need to go back and evaluate all of them, but I just kind of wanted to get a sense from Genny how you felt that ORCS performs for those other species, since there was so much concern for dolphinfish.

DR. NESSLAGE: It was a difficult conversation, and a bit circular, as I recall, and we did talk a little bit about how ORCS performs, and we did not really, as I recall, touch on its performance for other species, with the exception of other circumstances where the ABC would be higher than the historical observed catch, and I think that most of our conversation, as I recall, and someone else correct me if I'm wrong, focused on just a general unease with the ORCS approach, given the recent research that's been done, and I think my characterization, or my understanding, of where the SSC sits right now is that I think they would like an opportunity to take a really fresh, thorough look at the performance of ORCS, period, although I think we highlighted, here in our report, dolphin wahoo and snapper grouper, but also the jacks complex, because those are ones we're most concerned about, but, if we start looking more closely at ORCS, perhaps we would want to take a closer look at the other species to which it's applied.

Again, I don't think we discussed that too much, Steve, and I don't recall that, but we may have, and I think that we would really appreciate the opportunity though to kind of take a step back and look at ORCS more comprehensively, but that's just my recollection of the meeting, and does that help address your concern or comment?

MR. POLAND: Yes, it does, and I appreciate that, Genny, and my recollection of the discussion is I don't think you all really got into a lot of detailed discussion, as far as ORCS for other species, and, I mean, honestly, it really didn't click with me until right now, listening to the report, and I just kind of had a pit in my stomach that basically the determination of the SSC was that ORCS was not appropriate for dolphin, and we just received some ABC recommendations for other species using ORCS, and I don't want to say that I call into question those recommendations, but it just kind of gave me a pause.

DR. NESSLAGE: I think one of the reasons that we were concerned about dolphin was that the ORCS would have -- The ORCS-based ABC for dolphin would have been higher than the historical catch, as I recall, and that's where we would -- When that happens, then we would be recommending an ABC based on very little information, and so ORCS is designed to say, well, essentially, if you have a historical time series of catches, and you don't see any terrible things going on in the stock, you know that at least the stock could have, at least historically, sustained that level of catch.

When you start going beyond the historical observed catch, that's when you're really working with no information, and I think that's where the SSC started to pull back and say, well, I think we need to reconsider, and so you're right that we didn't spend much time talking about the other species, and, to the extent to which we should revisit that, I would leave that up to the council, of course.

MR. POLAND: Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I think spadefish and jacks were two examples where the ABC was based on ORCS, and it was greater than the historic time series.

DR. ERRIGO: I just wanted to add a little more clarification to the discussions of the snapper grouper species and ORCS. Back in October, when we discussed ABCs for all the unassessed species, the basic conversation was about updating the ABCs based on the new numbers, and so using the exact same methodology that was used in the past and just using the new numbers to update those ABCs, and so the conversation wasn't let's go back over every single species and try to find the most appropriate methodology for setting the ABC for each species, and, also, remember that I think more than half of the SSC that was around when we made ORCS is no longer on the SSC, and so there's been a lot of turnover, and so there's a lot of people who don't even know what decisions were made originally, and, now that they're looking at what has resulted from the ORCS approach, there is a lot of unknowns, perhaps misunderstandings and all that other kind of stuff, plus these new studies, and so it deserves definitely another look-see and discussion from the SSC, if not for any other reason than to bring everyone up to speed on exactly what's going on.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for that, Mike.

DR. PORCH: Just to address a couple of points here, as explained, ORCS, by definition, just relies on catch, because that's all you have, and so it's sort of a last-ditch effort to give ABC advice, and it can't perform well. I mean, even if you see a sustainable catch level, you don't know if it's sustainable at a high level and there's a lot more fish out there and you could fish even harder, or if you're just barely hanging on, and so it's not a real good way to develop ABC advice, but it's just all you have when there is only catch data available and no other information.

Having said that, the thing that makes dolphin different, and, to some extent, wahoo, is they're not a unit stock. I mean, dolphin range all over the Atlantic Ocean, and you only get some fraction of them in the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction, and so ORCS won't work for that. I mean, it's really just a fraction of the stock you're looking at, and so ORCS doesn't really apply, and that's probably -- I don't know if they discussed it, but that would be the reason that I would advance for saying ORCS isn't a very good way for dolphin wahoo.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Thank you so much for those clarifications. Is there any other discussion on this topic? Seeing none, we can move on to the update on the dolphin wahoo and HMS pelagic longline bi-op.

MR. HADLEY: Thank you. Jenny, we're ready when you are.

MS. LEE: I was just asked to update on the HMS bi-op, and so the good news is that the biological opinion on the pelagic longline fishery was completed on May 15, and it's a non-jeopardy opinion, and I think why this group was particularly interested in this particular opinion is because, in trying to think about parallel regulations with the HMS pelagic longline fishery and the dolphin wahoo pelagic longliners, and so I think the main points you want to know is just that this bi-op does not create any new requirements specific to sea turtle release conditions or requirements, or anything really, any sea turtle conservation measures, and there are no new requirements that need to be implemented.

The bi-op, of course, has terms and conditions related to monitoring and various reporting, but there really aren't any specific requirements that you should be concerned about with respect to

the current dolphin wahoo amendment that you are considering. Are there any specific questions related to the HMS bi-op? I will also add that there are actually two biological opinions that were completed, and we also completed one on basically everything else, the non-pelagic longline fisheries that HMS manages, and that was also a non-jeopardy opinion, and both are online now, and I know they were made available to you.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Thank you so much. I did read where it mentioned that you guys were working on prudent and reasonable measures, but it sounds like none of those prudent or reasonable measures would impact our current Amendment 10.

MS. LEE: Correct, and so, if you scan down, now that the bi-ops are completed, there are finalized reasonable and prudent measures with implementing terms and conditions, and so those are the more specific requirements that implement the reasonable and prudent measures, and, since I know you do have copies of the bi-op, if you just skim back through, you will see the various terms and conditions there, but I don't see any that I need to call out as you should be concerned with respect to Amendment 10.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. I appreciate that. That's good news for us, and it makes our job a little bit easier.

MS. LEE: Excellent. I was asked to also just share that the pelagic longline take reduction team -- NMFS has a draft and a proposed rule and an associated EA to implement the team's recommendations from -- It was actually back in December of 2015 and then again in October of 2016, but I bring this up because it does relate to your amendment with respect to the mainline length in the Mid-Atlantic Bight.

If the proposed rule follows along with the team recommendations, it would be changing the maximum length of the mainline from twenty nautical meters to thirty-two nautical meters, and I can follow-up with an email, with only thirty nautical meters of that being active gear, and so it would limit the number of pieces that could be set to one, to avoid multiple sets, but the bottom line is there is a -- In your Amendment 10, you have some language to parallel the requirement relating to mainline length in the Mid-Atlantic Bight, and so this rule is currently in the clearance process, and we expect publication sometime this summer, and then there will be a webinar meeting of the team during the thirty-day public comment period, and so that's the only one that it does make sense to pay attention to, because I think you have one of your alternatives that will soon be out of date.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you for bringing that to our attention. Are there any questions?

MR. SAPP: Just that it could not possibly have max meters, and more likely miles.

MS. LEE: I'm sorry. That is correct. My bad.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thanks for that. Is there any other comments or questions? Seeing none, thank you so much for your time, and that means we are now ready, folks, to move into Amendment 10.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just trying to figure out if we were going to get a full protected resources update on the non-dolphin wahoo items later in the meeting.

MS. LEE: I don't know if you're asking that directly to me, but I can follow-up during the status reports, or with Roy, if there's any particular information, but my understanding is that you did not request a full protected species update, but, if there are any questions, I am happy to make sure I have the answers for you and addressed prior to the end of your meeting. I think we have one thing that we might mention.

MS. WIEGAND: Jenny is correct. Because we switched this to a webinar meeting, we decided to forego doing the full protected resources report during Full Council, in the name of time and streamlining things, but Jenny and I can work on it, and we do have the usual set of items that we send to SERO for them to report on, and we can put together a written report that will then be sent to the council, but, no, we weren't going to have a formal report during Full Council.

MS. BECKWITH: Jessica, did you have any additional questions on that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: No, just that that sounds good. The written report will be fine.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Great.

MR. DILERNIA: Can you again review just that longline limit in the Mid? I think it's okay, but I just need to hear it again, and I'm sorry, but I was slightly distracted. Thank you.

MS. LEE: I was just pointing out that the Pelagic Longline Take Reduction Team and NMFS will have a proposed rule coming out, and so the team was changing the maximum length of the mainline from twenty nautical miles to thirty-two nautical miles, and then I probably gave a little bit more details than necessary, which confused folks.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you very much, because, when I had heard "meters", I said wait a minute. It's nautical miles, and so I'm very good. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. I don't see any other hands raised, and so we are ready when you are, John.

MR. HADLEY: Sounds good. I will just queue up the presentation here to orient everyone on where we stand with Dolphin Wahoo 10. Just to reiterate the general protocol, and we've gone over it for the most part already, but, since different committees are operating slightly differently, we're raising our hands to comment and make a motion. Julia is monitoring hands, and we will write your name on the Google Doc, and Anna is calling on everyone. I won't go into voting on motions, and we've already kind of gotten into that, and I think everything has gone pretty smoothly overall.

To jump into Amendment 10, just to review what the council did in December of 2019, since the last time that we were able to discuss this amendment, you reviewed several actions in the amendment and removed the action that would allow adaptive management of sector ACLs for dolphin. In doing so, you directed staff to move alternatives that would allow rollover of uncaught

ACL to be moved into the ABC control rule amendment, since this amendment will target and address allowing rollover of uncaught ACL.

You also removed associated alternatives in the action for the commercial accountability measure for dolphin, and we'll go over that a little bit more once we get into the amendment. As you may recall, there was a delay of discussion on other actions in Amendment 10 until this meeting, when new catch level recommendations would be available from the SSC.

Looking at some of the potential amendment timing, just kind of a brief history is we started talking about the amendment in March of 2016, and the amendment was scoped in August of 2016, looking at potential gear allocations in the commercial sector, longline versus all other gears for dolphin, and potential adaptive management of sector ACLs. This amendment has been developed -- It was developed until March of 2017, when the amendment was suspended, pending the availability of revised recreational data. In December of 2018, that's when the council directed staff to begin working again on the amendment, and we've been working -- We have reviewed the amendment several times since then.

Kind of moving forward to this meeting, we'll review the purpose and need statements, and we're looking for guidance on actions in the amendment. In September, and this is sort of a flexible timeline, we'll potentially approve the purpose and need statements, review preliminary effects, and select preferred alternatives, and maybe potentially approve for public hearings. Here again, this depends on how many actions remain in the amendment and how much work the IPT can really get done in the meantime.

Should this occur in the fall of 2020, public hearings would happen for the amendment. In December of 2020, we would have public hearing comments and revised effects. In March of 2021, you would review the amendment again. Then, in June of 2021, you would potentially move towards approving the amendment for secretarial review. Then the measures would likely be implemented sometime in 2022.

Looking at the actions, there are currently fifteen actions in the amendment, and they can really be broken down into four major categories, and the first accommodates revised recreational data and catch level recommendations, and these are Actions 1 through 4. Then potentially redefining optimum yield for the dolphin fishery, and so Actions 5 through 7, and then revising accountability measures, and that includes for both dolphin and wahoo, and these are Actions 8 through 10. Then implement miscellaneous management revisions in the dolphin and wahoo fisheries, and so there are several kind of standalone very targeted management actions that we will go over.

The first group of four, the actions that accommodate revised recreational data and catch level recommendations, Action 1 and 2 would revise the total annual catch limit for dolphin, to reflect the updated ABC recommendations that we just received a presentation on from the SSC. Action 2 would do the same thing for wahoo, revising the ACL for wahoo. Actions 3 and 4 look at revising sector allocations and sector annual catch limits. Action 3 focuses on dolphin, and Action 4 focuses on wahoo.

Looking at the next set of three actions that redefine optimum yield, Action 5 revises the optimum yield definition for dolphin, and one of the alternatives in this amendment would potentially use ACTs, annual catch targets, and so, in doing so, if this were to be used, you would have to establish

an annual catch target for dolphin, since one does not exist, and potentially revise the annual catch target for dolphin to potentially update with the new ACLs and ABC recommendations.

The next set of actions change accountability measures, and Action 8 would revise the commercial accountability measures for dolphin, and Action 9 would revise the recreational accountability measures for dolphin, and Action 10 would revise the recreational AMs for wahoo.

Moving along, the last set of actions, sort of the independent standalone actions, Action 11 would allow properly permitted commercial vessels with gear onboard that are not authorized for use in the dolphin wahoo fishery to possess dolphin or wahoo. Action 12 would remove the operator card requirement. Action 13 looks at revising or modifying the recreational vessel limit for dolphin. Action 14 is the action that looks at modifying gear, bait, and training requirements in the commercial longline fishery for dolphin and wahoo, to align with those requirements of pelagic longline gear in the highly migratory species fishery. Then, finally, Action 15 allows for filleting of dolphin at-sea onboard charter or headboat vessels in the waters north of the Virginia/North Carolina border.

What we really need to get through at this meeting is we'll go through the decision document, and we'll review the draft purpose and need statements, review the actions and alternatives, looking for guidance and potential approval of new actions and proposed revisions, as appropriate, and we'll consider the amendment timing and when the committee would like to review the amendment again. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions before we jump into the decision document.

MR. DILERNIA: I was just wondering, and where is the request for the bullet and frigate mackerel to be considered ecosystem components? Where is that contained, because it is a primary food source for wahoo, and so I was wondering if it was part of the amendment or if it was separate.

MS. BECKWITH: That is its own amendment that we will be discussing next, after we're done with Amendment 10. That's Amendment 12.

MR. DILERNIA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HADLEY: Not seeing any other hands raised, shall we jump into the amendment document? Okay. What we have included is a draft purpose and need statement. This is an initial attempt by the IPT to address the different actions in the amendment, and this will likely need to be updated, depending on what the council wants to add or remove from the amendment overall, and I won't read it to you, but in front of you is the draft purpose and the draft need for the amendment, and I didn't know if the committee would like to discuss what the IPT has put forth or potentially come back to this at a later date, or potentially after we've had a chance to discuss the actions.

MS. BECKWITH: I suggest that we discuss the actions first, especially if we're going to be removing a few. Then we're going to have to come back and change it, regardless.

MR. HADLEY: Okay. Sounds good. With that, we'll jump into the actions in the amendment itself. In front of you, we have Action 1, which will revise the total annual catch limit for dolphin, to reflect the updated acceptable biological catch, and, currently, the ACL for dolphin is approximately 15.3 million pounds. Alternative 2 would set the total ACL for dolphin equal to

the updated ABC catch level recommendation, which you just received. Alternative 3 would set the ACL for dolphin equal to 95 percent of the updated ABC, and Alternative 4 would set the ACL for dolphin equal to 90 percent of the updated ABC.

This is really in response -- The committee was asked if you would like to have alternatives that would allow a step-down of the ACL from the ABC, and so these are the three alternatives that the IPT has put together. With that, I just wanted to go over some of the figures and tables that were included in the decision document, and, overall, you can see this is the updated catch level - - These are the landings in relation to the current ABC recommendation, and so you can see the solid black line, compared to the previous ABC recommendation from the October SSC meeting, and so you can see the purple-dashed line, and so you can see the current ABC recommendation is considerably higher. In most years, total landings are well below that recommendation, with the exception of I believe that's 2015, but you can kind of see the difference in the two recommendations.

Looking at some of the PSEs for Atlantic dolphin, they tend to be fairly low, usually around 10 to 20 percent, in that range, which is pretty good, particularly compared to many of the other species that are managed by the South Atlantic Council, and so looking at the -- That's the recreational component, which, there again, that's the majority of the dolphin landings.

Just looking at overall what your potential ABCs would be in comparison to landings, we have Table 2, and so you're looking at the new ABC recommendation will be approximately 24.6 million pounds, with a step-down from there of 95 percent, and then 90 percent in Alternative 4. We're really looking for a potential motion on accepting the IPT's suggested edits to Action 1 in the amendment, and these were highlighted in yellow, and, with that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Great, and so we would be looking for a motion to approve the IPT's recommended language.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: It's seconded by Steve. Okay. **The motion reads to approve the IPT's suggested edits in Action 1 in Amendment 10. Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Thank you. Moving on to Action 2, this is very similar, except we're focusing on wahoo instead of dolphin. Currently, the ACL for wahoo is approximately 1.8 million pounds, and you did receive the updated wahoo annual catch limits, and Alternative 2 would set the ACL equal to the ABC. Alternative 3 would have a slight step-down, and so the ACL would equal 95 percent of the ABC, and Alternative 4 would -- The ACL for wahoo would equal 90 percent of the updated ABC.

Here again, just to look at -- In relation to landings and the kind of previous ABC recommendation versus the current ABC recommendation, there again looking at the October recommendation versus the April recommendation, you can see there was a slight bump there. In general, landings tend to be below -- There again, the solid black line is the current ABC recommendation, and the purple-dashed line is the previous ABC recommendation, and so we're really focusing on that dark-black line that shows where the new ABC recommendation is and where the ABC level is.

You can see, in most years, wahoo landings are below the currently-recommended ABC. However, the exception is that we did see -- I believe it was approximately 2015, 2016, and 2017, where you had a fairly good spike in recreational landings, according to the new FES estimates.

Again, looking at the recreational PSEs, just as a reminder, the wahoo fishery is largely driven by recreational landings, and so what sort of confidence you can have in these estimates, and the PSEs are -- They are a little bit higher for dolphin. However, they are fairly low, particularly in recent years, and also fairly low when it comes to comparing them to many of our other species that are common recreational targets.

Then, finally, we have a table here that shows what the new ACLs would potentially be under the different alternatives, in comparison to average wahoo landings, and so your ACL is at approximately 1.8 million pounds, and this doesn't really compare to the current FES estimate, since you're really looking at two different currencies, if you will. However, Alternative 2, 3, and 4 would be in the new FES estimates, inclusive of Monroe County, and you're looking at approximately 2.9 million pounds, with step-downs thereafter of approximately 95 percent of the ABC for Alternative 3 and 90 percent of the ABC for Alternative 4. Here again, we're looking for a similar action to potentially approve the IPT's suggested edits in Action 2.

MS. BECKWITH: John, you mentioned that some of those were not in the new FES estimates, and so are you saying that those landings would actually be higher?

MR. HADLEY: No, and sorry about that. I was just referring to Alternative 1, and so you can't really compare it, and so the average landings are in FES estimates, and so it's really not a proper comparison to compare the current ACL to FES estimates, and it's kind of two different currencies, and so that's the only point that I was trying to drive home there. All the other numbers here are in the updated MRIP data.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I see a question from Mel.

MR. BELL: I was going to make a motion, if that's all right. **I would just move to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 2 in this amendment.**

MS. BECKWITH: Excellent, and we have a second by Steve. **Is there any opposition to this motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 2 in Amendment 10? Seeing no opposition, this motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Moving along, the next two actions will address sector allocations, and the first one, Action 3, is addressing sector allocations for dolphin. There's a couple of things to keep in mind. The old sector allocations, if you will, are based on not the current FES estimates, and they're an older currency if you will. Also, with this new set of catch level recommendations, they were also inclusive of Monroe County, and so the point being that you're looking at an entirely different dataset.

With that, allocations likely need to change, compared to their current state, just to keep things kind of functioning as-is, so to speak, and we've gotten the presentation on allocations and the whole pie situation, and, in this case, the pie is growing, and so that's the rationale for presenting

the Action 3 and Action 4. This action has been included in several of your decision documents, but, since the committee was waiting on hearing the updated catch level recommendations, this hasn't really been discussed in detail by the committee, nor has it been accepted for inclusion in Action 10, and so, just keeping that in mind, we'll take a little bit of time to go over this in detail.

Currently, for dolphin, the recreational sector allocation is 90 percent of the ACL, and the commercial sector allocation for dolphin is 10 percent of the total ACL, and, there again, this is based on total catch between 2008 and 2012, and, as reported in 2014, it does not incorporate recreational landings for Monroe County, and so, there again, not using the new FES estimates and not including recreational landings for Monroe County.

Alternative 2 would use a similar approach, and so you're still using the same baseline of landings, and so 2008 through 2012. However, this would be based on the landings as reported in 2019, using the new FES estimates, as well as incorporating recreational landings for Monroe County. Alternative 4 would have a revised set of allocations, and this is based on an updated time series, and so 2013 through 2017, and you will see 2017 is the terminal year for several of these alternatives, and the IPT rationale for suggesting 2017 as the terminal year is because this was the terminal year that the SSC reviewed, and so that's the rationale and why you will see this repeated several times when presenting potential alternatives that would look at a more recent time series.

You are kind of updating the time series to 2013 through 2017, and so you're also incorporating FES estimates and recreational landings from Monroe County in Alternative 3. In Alternative 4, you're looking at based on a longer time series, and so you're looking at an allocation that's based on total catch between 1986 and 2017, and this is based on the new FES estimates and inclusive of Monroe County.

Then, in Alternative 5, there are several sub-alternatives, but what this largely uses is the -- As you have seen in the past, it's the Bow Tie Method and applying it to dolphin, and so you have different -- Looking at the general formula, it's the sector ACL, or sector apportionment, which would look at a weighted average of the long-term catch, and so 50 percent based on the long-term catch and 50 percent based on a recent catch.

Here, we have a different set of alternatives, and the long-term catch would be 1999 through 2008, and then the recent catch would be 2006 through 2008, and Alternative 5b is the long-term catch would be 2008 through 2017. The recent catch would be 2015 through 2017, and Sub-Alternative 5c is looking at a time series for long-term catch of 1986 through 2017, and so really a very long time series there, and then your recent catch would be 2015 through 2017, and so those last three years of landings, and you can see the various percentages there, and I have a table at the very end that I will get to that kind of has everything, and it's easier to compare side-by-side.

Then, finally, Alternative 6 looks at allocating 6.25 percent of the total ACL to the commercial sector, and so this is based on maintaining the commercial annual catch limit, which is currently approximately 1.54 million pounds of weight, and so 6.25 percent of the new ACL, with the current ACL, and so, essentially, you're keeping the commercial ACL constant and then allocating the remaining pounds to the recreational sector.

Here again, this action is relatively -- It's, quote, unquote, new to the amendment, and the committee has not had a chance to vote on it, and it was added in accordance with guidance

received in December of 2018 to add an action that revised sector allocations, and I won't go through the alternatives, since I just walked through them, but, looking at the different -- Alternative 5 here shows the different potential sector allocations on a percent basis, and then the following tables look at what you would be dealing with as far as pounds and potential changes to the recreational sector and the commercial sector.

You can see, for the different alternatives and sub-alternatives presented, the recreational sector is looking at a fairly large jump, keeping in mind that this is a new sort of currency, if you will, using the new FES estimates. However, the commercial sector is still operating in the same pounds that they've always been operating in, and you can see the difference for, if you apply the different baseline years to the time series, in what the commercial ACL would be.

The next set of tables, you're looking at how the new potential recreational ACLs compare to recent dolphin landings, recreational dolphin landings, and then, also, in Table 8, similarly, but, for the commercial sector, you're looking at how the new ACLs would compare to recent commercial landings.

Really, one thing to keep in mind is there are several -- This was an initial recommendation, and you have different rationales for suggesting this first set of alternatives, but, really, this is the IPT's initial recommendation for the committee to take and run with and either accept it or add something else, and this is really the first close look we've taken for it, and one thing to keep in mind is size limits and bag limits have potentially constrained the fishery, to some extent, since 2004, with the implementation of the FMP, and so that's something that you may want to consider, and ACLs have also gone into place, and the commercial sector faced a season closure in 2015, for approximately five months, but it has remained open otherwise. The commercial sector has not faced an in-season closure, and so, really, this may be a consideration, if allocations are based on landings in more recent years.

Despite the varying rationale and baseline years, there is very little difference between some of those alternatives or sub-alternatives, and so, given that outcome, are there some that the committee may not want to consider?

Then a couple more points are, since commercial landings have not notably changed, but recreational landings have increased, due to MRIP revisions, the initial range of alternatives does not increase the allocation of dolphin to the commercial sector on a percent basis, and so none of the alternatives that the IPT at least initially recommended go beyond 10 percent for the commercial sector, and so we just wanted to make sure that this is the intent of the committee, or would the committee like to consider alternatives that go beyond 10 percent for the commercial sector, and are there factors other than historic landings that you may want to consider? Overall, we're looking to discuss Action 3 and the alternatives, or the proposed range of alternatives, and approve it for consideration in Amendment 10, and I will take a break there.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, John. As John mentioned, we haven't approved this action into the amendment, and so, as I open up discussion, if there are alternatives that we are not interested in looking at, we don't have to push them into the Considered but Rejected, but we just simply have to indicate that we're not interested in adding those into this amendment.

MR. BREWER: Whoever suggested that we wait to see what the new numbers were before taking any action here was a very wise person. In looking at the new numbers, I don't think we need an Action 3, and I will leave it to you to discuss, or I shouldn't say it that way, but I would like to be rid of it. There are several other actions in this thing that I think we need to get rid of, but, on this one, I think that we need to -- If we call it to the Considered but Rejected amendment or addenda or whatever, but I would like to do that.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and, John, can you clarify -- Technically, we do need to have this action in here, because we need to update away from using the FES numbers, and so our current allocation is based on old MRIP, and so we are required, in some form or another, to update to the new FES numbers, and is that correct?

MR. HADLEY: I believe that's correct, and Shep may be able to speak more so to whether or not you are bound to do this. I will say, if you leave it at 90/10, that's going to be -- You can see in Table 6, Alternative 1 that this would be your different ACLs, and so I think that's certainly an option, but I am not sure exactly sure whether you have to have this action in here or not.

MR. GRIMES: First, I will answer that, and I think you really do need this action in here. I think, even if you decide that you want to keep your current allocation of 90/10, with the new numbers, the new FES numbers, that results in -- Well, you could look at the new numbers and say we want to keep our same 90/10, but you have to develop the rationale for it, because your existing rationale was based on historic catch, and that no longer stands up, because the historic catch distribution has changed, and so it's weird that you can -- No matter what you do going forward with this, there is really some change in it, it seems to me, and so we need to come in and either say, okay, we want this percentage, or we want this keep the current poundages for the commercial sector as one of your alternatives, which would result in whatever percentage, but, yes, I do think we need to revisit it.

I will mention three things that will hopefully guide your future discussion of this, and John did a great job of introducing it, and this is fairly new, and so I know you're just grappling with all of this, and what I'm telling you now is you don't necessarily need to make changes, and maybe we'll develop the record to support things as they are as we go through it, but, anyway, these are things to keep in mind.

The first one is just echoing what the IPT recommendation was. As we worked through this, we came out with things like this is a lot of different alternatives for very little difference in percentage, and so it seems like you could definitely whittle that down. Along those lines, you did have discussion, and not at the last SSC meeting, and I think it was the prior SSC meeting, when you got the first dolphin wahoo FES-based ABC recommendation, and you had discussion of Monroe County, and a large amount of landings of certainly dolphin happen in Monroe County.

The SSC made the decision to include Monroe County landings in the recommendation, and so maybe you could use that as a basis for removing alternatives that didn't incorporate Monroe County landings, and one other thing that John mentioned that you might want to consider that I would just like to make a plug for is that really everything you have here now, if you're going to move forward with changing allocation, or addressing allocation, they were all based on catch history, and it's really -- They're all based on that single methodology, and it can be viewed as fairly narrow in scope, and you're only shifting years here and there, and so it seems -- If we're

not going to consider other approaches, we ought to have a good discussion of why we don't want to consider anything other than historical-catch-based approaches, and that's it. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for that, Shep.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think a couple of things about this action, and so I agree that we need to keep it, and I would still remove Alternatives 2 through 5, including all the sub-alternatives in 5, and I would keep 6, and then I would probably add a couple new alternatives, including -- This is kind of a question for Shep, but, even though the current allocation is 90/10, it's 90/10 based on old MRIP numbers and based on the fact that it doesn't include Monroe County, and so don't we also need an alternative, because you can't choose no action and maintain 90/10. It's almost like you're going with this 90/10 split, but after these new datasets are factored in.

I can start making motions, but there's a lot of people in the queue here that want to talk, and so I would like to see an action that maintains a 90/10, which, to me, is different than Alternative 6, and then there's a couple others that I would like to see, and then also, as we go through the discussion, I can provide some rationale about why I think we should remove Alternatives 2 through 5.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Jessica, and I agree with you. I also think that Alternatives 2 through 5 probably don't need to be in here, and it doesn't make a ton of sense for us to be taking away quota from the commercial folks below their historic cap.

MR. GRINER: I was just going to say the same thing. I mean, if this action has to stay in the amendment, then 2 through 5 really -- I don't feel comfortable having those in there as alternatives, and I'm still not completely sold that we have to have this to begin with, but, as we get through some new alternatives, maybe it will change my mind a little bit.

MR. BREWER: I understand the rationale for keeping this in, so that we can say that we looked at it, and we can have a discussion of why we did what we did, and I will be happy to have that discussion at some point, and I think that -- Just right off the bat, I think that the 90/10 has worked, and I actually voted for that. That was one of the first things that I voted on when I came on the council, even though I'm recreational.

I agree, and I think 2 through 5 have no place here, and Alternative 6, yes, but I don't know what other things that Jessica is thinking about, but, if we are going to have this discussion about this, I really think that we start looking at the different actions that are in this amendment and, the ones that we really want to go forward on, we split them out and make them a standalone.

I have kind of talked myself in circles here, but I do agree that we do need to talk about it, and we do need to have a rationale for doing what we did, now that we have new numbers, and so I won't be making a motion to completely do away with Action 3, but I would join in a motion, if somebody cares to make it, to do away with Alternatives 2 through 5c. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Thanks. We may not even need a motion to get rid of those, because we haven't technically added them, and so let's hold on that one, and I'm going to go to Brian,

Steve, Roy, and then I'll come back to Jessica, and we'll start kind of working through some of those.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I just wanted to remind you all that all of the stuff that we went through with the GAO audit, one of the things that was part of that audit was that the council is going to be looking at allocations for dolphin and wahoo for this amendment, and so my recommendation is that, regardless of whatever you decide to do or how you decide to do it, that you include an action in this amendment, or something like this, that shows that you have given some serious discussion to how you want to handle allocations for both dolphin and wahoo. I think it will help meet the requirements for what they were looking for, and it was certainly mentioned in the report that we're going to be discussing at Full Council. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you.

MR. POLAND: I was just going to throw my support behind removing Alternatives 2 through 5, and, as far as Alternative 1, no action, and correct me if I'm wrong, somebody, probably Roy or Shep, since they're in the queue right behind me, but it sounds like to me that Alternative 1, moving forward with a 90/10 split, do we also need another alternative that's a 90/10 split, but acknowledges that we're also using, or accounting for, those landings from Monroe County, or does the current alternative of no action suffice?

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Steve. Yes, and Jessica had mentioned that concern as well and her interest in making sure there was an individual alternative that acknowledged the new FES numbers and the Monroe County landings in a 90/10 alternative.

DR. CRABTREE: With the status quo, the 90/10, I think the issue there is, if you want to stay with 90/10, you're going to have to develop a rationale for it, because, right now, the rationale for it is that's the mix in the fishery during some baseline period of years, and that's no longer the case now. In fact, if you use the same baseline years, and stand by your status quo rationale, you would -- It would be Alternative 2, which I think is the same time series, but just updating to the FES, and so I don't think you want to take Alternative 2 out, because I think it is a very reasonable alternative, and, in my way of thinking of these things, if you want to keep the current allocation, that is Alternative 2 now, based on the rationale you have used in the past.

I view 90/10 as a reallocation, because it's a significant increase in the commercial quota, which is fine if that's what you want to do, but I think you need to develop some rationale of why you're doing that, but I would not take Alternative 2, because I think it is quite reasonable, and I expect, in many fisheries, that's going to end up being what we decide to do.

One thing is I do agree with taking some alternatives out, because we have a lot of alternatives that result in very little difference in the allocations, but one alternative that seems to me to be appropriate, but is not in here, is to put in an alternative that uses the same years for the allocation that the SSC used to set the ABC, and that would be 1994 to 2007, and so I don't know what that gives you, in terms of an allocation, but there would be some internal consistency with the basis for the ABC in the allocation, but, mostly, I would not remove Alternative 2, and, if you're going to stay with 90/10, you need to think about what's the basis for your reallocation, because you are then increasing the commercial quota.

MS. BECKWITH: Great points, Roy. Thank you so much.

MR. GRIMES: Roy said what I was going to clarify there on why I said we need to keep this action. Again, if you keep the status quo, in terms of 90/10, as he said, you need the rationale to support that, because your rationale is no longer valid, and I don't think that -- No matter what, I think you need to shift this over and rely on the new FES numbers. Otherwise, we're vulnerable on not relying on the best available scientific information.

The only other thing that I was going to mention was, in terms of removing Alternatives 2 through 5, I had suggested, and I think it's perfectly reasonable to remove the alternatives that do not incorporate Monroe County landings, for the reasons the SSC discussed, but the others that do include it, and I know this is early still, but we're still on the record, and we should still try to develop a rationale for why we don't want to consider those other alternatives, because I think certainly Alternative 2, for the reasons that Roy just said, seems to me to be a very reasonable alternative. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Shep. For Alternatives 3, 4, and 5, I think the reasoning behind that would be that we would be providing a new quota for the commercial sector that is below their historic cap, and they originally started with a 1.5-million-pound cap that then we turned into that sector allocation, through our current status quo, and anything below that 1.5 would be sort of moving away from what their allotted historic cap has always been, and so that would be my rationale for removing 3, 4, and 5. I agree with you on Alternative 2, and that makes perfect sense.

MR. GRIMES: I thought there were still alternatives in here that did not include landings from Monroe County, but I read that wrong, and, looking at it now, only the status quo no action alternative does not incorporate Monroe County landings, and, obviously, we can't get rid of the no action alternative, and so my bad.

MS. BECKWITH: No worries. Thanks.

MR. WOODWARD: We are wrestling with something similar to this at the Atlantic States Commission with cobia, and the assessment produced a new ABC attributable to the revisions of the MRIP catch estimates for the recreational for-hire sectors, and we had a 50,000-pound allowance for the commercial sector, which carried over from the federal plan, but, yet, when we increased the ABC and left the allocation formula in place, it increased that 50,000 to 138,000, and it was not the intent of the board to increase it, and so now we're going through the amendment process to basically adjust the allocation percentages to keep the 50,000 commercial quota allowance in place, and so, to me, Alternative 6 is what captures, I think, what our intent is, to not see any diminution of the commercial ACL, but to make the necessary adjustment that reflects the increase in the ABC due to the addition of the Monroe County landings and the FES recalibrations.

Now, I am all for leaving in Alternative 2, to explore it, but I certainly agree with deleting the other ones, but, I mean, this is something we're going to deal with across a lot of other species, and so, if I misunderstand the way that the ABC has been influenced by the addition of the FES recalibrations, I would like somebody to tell me that I'm wrong. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I could get onboard with what Roy is suggesting for keeping Alternative 2, and I agree with Spud that we want to keep Alternative 6, and I agree with you that 3, 4, and 5 should probably be removed, in addition to the fact that commercial is below its historic cap. Alternatives 3 and 4 also include a year when the commercial sector had an in-season closure, in 2015, and then Alternative 5 and its sub-alternatives uses that Bow Tie Method.

I thought we said, in the past, that we wanted to get rid of this, since there is some complications, because of kind of the changes, the volatility, in the up and down commercial landings, and I thought that we wanted to avoid this, and this Bow Tie Method just amplifies it, and that's another reason why I would remove Alternative 5, is I think it's going backwards, and I think that we said, the last time we worked on dolphin, that we wanted to remove this, and so that's kind of my rationale on why we should get rid of 3, 4, and 5.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Do you want to talk about a couple of the ones that you would like to add for consideration and discussion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, although I'm kind of struggling with some of these. I mean, maybe we could add one that would be maybe a 93 recreational and 7 percent commercial split, which still gives a commercial increase in pounds, and then adding a 92 percent recreational and 8 percent commercial split, which also still gives a commercial increase as well. I think that these kind of go hand-in-hand with keeping Alternative 6, and it should, hopefully, prevent an unnecessary commercial closure in the future.

MS. BECKWITH: I like that idea, and a small boost to the commercial quota could potentially stop an unnecessary closure in a year of high abundance, and I also think some of those even numbers would probably be easier for the public to understand. In terms of coming up with a rationale, I'm sure that the IPT could help us with that, if there was a set of years, but, if the committee agreed that those might be reasonable options to include, I would be comfortable with that, because I think it would give a range from anywhere from keeping it with no increase, a small decrease, and it would probably be about an 185,000-pound increase, and maybe a 430,000-odd-pound increase, which could help prevent, as you said, unnecessary closures.

MR. POLAND: I was going to make all the points that everyone has already made, and so you all really didn't leave me a lot to make, but I just wanted to say that I do agree with the removals of Alternatives 3 through 5, for the reason that I don't see any need to reduce the commercial allocation, but Roy made two good points, first as far as keeping Alternative 2 in there, and I do agree with that, but, also, to look at what the allocations would be, based off of Monroe County as the same period that the SSC looked at 1994 to 2007, and I would just like to see what those numbers are.

Honestly, one of the proposed alternatives that Jessica put forward, as far as 93/7 or 92/8, those might be close, and, if they are, then I don't see any need to keep one or the other, but at least, looking at that same time, that provide a little bit more justification to go with that formula, since it is consistent with what the SSC based their ABC on.

MR. WOODWARD: This is a question for Roy and/or Clay, and so would any alternative that increased the commercial sector percentage more than 6.25 percent be a reallocation from the recreational sector to the commercial sector?

DR. CRABTREE: I think, arguably, that's correct. I guess it partly depends on how you view things, and I think that the ABC that the SSC just gave us is on a whole different basis than the ABC we had previously, and so that gets a little confounded, to me, in terms of being able to say, well, the commercial fishery shouldn't get any increase, and maybe they should, because the ABC is based on a number of things. That's not a very equivocal or a very good answer, I know, Spud, but that's the best I can do, but I do agree with Steve that adding in the 1994 to 2007 period makes sense.

MR. GRIMES: I was thinking about this, and I have been talking to a regional economist about it, and it's odd in that, if you decide that you wanted to shift one of those other alternatives, where it's 94 percent/6 percent, then, when we analyze that and discuss it, that is a shift in allocation. The current allocation is 90/10, on the books, and we would be changing that, and we would admit that it is, on paper anyway, a reallocation of the recreational sector, but, in fact, in terms of economic effects, I presume, as they analyze the effects of it, that would be the one that did the most to maintain the status quo economic conditions, or operating conditions, or however you want to word it in the fishery.

Maybe that's not accurate, but that's sort of how I view it, and so it seems like, if you want to maintain the status quo, in terms of percent allocation, that's going to have economic effects, because that's going to result in a shift in catch distribution, because of the change in the underlying number, and so I guess I would just lay that out, because I think there's sort of a difference between, in this particular action, what results it actually affects and what is a change to the status quo, and that seems particularly odd, to me.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, Anna, I think the key point there is it's a shift in the basis for the rationale, and one could argue that changing the underlying basis, even though the percents are the same, but you have changed the underlying basis, and I think you could certainly make an argument at least that that's a change in allocation.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. That makes sense.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Shep and Roy are kind of having the argument that I was struggling with, and Shep was bringing up the point that I was trying to bring up earlier, but he was a lot more articulate about it, and you have this current 90/10 split, and, like Roy is indicating, if you keep 90/10, because you have this percent in place, but you still bring in the new MRIP data, and you bring in the Monroe County and use new gears, but you maintain that 90/10 split, I just would like to see that particular alternative analyzed, if that makes sense, so that we can see that it is a big shift, by just bringing in those new numbers. I agree with Roy that Alternative 2 should stay, and it's most similar, I think, to the current allocation, but I would still like to see the percentages we're using now with the new data, and I would like to see that analyzed as one of the alternatives.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Sounds good. We can add that in for consideration.

MR. BELL: I was just -- Spud mentioned cobia, that we were struggling with this at the commission as well now, and so, if you leave the percentages the same, it looks like you're not having an allocation shift, but you are, and so you have to change the numbers, the percentages, as Shep pointed out, to actually achieve the same status, in terms of the economics and all, and so,

whichever way we go with this, we just need to be able to clearly explain that to the public and articulate it and build the case, and I would agree with Jessica that it would be nice to explore some of those other options as well, but that's been the difficulty with this from the start, and it hit us at a commission meeting, when we realized that the same percentages are actually a reallocation, and it just puts you in a bad way until we transition through all of this.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, you guys are welcome for allowing dolphin wahoo to be the guinea pig for all these discussions, but it is what it is. I've got Jessica again, and then we can take a look at the suggestions and see if we're comfortable with them.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's what I was suggesting, if staff could scroll down so we could see that language and just start editing this. For example, I guess we need to say that we want Alternative 6 included in the analysis, as well as the maintaining the 90/10 percentage split, but with the new data and the new years.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, and so, from the ones that are there, we would be keeping Alternative 2 and 6, and then we would be adding -- Basically, just like we're adding the 93/7 and the 92/8, we would be adding the 90/10, because they would all be analyzed using the new FES numbers, including Monroe County, and then those baseline years of 1994 to 2007.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: So, John, you would just include one more under that 92/8, and you would include 90/10. I think this gets us to what I had heard be the discussion.

MR. POLAND: I just wanted to clarify that all of those new alternatives include Monroe County, and I think it's implied, but I just wanted to, again, state on the record that all of these would include Monroe County.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, that is correct. Taking a look at what's on the screen, are there any concerns with what we've got up there? Are we comfortable with seeing these as the alternatives that will come back to us in September? Okay. John, do you need a motion from us to include I guess the --

MR. HADLEY: If everyone is comfortable with this, as far as direction to staff, this is what we'll take back to the IPT and how we'll revise the Action 3. We still do need a motion to consider Action 3, formally consider Action 3, in Amendment 10.

MS. BECKWITH: We'll jump to Tim real quick, because he raised his hand, and then we'll get that motion.

MR. GRINER: Does the existing Alternative 1, the 90/10, does that not include Monroe County right now?

MS. BECKWITH: It does not include Monroe County, nor does it include the updated FES numbers.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I was going to make a motion to approve Action 3 with the suggested direction to staff.**

MS. BECKWITH: That sounds lovely. Who would like to second?

MR. POLAND: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. **Is there any opposition to this motion? Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** I am getting mean text messages from people that folks would like a potty break, and so let's take a quick five minutes, and we'll come back to Action 4.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. BECKWITH: John, the floor is yours.

MR. HADLEY: All right. We'll get going again, and so Action 4 is a similar action, but we're examining wahoo instead of dolphin and revising the sector allocations and sector annual catch limits for wahoo, and, again, this is a kind of, quote, unquote, new action to the amendment, and it hasn't been discussed in detail by the committee, and so we will need a vote to formally consider it in Action 10, towards the end, but, just to go over the current alternatives that were proposed for the action, currently, the sector ACL for wahoo is approximately 96 percent for the recreational sector, approximately 4 percent to the commercial sector of the total ACL, and this is based on the Bow Tie Formula, and, here again, this was as landings were reported in 2013, and so it does not include the FES estimates for the landings that were available at the time, and it does not incorporate recreational landings from Monroe County.

Here again, the same sector apportionment, and so a 50 percent weighted average towards the long-term catch and a 50 percent weighted average towards the recent catch, and the long-term catch being defined as 1999 through 2008 and the recent catch being defined as 2006 through 2008.

Alternative 2, much like it was in the previous action, this would simply apply the same baseline years, but it would revise the landings, and so this includes the new FES estimates and Monroe County recreational landings, and so, in this case, you would approximately 97 percent of the total ACL going to the recreational sector and approximately 2.5 to 3 percent of the ACL going to the commercial sector, and, there again, this is based on FES estimates, as reported in 2019, or is inclusive of FES estimates reported in 2019, I should say, and it incorporates recreational landings from Monroe County.

Looking at Alternative 3, this would be a similar method. However, you're looking at different baseline years, and so you're incorporating the revised recreational data, as well as the recreational landings from Monroe County, using the same sector apportionment formula, and Sub-Alternative 3a would redefine long-term catches to 2008 through 2017 and recent catches as 2015 through 2017. Sub-Alternative 3b would use a longer time series for the long-term catch, and so 1986 through 2017 and recent catch being 2015 through 2017, and, again, the same rationale for including 2017 as the terminal year here across these alternatives is that was the terminal year of data that the SSC examined.

Moving on to Alternative 4, this would look at basing the allocation on a time series of 1986 through 2017, and so you're kind of looking at how the landings have played out between the commercial and recreational sector in the fishery over a fairly long time series, and Alternative 5 is similar to Alternative 6 in Action 3, the previous action, and so you're looking at setting the commercial ACL at its current level on a pound basis, but you're changing the percentages, and so, in this case, the recreational sector would have an ACL of 97.56 percent, and the commercial sector would be 2.44 percent, and, there again, it's sort of looking at freezing that approximately 70,000-pound commercial ACL and then allocating the remaining increase to the recreational sector.

I will jump down to -- I mostly just went through the discussion there, but it's noted -- Another thing that I didn't mention last time, when discussing Action 3, but one of the -- Additionally, there may be comments received on other ways to set allocations, and they may be received during public hearings, and so one thing to keep in mind is we can kind of tailor the public hearings to solicit that sort of feedback from any public comments received.

Looking at some of the tables, here's the different kind of comparison across alternatives, the different percentages between the commercial ACL and recreational ACL on a percent basis, and Table 10 has -- It basically converts those percents to pounds, in comparison of the different alternatives, Alternative 1 through 5, and then the different recreational sector ACLs and the commercial sector ACLs and how those would change compared to their current ACL.

Then, finally, the next couple of tables look at how these ACLs included in Table 10 compare to their respective sector, looking at the recreational sector and how they compare to current landings, and then the same thing for the commercial sector, and so how the potential sector ACL would compare to recent commercial landings.

Here is a lot of the same general comments, but just to keep in mind this is kind of an initial look of draft wording that the IPT has put together, and we're certainly looking for input on how this action should be changed, and just to keep in mind, there again, that trip limits and bag limits have potentially constrained the fishery since 2004, since implementation of the Dolphin Wahoo FMP, and ACLs went into place. Since ACLs have gone into place, the commercial sector faced an in-season closure in 2012. However, this occurred for less than a month, and the commercial sector has remained open otherwise, and the recreational sector has not faced an in-season closure since ACLs have been in place, and so that's just something that may be a consideration if the intent is to look at baseline years and which baseline years should be considered or shouldn't be considered, rather, as well.

There again, we're looking at the same situation, where we have different rationales for proposing the different alternatives, but, for many of the alternatives and sub-alternatives, there's not a major difference between them on a percent basis, and so, given that outcome, are there some alternatives or sub-alternatives that the committee does not want to consider? Also, since commercial landings have not changed, and recreational landings have increased, due to MRIP revisions, the initial range of alternatives does not increase the allocation of wahoo beyond its current set level of 3.93 percent, and so we just wanted to make sure that this is the intent of the committee, or would the committee like to also consider alternatives that would increase the commercial allocation of the total ACL beyond its current 3.93 percent? There again, are there other factors, other than historic

landings, that the committee would like to consider at this time? With that, I will turn it over, and I will jump back up to the different alternatives.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Thank you. I will open up the floor for discussion. It seems to me like this is a reasonable range of alternatives for consideration, and I am a little concerned with that 3a and 3b that would decrease the current commercial quota, and so if anyone has thoughts or comments in general on those alternatives specifically.

MR. BREWER: I would like to see alternatives considered really both in dolphin and wahoo, whereby the commercial folks keep what they have right now, plus perhaps a little bit more, and so the alternative to consider that -- John was speaking to that towards the end of his presentation on 4, and I think we should consider that with both dolphin and wahoo. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so it sounds like there are some alternatives, if you look at Table 10, that do allow for a slight increase in the commercial quota, anywhere from give or take 3,000 pounds to twenty-one-odd-thousand pounds.

MR. GRIMES: I was just going to say, given the obvious similarity of these actions, and keep in mind consistency and logic in argument as we go through it, and I've heard some criticism of the Bow Tie Method in the context of dolphin, and you see here the Bow Tie Method is the no action, and it's in Alternative 2 and elsewhere, and so I guess, if the Bow Tie Method is flawed and not going to be used, then the rationale would apply equally to dolphin and wahoo, it seems to me. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Go ahead, Steve.

MR. POLAND: I was just going to agree with you, as far as I don't see any need to include Alternative 3 in here, since it results in a decrease in the commercial allocation, for the same reasons that we stated previously for dolphin, and I also agree with Shep, as far as getting away from the Bow Tie Method.

DR. CRABTREE: It seems to me, to be consistent with what we did for dolphin, I think we keep Alternatives 2 and 5 and then add an alternative that looks at the 2004 to 2007 time period, and then I guess, if you wanted to add in an alternative, to bump up the wahoo commercial guys a little bit, like you did with dolphin, you could add that, but it makes sense, to me, to try and be consistent with what we just did.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Sounds good, and so, for direction to staff, we would include Alternatives 2 and 5 and then the years of 1994 to 2007. While John is writing that up, I will jump to Tim real quick.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. I would like to see Alternative 4 stay. What's the rationale for removing Alternative 4?

MS. BECKWITH: I believe the rationale is that it includes the use of the Bow Tie Method, and we, in our previous discussion during Action 3, made clear that there are some issues with the Bow Tie Method and that we did want to continue using it, and correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. HADLEY: Alternative 4 looks at just using a large time series, and so 1986 through 2017, and Alternative 3 does use the Bow Tie Method, and that's, I believe, one of the alternatives that won't be further considered. I will mention that Alternative 2 does use the Bow Tie Method, but it's looking at updating the data for the time series that is currently used.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, which we retained in Action 3 for dolphin wahoo, for consistency.

MR. HADLEY: Correct.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so, Tim, if you wanted to retain Alternative 4, that's certainly an option. Go ahead, Steve.

MR. POLAND: I am good. John answered it, and I was just going to say that Alternative 4 does not use the Bow Tie Method.

MS. BURGESS: I am stepping up, and Jessica had to step away for a minute, but one point that she wanted to bring up about Alternative 4 is that it does include a year when the commercial sector had an in-season closure, and so removing Alternative 4 in this action would be similar to the decision made by the committee in the previous action for dolphin.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm sorry, but could you say that again? There was an in-season closure for wahoo?

MS. BURGESS: In 2012, yes.

MS. BECKWITH: All right. Gotcha.

MR. GRINER: I would like to see Alternative 4 stay in there then.

MS. BECKWITH: Even with Jessica's point that it includes a year where the commercial guys closed, in 2012?

MR. GRINER: I don't see what difference that makes.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, because another option, as Roy mentioned, would be to create a new alternative that gave a bump to the commercial folks, if that's our intent, but Alternative 4, if you want to retain that, we certainly can.

MR. GRINER: Does Alternative 4 not give a bump to the commercial sector?

MS. BECKWITH: It does, by about 21,000 pounds. It just includes a year that the commercial had a closure, and so, if you're comfortable with that, then that's fine. I just wanted to make sure you're clear.

MR. POLAND: I tend to agree with Jessica and Erika. Just for consistency, we did remove a similar alternative for dolphin. However, the dolphin alternative showed a decrease in the commercial allocation, but this is an increase, and I still feel like, just to maintain consistency, it

should be removed, and I also wanted to support Roy's recommendation to have a similar alternative, but look at that 1994 to 2007 time period.

MS. BECKWITH: We have included the 1994 to 2007 option for consideration, and I guess one way would be to give some direction that we would be interested in seeing an alternative that provides the commercial with about a 20,000-pound bump that maybe doesn't include a year that they had a commercial closure, and maybe that would get to what Tim wants and keep us consistent with what we did in the dolphin action. Any additional thoughts or suggestions?

MS. BURGESS: Maybe a reasonable compromise the committee might want to consider would be to consider this Alternative 4 and simply remove 2012 from the formula.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I wonder if that would get them to the twenty-thousand-odd-pound bump, and we can certainly look at that.

MR. POLAND: I mean, I don't have a problem with including options that increase the commercial sector allocation, but I just feel like that last bullet right there is very, very prescriptive, and I think we're going to have a hard time justifying that in the record, and, again, I think, to maintain consistency, we need to remove Alternative 4, but, I mean, if there's another alternative that we can consider that excludes that year, I'm fine with it, but I've got some reservations with that, and I don't want us to be kind of backed into a corner or put in a bind because, with that, we're basically arguing for some discreet amount of allocation for the commercial sector, as opposed to basing it off of a standard formula.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, that's a valid concern, and so if there's any -- I mean, I hear Tim, and he would like to retain it, because he's interested in seeing that particular bump to the ACL, and I hear the concerns about the 2012 closure, and nobody has a specific option to lay out on the table on the moment, and so I hear you, and maybe we just need to take out that 20,000 from that direction to staff, and it's sort of understood that we're looking for a new alternative that might allow for a small bump to the commercial.

MR. BREWER: That's just what I was getting ready to suggest.

MS. BECKWITH: Brilliant minds think alike. Okay, folks. Take a look at what we've got for direction to staff, and we will not be further considering Alternative 3, and it looks like we are going to include Alternatives 2 and 5, and we're going to remove 4, and we're going to direct the IPT to use alternatives using the baseline years of 1994 to 2007 and an alternative that provides the commercial sector with some increase in their ACL, and certainly the discussion has been fairly clear. If folks are comfortable with that, then -- I see Spud. Go ahead.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Anna. Do we need to give the IPT some recommendation of range of increases in ACL? As of right now, it could be 1 percent to 100 percent.

MS. BECKWITH: I think that would be most excellent, and that's sort of what we were trying to get to by having that 20,000 pounds in there, but Steve wasn't comfortable with that, and so, if you've got some ranges off the top of your head, certainly lay them out.

MR. DEVICTOR: That was going to be my comment, is that you give the IPT direction. Perhaps 97/3, and that would get you just under 21,000.

MS. BECKWITH: That sounds good. Any other suggestions? Okay. Seeing no other suggestions, then I'm assuming we need a motion to include Action 4 in the amendment, with direction and changes, and what wording do you want? **Okay, and so we need a motion to approve Action 4 and the proposed range of alternatives for consideration in Amendment 10.** Who would like to make that motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Who would like to second? Spud. **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing no opposition, this motion carries.**

Next, John is going to be discussing Actions 5, and 6, and 7. Just to preface that discussion, the IPT has recommended removing Actions 5, 6, and 7 and addressing them at a later date in a comprehensive manner, since there is some need to take a broader look at our optimum yield definitions, and so I don't want to spend a ton of time talking about these actions, but I do want to allow John to introduce them, and then we will likely need to be doing something different with these actions that do not belong in Amendment 10. John, go ahead.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you. Getting into Action 5, it would revise the optimum yield definition for dolphin, and, in Alternative 1, the optimum yield is currently set to the total annual catch limit. In Alternatives 2 through 6, you're looking at revising the definition, in which case, in Alternative 2, you're setting it equal to the sum of the commercial annual catch limit and the recreational annual catch target, which is an annual value. In Alternative 3, you're setting an optimum yield equal to 75 percent of MSY. In Alternative 4, you would be setting optimum yield in the dolphin fishery to the long-term average catch, which is not to exceed the total annual catch limit and will fall between the total annual catch limit and the sum of the commercial and recreational annual catch targets.

Within these different alternatives, you're really looking at -- Including Alternative 1, no action, you're looking at definitions of optimum yield that are set for essentially an annual number or an annual target, and so, really, I'm going to jump down to the IPT recommendations and comments on this one, and so, according to the revised National Standard 1 Guidelines, although the council can establish an annual optimum yield, it must also establish a long-term optimum yield, and so ACLs are really inherently short-term in nature, and they're annual, and so the OY really should not -- According to the revised National Standard 1 Guidelines, and I want to emphasize the "revised guidelines", OY cannot be set equal to the ACL for an annual value.

Based on this guidance, the current definition of OY set equal to the ACL is not adequate. However, this is the definition that is really used in several of the South Atlantic Council's fishery management plans, and so, with this being the case, we can certainly look at it on a piece-by-piece basis, as the topics come up, but, overall, in discussion with the IPT, part of that discussion was that it may be better to address it in really a separate amendment and in a comprehensive manner, and so really go look through the different definitions of the optimum yield and find out which fish species and which fisheries the current definition may not be adequate and fit the revised National Standard 1 Guidelines.

The IPT recommended potentially removing Action 5 and addressing it a later date, and, there again, in a comprehensive manner, since OY is set equal to the ACL in multiple species, and just to keep in mind that, if the committee would like to keep the action redefining OY, then the following actions, 6 and 7, should remain together, and so Actions 5, 6, and 7 are sort of a block, and the reason being that part of Action 5 includes using annual catch targets as a potential alternative, in which case there would need to be a commercial catch target established, and there isn't one currently, and, also, the recreational catch target would need to be updated. If you remove these, you could remove them as a block. If Action 5 stays, Actions 6 and 7 really should remain in the amendment as a block.

Finally, if the committee wants to maintain the action redefining OY, further revisions to Alternatives 2 and 3 may be necessary, since they are linked to annual values, and one thing that I will mention is, if the council wants to remove this kind of block of Actions 5, 6, and 7, there are a couple of -- There are a few alternatives, when we get to the accountability measures actions, that do use an ACT, and so, just kind of ahead of time, it would be assumed that those alternatives would not be further considered, but we'll get into that once we get down into the other actions. With that, I will turn it over, and, if this action is to remain, we're looking for a motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits.

MS. BECKWITH: Who would like the pleasure of removing Actions 5, 6, and 7 from Amendment 10?

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we remove Actions 5, 6, and 7 from this amendment.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Chester, is that a second, or did you want to speak?

MR. BREWER: I second, and I want to speak. When we get down to sort of a comprehensive amendment, and let me back up for a second and say that this re-definition of OY came about because some of the recreational folks got tired of the commercial folks, every time a chance was presented, screaming that there needed to be a reallocation of dolphin, with more going to the commercial side, and the argument was, well, you've got -- We're getting ready to look at the numbers, to see how many -- We had to get an accurate count on how many fish the recreational people really are catching, and we now have that, and it shows that there is not a need for a major reallocation, and so hopefully we've got plenty of time to take a look at the definition of OY.

At some point though, when we do that, I would very much like to have in that amendment, and I know I'm way ahead of myself, but taking a look, on the commercial side, at what we've done to try to head off, or retard, or restrict, longline fishing for dolphin on the commercial side. That being said, I second. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Now we've got the motion on the table. If there is no need for further discussion on optimum yield, we can certainly take that discussion up, and Chester is correct that we were looking, originally, when we started this discussion, for a way to indicate the importance of abundance to allow for good catch rates and that sort of thing, but that was something that was more important to the recreational fishery, while the commercial fishery has 100 percent access to the quotas in the form of catch was what was most important to them, and so how do we acknowledge the differences in the priorities for recreational and commercial

fisheries. That will be an excellent discussion for this council to have on a broader basis. **Is there any opposition to removing Actions 5, 6, and 7 from Amendment 10? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Thank you, and I will note that I will try -- Rather than do it on the fly right now, I will try to capture that in the direction to staff for the Dolphin Wahoo Committee report and the intent there when the OY is discussed for the dolphin fishery in the future. Moving along, we'll skip over Actions 6 and 7. There again, Action 6 would establish a commercial annual catch target for dolphin, and Action 7 would modify the recreational annual catch target for dolphin, and so, with that, we will move along to Action 8.

This would revise the commercial accountability measures for dolphin, and, currently, the commercial accountability measure includes an in-season closure that will take place if the commercial annual catch limit is met or projected to be met. Additionally, if the commercial annual catch limit is exceeded, it will be reduced by the amount of the commercial overage in the following year only if dolphin is considered overfished and the total ACL is exceeded.

As you may recall, several of the alternatives were removed from this action that would accommodate adaptive management of ACLs, and what was left included two alternatives, and so one really was looking at mirroring the current recreational accountability measure, which we'll get into in a minute. However, it's been deemed that this is not necessarily an adequate accountability measure, since it includes language that the sole trigger is that that species must be overfished and the total ACL is exceeded, and so, since dolphin is not likely to be assessed in the near future, and the same case with wahoo, then that likely will never be triggered, or at least in the foreseeable future.

That language was removed from this alternative initially, and then Alternative 3 includes that the ACL would be changed for the commercial sector if commercial landings exceed the annual catch limit. During the following fishing year, the commercial season would be reduced, and so you're removing the in-season closure for the commercial sector, to ensure that -- But the following season would be reduced for the commercial sector, to ensure that commercial landings do not exceed the current year commercial sector annual catch limit. However, the length of the commercial season would not be reduced if the Regional Administrator determines, using the best scientific information available, that it is not necessary.

The IPT kind of -- We took a comprehensive look at all the different accountability measure actions in the amendment, and we came up with a similar set of alternatives, and these are the alternatives in gray here, and, really -- I will go over these, and these are -- This is the first time that they're being presented to the council, but this is kind of a -- You will see similar language, except for the recreational sector, in the following two actions.

Looking at different revisions to the accountability measures and what that trigger would be, and sort of cleaning up some of that language, not including the overfished language, but Alternative 2 is really very similar to what was the current Alternative 3, and so commercial landings, if they are projected to reach -- If the commercial landings were projected to reach the commercial annual catch limit, then the commercial sector would close, and so you would have an in-season closure, and you also have a post-season accountability measure, where, if commercial landings exceeded

the commercial ACL, and total landings exceeded the total annual catch limit in the following fishing year, the commercial sector's annual catch limit would be reduced by the overage.

Alternative 2 includes the use of an annual catch target, and I think this will likely be removed, and it's very similar language to Alternative 2, but, since we removed the annual catch target language, I won't go over that one, since presumably it will not be included in the amendment. Alternative 4 looks at a commercial in-season closure if the commercial annual catch limit is met, and a post-season accountability measure is, if commercial landings exceed the annual catch limit and total landings exceed the total ACL, then there is the potential that, the following fishing year, there would be a reduction in the commercial fishing season length, to ensure that landings do not exceed the commercial ACL the following year.

Then, finally, Alternative 5 is, if commercial landings exceed the annual catch limit and total landings exceed the total annual catch limit, and so those are your two triggers, then, during the following fishing year, you would reduce the length of the commercial fishing season, to ensure that the commercial landings do not exceed the commercial ACL, and so, there again, you're removing the in-season closure, but you're implementing a post-season closure and a post-season accountability measure.

With that, here's sort of a table that was put together that was very helpful, as far as comparing the different alternatives on what they currently include, and so, for all the alternatives, with the exception of 5, you have a potential in-season closure as well as a post-season accountability measure, where this would be triggered if the commercial and the total ACL were exceeded, and that's with the exception of Alternative 1, no action, since the potential post-season accountability measure is linked to if the species is also overfished.

I will go over the proposed Action 8, and so the alternatives are mirrored in Actions 9 and 10, for consistency, and so you'll see similar language across the next three actions. This is really meant as a starting point, to get the council's input on whether there should be a standard set of accountability measure alternatives among these different actions, and certainly different preferred alternatives could be chosen, to reflect the different needs of the recreational sector versus the commercial sector, and the IPT noted that it may be beneficial to remove the overfished language from the current commercial accountability measure, but it's not necessary, per se, simply because there is an adequate in-season accountability measure that will take place, regardless of stock status.

It also mentions that National Standard 1 encourages consideration of accounting for ACL overages, particularly if the stock is overfished, and it was noted that rollover of unused ACL will be addressed in the ABC control rule, and so this may affect when these potential accountability measures would go into place, and the IPT discussed the monitoring for persistence language that you see in a lot of our accountability measures, but it did not include it initially in the proposed alternatives. Landings uncertainty is often the rationale for monitoring landings for persistence, in which case the landings uncertainty for commercial dolphin landings is fairly low.

In this, we're looking for guidance and input on whether or not to approve the IPT's suggested edits in Action 8, and so those would be the ones highlighted in yellow, or potentially approve the IPT's suggested entire rewording of Action 8, and so those are the changes included and highlighted in gray, and so, with that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Thank you. A couple of things that I want folks to think about, and so, because we removed 5, 6, and 7, we must assume that proposed Alternative 3 will not be included, and I do want folks to have some discussion on the fact that we've got Alternative 2 and 4 that have in-season closures, and I feel like this committee has discussed in the past trying to get away from in-season closures, both for recreational, which we'll talk about later, but for dolphin specifically, just because of the nature of that fish.

Then, for Alternative 5, and really all these alternatives, I do need to acknowledge that, if we are waiting for the commercial and the total ACL to be exceeded, then we are essentially making it very unlikely that the total ACL will be exceeded in dolphin, and so, with that in mind, I've got a list of folks, and so let's start with Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, Anna. I was just going to get the ball rolling and just go ahead and say that we need to remove Alternative 3, since we removed Actions 5, 6, and 7.

MS. BECKWITH: Sounds good, and so we'll have that as direction to staff.

MR. BREWER: We are kind of nibbling around the edges, I think, of what the problem is, and the problem that reared its ugly head reared its ugly head in 2015, and that was when the longlines came in, or some longlines blew out the quota, the commercial quota, and the season for commercial guys closed in June. If I remember correctly, it was June 1.

I would like the council to entertain the thought of also removing 8, 9, and 10 from this particular amendment, with the idea that the issues brought up here, and particularly with regard to the commercial sector, be also considered at a later time, when we come back to 5, 6, and 7, and that's just a thought, and I will listen to more discussion and then maybe make a motion in a little while.

MS. BECKWITH: We did deal with a bit of what happened during that dolphin closure by making a step-down to 4,000 pounds at 75 percent of the quota, and so we did make it less, significantly less, likely for there to be a closure, where that hook-and-line fishery did not have access to that fishery, as occurred that year.

MR. BREWER: To that point, you're quite correct, and the step-down is at 75 percent, but, until you hit that 75 percent, you're not doing anything to protect the dolphin fishery from longlining and overutilization, and I think that's the one weakness, and I agree with you 100 percent, and it's less likely now that we will have a reoccurrence of what went on in 2015, but I never want to see it again, and I think that we really, at some point in the future, need to take a look at what the original fishery management plan contained and where they went with it, because I think they were right, but, be that as it may, I do think that we do need to pull 8, 9, and 10 for reconsideration in this sort of omnibus accountability control amendment, if we're going to call it that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I'm going to just ask some questions here, or throw out some points, and so, Anna, you mentioned that we didn't want an in-season closure, and I can get onboard with that, but I also don't want a payback, because I feel like dolphin is kind of an annual crop, and so, if it's an annual crop, it seems like a payback isn't appropriate, and so then I guess that brings me to my next question of do we have to remove the reference for the language about overfishing?

I know that we don't have a stock assessment, but, when John Hadley just talked about it, it sounded kind of squishy, but, I mean, is it required that we remove that, or can we add in some language that says something like the Regional Administrator would determine, using the best available science, that it's not necessary, or something, and I just wanted to ask some questions here, and I wanted to add that I know you don't like the in-season, but I think post-season payback is not really appropriate here either.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and that's fine, and, if the committee is comfortable with in-season closures -- I mean, certainly, if we're looking at giving the dolphin commercial fishery a small bump, that would also help avoid an in-season closure from occurring, but let me keep going through the queue.

DR. CRABTREE: I am comfortable with having an in-season closure for the commercial fishery, and we have it for most of our commercial fisheries, and I don't see any reason why we shouldn't do that here. The main reason that we have problems with that on the recreational side has to do with the data collection and the time limits of it and problems with that, and so I think the current accountability measure is fine, and you're not going to get into a payback situation. That requires you to have the status be switched to overfished, and so that means we would have to have a stock assessment, which I don't think is likely to happen any time soon, and so my recommendation, and what I think we ought to do, is just remove this action, because I think our current commercial AM is fine, and I would be happy to make a motion, Anna, if you would like.

MS. BECKWITH: Sure. Go ahead.

DR. CRABTREE: **I would move that we remove Action 8 from consideration.**

MS. BECKWITH: I know that, within the council, there's been discussion of trying to make some of these accountability measures more unified across the board, and so that's --

DR. CRABTREE: I would just point out, Anna, that I think the current status quo commercial accountability measure is pretty consistent with most of our other commercial accountability measures. It's an in-season closure with a payback only if it's overfished, and I think that's what we have for most commercial fisheries.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there a second to Roy's motion? Steve, can you second that, since you're next on the list?

MR. POLAND: No, I didn't have an intent to second that, but I do have something to say.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I will second.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Steve, you were next for discussion. Go ahead.

MR. POLAND: Thanks. I mean, I wanted to speak up and agree with Jessica, as far as not having a payback on this, and she's correct that this is effectively an annual crop, and I don't see the need

in having a payback, and, to speak to the motion that Roy has made, basically keeping it status quo, I don't like that language in the no action alternative that basically requires a payback.

I do agree that we will probably never have an assessment, and the stock may not ever be overfished, but I am also kind of -- I can see both sides of this coin, because, if we take out in-season closures and paybacks, then, really, what kind of accountability measure do we have, and then we're just flirting with not having any type of accountability measure, and, given that we do have that step-down at 75 percent, I myself am comfortable with an in-season closure for this species.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MR. CONKLIN: I hope you all are doing well, and I was just -- The longline part of the dolphin fishery is just -- It's an efficient gear, and I think, without it, we'll never come close to hitting the commercial definition of OY for the fishery, and it's a lot different up here than it is in Florida, where maybe people catch them year-round, but it's just a couple of weeks to a month that we, up here in the Carolinas, encounter them on a consistent basis, and, the time of the year that that happens, the market is very strong on the fish, because the rest of the world isn't catching them, and so it provides a good economic boost for the commercial fishermen in the Carolinas, and I wouldn't want to see it going away, and, while I don't mind if the council votes for say being a little bit more accountable and taking some more training and following the rules, and that makes sense to me, but I don't think that the commercial dolphin sector would ever come close to being hit if we didn't have an efficient gear type. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Chris.

MR. SAPP: So the reasoning that closure has to be avoided is there is a very large group of small operations that were absolutely devastated by that closure in 2015, and this group of fishermen bring day-caught fish to the market, in my opinion the highest of quality fish, that helps to maintain those higher prices of domestic-caught dolphin. Again, like I said, they were absolutely devastated in 2015 by that closure, and I'm here to try to do anything to avoid that happening again.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if the main concern with the status quo is that it has the payback provision if the stock is overfished, I don't really have objections to just having one alternative to status quo that doesn't have that payback language, if you could get that out, and I don't agree with Art that we want to avoid an in-season closure at all costs, because, if the consequence of not having one is overfishing, I don't think that's a good tradeoff, and we've had the in-season closure one time in all of these years, and so it seems to me that what you have as an accountability measure is working, and we don't need to make a substantive change to it, but, again, if the possibility of a payback at some point, as remote as that may be, is what is causing the concern, then just look at an alternative that takes that payback language out but leaves the accountability measure essentially intact.

MR. DILERNIA: I agree with Art, in that the closure was one that had a disproportionate effect on certain fishermen, and the closure really shut down the fishery in the Mid-Atlantic, just when the fish were arriving in the Mid-Atlantic region, and so that did have a significant disproportionate effect. At the same time, I understand that we have to be careful, and I understand that the payback may not be a good idea, considering it is, as someone said before, almost an annual crop, and so I

think the 75 percent level, where there's a stepdown, when you reach the 75 percent level, is a good compromise between not having a shutdown at all and having a shutdown, and I think the 75 percent level will give us a buffer, so that we can see some fish. If we start to catch them heavily at the southern end of the range early in the season, there will be a buffer to allow some of the fish in the northern end of the fishery's range to be taken later in the year. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Tony.

MR. CONKLIN: If everybody -- I mean, if people are extremely worried about having a closure, then maybe we should revisit our thoughts to the previous motions and keep the allocation the same, at 90/10, and both sectors take a boost, and everybody is happy, and we won't have to worry about a commercial closure, and everything could just be hunky-dory.

The council did take some actions, a couple of years, right after that, and something came through the pipe and gave a boost, and we haven't had a closure since, and I just wanted to point that out, but, if you're looking at keeping the commercial sector the same, and you're not going to limit the dolphin wahoo permits, because they are open access, and anybody can get one for commercial, then the sector might need those fish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chris's argument kind of confused me, but I'm going to go back to what Roy said, which was he made two suggestions, and one was the motion on the board, which I could support, but he also made another suggestion that we just have one alternative that removes the payback, and I'm really okay with either one of those things, either moving this action to Considered but Rejected or having one alternative that would remove the payback, but is very similar to the AM that we have now, and I'm up for either one.

MR. SAPP: Again, to support my thought a little bit here, are we not here to be fair and equitable, not only through different sectors, but through different groups in the fishery? As with what Tony was saying up in the Northeast, it's strongest, but, down here in the Southeast, we also get our strongest fishery there late in the season, and, if it's taken away, then a very big portion of these gentlemen's income, or ladies, is also taken away, and so I'm looking for fair and equitable here.

MS. BECKWITH: If you want to have further consideration for that hook-and-line portion of that fishery, then part of that discussion would be how do we -- Doing something different than what we did the last time, with the step-down at 75 percent. If you do not feel that -- If it was another closure that occurred, and it was presumed that that 75 percent step-down to 4,000 pounds was not adequate to protect either the Mid-Atlantic or the Florida hook-and-line fishery for dolphin, then the council could take steps to adjust that within the commercial sector quota, to assure the access to those fish later on in the season, and so, yes, we can be equitable and manage for the different types of fishing within the sector, but an accountability measure, yes, is for potentially the entire sector.

MR. POLAND: **I was going to offer a substitute motion, and so remove Actions 2 through -- Remove Alternatives 2 through 5 and add an additional alternative that basically the current commercial accountability measures include an in-season closure that takes place if the annual catch limit is met or projected to be met without a payback, and this is, to me, really reflective of the true biology of the fish.** Again, Jessica made a point, and I followed up, that

this really is an annual crop, and I don't see how a payback will do anything to protect the stock in the following year, since this is basically just like a shrimp or a blue crab or something like that.

MS. BECKWITH: I am fairly certain we make Dr. Porch cringe every time we call dolphin an annual crop. We have a motion. Do I have a second to his motion?

DR. CRABTREE: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Okay. Excellent.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was wondering, and maybe John would have these numbers, but, since 2015, when the closure happened in June, the middle of June, what's been the percent of the catch in 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019, since that period of time?

MR. HADLEY: Are you referring to the commercial landings versus the commercial ACL?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes, the commercial landings to the ACL, the amount or percentage.

MR. HADLEY: I don't know the exact percentage, but I can tell you that it's less than 75 percent, since we haven't seen -- Off the top of my head, we haven't seen the trip limit be implemented, and so that 4,000-pound step-down that's supposed to occur when 75 percent of the commercial ACL is caught has not been triggered, and so it's less than 75, I want to say, and I would have to look it up to be exact, but certainly less than 75 percent.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: My comment would be that the council voted for a step-down after the closure, and, given that that closure, if the -- Given that the increase took eight months to get, that was going to happen, that's not a normal time period, and that closure wouldn't have happened, given that that would have been the case for that bump to be updated, and so the council decided that the best way to look at this is let's do 75 percent of the catch and then to do a step-down, so that hopefully it wouldn't happen again, and so that's what the council did, and they should go with that.

It had an effect on not only the small guys or the different ones that account for this fishery in south Florida, but it had an effect on the folks in North Carolina and the Mid-Atlantic also, but, in general times, it wouldn't take eight months to get an increase, and so it must have been just extraordinary times that took forever to get the increase done, and that wouldn't have happened most of the time, and so hopefully we can continue on.

MS. BECKWITH: Dewey, there is no discussion of taking away that step-down. That's in place, and should stay in, and so this is just setting the accountability measure to just an in-season closure at the commercial quota.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was just referring to I hear a lot of the comments that seem to, over the time period, get rehashed, the same thing over and over, and so I just wanted to speak up on behalf of hearing the same rehashing of comments. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you, Dewey.

MR. DILERNIA: Much of what Dewey said, I was going to say, and I think the 75 percent trigger is a good one, and it would protect the fishery in the Mid-Atlantic. Actually, when we go to the 4,000-pound trip limit, the net return to the boats would probably be the same, if not an increase, because the price would go up as the trip limit gets put in place, and so it does protect the fishermen, commercial fishermen, both in the Mid-Atlantic and I think, from what Art is saying, down south, and so I would leave it there, and, if you still exceed the quota after the 75 percent trigger is in place, then I guess you do have to have a closure at that point, but I would not want to see a closure until that 75 percent trigger is put in place and you monitor the landings to that point. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I just want to do a quick time check. It's 4:05, and we are on Action 8.

DR. CRABTREE: I will support Steve's motion, and I think it's a good compromise, and I think we are rehashing a lot of things, and so the trip limit step-down seems to have taken care of a lot of these concerns, and I would be careful about calling dolphin an annual crop. There is language in the statute that exempts animals with short life spans from ACLs, and dolphin doesn't meet that, because some of them do live to be at least several years old, but I will support the substitute motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Sounds. I'm going to have Chip and Shep, and then we're going to go ahead and vote and hopefully move along.

DR. COLLIER: The commercial ACL in 2016, they got 61 percent, and, in 2017, they got 41 percent. In 2018, it was 35 percent, and, in 2019, they had 43 percent.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for that.

MR. GRIMES: I was just going to note that that leaves us with two alternatives, and I'm not a fan of two alternatives. I think it's often difficult to justify, particularly in this context, accountability measures, and you don't have to get into that here. If you guys vote to approve this motion, maybe you can get some feedback from the IPT on potential rationales to support just having the two alternatives, but, also, I think -- I don't have the provision off the top of my head, but I believe the National Standard Guidelines talk about encouraging councils to consider both in-season and post-season accountability measures, and dismissing them without having fully considered them and analyzed them in the amendment, the development of this amendment, might not be consistent with those. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okey dokey. **All right, and so we have a substitute motion to remove Alternatives 2 through 5 in Action 8 and add an alternative that would reflect the current AM, but remove the post-season accountability measure that includes a payback. Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing no opposition, it becomes the main motion. We are now voting on this as the main motion. Is there any opposition to the main motion? Seeing none, this motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Moving along to Action 9, here again, this action certainly needs to be updated, at the very least, and so this would revise the recreational accountability measures for dolphin. Currently, in the current recreational AM, if the recreational landings exceed the annual catch

limit, then, during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for persistence and increased landings.

If the recreational ACL is exceeded, it will be reduced by the amount of the recreational overage in the following fishing year, and there will be a season reduction as well by the amount necessary to ensure that the landings don't exceed the reduced ACL. However, this will only occur if the species is overfished and the total annual catch limit is exceeded.

There is also language, that being very important, and so that's the trigger for the accountability measure to go in place really depends on dolphin becoming an overfished species. As mentioned previously, it's not likely to be assessed in the future. Therefore, this is not likely to occur, and so there's been discussion in past meeting that the current AM likely is inadequate for the recreational sector for dolphin overall.

As the Alternative 2 currently stands, this essentially incorporates language that would accommodate a common pool ACL, and, there again, this is holdover language from the action that was removed, and the committee simply hasn't had a chance to come back and fully kind of sort of clean up this action and take out those alternatives that were related to that previous action, but Alternative 2 would accommodate a common pool ACL, and Alternative 3 would allow rollover of uncaught ACL for the recreational sector, and then Alternative 4, as you may recall, this is in relation to the discussion that's been going on over the recreational accountability measures amendment. This was moved over from that amendment.

You have several sub-alternatives here, and so only implement accountability measures, and so this is kind of setting the trigger if the recreational annual catch limits are constant and the three-year geometric mean of the landings exceed the recreational annual catch limit. Sub-Alternative 4b is if the recreational catch limits are constant and the sum total of the most recent three years exceeds the sum of the past three years for the recreational ACL. Sub-Alternative 4c is the AM would occur if the recreational ACL is constant and the recreational landings exceed the annual catch limit in two of the previous three years.

Sub-Alternative 4d is where the trigger for the accountability measure would occur if the total annual catch limit is exceeded, and Sub-Alternative 4e, which is suggested for removal, is, if this form of the action remains, if the stock is overfished, based on the most recent status of the U.S. Fisheries Report to Congress, and so, there again, this is unlikely for the species to become overfished, since it's not planned to be assessed.

Finally, Alternative 5 is, if the post-season accountability measure is triggered, reduce the length of the recreational fishing season by the amount necessary to ensure that the annual catch limit will not be exceeded in the following year, and so looking at a post-season accountability measure here, and so the IPT kind of took an overarching look at this.

Here again, I won't go into great detail, because these are very similar alternatives that are being proposed and as a replacement for what is currently Action 9, and so, Alternative 1, there again, and I won't go into it again, but it is inadequate at the moment, since there is the trigger, so to speak, for the accountability measure revolves around dolphin being listed as overfished. Alternative 2 would include an in-season closure for the recreational sector if the ACL is projected to be met. There is also a post-season accountability measure if the recreational ACL is exceeded

and total landings exceed the total ACL. During the following fishing year, the recreational annual catch limit will be reduced by the amount of the overage.

Alternative 3 I won't go into, because this is likely to be removed, since it uses the annual catch target. Alternative 4 is, if the recreational ACL is met, then there would be an in-season closure. Additionally, there would be a post-season accountability measure implemented if the ACL is met and total landings exceed the total ACL. Then, during the following fishing year, the length of the fishing season would be reduced. Finally, in Alternative 5, there would not be an in-season closure. However, if recreational landings exceed the recreational annual catch limit and total landings exceed the total ACL, then, during the following fishing year, there would be a reduction in the season length, to ensure that the recreational landings do not continue to exceed the recreational annual catch limit.

I won't go into much discussion, and we kind of went over the dynamics of the different alternatives, but, here again, it's a very similar table showing a comparison of the different proposed alternatives of 1 through 5 and if they include an in-season closure or a post-season accountability measure, the in-season accountability measure or post-season accountability measure, and what would be the trigger for that post-season accountability measure.

Really, one of the main recommendations on the IPT's part was you have the recreational AM that is likely inadequate, since it depends on the overfished status, and the original Action 9 certainly needs some work, removing Alternative 2 and 3, and the IPT recommended removal of Alternative 4e, since dolphin is unlikely to be assessed in the near future.

Really, as it stands right now, Action 9 includes some triggers for the accountability measure and what the accountability measure itself will be, and so that probably needs to be split into what -- If the desire of the committee is to keep Action 9 in its current state, you need to probably split them into two actions, one looking at the trigger and one looking at what the accountability measure actually would be.

I won't go into it any further, but we have proposed Action 9. There again, it's very similar language and rationale as has been previously discussed, and, with that, I'm looking for an action to either approve the IPT's suggested edits in Action 9, and so those that are highlighted in yellow, or potentially approve the IPT's proposed Action 9 in Amendment 10, and so those that are highlighted in gray. With that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, John.

DR. CRABTREE: This is one that I think we have to fix. I don't think we have a functional accountability measure right now, and I think this just slipped through, back when we were implementing all of the different ACLs and AMs, and, really, this shouldn't have ever gotten through the system, and so I think we have to fix this, and I think, if you don't fix it in this amendment, you put the whole thing at risk, because you don't have a -- I don't think you're in compliance with the requirements to have ACLs and AMs, and so I think you need to fix it. I think the IPT's suggestions and comments are good, and it seems to me that that's a good path forward for us.

MS. BECKWITH: Roy, does it make sense to have in-season closures for this fishery? I mean, there's two alternatives that have that as an option, 2 and 4, that would be retained, potentially, in the new proposed, and what are your thoughts on that?

DR. CRABTREE: I will leave that up to you. I am not uncomfortable with having the post-season accountability here. The problem with the in-season closure, of course, is that the timeliness of the MRIP data, and it requires us to rely very heavily on projections, which are often, especially for a short-lived species like dolphin that moves in and out of the areas, depending on oceanographic events, and so projections based on a previous year are quite likely to be way off, and so trying to do in-season things is problematic, and there's no doubt about that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I had a couple of ideas, and so I like what John Hadley was suggesting about splitting this into two actions, one that is for the trigger, and then the second one is what the trigger would do, and I say that because I'm wondering, and, instead of shortening the season, which is really going to affect people in the Keys, and maybe southeast Florida, that the conditional post-season accountability measure could include something like a reduced bag limit or a reduced vessel limit, in addition to the actions that are later in the amendment, and so I'm just going to kind of throw that out there, but that's another reason why I would kind of split this up into two actions.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. We had this discussion, or something similar to this, when we were discussing accountability measures for cobia, having the bag limit be reduced first, before the season was reduced, and so we have some history of this.

MR. BREWER: I agree with Jessica about kind of a two-pronged approach, a trigger and then what happens when you hit the trigger, and I agree with Roy that this needs to be fixed, and you've got to have some sort of accountability measure, and it's required, and what we've got right now is -- It's never going to be a trigger, and so I don't know that bag limits or boat limits are going to get us where we need to go, and I'm kind of speaking ahead of the curve here, but, when we've looked at that before, the reduction in the overall take or overall number of fish that are removed from the water really doesn't vary that much, and so it probably would be necessary, unfortunately, to have it closed down for a while, and I hate to even think about, recreationally, having the dolphin fishery closed down for any time, but, for right now, I agree that the thing needs to be split.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't know if you're wanting a motion to split this into two actions, because I would move that we do that, split this into two actions. While this is going on the board, just to address what Chester is saying, and kind of what you said too, Anna, I had typically shied away from this in the past, but I just think of a completely shutting off a fishery versus being able to reduce bag limits or vessel limits, even if it's in half or 75 percent less, even on the recreational side I think is better, because dolphin is so important for the Keys.

I just would love it if there was something in there that we could choose from where it doesn't completely close it, just because of its importance, and instead the trips could still be offered, and the fish maybe are just down to such a tiny bag limit or vessel limit or something, and I just would like to see some alternatives that do that, just for consideration.

MS. BECKWITH: I am just going to think out loud for a moment. My concern with splitting this and complicating this action is we've got a twenty-four-odd-million ACL coming in, and the likelihood of a recreational closure anyway is pretty minimal. If we look at Alternative 5 in the proposed, and added back in that language that we typically have that says, however, the recreational annual catch limit and length of the recreational season will not be reduced if the Regional Administrator determines, using the best available science, that it's not necessary, and I think that would give the Regional Administrator and at least the council --

I mean, if the recreational catch of dolphin exceeds the twenty-four or twenty-five-odd million pounds, then something pretty dramatic has happened that is not the norm, given that we've never had it happen, and so it would be just an incredible year of abundance and some major faux pas in the data.

I mean, there has to be something kind of in there that could be then discussed and considered that maybe doesn't then include complicating this action, because I do think we have the analysis below, later on in this amendment, from the bag limit reductions, and I think Chester is correct that reducing the bag limit recreationally does almost nothing, because not everyone catches a ton of those fish, and so I would be concerned that it wouldn't -- It would be a lot more complication with not a lot of benefit, and so those are just some thoughts. We could add that additional flexibility language into Alternative 5, and my gut tells me that that would probably be enough for dolphin recreational, but, obviously, the committee can move forth with what they want.

MR. DILERNIA: I agree completely with Jessica, with what Jessica was saying about, rather than shutting it down, having a step-down. Also, in the Mid-Atlantic, what we do very often is, if we see that the recreational fishery exceeded its ACL in a particular year, one of the things that we look at when we're setting the management measures for the upcoming year is reductions in season, bag limit, or increase in the minimum size, and so those are two factors that you should consider.

I agree with you, Madam Chairwoman, for the fishery to catch that many fish -- To catch that large of a number, it's got to be an anomaly in which the availability and the abundance is so high that it just occurs, and it wouldn't be a regular occurrence, and so, yes, split the motion into two and look at -- If you are reaching close to the numbers, looking at reducing the possession limit in the second half of the season, rather than closing it down. Thank you.

DR. CRABTREE: It's difficult to do step-downs in the recreational fishery the same we do in the commercial, because, by the time you knew that you needed to trigger the step-down, you would be long past when you hit the trigger, and so it's hard to do that, and so what you would really be looking at is finding out that, okay, we went over the ACL last year, and so, this next year, we're going to reduce the bag limit for the entire year, and that gets complicated, because how much do you reduce it and all those kinds of things.

Remember that, if we you get in a situation where you trigger the AM and the season is going to shorten the next year, you always have the option to say let's do a framework amendment, very quickly, and reduce the bag limit, and then NMFS will recalculate how much the season needs to be shortened by, and I think that gives you -- One, you make the decision about what the bag limit could be, and you're able to look at what happened and what's causing it, and so don't feel like

you're so roped in that you couldn't change it, because I think you could, but I think pre-programming in a bag limit reduction is -- It's awfully hard to know what that's going to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I would have normally agreed with your argument, Anna, but, with the new FES estimates, I think that there could be a likelihood that the recreational fishery would hit their quota, and so I just have concerns about not doing something like this, because it would really be inequitable throughout the region, and it would hit Florida harder than other areas, and so I was trying to think outside the box here.

I do agree that it's complicated, as Roy is suggesting, but I'm just trying to make sure that we have this covered, and I just think about the devastation that could happen, and might happen, with these new FES estimates to the recreational folks in the Keys if it were to close.

MS. BECKWITH: Point taken. Let me go to Steve, and then we'll come back and work with your motion.

MR. POLAND: I agree with Jessica, and, I mean, I'm not going to say that we'll never exceed this ACL, and that's kind of why I like that three-year trigger idea, because, honestly, if we exceed the ACL two out of three years, or three out of three years, then probably something does need to change, and, as far as adjusting trip limits, bag limits, or anything like that, to realize some type of reduction the following year, I'm not saying that I'm opposed to it, but we all just need to realize, in any recreational fishery, that typically translates into huge reductions in bag limits.

Tony mentioned the Mid-Atlantic, and I think bluefish is a prime example, and it went from fifteen fish to three fish to realize that needed reduction. Granted, that was overfished, and those reductions were to rebuild the stock, but I think that's something you need to keep in mind as well.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so did I hear you say that you wanted to keep the original Alternative 4 in some fashion as an option, Steve?

MR. POLAND: Let me go back up and read it, to make sure that is what I'm saying.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. While you read that, let's start working on Jessica's, because I know, as one of the alternatives to move forward, I would like to keep that Alternative 5, with the additional flexibility language, as an option in some form or fashion, and then Jessica can craft her new alternative, or however you want to do it, Jessica. You have the floor.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I agree. In fact, I think we can keep Alternatives 4 and 5, because that's about the trigger, and so I think that you're looking at the trigger and then what comes after that, and so I think that you could keep both of those.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Sounds good. What is your suggestion? Is it to keep the original Alternative 4 and the proposed Alternative 5 as some of the trigger options, and then how do you want to craft what happens next, because I'm assuming there is some consensus that we're not interested in seeing an in-season closure for recreational dolphin. If there is an interest for an in-season closure, then somebody needs to speak up. Otherwise, we're going to focus the attention on the post-season accountability.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have a question, just based on what you just said, and so I think that we need to keep original Alternative 4, and then did you mean original Alternative 5 or new Alternative 5? I got confused there.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm okay with new Alternative 5, as long as we add the additional flexibility language that we have in so many of the things, the however the annual catch limit and length of the recreational season will not be reduced if the Regional Administrator determines, using the best science, it is not necessary. Jessica, you still have the floor.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead and go to Tony. I am having trouble, because I'm flipping back between these various pages, and it might help if we could paste some things, so that we could look at it, but I'm just having a hard time here.

MR. DILERNIA: Let me give an example of what we did in the Mid with black sea bass. With black sea bass, we had a year that was probably 2013 or 2014, which we exceeded the recreational catch limit, but the stock was very robust, and I guess these questions have now become famous, and, when I spoke to the Regional Administrator at the time, I said, you're going to close the fishery because there is too many fish.

He looked at me, and he said, well, that's not really going to work, and so what happened was what we decided to do was our accountability measures for the recreational fishery kick in only if we exceed the ACL, the recreational ACL, three years in a row and the stock is overfished, and then we have to implement some type of accountability measure.

At that time, I spoke against the closure, because what was going to happen, if we were going to continue with an in-season closure, is most of the black sea bass would have been taken in the early part of the season from the southern New England states, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York, and we would have shut down the fishery when it was getting started down in Virginia and Maryland, and so I spoke very strongly against the in-season closure, and I was happy to report that I was successful in eliminating that in-season closure.

If we do exceed the ACL three years in a row, we do have to put accountability measures in place to prevent it from occurring in the following year, and, again, the only reason we're able to get away with skipping, so to speak, the first couple of years is because the stock is very robust and is very strong. In the case of black sea bass, it's two-and-a-half times the target level at this point. What we do is we put in place accountability measures, which are to reduce the season or the possession limit, and we're able to keep the fishery open throughout the Mid-Atlantic region, and they don't end up hurting the southern states. If there is some way that that thinking, that strategy, could be built into this fishery, I think it would be very helpful. Thank you.

MR. GRIMES: Madam Chair, I was going to ask, and maybe I'm wrong about this, but I thought that the language about if the Regional Administrator determines that it's unnecessary has been invoked or used with assessed species, where there is some information, and you have a new assessment that comes out or something that supports that there isn't overfishing and the stock status is good enough that the slight overage that you had doesn't warrant taking action. For this one, there is no assessment on the horizon, and I don't know if that's appropriate in this sense.

MS. BECKWITH: We just kind of like that language, but I hear you.

MR. GRIMES: Well, you have to have some basis for it. If the Regional Administrator determines, based on best available scientific information, then what are we going to point to?

MS. BECKWITH: My presumption would be that you would point to either an error in a particularly high PSE, higher than the average PSE, or you could point to if there is some data that becomes available that there was a particularly high year of abundance or incredibly large migration of fish, and, I mean, there may be some studies or some science that becomes available that we currently don't have, and it could be that, if our average PSE for dolphin is 20, and it jumps to 40 or 50 in that given year, then that would give enough information for the Regional Administrator to consider not reducing the following season, and that is information that's available to him.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, you should always trust in the Regional Administrator to do the right thing, and so you know that brings you comfort. That language is pretty common in the regulations for I think all three of our councils, and it is occasionally used, and I can give you an example outside of an assessment, and we used that language in the Caribbean, after the hurricane came through, and we had data that showed that we had exceeded the ACL in the previous year, and so we would have to shorten the season, but the hurricanes came through, and nobody was fishing anyway, and so I made a determination that we didn't need to shorten the season, because it's unlikely that the catch is going to be caught anyway, and so there are times like that, when something changes, and it's pretty clear, and you have a strong basis to believe that the catch rates are going to be much lower for some other region, and so a closure is not needed.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I sent you guys the motion, and John put it on the board there. I refined it, so it was clearer.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. **The motion is to split Action 9 into two actions, one for the AM trigger and the other for the post-season AM. Alternative 4 and its sub-alternatives become the action for the trigger. Alternative 5 becomes the action for the post-season AM, and, to Alternative 5, add sub-alternatives that would reduce the recreational bag limit and reduce the recreational vessel limit.** I feel like there's a word missing in there, before "Alternative 5", and is that the way you want it to read?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I did. And, to Alternative 5, add sub-alternatives, and so, in other words, you're taking Alternative 5, and then you're adding these additional sub-alternatives.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. All right. Is there a second to that motion?

MR. BELL: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Excellent. Okay. **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing no opposition, is there anyone that would like to abstain from this motion? Seeing none, this motion carries.** Thank you for working on that, Jessica. That was very helpful.

MR. HADLEY: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to add one point of clarification. In the existing Alternative 4, there was still a sub-alternative in there that included if the stock is overfished, based on the most recent status of the U.S. Fisheries Report to Congress, is can it be included as direction

to staff that that would not be what you would consider and what would become the new action, or do you want to keep that in there?

MS. BECKWITH: No, for the same reasons that we've already stated with that overfished concern.

MR. HADLEY: Okay. Great. I just wanted that clarification. Thank you. Moving on, we have a similar action for revising the recreational accountability measures for wahoo. Under Alternative 1, we had the same situation as with dolphin, where you have an accountability measure for the recreational sector that is currently inadequate, because it includes the accountability measure would only take place if the species is overfished, and, there again, wahoo being in the same boat, so to speak, as dolphin, where there is no plan to assess the species in the near future, and so it's unlikely to become overfished.

Looking at the different alternatives, we had a similar set as what is in current Action 9, and, there again, we have kind of the two separate -- We have some alternatives, currently, that are addressing sort of the trigger for the accountability measure and then some alternatives that address what the accountability measure is, or will be, and so Alternative 2 is very similar to what is Alternative 4 in the previous action, and so only specify a post-season accountability measure if the three-year geometric mean of landings exceed the recreational annual catch limit.

Alternative 2b is the annual catch limits are constant and the sum total of the most recent three years of recreational landings exceeds the sum of the past three years of the recreational ACL. Sub-Alternative 2c is if the recreational landings -- The AM would be triggered if the recreational landings exceed the recreational ACL in two of the previous three years or exceeds the total acceptable biological catch in any one year, and Alternative 2d is the total commercial and recreational combined annual catch limit is exceeded. Here again, as recommended, we have Alternative 2e, the stock is overfished, based on the most recent Status of Fisheries Report to Congress, and it's recommended that that is removed.

Alternative 3 is, if the post-season accountability measure is triggered, then the measure would be to reduce the recreational annual catch limit by the amount of the overage in the following fishing year, and, here again, only if the species is overfished, and it's suggested that that wording is removed. Then Alternative 4 is, if the accountability measure is triggered, then reduce the length of the fishing season by the amount necessary to prevent the annual catch limit from being exceeded in the following year, and so Alternative 3 is a reduction in annual catch limit, and Alternative 4 is looking at a reduction in the season.

I won't go over the alternatives again, but these proposed alternatives are the same as you have seen in Actions 8 and 9, the proposed action, I should say, that are highlighted in gray, and, there again, Alternative 3 uses an annual catch target, and that's not something that will likely be used, since that's been removed from the amendment.

With that, here again, here's the table that compares the proposed alternatives, and they all include an in-season closure as well as a post-season accountability measure, with the exception of Alternative 5, and that only includes a post-season accountability measure. Really, the comments are very similar. Since we're short on time, I won't go into the comments too much, but there is

a similar rationale on the IPT side for suggesting the new set of alternatives in Action 10, as was suggested for Action 9, and so, with that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Great, and, given that the bag limit for wahoo is only two fish, I'm assuming Jessica is not interested in splitting this out for anything like that, because I can't see anything except a season reduction or some version of a payback that would make sense as a post-accountability measure for a bag limit this small.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am writing a motion, and so stand by, but, also, don't we need to look at commercial AMs for wahoo?

MS. BECKWITH: For some reason, we don't have that in there. We must like it. We must have talked about it and decided that the current accountability measure for wahoo was fine, because it's not in this amendment anywhere, and so I feel like we talked about it and then it just went away.

MR. HADLEY: Yes, that's correct. The committee was asked if you wanted to include a commercial accountability measure action, and the answer was no, and I will mention that, at the time, we were looking at adding potential flexibility in managing ACLs, and so sharing sector ACLs and that sort of thing, for dolphin, and so for dolphin only, and so that's why the commercial AM was being examined in the first place, and so a similar action was not added for wahoo.

MS. BECKWITH: Right. Steve, did you have a comment? I am wondering if you are also interested in keeping some version of the original Alternative 2.

MR. POLAND: I was just going to ask what the commercial AMs were for wahoo, and I just assumed it's just an in-season closure.

MR. HADLEY: I would have to go back and check, and I know there is an in-season closure, and I believe the post-season is very similar, if not the same, as dolphin.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so the same conversation we had before, and we'll wait for Jessica's motion. Two of these alternatives have in-season closures, and, the new proposed Alternative 5, I am comfortable with keeping that with the additional Regional Administrator language. Steve will have to pipe up if he wants to keep that Alternative 2, the original Alternative 2, in some form, and we'll simply wait on Jessica's motion, and so, Steve, what do you think about that Alternative 2? Do you want that?

MR. POLAND: I mean, just for analysis and public comment, yes. I do feel like this -- As opposed to dolphin, wahoo is probably a fishery that I could see us realistically catching the commercial and recreational ACL, and, like you mentioned, there's not a lot of wiggle room there with the bag limits and stuff, and these landings can go up and down.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and that is something for folks to really consider and think about hard as we're going through these accountability measures, because I am certain that we are going to hit the ACLs for wahoo, certainly commercially or recreationally, given the new FES numbers and the ABC that we received, and so this is important stuff.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree with you. I think we're going to hit it on wahoo, and so John put the motion on the board there, and this basically is doing the same thing we did for dolphin, but the second action would establish a vessel limit, and so I get that the recreational bag limit is kind of low, and that's why we're suggesting here establishing a vessel limit.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and I'm trying to visualize this, because certainly most of the charter fleet would be -- Wahoo is a big deal for them, and so I'm trying to think. Is your intent to say, okay, first, we're going to go down to a certain vessel limit of whatever, and then there probably also will have to be some shortening of the season, if the vessel limit goes down to a certain number, and so, right now, they're allowed twelve, six clients, two fish per person, whatever, and it's twelve, and, at some point, we're going to have to come to a minimum that that vessel limit can hit before then also a shortening of the season has to take place. Keep that in mind, because I think that this has got the potential to be a bit complicated, and so what are your thoughts on that, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I would still like to see an action like that, because, ultimately, wouldn't it be up to the captain and the passengers to determine how they want to split those wahoo up, and why does it have to be two per person? Do you see what I mean? I guess it's something that I would like to see us get some feedback on, because I feel like this one is going to happen, that they're going to hit the ACL, and so I guess it kind of partly depends on what the trigger is.

MS. BECKWITH: I think one of my points is that there will be at some point where we have to say this cannot be reduced more than four wahoo or six wahoo per vessel, and, if that still doesn't get us where we need to be, there is probably going to have to be some shortening of the season pulled into that accountability measure.

MR. POLAND: I mean, I kind of agree with Jessica. I need to hear from people, from the stakeholders, on this one, because I don't know what a bare minimum vessel limit is for a charter operation, because I think, potentially, if this is triggered, it's certainly -- It's going to affect the entire region, but at least my experience here in the Carolinas is that wahoo in the fall and winter is the primary target for that charter fishery, and so we probably need to hear from them what the minimum number of fish that they feel like they need, with the alternative being you either get two or three or you don't get any.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, yes. I can see this discussion going very poorly.

MR. DILERNIA: How many boats take twelve? How many six-packs take twelve wahoo? I don't think there's very many. I think, if you look at the recreational landings data, you won't see very many boats taking that many fish, and so, I mean, if you do have to put a trigger in place, reducing the possession limit from two per person to one per person, I don't think that would be that much of a stretch, that much of a hardship.

I see Rick Bellavance is next up in the queue to speak, but, speaking from I guess I would say from Delaware north to New York, two wahoo per person in a boat is a lot of wahoo, and so I understand what Jessica is saying, but, perhaps if you dropped it down to one fish per person, and then you don't have to worry about the difference between the for-hire boats and the uninspected vessels, and that's the six-packs or less, and the inspected vessels, if you just drop it to one per person. That would be my recommendation at this point, to look at that, and I would like to see the MRIP

numbers in the landings, and I am really looking forward to hearing what Rick has to say. Thank you.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Just to pile on a little bit to what Tony had to offer, I guess I would have a question. With this wording and this motion preclude implementing a vessel limit on one mode as opposed to all modes? Like you could leave your vessel limit alone on the for-hire side, but then keep it on the private angler side? I'm not sure how that would work out.

Then the second question I had was in regard to size limits, and I don't know if there's a size on wahoo or if that could be something that could be considered for adjustment, and so those are my two questions. The first one is the size, and the second one is would this motion preclude implementing a vessel limit on one mode or the other?

MS. BECKWITH: Right now, the permits are open access, and so, no, it doesn't preclude us from giving different bag limits to for-hire versus recreational. We haven't done that, and that would certainly be an argument for sector separation, potentially, but I don't know, and we certainly don't have an example of that currently on our regs.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I put my hand up to respond to Tony's comment, and I am fine with adding alternatives that actually drop the bag limit and/or look at the vessel limit, and so I'm fine if, whether it's in the motion or as direction to staff, that we have some alternatives that also decrease the bag limit, and so I'm okay with that, and it doesn't have to just be vessel. I am going to avoid the sector separation comments.

MS. BECKWITH: I hear you.

MR. POLAND: I agree with what Jessica just said, and, as far as size limits, or triggering a size limit, I would caution against that, because I could see the discard mortality on a species like wahoo being very high, and then just a safety thing, and handling a wahoo to release, and I don't know if that's feasible.

MS. BECKWITH: Tony, and then we're going to vote on this motion.

MR. DILERNIA: I agree with Steve, playing with wahoo just to let them go. The first thing you do is you bat them over the head with a bat, and then maybe, if he stops moving around, then you try to go near his teeth, and batting him over the head and then letting them go, that's really not going to work.

The reduce the possession limit from the two to one, I think that will work just fine, and I don't even think the long-range boats out of San Diego catch two per man on ten-day trips, and so I could see if you have to reduce the possession limit from two to one, and I would definitely stay away from the sector separation discussion. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Jessica, would you read your motion into the record?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sure, and do you want me to amend it to add the items we just talked about, so that it adds the part about alternatives that would establish a vessel limit and a reduced bag limit? Is that what we're thinking here?

MS. BECKWITH: Sure, and there's been plenty of discussion, and so, unless there's opposition, but, yes, I think sure.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **Okay, and so the motion is to split Action 10 into two actions, one for the AM trigger and the other for the post-season AM. Alternative 2 and its sub-alternatives would become the action for the trigger, and Sub-Alternatives 3 and 4 become the action for the post-season AM. Add to the new action alternatives that would establish a vessel limit and a reduced bag limit.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there a second to that motion?

MR. BELL: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** Before we move on to the next action, I got a text message about a presenter, and I don't have access to my email right now, and why don't you guys tell me what you need for that, and then we're going to take a five-minute potty break at 5:00, and then we are going to go until 6:00. Sorry, guys, but we knew this was going to happen. So, what do we need to do for the presenter, Julia?

MS. BYRD: Matt McPherson is on the line, and he needed to leave by 5:45, but he has kind of worked things out a little bit, and so I was trying to get in touch and to see, if he wasn't able to work things out, if things could be switched around on the agenda a little bit. Matt, I don't know if you have -- What your time constraints are, if you're on the line.

MR. MCPHERSON: I think I've worked things out, and so I hang around.

MS. BYRD: Thank you so much.

MS. BECKWITH: I suspect that 11 and 12 will go quickly, and Action 13, 14, and 15 will not go as quickly, and so I suspect we'll be talking about Amendment 10 to the end of this meeting, and so, if he needs to give a presentation and cannot do it tomorrow, then we probably need to just take a quick break and let him do his presentation and then pick up this discussion.

MR. MCPHERSON: I can do the presentation tomorrow.

MS. BECKWITH: That's up to Jessica and John Carmichael, if that would make sense.

MCCAWLEY: When we take the break, which we might as well just go ahead and take the break now, John and I will talk and try to figure this out and get back to you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Sounds good. All right. Five minutes.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. BECKWITH: We are going to keep moving forward with Amendment 10, and the goal today is to make it through Amendment 10 and look at Amendment 12, if at all feasibly possible, and I

encourage folks to read through the dolphin wahoo participatory workshop update, and the North Carolina stuff is really, really cool. The Keys, of course, didn't happen, because of COVID, and we will likely try and get an update on that in September, but I do encourage folks to take a look at that. For now, let's keep on rolling with Action 11.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Thank you. Moving on to Action 11, this action would allow properly-permitted commercial fishing vessels with gear onboard that are not authorized for use in the dolphin wahoo fishery to possess dolphin or wahoo. Currently, the only authorized commercial gears in the dolphin and wahoo fishery are automatic reel, bandit gear, handline, pelagic longline, rod-and-reel, and spearfishing, and so a person aboard a vessel that has other gear types onboard may not possess or dolphin or wahoo, even if they weren't technically landed with those allowable gears.

Alternative 2 would allow a vessel in the U.S. EEZ that possesses an Atlantic dolphin wahoo commercial permit and the necessary state or federal commercial permits for trap, pot, or buoy gear to be authorized to retain dolphin and wahoo caught by rod-and-reel while in possession of these prohibited gears in the dolphin wahoo fishery.

Dolphin retained on trips when trap, pot, or buoy gear are onboard would not exceed the different sub-alternatives here, ranging from 250 to 1,000 pounds, and the wahoo commercial trip limit would remain at 500 pounds, and so, really, it's a two-alternative action here with these sub-alternatives.

As you may recall, the topic originally came up through a request from the Atlantic Offshore Lobstermen's Association, and the request was to modify regulations to allow the historic practice of harvesting dolphin and wahoo with rod-and-reel gear to be allowed while in possession of lobster pots, and so, currently, there is an incidental limit in place of 200 pounds for dolphin and wahoo north of 39 degrees latitude. However, these landings would technically be prohibited if prohibited gears are onboard.

The current list of allowable gears does not include trap or pot or buoy gears, and the committee's discussion really has been looking at a comprehensive way to address potentially prohibited gears that clearly could not be used, or likely would not be used, in the dolphin or wahoo fishery, but would allow possession of these gears onboard for dolphin that were caught by rod-and-reel gear, specifically.

This action was reviewed by the Dolphin Wahoo AP, and they made a motion to allow vessels with pot gear onboard to possess dolphin or wahoo, as long as they are permitted vessels and fish are caught by rod-and-reel. Really, there is no committee action required here, but you may want to discuss the actions and alternatives in the action.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, John. Again, there is no action, and we've seen this before, unless there is some need or desire to make a change, and does anyone have any comments or questions or thoughts on this action, or shall we move along?

MR. BELLAVANCE: Just a quick comment. The folks that I have talked to up here in New England are fine with the range of alternatives under this action.

MS. BECKWITH: Fantastic. Okay. Cool. For Action 12, it's another one that we have seen before, over and over again, and so I'm going to have John skip it, unless somebody actually wants to talk about it. There is no action required in this one. This is the removing the requirement of the vessel operator card, and so we've talked about it a few different times, and so does anybody feel the need to talk about this one? Okay. No takers. Let's go to Action 13.

It looks like, on this one, there's a couple of IPT changes that we've got to make, but, really, we've also talked about this a couple of different times, and so, in the essence of time, does anyone want to have this discussion again? If they do not, I need a motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits to Action 13 in Amendment 10, which are highlighted in yellow and are pretty miniscule? It's one word. Can I have a motion?

MR. POLAND: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Do I have a second?

MR. BELL: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank god. Okay. **Is there any opposition to this motion?**

MS. MCCAWLEY: No opposition, but I just have a question. I know that we have an alternative in here that's only for Florida, and I'm good with that for now, and I just wasn't sure if we needed to add options for other states, due to FES estimates, and I'm just throwing that out there for a short discussion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Would anyone else -- Is any other state interested in reducing their recreational daily bag limits of dolphin? Okay. **I think that is less than crickets, and so, seeing none, we've got no opposition. That motion carries.** Now we actually have to start talking about Action 14.

MR. HADLEY: Moving into Action 14, the intent here is to modify gear, bait, and training requirements in the commercial pelagic longline fishery for dolphin and wahoo, to align with those in the highly-migratory species pelagic longline fishery. Just a brief overview, and, currently, there are some requirements that go along with the Atlantic dolphin wahoo commercial permit, and this includes that, inside the wheelhouse, a sea turtle safe handling and release guidelines plaque must be placed.

Also, an owner-operator must comply with sea turtle bycatch mitigation measures that are specified in the highly migratory species rules for these bycatch mitigation measures, and so there is some parity there from the bycatch mitigation measures and gear requirements for sea turtle handling and release.

The following requirements are a reference to the highly migratory, as I mentioned, the highly migratory species regulations for pelagic longlines, and there are no protected species handling, release, or identification training requirements, no circle hook requirements, no hook material requirements, or no gangion length requirements in the dolphin wahoo fishery for pelagic longlines.

Alternative 2, and I will just kind of go over these very briefly, and I wanted to get into sort of the suggested reorganization of this action into two actions, but you have Alternative 2 that includes the requirement, when using pelagic longlines in the dolphin wahoo fishery, to look at requiring the safe handling, release, and identification workshop certificate, possessing only corrodible circle hooks, and, additionally, possessing 18/0 or larger circle hooks with an offset, not to exceed 10 degrees or 16/0 or larger non-offset circle hooks.

We're looking at must use whole finfish or squid as bait. If the total length of any gangion plus the length of any float line is less than a hundred meters, then the length of all gangions must be at least 10 percent longer than the length of a float line, and so this is looking at mitigating mortality for sea turtles that are hooked, and you cannot deploy a pelagic longline that exceeds twenty nautical miles of length in the Mid-Atlantic Bight, and this was the potential rule change that Jennifer Lee mentioned earlier, where this is likely, I believe, extending to thirty-two nautical miles.

You have Alternative 3 that requires the safe handling, release, and identification workshop certificate be supplied when renewing the Atlantic dolphin wahoo permit, and this would mirror the current requirement for those that participate in HMS fisheries. Then we also had Alternative 4, which is sort of a restricting of what was discussed earlier, but included in one alternative, and so, for vessels that do not have the HMS pelagic longline permits, there again, that allow the use of pelagic longline gear, commonly referred to as the tri-pack permits, they must possess the protected species-related workshop certificate and then looking at potentially setting minimum hook sizes at 12/0, 14/0, or 16/0, and, additionally, mirroring those whole bait fish or squid requirements.

Finally, Alternative 5 would look at establishing the -- It would require a longline endorsement, and so establishing an endorsement on the Atlantic dolphin wahoo commercial permit to use longline gear in the dolphin and wahoo fishery, and so the IPT reviewed all of these different alternatives and came up with a new proposed sort or reorganization, and so the content is very similar, if not the same, but it just sort of reorganizes this action, where you have several different alternatives and sub-alternatives into a series of actions and sub-actions.

The first one being proposed Action 14, which would establish a permit endorsement requirement for dolphin and wahoo when using pelagic longline gear. Currently, there is no endorsement. Alternative 2 would establish this permit endorsement for those that wish to use longline gear in the dolphin wahoo fishery, commercial dolphin wahoo fishery, and then what would be proposed new Action 15.

This really takes a lot of those requirements that I just reviewed, but you have sub-actions that focus on protected species handling and release training requirements for dolphin and wahoo when using pelagic longline gear, and Sub-Action 15B is bringing in deployment requirements, and so, for dolphin and wahoo using pelagic longline gear, hook requirements for use in the pelagic longline fishery, and then, finally, bait requirements in the pelagic longline fishery.

I will mention that it was suggested, initially suggested, that these be organized in sub-actions. It's likely, assuming that this action remains, or the new organization of this action is included in Amendment 15, that these sub-actions will likely be split off into different actions themselves, independent actions, largely, if nothing else, for comparison purposes.

Before I get into the discussion materials, I just remembered that I need to bring up a long-awaited data request that we have been interested to see, and that is the vessel count analysis for council boats versus those vessels that -- Council boats being those vessels that fish pelagic longline gear and only have the dolphin and wahoo commercial permit and then boats that are also involved in the HMS fishery.

This was Attachment A1b, and this was included in the -- This was in the late materials folder, but I will just briefly review this table, and what was provided is an updated series of landings, and this is dolphin landings for pelagic longline gear overall, and so, on the top, you have the different permit categories, and so vessels that have the dolphin wahoo and HMS permits, vessels that only have the dolphin wahoo permit, vessels that only have the HMS permits, and vessels where it's unknown what permits were held. Then there are total dolphin landings by gear, and, here again, this is through 2019, and so this is an update from what you had seen previously.

Then, moving along to Table 2, this includes the vessel counts for the vessels that accounted for these landings, and so you can see, overall, on the far right, this is the total number of vessels that could be identified that use pelagic longline gear in the dolphin fishery, and then, moving back, you can see the different permits in the different permit categories, rather, and then the vessel counts that fall under those permits, and so, essentially, in 2019, there were forty-one vessels that landed dolphin with pelagic longline gear that had both the commercial dolphin wahoo and HMS permits.

There were four vessels that were identified that only had the dolphin wahoo permit, and there were five vessels that only had the HMS permits and not the dolphin wahoo permit overall, and so that's kind of the way this could be read, and it just shows you sort of the universe that may be affected by this action in general, and you're looking at overall -- These vessels that have both the dolphin wahoo and HMS permits would need to abide by the HMS regulations, and they would not necessarily be affected, and they're not necessary council boats, so to speak, and these are your council boats that would be affected by the regulations implemented in Action 14.

With that, I would be happy to go and jump into each one of the actions and alternatives, as requested, but, just as a reminder overall, these actions are mirroring several requirements in the HMS fishery that were implemented towards mitigating interactions with protected species overall, and so that's why you tend to see these larger hook sizes and then the gangion requirements, the maximum longline length requirements, and the whole bait requirements. Overall, that's kind of the original rationale. With that, I will turn it over, and maybe we can discuss the proposed new wording.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Does anybody have comments, first, on that table showing the council boats versus the HMS permits and such?

MR. BREWER: John, can you move it up to Table 1? It looks like, to me -- The reason we wanted this information is we wanted to know was it, quote, council boats or was it blue-water boats that whacked the dolphin in 2015 and caused it to close. As I read this chart, it looks like, to me, it was blue-water boats, because they've got over a million pounds that they landed in 2015, and so am I incorrect on that?

MR. HADLEY: No, that's correct. The majority of the pelagic longline landings of dolphin occur on the vessels that have both the HMS and the dolphin wahoo permits.

MR. BREWER: Okay. So, the purpose, as I understood it, of this amendment was, and it was put forth, I think, first by Terry Biederman, to get these, quote, council boats in line and stop them from whacking the dolphin, and, to do that, you would force them to come into line with the requirements for the blue-water boats, and, in fact, this amendment takes a lot of the requirements that are on blue-water boats and essentially, if you're going to fish for dolphin with a longline, applies them across the board.

I mean, I'm seeing that, and this is counterintuitive to me, but, from what I see, you've got 10,000 pounds that was landed from people that only had a dolphin wahoo permit, and that's not a significant amount, quite frankly, compared to the over a million pounds that was dolphin wahoo plus HMS, and so I'm questioning, while I like the amendment, to try to keep people from longlining dolphin, which is, to me, that's something that should not be allowed, and no directed longlining of dolphin, period, but I don't know that we get where we want to go with this amendment, and, with that, I will mute myself.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Just a couple of thoughts. You're right that the original request came from HMS pelagic longliners that felt that there was inequity between them and this open access permit that allowed the use of pelagic longline gear, and so that's correct. There's also, if you look at that same table, there's also about 100,000 pounds that are not assigned, because they weren't 100 percent sure what permits were held, and so the impact from council boats may be higher than that, and that's just the amount that we know for sure came from our, quote, unquote, council boats.

I'm not sure where we are, except to move forward through the actions and just let the discussion kind of flow naturally, and I wasn't clear if Chester had an alternate direction that he was looking at, but shall we start moving through some of these actions? Chester, did you have something to add?

MR. BREWER: I didn't have anything, but I was just a little shocked, quite frankly, when I saw Table 1, because I know what we were told, and I remember it very distinctly, and apparently what we were told was incorrect, because we were told that the blue-water boats were bringing in an average of about 600 pounds a trip, and it doesn't look like that was true.

MS. BECKWITH: All right. Any other comments on these tables? Seeing none, let's start rolling.

MR. HADLEY: With that, maybe we can get some discussion on would the committee be interested in pursuing the IPT's suggested reorganization, looking at the standalone action that would establish an endorsement and then the set of sub-actions that will likely become their own actions?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I think it's easier for the public to understand, the way that that's organized, also assuming that they're all their own actions, because, otherwise, you get used to looking at it one way, and then you hit the end of the document and it looks different.

MR. HADLEY: Okay, and, if I could, I just wanted to mention a couple of things on the proposed action, and we'll start with Action 14, proposed Action 14, and this is the action that would establish a permit endorsement. It is noted that there are probably several decision points that will likely go along with this endorsement, and that will include eligibility, open versus -- If the council wants to pursue this endorsement, open versus limited access, transfer criteria, and potential renewal criteria, and so any sort of guidance that can be provided along those lines. If this is the road the committee wants to pursue, it would be helpful for the IPT, as far as how we would draft those follow-up actions moving forward.

Additionally, in proposed Action 15, I won't go over all of these comments, because I think you've heard them before, related to some of them, but the larger hook sizes specified may not be conducive to dolphin at times, and so that entire range of I believe it's 12/0 through 18/0 are included, but it was discussed, last time the committee discussed this, those might not be conducive to the dolphin fishery.

Also, HMS has a number of required workshops for training, and what's in HMS regulations, there again, may be a good start for changing the pelagic longline regulations for dolphin and wahoo, and we're still -- As this amendment develops, we're still developing the dolphin wahoo biological opinion, and so what may come out of that may have some potentially new requirements that would need to be implemented in the dolphin wahoo fishery, and, there again, overall, it's mentioned that Alternative 3 be -- We have that rule change coming up, and so likely this will be outdated by the time this action would be put in place.

It was noted, and it's certainly up to the committee, but it was noted that the actions are fairly complex, and you're going to end up with several other actions that are related to bringing parity to the HMS fisheries, and so, if it's the committee's preference, these could be well suited to a separate amendment, or they could continue to be included in Amendment 10, and so that was just part of the IPT's discussion, and, with that, I will turn it over, and we'll potentially focus on proposed Action 14.

MS. BECKWITH: Thankfully, at least the bi-op question has been put to bed, and so there will be no additional requirements or regulations that we'll have to take into consideration. For proposed Action 14, for a potential endorsement, and this would be really a question for Roy as well, and the goal of this would be to identify the group of people using pelagic longline within the dolphin wahoo fishery. If we made it open access, non-transferable, with the required training to be presented at application, and the only eligibility requirement required would be to apply for a dolphin wahoo permit, would that be the easiest and smoothest and quickest way forward?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it might be the easiest and quickest, but it may not be the best, and I would have a lot of reservations about setting up a permit with all these requirements without making it limited entry. My advice to you would be to take all of these permitting issues and the HMS issues and move them to a separate amendment, because I think they're going to take a lot of thought and a lot of work to do, but, if you leave it open access, I'm not sure that any of this will be very effective.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, part of my thought process there, Roy, is that we've had trouble identifying who these folks are and who is using the permits, and, if we are going to put in these additional requirements to bring parity between the HMS guys and our council boats, then it's hard

-- I mean, we could just put the regulations out there without the endorsement, but how -- That would be, I think, more difficult to track, versus having an endorsement for the sheer purpose of identifying those people that intend to or are using pelagic longline.

We haven't made an argument that this has to be limited. If the effort needed to be limited, down from the four to ten or fifteen people that are actually participating in it, then the alternate approach would be to disallow pelagic longline in the dolphin wahoo fishery unless you hold an HMS limited entry permit.

DR. CRABTREE: That may well be the best approach, because we're talking a very small number of boats and a lot of issues with it, and I've heard at least some on the council have reservations about allowing the longliners to fish for dolphin anyway, and so, at any rate, regardless of what you do exactly, I think you probably are best off to split this off in another amendment, because I think it's going to get complicated and take more time, and it's going to hold things back, but probably a reasonable alternative is to just restrict the longline fishery to vessels that have the HMS permits.

MS. BECKWITH: That would certainly be an alternate approach to all of these, and so that is a discussion for the committee, and I don't really want to see this go away, per se, because this is a request that came from HMS a number of years ago, and we all know, if this gets shifted into a new amendment, it just kind of goes away and floats around for a long time, and there appears to be some additional recreational angst, at least in North Carolina, with pelagic longliners and the pelagic -- It's just out there, and so I would like to see this settled in some format and retained in this amendment.

If the committee is uncomfortable with this scenario, because of the complexity, then, again, an alternate direction would be to disallow pelagic longline as an allowable gear in the dolphin wahoo fishery unless you hold one of the HMS limited entry permits, and so I would like to hear some discussion on what direction, particularly from Dewey maybe, what direction the council would like to move forward with this. Chester, any opinions?

MR. BREWER: Oh, yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Keep them short, because we've --

MR. BREWER: I understand that, but I think this is really very important.

MS. BECKWITH: I agree.

MR. BREWER: **Because this is a root problem, and I would like to make a motion that longline gear be removed from the list of permissible gear for dolphin, such that, if you have longline gear onboard, you are not allowed to possess dolphin.**

MS. BECKWITH: I would caution you against that, because I think that would create quite a bit of discard in the properly-permitted HMS fishery.

MR. BREWER: Well, Anna, you can argue with me in the middle of me making a motion, but I just saw a chart that said that, in 2015, that HMS boats are the ones that blew out the quota, and I think that --

MS. BECKWITH: Go ahead with the motion. I apologize for interrupting you. Go ahead.

MR. BREWER: In 2015, that's who blew out the quota, and we've been wanting to know who blew the quota out, and now we've got the numbers that show us, and I think that a lot of the problems that we've been talking about, and a lot of the angst in the recreational side, goes away if you just say, okay, longlines are not a permissible gear for dolphin, period, and I would like to make that motion, please. It's up there on the board. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Do I have a second to Chester's motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. The motion is to remove pelagic longline as an allowable gear in the dolphin wahoo fishery.

MR. GRINER: I can appreciate Chester's sentiment here, but, if you look at this chart, and you look at the real numbers here, you're talking about forty-one boats that this past year barely averaged 12,000 pounds per boat per year. If you took the pelagic longline fishery away from -- If you took the dolphin away from them, then the commercial catch of dolphin would be 30,000 pounds a year, and so, out of 675,000 pounds we caught last year, 644,000 of them came from longlines.

By trying to remove that, you have basically shut down the entire dolphin market in the South Atlantic, and bandit boats aren't going to be able to do it. There is no big dayboat fishery commercially targeting dolphin, and so, if I look at the number of vessels from 2015, when you saw that spike, down to now, there are 30 percent less vessels.

There is 50 percent less vessels than there was in 2009, and so this fishery is not growing. It's diminishing, and all this action in this amendment was trying to do was to bring some parity among people that were out there using longlines and put them on a level playing field with the guys that were out there doing it right, and that's all this does, but, to think that we're going to somehow morph that into shutting down an entire fishery, I can't get behind that at all.

DR. CRABTREE: Just remember, and I guess what this motion would do would be add another alternative into these actions, but I would remind you that we put in place a step-down to deal with this issue, and it appears to have worked, and the fishery has closed one time in all the years since we created the dolphin wahoo plan, and we have made the case that the step-down would resolve this, which appears to be the case, and so I think you will have an extremely difficult task of coming up with a rationale for this one.

Again, you see where this is leading us, and it's going to be a complicated, difficult issue, and I think, if you don't move this whole thing into a separate amendment, it's going to bog down everything you're trying to do, because it's just going to get contentious, and there are going to be all kinds of analytical issues and things we have to look at, and so I think you ought to split this

off and come back to it a different day, but I wouldn't support this. We just implemented measures to deal with what was thought to be the problem, and they seem to be working.

MS. BECKWITH: Really, I couldn't support this either, unless -- Anything that takes away the properly-permitted HMS guys that are using pelagic longlines and have video monitoring and observers and all the rest of it all their boats, and anything that does not permit those folks to be able to retain dolphin is, I think -- It's not something that I would be able to support.

MR. DILERNIA: I agree with what Tim has been saying and what Roy just said, and I also have a question regarding this motion, when viewed in light of the National Standards, and I would like to see what NOAA General Counsel has to say about it, but I think this really gets close to violating the National Standards dealing with allocations, and, again, the step-downs and all the other measures that are in place seem to be working, and some would just -- Some in the public would just identify this as a resource grab, which would violate the National Standard. Thank you.

MR. GRINER: I was just going to reiterate what Roy was saying. I mean, we've got this step-down in place, and we haven't even used it yet. I mean, we haven't even gotten to the point where we needed it, and so, when you really look at it, what we're doing is working, and the amount of boats that are using this gear that are interacting with dolphin is shrinking. The fact that we haven't gotten to a step-down of 4,000 pounds tells you that these guys -- If we look at the number of trips they're making, they're not catching a lot of dolphin per trip, and they're only catching 12,000 for the whole year, per boat, and so I think we need to leave it like it is. It's working.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so I see -- I really see us going in two directions, and so stick with me for a second. The original HMS request was for parity, and the proposed new actions are the steps forward to achieve that parity between our council boats and the HMS boats. If the council were not interested, because they either view the number of council boats to be too small or the effort to bring parity too great or whatever, then an alternative route would be Chester's motion with an addition, which would be to remove pelagic longline gear as an allowable gear in the dolphin wahoo fishery unless you hold one of the HMS limited-entry permits.

That would allow all those guys that have the HMS pelagic longlines to keep doing what they're doing, and the only people that it would not allow pelagic longline gear to be used would be our, quote, unquote council boats, and so I don't think it's realistic for us to take away the ability for the HMS pelagic longliners to be able to retain dolphin, and so I think this motion -- We'll take it to a vote, and I suspect that we'll be having a separate discussion, but, if folks were interested in only allowing the HMS folks to be able to retain dolphin using pelagic longline, then that might be a reasonable and simpler short action that we can move forward within this amendment, or we can keep going through the parity discussion for council boats versus HMS, and that's going to take more effort, and, as Tim has pointed out, it is a fairly limited amount of boats participating as council boats, but it's probably very important to those individuals. I am going to let Chester speak one more time, and then we're going to take this motion to a vote.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Anna. **With the permission of the seconder, who was Jessica McCawley, I would agree to your modification of the motion that's on the board.**

MS. BECKWITH: Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am good with that.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. **Then the modification would be to remove pelagic longline gear as an allowable gear in the dolphin wahoo fishery unless you hold an HMS limited-entry permit.** There was a lot of discussion, and so does the committee as a whole -- Does anyone have any opposition to adjusting this motion, because it belongs to the committee now. I don't see any opposition.

MS. BYRD: There are lots of people who are raising their hands.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Give me a list.

DR. CRABTREE: Can we just make it clear in the motion that we're talking about adding an alternative to the document and which action?

MS. BECKWITH: It can be an alternative, or, quite frankly, this could be the only thing that we move forward in this amendment.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay.

MS. BECKWITH: So I'm not 100 percent sure where that's going to go yet.

MR. POLAND: I agree with Roy that we probably need to clarify that this is an alternative, and it probably needs to be an alternative somewhere in Action 14 or wherever, but, as far as the HMS limited-entry permit language, do we need to specify right now what those permits are or just let the IPT fill that in later, when we see this again?

MS. BECKWITH: The IPT could probably fill that in later, but it would be the tri-pack and the shark -- They've got a couple of shark permits, and there is also a swordfish handline, and so, really, to me, any of the HMS limited-entry permits have appropriate amounts of monitoring and whatnot, but I'm sure the IPT could give us some feedback on that.

MS. BECKWITH: Chester, did you have something else?

MR. BREWER: You touched on what I was going to recommend. If you say "HMS limited-entry permit", there are a number of them, but I think what we're really talking about here is the tri-pack.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I think some of the shark directed permits would probably be appropriate as well, and, with some of my discussions with the HMS office, they say that they have figured out who is using this, and it is either tri-pack or they have some folks that have pelagic longline using the dolphin wahoo permit and the shark directed, and then there's another sub-set that have the shark directed, the swordfish handline, and use the dolphin wahoo permit, and so those are really the totality of the permits that they see that are paired with our dolphin wahoo permit.

MR. BREWER: Okay, and just a follow-up. I don't know the magnitude or what the world of the people that have shark permits or that have handline permits is, but, the guys that have the tri-

packs, those are the true blue-water boats, and that's -- We can work this out later, because I agree with where this motion is going, but it seems like, to me, that you want to put in there, or you want to at least be thinking, that what you're talking about are these guys that have the tri-packs.

MR. DILERNIA: Again, I am a little concerned about the National Standard 4 effects of this motion, and so I feel a little better with the clarification, but, still, I'm going to abstain on this vote at this time. Thank you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Basically, with this motion, what is the amount of pounds that you're trying to remove that's been caught? It's my understanding that, now that they've given the information on the council boats, it's not a very big fishery or very many participants, and maybe something to the effect that, if you're using pelagic longline gear, there is a limited entry in that, in that dolphin permit, because, you know, to these guys here that are doing this, in a very limited amount, they can be put out of work just as good as somebody else can, and so I'm not in favor of this motion. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Dewey, the concern, of course, is that this is an open-access permit, and so it sounds like you're more interested in going the route of setting up the endorsement and putting in the requirements and moving towards the equity, the parity, portion for whatever, the ten or fifteen or twenty boats that are doing this.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was under the impression, back in September, unless I'm wrong, that there was already a vote at a committee meeting to not be able to use pelagic longline gear, and it was voted down. The first and the seconder on this same one, and it was voted down back in September, and so I thought that already stuff was in motion for the parity part, and so I guess that this is something extra?

MS. BECKWITH: The parity part is Action 14 and all the actions in 15 that we're currently discussing that Roy was suggesting that we put into a different amendment.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BYRD: Chris Conklin had audio issues, and he wanted me to let you know that he was opposed to this motion, and so that's all I had to say, but I just wanted to pass on his thoughts to you all.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't want to throw a monkey-wrench in this, and maybe the IPT can just fix it, but I was wondering if we needed to have alternatives for pelagic longline only and then all HMS limited entry, and I'm not trying to make this more difficult, and I was trying to fix it.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, some of the limited-entry permits from HMS aren't specific to pelagic longline, and so I would just say the limited-entry permits as a whole, just to keep it simple.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, but I was suggesting that you could have two different universes of people, and, that way, you would have some alternatives here underneath this action.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Let me go to Tim while I think about that.

MR. GRINER: Again, I couldn't support this. I mean, you're talking about now basically cutting out only -- You're going to cut four or five guys out of this, and, right now, there's only four vessels that only have the dolphin wahoo permit. By bringing them into parity and making them get on the same page with the tri-packs, you're already limiting anybody else from getting in this thing.

In fact, I would venture to say that, when you did that, those four boats will become two boats. It's a big difference between what these tri-pack guys are doing, as far as their requirements, and just putting a spool on the back of your boat and getting yourself a dolphin wahoo permit, and so I couldn't support turning them into only having to have a limited-entry HMS, and I don't even know what they would have to go through to even obtain one of those, and maybe Dewey can elaborate on that, but the idea here was to put everybody on a level playing field, and we're talking about a half-dozen guys, at best, and maybe ten, and I don't even know, but, once they have to come onboard with all these requirements, you're going to see that cut in half again, and I feel certain of that.

MS. BECKWITH: Tim, I agree, and I am using this discussion as a way of gauging the wherewithal of this council to see what direction they want to go through, and do they just want to not allow the council boats to use pelagic longline, or do we want to go through the effort of bringing parity, recognizing that it's a fairly limited number of council boats currently in that fishery, and so this was my intent, is to figure out where people actually are.

MR. BELL: I should have said this a long time ago, but I guess the discussion we've had just makes me more convinced that Roy's original thought about this is perhaps a little bit complicated and involved, and, if we were going to do something like this, maybe it's a whole separate amendment, and I get the parity thing. I mean, I went back and read the purpose and need statement, although I know we haven't obligated ourselves to that yet, and what I'm afraid of is this one particular aspect is potentially so complex, and there is some hidden things in there, where we might -- I'm not sure how time critical it is, but we're perhaps jeopardizing the timing of the actions we've already kind of worked through, and getting bogged down in this, plus, not to mention, a lot more staff time and IPT time, and Roy's point originally about perhaps a separate amendment makes more sense to me, and so I would kind of have a hard time supporting this motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I see a path making itself clear. I'm going to go to Dewey and Jessica, and then we're going to move on.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: If you can hear me, to answer Tim's question, a minimal tri-pack is probably \$30,000 to \$35,000, and that's some that have been sold here in the last month or two, and so it would be very expensive for a council boat to have to have -- Well, \$30,000 to \$35,000 is probably a minimum to have a tri-pack right now. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I think a directed shark is not quite that expensive, nor the swordfish handlines, which is one of the reasons that I was also suggesting any of the limited-entry HMS permits, to not make it completely impossible to get in, if somebody really wanted to go that route, but, yes, the tri-packs are very expensive.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I'm kind of where Mel and Roy are. I'm okay if we want to vote this motion now, but I'm wondering if we pull this motion and some other actions into another amendment, because maybe we don't have all the information right now, and so we're sitting here debating even which particular permits, and I agree, and I was just looking at something for directed or incidental shark limited-access permit, and, I mean, there are other permits here that I am realizing that are involved, and so I'm not convinced that we have all the info that we need, and so do we want to lay this on the table until a time certain, with all the other actions here, as a grouping and move on to bullet and frigate? Maybe this is a question for John Hadley, and I don't know, and I'm just throwing some ideas out here.

MS. BECKWITH: I am fine, and this is a discussion that I needed to get from you guys, and so I'm okay moving this discussion with this motion, this idea that we're currently discussing, along with the other actions, 14 and 15 and the sub-actions, and making them their own amendment, and I would like to have the opportunity to have some of those discussions with you before I leave the council, and so I don't know if that impacts the time certain, but certainly we don't need to see this in September, and probably even December would be a stretch, and so March of 2021 could possibly be a suggestion. Thoughts? John, what do you think?

MR. HADLEY: It's up to the committee on what you would want to see. It would help if we could -- We have the motion on the table, if we want to vote it up or vote it down, and then, if we want to take the route that you were sort of discussing, as far as coming back at a different time, if we could form a motion together that would reflect that, I think that would be pretty helpful, and it would make it clear to the IPT, as far as timing.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so then we should vote this motion up or down, with the idea that this would end up being an alternative to be considered in a new amendment dealing with this.

MR. POLAND: That last thing you said just clarified it, and I just wanted to make sure that we were all on the same page, as far as this moving into another amendment, as opposed to tabling it for this amendment, but you cleared it up.

MR. BREWER: I agree. Let's vote this thing up or down, and then we can decide whether we want to move it to a time certain, and March of 2021 sounds pretty good. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am okay doing that, and I was just going to state that I really would like to see more information on this too, because I keep dredging up permits here that look like they're part of this, and so I feel like I need additional information, but, with that being said, I am fine approving this motion, knowing that it and these others would go to another amendment, and then we would deal with that in a timing and tasks motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so would you like to -- Let's vote on this one, and I'm getting ahead of myself. **Is there any opposition to this motion to remove pelagic longline gear as an allowable gear in the dolphin wahoo unless you hold an HMS limited-entry permit?**

MS. BYRD: Anna, there are two people, and Spud and Dewey both raised their hands, and so do you want me to do a voice vote with everyone? Mel raised his hand, too.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. Sure. Go for it.

MS. BYRD: Art Sapp. When I call your name, please let me know if you're for the amendment, against the amendment, or you want to abstain. Art Sapp.

MR. SAPP: To be honest, I don't feel like I've had the time to put enough thought into it. I mean, this thing just sprung here in the last hour.

MS. BECKWITH: It's just to add it as an alternative to a future amendment for future consideration. You can abstain if you're uncomfortable.

MR. SAPP: I'm uncomfortable. I will abstain.

MS. BYRD: Chester.

MR. BREWER: Since it's my motion, I think I'll vote to support it.

MS. BYRD: Chris Conklin. I know you may still be having audio issues. If you can't unmute yourself, you can use the question window. I will go ahead and move on. Tim Griner.

MR. GRINER: I need to make sure that I understand what we're voting on here. The motion is Motion 10 to remove pelagic longline gears as an allowable gear in the dolphin wahoo fishery unless you hold an HMS limited-entry permit, and is that what we're voting on?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and so we would be adding -- If this moves forward, then we would take this and all the other discussion points and push them into another amendment for future consideration.

MR. GRINER: Well, that's not really what the motion says, and so I'm going to vote against the motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MS. BYRD: Steve Poland.

MR. POLAND: I tend to agree with Tim. I would like to see this language clarified that this is an alternative to be considered, and so I'm going to have to vote against it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: A point of order here. I feel like we're sinking this motion, whether we want to or not, because the timing thing is not clear, and everybody that you unmute is not understanding what they're voting on here, because that timing thing is not in here, and it's also not clear that this would go with those other actions into a separate document to be analyzed, and so do we need to modify the motion?

MS. BECKWITH: How do we make this go away?

MR. WOODWARD: Those are my concerns, and I voted against this because it is a motion to take an action, and it is not a clear motion to add an alternative for a specific purpose, and so that's -- I am glad that I'm not the only one that was confused by this.

MS. BECKWITH: In reality, even if we vote this down, that doesn't mean that we can't bring this idea into a future amendment, and so it was just -- The motion was on the table, and so it needed to be voted up or down, but, even if we vote this down, I suspect this can still be discussed again in whatever amendment we come back and see. Roy, lead us through the darkness.

DR. CRABTREE: Perhaps the maker of the motion will consider amending it to be more specific.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so that was a suggestion that Chester amends the motion to add it as an alternative for consideration in a future amendment.

MR. BREWER: If I can speak, that's exactly what it is. It is to add the alternative to move pelagic longline gear as an allowable gear in the dolphin, blah, blah, blah. Keep it in as an alternative, and then we can make a motion to move this out of Amendment 10 and make it a separate amendment.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so I see where Chester is going, and so he's okay stating that it's to add an alternative to remove and so on and so forth, and then, if we go ahead and vote to add this alternative, then our next motion will be to move this and the other associated actions into another amendment, and does that clarify where we are? Does anyone need any additional clarification?

MR. POLAND: I guess this is one of those friendly amendments that's kind of there on the edge of Roberts Rules.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and let's just roll with that.

MR. POLAND: Because, technically, Jessica would need to second this, since she was the seconder of the original motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. All right. Does anyone need any additional clarification for this? I am trying to avoid the person-by-person vote.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't think you can avoid the person-by-person vote. I think that you should start the voting again, because the motion wasn't clarified.

MS. BECKWITH: Correct. I agree, and so we're working with a fresh slate on the vote now. This is just to add an alternative for this to be considered. Any additional discussion? **Is there any opposition to this new clarified motion?**

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Can everyone who is opposed to it just raise their hand real quick, so we can make a note of it?

MS. BYRD: Anna, there are some people that have their hands raised right now, and so, if we want to do that, if everyone -- I don't know if people are raising hands because they oppose, and so, if we can have everyone lower their hands, or I can lower everyone's hands.

MS. BECKWITH: Go ahead and lower everyone's hands, and we only want you to raise your hand if you are opposed to this new clarified motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think that this is confusing. We already agreed, at the outset of this council meeting, that we would call the committee members for the vote. I don't want to go back on what we already decided as our policy for this meeting.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. All right. Julia, will you call?

MS. BYRD: Sure. Art Sapp.

MR. SAPP: Yes. I'm okay with it now.

MS. BYRD: Chester Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Since I made it, I'm going to vote in favor.

MS. BYRD: Chris Conklin. Again, if you're having trouble with audio, Chris, just type into the question toolbar. Tim Griner.

MR. GRINER: No.

MS. BYRD: Steve Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MS. BYRD: Spud Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MS. BYRD: Carolyn Belcher. Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: Okay.

MS. BYRD: Kyle Christiansen.

MS. THOMAS: Julia, Doug Haymans sent yes in the question box.

MS. BYRD: I assume that's for Carolyn, and so I got it. Thank you. Do you have Chris Conklin, too?

MS. THOMAS: Well, I'm waiting. He finally got -- He responded to my text, but I haven't gotten the vote yet, and so he does intend to vote.

MS. BYRD: Okay. Thank you. Let me know when you hear back. Kyle Christiansen, we can't hear you, and so, if you have audio issues, just use the question section of the Go to Webinar toolbar. Roy Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MS. BYRD: Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MS. BYRD: David Whitaker.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes.

MS. BYRD: Robert Copeland.

LT. COPELAND: Sorry. What was the question?

MS. BYRD: The question is what your vote is on Motion 10 that's on the screen.

LT. COPELAND: Sorry. I thought I was a non-voting member.

MS. BECKWITH: You can vote on the committee, but you can also abstain.

LT. COPELAND: Okay. In that regard, I abstain.

MS. BYRD: Tony DiLernia.

MR. DILERNIA: Abstain.

MS. BYRD: Dewey Hemilright.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: No.

MS. BYRD: Rick Bellavance.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Abstain.

MS. BYRD: Suzanna, have you heard from Chris?

MS. THOMAS: Not yet. I just had him, and I don't know what happened. I'm sorry.

MS. BYRD: Okay. As of now, we have a total of nine yes, two no, and three abstentions.

MS. BECKWITH: **Okay, and so the motion carries.** I would be looking for a motion to move this alternative and the proposed Actions 14 and 15 into a new amendment with dates to come back and look at it of March 2021.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Do I have a second?

MR. BELL: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Do we need any discussion on that motion? **Is there any opposition to that motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

I believe that only leaves one additional action in this amendment, which is allowing the filleting of dolphin at-sea onboard charter and headboats, and I believe that there is no committee action required, and we have seen that action before, and so, unless somebody would like to discuss it further, we could probably move on to Amendment 12, but I want to open the floor and make sure that no one would like to discuss the filleting of dolphin at-sea onboard charter/headboat vessels in the Atlantic EEZ.

MR. GRIMES: I just had a question, and the motion said Action 15, and so did it not include what you're talking about now?

MS. BECKWITH: No, and it was the proposed Actions 14 and 15. I guess we never really technically approved those proposed, but all of -- The intent is all of the associated actions that were the proposed Action 14 and proposed Action 15, which had the sub-actions of A, B, C, and D, along with the motion that we just carried, and so the staff can probably take that as direction.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Now, the current Action 15 is the filleting of dolphin, and so, again, is there any need to discuss that action? It does not call for any committee action. I don't see anybody raising their hands, and so, with that, I think that ends discussion of Amendment 10. We will see what should be a public hearing document in September, and then we will go from there. The last thing on the plate for today is Amendment 12, and so let's see how quick we can make it through this one. I'm so sorry, guys.

MR. HADLEY: This should be fairly brief, but I will give a few quick orienting slides on Amendment 12. As you may recall, in March, the council received guidance from SERO on the council's ability to designate bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel as EC species and implement associated regulatory measures, and you revised the purpose and need statement, and you selected a preferred alternative that would add bullet and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP as ecosystem component species and directed staff to not include the other actions for further consideration in Amendment 12. We looked at topics such as permit requirements, reporting requirements, trip limits or vessel limits, the process for developing a directed fishery, and a prohibition on sale for the two mackerel species.

Looking at the potential amendment timing, at this meeting, we will be reviewing the amendment and potentially looking for a vote to approve the amendment for public hearings, and these would occur later over the summer, and then the amendment could potentially be ready for formal review at the September meeting.

There is a single action in the amendment, and, really, you can see the draft amendment document that's in the briefing book, but it's been formatted as a categorical exclusion, and you've seen this before with several of the other actions that are fairly straightforward, and it's a much smaller condensed version of an amendment document than is typically done overall. In Amendment 12, there's a single action in the amendment that we'll review. There again, it's slightly different wording, and it's the same effect.

Amendment 12 to the fishery management plan for the dolphin wahoo fishery of the Atlantic, the Dolphin Wahoo FMP, proposes to add bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP and designate them as ecosystem component species. There again, what needs to be done at this meeting is we'll review some minor edits to the purpose and need statements, review the options in the amendment, and consider timing of the amendment and approving for public hearings. With that, are there any questions?

MS. BECKWITH: I see that Steve has his hand raised.

MR. POLAND: I was just getting in the queue to comment, but I will let John go ahead and move through the decision document before I comment.

MR. HADLEY: All right. With that, we'll jump into the purpose and need statement. As you can see, there is a few relatively minor suggested worded changes from the IPT, and so the current purpose and need reads: The purpose and need is to add bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the fishery management plan for the dolphin and wahoo fishery of the Atlantic as ecosystem component species to safeguard their ecological role as forage fish for wahoo.

Given that there are no regulatory measures that are going along with this designated ecosystem species, the suggested rewording was to acknowledge their role as ecosystem component species, and, there again, since there aren't necessarily the directed measures, or potential regulatory measures, that go along with this, it was suggested that "for wahoo" may be removed and just a general ecological role as forage fish, and it's certainly important, very important -- The two mackerel species are very important for wahoo, and they do play a role in dolphin and many of the other offshore pelagic species, and so that's the rationale for the suggested changes from the IPT highlighted in yellow. With that, I will turn it over, and I'm looking for potentially a motion to accept the IPT's suggested edits or specify otherwise.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Great.

MR. POLAND: **I will make the motion to approve the IPT's suggested edits to the purpose and need statement.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Is there a second?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Excellent. Okay. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition?**

MS. MCCAWLEY: I had some discussion, but you're a little too fast for me.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm getting overzealous. Is there discussion? Go ahead, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just was going to say that I really like these modifications to the purpose and need statement. I feel like this is what we had been discussing for multiple meetings, and this finally captures what I was hoping the purpose and need statement would look like.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MR. BREWER: I like it.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Okay. Is there any further discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MR. HADLEY: Moving along, we have a single action in the amendment, as I mentioned, and you've seen it before, how an amendment may have started as a regular environmental assessment, or environmental impact statement, and it gets set down to a categorical exclusion, and then, really, the layout of the amendment changes quite a bit. In this case, instead of having a typical action and alternatives, we have included a general statement, which is the action, and then the two options that the council has decided to include, and, really, the action in the amendment, there again, is Amendment 12 to the fishery management plan for the dolphin wahoo fishery of the Atlantic (Dolphin Wahoo FMP) proposes to add bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP and designate them as ecosystem component species.

There is two options available here. Currently, there are no ecosystem component species in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP, and we added "of the Atlantic", and that was a suggested IPT addition, and then Preferred Alternative 2, the council's preferred Option 2, rather, would be to add bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP of the Atlantic and designate the two mackerel species as ecosystem components.

Overall, this action -- It's certainly necessary to add the two mackerel species as ecosystem components, and the IPT discussed, a sub-group of the IPT in particular, discussed the jurisdictional issue that that was touched on last time, at the March meeting, looking at how the jurisdictional issue may apply to listing bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel as ecosystem component species.

This was discussed, and it was determined that it's not relevant to the current action, as proposed in Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 12, and bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel are being added to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP as ecosystem component species, and this designation applies wherever the Dolphin Wahoo FMP applies, since there are no regulatory measures that go along with that, and so, really, there's no management measures in conjunction with this EC species designation status. Therefore, there is no need to discuss the geographical jurisdiction of the ecosystem component species.

Just a reminder that, as you've been presented before, there is certainly the consideration of the ten factors listed in the National Standard Guidelines for determining whether a species is in need of conservation and management, and the IPT has discussed these ten factors, and they have provided an analysis of this and determined that bullet and frigate mackerel do not appear to be in need of conservation and management, and, thus, have the potential to be designated as ecosystem component species.

Really, this action is similar to the actions that have been taken for snapper grouper species, in that it may elevate the importance of bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel for research and monitoring purposes, and it also may help achieve ecosystem management objectives, and these objectives have been addressed in the council's revised Dolphin Wahoo FMP goals and objectives, and, additionally, this is consistent with the definition of EC species in the National Standard Guidelines.

Overall, as a reminder, landings have been fairly low. Overall commercial landings, looking over the recent years, are approximately just under 2,000 pounds in the entire U.S. Atlantic, and these landings were reported from only the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions in most years, with the exception of 2018, when relatively minor landings of frigate mackerel were reported from the South Atlantic region as well.

Additionally, looking at recreational landings, they have really been variable over the years, but they tend to be fairly low. You're looking at approximately 4,700 pounds of bullet mackerel landed a year and approximately 324 pounds of frigate mackerel landed a year, and so just under 5,000 pounds combined for both of the species annually over the past five years of available data. Recreational landings of bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel have all occurred within the South Atlantic region.

With that, just a reminder of the public comments that were received during scoping, and a vast majority of these comments were in favor and expressed support for the council considering adding the two mackerel species as ecosystem components in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. Additionally, you have had motions from the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel, the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Advisory Panel, and the Scientific and Statistical Committee that endorsed the notion of adding bullet mackerel and frigate mackerel as ecosystem component species in the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan.

With that, we're looking for two motions in general here, and one is just to make sure that you're okay with the addition of the edits to the options that are highlighted in yellow, and so specifying "in the Atlantic", and I will go back up to those in just a second, and, additionally, a second action to approve the amendment for public hearings, and there's a draft motion there that can be read for approval for public hearings. With that, I will turn it over.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Chester, did you have a comment?

MR. BREWER: A quick question. I thought we already approved the IPT edits, and is that not correct?

MS. BECKWITH: We approved the IPT edits for the purpose and need. This is for the action.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Then I would like to approve the -- I am getting confused. I thought we already approved the IPT's suggested edits to the options. Did we not do that?

MS. BECKWITH: We did it for the purpose and need.

MR. BREWER: Okay. **So this is all of their suggested edits, and I move, therefore, that we approve the IPT's suggested edits to the options.**

MS. BECKWITH: It's seconded by --

MR. BELL: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.** I need an additional motion to approve the Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 12 for public hearings. Who would like to make that motion? Steve. Seconded by --

MR. POLAND: Woah. I wasn't quite ready to make the motion yet. I wanted to have a discussion, and I know, last time we talked about this, we talked a little bit about the amount of public comment that we've already received on this and the possibility of maybe not doing another round of hearings, since we received so much, and just moving forward with approval of the action, and I didn't know if that was something the committee wanted to discuss right now.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Do you mean just approving the amendment for secretarial review?

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Roy and Shep, that would be a question for either or both of you.

DR. CRABTREE: Anna, is it noticed for final action? I don't think it is.

MS. BECKWITH: I do not think it was noticed for final action either.

DR. CRABTREE: Then I don't think you can take final action.

MR. POLAND: That's fine. Then that answers my question. **I will move to approve Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 12 for public hearings.**

MR. BREWER: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: **Great, and the totality of that motion is approve Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 12 for public hearings to be held via webinar with comments brought back to the September council meeting.** I am assuming, at the September council meeting, it will be noticed for final action, and is that correct, John?

MR. HADLEY: Yes, that is correct.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. We have had a motion made and a seconder, and is there any discussion? I see Shep, and I believe he was answering the previous question, but certainly speak if you would like to.

MR. GRIMES: I was just going to elaborate that, aside from the final action part of it, yes, you could probably -- At this point, you've had a lot of public input, and you've had public hearings, and this counts as a public hearing, but you've done a lot of that, and so I think you would be fine not holding additional public hearings, but, if you're going to do it via webinar, maybe there's not much cost/benefit. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MR. BREWER: Again, as I always do, I have to agree with Roy. If it hasn't been noticed for final approval, then you've got to put the notice out, which pushes it to the next meeting, and so, therefore, some sort of webinar public hearing is not going to hurt, and let's notice it in September for final approval.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BELL: I just had a quick question. Listening to John explain the current landings that exist and the fish that exist, that's the reality we're in right now, but I guess the assumption I would make is that NMFS would kind of periodically monitor the landings, and, if anything changed with that, they would report that or something, and I don't know, and that doesn't necessarily need to be stated in there, but I guess that's an assumption I'm making, is that we just kind of keep an eye on the landings for the future.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, we will.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I am wondering if we could change this motion so that, instead of "to be held via webinar", "to be held at the September council meeting", with the intent of taking final action at the September council meeting, because I feel like we've had plenty of input on this.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Who made the original motion?

MR. POLAND: **I did, and I'm fine with that.**

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. The seconder was lots of people, and so is anybody not --

MR. BREWER: I think it was me, and I absolutely agree.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. All right. **Is there any opposition by the committee, since there's been so much discussion, and the motion belongs to the committee? I am not hearing any opposition, and so the motion is approve Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 12 for public hearings to be held at the September council meeting with comments brought back at the September**

council meeting, with the intent of a vote on formal approval of the amendment. Is there any additional discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

MS. BYRD: Anna, Tony DiLernia had his hand raised, and I'm not sure if it was in opposition or if he just had a comment.

MR. DILERNIA: I wanted to thank -- I was the one who brought this before the South Atlantic Council, and I wanted to thank you for taking such rapid and quick action, and, naturally, I am going to support the motion. I cannot vote on it when it comes to Full Council, because I'm a committee member, but, on behalf of the Mid-Atlantic Council, I would like to thank you, and I would encourage you to go forward with it and take final action at the September meeting, and I think that would be helpful. Thank you again.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Okay. That motion passed, and I believe that takes us to the end of the amendment. John, is there anything else?

MR. HADLEY: That should do it for this amendment.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Great. I think that takes us -- Is there any -- We still have a couple of items on the agenda, and you guys are going to read through the dolphin wahoo participatory workshops, but there was also a discussion on the Mid-Atlantic representation on the Dolphin Wahoo AP. Jessica, did you want to save that for another time, since everyone's brain is fried, or how you would like to handle that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's save that, if you wouldn't mind.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Sounds great. Then I will not adjourn, because we might have to pick up that discussion again at some point, if time allows. You guys have done an amazing job today, and thank you for your patience and your attention.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, everybody. We'll start again at 9:00 in the morning, please.

MR. POLAND: Are we starting with Snapper Grouper or going back into Dolphin Wahoo?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We're going to go into Snapper Grouper.

MS. BECKWITH: All right. Thanks, guys. Have a great night. John, as always, an amazing job.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on June 8, 2020.)

JUNE 9, 2020

TUESDAY MORNING SESSION

The Dolphin Wahoo Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened via webinar on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Anna Beckwith.

MR. HADLEY: Thank you, everyone, for logging on early this morning, and we certainly appreciate it, and, just to give a little background, we're taking up Agenda Item Number 5 in the Dolphin Wahoo Committee, and so this is an update on the dolphin wahoo participatory workshops, and, just before we get into that, I just wanted to express a -- Say a few thank-you's and just kind of give a brief update.

As you may recall, in March, we briefed the committee on the dolphin wahoo participatory workshops that were being planned, and these are the ones in North Carolina and Virginia, and we certainly received a lot of help, and it's been a pretty incredible collaborative effort on the part of the Science Center, and particularly Matt and Mandy and their team, in helping to organize this, and we certainly received a lot of help from others as well, and certainly Dewey was very helpful in planning the workshop and also attending, as was Rick Robbins, and he helped a lot with the planning in the Virginia Beach area.

Also, certainly thank you to Anna and Steve for your help in kind of spreading the word in the planning stages, and Chip as well, and we received a lot of help from Sarah Mirabilio, with North Carolina Sea Grant, in securing a location in Wanchese, and, there again, a few more shoutouts to the Dolphin Wahoo AP, and several we had show up to these, at least that were in the area. In the areas where we had these workshops, they showed up, and they were helpful in spreading the word and also providing feedback, and, last but not least, certainly all the participants that took their time to come out and spend a day with us and to help us run through these workshops and build these models, which we'll into here in just a minute, and so this has certainly been a collaborative effort, and we're very thankful for all the help that we've gotten. With that, I will turn it over to Matt.

MR. MCPHERSON: Great. Good morning, everybody. My name is Matt McPherson, and, for those who don't know me, I lead the Social Science Research Group at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and I just wanted to, first of all, thank everybody for giving us the opportunity to just present and provide an update on the dolphin wahoo participatory workshops that we've been holding, and I also wanted to just sort of second John in saying that one of the really neat aspects of this project has been all of the collaboration and the fact that we're working in a real interdisciplinary way.

I mean, I'm an anthropologist, but this has given, I think, social scientists a chance to work really closely with non-social scientists and also across organizations, in order to kind of bring a coupled approach to this topic, and so it's been really interesting, and I just wanted to emphasize that I'm going to present a few themes and show you some of the preliminary results, but this is just an update, and so we're still in the process of doing an analysis of this information, and so nothing that I present here is really final.

Overall, the goal of these workshops has been to increase the information flow between scientists and managers and fishermen who support improved fisheries resources in the Atlantic, and we have done something similar over in the Gulf, working with the snapper grouper fishery, and so we kind of began to sort of develop and test this approach over there, and we brought it over here to narrow the focus a little bit, and, in our workshop, our approach is to develop a conceptual

model, in this case of the dolphin wahoo fishery, and we wanted to do it in two different areas in North Carolina and Virginia and then down in the Florida Keys, to kind of be able to compare the perceptions of the system in those two different areas.

We look at major factors that are affecting the fishery, and we use the conceptual modeling to look at where risks lie in the fishery, to identify gaps in research and what kind of targeted research may be needed, what's most valued in the ecosystem, to be able to think more about how changes in the ecosystem affect businesses and communities, and how environmental factors affect the fishery, and we've already mentioned sort of the broad collaboration that we've had in this project.

Our plan has been implemented, halfway, and we held three workshops in North Carolina and Virginia, on March 9 through 11, and we just barely managed to squeeze it in, and I think, like three days later, all the shut-down orders started, and so it was like the last thing we did before everything started to get shut down, and then, of course, our plan of going down and doing the workshops in the Keys had been originally scheduled for around this time of year, but our planning has been, of course, impacted by the pandemic, as has everything, and the Keys, I think, only recently even opened to non-residents, maybe last week.

As everybody else is, we're just kind of following what's going on, in terms of openings and opportunities, and so we're looking to try to reschedule those workshops as soon as we can, and, maybe optimistically, we would hope to be able to do them maybe late in the summer or early in the fall of this year, and we're going to be contacting council members and AP members and other parties and contacts that we have down in the Keys to consult with them closely on the timing and locations that those meetings can be and who should participate.

I am going to just show you a little bit about what happens in these workshops, and I will just start by saying that conceptual models are developed to identify and characterize the existing conditions and the key drivers that affect the current status of social and environmental variables within a system, and so we sometimes can call this doing a situation analysis.

In other words, we're trying to portray the different factors within a system and the relationship between those factors, and so it's -- Part of the process is developing this map that shows all these different relationships, but, as sort of a part of the process beyond mapping that is so important is that it gives us an opportunity to discuss, in great specificity, the key drivers in the system and their relationships. This includes the relationships between the biophysical and the socioeconomic factors, and that's why it's been so interesting having an interdisciplinary team for the modeling.

Beyond the models that I will show you, we have notes and transcriptions from our meetings that capture all of the conversations that we had during the workshops, and we're currently digging into and analyzing those, and that's one of the real important sort of outcomes of this whole process, and so, to develop these conceptual models, we use sticky notes for each factor, and that gives us the ability to add factors and move things around as the relationships in the system become clearer, as our discussion evolves during the day, and, in this case, we're starting at the very beginning, with our first sticky note, by putting dolphin wahoo abundance in the center of the model.

Here, you can see the process evolving, and we begin brainstorming the different factors that affect dolphin wahoo abundance, and then we -- As these factors are going up on the board, we start

talking about how these factors are connected to one another, and so here's a bunch of stuff that's kind of -- Some of it is starting to become positioned in the clusters of things that go together. This is an example of what a final model looks like after the workshop with all of the key factors, and you can see all the arrows and interconnections within that model.

Something else that we did in this workshop is that we asked participants to draw graphs of certain factors that emerged as particularly important for the fisheries, and so, in this case, we used charts, and we asked people to draw charts to capture the seasonality of different fisheries, and also the perceived local abundance trends over time, and so you can see two actual graphs that were done by participants in the Beaufort workshop looking at the relative importance of different species through their fishing operations during the year on the left-hand side, and on the right-hand side it's a plot of perceived local abundance trends for dolphin and wahoo and mahi over time.

As I mentioned before, we held three workshops in North Carolina and Virginia Beach, and the workshops were actually pretty well attended, and so it's important to note that we try to keep the number of the participants of these workshops fairly small, and, generally, we would want to have less than fifteen people, or maybe even, ideally, sort of like eight to twelve people, which would be a good size if you were holding, for example, a focus group, because, if you have a group that's larger than that, it's really hard to keep everybody engaged in the conversation and keep everybody participating in the process.

The group size that we had, our largest group was fourteen in Wanchese, and it was a mixed -- They were mixed groups, with for-hire, commercial fishermen, as well as we had a couple of dealers that showed up to those workshops, but we had enough participation to really be able to have successful workshops, I think, in all three places.

That big wall full of sticky notes and drawn lines that you saw before can be cleaned up to look like this, and this is our cleaned-up conceptual model from the workshop in Beaufort, and you will note a couple of things. One is we ended up splitting up the dolphin abundance and the wahoo abundance, and so, just to talk through a little bit about how you would read this, and, unfortunately, I don't have a pointer or anything, but you can see the local dolphin abundance sort of up towards the top of the model, right in the center, and then you can see that, for example, that the two key factors that are related to local dolphin abundance were commercial fishing effort and recreational landings, and then we have a whole bunch of factors, and I'm not going to go through them all, but a whole bunch of factors that we tied as identified to recreational landings.

Commercial fishing effort was regarded as being tied primarily to the number of longline fishermen, and then there were some factors that were drivers of the longline fishermen numbers, and so, if you take this and you go through it, you can see sort of all these interconnections and layers of interconnections within the system, and, from this conceptual model, you can also see, they are divided by color into biological, physical, and socioeconomic factors, and we could have added another color there just to point out sort of regulatory factors, and we included that as a socioeconomic factor, but we've divided those up by colors.

One of the really interesting things, just by looking at sort of the relative numbers by type of factor, is the relatively small number of biological and physical drivers in the system in comparison to the socioeconomic drivers, and this contrasts, for example, greatly with the snapper grouper models that we did over in the Gulf of Mexico, where there was a much more substantial sort of

biophysical component to the model, in comparison to the socioeconomic part, and this was consistent across all three workshops, and so this may be due to the migratory nature of dolphin in particular or maybe the relatively limited amount of information we have on factors that affect local population abundance, but, like I said, that was something that was really interesting and just kind of emphasizes, I guess, the heavy emphasis on socioeconomics within this system.

As I mentioned before, we also did participatory charts, or graphs, and here is the draft result of the combined charts from the Beaufort workshop for seasonality, and so we've combined all of those charts, and just some of the sort of observations from this chart is that dolphin is clearly most locally important in the summer, and wahoo in the fall, and dolphin and wahoo clearly form just part of a large fishing portfolio, both on the commercial and recreational side, and they frequently are not the primary target species, and that doesn't diminish their importance, but they play a particular role within a broader portfolio of species.

Just a chart like this is something that you could look at to help to inform effort shifts that may occur in response to decreased access to a fishery, and we had conversations about how particular changes in other fisheries have led to effort shifts, for example, into the dolphin fishery over time, and so, whenever you are changing access to one fishery, looking at this chart, you have to think about where is that effort going to shift and how may it affect other fisheries.

Here is also, from Beaufort, the combined graph of perceived abundance trends, and the average perception is that local dolphin availability has been gradually decreasing over time and that local wahoo availability has been increasing.

The group got together and discussed the results and all the conversations that we had in the workshops, and we just kind of came up with some areas, or emerging themes, that we think would deserve further thought and research, but that were really interesting, and so some of these are, in the sort of comparison between dolphin and wahoo, one of the things that came out is the really large differences between the species and, as I noted before in the conceptual model, we ended up separating out dolphin abundance and wahoo abundance within the model.

In all three workshops, the conversation immediately gravitated towards dolphin abundance, and that dominated the conversation. Wahoo was kind of a side thing that we had to go back to and encourage people to talk a little bit about, in terms of where wahoo fit in within the overall system, and so there really are some large differences, perceived differences, between those systems in the fishery, although there seems to be the same fishery participants, especially on the recreational side, that are involved in both fisheries, and so, as I mentioned, there was overall relatively little discussion of wahoo, very little discussion of wahoo compared to dolphin.

There weren't any clear hypotheses regarding overall stock drivers and abundance patterns, and that goes back to that point that I mentioned about the fact that there just aren't that many sort of biophysical drivers in our model, and the model heavily emphasized the importance of the social and economic considerations for the management of the species, and there were concerns raised in all the workshops about accountability, particularly regarding overall recreational effort for both charter/for-hire as well as private recreational effort in all of the areas.

With regard to dolphin in particular, we found that even -- So our original idea is that we were going to find sort of two major differences between sort of the northern part of the South Atlantic

and the Mid-Atlantic regarding dolphin and then down the Florida Keys, and we wanted to kind of compare those two areas, but what we actually found is also that, within a very small geographic range, there is a large variation in the role of dolphin in the overall fishery of those areas, and we found that there are conflicts over dolphin between sectors at the local and regional scales, and so it's not just between -- It doesn't seem that there are just conflicts between sort of the Keys and the northern part of the South Atlantic, but, actually, we're finding these at the community level.

Something else that came out and was repeatedly emphasized was the impact of dolphin bag limits on consumer satisfaction, and so charter/for-hire fishermen were extremely concerned about finding appropriate bag limits, and they emphasized that those bag limits are very important for their business. The interesting part is that, sort of in Beaufort and that area, the emphasis was more on dolphin as a meat fishery, and then, in Virginia Beach, it was all about sportfishing, which you would think would make the bag limits less important, but it actually, as you can see from these photos, catching a large number of fish seems to be very important, in order to get those great end-of-day photos with all the fish lined up that you can put on your Facebook site or circulate via social media.

We also had really interesting discussions, and it's not only about overall abundance and access to just fish overall, but that different size classes, sort of the gaffers versus bailer argument, or contrast, was variable across the area and sector, but the size class is something that's really important. It's not just about numbers of fish, and there is a perception that there has been increased private recreational effort on dolphin, and, again, mentioning the accountability concerns, that we just don't really have good data on that private recreational effort.

Just to conclude, as I had mentioned at the beginning, our next steps are to do the same conceptual modeling workshops in south Florida, and, of course, that all depends on the pandemic situation and when we can get down there, and we're in the process of doing more in-depth analysis, and so I just showed you some snapshots from some of the local models, but we're going to begin to bring all those three models together, and there is different kinds of analysis that we can do with that, as well as much more sort of in-depth analysis of the transcripts and then using other outside information to perhaps inform some of the questions and hypotheses that were raised during the workshops, and we will then produce a final report for the council relatively soon after we're able to finish the workshops in south Florida. I think that's it, and we're open for questions, and Mandy is also on the line here, and, of course, John and Julia, who were all involved in the workshops.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Matt, so much for the presentation. I was really interested in taking some time to looking at this in the briefing material, and one quick question. The charts for the seasonal importance and the perceived abundance charts, you did them for Beaufort, and I'm assuming, in the final report, that you might be also doing them independently for the Wanchese and Virginia Beach and the Florida Keys, just to see the comparisons, or do you feel like they're pretty similar?

MR. MCPHERSON: I think they're pretty similar, but we will do them. I just showed you the combined charts for Beaufort, because that's the one that we had completed, but we did them -- We are following the same approach and doing the same thing in all the workshops, and so we have those for all three of the workshops that we've done so far. I don't know, Mandy, if you want to say something about -- Perhaps you compared the three, and were there differences?

DR. KARNAUSKAS: We had to digitize those all, and so it's just a little bit of a time constraint, and so we were only able to get through Beaufort, but we will be finishing those for all the workshops, and so we'll have all those results.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Thank you so much for that.

DR. MCGOVERN: Matt, that was a good presentation, and thank you for that. I had a question about the bag limit satisfaction and the impact of bag limits, and I assume that fishermen like a bigger bag limit, but there's an action in Dolphin Wahoo 10 that would put a vessel limit in place, and I was wondering if there was any discussion about the potential impacts of that.

MR. MCPHERSON: I don't recall having discussion about the impacts of vessel limits, although certainly there was a great amount of concern that was expressed about especially the number of private recreational vessels that are in the fishery, and there were sort of increasing conflicts that were noted as taking place probably just because, in part, because of increased congestion, but I don't know, and, Mandy, do you remember any details of that?

DR. KARNAUSKAS: No, I don't recall any discussion on that, but we can go back to the transcripts, and there was definitely a lot more discussion on bag limits.

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WHITAKER: This is a nice job, and it's interesting work, and it will be interesting to see how south Florida compares with North Carolina, in particular, but I was curious about this third bullet here that we have on the screen, meat versus sportfishing. In Virginia, are those customers taking those fish home, or do they just want a picture and they're giving those fish away, or do you have any feel for that?

MR. MCPHERSON: My sense is that the customers -- That's actually a really good question, and I was having a discussion with one of my colleagues about what happens to those fish, and we need to look into -- It's something that we need to look into more, but my perception, based on the discussion, is that they're not going out to take all those fish home, and so I'm not sure -- I would imagine that somebody is using those fish, or doing something with those fish, but I'm not sure exactly what's happening with the fish.

Clearly, in Beaufort, in North Carolina, it was emphasized that people are coming to take back -- They are coming in pickups with a bunch of coolers in the back, hoping to take home a lot of fish, but that was completely different from what we heard in Virginia, but it's a good question for future -- We'll sort it out, what's going on and what's happening with the fish.

MR. WHITAKER: Okay. Thank you. That's very interesting.

DR. PORCH: Good morning. I just wanted to thank Matt and Mandy and all the folks who organized and participated in this workshop, and this is exactly the kind of things we should be doing to better listen to the voices of our constituents, and, of course, as you know, there are more

fishermen in the Southeast than the rest of the country combined, and so there are a lot of people to listen to.

The Center, at one time or another, has held several listening sessions for each of the three councils and HMS, and we are repositioning our resources to do even more of that, but, of course, none of us have the resources to do it right by ourselves, and I think collaborations with the councils and the commissions and Sea Grant and the states and other organizations are going to be key, but I am really glad to see this starting to happen.

MR. SAPP: (The question is not audible on the recording.)

MS. BECKWITH: Art, can you repeat your question, because you were cutting in and out for the beginning of your comment.

MR. MCPHERSON: I think I heard the question, and I think he asked if, because it was more of a sport fishery up in Virginia, if they still didn't like the idea of having a smaller bag limit, and maybe you guys can help me. I mean, I think what struck me was the conversation about how important it was to still catch a lot of fish, for consumer satisfaction, but, in this case, it was more about kind of the photo opportunities than being able to take the fish home to eat, which I found just interesting, and I think it is important to find out what happens to those fish.

I think there may be probably more flexibility and openness to the smaller bag limits because of the use of the -- In North Carolina, they really emphasized that, because it's a meat fishery, maintaining those bag limits was important for their business, even though most of them said they usually don't -- I think the bag limit is sixty, and they usually don't catch the full bag limit, but that people come at least with the hope and expectation that they could potentially take that many fish back with them, and I don't know if you guys have details about that.

MR. HADLEY: If I could, in relation to Art's question, I think, in the Virginia Beach area, there was a lot of emphasis on yellowfin tuna and how that's kind of the -- And white marlin. Those are the kind of prize species, and the dolphin seem to be very important as a secondary species, and customers weren't necessarily -- I think the input that we received from one captain is customers in Virginia Beach weren't necessarily booking trips for dolphin, but they were extremely important as far as the trip satisfaction, whereas, as you move south, dolphin tended to become more important.

In Beaufort, in our southernmost workshop that we were able to hold, in Beaufort, it was certainly emphasized that dolphin were the sort of prized species at that time of the year, in the springtime and early summer when they're available, and customers were interested in booking trips to go catch dolphin, and some for-hire captains expressed that the sixty-fish bag limit was important for helping them sell the trips, and so those are some of the regional variations that we saw overall.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you for that.

MR. BREWER: Thank you very much for the presentation, and I've got to tell you that this photograph that's up on the board right now makes me sick to my stomach, and I would very much appreciate it, when you do get down into the Keys, that you do see what information you can put together from these workshops of what people feel about a reduced -- Not necessarily bag limit,

but boat limit, or actually both, because it's something that we're looking at very closely, and it's something that, as a recreational fisherman, private recreational fisherman, there's a lot of interest, at least in my area, of reducing these things, because, I mean, nobody really wants to clean sixty dolphin, and so putting some sort of realistic limits on the bag limit, but thank you very much.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was able to participate in two of these meetings, and I wish that stuff like this would have happened ten years ago. I thought it was very informative, not only for the people sitting around the table, but also the folks that put this on, the cooperative and collaborative effort of everybody involved.

I also recommended that, if there was some way, in the future, if there was a study to be done of tracking the seasonal fishers over the time, where, if you took a couple of Facebook or social media posts and tracked different vessels over the time, just to see the emerging of different fisheries, and this particular picture here that's on our screen is a charter boat out of Oregon Inlet, North Carolina, and a lot of the boats there that are fishing -- People are coming down with their coolers, and they've been doing it for years, fishing with the guys, and this is -- They take back a lot of the meat to freeze and give away to their folks and stuff like that, and so I think the theme is that this is important. These meetings were very important, and I look forward to hearing from the ones in the Keys, and kudos to everybody that participated.

I also learned, as I'm laughing, a little difference between the work that an intern does and a graduate student. I made the mistake of saying a graduate student maybe should look at doing some social-media-type browsing, and I realized -- I was quickly told that graduate students don't do that, and so that was for the interns, and so thank you, and I will mute myself.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks for those comments, Dewey. I've got Tony next.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you very much. Sixty fish per person, a six-man charter, that's ten fish per person, and these folks are traveling a long distance to go fishing, and these fish, mahi, freeze very well, and so, while that photograph can be disturbing, when you think about it in terms of how many fish per person, it may not be all that unreasonable, and, yes, it's going to take a long time to clean all those fish, and that's why I've asked that this council consider the for-hire fleet be able to clean them at-sea before getting back to the dock. Thanks, folks.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks. Mandy, go ahead.

DR. KARNAUSKAS: Thanks. I just wanted to respond to Dewey's point. First of all, thanks, Dewey, for attending two of the workshops. We really appreciated your input, and we thought that was a great suggestion to do the Facebook analysis, and we are going to -- We are looking into that, and I think it would provide a real independent view of information we got from the workshop and how representative was it of the broader fishery, and so we are going to be following up on your suggestion, and so I really appreciate that, and we'll find an intern or a grad student or someone to do that work, and so thank you.

MR. POLAND: I just wanted to pass along my gratitude to Mandy and Matt and everyone at the Science Center that facilitated this, and council staff. I enjoyed attending both of the North Carolina workshops, and it was really informative, and it was really good just to get in a room for the better part of a day and just talk to these fishermen, not only during the workshop, but at lunch

breaks and breaks and really hear from these individuals as to what they think about their fishery and what they're seeing and what they would like to see and that kind of stuff, and so I put a lot of value in this, and I appreciate your work, and I would certainly like to see this done with maybe a few more of our fisheries in the future. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, I agree. This was an excellent presentation, and I really appreciate the work that you guys are putting into this. I don't see any additional raised hands or comments, and so, with that, again, thank you for being patient with our crazy schedule, and we appreciate the time and effort.

MR. MCPHERSON: Great. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Anna. Let's take a ten-minute break, and I'm not sure if all the council members were actually logged on at 8:30, but let's take a break, and, during that break, if staff could do soundchecks on the folks that weren't on for 8:30 and other types of things, and then we'll get going in the SEDAR Committee in ten minutes.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. BECKWITH: I am going to turn it over to John Hadley, when he is ready, for the overview, but this is Item Number 6 on the Dolphin Wahoo agenda, which is the Mid-Atlantic representation on the Dolphin Wahoo AP.

MR. HADLEY: As everyone can see, I kind of have the overview up on the screen, and the idea behind this discussion item was that, back in September, you voted to add a seat to the Mid-Atlantic -- Well, with Mid-Atlantic representation, specifically, to the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel. The intent there was that the Mid-Atlantic Council would be paying for and funding the travel and per diem for that, cover the per diem for that, additional AP member.

In discussions, and I will certainly invite John Carmichael to join in, if he would like, but John Carmichael and Chris Moore have been in discussions on identifying a person, and part of that discussion came up with would it be good to have two members with Mid-Atlantic representation on the Dolphin Wahoo AP, and so an additional -- It's basically an additional seat beyond the one that you currently voted for, with the intent there that one could be from the commercial sector and one could be from the recreational sector, or you could have a larger geographic distribution, and so maybe somebody from the New York or New Jersey area and then somebody more from the New England/Virginia area.

We wanted to bring that back to the Dolphin Wahoo Committee, and, there again, the intent would be that that additional advisory panel member would -- Their travel expenses would be covered by the Mid-Atlantic Council, and we just wanted to see if the committee would want to add essentially another seat with Mid-Atlantic representation, and so that would be two total seats with Mid-Atlantic representation to the Dolphin Wahoo AP, and, if so, we would get a motion to do so.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I would open it up for comments or thoughts on that.

MR. BELL: I was just going to ask if Tony is still onboard with this. I mean, in terms of which would be better, a wider geographic distribution or commercial versus recreational, do they have

a preference, if we go that route or something? I mean, as long as they're footing the bill, that's not an issue, and so, kind of the what that looks like, I would ask them perhaps what would work best for them.

MS. BECKWITH: Right now, we've got about sixteen people on our Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel from our region. Is Tony on the --

DR. CHEUVRONT: I don't see Tony, but I do see that Dewey is here.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, and so, Dewey, would you like to respond to Mel's question?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I think it would be probably best to have both, one commercial and one recreational/for-hire, given that the mahi are up in the Mid-Atlantic part, and so I think it would be good to have two, one of each.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Dewey.

MR. BREWER: I was going to make a motion to go ahead and approve this, but I see that there are other people that want to talk, and so I will wait a while before I make a motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was going to make a motion also, and so I will wait.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. SAPP: You all go ahead. I was just curious if the current AP members have talked at all about it or have said anything to us about it.

MR. HADLEY: We haven't spoken with the AP about it specifically, and I will mention, in regard to the AP and their meeting, the intent is to try to have a Dolphin Wahoo AP meeting this fall, and so that's one of the reasons for the timing of coming back to the committee and asking your preference on getting AP members with Mid-Atlantic representation, is that, if we can get them kind of up to speed, they would be able to attend the meeting this fall, if we can get that meeting together.

MS. BECKWITH: It sounds like there is a fair bit of consensus that we would be willing to add two seats, one commercial and one charter/for-hire.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I may have caused a little of this confusion, because I saw this on the to-do list from some time before, and I reached out to Chris earlier, before COVID time, and I talked to John about it and just said, hey, is the Mid still interested in supporting maybe a couple of AP members, and we just talked about it based on the size of the fishery and the growing importance up there, and Chris said he was willing to support a couple of people, and then, when I came back and talked to John about it, we realized it was really approval from our council to add one seat, and so we came back here to you guys to see if you are comfortable with adding two seats.

I do think it would be good, given the Mid is supporting these and we're looking for representation of their area, perhaps that we would suggest the coverage that they provide, but we probably should yield to them for who they will nominate and suggest, and process-wise, they would forward names to us, as their representatives, and then our council will take a formal motion to appoint them to the AP, very much as we do with say SSC seats filled by a state agency representative for a name that's put forward, and the council then approves them. I think that's how we've handled it with other APs where we have joint people.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Thank you for that. So it sounds like we might be ready for a motion. Chester, would you like to go ahead with that?

MR. BREWER: Yes, and thank you, Madam Chair. **I move that we add two members to the AP, the Dolphin Wahoo AP, that are representatives of the Mid-Atlantic and that we would encourage a commercial and recreational member, but that that's not an absolute requirement.**

MS. BECKWITH: I think we can --

MR. BREWER: We don't have to say that. **You're right, but just encourage a commercial and recreational member.** That's fine.

MS. BECKWITH: If you don't mind putting recreational/for-hire, just for clarification.

MR. BREWER: Why?

MS. BECKWITH: Recreational/for-hire as a seat. Commercial, and then the second seat being a recreational/for-hire.

MR. BREWER: It needs to be a recreational person. Recreational/for-hire is recreational. They come within that subgroup, that group.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Do I have a second for Chester's motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Jessica. Is there any discussion on Chester's motion? **Is there any opposition to Chester's motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** With that, Madam Chair, I think we actually can adjourn, unless you would like to keep the committee open for the presentation, if we have time for it sometime this week.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Great point. I am thinking that we might be able to get that presentation in at 8:30 in the morning, if folks are willing to get on thirty minutes early to see that presentation, and so I think that they can give it to us tomorrow, and they couldn't give it to us this afternoon.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. That sounds fine by me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Anna. I think that we're going to go ahead and adjourn for today, and so, as I just mentioned, if you would like to see the update on the dolphin wahoo

participatory workshops, that will occur at 8:30 in the morning, and then, starting at 9:00 a.m., we will go into the SEDAR Committee, and we will go from there. Tomorrow evening, we will be -
- It's afternoon/evening, and that will be our public comment session. Thanks, everybody, for their great work today.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 9, 2020.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
July 20, 2020

SAFMC June Council Meeting

Attendee Report: (6/8/20 - 6/11/20)

Report Generated:

06/09/2020 07:48 AM EDT

Webinar ID

714-501-819

Actual Start Date/Time

06/08/2020 09:29 AM EDT

Last Name	First Name
Addis	Dustin
Atran	Steven
BLOUGH	HEATHER
Bailey	Adam
Baker	02_Scott
Beaty	Julia
Beckwith	00Anna
Belcher	00Carolyn
Bell	00Mel
Bellavance	10 - Rick
Bianchi	Alan
Brame	Richen
Brennan	Ken
Brouwer	01Myra
Bruce	James
Bubley	Walter
Burgess	Erika
Byrd	Julia
Carmichael	01John
Chaya	01Cindy
Cheshire	Rob
Chester	Clay
Cheuvront	01Brian
Christiansen	00Kyle
Christopher	Michael
Clarke	Lora
Clay	Billy
Conklin	00Chris
Copeland	00Robert
Cox	Jack
Cox	Derek
Craig	Nico
Cranford	Jay
Crimian	Robert
DeVictor	00Rick
DiLernia	Anthony

DuBeck	Guy
Errigo	01Michael
Exley	Gary
Finch	Margaret
Fitzpatrick	Eric
Flowers	Jared
Foss	Kristin
Friedrich	Tony
Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
Gentry	Lauren
Gilbert	Steve
Glasgow	Dawn
Goldsmith	Willy
Gore	Karla
Grimes	Shepherd
Griner	Tim
Guyas	Martha
Hadley	01John
Harrison	01BeBe
Hart	Hannah
Hawes	Rachel
Haymans	Doug
Helies	02Frank
Hemilright	Dewey
Horton	Chris
Howington	Kathleen
Hudson	Rusty
Iberle	01Allie
Jepson	Michael
Johnson	Alison
Johnson	Denise
KELLY	BILL
Karnauskas	Mandy
Keener	Paula
Klasnick	01Kelly
Knowlton	Kathy
Kolmos	Kevin
Kramer	Rob
Krikstan	Catherine
LARKIN	Michael
LLOYD	VICTOR
Laks	Ira
Latchford	Lauren
Lee	Jennifer
Levy	Mara
Long	Stephen
Lyons Gromen	Pam

Mask III	Tad
McCawley	00-Jessica
McCoy	Sherylanne
McGovern	00John
McPherson	Matthew
Mehta	Nikhil
Mendez	Natasha
Mirabilio	Sara
Morrison	Wendy
Moss	David
Musick	Susanna
Nee	Shannon
Neer	Julie
Nesslage	02 Genny
O'Shaughnessy	Pat
Pfleger	Mariah
Porch	00Clay
Pugliese	01Roger
Pulver	Jeff
Ralston	Kellie
Reichert	Marcel
Rhodes	01Cameron
Roberson	Kimberly
Roffer	Mitchell
Sagarese	Skyler
Sapp	00Art
Schmidtke	Michael
Schueller	Amy
Scott	Tara
Sedberry	George
Seward	McLean
Shervanick	Kara
Smart	Tracey
Smit-Brunello	Monica
Sneed	David
Spurgin	Kali
Stevens	Laurie
Sweetman	CJ
TRAVIS	MICHAEL
Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Vara	Mary
Walia	Matthew
Whitaker	David
White	Geoff
Wiegand	01Christina
Williams	Erik
Willis	Michelle

Woodward
Wrege
brewer
collier
crabtree
crosson
fabbri
geiger
gomez
poland
sandorf
sibley
sminkey
thomas

00Spud
Beth
chester
01chip
00Roy
scott
jeffrey
george
richard
00steve
scott
jackson
thomas
suz