SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION I

Webinar

June 14, 2021

Transcript

Council Members

Mel Bell, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Andy Strelcheck
Stephen Poland, Vice Chair
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Dr. Kyle Christiansen
LT Robert Copeland
Kerry Marhefka
Art Sapp
Spud Woodward

Council Staff

Myra Brouwer
John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
Kathleen Howington
Kim Iverson
Dr. Julie Neer
Cameron Rhodes
Suz Thomas
Julia Byrd
Cindy Chaya
John Hadley
Allie Iberle
Kelly Klasnick
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Michael Schmidtke
Christina Wiegand

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick DeVictor
Dewey Hemilright
Dr. Genny Nesslage
Dr. Clay Porch
Anthony DiLernia
Dr. Jack McGovern
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Monica Smit Brunello

Additional Attendees and Invited Participants attached.

The Full Council Session I of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Monday, June 14, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: I would like to call to order the June 2021 meeting of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and so welcome, everyone. I'm hoping this might be our last virtual meeting, but we'll see how that goes. It's an evolving situation, but our desire would be to have an in-person meeting in September, in Charleston, and so we would love to have everybody here for that, and we'll have a big celebration. Other councils and commissions are dealing with the same sort of transitional period, and so some folks are virtual, or a hybrid, but we hope to be back to the in-face world the next meeting, and that would be our desire.

The first thing I would like to do, just so everybody -- Since we're not sitting at the table and people aren't looking at us, Chip is going to, or Roger or someone, is going to institute kind of a roll call. When they call your name, just introduce yourself and what your position on the council is, and then we'll have enough of that for a voice recognition for both transcription and for the public. Chip, I guess, are you going to do that?

DR. COLLIER: I will, and I will start off with you, Mel.

MR. BELL: All right. Mel Bell, Chairman, South Atlantic Council, and I'm from South Carolina.

DR. COLLIER: Then I will go to the Vice Chair, Steve Poland, and then I will do alphabetical order after that. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Good afternoon. Steve Poland, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

DR. COLLIER: Anna Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Anna Beckwith, North Carolina.

DR. COLLIER: Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Carolyn Belcher, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

DR. COLLIER: Chester Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Chester Brewer, Florida, recreational.

DR. COLLIER: Kyle Christiansen.

DR. CHRISTIANSEN: Kyle Christiansen, Georgia, recreational.

DR. COLLIER: Chris Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Chris Conklin, South Carolina, commercial.

DR. COLLIER: Lieutenant Robert Copeland.

LT. COPELAND: Good afternoon. Lieutenant Robert Copeland, U.S. Coast Guard representative for District 7, located in Miami, Florida.

DR. COLLIER: Tim Griner.

MR. GRINER: Tim Griner, North Carolina, commercial.

DR. COLLIER: Kerry Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Kerry Marhefka, South Carolina, commercial.

DR. COLLIER: Jessica McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Jessica McCawley, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

DR. COLLIER: Art Sapp. It's showing that Art is temporarily offline, and so we'll come back to him when he's back. Andy Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Andy Strelcheck, Acting Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Regional Office.

DR. COLLIER: Spud Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Spud Woodward, Georgia, other.

DR. COLLIER: Then we have a couple of liaisons joining us today. Tony DiLernia.

MR. DILERNIA: Tony DiLernia, liaison, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

DR. COLLIER: John Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: John Sanchez, Gulf liaison, Florida.

DR. COLLIER: Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Chip. I appreciate that. That actually kind of killed about two birds with one stone. The other thing I was going to do was introduce our liaison folks, but, also, if he is on part, Lieutenant Pat O'Shaughnessy with NOAA OLE, and I have him down as being one of our guests, and that's all I had there.

The first item of business would be Adoption of the Agenda. Does anybody have any changes to the agenda they would like to put forward? I don't see any hands. I don't really consider this a change, but, when we get to reports, which will be the first item, the order I was going to follow was sort of, in respect for our guests, starting with NOAA OLE first, and then the Coast Guard, and then council liaisons, and then the state agencies would follow-up last, and I think Chip has things queued up for that, and so that's not really a change. Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Mel. There was something that I would like to see added to the agenda, and maybe it can just come in as other business in Mackerel, but I had asked Kelly to send around, and he sent around, an EFP request that is currently under consideration dealing with what we call greenies, which are threadfin herring, and I would like, at some point, for the council to discuss the issues surrounding that, and I talked with Steve, and we kind of agreed that probably the best place to do it would be in Mackerel, because a goodly portion of king mackerel's diet consists of these forage fish.

MR. BELL: Okay. That makes sense, Chester, and we can deal with that when we get to Mackerel then, and not this particular part of the meeting. Tony, did you have something for this part of the meeting?

MR. DILERNIA: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, and I believe Council Member Brewer's comments may be referring to a recent experimental fisheries application that has been sent to GARFO from Lund's Fishery in Cape May, New Jersey, and, when the time comes, I am prepared to speak to the actions and the deliberation the Mid-Atlantic Council took regarding this application to have an experimental fishery of threadfin herring, and I believe that may be what Chester is referring to. Thank you, sir.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, Tony. It sounds like we can deal with it in Mackerel and not necessarily add it this afternoon, if that seems to work with folks. Seeing no other hands, then we will just adopt the agenda as approved as-is. The next item of business would be Approval of the Minutes. There were two in your binder. There's a Session I and Session II Full Council from March 2021. Are there any changes or corrections necessary to either the Session I or Session II minutes? I don't see any hands. Any objection to approval of the minutes? I don't see any hands, and so the minutes from the March 2021 meeting will stand approved. That will take us to our first item on the actual agenda, which would be reports, and, as I mentioned, I was hoping to start with NOAA OLE first, assuming Pat is onboard.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I am.

MR. BELL: Great. Well, welcome, and we'll queue this up, and you can take it away.

LT. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Okay. Great. The OLE report, as you'll see on the screen there, for the second quarter, was sent out last week, and it is available for viewing in the late materials folder in the briefing book, and that report is twenty-four pages long, and it actually covers the South Atlantic AOR, the Gulf, and the Caribbean regions, and the brief I will give will just be a short South Atlantic summary. It pulls out the information pertaining to this council.

There was 233 open incidents in the South Atlantic, and we actually processed forty-one violations. Of those, thirty-five were summary settlements, which is our de facto ticket, and then there were six more serious cases that were forwarded to General Counsel. The remaining were no violations, fix-its, help with compliance assistance, written warnings, or are still ongoing. The summary settlements range from $250 for failure to properly release to $5,000 for multiple failures to take an observer citations.

A quick summary of the summary settlements, again, there were thirty-five total issued, and ten were for retention during a closure, four were failure to take an observer onboard, three were

citations for illegal and unpermitted charters, two were for expired permits, two were for dispose of fish upon LE approach and retention during a closure, and those are unique, because, if you get caught with, for example, one sea bass that's illegal, it's $250. If you throw it over the side when we approach, it adds $1,000 to that fine, which people aren't too excited to find out about after the fact.

There were two for right-whale-approach-type cases, two for closed area violations, and then there were single-type cases for TED violations, HMS handling, undersized fish, improper release, failure to maintain intact, VMS violations, and prohibited gear violations.

Of the six cases that were forwarded to General Counsel, two were for recreational fishing vessels, three were for commercial vessels, and one was for a commercial shipper. Two of those cases were National Marine Sanctuary operating a vessel and causing damage to habitat, and those are grounding cases. One was for a National Marine Sanctuary closed area incursion, and one was for an observer violation. One was for a SIMP violation, and that's our import monitoring program, and one was for a fish taken in violation of foreign law, a Lacey Act violation.

In that report, you will also see, from our partner state agencies, under the JEA program and the U.S. Coast Guard, we had fifty-nine total cases forwarded to us from our states and the U.S. Coast Guard. I would like to highlight there that thirty-one came from the State of Florida and eighteen from units within Coast Guard District 7.

Some other OLE items, just following-on what I've been briefing on, the new Miami enforcement officer has completed his training and is operating out of South Florida, and so OLE now has enforcement officers in New Bern, North Carolina; Charleston, South Carolina; Savannah, Georgia; Cape Canaveral, Florida; and Miami, Florida. Our authorized number for the South Atlantic is five, plus one supervisor, and that's where we're currently at.

Three new South Atlantic special agent positions have been filled, and the new Miami, Florida special agent is currently onboard and training in Miami, and the new Charleston, South Carolina special agent position starts on July 18, and the second new Miami special agent starts -- The date is to be finalized on when they start, and our current authorized number for the South Atlantic special agents is nine, plus one supervisor, and, when that last person comes onboard, we will be at that level.

A couple of other items is my enforcement officers out in the field have received some very positive feedback regarding the commercial edition of the Fish Rules app from the commercial fishermen that we regularly are boarding and talking with, and my enforcement officers provided feedback during that testing stage, and so I did make sure that they were included. One item to continue to pursue, that we're hearing from the commercial fishermen, is the inclusion of the highly migratory species regulations on that app. Otherwise, it's fantastic, and we hope that gets added sometime in the future.

One other case I wanted to highlight that's not in this quarterly report, but, in May, closed out, and it's the sentencing last month of a Keys fisherman who pled guilty to a criminal Lacey Act violation for fishing illegally in the Bahamian waters near the Cay Sal Bank and then returning with commercial quantities of reef fish, and that's an ongoing problem that we have, and that case

from 2000 actually resulted from a Coast Guard boarding, and the case, and the seizure, was turned over to NOAA OLE for further investigation.

In May of this year, the individual was sentenced to one year of probation, and he will have to make restitution to the Bahamian government by purchasing a 2021 thirty-foot brand new Contender vessel, and so rather a unique outcome, but he is basically going to have to buy a new patrol vessel for the Bahamian government as part of his sentencing, and so unique, and we're very fortunate for that outcome.

Finally, the last two pages of the OLE quarterly report -- I'm not going to highlight them here, but we have included two new pages that highlight all the General Counsel outcomes for cases that OLE has previously sent over in other quarters, and the Notice of Violations issued by General Counsel range from written warnings for illegal shark purchase to $38,500 for failure to have a VMS onboard to $81,382 for using non-compliant TEDs, and so those last two pages cover both the Gulf and South Atlantic, but it's interesting to see some of the violations that General Counsel cites based on cases that we've sent over there.

Those are all the items that I wanted to cover, and I will be onboard with the council for 95 percent of the week. If there's any questions, or anybody follow-up that anybody wants, you can shoot me an email, or shoot me a note on the side, and I will research it for you and get back to you. Otherwise, thank you for your time.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Pat. I appreciate the thorough report. It's very detailed, and this reminds me also that one of the reasons that we're kind of going the format we're following was, again, in the real world, which we will hopefully be in soon, you would see Lieutenant O'Shaughnessy sitting in the back, sharply dressed in a NOAA OLE uniform, and this would give you the opportunity to interact with him throughout the week about anything that might be in his report, and the same thing for the rest of us, and that's why we're trying to give the reports upfront, because, when we go back to the real world, so to speak, you'll have an opportunity to interact with people throughout the week about anything that might come up in these reports, and so, right now, are there any questions for Pat regarding anything he presented or anything he can help with right now? All right. I am not seeing any hands. All right. Well, thank you very much. Next, we would like to shift to Lieutenant Copeland, if you would like to give the Coast Guard report at this time.

LT. COPELAND: Sure. Good afternoon. Thank you very much. I would just like to highlight a few things that have happened in the last couple of months, since the last meeting, some of which has already been stated by Pat, but just to highlight some of the great work that the Coast Guard units are doing downrange.

We've got one of our FRCs that issued two Lacey Act violations for illegal harvesting of commercial fish from the Bahamas, and one of the big cases that Pat already highlighted was something that occurred last year, but just went to court, and the individual was sentenced for the illegal harvesting of commercial fishing in the Bahamas, and so, as he stated before, the Lacey Act violations is something that we've seen a little bit of an uptick, but, moving along, we've also issued violations for possession of fish and actively fishing in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

One of our eighty-seven patrol boat vessels also recently conducted joint boardings with NOAA OLE, resulting in multiple LMR violations and fines up to about $5,000. Some of those violations included no turtle mitigation gear, prohibited fishing gear, no descending devices, and filleting fish at-sea. That was just a few of the major boardings that are units are doing downrange, and, pending any questions, that completes my portion of the brief. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Lieutenant Copeland. Any questions regarding the Coast Guard report? All right. I don't see any hands. You all aren't very inquisitive yet today. All right. Then let's shift to our council liaisons, and we can just work from north to south. Tony, if you have something that you would like to report from the Mid at this time, we would love to hear it.

MR. DILERNIA: I can do it now, Mel. Mel, thank you very much. I will work off my agenda from last week. We met last week for four days, the Mid-Atlantic met, and the first day was devoted to developing our appointments for our advisory panels, our APs, and that was done in closed session. The second day, on Tuesday, we received a presentation, and I believe you received the same presentation, on MRIP estimations and how the new MRIP estimations are going to be affecting our quotas.

Then, on the second day, we went right into our bluefish allocation and rebuilding amendment, which I believe we held jointly with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, and so I believe you, Mr. Chairman, and representatives from the other southern states were included in these actions over the two days that we met. Basically, what we did was we considered final action on the rebuilding amendment, and we passed the constant harvest strategy, which should get us back to, or the stocks back to, where they should be in about seven years.

We also had a -- We received a report on our recreational reform initiative, and the council is working with GARFO, and there's a working group between GARFO and council members trying to develop alternative measures, or measures that we can manage the recreational fishery, but without as much variability that seems to result from the MRIP data that we get each year, and so we're trying to bring some more stability to regulating the recreational fishery that way, and we've been exploring some ideas, and the council just got an update from the working group regarding how far that's going, where that's going.

On Wednesday, we did Atlantic surf clam and ocean quahog specifications, and we basically reaffirmed the specifications that we set last year, and, also, longfin squid and butterfish specifications, and we reviewed that, and we made no changes to that, and our ilex squid specifications are very similar to what we've had in the past few years.

Something that came up, and I think Chester brought it up earlier on, or the first thing at today's meeting, and one of the things that we passed, and the council is aware of it, but we have an unmanaged forage fish plan currently in place. What we did was, a number of years ago, we basically took a lot of the forage fish, and we froze the footprint on these fisheries. If there was some take that was being conducted for different types of forage fish that we manage, we tried to freeze the footprint on fisheries for those forage fishes.

As a matter of a fact, the reason we asked you to do bullet and frigate mackerel, originally, was because we tried to include bullet and frigate mackerel in our forage fish plan, but the agency disallowed it, because they didn't think that enough Mid-Atlantic critters ate bullet and frigate

mackerel, and we were very happy to partner with your council in being able to make bullet and frigate mackerel a protected forage fish, due to your inclusion of them in the dolphin wahoo plan.

Recently, we have received, or GARFO has received, an application for an experimental fisheries permit for threadfin herring, and threadfin herring are a very important species as forage for both commercial and recreational species that we fish for, and you all fish for also. In the past, threadfin herring take has been around 18,000 pounds, if I remember the briefing correctly. The application from Lund's Fishery is for 6.5 million pounds, and the fishery would be prosecuted via a purse seine fishery.

Now, if I could just speak to the way an experimental fisheries permit works, and the council doesn't really pass, or accept, the experimental fisheries permit, and the permit application goes right to the region, and so the Regional Office has the permit, and the Regional Office will ask the council to comment, but the Regional Office is not obligated, one way or another, to accept the comments of the council regarding this application, and so the council really just received a briefing on this, and we haven't really commented on it officially, although I will say, as an individual council member, I did object to the fishery being prosecuted, but let me point out that this is my last meeting, and I'm term-limiting out, and this is my last meeting with you all, as a liaison, and my August meeting will be my last meeting with the Mid-Atlantic Council as a member representing New York. Where that experimental fisheries permit application will go, the results of that permit application, I don't know.

Finally, we received an update on habitat, and we received the standard offshore wind updates, like you all have been receiving lately, and then we met on Thursday with the ASMFC Policy Board regarding the commercial state-by-state allocations for black sea bass. You may know that the commercial fishery for black sea bass is managed jointly by the council and the commission, and that joint management requires that we have the same set of quota recommendations for each state. Well, as a result of a recent appeal by New York to the ASMFC Policy Board, we have been asked to go back and to reexamine the quota allocations to the different states, and that is in the process of being done.

That's quite a bit already, and I will be happy to take any questions, and hopefully I will have another opportunity to speak to the council, and thank you all for the wonderful opportunity I've had over these years to be your liaison, to have the privilege of sitting at your table, and so thank you, and I will mute myself, unless there's questions.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Tony, and the meeting is just getting warmed up, and so we'll have plenty of opportunity to speak with you, or hear from you. Any questions for Tony about anything that he presented or anything from the Mid? I will say that, serving on the ASMFC as well, along with Spud, some of these stuff -- When you have fisheries that are jointly managed, or there's a need to tightly coordinate between the National Marine Fisheries Service, or the council, and the commission, it presents some interesting challenges, and so a lot more extra meetings, that's for sure. Anything for Tony right now? I don't see any hands. Dewey isn't here, and so that would shift down to the Gulf, John Sanchez, and I know we have a --

MR. PUGLIESE: Mr. Chair, Dewey has joined us.

MR. BELL: Oh, okay. Dewey, did you have anything to add, from the Mid's perspective?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: No, sir. I'm going to miss Tony's presentations in the future.

MR. BELL: Yes, we'll all miss Tony. Okay. Shifting to the Gulf, John Sanchez had submitted a report, and it's already in your briefing binder, but, if John wants to work through that, or offer some comments on that, that would be great.

MR. SANCHEZ: I will just give you an update on what we did at our last meeting, briefly, and it will be quicker than, I guess, reading through several pages worth of stuff, which is a matter of record in your binder. You can imagine -- We spent, as you can imagine, the bulk of our time at our last meeting discussing red snapper and the Great Red Snapper Count and the SSC's resulting recommendations.

Then we had a final action on state calibration issues for the respective states with regard to red snapper, and we spent some time discussing a potential interest in pursuing an IFQ for the king mackerel gillnet fishery, and that's kind of been put on hold right now, as that universe of fishermen -- There is some lack of agreement on how they want to proceed, and so we're waiting to see how the quota and the allocation are going to be rolled forward, going through FES iterations, and then maybe that discussion will resume, and maybe it won't.

Then, as we're going to get into in this meeting, we're going to discuss cobia, where there's been some concerns in the Gulf regarding cobia undergoing overfishing and anecdotal information throughout the region that they're not seeing them like they used to, and so there's some interest in reducing effort, by virtue of reducing bag limits and vessel limits and increasing the size, and, of course, allowing you to do what you feel appropriate in the FLEC Zone, and we'll be getting into that, I'm sure, at this meeting as well, and so I won't get too far into that.

SEFHIER, we're excited to have that program pop-off in the near future and get it properly vetted, so that we can get some meaningful data out of that for the charter industry, and hopefully it will work and accomplish all the goals that we've set, which is, basically, real-time landings documentation and accountability for that sector.

We've also engaged in some discussions regarding Amendment 53 for red grouper, which we're coming up for a final next week, and, as you can imagine, there are some sticky issues with allocation, which is usually our more controversial, contentious issues, when we get into those, and so we'll wait and see what next week brings.

Shrimp, we're working on some shrimp data effort collection platforms to replace ones that are no longer viable, and we're hoping to have a meaningful and seamless transition into that, and that about gives you a summary of where we're at, and next week promises to be a long, challenging meeting, with some difficult issues, and we had a lot of input during public comment this past week regarding Amendment 53 for red grouper, and I guess it will be coming in for a landing next week, which, much like Tony, this will be my last meeting too, and I'm term-limiting out, and so I will probably say it again to you before the week is over, but it's been a pleasure working with everyone and meeting people and making new friends and seeing old ones, and so that's all I've got, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, John, and we appreciate you being here with us this week and then having your own meeting to deal with next week, and so I know that's a lot going on back-to-back for you, but we do have your report, and, again, the beauty of doing things this way is, if you have anything you need to, or would like to, talk to John about, of course, reach out virtually at this point, but the idea is, in the future, we would be able to actually talk to folks and go to dinner or have a beer or something, and so any questions for John right now about anything he covered or anything the Gulf might have going on? All right. I am not seeing any hands. Then, moving along in the order that I laid out, that would take us to state agencies. Again, I guess let's go from north to south. Steve, are you ready to present whatever you would like to present at this point?

MR. POLAND: Mel, I can go ahead. I will be brief, and I really only have two things to update the council on. I will start with, I guess, the better of the two bullet points, and so we have a new director now at the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Kathy Rawls was recently promoted into that position, and she's been with the State of North Carolina for twenty-five years. She started as a technician in our Elizabeth City office, and she has risen the ranks to the director's position. We're all really excited to have an internal person lead the division, and I know she's excited to come to hopefully the in-person meeting in December in Beaufort and get to meet everyone and kind of get a feel for council management. That was the good news.

I will provide a quick update on southern flounder, since so many of our states are intwined in flounder management issues right now, and so we updated seasons for flounder here in North Carolina, based off of the 2020 landings, and it looks like both of our sectors went over their soft quotas for flounder and didn't meet the needed reductions this year, or last year, and so, for this year, the division will be reducing the seasons for both the commercial and recreational sectors on southern flounder.

We'll continue working on our southern flounder Amendment 3, which will kind of transition those soft quotas into more hard quotas, TACs, so to speak, with payback measures, accountability measures, and also looking at modifying size limits and vessel limits and bag limits for that species, and that's all I have to report, Mel, and I will take any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks. Any questions for Steve? I don't see any, Steve. Okay. Moving south, I will go next. A couple of things. The good news, from our perspective, is MARMAP is -- The blue boat is up and running again, and so I think MARMAP has already put in fifteen days at-sea, so far, and they're back on schedule, back on track, and so that's going well. I think, due to just challenges with the budget and all, they may be a little less participatory in stock assessments, in terms of in-person involvement, but, of course, we'll always provide data, and that won't be an issue, but that's good news, to have the Palmetto underway again.

Also, assuming everything works out completely, it looks like our South Carolina General Assembly is going to help us out with some funding to acquire a replacement for the R/V Lady Lisa. The Lady Lisa is our SEAMAP vessel, and so we're hoping to replace, gosh, a forty-plus-year-old wooden trawler with maybe a steel-hulled stern rig, and so we'll see how that goes, but that will be a welcome addition, and the problem with wooden boats is the maintenance drives you crazy after a while, and so that's good news.

Also, slightly federal, but state, is we opened all of our state waters to our shrimp fishery on the 27th of May. Of course, you know, we have a shrimp management plan, and one thing that we've

noticed, over the past few years, is that, as a result of what I would assume to be warming waters, it seems like white shrimp are definitely expanding their range farther north, to the point where Virginia has a very small-scale white shrimp trawl fishery now, and North Carolina is, I believe, doing much better with white shrimp.

What that has resulted in, for us, is the presence of white shrimp, of nice white shrimp, later in the year, and so this kind of affects our closing strategy, and even our opening strategy, and so, in dealing with range shifts for species, I would say, from a fisheries perspective, there are kind of winners and losers, and we seem to be in a pretty good spot, where, whatever white shrimp are doing, it seems to be benefiting us.

Last year, even with the COVID problems we had, we had the highest landings of shrimp that we've had since 2010, I believe, and so it was not a bad year overall, and so that's good news, but just something that, as we talk about other species, potentially, having changes in their ranges and things, white shrimp is just one of those, and the council does have a shrimp plan, and so it touches on us.

Not really affecting us here so much, but it is linked to federal, is we're moving forward with -- I know this isn't the proper name for it, but what we call CARES 2.0, the second round of funding, CARES funding, similar to last year's, and we've got our plan submitted, through the ASMFC, to NOAA Fisheries, and we're waiting to hear back on that, and so we're hoping to be able to process through with that.

Then another bit of good news is, thanks to the Governor's Cup Billfishing Series, they are working very hard to generate funds to allow us to -- Our artificial reef program to add another structure to the Charleston Deep MPA artificial reefs, and so we're hoping to sink a ship out there, actually, and the Governor's Cup is in the middle of raising funds for that, and so we certainly appreciate that, but that would be another nice addition to our deepwater MPA reef, and that's really all I have. If anybody has any questions, I will be glad to take them at this time. All right. I don't see any hands. If you think of anything during the week, feel free to buy me a virtual beer or something. Okay. Moving on down the coast to Georgia.

DR. BELCHER: Georgia, we're pretty much back to business as usual. Our office is fully staffed again, and things are rocking along, and not that we lost a lot over the year, and we were kind of fortunate that way. We are still dealing with the Golden Ray. It seems like, every time somebody gets overly confident that we're in the final stretch, that ship throws another curveball at the crew, and so they are, right now, in the middle of a stand-down, because they kind of hit a hard spot in the hull.

We are three cuts away from being done, and the third cut is about seventy-some percent completed, and so we're kind of in limbo right now with that. The hope was that it was going to be gone by hurricane season, and now the hope is that it will be gone by the end of hurricane season.

Shrimp, for us, opened the week after South Carolina, and we opened on the 8th, and we've had some hit-or-miss mixed reviews on that, and the brownies mixing in, and they're not a very large size, and there's been a little bit of concern in the market with that, but, as far as the white season, it's looking pretty good for that crop going through, and, other than that, Georgia really doesn't

have a whole lot going on that's noteworthy at this point, but, if something comes up, I will be sure to bring it up later in the week.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Carolyn. Anything for Georgia? You could get a good deal on a slightly-used car down there in Brunswick right now, if you move quickly. All right. I don't see any hands. All right. Let's move on down to Florida. Jessica, are you ready?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and thank you, Mel. I just wanted to bring up a couple of things from our most recent FWC Commission meeting. Our commission discussed goliath grouper, at length, at their recent commission meeting, and they directed staff to bring back a draft rule for a limited harvest in state waters, and so staff is working on this, and we play to bring something back for their consideration later this year.

There was a video taken of that commission meeting, and I can send you guys a link, if you're interested in watching the presentation that we gave, as well as hearing the discussion that our commissioners had, and, also, at that commission meeting, we had a lengthy shark panel discussion about shark and fishermen interactions. There were a number of big names, including folks like Guy Harvey and Bob Hueter, and we also had Karyl from HMS on the panel as well, and she was there virtually, and did a video, and so, also, at the link for that commission meeting, you could watch the shark panel discussion as well, and so this was really just a discussion, kind of a baseline, hearing from recreational folks, commercial folks, researchers, HMS, et cetera, about what's going on.

Some folks had some ideas, but it wasn't an action-oriented discussion, and there aren't specific actions that came out of this at our commission meeting, but we are working on a white paper to look at some of our state-waters prohibited species and look at our state commercial and recreational regulations, and we'll bring that back to our commission later this year. Those are the only two things that I wanted to highlight as part of this discussion.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Jessica, and you guys never are dull down there, that's for sure. Any questions for Jessica, in terms of -- Tony. A question. Go ahead.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I have a question for Jessica. I know there's a lot of concern about the effects of bioaccumulation in goliath grouper as they age, and do you know if the draft plan may contain a slot limit provision that may allow harvesting of goliath without being concerned with the bioaccumulation effects that may occur in the much larger fish? Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Great question, Tony. That was a topic of discussion at the commission meeting, and the commission has certainly discussed that in the past. Right now, there are no Department-of-Health-type advisories out there on goliath, since it's been closed for so many years, and we would be working with the Department of Health to get some type of advisory in place.

Yes, the commission discussed a slot limit, and they discussed a slot limit back in 2017, when we talked about this before and took it out to workshop, but the commission also said please don't bring back what you showed us in 2017, and so we are trying to change that up a little bit, thinking about creative things, like maybe there's a way to do a smaller slot, or harvest more on the juvenile

side of the range, in order to avoid some of those large individuals that could have a high mercury content.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you very much. I look forward to seeing the report. As a 50 percent resident of Florida, I look forward to your recommendations. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Jessica, for that. Any other questions for Jessica? I know, related to goliath, you may have seen the news, and we had a catch-and-release of one, off of Hilton Head, I believe, a weekend or so ago, which I don't recall anybody seeing one around here for a while, and I think maybe occasionally one or so, but it will be interesting to see, as the stock rebuilds, and then, perhaps, you have the influence of warming waters, and what might happen in the future, but nothing really soon, and so all right. No more questions for Jessica? I don't see any hands. That will conclude our first item of business.

The second one would be South Atlantic research priorities, and that would take us to Clay for a status of research to meet 2019 priorities. That's being queued up, and, Clay, whenever you're ready, you can take it away.

DR. PORCH: All right. I'm ready.

MR. BELL: Have at it.

DR. PORCH: All right. Thank you, Mel. I am just going to talk about the Southeast Fisheries Science Center response to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's 2019 research recommendations. First of all, I just wanted to emphasize that it's not that we're taking on those research recommendations alone, and, obviously, we're part of a much bigger community, and so we have a lot of state, academic, and federal partners, and, in fact, I would emphasize, even further, that our footprint is actually pretty small, when you consider we have about 350 staff members and a $55 million base budget that covers the entire southeastern United States and U.S. Caribbean, and so, really, I think the future of science in the region is for all of us who are active to kind of leverage each other, take advantage of the resources we have and try and pool them, and, together, accomplish a lot more than the sum of our individual efforts.

These research activities are a perfect example of that, and, if you looked at all the various research projects, you will see there is many, many different partners, too many to list, and so what I'm going to do here is just give you an overview of the status on particularly the 2019 research plan, keeping in mind that we're involved in many, many other research plans, two other councils, and highly migratory species.

I will reserve, for later, for your own review, some -- There is a part in this presentation, when you pull it up, that highlights several key projects, but I think, in the interest of time, we probably won't go through those individual projects here.

In terms of our progress, the council has these eight research needs: short-term stock assessment needs; long-term research needs; the spawning special management zones; the short-term MPA monitoring needs; the long-term other needs; habitat research and monitoring needs; specific monitoring priorities; and then the specific annual reporting request. This is just an accounting of where we are, in general, of them.

You will see that, for the short-term stock assessment needs, we have actually completed seven of the projects, either us or our partners, and there is ongoing research now, about nine projects, and ten of them, total, have been delayed or are not actually being planned, and so the completion rate here, or at least the ongoing rate, is about 62 percent. In terms of the longer-term plans, of course, you would expect the completion rate to be a little bit lower, simply because of the fact that these are long-term-five-year plans, but, still, we're making good progress on most of them. You can just see down the line, and I won't read every single one, but, for a large measure, we have accomplished most of what has been asked in those plans, and, overall, it's about 68 percent, and so it's pretty good.

This just gives you some of the reasons for some of the delays. Obviously, COVID-19 has caused delays, particularly with things like the gray triggerfish and addressing the age determination issues, when our folks had very limited access to the facility, and, also, the SEDAR Steering Committee has changed and delayed some of the assessments, sometimes because of COVID-19 concerns, and so some of the urgency for some of these projects has diminished, and probably they will pick up in the next year, or just start now, but the main reason for most of the delays is really COVID-19 or Steering-Committee-related delays in the assessments.

Then there are some things that the proposal seems like something that you could answer in a relatively short term, but, when you really get into it, you realize it's a much longer term, and one or two years is not going to be enough, and so things like investigating the possible effects of hermaphrodism on the steepness parameter is not something you do in a year or two, and the same thing with things like investigate temporal patterns in sexual transition and develop explanations for any patterns identified.

I mean, a lot of that is collecting the basic data, so that you can understand and measure, for instance, the rates of sexual transition, but you have to have a time series to look at that, and, in order to develop explanations, you need a good mechanistic understanding, and those are not things that you do in a short period of time, which is why they're under long-term research needs, and, again, I won't read through all of this, but you get the gist of it.

Then some of the things -- We had delays in the MPA research, and one of them, obviously, was we couldn't conduct surveys in 2021, and then there's some other things, where the research actually involves some invasive techniques, where you're actually killing animals, and, obviously, we get some pushback from the sanctuary programs when you start asking to do things like that, and so there's a few delays in MPA research, for those reasons.

Just to conclude, of the seventy-seven research priorities that have been put forward, 68 percent are completed or in progress, and six of those are actually funded through special initiatives, funded through NOAA Fisheries, and that's MARFIN, Saltonstall-Kennedy, the Cooperative Research Program, and the Coral Reef Program, but the rest of them are basically coming from either other NOAA Fisheries line offices, including the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, or our state partners, and that's, between the two of us, where most of the funding for this projects is going, and most of the labor.

One thing I wanted to tell folks is that I do think that we could probably partner a little bit better with the councils, the South Atlantic Council and the others, in terms of developing our strategic

priorities. We now have, actually, a fully functional strategic planning process, and it's the first time the Center has actually had a formal strategic plan with an implementation strategy, and so we have a vehicle for working our priorities into the system and, ultimately, changing where we put our focus.

Having said that, it's not that we have this huge budget in the sky waiting to be utilized, and almost all of our budget goes to core activities, whether it's surveys or conducting stock assessments or collecting basic fisheries data, and so we don't have a huge pool to work from, in order to fund research, and so what we've done is set up what we call priority-based resourcing.

The idea there is that we look at all our core programs and make sure the ones that need to be funded are, and then, as we get down to our discretionary spending, we decide what's the most appropriate project to put those funds into, and this is where I think we could probably work a little more effectively with the councils, looking at what the councils see as priorities, and what our other clients see as priorities, and then try and figure out how we can get those things done, sometimes from our base budget, and sometimes it may be that we're more a catalyst, and we work with other agencies to get something executed.

I think I will leave it at that, and the only thing that I would also add is, obviously, under the new administration, there are a whole suite of new priorities, and climate science is a big one, and wind farms are another, and diversity and inclusion are another, and so the National Marine Fisheries Service is actually busily trying to re-write their own strategic plan, which will affect, of course, our strategic plan for the Center.

Right now, they're just in a draft phase, and everything is happening fast, but I expect that, fairly soon, you will see the new priorities reflected in an updated National Marine Fisheries Service strategic plan, and, as I said, that will then be reflected in our regional strategic plans and the Center strategic plan, and so I will leave it at that, unless there's any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Clay, and I will point out that the presentation is Attachment 2a in the Council Session I briefing binder, and so you can take a look at that as you would like, and that's in there as well, and so any questions for Clay right now, based on what he has presented? I don't see any hands. Okay. Certainly we do look forward to opportunities to work closer with you guys, in terms of strategic planning and establishing council priorities in a way that maybe we can address some things, the process you described, and so I appreciate the report. We can move along then. All right.

Next on the agenda, I have -- Of course, due to the MSA requirement for the council to provide research and monitoring needs to the service on a regional basis, we have a research and monitoring plan, and this will be, I guess, an action item for us, but I think Chip is going to walk us through -- Chip is going to walk us through that, and then we'll need to kind of weigh-in on that and for potential approval, and is that right, Chip?

DR. COLLIER: That's correct, and so I pulled up the South Atlantic research plan, and it is in your late materials, and we were waiting on some comments from the SSC, in order to get everything included in there. I did also want to thank Clay for putting that PowerPoint together, and, also, if you guys are interested, there are some individual projects that are at the end of that presentation, if you want to look into those. I think it provides some interesting research that

they've been doing in the South Atlantic region, but we don't want Clay to relax too much, and so we're giving him his next task list as he's completing this one.

That's what we're going to be going over today, and you guys can comment on these things as you want, and I pulled it up as a Word document. That way, if you want me to change anything, or add anything, that's going to be a little bit easier for me. In addition to that, there was an idea that popped into our heads, as staff, to add into this document, and so we've also included that, and I have that highlighted in yellow, when we get to it.

We've changed it a little bit to how it's been done in the past. Sometimes we would have these short-term research needs, and they were quite often listed in an unrealistic fashion that the National Marine Fisheries Service could get it done in order for it to be used in stock assessments, and so we're trying to give them a little bit of a buffer there, and so what we're looking at is mainly things to be completed in 2023 and 2024 for stock assessments. That way, they will be able to be written up, to be researched and written up, prior to a SEDAR coming into play.

The first one that we're looking at is black grouper, and that one is planned to start in 2025, and one of the big issues for the last black grouper assessment was trying to resolve the species identification issue and landings, and so this needs to be resolved prior to FWC picking a black grouper assessment up again, and I will pause after each one of these. That way, if council members have anything that they would like to include, they can. Just simply raise your hand, and we'll call on you.

MR. BELL: Anything on black grouper? I don't see any hands.

DR. COLLIER: All right. We'll go on to the next assessment. If we need to go back, we can go backwards. The next one is looking at the FWC benchmark assessment for hogfish. If you remember, that assessment had three different populations of hogfish that were identified, and one of the things that the assessment kind of indicated was they need additional genetic sampling to better define the boundaries between the southeast Florida/Florida Keys stock and the Georgia/North Carolina stock. In addition, they were talking about monitoring changes in growth that may occur due to reduced fishing pressure on the southeast Florida and Florida Keys stock. There was some concern that growth overfishing was happening to that stock, and that needed to be monitored for changes in the future.

MR. BELL: I don't see any hands.

DR. COLLIER: Okay. We'll go on then to the red porgy operational assessment, and this one is, once again, looking at some of those potentially plastic life history traits, looking at temporal trends in growth, sex-at-age, and female maturity. There was also some discussion about whether or not males establish and maintain territories as part of their spawning behavior, and then another one was talking about the impacts of increased abundance of red lionfish and red snapper on red porgy, and particularly looking at predation on juvenile red porgy, as well as competition between red porgy and red snapper for prey.

Not seeing any hands, we'll go into the blueline tilefish operational assessment. This assessment is a biomass assessment, and so a little bit different than the age-structured assessments that are typically presented to the South Atlantic Council, but they still need to address some of the life

history gaps as noted in SEDAR 50, and this will help inform some of the growth parameters for that population, and, also, evaluate recent survey efforts to determine if an independent abundance index can be developed.

MR. BELL: Dewey has a question.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was wondering, on your -- Given that this is an operational assessment that's planned in 2024, when would the necessary information need to be available for that operational assessment? That's one question.

DR. COLLIER: It would be good to have it in 2023.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: So, if you had data up until 2022, or 2023, that could be used for this?

DR. COLLIER: Potentially, yes. It could definitely be considered. They will have to start planning for these assessments a little bit early, and so, depending on the actual start time of that assessment, they could be putting the data together in late 2023, if it's expected to be presented to the council later that year, in 2024.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: My last question is it says evaluate recent survey efforts to determine if it can be developed, and is that -- I mean, if you're doing a survey right now, don't you have -- If its methodology is done a certain way, wouldn't that already determine that it can be used in the future?

DR. COLLIER: It will help to determine it, yes, but sometimes it's dependent on the number of animals that are caught in the survey, and so, if it's a general survey, it might not catch sufficient numbers, and so they just need to evaluate it and make sure it's potentially representing an abundance index. Did that help?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes, and one last question. For blueline tilefish, the amount of work that's been done since about 2015, there is not blueline tilefish all over the whole ocean, from Key West to the Virginia/North Carolina line, and how is that factored in, to where there's only certain places that the biomass is? How would that work in the survey efforts, because they're not everywhere from Key West to the Virginia/North Carolina line, and there are some areas that the biomass has really an abundance, and, in other places, it's not there, and so how would that work, given that data?

DR. COLLIER: Thanks for that question, and so, with the deepwater longline survey that the Science Center is going to be talking about in just a few minutes, or after we complete this, and I believe they're next on the docket, and they will probably go into this a bit more, but, when they're first starting out, they're looking at a survey to really collect more information on deepwater species, and so it's not just blueline tilefish, but they're looking to address golden tilefish, snowy grouper, blueline tilefish, as well as some other species that are out there, and so, as they're starting off with that, they're going to be doing broad swaths.

Then, as they get more information, you can potentially refine these surveys based on either habitat availability, increased knowledge of the species, several different things, but, before you do that, you can also develop a model that actually incorporates some of the habitat variability in it, and so

let's say, up there off of Hatteras, you have certain characteristics, like the latitude and the depth, and that might be used to indicate whether or not blueline tilefish was even present, but it can also weight that information as well.

If it's likely that a species is in that area, that actual block that's being surveyed could potentially have a greater weight than let's say a block that is somewhere blueline tilefish aren't, and so those blocks are going to be weighted not only for that area, for that year, but it's also weighted for the different species as well, and so it's a complicated process, and I'm sure you've heard of those, and these are the negative binomial indices of abundance that are commonly used, and it basically has a two-stage in it.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you.

DR. COLLIER: Sure. Any other questions?

MR. BELL: I don't see any, Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Okay. Going on into the next assessment, or the next species, we're looking at an operational assessment for tilefish that's planned to start in 2024, and, with this species, there was some concern about the natural mortality MCBE, which is the Monte Carlo Bootstrap Ensemble uncertainty analysis, and so the SSC requested to explore alternative distribution assumptions for that. They also recommended considering incorporation of new fishery-independent abundance data, as well as life history data from the CRP longline survey, deepwater survey, South Carolina DNR vertical longline, and South Atlantic deep longline survey. The SSC also recommended investigating the relationship between recruitment and environmental variability, to predict recruitment using environmental data.

Then, going on to the next bullet, collect information on pre-recruitment abundance, and, typically, the selectivity for this species, in the commercial fishery, is around age-seven, and so getting some more information on some of the younger fish would be beneficial. Any questions on tilefish, golden tilefish? All right.

I will go on to snowy grouper, and this is an operational assessment planned to start in 2025, and there was a request to look at uncertainties regarding maximum age assumptions and the resulting estimation of natural mortality. If you remember, back from this assessment, the maximum age increased from I believe it was thirty. In the most recent assessment, they used age-sixty, and there is some evidence of fish up to age-eighty in the Gulf of Mexico. Then they also recommended estimation of the Beverton-Holt stock-recruit curve with fixed steepness for the next assessment.

White grunt is a research track assessment, and that's going to be starting in 2024, and, with this, there's evidence of different stocks within the South Atlantic region, and so there's a recommendation to continue efforts to evaluate the stock boundaries, and hopefully clearly define those stock boundaries. Any questions or any other species that we need to add into this list for the short-term research needs coming up for stock assessments?

MR. BELL: It seems like a full plate.

DR. COLLIER: Yes, we're going to keep the Science Center busy. We don't want them getting to relax at all.

MR. BELL: Yes, that's for sure. I don't see any hands. We'll take what we've got then.

DR. COLLIER: There is one.

MR. BELL: Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you. Given what was just said, is the perception that this is a laundry list just for the Center to address? That being the case, or at least if some have that perception, I want to clear up right now that we don't have the resources to tackle all of these. Keep in mind that each of the councils and HMS have similar laundry lists, and this is something that we have to take on in partnership with the states and academia, getting back to leveraging resources, as I mentioned earlier, and I wonder, as these lists are developed, if maybe we could look at it that way from the start. In other words, think about, when we identify research priorities, who could bite out which pieces, who could tackle what parts of this, because, clearly, one agency can't do all these things. We have to do it together, and it may be the wiser strategy to kind of divide and conquer as you're developing the list, rather than just having a big laundry list and hoping somebody is going to do it.

DR. COLLIER: Thank you for that, Clay, and I should have been pointing this out all along, but this is not only for the Science Center to accomplish, but for all of our partners to accomplish, and one of our reasons for writing this out, in addition to Magnuson requiring us to do it, but it's to lay out some of the research priorities for groups like the S-K, the CRP, and so the Saltonstall-Kennedy, the MARFIN, the Cooperative Research Program, and hopefully some of these will get addressed through those.

Some of these could potentially be addressed through a Citizen Science Program, and so it's helpful to have some of those items listed in there that could potentially be adopted into the Citizen Science Program, for data to be collected through that kind of project as well, and so it's meant to be all-encompassing, and I think, going forward, it might be a good idea to evaluate these and figure out which ones we want to send to the different groups as they are developing their research priorities, as well as the Science Center and which ones they could address.

MR. BELL: That's a really good point, Clay, and I'm glad that you brought that up. Obviously, there's enough here that it definitely requires a partnership and cooperation of everybody, and it's going to be a matter of who can do what, like you said, and particularly since the Science Center -- This isn't the only dance you've been invited to, and so you get the same thing from the Gulf and the Caribbean, and so certainly it's definitely going to require everybody working together, with all the assets we have at our disposal. All right. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel. Along those lines, our agency has been really emphasizing, the last few years, strategic planning for the resources we have available, and Clay and the Center, as well as the Regional Office, are heavily invested in this, and I guess one of the things that comes to mind is, based on the comments just now, there's a lot of different people that could be involved in this, and it's beyond just the Science Center.

I'm wondering if there's an opportunity here, Clay, to kind of hone-in on what the Science Center may be capable of working toward, kind of a gap analysis, so to speak, and determine kind of what can be leveraged and what can't, and then to look for, obviously, those opportunities like Chip just discussed, the grants and other processes to accomplish some of those other priorities, and maybe that's kind of naturally occurring, but I'm just wondering kind of how we can coordinate better on this, so that we know where those gaps exist and what the Science Center or others can accomplish, and then include this into grant processes and other funding mechanisms, so that we have a higher likelihood of success of completing it.

MR. BELL: Clay, did you want to comment on that?

DR. PORCH: Sure. I completely agree with Andy, and I think what needs to happen is, as we're developing these priorities, we submit it to another process, where various partners can get together and, like I said, kind of figure out how we can divide and conquer and maybe have another layer of review.

For instance, just when I look at the list of priorities, some things rate a lot higher than other things, and, of those things that rate higher, there are some that we probably could accomplish by ourselves, and others that we might be able to contribute to, but somebody else should be taking a lead on, but I think there's a missing step, where we start thinking strategically and working with council staff and other partners to carve this list up a little bit, refine it and carve it up, because, right now, there's a long list, and we look at it as part of our strategic planning, along with many, many other things, but we don't look at it simultaneous with other potential partners, and, like I said, I think maybe a new process needs to be developed, where we can do that more effectively.

MR. BELL: So that makes sense to me. I think, like you said, it's sort of adding another step, perhaps, to the overall process of working through this, but we could certainly identify a long list of needs, but then you've really got to work through that, and, in a realistic sense, what can we do, who can do what, and who can bring what to the table, and that sort of thing, and that's where that strategic planning aspect makes perfect sense, and I think, Chip and council staff, if that's the proper touchpoint there, it makes sense to me.

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and we can definitely work on that going forward, and we can present this to the Science Center and SERO and let them chop it up, but I think the council needs to get out front and say these are the important things, as we see it, and what is needed for assessments, and also management, and so we can definitely work with Clay and his group, as well as Andy and his group, to make sure that we're getting them the information that they need, and then we could potentially look at categorizing these on who could potentially do it.

MR. BELL: Right, and I have always struggled with this, and you mentioned, Clay, that you have a new administration and new priorities, and new things kind of coming down the pipe, in terms of things that need to be focused on, but, for a long time, and even before that, we've had a long list of things that we really need, in terms of research and data, and it's just become ever more challenging, and thus the reason for, I think, realistically looking at and prioritizing what our needs are, because I think that environment is only going to become a little more challenging here in the next couple of years or so, and so, yes, we definitely need to be communicating closely on all of this. Chip, do you want to keep walking through?

DR. COLLIER: I will bounce into our more longer-term assessment and research priorities, and so, as opposed to putting a timeframe on these, we just kind of left them without a timeframe, like they did before, and so these are a little bit more nebulous and potential assessment research priorities without any weight on them.

The first one were just some general assessment topics, and the SSC has brought this one up before, and they're talking about it -- They have been talking about recently, but evaluate assessment projection performance, considering their ability to estimate landings, recruitment, and biomass levels, and, also, evaluate size cutoffs for using age and length compositions, and, basically, establishing what minimum standards should be and how they interplay with the number of age and length classes modeled in the assessment.

Initiate long-term, continuous monitoring of age structures and age validations for species listed in the Level 1 of Table 1, and that's at the end of this document. Then the next one is looking at a method to account for the non-independence of the SERFS trap and video indices and the likelihood function of assessments, and this is an ongoing project that the Science Center has been working on, and they've been talking about it quite a bit.

This new one is the one that I had mentioned that's in yellow, to evaluate estimation of stock-recruit relationships and steepness parameters used in stock assessments and update the prior distribution analysis used as a proxy steepness value coming from that Shertzer and Conn paper from 2012. Then the next one is looking at research needs for protogynous stocks, particularly black sea bass and groupers, and hogfish was added in this as well, since they are protogynous hermaphrodites. Any questions on those?

Spanish mackerel needs observer coverage, and I will just stop there, and then examine how schooling or migratory dynamics may influence the catchability of the species, and then a third one is looking and evaluating stock structure for this species, using some updated data and modern techniques.

Going into gag, identify or sample juvenile and spawning gag to identify important spawning populations, and basically make sure that some of the MPAs we're putting out there are effectively protecting some spawning populations of gag, identify factors contributing to the decreased recruitment that we've been seeing in gag in the more recent time period. Indicate the utility of the SERFS index for future assessments, if it could be improved if length information is available.

Better characterize the reproductive dynamics of gag, including sex ratio, maturity, batch fecundity, spawning seasonality, and spawning frequency, and then the SSC recommended looking at three different information sources to develop and evaluate recruitment indices for gag, looking at the recreational catches in inland waters, looking at a variety of traps to collect some of the early larval fish, and then potentially look at chevron traps for catches of age-one to three fish.

Going into red snapper, some of the long-term is looking at the documented spawning migrations, or aggregations, and return of fish to non-spawning areas, evaluate the environmental variation on recruitment and survivorship, obtain empirical estimates of natural mortality for all ages in the U.S. South Atlantic, with a special focus on age-seven and less, investigate possible changes in sexual maturity for red snapper, given that red snapper is extremely low and unusual for other lutjanids. Quantify egg size and quality, as well as batch size by age, and then estimate discard

mortality associated with different release techniques, gear, and size classes. Then monitor the impact of climate change on the species.

Going into black sea bass, investigate potential range shift of the black sea bass population and potential causes, such as climate change. If you remember, black sea bass have a different genetic stock south of Cape Hatteras, and so potential range shifts in the South Atlantic stock. The North Atlantic stock is seeing range shifts already. Estimate discard mortality associated with different release techniques, gears, and areas, and then identify factors contributing to decreased recruitment for black sea bass.

Going into blueline tilefish, develop ageing techniques for blueline tilefish age-structured assessment. Going into red grouper, evaluate the frequency and magnitude of recruitment coming from other regions, such as the Gulf of Mexico or other areas to the south, identify factors contributing to decreased recruitment, and then update the reproductive biology and evaluate potential latitudinal variation and spawning characteristics.

Going into muton snapper, conduct a multiyear study to collect age and gonad samples at spawning sites during the spawning season, and this should entail identifying the diurnal usage patterns at spawning sites during the year, and then there's some additional species to collect life history information on, including almaco jack, Atlantic spadefish, dolphin, hogfish, with the Georgia/North Carolina stock, lane snapper, and wahoo. Then the last one for research is define migratory patterns for wahoo. Any questions on those, before we switch over into research needs for managed areas?

Not seeing any hands go up, and these managed areas are focused on the spawning SMZs and the deepwater MPAs, and the first one is probably the highest priority, and this one actually does have a time component to it, which is document occurrence of spawning within spawning SMZs by priority species in the snapper grouper complex, and that one is needed before 2025. That way, we can incorporate the information prior to the sunset of the spawning SMZs, or it can be reviewed prior to the sunset of the spawning SMZs, which occurs in 2027.

Characterize usage of deepwater MPAs by managed species, and then develop annual monitoring to collect data inside and outside managed areas. We also need some multibeam on some of the deepwater MPAs. The spawning SMZs have been completed. Evaluate compliance with regulations for the managed areas, and then use hydrodynamic modeling to assess connectivity between MPAs and other habitats. Any questions on those, before we jump into management research needs?

Not seeing any hands, the next one goes into climate-change-related priorities. Develop models to predict suitable areas for shallow-water and deepwater coral as climate changes. Develop models to predict changes in managed fish populations due to climate change, including changes to species distribution, movements, and reproductive patterns, and then we have a list of five species that -- Well, actually, many more than that, but dolphin, king mackerel, Spanish mackerel, shrimp, and wahoo are the species of particular interest.

Expand fishery-independent monitoring programs and implement additional monitoring programs required to ensure survey coverage of the resources managed by the council and then investigate

how potential shifts or expansions in managed species ranges may affect fishing community dependance on the key species and overall community revenue.

Going into some social and economic priorities, evaluate the cumulative economic and social impacts of existing regulations on the multispecies snapper grouper fishery in the South Atlantic. Provide estimates of the recreational economic values for council-managed species and develop a study to quantify current and baseline access to fishing infrastructure throughout the South Atlantic region.

Characterize usage of and evaluate compliance with the best fishing practices for reducing discard mortality in the snapper grouper fishery and then develop and annually update abundance indices for all managed species effectively sampled in the trap-video survey. Any questions on those?

MR. BELL: Kerry. A hand.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm here. Going back to the social and economic priorities, Chip, knowing that we may be having some discussion later on evaluating the two-for-one, I don't know if this is the place to discuss this, but maybe we might want to start thinking about researching sort of the level of effort, commercial effort, that the snapper grouper fishery can actually sustain, so that we may have that in our deliberation of whether or not it's time to end the two-for-one.

MR. BELL: It seems like we've kind of done that a little bit in the past, or took a snapshot of that, or capacity, or what would be a reasonable capacity kind of thing, but, yes, that would be important, if you were going to have a discussion about that, I think.

DR. COLLIER: I will wordsmith this with John Hadley, as well as Christina, to make sure we're getting something in there, and so I will highlight this for when it comes back to Full Council at the end, but, yes, I will put that in for you guys.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Chip.

DR. COLLIER: All right. The next group is habitat research and monitoring needs, and so map coral distribution in the South Atlantic region and also monitor the health of coral reef systems. Then, last, but not least, we have a list of specific monitoring priorities, and so increase funding for fisheries-independent monitoring in the South Atlantic region, and we have some specific needs, which include restoring MARMAP funding, funding MARMAP sufficiently to support reinitiating the long bottom longline survey for some important deepwater stocks, such as tilefish, maintain funding for SEAMAP, maintain funding for SEFIS, to support the video work, and increase funding for SEFIS, to support the use of stereo cameras, and then provide funding for MPA and spawning SMZ monitoring, as noted above.

Then implement a monitoring and research program to address issues relevant to ecosystem management. Topics include trophic interactions, food preferences, predator-prey relationships, and ecosystem connectivity. Develop and implement new methods for decreasing uncertainty of recreational catch estimates for federally-managed offshore species, including, but not limited to, enhancements to the MRIP survey, add-on surveys, and new methods for collecting recreational data.

The council specifically requests that NMFS complete the work of the MRIP rare event species estimation working group by January 31, 2022 and provide a final report on the group's recommendations for review by the South Atlantic SSC in April 2022. Then there was a last bullet to improve estimates of commercial discards. Any questions on those? All right.

Then we have reporting requests. By June 1, annually, a SAFE report that provides stock status, including OFL and MSY, an evaluation of the management program, including whether ACLs were met, or AMs were triggered, and addressing reasons for such. The next bullet looks at providing a report on the SEFIS program by October 1, annually, and that report include survey sampling effort and biological sampling intensity. Also, include abundance indices and trends for Level 1 and Level 2 stocks, listed in Table 1 below, and then provide annual progress reports, which Clay already did at this meeting, by the Science Center at the June council meeting. That's it for me, unless there is additional questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Gee, that's just a little bit of work. That looks like that's going to be Andy. Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Chip. Yes, it's definitely a lengthy list of priorities, and I appreciate all the thought that's gone into this. I did want to comment about this last section, and the SAFE reports in particular, and I know this has been a long-standing request from the South Atlantic Council, and it's certainly of interest to all of us, and it would be of benefit to all of us. I am not convinced that the Center, the Regional Office, and others have the resources to pull this off, and I so I wanted just to acknowledge that out front, that I know many of the things that are in this may not be doable, but this is one that I'm just concerned that we continue to kind of carry this forward and include it. Given existing staffing and resources, it's really unrealistic, from my perspective.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for that, Andy, and, yes, it has been something that comes up frequently, and, overall, I would look at this document, in a way, as it's kind of a -- The rest of the document is it's kind of like a version of -- Remember the sticky wall, where you just sort of -- You're throwing everything on the sticky wall that you're trying to capture, and so this is just capturing everything we can think of in here, but then there has to be some process that you work through and prioritize, whether it's strategic planning efforts, but it's, obviously, a huge list of things, but it's meant to kind of just capture everything, and that's what we were kind of asking, is were we missing anything, and it's hard to believe we would be missing anything, since it covers so much, but, yes, and I understand the SAFE reports -- That has come up more than a few times, I think, over the years.

MR. STRELCHECK: To that point?

MR. BELL: Sure.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks for that, Mel, and I guess one thing I would add, and you're reading it in the news, and you're seeing it with companies, and we're seeing historic levels of burnout in workload in many professions, including the work that all of us do, and a lot of it comes down to resources and the availability of resources.

The previous section was talking about cuts to MARMAP and some of the sampling programs that I know you work closely with, Mel, and so that's a little bit of my concern here, is that this is a very, very ambitious list of priorities, and I appreciate that it's ambitious, but it also can be, I think, overwhelming to those that might pick it up and look at it and have to potentially work on this, and they view it as very unrealistic, and so, maybe not this go-round, but I would like to talk about maybe how we could refine, or improve upon, this priority list, going forward, and make it I will say more realistic, in terms of what can be accomplished, and maybe even some prioritization within the document, with regard to things that are more important or less important to the council, in order to carry through with and complete in the short and long-term.

MR. BELL: All right. John, do you want to weigh-in?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thanks, Mel, and I appreciate this, and just to remind the council that we do this report because we're required, under the Magnuson Act, to provide our research and monitoring needs, and I understand that it is an optimistic list, and it's always been an optimistic list, but we do have a lot of pretty long-standing data needs in this region, and we're obligated to list what they are, knowing that there aren't going to be the resources to do all of them.

I guess there's different ways of looking at it. In the past, one thought has been, well, if you list everything that you really need, then at least you're documenting how great the need is in our region. If we were to start leaving things off, because of, well, this is never going to happen, then we're pretty well guaranteeing that it's never going to happen, and I think the SAFE reports is one, in particular, that the council is certainly well aware of the challenges within our region to get this kind of stuff done, but, on the other hand, there is a prevailing attitude, in other regions and in D.C. and Headquarters, that these things just happen.

I run into it a couple of times a year, where someone mentions something about SAFE reports, and you remind them that we don't get SAFE reports. We have resources stretched way too thin in this region, honestly, and SERO and the Science Center are dealing with three councils and HMS, and that's a big lift, and so we have, in the past, viewed this as an opportunity to continue to remind that this stuff is expected under the Magnuson Act, and it's not something that the agency has funded our region to accomplish.

I don't look at it as a failing of the Science Center or Regional Office alone, and I think it's something that does need to be reminded and brought up, so that NMFS overall recognizes how they have shortchanged, in our opinion, our region in a lot of ways, so, for those reasons, I would really be opposed to trying to pull some of these things out. I think there's things that we could do to discuss what has the most bang for the buck, the assessment things in particular, and we could probably get more feedback from the SEDAR groups and the SSC.

I will say, having dealt with this since day-one, we've not made a whole lot of progress, over the years, in getting those groups to focus in on a little more of what they think is the most important and the most useful, but we can also continue to try, in that regard, and so thank you, Mel.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, John. I think what I heard Andy saying is you've got this huge list, and you don't necessarily want to frustrate everyone, but, at the same time, you want to make sure that you've captured everything, and how do you sit down and work through things in planning and somehow prioritizing what you can do, and I think, you know, we've always been -

- I mean, the council itself, I feel, has always been strongly advocating for the necessary funding and resources.

None of us are the people that write the checks, and so we don't hold the master checkbook, but we've constantly pointed these needs out, and I think the idea is that, at some point, somebody will pay attention to us that has access to the checkbook, so to speak, but there does -- You know, you do need to be realistic and somehow prioritize things, and I'm all for a process to kind of work through that, but, like you said, John, I mean, the SAFE reports is something that -- Well, it's in Magnuson, and it's something that other folks do, but that's been an ongoing one, for certain. Okay. Nobody here has the master checkbook, and I get that, but it would be great if someone would give us a billion dollars or something. Okay. Chip, what do we need to do, moving things along here?

DR. COLLIER: Well, if there's no other comments, what I will do is I will work on what Kerry had recommended, and I will get that one worked in there, and then I will provide you guys a finalized version, and I will email it to you guys, and that will include that, and then I'll put the changed language in the update for this section of the council meeting, and then you guys can approve it with that change in the language in it, and so it would likely be on Friday when you would approve this as the research plan.

MR. BELL: All right. Sounds good. Any other comments or questions related to this? I am not seeing any. I would be all for taking -- Before we go to the next item, which would be the southeast longline survey presentation, can we take a ten-minute break? Is everybody good for a ten-minute break? I'm not seeing any opposition to that, and so let's meet back here at 3:25, if we could.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: Let's go ahead and get into our next item, which would be someone from the Science Center, and I don't know who, giving a presentation, which would be Attachment 3, on the 2020 Cooperative South Atlantic Deepwater Longline Survey, and so if you can queue that up. I'm not sure who is going to be making the presentation.

MR. PUGLIESE: It will be Todd Kellison.

MR. BELL: Hi, Todd.

DR. KELLISON: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Todd Kellison, and I'm with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and I'm based at the Beaufort Laboratory in North Carolina, and I appreciate the opportunity to spend a few minutes talking about the South Atlantic deepwater longline survey that we initiated last year, and so this relatively short presentation has four main parts. First, I will go through some brief background and need for the survey, and then I will talk about the methodology that was utilized in 2020, and I will go through some results from 2020, and then we'll talk about plans for this year and beyond.

In terms of background, I will first note that there has been, and continues to be, a longline survey in South Atlantic waters, an annual survey, since 1995, and that is a survey that's carried out -- I will refer to it, in terms of this presentation, as the Southeast Fisheries Science Center bottom

longline survey, and it's carried out in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic by survey leads out of our Pascagoula and Mississippi laboratories.

The South Atlantic component, which, again, has been annual since 1995, operates from nine to 183 meters, and that deeper depth limit is due to current-driven gear loss in depths greater than 183 meters, and so there is high current in a lot of those areas, and they have lost a lot of gear in deeper waters in the past, but, more importantly, that survey on the Atlantic side really catches very few demersal, or non-shark, species, and so it doesn't provide useful information for species, for example, that we would consider within that snapper grouper complex.

We do have a survey in the South Atlantic that does provide useful information for snapper grouper species, and that's that trap-video survey, which effectively samples out to about eighty-five meters. There are some sites that are a little deeper than that, out to maybe 100 or 110 meters, but most are eighty-five meters or shallower, and so, beyond those depths, we really have limited data for the deeper-water demersal species complex. Thus, the need for this longline survey.

In 2020, we initiated a cooperative with industry survey, and it's anticipated that it will become an annual survey, and, at least currently, there are multiple focal species, and so some of the main focal species are listed there with sub-bullets, the tilefish species and grouper species, and the objective of the survey is to generate indices of abundance for these species and also to provide other biological information, such as age and reproductive data to support stock assessments and management.

The survey methodology is based on a number of resources, but, predominantly, it's from recommendations from a workshop that was held in 2015 that was -- The purpose of the workshop was explicitly to make recommendations on methods for a deepwater survey in South Atlantic waters, and so we do have some recommendations from that workshop, but, also, results from recent cooperative research projects and recent surveys. One example of a recent survey that I will mention a little later in the presentation is some Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council-funded surveys in recent years.

Then, lastly, we refined the survey methods during a one-day meeting that we held in February of 2020, which was predominantly scientists, but it also included the two industry participants who participated in the survey in 2020.

What is the methodology? The survey is envisioned to sample in deep waters from off the Carolinas down to the Florida Keys. The 2020 target survey area is shown in the figure on the right in this slide, in the sort of lavender-shaded area, and one note that I will make is that, in 2020, we didn't sample north of 36 degrees North. In 2020, we didn't sample north of 36 degrees, but the North Carolina/Virginia border is the area that Dewey was referring to earlier, in between 36 and just about thirty-six-and-a-half degrees, and so, this year, when we sample, it will go all the way to the Virginia border, but it's intended to go from all of the Carolinas to down to the Tortugas off of Florida.

The targeting sampling depths range from seventy-five to 366 meters, and you can see the ranges there in feet, and fathoms are in parentheses, and we stratified the survey by depth and latitude. Depth, we split into two depth zones, and then we stratified that one to three latitude, and so that basically means that we just had to allocate sampling effort, distribute sampling effort, within each

of the depth by latitude cells, to ensure that we were sampling across the sampling area. The gear that was utilized in 2020 was a four-mile mainline, with 150 hooks per mile, and we used a single hook size and it's a 12/0 offset circle hook, and the bait that we used was squid.

The deployment and retrieval methodology was last-hook-in-first-hook-out, and that first sub-bullet says that the vessels never let go of the gear, and the reason for that is that, as I mentioned in the second slide of this presentation, that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center bottom longline survey has lost gear in the past, in the deeper waters of the South Atlantic, due to high current, and the current is driving the loss of that gear, and, for that reason, industry told us, when they're fishing in these high-current areas, they just don't let go of their gear, and so that necessitates pulling the last hook that went in first, and so we had a last-hook-in-first-hook-out methodology, and there is a short interval between when that last hook on the mainline hits the bottom and when retrieval starts, and then all sampling was done in the daytime.

A little bit of background information on how we determined where to sample, and that first sub-bullet notes that -- So we have a range of focal species, and those species utilize a range of habitat, and so like golden tilefish tend to utilize the further-in structured habitats, soft-bottom habitats, while some of the grouper species are affiliated, or pretty closely affiliated, with hardbottom, and so we have a range of habitats utilized, and we need to sample that range of habitats in the survey.

Unfortunately, we have a pretty poor knowledge of distribution of habitats within these deeper waters off the South Atlantic, but one thing that we did have was a relatively large number of sites in our database, from both our South Carolina DNR colleagues and our Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and so those points are shown in the figure on the right now, and the different colors are just the data from the different sources, but a lot of those sites indicate that there is at least patchy hardbottom in that area, and so we did have some knowledge about where some hardbottom was, and we refer to these sites, in the figure on the right, as sort of our universe of known sample sites.

For site selection in 2020, we used three different site types, which are listed in the first sub-bullet here, and so some of the sites were truly random, which means that the scientists use a random-site-selection algorithm in ArcGIS to select sites within each depth and latitude cell and then provided them to the industry participants and ask that they sample those randomly-selected sites, and we also, within the shallow cells, we selected some sites at random from this universe of sites that we have, and we only did that within the shallow zones, because almost all of these sites that we have were in the shallow zone of the survey, and we call those sites universe random. There are some truly random, some selected at random, and a number of sites that we already had in our universe, and then, in each of the depth by latitude cells, we asked that the industry participants sample some sites at a location of their choice, and we called those captain's choice sites.

For shallow cells, we asked the industry participants to sample one random, one universe random, and one captain's choice site, and then, in the deeper cells, where we didn't have the pre-selected sites, we asked to sample two random and one captain's choice, and we anticipated being able to complete about seventy-two longline deployments in 2020.

I've been mentioning industry participants, and so we used two industry participants, and they were contracted by our South Carolina DNR partners, and one was based in South Carolina, and that participant sampled the northern portion of our survey area, and one was based in Florida, and

that person sampled -- Their team sampled the southern portion of the survey area, and the pictures on the right are the vessels that were utilized in the survey.

Then, on all trips, we had a National Marine Fisheries Service observer on the boat, and the observer was responsible for collecting information, the date of sampling, the lat/long of sampling, et cetera, and also collecting information on species-specific lengths, abundance, and collecting, when possible, biological samples.

Those were the methods, and so I will jump into the results from 2020, and so I mentioned that we had anticipated being able to complete about seventy-two samples. We completed forty-six in 2020, and the sampling occurred between August and October, and, essentially, the entire depth range of the survey was sampled, and so the shallowest set was actually a little shallower than our shallow survey limit, and the deepest was almost at that deeper limit, but it was from seventy to 362 meters, and the overall catch per unit effort, or CPUE, shown here, is the number of fish per 100 hooks, and it was pretty variable, but it was about just a little less than -- On average, it was a little less than four fish per hundred hooks, which is pretty consistent, in terms of with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center bottom longline survey.

I will note that we collected multiple species of management importance in 2020, and so five of the six focal species were collected, and the numbers caught are listed there in parentheses, and I will pause just a moment for you to take a look at that. I think I forgot to mention, on the previous slide, that the figure on the right here shows -- Each of the circles is one of those forty-six deployments, and so the sampling was sort of throughout the survey area.

Other species of management importance that were collected included mutton snapper, scamp, vermilion snapper, red porgy, red snapper, gray triggerfish, gag, and red grouper, and the numbers caught are in parentheses beside each species.

In terms of the spatial distribution of catches, this figure and the following two figures -- Where species were caught are indicated by the colored circle, and the size of the circle indicates the number caught in that area, and so you can see the distribution of golden tilefish, which ranged from the very northern end of the survey down to off of Florida, and here's the distribution of blueline tilefish, which are similar to goldens, and here's snowy grouper, and so these are just three example focal species.

Then this next slide is a multi-panel slide, and on each of the panels -- This one is for mutton snapper, and these larger dots are -- There's a white dot for each of the forty-six longline sets in 2020, and the red dots indicate where, in this example, mutton snapper were collected, and so this is just an example of the distribution of catches for these eight species of management importance, and I will pause just for a moment to let everybody take a look at those panels. I haven't included any size information on the sizes of species caught in this presentation, but we, of course, do have that information as well.

Moving on, in terms of the distribution of the different sample types, of the forty-six samples that were collected, or completed, in 2020, twenty-nine of those were random, at random sites, and twelve of them were at our universe random sites, and five were captain's choice. I will note that the proportion of those three site types was nearly identical between industry participants, and so sort of an equal proportion of random sites.

Universe random and captain's choice occurred in the northern and southern portions of the survey areas, and the catch per unit effort was highly variable across those site types, random versus universe random, or there's this captain's choice, which made it very difficult to make inferences about the relationship between site types and catch, and, as an example, the highest CPUEs, catch per unit effort, from deployments were from random sites in 2020, but the lowest CPUEs in 2020 were also from random sites, and some of the captain's choice sites had high CPUEs and some had zero catches, and so there is a lot of variability about catch per unit effort.

There was some variation in our standardized methodology, which is not something we want in a fishery-independent survey that depends on consistent use of methodology over space and time, and so we did have one industry participant who, at least on some trips, it appears had a captain who fished 100 hooks per mile, instead of 150 hooks per mile, which I will note that we've already taken a lot of steps to assure that we don't have variation in methodology in sampling this year and beyond.

Outcomes and implications, one point that I will note is that the survey was completed during the pandemic, when COVID metrics were pretty high across the country, and so I really want to credit and say thank you to our industry participants and the observers for working with us to make this survey happen in 2020, and we greatly appreciate their efforts.

The results from 2020 indicate the potential for an effective regional-scale cooperative survey targeted multiple focal species, and so sampling occurred across the targeted sampling areas, and we had relatively good spatial distribution of sampling in the targeted depths, and five of the six focal species were collected, along with multiple other species of management importance.

The sample size was smaller than we anticipated, but, while smaller than anticipated, I will note that sample size was similar in scope to the typical annual sample size of the South Atlantic component of that Southeast Fisheries Science Center bottom longline survey that I've mentioned, and that certainly is effective and generating indices for multiple shark species. Then I will also note that, logically, increased catches would be likely with increased sample size.

From there, let's transition to what do we have planned for 2021. Well, we plan to increase the sample size in 2021, and so we're hoping to increase the sample size relative to 2020 by a factor of about three to four, so that we end up with about 175 to 200 longline deployments. The figure on the right, ignoring the colors for a moment, which I will explain in a moment, but the numbers indicate the number of anticipated samples for each depth-latitude combination, and so, just for example, in this depth and latitude, we would hope to have seven longline deployments, and so seven in the shallow and seven in the deep. There are fewer in this area north of 36 degrees latitude, because that's only about half a degree of latitude.

This shows you our hoped for sample size for 2021, but the eventual sample size will really be dependent on the amount of the bid, and so we still haven't gone through the bid process this year, for 2021, to identify our industry participants. We also hope to increase the number of industry participants from two to four in 2021, and we would anticipate each industry participant sampling one of those different-colored areas in the figure on the right.

We also hope to initiate the survey earlier in the year, this year, allowing for better weather, longer trips, and increased sampling efficiency, which we're still working towards that, but things are on the move to allow us to begin sampling a good bit earlier than we did in 2020. Our overall objective is to considerably increase catches of focal species and other species of management importance.

A few considerations, and the first bullet is that multispecies surveys cannot be optimized for all species, and so there is species-specific variability in factors such as gear selectivity, depth distribution, and preferred habitat, and so, just for example, we might be able to catch more blueline tilefish if we used a smaller hook size, or potentially a range of hook sizes, but, if we use, for example, a smaller hook size, we tend to catch more blueline tilefish, but we might catch fewer grouper, just for example, and so we cannot -- If we want to target multiple species, we have to land on something that is best overall for catching all of the species.

The second bullet is it's possible that a survey that effectively targets the suite of focal species is not logistically feasible, given available funding and the logistical constraints, even at increased sampling levels, and I will give an example, which is the third bullet, of a recent Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council longline survey, and so, in 2018, the Mid-Atlantic Council funded a survey with an objective of demonstrating an approach for a paired golden tilefish/blueline tilefish survey, and they carried out the survey as a cooperative survey with industry, and they caught both blueline and golden tilefish, but they caught a lot more golden tilefish, similar to the results from our South Atlantic survey in 2020.

They thought about the results, and they looked at them quantitatively, and they decided that the best use of their funds would be to refine the survey and focus solely on golden tilefish, and so they did another survey in 2020, and, again, another cooperative survey with industry, but they focused solely on golden tilefish, and they reduced the focal area of the survey, and it was focused more on the area of golden tilefish, and they changed the depth range, to make it more efficient for golden tilefish, and they had really good catches of golden tilefish in that survey, and so they decided that it was better to focus on one species and do it well than to try to do multiple species.

For the South Atlantic, once we complete the sampling in 2021, at what we anticipate will be a considerably increased sampling level, we should be -- It should allow us to assess whether it's going to be possible to index multiple species with a single survey, and, if yes, we'll continue to pursue the multispecies annual survey, and, if not, then we're going to need to think about whether it might be preferred to focus on one or two focal species, for example, such as golden and blueline tilefish.

Then a last point, but I think an important point, is that I think there's a strong potential for cross-regional coordination on the longline survey. In fact, there's been a lot of cross-regional coordination already, over the past five or six years, and I really would like to acknowledge the Northeast Fisheries Science Center and the Mid-Atlantic Council staff for being so communicative, and the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources personnel and our Southeast Fisheries Science Center personnel, and we've had numerous conversations about how to potentially link surveys.

The most recent conversation was in late May of this year, and so I do think there's a high potential for having a survey that's crosses regulatory boundaries, which is an important consideration, particularly given the changing climate, changing ocean conditions, and potentially shifting

species distributions. With that, I will stop and say thank you, and, if there's time, I will be happy to try to address any questions.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Todd. Any questions for Todd? We've got Kerry first and then Dewey.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thanks, Mel. Todd, thank you. I really enjoyed that presentation, and great work for everyone. Forgive me if I missed it, but what relation, if any, was there to your sampling sites to any of the deepwater MPAs? Did you consider them, or did you try to avoid them, sort of any of that?

DR. KELLISON: Kerry, thank you for that question, and I'm a little embarrassed to say that I don't have that information prepared, but I will get it ASAP, and I could provide it probably by tomorrow morning, but it was not a -- We did not try to stratify by the deepwater MPAs.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for that, Todd. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you for the presentation. Could you go to page I think it's 15, and it's the one that shows the sets, and it shows the number of sets for 2021 and the different strata. When you look at these here, are the captain's choices included in these different numbers, or is this just the random, or is this just the predetermined sites?

DR. KELLISON: It's the former, Captain Dewey, and so those sevens represent the total number of samples that we anticipate, based on our sort of best guesses at bid cost, number of samples that we would be able to have completed in each of the depth by latitude cells, and so it would include the captain's choice sites.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: One other thing. Are you familiar with any of the MRIP data that's produced, particularly that shows that the majority of the catch of blueline tilefish in 2020 came from north of Cape Hatteras? I believe that particular number is going to be probably in the 250,000 pounds, just recreationally, and then, if you include the 80,000 pounds that was caught commercially, the site north of Cape Hatteras to the Virginia/North Carolina line is producing, in 2020, probably in excess of 350,000 pounds, in that one particular area, and so hopefully the procurement of survey for 2021 will shed some light on the true abundance that I have been discussing for years north of Cape Hatteras and that we're seeing with the charter industry and the commercial industry. Thank you.

DR. KELLISON: Thanks, Captain Dewey, and so I'm not particularly familiar with the MRIP data, but I guess I would just comment that we've had, as you're aware, a lot of conversations with potential industry participants in North Carolina, and we're looking forward to having a productive partner there and getting that sampling done all the way to the Virginia line this year.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Any other questions for Todd related to the presentation and the survey? I don't see any hands. Again, that's in the briefing binder, and that's Attachment 3, if you go back and review, or if you think of anything else. Okay. Well, thank you, Todd. I appreciate that. I appreciate the presentation. We'll go ahead and shift to the next agenda item, which would be, according to my notes, Julie Brown from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center giving a

presentation on the commercial electronic logbook, basically an update, and this would be Attachment 4 in the proper section of the briefing binder.

MS. BROWN: Hi, everyone. Thanks for listening in. I'm just going to keep it short and sweet, per usual, with time for questions at the end. Last time, I told you that we were almost ready to publish the technical requirements, so that other third-party application developers can create software for the commercial logbooks. Well, we're backing that up, just a little bit, to review the reporting requirements, after we got some feedback from the Gulf advisory panels.

This is the only major change from the previous update that I gave last March, and we're planning on aligning the definitions of some of the variables with the GARFO requirements, and the purpose of that is to start inching our logbook reporting in the direction where fishers who have multiple permits in the regions can submit one report to satisfy both of the regions' requirements. Again, this won't get us to that point yet, but we want to start inching our way in that direction.

Just to reiterate the plan, the initial launch of electronic reporting in the Southeast will be for volunteers, leading up to the mandatory submission launch, but the reporting requirements really should be set in absolute stone before we want to publicly distribute the technical requirements, and so that's why we've moved this action to be considered pending.

What hasn't changed is that we still have a functioning view, created by ACCSP, to test data flow, and that's ongoing, and we still have a functioning Southeast Fisheries Science Center application for reporting the no-fishing reports, and the eTRIPS application from ACCSP is functional for the purpose of mapping variables. However, it's still undergoing adjustments to conform to our proposed reporting requirements.

This slide is mostly a refresher from the last time, and the variable mapping is the biggest task right now for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and we do depend on the functionality of the mobile application for this assignment, and so tweaks, or updates, in the application do occasionally disrupt our ability to push data through and map it to our existing database. However, these tweaks and updates are also improving the user accessibility of the application, as well as accommodating the other partners that ACCSP serves.

We're also working to update our existing validations, to check the trip reports that are going to reflect this new set-based reporting, and that's something that is ongoing. Lastly, we got an update to the new user account self-creation tool from ACCSP, which now allows for permits that are held by either businesses or LLCs or other non-person entities -- They can now sign up for an account without assistance, and this was a major contribution from ACCSP, because of the huge proportion of the fleet, both commercial and for-hire, that that type of participant represents.

Last March, I said that we would like to begin the recruitment phase, to get volunteers who are going to report their trips electronically when the application is ready to launch. Well, we're putting that on hold until we get the aforementioned reporting requirements aligned, but, to restate from last time, once we do have volunteer reporting, it will be for real-time compliance, and the participants will not have to do any duplicative reporting on their paper forms. All volunteers will initially be asked to participate in the discard survey and the socioeconomic survey that are currently part of our logbook program, and we will also be able to publicly share the report of the

pilot project very soon. It's currently in the review process of NOAA's publication tracking system.

This is the slide where I always like to take the opportunity to remind anyone listening about the current commercial logbook reporting at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. As I mentioned earlier, we have available, for the last two years, an option for commercial permit holders to create an account and report their no-fishing reports online. This program is currently serving 422 users, at the time that I created this, with approximately five to ten new users signing up each week, and we highly encourage anyone who has logbook reporting requirements to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to go ahead and create an account, and save yourself a big headache.

Because we do have this reporting availability, and all of the COVID restrictions on personnel coming into the buildings, we are no longer accepting faxes or emails of the logbook documents. These rules have been in place for over a year, and we did send out a reminder in the annual December logbook mailing about these rules, and so hopefully no one is finding that to be a surprise.

Just a quick summary, and we are putting a hold on publishing those technical specifications that I mentioned at the very beginning, because we are aligning certain reporting elements to more closely match with the GARFO reporting elements of similar nature. When these guidelines are published, they will be for voluntary reporting, and mandatory reporting requirements will ultimately be dictated by the councils for a future date. Our biggest task is using the mobile application, which does still undergo periodic modifications by the developer, ACCSP, to test data flow and mapping the variables to our existing database.

With this in mind, we are easing off of our recruitment of volunteers until we get those reporting requirements squared away and the app can be approved by both councils, and, lastly, again, the major accomplishment from ACCSP was altering this self-creation tool, which can now accommodate a variety of permit holders. I believe that's it, and does anyone have any questions that I can answer for them?

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Julie, for that presentation. Any questions about what's been presented, where we are, where we're going, when we're going to get there? This is something that we've been talking about for a while, I think.

MS. BROWN: Right. Yes.

MR. BELL: No curiosity, and so you did a thorough brief, obviously, Julie. Okay. You mentioned that, once you get the technical specifications worked out and everything, then eventually we would get to the point where we would look for approval from the two councils, and that's in the future a little bit.

MS. BROWN: Right, and we don't want to start directing any of the third-party software developers to create an app and then come back and say, wait, never mind, we're actually going to slightly change the definition of a fishing event.

MR. BELL: Right. That makes sense, and you don't want to tell that, gee, we zigged instead of zagged, and so sorry about that, and so that makes sense.

MS. BROWN: Exactly.

MR. BELL: Okay. No questions? All right. Well, nice job.

MS. BROWN: Thank you very much.

MR. BELL: All right. We'll move along on the agenda, and the next item would be we're going to receive a presentation from the tag-team effort of Dr. Mandy Karnauskas and Dr. Matt McPherson, one or both, from the Science Center on the dolphin participatory workshops, and this is something that certainly COVID landed in the midst of, which was very inconvenient, but folks made the best of everything and moved through that, and are still moving on, and, also, council staff is involved in that as well, and so, whoever is going to run the presentation, take it away.

DR. KARNAUSKAS: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I am honored to present this work today, on behalf of my group of collaborators, and, first of all, Julia and John from the council, and a big group from the Science Center, but, in particular, Matt McPherson, who has been my co-lead on this initiative. We gave an hour-long talk on this work at the council seminar series last month, and so, today, I'm going to try and be really brief, and I think a lot of you have seen that talk already, and I'm just going to give a very high-level overview of some of the major results from this work.

Jumping right in, we essentially carried out a series of workshops, and the goal of these workshops was to increase communication between scientists and managers and fishermen, to better understand the dolphin wahoo fishery in the South Atlantic, and we used this participatory process to create concept models of how people view the fishery system, and so, with these concept models, we're able to map out the system of key factors that affect the fishery, from the physical and biological all the way to the social and economic side.

We identify major concerns and values and preferred objectives related to the fishery, and we also develop hypotheses, and we identify key questions and information gaps, and, again, this is a collaboration between the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and the council, with some funding from the Marine Resource Education Program, and, most importantly, the fishermen and industry members. As you will see, they're really critical participants to this process, and all of the work that we're going to present today is built off of their insights and their perspectives.

We carried out three workshops in North Carolina and Virginia in March of 2020, and so we went to Beaufort, Wanchese, and Virginia Beach, and we had a mix of for-hire and private folks, as well as some commercial in Wanchese, and then, of course, just after we came back from those was when things started shutting down for COVID. We had originally scheduled to do workshops in south Florida for the summer of 2020, and those got postponed, and we waited and waited for travel restrictions to ease up, and, of course, we're still waiting, and so we made the decision, earlier this calendar year, to go virtual, and so that involved a series of one-on-one phone calls with for-hire and private anglers, this past March, and then we put together a group webinar in April, to try and replicate some of the group discussions from the in-person workshops.

I'm just going to jump straight into the findings here, so we can try and keep it brief. This is a summary of the findings from the North Carolina and Virginia workshops. One of the big things we found was there's a lot of sub-regional variation in a bunch of a factors, which really shaped

the usage of the species, and so, for example, in access to coast and the position of the Gulf Stream and how far it is from the coast, the local demand for different species, and the shark populations, and so all of these factors vary across the region and sort of defined areas of low and high usage of the species.

This can impact local abundance of dolphin and wahoo, and so, for example, you have areas that might be constrained, where you have fishing that gets concentrated in certain areas, due to shark populations, and you can't fish in other areas, and so you can get impacts on the local abundance, even if overall effort or catch has not decreased. We also found that, up north, it's very much a meat fishery, and clients come to this area with the expectation that they're going to pack their coolers, and so they're interested in catching a lot of fish.

The charter demand in this region is largely driven by tuna and dolphin, and, to a lesser extent, wahoo. There are concerns in the area about accountability, particularly with recreational effort, and, overall, there was relatively little discussion of wahoo. I will note though that we held these workshops back before some of the wahoo -- The bag limits were being discussed in the amendment, and so we may have had more discussion of wahoo if these things were on the table back then.

Here is an overview of the summary of our south Florida findings, and we found that dolphin is a really important symbol of south Florida, and it has a key economic role. Down here, dolphin is on the t-shirts, and it's on the license plates. It's everywhere, and so it has a really important role with respect to recreational fishing and tourism. Another key finding was that, pretty much across the board, we were told that dolphin size and abundance has markedly decreasing, starting about in the past five years, or some folks said five to ten years.

The biggest change that folks saw was basically an absence of large gaffer dolphin, and then, subsequently, it was felt that effort and cost to catch dolphin is increasing, because of the scarcity. There is also the perception of a growing number and power and efficiency of private anglers. There was, as in North Carolina, relatively little discussion of wahoo, although there were some concerns about the impacts of spearfishing on wahoo. There were concerns about international fisheries, fisheries in the Caribbean and upstream, impacting abundance in south Florida, and there were some concerns in some, and not all, regarding the loss of bag limit sales that had previously been allowed.

Here is a quick sort of contrast, how south Florida differed from North Carolina and Virginia. In south Florida, there was a much bigger emphasis on the physical and biological drivers of dolphin distribution and local abundance, and a lot of that was in relation to kind of what happened to dolphin in the past five to ten years. Because of the scarcity, there was major concern about local and Atlantic-wide depletion, and a lot more support in Florida for stricter regulations, on dolphin in particular.

In this area, Atlantic-wide dolphin abundance was thought to be impacted by local commercial longline and recreational fishing pressure, as opposed to up north, where they didn't really perceive that these activities were impacting the overall stock abundance, and it was more of a local abundance issue, and then we had the contrast of Florida being more of a sport or leisure fishery, and so people are content to spend a few hours on the water, and maybe catch a few fish, where, as opposed to up north, where they were really trying to pack the coolers and come home with a

lot of fish. Then, in south Florida, there's a lot less variation in drivers of recreational effort, because of distance from the shore to fishing grounds, and coastal development is pretty consistent across that region.

Here is a table trying to sum up, as briefly as possible, the perceptions of regulatory impacts, and so sort of five different types of regulatory impacts, and we have a column for south Florida and a column for North Carolina and Virginia.

Just to go through this briefly, with respect to bag and trip limits on dolphin, in south Florida, there was some support for a reduced bag limit, and pretty widespread support for reduced trip limits. In contrast, up north, reductions in bag limits and trip limits were linked to reduced customer satisfaction and reduced charter demand, and this came up in Wanchese and Beaufort.

With respect to size limits on dolphin, in the south Florida region, there was widespread support to increase size limits, with the thought that this would increase spawning biomass, although some folks thought that size limits would have no impact, due to discard mortality, and then, up north, the size limits -- It was noted that this would shorten the season, because of the availability of size classes at different times of the year, and Beaufort folks noted that, if there were size limits imposed, effort would likely shift to triggerfish and beeliners. There were no impacts of size limits noted in Wanchese or Virginia Beach.

In terms of the level of regulation, there was actually agreement between the two regions. Overall, there was the viewpoint that generally low regulations and lack of data have allowed increasing effort in both the recreational and commercial sectors. With respect to effort shifts on the commercial side, in south Florida, it was noted that there's been a decrease in local commercial sales of dolphin, due to regulations that restricted the bag limit sales by charters, and, up north, it was perceived that the increase in pressure -- That there has been an increase in pressure on dolphin, and that this was largely due to blueline tilefish regulations that have been put in place and then overall less tuna availability.

Then, similarly, on the recreational side, for effort shifts, it was noted, in south Florida, that effort is shifting to snappers and porgies and a whole variety of other species, but this is due to the declines in the dolphin population in that region and not the regulations, and then, up north, the shorter season for yellowfin tuna increases pressure on dolphin and wahoo, and that was brought up in Beaufort, and then, similarly, there's an inverse relationship between the availability of tuna. A high availability of tuna reduces effort on dolphin, and that was brought up in Wanchese and Virginia Beach. That's a summary of the sort of perceptions that we got from the workshops in the two regions.

Then the next step of this project -- As I mentioned earlier, one of the things we try and do in this participatory method is hone-in on the key questions or hypotheses, and so we identified four major hypotheses that we felt necessitated further exploration. The first one is regarding the role of the species in the fisheries and how variable this is across the different regions. The second one was the dolphin populations and this drastic change that's perceived in south Florida in the last five years, and this is not so much a hypothesis, but a question of what is going on here.

Thirdly, there is the perception that economic forces have caused an increase in commercial activity, and then, fourthly, the perception that the power and scope of the private recreational fleet

is expanding rapidly, and so we're going to go through some data, and we tried to put some data to these hypotheses, and I will go through them one-by-one.

First of all, regarding the role of the species and how it varies across the region, we carried out a social media photo analysis, and, again, we went into detail on this in the seminar, but, very briefly, what we tried to do, or what we did, is we took a list of marinas in each of the regions, and we searched for charter companies that routinely post their catches online, and so pictures of sort of the dock layout photos, where they post the catch at the end of each trip, and we tabulated the number and species in each of these photos, and we counted a total of almost 4,000 pictures from 2017 to 2020, which is the time span that this occurs.

This allowed us to get a really high-resolution picture of the species usage in each of these regions over time, and so what I'm showing you in these figures here is the proportion of catch by species, in the different colors through the year, and so from January to December in each of the regions, and so, just glancing at these, you can see that the species usage is highly variable between south Florida and North Carolina/Virginia. South Florida is an opportunistic fishery, with a lot more species diversity, and you can see that dolphin is probably year-round, but it really dominates in the June to October period. Yellowtail is the primary fallback, at least in terms of numbers, and then wahoo, in the green here, is the twelfth-most abundant.

Then you can see, in the northern areas, really, the catch is dominated, almost entirely, by tuna, from December to April, and then, starting in May, it shifts largely to dolphin, and then wahoo are the fifth-most abundant in catch, and they are increasingly important in this fall period, and you see that king mackerel is a winter fishery here, as opposed to a more summer fishery in south Florida.

With this social media analysis, we also looked at the dolphin-specific trips, and we're plotting out, here on the left, histograms of the number of dolphin per trip when dolphin were present in the catch, and we've got North Carolina/Virginia on the top and south Florida on the bottom here, and you can see that, on average in the northern regions, they're catching about twice the number of dolphin per trip, and, if we look on the right here, we've outlined some of the -- From the MRIP program, intercept surveys, some of the trip characteristics that help explain some of these differences.

For North Carolina dolphin target trips, the average charter duration is over ten hours, and the average hours fished is almost seven hours. Then the vast majority of these trips are offshore, whereas, in south Florida, the dolphin charter trips -- We don't know the average charter trip duration, because it's not reported, but the average hours fished is quite a bit less. It's 4.7 hours, and then over a fifth of these are actually inshore trips, and so you can see that there is different trip characteristics that create economic incentives for larger trip catches in the northern region, as opposed to south Florida. Then there's the added aspect of the different clientele, as we talked about earlier, the meat fishery versus the sport/leisure fishery. Folks in North Carolina and Virginia, the customers go on all these trips hoping to pack their coolers, whereas, in south Florida, they're not necessarily looking to take a lot of fish home, and folks are satisfied with four to five dolphin on a trip, in some cases.

Our next hypothesis, or question, was what is going on with the south Florida dolphin populations that we've seen some drastic changes in the last five years, or our fishermen have perceived drastic changes in the last five years.

This really was quite interesting to us, because of the South Atlantic's ecosystem status report, which is about to come out, as a compilation of indicators that gives a look at what's going on in the ecosystem. This report has picked out a lot of major changes in the South Atlantic ecosystem in the last five to ten years, which is consistent with a lot of the observations we heard from the fishermen, and so I'm just showing three examples here. Chlorophyll-a is an indicator of primary productivity. Then there's an upwelling index and bottom temperature, and you can see the red is well below, and the green is well above average, and, if you look at the blue window, you can see a number of substantial changes in the last five years.

The temperature increase, in particular, is interesting, because dolphin, like many other highly migratory species, have specific temperature preferences, and we know that their migration patterns are driven by temperature, to some extent, and there was a really nice paper done by Lela Schlenker and her co-authors, and this came out last year, where they used satellite tagging to get at the temperature preferences of dolphin, and this group of researchers found that dolphin are spending 95 percent of their time at temperatures between 25 and 29 degrees Celsius, and this is regardless of region, and they looked at the Gulf of Mexico as well as different areas in the Atlantic.

Really, once you get up to 30 degrees Celsius, you don't see very many dolphin at all, and they just don't spend a lot of time in this temperature range, and so what I'm going to show you now is a temperature animation. The top plot is you're going to see annual average sea surface temperatures for south Florida, and so that south Florida I'm defining as this little dotted box on the bottom here, and then, in the bottom plots, you're going to see snapshots of sea surface temperature for six months out of the year, and the color scale is here, and what you will see is I have this thick black line at the thirty degree Celsius cutoff for the temperature, and so you can those areas that are kind of outside this range. I'm going to let this run, and hopefully the animation is coming across on the screen.

You can see there is a lot of variability in warmer El Nino years in the late 1990s, and then, once we get into these last five or so years, you can see that there is a pretty substantial increase in sea surface temperatures year-round, almost a whole degree Celsius, and this equates to several months out of the year where sea surface temperatures in south Florida are exceeding this thirty-degree Celsius threshold.

We don't mean to say that this is conclusive, or this is the only explanation for what's going on in south Florida, but certainly these data would suggest that there have been some shifts in the environment that are relevant to dolphin and the basic physiological needs of the species, and this is one potential explanation for what's going on in south Florida and, in particular, the absence of gaffers in the last recent years.

We're going to move on to Hypothesis 3, which is regarding the economic forces that have caused an increase in commercial activity, and we heard concerns that increases in price were driving increased commercial activity, and I'm showing you here imports, and this is from the NMFS foreign trade data and the NMFS commercial landings statistics and the average price per pound,

and it is true that the price of dolphin has increased over the past twenty years, with the exception of perhaps the last four or five, and we also see a big increase in imports.

However, note that the vast, vast majority of these imports are coming from areas that are not western Atlantic, and so this is largely coming from the Pacific, and so you can see a little blip in red, and you do see some increase in imports from Caribbean Sea countries, starting in about 2015.

We also looked at the NMFS landings statistics, combined with the Sea Around Us database, and this is a database that is compiled by Zeller and Pauly, and it has -- It reports not only the reported landings that go through FAO, but it also attempts to reconstruct landings that are not reported through official government channels, from gray literature and things, and so it's probably the best reconstruction of the actual catches that are occurring for some species internationally.

What it does is it plot out the landings by region, and so we have Canada, the U.S. Gulf of Mexico, Mid-Atlantic to New England, and then the South Atlantic EEZ and then the Caribbean Sea EEZ in yellow, defining Caribbean Sea here as the southern Gulf of Mexico all the way to the eastern Caribbean. Then, in the shading, you can see the darker shading is commercial catches for these regions, and then the gray is recreational.

The commercial landings in the Caribbean Sea does dominate the commercial landings for the Western Atlantic. However, we don't see a big increase in the commercial landings in recent years, and there's a slight increase, but, overall, they've kind of been constant for the past couple of decades or so, and so, again, we are seeing increases in the price of imports, but it doesn't seem to be driven by increased commercial activity from the Western Atlantic, at least according to this database.

Then just kind of going into a little bit more detail into the U.S. commercial catches, we heard a lot of concerns about increased longlining and its impact on the for-hire sector, and we do see that there is some increase in commercial longlining in the U.S. Atlantic over the past twenty years, although, overall in the commercial sector, we're seeing a reduction, and, actually, the longlining has kind of dropped off in the past five years, but, that said, the things that we heard from the fishermen -- The data support the observations that they're making, and, again, some of the concerns that we heard were the overall absence of large gaffers in south Florida, and, in North Carolina and Virginia, there were concerns about lower gaffer abundance in the summer.

Here, we go back to our social media analysis, and, here, we're just showing seasonal trends in dolphin, and the bailer size class are the pink, and the gaffer size class is in the blue, and what we're calling the raw catches are the dots, and then there's some statistical smoothers, to help you to pick out the seasonality, and so, again, what the fishermen are saying about the patterns seems to be absolutely true on social media, the data that we considered.

What we think potentially the concern is surrounding are maybe some more localized factors, and so, if you look at when the longlining is actually occurring, there's a vast majority of it occurring in May and June, and that coincides with heavy usage of the species at the same time and place in the recreational sector, and so some of these concerns about increased longlining might be in regard to local competition, competition of this fish over small temporal and spatial scales, as opposed to impacts on the entire stock abundance.

Then, lastly, we looked at this perception of power and scope of the private recreational fishing fleet and its expansion, and we heard, pretty consistently, that there's different factors that lead to increasing recreational effort, and those are access to coast, the actual human population growth, and then the economy, which gives now each person more spending power to buy bigger engines, go offshore, et cetera, and so these plots are from the ecosystem status report, showing developed areas and the population density, and they really tell a nice picture.

We heard this concern in North Carolina, about developed areas and population density, and the concern was really exacerbated in south Florida, and you can see exactly why this is. There's a lot of coastal development and human population growth.

Looking at the recreational dolphin landings and wahoo landings for the U.S. Atlantic in the past few decades, I have it plotted here, and you can see that the private sector really dominates the landings. We're also looking at the angler trips, on the lower right here, and you can see that this has increased sort of linearly over time, with maybe a drop-off in the past decade or so, but, really, the concerns of the workshop participants were that they realized the power of each individual trip has increased, and so things like better technology of electronics on each boat, the number of engines on the boat, the ability of people to get offshore, the lower gas prices, and they're spending more fuel and getting further offshore.

The social media transports information, and people's fishing spots are now publicized, and so, in the perception of fishermen, really, the recreational fleet has -- Its realized power has actually increased sort of exponentially over time, and we really don't have the data to pick up those concerns.

Now I'm going to try and wrap-up, briefly, with just the conclusions, and so, with regard to our first hypothesis, we saw that there is highly variable drivers of resource use at the sub-regional level, and even more relevant for management is that there is different values related to the management of the stock, and so people view these species -- They have different values about how the species should be used, and this presents a particular challenge for management, because it's going to be difficult to find a one-size-fits-all solution that makes everybody happy, and so we think that management may want to consider some measures at the sub-regional level that this would be justified based on the different values across the regions.

The second conclusion is, again, we saw this environmental signal that we think is probably relevant to management of the species, and we hope that, if we can continue to do research on this area and better understand the environment, that, if we have sort of a predictive index for how the environment impacts the dolphin stock, and the wahoo stock, that we could hopefully integrate that into management and improve our management.

The third conclusion is, again, we talked about these issues of ensuring sustainable harvest, versus addressing usage patterns and the localized conflict, and, here, we just want to reiterate that these are really different issues, and so, again, an issue of ensuring sustainable harvest is somewhat out of our control, because a lot of the landings are coming from other jurisdictions, other nationalities, but the issue of addressing usage patterns and localized conflict is very much in the South Atlantic Council's control, but it does require a different set of tools, and it's not just about setting the appropriate catch rate, but also looking -- Paying close attention to how the species get used in

space and time and trying to resolve those conflicts, where you have high usage in space and time overlapping.

Then, finally, we heard that private recreational effort is a pervasive concern, and I don't need to belabor the point here, and I think these pictures say a lot, and this concern is certainly exacerbated in south Florida, and I think that's for pretty straightforward reasons.

Then just next steps, in terms of what we're going to do, we want to summarize all of this and report to the council, and we've put out a number of presentations and some summary products, but we will summarize the full project results into some sort of report or publication, and we also think that management strategy evaluation would be a very good step, particularly for dolphin, and so management strategy evaluation involved simulating the entire management process and biology, and so you simulate the fish stock itself, the monitoring process, the data analysis, the application of the management, and then the fleet dynamics, and you look at, if we manage in this way, does it allow us to meet the management objectives.

We think this would be really valuable, given how dynamic these stocks are and how different the management objectives are across the region, and that management strategy evaluation might shed some light onto an improved management sort of strategy, and we just wanted to note that a lot of the participatory workshop inputs would lend themselves, or inform, this management strategy evaluation exercise, and so, based on the conceptual modeling, we have a good understanding of how the fish stock dynamics work, and also the response of the fishing fleet, and then, of course, through these workshops, we honed-in on what people value in the species, how they use the species, and what those management objectives might be.

That's it, and I wanted to just take time to thank all the fishermen and industry members who participated in these workshops, and, again, all of this was inspired by the input that they gave us, and so we very much appreciate all the time that they spent with us, speaking to us on the phone and in workshops, and I wanted to thank folks from the Center and the council for additional support for funding, and thanks to Dewey Hemilright for the idea of the social media analysis, and then I think we wanted to leave off with some questions.

This first bullet, I know John and Julia had put some of the conceptual models in the briefing book material, and I don't know if folks have had a chance to look those over, but I could take a brief moment to walk through those, if that would be desired. John and Julia, maybe I will just ask you to chime in here and --

MR. BELL: Mandy, first let me thank you for that. It's a tremendous presentation, and it's a tremendous amount of work by you and everybody involved, and so it's very informative, and there's a lot there. In terms of working through the conceptual models, or spending some time on that, I'm not -- We've got less than an hour left, and, John or Julia, I would ask you, in terms of -- Should we spend time on that now or give folks a chance to play around with it some, if they haven't, and then kind of get back to that particular question later, or what do you all think?

MS. BYRD: I would just say I think Mandy and Matt were trying to develop some tools that you guys can use that are kind of synthesizing all of this information collected through these workshops, and then these interactive conceptual models are one way that they have summarized this information, with kind of searchable tables and things like that, for your use, and so I think it

would be helpful for you guys to look at those and provide some feedback on whether or not kind of how the information is presented is useful to you.

I don't know if you all feel like you have time to do that today, but I think Mandy and Matt want to make sure that they're providing you guys with tools you can use, and so having you guys review those and provide feedback to them I think will help them kind of make sure the tools that they're creating are useful to you.

MR. BELL: Right, and so, giving folks a little bit of time to do that, we could have a process where we give input back through a central point, such as yourself or directly to them, and, I mean, whichever way you guys would like to get that, but I think it might be helpful to let folks kind of play with those a little, to be able to properly weigh-in on them, is just my thought. Anna, have you got a question?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I'm curious where those conceptual models are, because I see the presentation in the briefing book, but I'm not seeing a link for the conceptual models.

DR. COLLIER: If you look in your agenda and overview, it's under the Dolphin Participatory Workshops, Item Number 5, and then you just scroll down, and you will see the links here for these conceptual models.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Got it. I will take a look at those, and, in just a quick minute, I just wanted to thank Mandy, and I thought the presentation was fantastic. It's the second time I've heard it, and I think they've done a really amazing job of breaking down the differences between North Carolina and Florida accurately and giving a really broad picture of how differently those fisheries are prosecuted in an accurate way, and maybe some additional factors that are not fishing related, per se, that may be influencing the fishery, such as the higher surface temperatures, and so I really appreciate the work, and this is great stuff, and I'm sure that we will be referencing the presentation often over the next few days, and so thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. John Hadley, did you have something that you wanted to weigh-in, process-wise, before I go to Art?

MR. HADLEY: No, and thank you, Mel. I just have a hand up, and I was going to point out where the links were to each one of the conceptual models, but I think that was covered, and so thank you.

MR. BELL: Got it. Thank you. Art.

MR. SAPP: Thank you. I hear and understand, and can even appreciate a little bit, the sea surface temp concerns. However, we have lots of friends fishing all the through the Caribbean currently, and all the way through the August and September moons, blue marlin fishing, and getting annihilated by mahi down there, and they're fishing well into thirty-degree Celsius water temperatures, and, here for the last eight years in south Florida, our best dolphin fishery has been August, September, October, when we have, by far, our warmest sea surface temps, and so I'm not buying into warmer water temps pushing the fish away from us. I mean, I understand how a science mind might think that, but that's not the real -- That's not what we're seeing in real time.

Beyond that, it is a phenomenal presentation there, and I do appreciate the time you all put in on it. Thank you..

DR. KARNAUSKAS: If I could respond to that, if it's possible.

MR. BELL: Yes. Sure. Go ahead, Mandy.

DR. KARNAUSKAS: I wanted to point out that, like I said, this isn't -- We don't want to say this is the only thing that is going on. A couple of things. That analysis, we looked at that because there were fishermen who told us that they felt that increasing sea surface temperatures were being to the lack of mahi, and they specifically said that, when it gets above this temperature, we don't see mahi as much, and we think that they're avoiding the area, and so I wanted to point out that the analysis that we showed you was based on hypotheses that were brought to us from the fishermen.

Then the second point I would like to make is that we showed that the average sea surface temperature for the whole year has made a big jump in south Florida, and so what that means is that that preferred temperature might be moving north, and so it might not be so much that the dolphin are avoiding south Florida, necessarily, but that their range is expanding north, and so, if you have the same number of dolphin distributed over a larger area, you're going to see lower abundances in those local areas, just because they're expanding, and, again, I'm not saying that we know for certain that that's occurring, but I just wanted to clarify the conclusions that we're drawing from the analysis that we showed.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Mandy. Chester.

MR. BREWER: I just wanted to echo what Art just said. I mean, historically, in Palm Beach County anyway, our very best dolphin fishing has been when the water is the hottest, and I'm talking about we consider that a summer fishery, and so I have -- I understand why the work was done, to see if there has been a change, environmentally, for warming, and I think there has been, I really do, and, I mean, we've been seeing it for years, particularly like bluefin tuna and fish like that, but I still suspect there is something that's going on that is being witnessed by the charter guys down in the Keys, whereby they have still got the smaller fish.

Their big concern is the big fish, and they're not seeing the big fish, and, if I might suggest something, I still would really very much like to know whether there are international longlines that have gotten involved in prosecuting a dolphin fishery now, because that, to me, is what makes the most sense.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Chester. Kind of getting back to their questions that they posed to us, and so we kind of discussed the conceptual models already, and then we've talked a little bit about the hypotheses, which hypotheses are a priority, and then are there any other major questions or hypotheses for investigation, and Chester just mentioned something about longlines. Anything else that we can help them? They're looking for feedback on how to perhaps steer things in the future here, and is there anything else we can tell them right now that you would like to pass along to them? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: How about looking at the distribution of where the abundance of the mahi are just spreading out more, because, over the last three or four years, I know, particularly for marlin tournaments on the east coast, in Maryland and New Jersey, in August, you see more catches being weighed-in of the mahi. Plus, we look at MRIP data of New Jersey, New York, Delaware, and folks are encountering and seeing mahi, small mahi and larger-sized mahi, but I'm just wondering if maybe the abundance is just spreading out more, over areas, and how do we take into account the fish, more fish, being north? What's the reasoning for doing that? Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Dewey. That's something that I don't know if you all captured, Dewey's comments there. Andy, did you want to weigh-in here?

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel, and, Mandy, great presentation, as always. I guess a couple of thoughts. One, the issue of vessel limits and kind of demand for customers and whether or not they go on fishing trips, especially in the northern area, seems to be a theme, and certainly I think an area that is worth investigating. We hear a lot about this, not just for dolphin, but in other fisheries, whenever we're reducing bag limits or vessel limits, and so I'm always interested in kind of seeing the tradeoffs there, with regard to regulatory requirements.

Then the other thing that I guess strikes me, and I don't know if it's a hypothesis or not, but you, obviously, are hearing and seeing the changes in abundance and size in south Florida, and it doesn't seem like there was much in the way of information coming from North Carolina and Virginia, with regard to changes in size or abundance, and I'm curious as to why that might be and if there's differences just in kind of the fishery as a whole and kind of the presence and availability of those larger fish off of North Carolina and Virginia and if that's changing over time as well for that area.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Andy. That's worth capturing. Tim, something else?

MR. GRINER: Thank you. I keep hearing the word described as "larger fish", but I don't really know what a larger fish is. So, I mean, is there some -- Is there some size, or some standard, that people in Florida, or people anywhere, think that a dolphin is large, versus small? I mean, because I see all different sizes, but what's large to me might not really be large to someone else, and what's large to a family from Ohio from might be a lot different than what's large to me, and so what is a large mahi?

MR. BELL: That's a good question. You know, we tend to use these terms of bailers and gaffers, and there is no length associated with that, I think, specifically, and I'm not the person to weigh-in on that, but that's -- Yes, define your term, and what is large and what is small, and it has to do with how they prosecute the fisheries and how they kind of deal with the fish themselves, based on how they present themselves at the boat, but, yes, I don't think there's any necessarily clear definition of that, Tim.

DR. KARNAUSKAS: Did you want me to try and respond to some of these questions?

MR. BELL: If it would help you, in terms of getting a sense of capturing what you guys need or help you move forward. If you think that would be helpful, then sure.

DR. KARNAUSKAS: I just wanted to note, for the social media analysis, we did sort of try to standardize, by sixty centimeters and up was considered a gaffer, and so it was standardized, to

the extent possible, for that analysis, but you're right that, as far as what people call a gaffer or a bailer, it does differ, although we do have notes on sort of the size classes that people consider to be in those different classes of dolphin.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, I didn't realize you had that. That's good. Anything else you wanted to respond back to, or is that it for now?

DR. KARNAUSKAS: I guess, just to Andy's question, Andy asked about different perceptions about trends in abundance over time, and we went into more detail on that in the seminar series talk, and, in a nutshell, north of Virginia, it was sort of stable or increasing abundance for dolphin, and Beaufort was a slight decrease, over time, if I remember, and so we do have that data, and it's in the seminar series talk, and so we have those perceptions in the talk.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Mandy. Anything else that we can help them with right now? Does anybody want to weigh-in and ask? Tim.

MR. GRINER: So were you saying that sixty centimeters was considered the threshold to be a large fish?

DR. KARNAUSKAS: For the purposes of the social media analysis, yes, but that is not necessarily what everyone calls a large fish, or a gaffer-sized dolphin.

MR. GRINER: That's less than two feet, and that's a twenty-three-inch fish, right?

DR. KARNAUSKAS: I'm sorry. Was it inches? Was it centimeters or inches? No, and it should be -- Sorry. I need to check and get back to you.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, we can figure that out. Anything else?

DR. MCPHERSON: We'll have to go back and check on the specific size standards that we used for the social media analysis, but one thing is very clear, and that is that, in south Florida, based -- People were basing this on their perception of what they used to catch in the past, versus what they're catching now, and there was strong consensus that the larger fish that they used to get, those big fish that they would tell stories about, were becoming increasingly scarce in south Florida, and what they were catching were a lot more smaller mahi, and so, I mean, there was no -- There really wasn't any notable disagreement about that for south Florida.

Remember that we had some discussions in North Carolina, and they weren't as adamant about it, and I think there was some discussion about potentially -- We were looking at the notes the other day again, and there was some discussion about mahi in that area potentially not being as large as in the past, and there was also discussion about finding a lot more larger-sized fish farther up north, and so it's sort of referring back to people's experience and what they perceive of as being the large fish, and there's a clear perception that those large fish that they used to catch in the past aren't as present in the system as they were, but we can get the other, more specific, information that we used for the social media analysis.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Matt. In the interest of getting through the schedule here today, is there anything else that we can help them with right now that you guys want to provide input

on? Okay. I am not seeing any hands, and so, Mandy, thanks so much for the presentation, and all of you guys that were involved in this, and great job, and a great job of navigating through some challenges that were thrown at us last March, and so well done. Thanks a lot. Okay.

Moving to the next agenda item, that takes us to the Recreational Workgroup Updates, and I think the first one is going to be Steve, I believe, the joint workgroup with the Gulf on Section 102, and you heard Tony, this morning, mention an effort up in the Mid-Atlantic and the Commission, dealing with recreational reform stuff, and so there's kind of a theme here, and there's lot of different things going on, workgroup-wise, and efforts to kind of deal with, regionally, the same sort of topic, and so, Steve, if you're ready to make your presentation, that would be great.

MR. POLAND: Mel, thank you, and so we don't have the workshop report ready yet, and so hopefully it will come out by the end of the week. I worked with council staff at the Gulf in getting that prepared, and so hopefully we can provide the council with something before we adjourn on Friday.

The joint workgroup for Section 102, and this is a joint workgroup with the South Atlantic and the Gulf Council to provide recommendations based off of the Modernizing Recreational Fisheries Act, specifically the Section 102, which authorizes alternative management approaches for the recreational fishery, and we met June 3, in the afternoon, and it was about a two-and-a-half-hour meeting. We received two presentations.

The first was from Richard Cody from the Office of Science and Technology, and he gave us an update on NMFS' allocation and use of approximately three-and-a-half-million dollars budgeted for the Modernizing Fish Act of 2018. This money, he reported, was going to be used to increase sample size and precision of MRIP estimates, and this will be done by increasing the number of APAIS intercepts, and that's the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey, and so these are the creel clerks at the dock that are actually sampling the fish. This money will be distributed through -- In our region, through ACCSP to the states to increase those sample sizes.

Of note, the three-and-a-half-million dollars, $3 million of that money is considered permanent funding on a continuing basis to keep these sample sizes up, and so that will potentially raise and maintain the number of samples coming in through the APAIS survey as a component of the MRIP estimates.

Next, we received a presentation from Russ Dunn at National Marine Fisheries Service on the flexibility under the Magnuson-Stevens Act for alternative management approaches, and he provided a brief summary and overview of the Act and Section 102, with regard to alternative recreational fishery management approaches. He noted that many hallmarks of the Magnuson Act remain in effect, like the requirement to manage using annual catch limits, following the National Standards, and use of accountability measures and rebuilding requirements.

He provided some examples of potential management under Section 102, which included using extraction rates, fishing mortality targets, harvest control rules, conditional accountability measures, carryover, and phase-in of ACL, multi-year fishing definitions, a multi-year, potentially multi-year, ACLs, flexible rebuilding schedules, and different measures focused on data-poor species. He noted that multiple approaches are being explored and applied to suit region and

fisheries-specific needs, including annual and multi-year catch limit specifications, harvest rates, and harvest control rules, currently.

Discussion after Mr. Dunn's presentation, a few of the workgroup members noted that the council is still required to manage to an ACL, which they feel limits the flexibility that it appears the Act provides the councils, and it was also asked of Mr. Dunn what needs to be done to allow the councils to manage to an extraction rate, as opposed to an ACL, and he responded with the catch is catch in either numbers or weight, and it must still be monitored to an ACL, and this was reinforced in the Modernizing Fish Act.

He, additionally, suggested approaches to adjust fishing opportunities relative to stock status, such as through various harvest control rules, as a way to offer additional opportunities for stocks, based on positive health, the positive health of the stock.

After those two presentations, the workgroup had an open discussion about potential recommendations to the two councils on alternative recreational management. Staff with the Gulf offered ideas for approaches that the workgroup may consider, such as phasing-in increases in projected yields, step-downs, and recreational bag limits to extend fishing seasons and other triggers for management changes in response to changes in harvest rates or stock status. Again, the idea of a multiyear ACL was of interest to a lot of the workgroup, and it's something that the workgroup wants to spend some more time digging into.

Next, we reviewed the goals identified by the workgroup at its May meeting, to structure our discussion, and workgroup members did suggest, as far as the goals identified in the May 2020 meeting, that it's rare to use in-season bag limit reductions for recreational fisheries, and that, by doing this, it would add a degree of difficulty and confusion and angler comprehension of and compliance with fisheries regulations, but the workgroup discussed this and settled on the burden of regulations would have to be weighed against any gains in fishery access, and so, basically, the more creative and convoluted we get, it might add additional opportunities, but it comes at a cost for creating further regulatory confusion, and that was a theme that we kind of carried through to a lot of our discussions.

At the conclusion of our discussion, it was requested that a list be developed of all the discussions we've had up to this point, and so our May 2020 meeting, where we developed goals for the group, and the discussion at this meeting, and so, basically, a list of those goals and now some potential recommendations, or actions, to address those specific goals, and this list be developed in between now and the next workgroup meeting, to allow the workgroup some time in between to chew on those and come prepared to the next meeting to finalize, or potentially finalize, some recommendations.

Lastly, we discussed scheduling for our next workgroup meeting, and the workgroup was in unanimous opinion that our next workgroup meeting should be in-person, if at all possible, because a lot of the discussions that are needed for this type of workgroup and the subject matter would probably lend better to in-person discussions, and there is just a limitation, through webinars and having an open, robust discussion, and we really feel like our next meeting we would like to have as an in-person meeting, probably in a central location, just to accommodate travel for so many people, but I foresee, as the chair of this workgroup, basically a couple-day workshop meeting, where we lock the doors and we don't leave until we have some recommendations. With that, that

concluded our meeting. Like I said, we're working on a meeting summary, and hopefully we'll be able to distribute that document to the council by the end of the week. Mel, that's all I've got, and I will take any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Steve. I don't remember the door-locking part, but I do agree that we do need to get some recommendations out.

MR. POLAND: I'm ready to wrap this up and put a bow on it.

MR. BELL: Okay. As long as we can order pizza or something. Any questions for Steve? Chester.

MR. BREWER: I don't really have a question, and I have more of a comment. After listening to Russ Dunn's presentation, it became clear to me that we, at some point, if we want to actually use some of the tools that are put forth in Section 102, we're going to have to get NMFS to change some of the definitions that it uses, particularly with regard to what is catch, or we're going to have to say to NMFS that we disagree with your interpretation, and here is ours. That's not a really happy place to be, but, if this act, which had so much promise to it, is to be effective, we're going to have to do something like that, and, with that, I will sit down and shut up.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, Chester. Yes, I remember, in the meeting, kind of when that lightbulb went off, and perhaps it didn't -- The thought was perhaps it didn't quite give us the flexibility that we thought it might have given us, but you're right that that is something we're going to have to work through here. Any other questions for Steve or comments? All right. I am not seeing any hands. Thank you, Steve. That will take us to our next workgroup, which is the Private Recreational Reporting Workgroup, and I think John is going to give a brief summary of that that went, I believe.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair. I will, because Spud is unable to be with us this afternoon, and so he asked me to give the report. Spud would normally be doing it, and he is the chair of this group. We met not too long ago, on May 26, and we continued on our let's say background fact-finding efforts.

We had three very interesting presentations as the bulk of the meeting, and the first one was from Karson of the Mid-Atlantic Council staff about the tilefish, private recreational tilefish, reporting that the Mid-Atlantic recently put into place, and it was in response to issues with their lack of confidence in the MRIP estimates for blueline and golden tilefish, something we dealt with a lot when we did the last blueline tilefish assessment, with that stock overlapping our two regions.

They did this through developing an application, working with Harbor Lights Software, actually, who we have worked with a lot, and ACCSP works with a lot, and it allows fishermen to report. They didn't have a whole lot of reports filed last year, but it didn't go into effect until August, and the fishery closes in like October, and so they were only a few months in, and, as we all know, COVID and weather such as they are, it's kind of hard to judge just whether or not there was a big reporting, lack of reporting, issue or not, and so they're continuing to monitor it and looking forward to this year and getting some updated information on the use of it. It is interesting that it does show a council can initiate this activity, and private recreational reporting is certainly not totally beyond the realm of possibility.

The next one was from HMS about the private recreational reporting that they do, largely tied to tuna and billfish, and this was by Jackie Wilson, who is with their staff, and this is a long-standing program that goes back to 2000, and they really started it because of the large pelagic survey, which is the topic below, not providing the coverage that they needed across time and space, and so this is mandatory. You have to have a permit, and you have to report whenever you catch one of these species, and it's expected of all recreational fishermen that you're going to keep them.

It was interesting to see that the agency has done something like this, and did it over twenty years ago, and has had it in place for a long time, and uses it to provide estimates for use in their stock assessments and their management of these species, and it was triggered -- This and the LPS, which follows, were triggered in response to complying with ICCAT requirements for those species.

Then the final presentation of this meeting was on what's called the MRIP Large Pelagic Survey, and this is a survey that's dedicated toward those species, and it covers the Mid and North Atlantic, and it covers June through October, and so it has spatial and time gaps that were made up for by the HMS mandatory reporting program. The two work together, obviously, and they really need to, to develop the estimates, and they work within the overall MRIP framework as well.

The other important part of these is both said they were -- All three of these, really, were designed to deal with situations where the generalized survey of MRIP is not providing adequate information on specialized fishing effort, and that's really where the idea of the rare event comes in, and these are specialized-type fishing trips, and they're not just the common, everyday-type trips, and so they're not well covered by the common, everyday survey of MRIP, and that's very much the challenge that we're facing with the species we're looking at and considering some type of alternative method of collecting estimates.

After having the presentations, the committee went through and had some discussion. The first thing to highlight is the committee has a series of goals and objectives that were developed at the last meeting, and we've been working through those with the presentations. We're beginning to have some ideas come together as principles of whatever recommendations come from these principles that they will follow.

One that was discussed is it recognizes that it's very important to have measures of success. This could be PSEs, and this could be more participation, data quality, consistency between management actions and participant observations, which, you know, that is definitely a big one, certainly one we'll be thinking about a lot this week with some other species, and increased trust in management.

The workgroup also agrees that reporting and permitting should be coordinated with MRIP and not to be a supplement to and not to be a competitor to, but to be something that works with existing programs like MRIP, and that's certainly very critical to us having a cohesive effort here in our region to collect data, and we well know, as discussed in the research discussion earlier, there is not enough resources to go around, and there's plenty of gaps, and so there's plenty of opportunity for us to work with each other, work together, rather than trying to compete.

Then, finally, the other principle is that an ideal program will provide flexibility, timely data, and be adaptable to future situations, and so we see there that there's some ideas starting to come

together in the group. At the next meeting, we expect to continue that, and the next big hurdle, really, is trying to better understand the legal and regulatory framework behind different reporting programs, and so we intend to look into state versus federal and how regulations are developed and what the standards are and what is necessary.

You know, we haven't ruled out whether this would be state led or federal led, et cetera, and so trying to understand what the states can actually do will be important, and then trying to really understand how this could fit within the federal system and dealing with fishermen who can cross state bounds and all that kind of stuff.

We're also keeping tabs on the use of the recreational data for Gulf red snapper, because of the many different state programs that are underway there, and we're going to start talking some about census versus survey reporting approaches. You know, most of your mandatory programs, those are intended to be a census, and you make everybody report every trip, or every time they catch a fish, in the case of the HMS mandatory reporting program, versus the generalized survey of something like MRIP, and some more background just listed there is about an MRIP report that was done to the National Academy of Sciences for their ongoing study for reporting programs.

That study that was done on MRIP and timeliness may have some information that's useful to us, and my understanding is the report is under review now, but certainly we're keeping tabs on that as well, and we'll make it available. Then the group also is interested in trying to get a better handle on what the actual council data gaps are, and that may help us hone-in on what we actually need out of the reporting efforts. Mr. Chairman, that summarizes the report on this committee, and we're looking at the next meeting probably being July or August, and so it will before our September meeting, and we'll report back again in September.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, John. That's a good summary. The goal of this particular group is to come up with some reasonable recommendations to coordinate state and federal data collection and permitting programs, and it's not as simple as it sounds, perhaps. There's a lot of moving parts, and so we do appreciate everybody's efforts on this. Any questions for John, in terms of what transpired at the workgroup meeting? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. Thanks for the presentation. Just to pass along that the Mid-Atlantic Council developed that app I think for like $20,000, and so it was three years in the making, and the reason for having to make that app is because we have to use a different method that -- We couldn't use MRIP, because MRIP had zeroes, and so it lacked greatly in the Mid-Atlantic, and so that's why they went to a private reporting app, and, before that, there was the other methodology, which I forgot the name of, but thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Dewey. Yes, the Mid-Atlantic effort was something we were paying attention to there. Any other questions for John related to the workgroup?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Dewey, I think you might have been thinking of the Delphi, perhaps? That's what they used for the assessment.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes, that's what it was. I couldn't remember, and I took part in that, but yes, and so we're still using part of the Delphi process to estimate the recreational account right now, and we're not using MRIP, because it still has zeroes, and so hopefully maybe -- You know

it how it works, and probably, three or four years down the road, there will be enough coming out of private reporting that there will be some use there.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Dewey. Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to build a little bit on what Dewey was talking about on the mandatory reporting on the tilefish, we felt it was a good first attempt at instituting mandatory reporting in the recreational community. Those that go recreational tile fishing, that's a limited universe of users, and so it was -- In my opinion, and I believe the majority of the council, it was a good idea to get a first step, a first shot, at trying to get mandatory reporting for the recreational community, as we might eventually transition away from MRIP.

You had also mentioned, or it has been mentioned, that the response rate last year was low, and that was due to the late implementation, and we are now publicizing it more frequently, and we're trying to get the word out, and so we think it will be a first good step to eventually having mandatory reporting in the recreational community. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Tony. All right. Anything else for John right now? I don't see any hands. We've got two other items on the agenda. Next is Anna is going to give us an update on the recent HMS meeting and advisory panel, the HMS Advisory Panel, and ICCAT, and so there's some documents, which will be 7a and 7b, in the briefing binder, but Anna, I guess, is going to give us a quick synopsis of whatever she would like to related to those. Anna, whenever you're ready.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm ready. Over the last couple of months, the ICCAT Advisory Committee met twice, once in April and once in May. The 2020 annual ICCAT meeting was done via correspondence, and it took four months, instead of the normal ten days. A basic overview of the results was the highest priorities were to avoid lapse in expiring measures, and we were able to do that. Examples included northern and southern albacore, bigeye tuna, and western bluefin. All of the measures that could be rolled over and were considered non-essential -- All non-essential business was, of course, delayed.

In total, we only got through nine recommendations, and the U.S. delegation was generally satisfied with those outcomes, with some specific exceptions, mostly to do with bluefin tuna. The western bluefin tuna TAC was maintained at the status quo, and a reduction was needed and called for, and the current measure has a 94 percent chance of overfishing. The U.S. delegation fought for a stock assessment this year, but was not able to achieve that, and we did not adjust the TAC based on the 2020 assessment. There was a promise to decrease the TAC in 2022 to end overfishing.

The 2021 meeting is also going to be held as a combination of virtual and correspondence, and the U.S. delegation needs to be much more aggressive. If they continue to, as a whole, just rollover measures, that would turn into a very unsustainable process. I shared some detailed documents, because there is a lot of information, for those that might be interested, and that is one document.

In our May meeting, we reviewed those 2020 outcomes that I just sort of discussed, and then we started to set priorities for 2021. The way that works is there are four working groups, and there

is a bluefin tuna working group, a BAYS working group, which includes bigeye, albacore, and yellowfin tuna, and a billfish working group, as well as a swordfish and sharks.

In those attachments are the priorities for each of those working groups, and I won't go through that, because that would take way too long, but, if you're interested in one particular issue, or one particular species, the details for the summaries from those working groups for the 2021 priorities are listed there.

For the HMS meeting that happened a couple of weeks ago, there was a couple of things that I did want to bring to the attention of the council. Most folks have a state rep that attends as well, and so, for those that don't follow, they discussed a proposed rule to implement restricted fishing days for bluefin tuna, which means that the general category would not be able to possess, retain, land, or sell three days a week, and charter/headboats would only be able to fish recreationally. The intent is to use that as one tool in the toolbox, along with adjusting retention limits as needed, to extend the season and stabilize markets.

This will have a negative effect on tournaments, as those closed days are Tuesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays from July 20 to November 20. They do have the flexibility to waive these, as needed, and the number-one concern was that this announcement for this season occurred very recently, and the charter fleet had already booked their season, and so this is impacting the charter fleet's ability to sort of plan.

There was a lot of discussion on Amendment 13, which is changes to bluefin management in general, and this one does have a comment period that's going to close very soon. There was a lot of angst with this amendment, a lot of dissatisfaction with how some of it shook out, along with some good parts, and there were some concerns with a new proposed method for IBQ allocation for the pelagic longliners. The new method would be based on tiers, and there's concerns that provides the wrong incentive for folks to catch more to get more quota and focus on quantity rather than quality. There were some concerns about a new requirement to measure fish on-deck, which would, of course, allow increased handling of unwanted fish, and would probably lead to a higher discard mortality.

They did put a cap on share ownership of 25 percent in the IBQ program, and there was a lot of discussion on what happened to the quota from the discontinued purse seine. The pelagic longliners fear not being able to lease this quota, and that their inability to lease that quota will have a negative effect. None of that quota was reallocated to the pelagic longliners, and that is going to decrease their ability to catch the U.S. quota of swordfish.

There was a couple positive things. There was some positive feedback on a new trophy subcategory in the north, and they did add some more flexibility in changing your permit category, if you mistakenly got the wrong permit, if you got the wrong permit category.

We did have a presentation on -- They called it a share presentation, which was the shark fishery review, and that was a really interesting presentation, for folks interested in sharks, and I can share more about that with anyone that is interested, but they did go through sort of areas of success and concern for commercial folks, areas of success and concern for the recreational fishery, and they did note the shark depredation issue that we've all talked about, and they did present a map, where they sort of tracked each individual species of shark and what fishery they were interacting with,

and so they are hearing folks, and they don't have a plan on how to fix it, and they discussed some really broad potential ways forward, but they are tracking all of that information.

We did have a swordfish and shark retention limit presentation, and that is rulemaking, and the objective was to sort of provide increased fishing opportunities for sharks and swordfish for fishermen with the swordfish general commercial and HMS charter/headboat and the HMS commercial Caribbean small-boat permits.

Really, finally, we did have a presentation on the shortfin mako and the ninety-day findings, which I'm assuming the person between us and a beer will touch upon, but the mako is overfished, and they are saying that listing may be warranted, and so there was a positive ninety-day finding in April, and they are currently doing the status of review of the species, and I imagine that we will hear a little bit more about that, but we talked about a bunch of other stuff too, but those are primarily the ones that I thought that at least some folks might be interested in, and so I will end there.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, thanks, Anna. Thanks for being our eyes into the world of ICCAT and HMS. While we don't manage these species, a number of our fisheries are kind of intertwined with some of these, and so they are important to a number of people, and so it's worth keeping up with. Any questions for Anna? All right. I don't see any hands.

Anna, thanks for that, and that will take us then to our last agenda item for the day, and Jennifer Lee with the Southeast Regional Office, and she's already provided us an attachment, a detailed report, but we'll turn it over to Jennifer and allow her to basically run through anything she would like at this point related to protected resources stuff, and so, Jennifer, if you're with us.

MS. LEE: Yes. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Okay. Welcome.

MS. LEE: Thank you very much. I hope you're having a good afternoon, and I'm sorry to keep you this last little bit, but it shouldn't be too long. For ESA action related to listing and rulemaking, nothing new really to report on determining critical habitat for threatened corals since your last March meeting, and we're just still working through addressing public comment, working with an economist on our economic analysis to support the rule.

As far as the next one we have, we have an ongoing five-year status review for our recent listed threatened coral species, and I don't think I mentioned this at your March meeting, but, in January, we did announce that we were doing one, and, once complete, that status review would be made available on the five-year review webpage that OPR maintains, once complete, and the hyperlink in the briefing actually is of that page, and so you can find that there, but the comment period on that closed back in March, and so it's projected to be completed by the end of June. Just so you're aware, if there is a change in status recommended, then it would go through a separate rulemaking process with an opportunity for public comment, and so I'm just letting you know that that's going on right now.

We also have a -- We are working on a determination regarding Nassau grouper critical habitat, and so, for that one, we actually entered into a settlement agreement back in December that we

must submit a proposed determination concerning the designation by December 30 of 2022, and so, if NOAA Fisheries determines to propose critical habitat, we would submit, for publication in the Federal Register, a proposed critical habitat rule on that same day, and then, to the extent a proposed rule has been published, a final rule would then follow by December 29 of 2023.

To determine potential critical habitat areas, we are currently reviewing the available data on Nassau grouper, and potential critical habitat areas could include areas of the east coast of Florida, areas around Puerto Rico, and areas around the U.S. Virgin Islands, and so, again, you will have an opportunity to provide comments if critical habitat is proposed, but I just wanted to let you know that that was out there. I had a question about that, and so I wanted to talk about that.

The next two here relate to the shrimp fishery. On March 31, and I'm pretty sure everyone is aware, but we did publish a final rule delaying the effective date of our December 20, 2019 final rule, which was requiring the use of TEDs designed to exclude small sea turtles in the their nets and skimmer trawls forty feet in length and greater in the southeast U.S. shrimp fisheries until August 1, and so you still have a month there, and then I think we had done that just due to safety and travel restrictions due to COVID, and we have been able to complete some of our in-person workshops and training, and so the effective date was delayed to allow additional time for training and making sure that those TEDs are built and installed properly. We do have an ongoing outreach strategy that you're probably also aware of, as well as we've created a special email account to help with that outreach.

Then the last one related to ESA rules is that advanced notice of proposed rulemaking that we published in the Federal Register on April 20, and so what that's about is that, of course, we were soliciting comments on the possibility of modifying the turtle-excluder-device-related requirements for skimmer trawl vessels less than forty feet in length operating in the southeast U.S. shrimp fisheries, and the comment period on that potential action closed on May 20.

Related to Section 7, our biggest ESA news for Section 7 was that we did complete a new shrimp biological opinion, and we did that on April 26, and, since the 2014 opinion, we have developed new bycatch information, and so that was a big deal, to better analyze the effects of the shrimp fisheries on sea turtle populations, and we also had issued a final rule requiring TEDs for a portion of the skimmer trawl fishery, as I mentioned, and we have some new listed species that may be affected.

In the 2021 opinion, we concluded the proposed actions, and so it's looking at the federal shrimp fisheries and our TED regs, may adversely affect, but is not likely to jeopardize its continued existence, is Kemp's ridley, green, loggerhead, leatherback, and hawksbill sea turtles, Atlantic and Gulf sturgeon, giant manta rays, and smalltooth sawfish. The new opinion doesn't rely on that TED compliance as a surrogate metric for sea turtle incidental take, like we did previously, and you talked a lot about, probably, and, instead, we employed available shrimp trawl fishery observer and effort data and a new Bayesian modeling approach from Babcock et al. 2018 to estimate the total effort of shrimp fisheries on sea turtle populations, and we also applied post-interaction mortality for each species, and so some new methods there, and maybe we'll look at that at a later meeting. Then we also determined just that basically all the other species that are in the area are not likely to be adversely affected.

Our dolphin wahoo consultation, still no change on that, but I know your amendment is getting closer, and so we'll be working further, after this meeting, on preparing the draft biological assessment, and then the only other new Section-7-related news, at the time of this update, is the GARFO biological opinion that was relevant to the right whale conservation, and that wasn't out yet, but that did come out. It was released on May 27, and so that's now available, and, on that same date, they released the North Atlantic Right Whale Conservation Framework for Federal Fisheries in the Greater Atlantic Region, and so that is a non-jeopardy opinion worth taking a look at, and it reviews a bunch of their -- I think it's ten different fisheries in GARFO, and I think that's all I will say about that for now, and, if you Google it, it's available, with a nice summary description.

That takes us to Marine Mammal Protection Act actions and news, and so the first here -- I don't really have any new information, as far as the Northeast lobster and crab rule, which is part of the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team rulemaking. At the March meeting, I did share how the comment period for that rule, which was published back on January 15, had closed on March 1, and they had received over 170,000 public comments, and so those are all being, of course, reviewed and prepped for a final rule and associated NEPA, and I think the date is still the same, as far as expecting that rule to be finalized sometime in the summer.

I have a little more information on some of the Rulemaking Number 2, related to Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team, and that rule is focused on trap and pot and gillnet rulemaking, and it will be coastwide. Back in April, the team met in small groups to learn about and suggest improvements to a decision tool. The decision support tool was developed to model estimated risk of various fishing gear in areas where right whales occur, and it's based on Farmer et al. 2016, and so if you remember that from the snapper grouper bi-op, and you heard a fair amount about that publication.

In May, the team met virtually to discuss risk reduction ideas and run through that support tool, and so the Southeast Atlantic black sea bass fishermen are part of that discussion, and they discussed the potential for ropeless exemptions for black sea bass trap and pot fishing in the areas of existing closures, and so, anyway, a second team meeting is taking place in June or early July. In late summer and early fall, there will be scoping meetings, and they're going to try to coordinate with the council on the possibility of conducting one of those scoping meetings concurrent with your September meeting.

Again, you will be kept in the loop and hearing about it, and then in the fall is when the team would meet to discuss the results of those scoping meetings and make some recommendations on new measures, and so we would have probably a proposed rule sometime in 2022 that would address that for this fishery.

Other than that, we have just crept up one additional serious injury since the last report that I gave you in March for the unusual mortality event for the North Atlantic right whales, and the Pelagic Longline Take Reduction Plan proposed rule -- We're in the process of finalizing that, and I expect that by the end of the year, and so that's really only the additional timing information, and there's nothing on the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Plan, and then the last thing to mention is just that we are currently drafting a list of fisheries for 2022, and so, again, we'll keep you informed if we expect any changes, but just kind of a heads-up, and that concludes my report.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Jennifer. That's a good report, and I do appreciate the hyperlinks in your document and all there. For folks that want to dig a little deeper, that's very helpful, and so thanks for doing that. Thanks for providing such a thorough report. Any questions for Jennifer? Don't be shy. We stuck her at the end here, and we appreciate you bringing up the end for us today, and I know it's not a fun place to be sometimes, but you did great.

MS. LEE: No problem. I tried to speak fast, but so that you could still hear the information.

MR. BELL: Dewey is going to ask a question.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. I was wondering, what's the depth of the sea bass pot closure and the dates of it, from when to when and the depth that it occurs? Thank you.

MS. LEE: Dewey, that's a real specific question, and, on that, I don't know offhand, but I am happy to find that out for you and get back to you, and, since I was on the first day, I now have plenty of time.

MR. BELL: There you go. See, there's an advantage to having your question on the first day. If you don't mind, that would be great, if you've got time in the meeting at some point. Any other questions for Jennifer today?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Maybe she could just put it in the chat or something. I was just curious.

MR. BELL: Or email. Okay. Thanks, Dewey.

MS. LEE: Just to make sure I have it clear, you want the depth of the closure? If you want to repeat it just one more time, just to make sure I have it right.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes, the depth of the closure. Like is it forty fathoms seaward or whatever like that, and I'm just trying to figure out when the closure is and what are the dates of it.

MS. LEE: Okay. Thanks.

MR. BELL: Monica, have you got some insight into that, or have you got something that you wanted to add?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I was going to tell Jenny that I will be happy to look that up in the regs. I know where it is, and so, yes, I will -- Dewey, I will get that to you and to all council members.

MR. BELL: Great. Thanks, Monica. Anything else for Jennifer this afternoon? Okay. Seeing none, then is there any other business to come before the council this afternoon? I don't see any hands. Good. Then we will recess and pick it up tomorrow morning in Snapper Grouper, and so eat a good breakfast. We're going have a full day of Snapper Grouper, and Jessica will work you hard, and so everybody get some rest tonight, and thank you for today. Good job. We got through everything, and so thanks a lot, and we'll see you tomorrow.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 14, 2021.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
August 9, 2021

Attendee Report: SAFMC June Council Meeting (6/14/21 - 6/18/21)

Report Generated:

06/16/2021 07:50 AM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration
811-235-419	06/14/2021 01:00 PM EDT	4 hours 43 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	BROUWER	MYRA
Yes	BYRD	01JULIA
Yes	Beckwith	00Anna
Yes	Belcher	00Carolyn
Yes	Bell	00Mel
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Brame	Richen
Yes	Brown	Julie
Yes	Bubley	Walter
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Carmichael	01 John
Yes	Carr	Matthew
Yes	Carrodeguas	David
Yes	Chaya	01Cindy
Yes	Cheuvront	Brian
Yes	Christiansen	00kyle
Yes	Clarke	Lora
Yes	Collier	01Chip
Yes	Conklin	00 THE REAL Chris
Yes	Copeland	00 Bobby
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	DiLernia	00Anthony
Yes	Donaldson	Mary
Yes	Foor	Brandon
Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Glasgow	Dawn
Yes	Godwin	Joelle
Yes	Guyas	Martha
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Hart	Hannah

Yes	Hawes	Rachel
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Hemilright	00 Dewey
Yes	Hoke	David
Yes	Horton	Chris
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Hudson	Rusty
Yes	Hull	James
Yes	Iberle	01Allie
Yes	Iverson	01 Kim
Yes	Jacoski	Greg
Yes	Jepson	Michael
Yes	Karnauskas	Mandy
Yes	Kellison	Todd
Yes	Klibansky	Lara
Yes	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	Krikstan	Catherine
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Lee	Jennifer
Yes	Lewis	Savannah
Yes	Lowther	Alan
Yes	Lyons Gromen	Pam
Yes	Mahoney	Andrew
Yes	Marhefka	00Kerry
Yes	Masi	Michelle
Yes	McCawley	00-Jessica
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	McPherson	Matthew
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Meyer	Robert
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Nix	Sara
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	OLeary	Joan
Yes	Petersen	Andrew
Yes	Porch	00Clay
Yes	Prewitt	Brian
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Pulver	Jeff
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Ramsay	Chloe
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Reynolds	Jon
Yes	Rhodes	01Cameron
Yes	Sabo	Mary

Yes	Sanchez	Joseph
Yes	Sanchez	John
Yes	Sapp	00Art
Yes	Schmidtke	01Michael
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Smart	Tracey
Yes	Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Yes	Smith	Duane
Yes	Spanik	Kevin
Yes	Stemle	Adam
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Strelcheck	00-Andy
Yes	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	Travis	Michael
Yes	Turley	Brendan
Yes	WHITE	GEOFF
Yes	Walia	Matt
Yes	Wiegand	01Christina
Yes	Woodward	00 Spud
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	crosson	scott
Yes	emery	jeff
Yes	fabbri	jeffrey
Yes	gloeckner	david
Yes	griner	tim
Yes	moss	david
Yes	poland	00steve
Yes	sminkey	thomas
Yes	thomas	01suz