

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **FULL COUNCIL SESSION II**

### **Webinar**

**June 18, 2021**

### **TRANSCRIPT**

#### **Council Members**

Mel Bell, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chester Brewer  
Chris Conklin  
Tim Griner  
Jessica McCawley  
Andy Strelcheck

Steve 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  
Suzanna Thomas

Julia Byrd  
Cindy Chaya  
John Hadley  
Allie Iberle  
Kelly Klasnick  
Roger Pugliese  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
Christina Wiegand

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

Rick DeVactor  
Shep Grimes  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy  
Monica Smit-Brunello

Tony DiLernia  
Dewey Hemilright  
Dr. Genny Nesslage  
Dr. Clay Porch

Other attendees and participants attached.

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Friday, June 18, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: While folks are still coming onboard, let's go ahead and kind of get things rolling, and so good morning. I will call the Full Council to order this morning, and this will be Council Session II. The first order of business for us will be to approve the agenda, normally, but I'm going to make a modification to the agenda, as I mentioned, and so any problems with the agenda?

DR. COLLIER: If you could hold on one second.

MR. BELL: Because you can't do both features. I've got you. Sorry.

DR. COLLIER: So you wanted the agenda for the Executive Committee, correct?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Chip, I've got it up. I can display it. Let me grab the presenter.

MR. BELL: This is some of the joys of doing this virtually and not being in the room with each other. That's the agenda for the last remaining part of the Executive Committee, but what we do need to do is approve the minutes from the previous Executive Committee meeting in March, and so are there any changes or modifications to the Executive Committee minutes from March? Chester.

MR. BREWER: Fat finger. Sorry.

MR. BELL: So that's a false alarm there?

MR. BREWER: Yes, sir.

MR. BELL: Okay. All right. Any objection to approving the Executive Committee meeting minutes from March 2021? I don't see any hands, and so the Executive Committee meeting minutes from March 2021 are approved. Okay. John, do you want to just go ahead, and we'll roll through the workplan, and we'll do that while you've got that up under Executive?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, we'll do that, Mel, and John Hadley and I are going to be handling this, and, John, since I'm already presenting, I will just display this.

MR. BELL: All right, and so we spend a good bit of time on this.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, we do, and so this is the version that was sent around this morning, and it's updated from what you had in your briefing book, and so this is the June meeting revised version of the workplan, looking ahead, and what we have done is address some of the events that came up this week, and so I will highlight here CMP 34, the king mackerel response, and we didn't approve it for public hearing at this meeting, and so that struck out there and moved to the September meeting, and that then, obviously slides the subsequent events out a bit further, and so that's the primary change, based on things that have happened this week.

Then the other issue that's been discussed here, that we knew that we had to take on, was what do we do down here in the bottom, in this light blueish-gray area, with new projects and the potential

dolphin framework. If you recall, back in December, we had these potential new projects that were penciled in, and we knew, at the time, that we needed to make progress on all of the other things that were already on the books for 2021.

As a result of some circumstances that have delayed some projects, dolphin wahoo being one that got pushed back a bit farther than we had hoped for final approval, and, as we said, king mackerel now, and then this coral amendment as well is one that we had hoped to approve earlier in the year, and what we've done is we've been forced to gradually shift these different items further to the right and delay their start.

Back in either December or March, there was discussion of the dolphin longline issue and the commercial electronic logbooks being potential top priorities of new projects, and then we got into the idea of the dolphin wahoo framework, focused on some rec issues, and so we had penciled that in, and that was a priority of the council in March, and we talked about the plan in June, as we did here, and, if we're going to pursue those, potentially, you see the workplan bringing back some more information in September, potentially scoping, et cetera, in December and pushing this on through.

However, if you look at the workload that we have now, and you look at the situation with red snapper, which is here in 6 and 7, what we've done is split out the red snapper response into the short-term and long-term, versus, before, if you will recall, in your earlier version, there was just one red snapper line, and so, based on the discussions in Snapper Grouper and how we want to approach red snapper, that has created an extra project up there.

The reality of all of these changes is that the workload is looking excessive as we move into the latter part of this year, and a couple of things to highlight. You know, we tally your workload based on just the total amount of time that we expect the various discussions to take, and so, if you recall, we treat the oranges as a full unit, and that's -- Figure that's a four-hour discussion, and that's a full morning or afternoon session, and the yellows are half, and you could do two yellow discussions, perhaps, in a morning or afternoon discussion.

We try to keep the total of all of this to eight, and eight-and-a-half is usually pretty good, and these times are very coarse and approximate, and so, anyway, we go anywhere from seven to eight-and-a-half on these different total workload schedules in a meeting, and that seems to do okay, and so, for example, you figure that, this meeting, our workload was estimated to be at 7.5, and everyone is well aware of the discussion and the time that everything took, and so I think we know that keeping it below 8.5 is probably the most optimistic scenario. If you get any more than that, then it's very likely that you're just not going to have time to get through the items.

The other tally, and this is a bit of a new one here, and this is 26, Line 26, is the number of items to discuss per meeting, and so, if you think back, before we started taking a little closer look and accounting for time, we used to just try to tally up the number of items per meeting, and I think we tried to keep that at eight, if I recall. We are looking at potentially moving into eleven or fourteen individual FMP items at these meetings, getting into September and December and then March of 2022.

The concern here, obviously, is that that's a lot of directions for the council to direct its attention, and it can be hard for you to prepare and hard for you to keep track of all this, and it's, obviously,

very difficult for staff to prepare more items than this, and so the bottom line of what I'm saying is, as you see, we're not too bad on the overall workload in September, but we do have quite a few items that are going to potentially come to you, but, when we get into December and March and June, we have both an overload in terms of items and in terms of the time that we expect these discussions to take.

The reality of that is, here in this blue box that says we need to delay, we are going to need to delay consideration of these four items here, potentially, to manage the workload. The other option, of course, is you can delay some of the projects that are above them, perhaps skip a meeting of discussion of a topic here and there, if that's possible. To help you in that decision, we highlighted, in the very light red color, the things that are under statutory deadlines, where we need to get those done by the time you see these "A", to meet the requirement to get regulations in place to address overfished circumstances within a two-year period.

We have quite a few things here, and we have some flexibility, but I think we do need to talk about what do we do as far as new things, and how do we fit that in within the obligations that we have already committed to, and so I think I'll open it up now for discussion, and I see that Steve has his hand up. Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: Let me make something clear, and I apologize for the back-and-forth, and so we're technically in Full Council now. If we were in Executive Committee, it would just be five of us, and so we want to just touch this once, because we've only got time to touch this once, and so anybody can, obviously, participate, from the council, in this discussion, and then, if we have to vote on things, then we'll have it, and we'll touch it once. All right. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Thank you for that clarification, and so, to that, just real quick, I wanted to make sure, under Other Business, we took care of that EFP discussion that we pushed off from the Mackerel Committee.

MR. BELL: Right. I remember that.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thanks. As far as the workplan, John, I know we've done it in the previous year, having a short kind of topics-focused council meeting in between our quarterly council meetings, and could you give any perspective on which work items here we might could gain a little bit of time if we did say a one-day meeting in August or something like that? I mean, I know that's a lot to ask of staff, and I certainly don't want to ask staff to work double-time to get something quicker, but, if there's anything that is close enough that maybe we could schedule a short special meeting to just go ahead and move the issue a little bit further in the timeline, and I would be open to that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Steve, that's a good point. We have done those, and I think they've been well received. One thought is, if you look ahead now to December, we have planned discussions on the different recreational working groups, and I think that is a topic that could lend itself well to a half-day special topics meeting, perhaps between the September and December meetings, or maybe even in early to mid-January, to get that issue off the table for the December meeting, and that will help the workload bottom line, and so that's definitely one that I thought had some real potential.

As far as the FMP items that are scheduled here, looking into September and December, I'm not sure. We did talk about a potential extra red snapper meeting being held maybe between September and December. One challenge there is we have so many AP and SSC meetings and other things already scheduled in October that it can get really hard to schedule something else, because November gets early, and then you have Thanksgiving and different holidays creep in, and then you have getting anything for a briefing book deadline, and so, just logistically, that will be tough, but I want to see if -- John or Myra, have you guys -- Based on a little deeper knowledge on where these different projects come, do you see any of these in September or December that might lend themselves well to say a half-day special council meeting, to reduce some of that overall FMP burden?

MR. HADLEY: You know, I'll have to give that a little bit of thought. I think what you pointed out, kind of in the Other Activities column, might be a good place to look, as far as potential other meetings that we can have outside of the typical council schedule, but, as far as the FMP workload, I might need to give that a little bit more thought and maybe circle around back to it.

MS. BROUWER: I agree with John Hadley. I think we'll have to chew on this a little bit more. I was thinking one of the things that the council may want to spend maybe a little bit of time on that could save time during the meeting is on the habitat blueprint, and that might be something that we could extract and put on its own some other time.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think that's good suggestion, Myra, and another that I'm looking at here, perhaps just kind of thinking about what Steve posed, is potentially the ABC Control Rule. That's a bit of a specialized topic that may lend itself to a special meeting, and another area with a little flexibility, is you'll notice, on the CMP actions with the Gulf, there's double entries with question-marks.

We have a little leeway there, in terms of what the timing is, and we're not sure, necessarily, how those documents play out, and so we will gain a little bit there, and so perhaps a rec meeting, considering the habitat blueprint, and maybe the ABC Control Rule, pulling a few of those out, if we can stomach more half-day special-topic council meetings, and I'm really thinking here from August through really January, to spread this workload out, and it may help us get to a better balance.

MR. POLAND: Chairman Bell, can I follow-up, real quick?

MR. BELL: Sure.

MR. POLAND: Thanks, John and staff, for that. Since you had mentioned the Section 102 Joint Workgroup, I will say that I would love if we were done in time to maybe provide our report before the December meeting, but that's not looking likely. At our last workgroup meeting, there was a lot of interest expressed in meeting in-person to review all the information we've discussed and finalize our recommendations, and there was even talk about potentially doing that in conjunction with either a Gulf Council meeting or South Atlantic Council meeting, and so, basically, try to come in a Sunday and take care of that the day before the council meeting, and there was some interest expressed for the December meeting, and so that's -- I'm fine with doing that in a special meeting, but it would probably have to be after the December 2021 meeting before we had anything ready to present to the council.

MR. BELL: That's a good point, Steve, and I was trying to remember the schedule we were on for that, but I think we would have to -- It might not be ready to go when we were thinking, and so, yes, we'll have to look at that. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, Mel. Just a thought, and that is it seems that any FMP-related action that involves allocation is taking a lot of time, and maybe that's not going to always be the case, but perhaps, as we move into the future and plan, and we're looking at these color codes of things, we might need to give ourselves more than four hours to be able to have the kind of discussions that we need. I mean, these allocation discussions are difficult, and they're time consuming, and being time squeezed is the last thing we need to add to something that's already difficult, and so that's just a thought.

Also, just to follow-up on what Steve was talking about, in the Atlantic States Commission, we're looking at sort of similar approach to best use our in-person meeting time, by doing some more routine housekeeping informational-type things in a virtual setting, and then using our in-person meeting times, at our quarterly meetings, to deal with more complicated and complex, or potentially contentious issues, like allocation, and so I certainly am supportive of that.

MR. BELL: That's a good point, Spud, just so folks realize we're not the only ones struggling with balancing massive workloads, and the commission is kind of relying on that, and maybe they're a little more nimble, in terms of being able to do that, but it certainly is an option. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel, and so two things. One, don't we normally have a separate webinar budget meeting in October? I can't remember what the details -- I get confused every year about this separate budget meeting webinar, and so that's one thing.

The other thing that I had was -- So Anna brought up a good point, when we were talking about that coral amendment, that there are really only, I think, three people here, Mel, you and me and Anna, that were on the council when these discussions occurred. Anna is term-limited out, and I'm wondering if we could have a half-day webinar to finalize that coral amendment, and that's just an idea, to try to finalize that before Anna leaves. Otherwise, there's only you and me left, since it's been seven years, but that's just a thought.

MR. BELL: Right, and it's a one-topic thing, and you're right, and, if we're depending upon my memory, we're really in trouble.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mel, to Jessica's first question, yes, we do have a webinar budget meeting, usually in October, of the Executive Committee, and so we go over the budget and prep it to present it to the Full Council in December, and so, yes, that's another meeting that falls into that very busy October window.

MR. BELL: All right. Spud and Jessica, I assume your hands are just still up from the last time?

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, that's correct. I am taking my hand down.

MR. BELL: Okay. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel. I really like the approach the South Atlantic takes with regard to managing your workload, and, unfortunately, I'm not seeing a lot of things that can be modified, or that we can slide, and I do appreciate the consideration for the red snapper assessment response. I did want to note that I guess the South Atlantic Council got recommendations for unassessed ACLs and ABCs quite some time ago, and that's way down at the bottom of the list, and I'm not sure at what point those kind of become out-of-date, and that's something else I guess we need to keep in mind, in terms of making adjustments.

The other one I guess I'm struggling with, and I'm a huge proponent of improving our data collection systems and electronic monitoring, but the wreckfish ITQ system, relative to all of our other kind of mandated activities, to me seems like a very low priority, and it's a small fishery, and I recognize that we have a very antiquated system that we're operating within, and I was wondering if we should be shifting that to a lower priority at this point, and I know it's been delayed for quite some time, but we've got a whole slug of, obviously, mandated priorities that we need to be working toward, and that might be an area where we could save a little time.

MR. BELL: Yes, that's a good point, Andy. If you kind of look at this thing based on what are the ones that have more of a time-sensitive nature to them, you're right that the wreckfish has been going on for a while, and we mentioned it this morning, and the thing with Coral 10 -- That issue has been going on for a while, but it's, unfortunately, just the amount of things we're trying to juggle at one time, but I think being sensitive to things that have a short time, or a fuse, on them, we definitely have to prioritize those. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Two quick questions. In the blue-gray-shaded area under dolphin wahoo frameworks, the new 2022-2, what is that action? Then, right under that, the scamp response, is that just the response to the anticipated assessment, or is that something different?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Steve, thanks for that. Yes, the 2022-2 is a placeholder for workload purposes, but the council hasn't identified a topic to put into that slot, as you suggested, and then the scamp response is similar, and it is a placeholder for an assessment that we anticipate to be receiving, the assessment report, in December of 2022, and so that's another placeholder for something that we know is going to come at us, and there's a few others of those indicated down here below. When we take an even longer look, where we know the black sea bass assessment, vermilion, red grouper, mutton, and so, the things that are on the SEDAR schedule and we know are coming, we try to keep them on here, in some way, so we don't lose track of them, and we do look ahead, because we know, when that workload hits us, a lot of times, it can be something that we simply have to deal with.

MR. BELL: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, and I wanted to follow-up on a couple of other points, and I think it was Steve that mentioned, or maybe someone else, about kind of -- Maybe it was Spud, about focusing on topics during meetings, and maybe some of the routine presentations or things that aren't necessarily as decision oriented could be handled in a different manner, and I'm certainly supportive of that, and I think, if we need to carve out more time for discussion and decision-making during a council meeting, we should look toward what items we could maybe set aside and be done outside of the meeting framework.

The other note I will make is that I'm supportive of additional meetings being added to the schedule, but in a very kind of targeted manner, and John kind of alluded to the fact that the schedule is already getting very busy, with AP meetings and other activities.

With my team, we have two other councils that we're working with, as well as all of the implementation of regulatory actions, and so I think, if we target meetings, like Jessica was suggesting, where we have a specific action that we want to kind of work on and take action on and move off the plate, that that might be ideal, and I would be cautionary to kind of add too much, in terms of an additional meeting, because that just means a lot of additional work and staff time that has to go into meeting the requirements of that meeting, in addition to everything else that's going on.

MR. BELL: Right, and that's a very good point, and it seems so simple to say, well, let's just have a meeting, but then you have to realize what all goes into that, in preparation and demand on staff, and our staff and your staff, and it's not an easy thing. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel, and so I'm looking through the spreadsheet right now, and I'm trying to keep in perspective how this week progressed, and I'm at the very bottom, on Line 40, workload total, and John had mentioned that about eight-and-a-half is pretty much max, and that's kind of where we were at this week, and I'm looking forward to December, and we're at eleven, and so things we've already suggested, as far as pushing the joint workgroup and the data workgroup reports, or presentations, to a special meeting, and potentially the habitat blueprint to a special meeting, and that drops us down to ten.

Then, looking up towards the top, I don't see a lot of issues, or items, up there that we could really move around, and maybe the Gulf king mackerel action, CMP 33, but I don't know how time sensitive that is to the Gulf, and the same thing with the CMP 32, but we've worked on that quite a bit, and I don't know how much longer approval will take, but I guess my point is that I don't know -- Unless we push some higher-priority items off, I don't know how we're going to get down to that magic goal of eight or eight-and-a-half for December, even looking forward to March or June, and so I guess my question is, as far as all these items that have statutory deadlines, and I believe you've got that noted in some of these other things, and I don't know, and I guess we'll just have to make some hard decisions about delaying some stuff.

MR. BELL: Yes, it's going to come down to that, but I'm wondering -- I'm, honestly, a little intimidated by the amount of red I'm seeing on the board here, and I don't get the sense this is something we can easily resolve right now, and we know we need to move things, and we know we need to prioritize, and we know, in the process of doing that, as soon as you start touching things, it moves other things around, and, again, whatever we end up with is not just the workload for the council and council staff, but it also involves other folks, and so what I'm wondering right now is -- I have also heard staff say that they have to think about some things a little bit, and is this something where what we focus on right now is -- I mean, if there's anything clear to folks that we can document that they see that they want to point out, then great, and we can capture that, but we probably need to come back. I mean, I don't see us turning this into a green board right now, unless I'm just being overly pessimistic. John, does that make sense?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, Mel, that makes sense, and it does sort of sum up, I think, the approach that we believe should be taken. What we try to do, during each of these looks, is try to at least

get the next meeting to a manageable workload and keep the council thinking about what's piling on for the future, and so I think our first priority should be to make sure that September looks like it's manageable, and I would say, at 8.5 and eleven, it's manageable overall, but we will be putting a burden on you guys for preparing for a lot of different topics, but I think, overall, September is not too bad.

As we look ahead, yes, it gets to be more, but we've heard some things here today that will certainly help us balance out the December workload, and perhaps into March. Definitely separating out the recreational workgroup reports into a special topics half-day council meeting, and doing the blueprint the same way, and that will help. As Steve laid out, if you do that, and you deal with habitat, you're down to about nine or nine-and-a-half for December, and so then that makes me look at the CMP items.

If the CMP items would become a March issue, then I think we're definitely getting very manageable for December. If the CMP items need to be addressed in December, then we either delay discussion of one of the other topics in our priorities, like maybe wreckfish, as Andy indicated, or maybe we pull the ABC Control Rule out as a one-topic meeting, or we just consider some other changes that we can do once we know when that happens, and maybe the CMP becomes its own special topic meeting.

I think there's some options there that we're probably close enough, in December, with this guidance, and then in March it gets tougher, obviously, as we see the rest of the year, and normally what we would do is say, in December, we'll take a bit of a longer look, and we'll extend this out to 2022 to 2023, and then I think our goal then, in December, would try to be to make sure we can balance out March and June and September of 2022 to a pretty reasonable workload.

That's one reason why we talked about these objects in blue, because, while we can start something for September, as you can see, it gets a lot tougher to continue to do that work later in the year, because we do have some other things that are coming on, and some of the other documents that are just getting started are going to take more discussion.

I think, as Spud aptly pointed out, allocations are going to take a lot of time, and that's leading us to both more time for discussions as well as some extra meetings on some of these amendments that we feel like we could probably otherwise get done a little bit more efficiently, but, with the allocation discussions, that adds a lot to it, and so we do have to take a lot of caution in making commitments to start things now that our workload may not allow us to follow through, and so I think the council really does need to, as a final step, focus on these things and what you really want to do.

One item in there that I will add, while I've got it, is the commercial logbooks, and there was some question about whether or not this can just be done based on previous actions the council has taken or if there's an amendment required, and so, while you did provide a provision under snapper grouper for allowing folks to be selected for electronic logbooks, as well as video monitoring, you didn't do it for all the FMPs, and one big difference there is there is language about there about "if selected", and so that's a little bit different than what you've done, for example, on for-hire, where you removed the "if selected" language, and you said everyone with a permit needs to file these logbooks, and needs to file these logbooks electronically, and so, after consultation with Monica and GC there, the recommendation she's given us is it would be really be best to just do another

comprehensive amendment for that. Then you can include Snapper Grouper and the other FMPs where you want to do it, to ensure consistency and make you have one language way of putting the logbooks in.

The good part of that is, that ideally, it can be a one-action amendment, essentially, if you're not going to change other parts of the logbook program, but things do have a tendency to become more complicated as we get into them.

MR. BELL: Yes, and I think, after Monica's input, obviously, we need to move on that, or that otherwise just becomes a roadblock to moving forward on the commercial logbooks, and so that's a necessity, if we really want commercial logbooks, which we've invested a lot of effort in to move forward, and so I agree there. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel, and I really appreciate John's comments. John, in thinking through this, I think it would be beneficial to, like we always do, get our teams together and talk through this in more detail. A couple of things that are kind of coming to mind is I got a suggestion with wreckfish, and there's no statutory deadline, and maybe, to kind of make forward progress, we could do an every-other-meeting model, so it's not coming before the council every meeting, but we're moving it forward in a slightly slower fashion.

The other, and I don't know if this saves us really any time, but we have three assessment response actions for snowy, gag, and golden tilefish, and is there opportunities to combine two or more of those into a single document, and will there be some efficiencies gained by doing that, and it still means that we're going to have a lengthy discussion, in terms of the assessment response, at council meetings, but, rather than reviewing potentially three documents, we're reviewing less documents at each meeting, and so that's just a few suggestions to consider.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Andy. We definitely need to work together on all of this. All right. Any other specific input on this right now? John, do you feel like you have enough to kind of begin kind of -- You and staff, Andy, on kind of working on this some, or thinking it through?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I feel like we do, and we've had a good discussion here today, and, like I said, I think we've got September to a reasonably manageable approach, and I think we definitely should consider Andy's suggestion there about whether or not there's any efficiencies gained by combining some of those documents, and so I think that would be good.

Then, I guess, earlier, I wanted to say that Andy raised another good question about the unassessed stocks and if they're potentially going out-of-date. As I recall, those are largely based on historic landings periods, and so, unless the data changes, those ACLs and ABCs don't really change. If we got some new analyses or something, then, of course, they would, but that would automatically elevate them up on this list, I presume, and so those are okay.

They're not going to have a real strong expiration date, because they really just update based on that revised MRIP data way back in time, and so we're a little better there, and I don't think that's something that we need to feel like we've got to squeeze in here, but I do think, as we look forward to getting past this current logjam that we see, all these "A" that are out here on the right are very positive, I really would like to see that unassessed ACLs pop up in here in the priority, in late 2022,

perhaps. I will say, Myra or John, any other thoughts on there, or any more guidance you feel like we need for the September meeting?

MS. BROUWER: I can't think of anything at the moment.

MR. HADLEY: Same here. I think we should be all set for September.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, guys. So, yes, Mel, I think we have what we need to get to our next marker in time, and we look forward to more of these discussions, as we continue to balance our capabilities.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, John, and thanks, everybody. As you can see, the amount of red that popped up, we've definitely got a full plate, and I don't know if we're cramming ten pounds of potatoes in a five-pound sack, but that's what it feels like sometimes. Okay. Now we will -- We've got that taken care of, and I have a question about -- We're obviously a little behind, and we want to make sure, while we have everybody, of anything that needs votes, and we want to make sure we've got that done.

Remember, when we get to committee reports, there can be votes and things going on there, motions and all, and so I am asking this question, since I can't talk to you face-to-face, and are the committee reports at a state where we could push those up in the schedule here, or are they still being worked on? Where do we stand on that, or do you have a feel for that, John?

MS. BROUWER: Mel, Dolphin Wahoo is ready to go.

MR. BELL: Okay.

MS. BROUWER: We have all the committee reports except for, obviously, Executive, and Habitat is still being worked on, but everything else, Mel, is ready.

MS. BELL: Okay. So, if we were to go ahead and jiggle the schedule here and start the committee reports, to make sure we get those done, that wouldn't create a big problem for anybody, would it?

MS. BROUWER: I am ready to get that going, like I said, except for those last two. If you want to do that, I can do that.

MR. BELL: Okay. All right. Well, why don't we do that? I am sensitive to not pushing too long, and so, if we could go ahead and take five, maybe, to reset, and then we could start the committee reports, and so that would be --

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mel, that's a good plan, and I would also point out Topic 6, the Executive Order 14008 Presentation, and we will not be receiving that today, because of the creation of the Juneteenth holiday yesterday that has been applied to federal employees for today, and so they're not going to be able to make that presentation, and we'll look at doing that at a later meeting, or perhaps we have another one of our special topic items to talk about Executive Order 14008, as we learn more, and so that should gain us a little time, and I think going into the vote things, and

then, Mel, also the EFP, and so we may want to do the committee reports and the EFP discussion and then give our general updates.

MR. BELL: As long as -- I mean, Tony will be us for a little while, and Chester will be with us, and so we can do that, hopefully, at the normal time. Okay. Good.

MR. DILERNIA: I will be here for your whole meeting, until you end, and so call on me anytime you want, Mel.

MR. BELL: I appreciate it, Tony. Okay. Take five, and we'll be right back.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: What we're going to do is committee reports, and first up would be Law Enforcement, and so, Spud, if you're ready.

MR. WOODWARD: I am ready, Mr. Chairman. The Law Enforcement Committee met in closed session via webinar on June 14, 2021. The committee approved minutes from the March 2021 meeting and approved the agenda for this meeting.

The committee operated as a committee of the whole to review nominations for the 2020 Law Enforcement of the Year Award. Nominees are submitted by agency representatives on the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. Four nominees were received for the 2020 award. Voting was conducted using the polling function on the webinar platform. Preliminary results were shared with closed session attendees, and staff later audited the poll to ensure voting had proceeded properly. The award will be presented during the September 2021 council meeting. The results of the poll was that United States Coast Guard Lieutenant James Bruce was identified to receive the 2020 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award, and I would request that someone be willing to make that motion and second it, so that it can be considered by the council.

MR. POLAND: Do I need to read the motion?

MR. WOODWARD: Yes. We need someone to read the motion into the record and that it be seconded, and then it can be considered.

MR. POLAND: **I move to select United States Coast Guard Lieutenant James Bruce to receive the 2020 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MR. WOODWARD: We have a second from Jessica, and so we have a motion and a second. Any discussion of the motion? **Any opposition to the motion? Signify by raising your hand. Seeing no opposition, the motion carries.** There were no items discussed under Other Business, and so, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. BELL: Great. Thanks, Spud, and congratulations to Lieutenant Bruce. All right. That moves us to the next report, which would be Snapper Grouper.

MS. BROUWER: Actually, Mel, I'm sorry. I meant to mention this before, but I pieced this all together in the order that things went.

MR. BELL: That's fine. We'll do this. We're good. You've got it up there, and so I believe that Chester is going to help us with this.

MR. BREWER: I have been volunteered.

MR. BELL: You're volun-told. Thank you, Chester.

MR. BREWER: Yes. Anyway, the AP Committee, meeting as a committee of the whole, in other words the Full Council, met in closed session on Monday, June 14, 2021, to review applications for the open season on advisory panels and applicants for the council's Scientific and Statistical Committee.

Seats on the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management, Law Enforcement, Mackerel Cobia, and the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panels were considered. Open seats on the SSC were also reviewed and applicants considered. The council provided the following recommendations during Council Session I for consideration during Council Session II, which is the open session. The following recommendations were made.

With regard to the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management AP, that we appoint Sam Young of Florida to the Habitat Advisory Panel. Do I say this on behalf of the committee I so move, or do I need to get somebody else to make the motion?

MR. BELL: I am trying to think.

MR. CARMICHAEL: These are recommendations, and they weren't made as motions, and there's no committee, and so what we need is someone to make the motion and second it. We shouldn't be saying on behalf of the committee, I so move.

MR. BELL: Right. Exactly.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Well, old habits die hard, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That may be.

MR. BREWER: So, would anybody care to make that motion, on behalf of the council?

MR. POLAND: Yes, I can make that motion. **I move to appoint Sam Young to Habitat Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Steve. Would anybody care to second that motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MR. BREWER: Thank you. I think that was Jessica. Anyway, is there any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to this motion?** Steve.

MR. POLAND: I never lowered my hand. Sorry.

MR. BREWER: That's all right. **Anyway, I don't see any objections, and so that motion stands approved.** Next, reappoint Thomas Jones of Georgia to the Habitat Advisory Panel for a one-year term. You all might remember that he has termed out, and so we were going to put him on for an additional year, to give the Georgia folks a chance to go out and beat the bushes. Would anybody care to make that motion?

MR. POLAND: **I move to reappoint Thomas Jones to the Habitat Advisory Panel for a one-year term.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Mr. Woodward, I assume you were going to second it?

MR. WOODWARD: That is correct.

MR. BREWER: All right. So, is there any discussion on this now motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** Next, appoint David Whitaker to the Habitat Advisory Panel. Would anybody care to make that motion on behalf of the council?

MR. POLAND: **Chester, I move to appoint David Whitaker to the Habitat Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Can I get a second?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Jessica. Is there any discussion with regard to this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, this motion stands approved.** Next, appoint Kevin Spanik to the Habitat Advisory Panel. Would anybody care to make that motion?

MR. POLAND: **Chester, I move to appoint Kevin Spanik to the Habitat Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Can we get a second?

MR. WOODWARD: Second.

MR. BREWER: Thanks, Spud. Any discussion on that motion? **Seeing no hands, is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** Next, reappoint Dr. Steve Ross to the Habitat Advisory Panel. Would anybody care to make that motion? Steve.

MR. POLAND: **Chester, I move to reappoint Dr. Steve Ross to the Habitat Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Could I get a second?

MS. BECKWITH: Second.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Anna. Is there any discussion on that motion? **Seeing no hands raised, is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, reappoint Kevin Roberson to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. Steve.

MR. POLAND: **Chester, I move to reappoint Kevin Roberson to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Would anybody care to second?

MS. BECKWITH: Second.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Anna. Is there any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, appoint Alana Harrison to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. That's for the commercial seat. Steve, would you care to make that motion?

MR. POLAND: Yes, sir. **I move to appoint Alana Harrison to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Would anyone care to second?

MS. BECKWITH: Second.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Anna. Any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, we will move to the Mackerel Cobia AP. The first recommendation is that we reappoint Ira Laks, Keith Bowen, and Steve English to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. Steve, would you care to make that as a motion?

MR. POLAND: **I move to reappoint Ira Laks, Keith Bowen, and Steve English to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Would anyone care to -- Anna, are you seconding? Thank you very much. Any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, appoint Charles Griffin to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. Steve, would you care to make that motion?

MR. POLAND: **Move to appoint Charles Griffin to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you. Anna, I'm assuming that you are seconding, and so is there any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, this motion stands approved.** Next, appoint Anthony Beneveto to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel. Steve, have you got your hand raised to make this motion?

MR. POLAND: Yes, sir. **I move to appoint Anthony Beneveto to the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Anna, would you care to second?

MS. BECKWITH: Always.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Is there any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, on the Snapper Grouper AP, reappoint Robert Lorenz and James Paskiewicz to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. Steve, would you care to make that motion?

MR. POLAND: **I move to reappoint Robert Lorenz and James Paskiewicz to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Anna, do you care to second?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Is there any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, we did the SSC appointments, and the first recommendation is that we reappoint Dr. Yan Li to the North Carolina seat on the SSC. Steve, would you care to make that motion?

MR. POLAND: **I move to reappoint Dr. Yan Li to the North Carolina seat on the SSC.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. Second.

MR. BREWER: This is a little cumbersome, isn't it? Is there any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** The next recommendation was to appoint Dr. Jennifer Sweeney-Tookes to the social science seat on the SSC. Steve.

MR. POLAND: **Move to appoint Dr. Jennifer Sweeney-Tookes to the social scientist seat on the SSC.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you, sir. Anna, I'm assuming that's a second.

MS. BECKWITH: Please.

MR. BREWER: Is there any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** The next recommendation was to reappoint Dr. Chris Dumas to the socioeconomic seat on the SSC. Steve.

MR. POLAND: **I move to reappoint Dr. Chris Dumas to the socioeconomic seat on the SSC.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Is there any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** The next recommendation was to reappoint Dr. Fred Serchuk and Dr. Alexei Sharov to the SSC. Steve.

MR. POLAND: **I move to reappoint Dr. Fred Serchuk and Dr. Alexei Sharov to the SSC.**

MR. BREWER: Thank you. Anna, is that a second?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Thank you. Any discussion on this motion? **Seeing none, is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

I'm assuming, on this direction to staff, I will just read it, that we re-advertise the open seat on the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel for consideration by the council during their December 2021 meeting, and I'm assuming that's that Georgia seat, or that has been held by somebody from Georgia, and is that right, Kim? Oh, well. I'm pretty sure that's right. With that, I think we can close out the portion of the council meeting dealing with APs and the SSC. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Chester, and thank you to our motion makers and seconders. It's a necessary and important task, but we needed to do that. Thank you. Okay. Myra, what are we rolling into now? This is just the open session, and I would read this, I assume?

MS. BROUWER: Sure, and you don't have to read all of it, and I think the action item here, besides the reports that were given during the open session, is the approval of the research priorities.

MR. BELL: Let's scroll down to that. You were all there, and so you remember all of this, and it's all covered here in the report, and so we had one -- This is an actual draft motion from ourselves to ourselves, because this was council open session, and so we're making this motion to --

MS. BROUWER: I think Chip might want to walk you through the changes, and I know he mailed a final draft.

MR. BELL: Go ahead, Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Just to clearly state what the changes were, the first item that Myra has listed up there is evaluate the estimation of the stock-recruit relationship, and that was discussed on Monday, and I just wanted to make sure that it was clearly laid out and put in the report that it was added. The second item came from Council Member Marhefka, indicating to conduct an economic analysis on the capacity of the commercial snapper grouper fishery, and then the third item came up and was recommended by the Snapper Grouper AP to examine the anthropogenic noise on yellowtail snapper catchability, and so those are all the changes that were added, and everything else has remained the same to the original document that was given to you on Monday and as provided in the late materials.

MR. BELL: Okay.

DR. COLLIER: If you guys approve this plan, we'll take these modifications, and that will be the finalized research and monitoring prioritization plan.

MR. BELL: All right. From a technical standpoint, do I make this motion, or does somebody else need to make that?

DR. COLLIER: I think it's always a little bit cleaner if the Chairman doesn't make the motion.

MR. BELL: Does not.

DR. COLLIER: Correct.

MR. BELL: All right. Would somebody be willing to make this motion?

MR. POLAND: I can, Chairman Bell.

MR. BELL: All right.

MR. POLAND: **I will move to approve the South Atlantic research and monitoring prioritization plan for 2021 to 2025, as modified.**

MR. BELL: All right. Do we have a second?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MR. BELL: We have a second from Jessica. Any discussion of the motion? No hands. **Any opposition to the motion?** Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am not opposing, but I just wanted to ask Chip a quick question, and so we had a good discussion about dolphin yesterday, and I brought up the idea of needing more research focused on dolphin, and, obviously, the differences in kind of the perspective between North Carolina and Florida. I don't recall, in the research priorities document, what it says about dolphin and if we have any priorities in there, and I just wanted to see if you could speak to that.

DR. COLLIER: Let me pull that up, real quick, and look through it. We had some stuff in there previously on dolphin, and then I think there's some additional information, where we're asking about some life history traits for some of the unassessed species, and dolphin was listed in there for that, and some of those life history traits that we're looking for are the growth parameters, maturity, and reproductive rates. We also want to develop models to predict changes in managed fish populations due to climate change, including changes of species distribution, movement, and reproductive patterns, and dolphin was included in that one as well.

MR. STRELCHECK: That's what I was looking for. Perfect. Thank you.

DR. COLLIER: Okay.

MR. BELL: Great, and so we're covered then. Thank you. Okay. Then, following through on this, then was the discussion of the Southeast Longline Survey presentation that Todd gave.

MR. POLAND: Chairman Bell.

MR. BELL: Sorry. Clay, could you -- I saw Clay's hand first.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to mention that we talked, at some length, about formalizing the process where we might incorporate some of these research items in the various potential research agencies' strategic planning process, including the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Remember that, right now, it's just a long laundry list, but it's not clear who is going to commit to do what, and I'm a little afraid, as often happens, that everybody thinks somebody is going to do it, and nobody does. Again, I think it would be good if we mentioned something about that conversation and try and get a more formal process going. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Yes, and I recall that, Clay, and I thought what we were basically doing was trying to capture everything that we could think of that needed to be in this laundry list, but you're absolutely right, and no one entity is going to handle all of that, and it would have to be a coordinated effort across-the-board, as you discussed, and I recall that in that part of the meeting. In terms of how we move forward with that, I think that would, obviously, need to be coordination with your staff, our staff, and just kind of working through who handles what and who has got the assets, and even beyond just our staff, and it's whoever can help address some of this stuff, but I do recall that conversation.

DR. PORCH: Chair, if you will indulge me, I see that they scrolled down where it mentions where I brought up the issue, but I thought that there was a general agreement that we needed to set up a formal process, and so I just wonder if there could be some acknowledgement of that. In other words, it's not just that I suggested it. As far as I understood, council staff, and the council, agreed that we should do something along those lines.

MR. BELL: Yes, and, I mean, that was my understanding. Obviously, no one entity could do all of that, and so there would need to be a process where we sit down and look at the whole list and see who can help with what in a prioritized fashion. That was my understanding.

DR. PORCH: Thank you.

MR. BELL: We're putting some clarification in there. Okay. Steve.

MR. PORCH: Thank you, Chairman Bell. Two quick things. I just wanted to speak to the topic that Andy raised. If I remember, from the Dolphin Committee meeting yesterday, he had suggested some type of collaborative approach between North Carolina and Florida and the agency, kind of a consortium, or taskforce, to work on research specific to dolphin, and, as I was interpreting it, some type of kind of state of the science, or at least a forum to come together and discuss what science is there and what science we need to pursue, and I just wanted to endorse that and support that initiative. Then, second, and this is a process question, and I don't know if we approved this motion yet, and I don't think we've dispensed with this motion yet or not.

MR. BELL: I thought we did, but did we or not? We didn't?

MS. BROUWER: I don't think you did, Mel. I think there was some discussion, but I don't think you ever approved it.

MR. BELL: Okay. Yes, that's right. I am getting that mixed up with the last motion. Okay. The motion actually still needs to be made then, or we were at the point of discussion and voting?

MS. BROUWER: I believe Steve made the motion.

MR. BELL: Okay, and Jessica seconded it. Okay. So we were having discussion, and so is there any other discussion of the motion? **Any opposition to the motion?** Remember that we just had some more discussion about it, but we captured some things. **Seeing none, then that motion passes.**

Then, wrapping up the other things that we covered in the open first session, we had that briefing from Todd Kellison, and then there was a commercial e-logbook update, and we received that. Then there was a presentation on the dolphin participatory workshops, and that's captured there, with the links. Then recreational working group updates for both the Section 102 and the private rec workgroup, and we received those. Anna gave us an HMS Advisory Panel and ICCAT update, and then we had Jennifer Lee's Protected Resources report at the end, and so that's how we concluded the first open council session on Monday, and so that concludes that. All right, and so I see you have Dolphin Wahoo up next. Anna, are you prepared to give that report?

MS. BROUWER: Mel, it should have been Snapper Grouper, and so, in just putting all this together, someone I --

MR. BELL: I was just going off of what you -- I don't think the order is that critical, and so it's whatever you have up there.

MS. BROUWER: If you're okay with that, we'll keep going. Otherwise, I will fish out Snapper Grouper for you.

MR. BELL: No, this will be easier, just to keep us flowing, as long as Anna is ready.

DR. COLLIER: Anna, if you're speaking, you're not unmuted.

MR. BELL: Well, would be a matter of just scrolling down to Snapper Grouper, or do you have to go find it?

MS. BECKWITH: I'm back, guys. Sorry. I was having trouble.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm ready. Okay. The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met on June 16 and 17, and the committee approved the amended minutes from the March 2021 meeting and the agenda. We received a status of amendments under formal review, and then we began our work on Amendment 10. The committee discussed the amendment and reviewed the effects analysis and made the following motions.

**Motion 1 is de-select Alternative 4 and select Alternative 3 as preferred in Action 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion?**

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Tim, go ahead.

MR. GRINER: I would like to make a motion to de-select Alternative 3 and re-select Alternative 4 as our preferred.

MS. BECKWITH: I think, if I'm not mistaken, technically, Alternative 4 is currently our preferred, unless this motion passes. If we vote on this, and this motion is voted down, then we would maintain Alternative 4.

MR. GRINER: That was to be a substitute motion, I guess, then.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, that's what I'm saying. I need someone to speak to that, because I'm not sure that we can substitute back to our preferred, or maybe we can. Sorry. I'm a little confused. Who is our person?

MR. BELL: Our Roberts expert.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. So, if you guys want to go back to Alternative 4, in theory --

MR. BELL: I think what you were just simply pointing out, from a process standpoint of just moving this, to achieve what Tim is wanting to achieve, you simply vote this up or down. If it doesn't vote up, then you end up where you were, I believe.

MS. BECKWITH: Correct, and that's what I am thinking is the process, Tim, and so, if you want to speak your reasons again or whatever -- If this motion fails, then we would go back to the original preferred.

MR. GRINER: I guess either way. I mean, you can make a substitute motion, and then, if the substitute motion fails, it becomes the main motion, but either way. I mean, the rationale is that Alternative 4 was our preferred, and we looked at all -- We decided we would change to Alternative 3, in light of the fact that the Action 12 was going to look at a reduction in bag limit, and, since we dispensed with that action, there is no real need to do that, and so I feel like we should go back to our original preferred, to be fair and equitable to both sides. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. I see Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I'm good.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Our current preferred, or rather Alternative 3, gives an extra 16,000-pound buffer towards the recreational, and the Alternative 4 would give the bump of that 16,000 pounds to the commercial, and so just to make sure everyone is clear. So, if we vote this up, then we will have our Preferred Alternative 3, which allows that 16,000-pound additional buffer for the recreational. If we vote this down, we will go back to the original preferred, which was Alternative

4, which would give that 16,000-pound bump to the commercial. Just so we're clear, let's take a roll call vote, please.

MR. HADLEY: If it's okay, I'm going to go ahead and go through the list of names.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. We're ready, please.

MR. HADLEY: All right. I will do that. I will start off with Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Steve.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Chester.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: No.

MR. HADLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: No.

MR. HADLEY: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Art.

MR. SAPP: No.

MR. HADLEY: Kyle. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Abstain.

MR. HADLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: No.

MR. HADLEY: All right. Kyle said he might have some internet issues, and I just want to give him one more chance to vote. All right. I'm not hearing anything from Kyle. **The motion does pass with seven in favor, four not in favor, and one abstention.**

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. All right. **Our second motion was to de-select Sub-Alternative 2d and select Sub-Alternative 2e as preferred in Action 11. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? I see Art in opposition, Jessica in opposition, and so --**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can we do a roll call on this one?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. That's what I was going to say next, is we need to do a roll call, and so, yes, please. John.

DR. COLLIER: Just for clarification, I don't know if they were in opposition. They had their hands raised as the motion was being made.

MS. BECKWITH: Gotcha. Let's go back to discussion. Did one of you guys want to participate in discussion, or did we want to move to the roll call vote?

MR. SAPP: I want to make a point one more time, please.

MS. BECKWITH: Sure.

MR. SAPP: I feel like we've got an opportunity to listen to the true holy grail, the people that spend two-hundred-and-fifty-plus days a year on the water, and they're screaming for help on this, and we're not doing it. We're denying people that make their living on the ocean that are saying there's an issue, and we're doing absolutely nothing, and it blows my mind that this council can't look at this and realize that something can be done now that will help the future, instead of having to react when the whole region is in trouble, but that's my point that I needed to make one more time. Thanks, guys.

MS. BECKWITH: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have already made my points, and Art just reiterated them. I'm ready to vote.

MS. BECKWITH: Great. Let's do a roll call vote, please.

MR. HADLEY: All right. We will start off with Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Steve.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Chester.

MR. BREWER: No.

MR. HADLEY: Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: No.

MR. HADLEY: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Art.

MR. SAPP: Negative.

MR. HADLEY: Kyle. It looks like we still don't have Kyle. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. HADLEY: Okay. **The motion passes with nine in favor and three opposed.**

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. **Our third motion was to de-select Alternative 2 and select Alternative 1 as our preferred in Action 12. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? The motion passes with no opposition.**

Then our next motion was to approve the IPT's suggested edits to the -- Is that right? I skipped one, didn't I? Yes, Motion 4. **Move Action 12 to the Considered but Rejected section. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**The fifth motion was to approve the IPT's suggested edits to the purpose statement in Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition?**

MR. HADLEY: Anna, if I could, under discussion, I just wanted to highlight that the changes in green represent additional edits to reflect the removal of Action 12, and so the yellow was the original edits that you had seen, and then the green were additional edits to reflect the motion that was just passed by the council.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. So noted. Is there any additional discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**The next motion is approve Amendment 10 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revision and re-deem the codified text. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition?**

MR. CARMICHAEL: This is the part that needs to be a roll call vote, correct?

MR. BELL: Yes, I think so. We need a roll call on these.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It's a little different roll call vote than what you've been doing, just to clarify on the webinar, and this is an official roll call vote, and so I will call that out, and it's alphabetical, and we'll record the responses, when you're ready.

MS. BECKWITH: We're ready.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. Thank you very much. Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Christiansen. We'll come back to Kyle. Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Sapp.

MR. SAPP: No.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Chairman Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I will go back to Kyle Christiansen. Are you here?

MR. BELL: He said he might lose connectivity.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **So, therefore, the motion carries with one objection and one absent.**

MS. BECKWITH: Well, congratulations, folks. After five years of work, we did it. Continuing on with the report, we discussed a project plan for future Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management

Plan amendments. Under direction to staff, you will see some details, and I will go ahead and read it for folks, and then I will ask someone to, I guess, make that. Actually, it's not a motion, and it's just direction to staff, and so, if folks want to review or have additional comments.

The committee discussed the timing of potential upcoming amendments to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP and provided the following direction to staff. The timing of the amendment was specified by the Executive Committee, or will be, rather, probably in September, and so the direction to staff included three points. In the near term, develop an amendment that would consider retention and size limit topics to include a different retention bag limit between charter and private vessels for both dolphin and wahoo, consider removing or reducing captain and crew bag limits, and explore extending the range of the minimum size limits for dolphin.

The second point was to examine changes in the pelagic longline fishery after the updated biological opinion for the dolphin wahoo fishery is available, and the third point is other potential future amendment topics for consideration, and regional management actions, as an example, and establishing regional ACLs. Remove the open-access nature of the commercial dolphin wahoo permit and discuss re-establishing for-hire bag limit sales, which makes me twitch. We had -- Is there anyone that would like to comment or add or delete? Is there anything in there that needs to be discussed?

Not seeing any hands, there was nothing under Other Business, and we have one timing and tasks motion that needs to be made by someone. I will go ahead and read it, and then I will ask someone to make it. **Approve the following timing and tasks: prepare Amendment 10 for submission, prepare information on an amendment that would address the identified retention and size limit topics for review at the -- It says the September 2021 meeting, but it sounded like, from Executive Finance, that might be closer to the March meeting of 2022, and is that correct?** Kerry, go ahead.

MS. MARHEFKA: **I was just going to make the motion, but we should probably get clarification.**

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and so, John Carmichael, is that September 2021 not accurate in that highlighted portion of that timing and tasks, and it was closer to March, was it not?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We still had some effort going into that highlighted for September, for the framework actions.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. If you guys are comfortable with that, Kerry makes the motion. Do I have a second?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Jessica seconds the motion. Is there any further discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.** Thanks so much.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Anna. I appreciate that, and I appreciate your service all these years. We will miss you. Okay. Let's move right on to -- Mackerel Cobia is the next one that's queued up. That would be Steve, if you're ready.

MR. POLAND: Yes, sir, Chairman Bell. The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Council met via webinar on June 17, 2021, and we dispensed of the approval of the minutes from the March 2021 meeting and the agenda. We received a report from AP Chair Ira Laks, who provided a summary of the April advisory panel meeting, with emphasis on Coastal Migratory Pelagics 32 and 34, which were slated to be discussed during this committee meeting, as well as other items that came up during the AP meeting.

Next, we moved into a review of Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34, and this is an amendment in response to an updated assessment, SEDAR 38, and an update to the management of king mackerel. The committee provided the following comments on the actions and alternatives. Management of Atlantic king mackerel has been successful, and maintaining the historical makeup of the fishery may be beneficial (rationale for adding new alternative under Action 2 (sector allocations)).

At the September 2021 meeting, council state representatives will provide information on how Action 6, and this is the action related to damaged fish, may conflict with state regulations and their state regulatory process for modifying those regulations, and approval for public hearings will be considered at the September 2021 council meeting.

The committee provided the following direction to staff: include the current CMP FMP goals and objectives for the council to consider when reviewing modifications to sector allocations; provide detail on ACT alternatives based on the council's selected preferred alternatives under Action 1 and Action 2; divide Action 5 into two separate actions, one for each sector, with a preferred alternative for the recreational sector, per motions below, and see the draft motions below; provide information on the rationale for setting the Atlantic king mackerel minimum size limit at twenty-four-inches fork length, and you can see, in italics, a little information pulled from the rationale, back when that size limit was increased from twenty to twenty-four inches.

The following motions were made. **Motion 1 is to select Alternative 3 as preferred under Action 1 in CMP Amendment 34. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any opposition to approval of the motion? Hearing and seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

You can see there was another motion that failed and then a follow-up motion with a substitute motion, and the substitute motion passed, and that motion became the main motion. **Motion 2 is add an alternative to Action 2 that would allocate 62.9 percent to the recreational sector and 37.1 percent to the commercial sector. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Next, **Motion 3 is select a new alternative (allocate 62.9 percent to the recreational sector and 37.1 percent to the commercial sector) as the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing and seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

Next, **Motion 4 is select Alternative 2 as the preferred under Action 4 in CMP Amendment 34. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Hearing and seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

**Next, there was a motion made with a substitute motion, and the substitute motion was voted in favor, and it became the main motion. Motion 5 is add an alternative for only reducing recreational harvest to twenty-two inches fork length and select as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

Next, we discussed Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 32, and this is updates to Gulf cobia management and the Florida East Coast Zone, and this is in response to an updated SEDAR, SEDAR 28, and, Andy, I see you have your hand raised. Go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: Steve, I didn't want to disrupt the motions that were being made. Just two comments regarding the allocation discussion that we had. One thing that I do want to make sure comes back to us at the September meeting, and Monica mentioned it, is discussing allocation in light of the goals and objectives of the FMP. I think that's important, given the allocation policy that's in place.

I also asked my team to dig into the allocation policy, to see if there was anything with regard to using kind of old landings time series for allocation, and, although there's really nothing specifically that pertains to that, the policy does state that we should provide a mechanism to ensure that fishery allocations are periodically evaluated to remain relevant to current conditions, and so I just wanted to note that, because I think we did have some good discussion about the basis for choosing the preferred that we just passed, but we'll want to kind of further emphasize that, with continued discussion and rationale, as we build the record on that allocation, if that remains our preferred.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you for that, Andy. Any further discussion or any comments? All right. Hearing none, we'll jump back into CMP Amendment 32. The committee provided the following comments on the actions and alternatives. In future decision documents specify all preferred alternatives as approved by the South Atlantic Council, Gulf Council, or both councils. Maintain the council's current preferred alternatives under Action 5.1, because the goal of Amendment 32 is to reduce harvest to prevent overfishing, and the council would like to maintain consistency in regulations between federal and state waters and between the Gulf Zone and the Florida East Coast Zone.

Maintain the council's current preferred alternative under Action 6, the minimum size limit action, because it provides a needed reduction in landings to keep harvest below the ACL. It will be important to educate the public on netting large cobia, as opposed to utilizing a gaff. The committee provided the following direction to staff, to provide history on joint council decisions related to seasons and seasonal closures.

The following motions were made. **Motion 6 is, in Action 2, to move Alternative 4 to Considered but Rejected. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

**Motion 7, and this was a motion to table until Full Council, and the motion reads: Select Alternative 2 as preferred under Action 4. The motion to table with a time certain to Full**

**Council, and we are at Full Council, and so we have an action motion on the board for discussion.** Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: This is Action 4, right?

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. So, this is selecting Alternative 2 as the preferred under Action 4. After we looked into the full amendment, I agree this is still where I would like to keep our preferred. This is close to what the current no action alternative is, and so I am confused, because we skipped Action 3. Go ahead to Andy, and I know that he wanted to discuss this more, but I'm good with this particular alternative. Let me look at my notes some more.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Andy, did you want to comment?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and so I had looked at the alternative more carefully, after our discussion in committee, and I agree that selecting Alternative 2 is the best choice. If we selected Alternative 3, it would set a commercial catch target with I believe a 10 percent buffer, at least as currently estimated, and that has several ramifications. One, it would require additional action to modify the accountability measure, because the accountability measure is based on the ACL and not the ACT, and not that that can't be done, but it's not necessarily needed, and then, given the low landings for cobia in the commercial sector, and the low possession limit, or catch limit, it's fairly easy to monitor landings, and I think negating the need for a large buffer for the commercial sector, and so I'm in support of Alternative 2.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Andy. Jessica, did you have any additional comments?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I put my hand back up, but I don't think folks saw it, and so I agree. I don't think we need to establish an ACT for the commercial sector, which is Alternative 3, and so I recommend sticking with this Preferred Alternative 2, since it doesn't create a commercial ACT.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Jessica. I have a parliamentary inquiry. Since this was a motion that was tabled during committee, how do we need to dispense with this motion here in Full Council, because it wasn't approved by the committee, but it was just tabled and brought into Full Council, and so does someone need to make the motion in Full Council, or can we just do a Full Council vote and dispense of it?

MR. BELL: I would be flying by the seat of my pants with this. I mean, your two options would be the committee would somehow have to vote on that, and then turn it over to the council, but, if the council can simply make -- Well, it's an active motion coming from committee, and so it seems like the committee would have to resolve it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mel, I think you have a committee motion, and you tabled it until Full Council, and now you're in Full Council, and it would seem to me that, if Full Council just makes the motion and accepts it, you've at least -- You've clearly made a motion at Full Council and either accepted it or rejected it.

MR. BELL: Right. That sounds like a logical approach. All right.

MR. POLAND: Then would someone like to make the motion at Full Council? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we select Alternative 2 as preferred under Action 4.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you. Is there a second?

MR. SAPP: Second.

MR. POLAND: Thanks. Art seconded. Any further discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, the committee made the following motion, Motion 8. Excuse me. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Is there any chance we could go back to Action 3? We had, in our notes, that we were going to come back to that in Full Council, and I was ready to suggest a preferred on Action 3, and I don't see it in the list here, and I apologize if it's further down.

MR. POLAND: It's not. This is the last motion that we're going to deal with. Can we dispense with this motion and then take up Action 3 after this?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We sure can, but I just didn't want to lose it.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you. All right. **Motion 8 is to select Alternative 2 under Action 7 as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion on Motion 8? **Is there any opposition to Motion 8? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** I will turn it over to you, Jessica, for any comments on Action 3.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I would like to make a motion on Action 3, that we select Alternative 3 as our preferred.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. Is there a second to that motion?

MR. SAPP: I will second it.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Art. All right. Is there discussion? Staff, is it possible to at least show the action and alternatives on the screen, real quick? If you can, while you're looking for that, I'll go to Jessica. Go ahead, Jessica.

MS. BROUWER: Christina has got her hand up. She can probably address it.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: I was just going to say, Myra, I have the actions and alternatives up on my screen, if you want me to switch over as presenter, real fast, so everyone can see it before hopping back over to the committee report, whatever you think is easiest.

MS. BROUWER: Yes, go for it. That sounds fine.

MR. POLAND: All right, Jessica. While she's getting that pulled up, you can go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Steve, and so I'm going to remind people that this is the one that we had some debate about, and we had to go look at the tables that were in the full amendment, and not in the decision document, and it was a little confusing, and so we had to go back and study those tables, and we had it on our notes that we would come back in Full Council with something on Action 3, because we needed to study those tables, and so I'm recommending that we select Alternative 3 as our preferred under Action 3, because it retains the current allocation, and Alternative 3 is very close to Alternative 4, which is the one that is selecting the 70,000 pounds for commercial.

Once you look at the tables, Christina was right, but I had to do some comparison, but, once you look at the tables, there's not a lot of difference between Alternative 3 and Alternative 4, but, since 3 is matching what we currently have, I am suggesting that we go with Alternative 3. 4 is very close, but I think that maintaining what we have is better.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Jessica, and, just so I'm clear, remembering those tables, in Alternative 3, there was a small differential of a couple thousand pounds, correct, between what's currently in place and what Alternative 3 would be?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Alternative 4 gives less than 1 percent over to commercial, and then Alternative 3 maintains the current allocation percentages of 8 percent to commercial and 92 percent to recreational.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you. Christina, go ahead.

MS. WIEGAND: I just want to make sure I have the correct rationale for Alternative 3 when I'm explaining, or Chester is explaining, the council's decision to the Gulf Council next week, and so I guess just a reminder that the 8 percent/92 percent is based on landings for the entire Atlantic cobia stock, and based on CHTS numbers, and so I guess, if it would be possible to provide a little bit of rationale why we think the current numbers should stay in place, even though they're based on the entire range of Atlantic cobia, that would be helpful when we're explaining this to the Gulf Council next week.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Christina. Can someone speak to that? Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't think that the commercial quota is expected to be met, but this is retaining commercial at 8 percent, and the commercial quota is already so small that I didn't feel like we should go down to 5 percent for commercial, which is in Alternative 2. Alternative 4 is a little bit confusing, what appears to be holding that poundage, but, if you look at the table, it's technically not exactly holding that poundage, and it's like an 0.085 percent commercial to 91.915 percent recreational.

I just think that it's a little bit cleaner, unless we could maybe clean up Alternative 4, but it seems a little bit cleaner to just stick with retaining that current allocation. The confusion about holding 70,000 pounds, the way that this is worded, that's not exactly what is happening when you study the tables.

MS. WIEGAND: Thank you, Jessica. That was helpful.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you for that, Jessica. Mel.

MR. BELL: In addition to having that on the record, recall that Chester is going to be our rep at the Gulf meeting, and so I want to make sure that he's comfortable and up-to-speed. That doesn't have to happen right now today, but, before he attends, which is coming up pretty quick, you just need to make sure you get with Chester.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Mel. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess I would be interested in hearing some discussion as well with regard to the fact that this stock is undergoing overfishing, and so it gets confused, obviously, because we're also changing the recreational numbers under FES, but, by putting the commercial allocation essentially constant, you're essentially shifting the burden for addressing the overfishing onto the recreational sector as a whole, rather than partitioning it between both sectors, and I don't know if anyone has kind of thought about it in that way, but it's certainly, I think, a different situation than we often deal with, with regard to allocations, when we're dealing with overfishing and needing to cut back on harvest at the same time.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Andy, and I may be off-base on this, because this is not an amendment that I have really kept my thumb on, since it doesn't affect our cobia fishery up here, but don't we also have a preferred selected to reduce the commercial bag limit, or possession limit, to one, and so wouldn't that also reduce landings from the commercial sector?

MR. STRELCHECK: To the extent they're not landing even one fish per trip, yes, or achieving more than one fish per trip, it would reduce their catch rates, and reduce the likelihood of meeting the catch limit, and I don't recall -- I think the catch limit has been met in years past, but maybe not more recently.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Chester, go ahead.

MR. BREWER: I was just going to point out that Christina has put together cheat sheets for me in the past, and she does a beautiful job, and so I feel very confident going to the Gulf Council meeting.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Chester. All right. Is there any further discussion? Is everyone satisfied with their look at Action 3? I appreciate staff pulling this up, so we can all see the entire action and the alternatives, and so if we can go back to the motion that's on the board. **To remind everyone, we have a motion to select Alternative 3 under Action 3 as preferred.** Is there any further discussion on this motion? **Hearing none, is there any opposition to this motion?** Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Steve, I just wanted to note that I'm abstaining.

MR. POLAND: All right. **Any other opposition or abstention to the motion? Hearing none, the motion stands approved, with one abstention.** The committee did not take up any other

business, and there was one item of other business that we moved to Full Council, and so, with that, I will read the draft timing and tasks motion.

**Adopt the following timing and tasks: continue work on CMP Amendment 34 and prepare a draft for discussion and approval for public hearings at the September 2021 meeting; continue work with Gulf Council staff on CMP Amendment 32 and prepare a draft for discussion and approval for public hearings at the September 2021 meeting.** Would someone like to make that motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: **So moved.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. Is there a second?

MR. SAPP: I will second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you. All right. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition to the timing and tasks motion? Hearing and seeing none, that motion stands approved.** Chairman Bell, that concludes the Mackerel Cobia Committee report.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Steve. Well done. Jessica is ready to go, I believe, and we're queued up for Snapper Grouper.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mel. All right. The Snapper Grouper Committee met earlier this week and approved the minutes from the March 2021 meeting and the agenda for this meeting. We got an update on the status of amendments under formal review, and then we moved into the gag grouper stock assessment.

Gag grouper, from SEDAR 71, is overfished and experiencing overfishing. We received a presentation from our SSC Chair with the SSC recommendations, and then the committee discussed projections and rebuilding timelines. There is some confusion on the rebuilding timeline, and there is some discussion of that under Other Business.

**The committee made the following motion, Motion Number 1, to initiate a plan amendment to rebuild and end overfishing of gag grouper. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Next, the committee discussed red porgy, and this stock is overfished and experiencing overfishing, and there was work begun on a plan amendment, and scoping hearings were conducted in February and during the March council meeting. The committee reviewed modified and approved actions and the range of alternatives under each action for further analysis. We heard from Jimmy Hull with the Snapper Grouper AP on feedback, and the council staff presented an overview of the decision document and updated analyses, and the committee made the following motions.

**Motion Number 2 is to approve the purpose and need, as modified. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 3, which was to select Alternative 5 under Action 1 as the preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection?** Then there was a substitute -- It looks like that motion is approved, and there was a substitute motion, but it failed for lack of a second. There was direction to staff, if you scroll down a little bit further.

MS. BROUWER: I'm sorry, Jessica, but was that motion approved, Motion Number 3?

MS. MCCAWLEY: **It was. I got confused about the substitute on the screen, but there were no hands with any objections.**

MS. BROUWER: Gotcha. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you. Then there was direction to staff to use gutted weight instead of whole weight to specify catch levels. **Then the committee made Motion Number 4 to move Alternative 5 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 5, which was to move Alternative 4 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The committee made Motion Number 6 to select Alternative 3 as preferred for Action 3. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objections? That motion is approved.**

**The committee then made Motion Number 7 to select Sub-Alternatives 2a and 3a as preferred, which was fifteen fish per trip in each season. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion is approved.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 8 to move Alternatives 3 and 4 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion is approved.**

**The committee then made Motion Number 9 to select Sub-Alternatives 2a as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? That motion is approved.**

**Then the committee made Motion Number 10 to select Alternatives 3 and 4 under Action 5b as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Andy.**

MR. STRELCHECK: I kind of voiced -- I won't say my objection, but comments, obviously, during committee. I guess one thing I wanted to throw out as I will say a compromise, but maybe another alternative, would be to consider a June/July/August season. It's not always ideal to split a wave of recreational fishing data, but I think we did hear from the AP the importance of trying to have a summer fishing season, and I'm still concerned that that may be too long and trigger accountability measures, but it would give us another option on the table to consider, and so I wanted to toss that out for the council's consideration.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Andy. Would you be suggesting -- I don't know that we have an alternative that allows it to cross waves like that. Are you suggesting that we add an alternative to the document?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. All right. It sounds like you're suggesting two things, one that we add the alternative to the document and select it as the preferred.

MR. STRELCHECK: I didn't necessarily suggest selecting it as preferred, but I would like for the council at least to consider it as a reasonable alternative, given our discussion during committee.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. STRELCHECK: **I will make the motion to add a new alternative establishing a recreational fishing season for red porgy of June through August.**

MR. BELL: I will second it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel. Just kind of a point of order here, and is this -- This isn't really a substitute motion, and should I record you as an objection to the previous motion and then us to --

MR. STRELCHECK: Sorry. I thought we had dispensed with the previous motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **Okay, and so then, on Motion 10, we don't have any objections, and that motion is approved.** Then we now have an additional motion. Thanks for that clarification. The motion has a second to add a new alternative establishing a recreational fishing season for red porgy from June through August. **Is there any objection to adding this alternative? I don't see any hands. All right. That motion is approved.**

Then we got into Action 6, which was modifying the red porgy recreational accountability measures. Myra, we said we were going to revisit this at Full Council, and I think I'm going to turn it over to you to kind of explain where we are here.

MS. BROUWER: Sure, Jessica. Let me just move this down so we can have it all on one page. On your screen, Motion 11 was to add that language as a potential alternative for Action 6, and there were some issues about how this would be implemented and the length of time it would take for the accountability measure to kick in.

That's why we are discussing this again, and you see, on your screen, potential alternative language, based on what was approved for dolphin and wahoo. You had stated that you were interested in potentially considering something similar for red porgy, and so we basically went and took the language from dolphin wahoo for you to consider applying it, and so, under that alternative language, if the total commercial and recreational ACLs combined were to be exceeded, then the length of the following year's recreational fishing season would be reduced by the amount

necessary to prevent the ACL from being exceeded in the following year, and so the timeframe here would be shortened to two years.

There is the language there stating that the length of the season would not be reduced if the RA determines that it's not necessary. The one thing I would point out is there is no mention in this language about stock status, and, for most of your other snapper grouper species, you have the AMs tied to an overfished determination, and so you could potentially add that language back in here, if you want. I will leave it at that for any questions.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Myra. We have at least one hand. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thank you. Speaking to the alternative that is not italicized, and so it was the one that we looked at the other day, Steve asked -- Anna brought up that there was a similar alternative in the Dolphin Wahoo Draft Amendment 10 that was determined that it wasn't legally sufficient, and so Steve asked that I go back and look at that, and I did.

It was really instructive to review the Dolphin Wahoo Committee's discussion on a similar AM that, obviously, was found to not be legally adequate, and we shouldn't include an AM that would allow overruns of a sector's ACL for several years with no correction, because that's not an adequate accountability measure. I think the revised language that Myra has proposed better gets us to where we need to be, and so I would suggest that we remove the previous not italicized alternative that we looked at that would take three years before any correction would be made.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Monica, and so I think that we would need a motion to do that, because we already had a motion to add this new alternative, the non-italicized language, and we're suggesting replacing that with this italicized language, based on what folks have looked at.

MS. BROUWER: Jessica, one point of clarification. I'm not sure that the committee actually approved that motion, and Mike can correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't know that you got that far.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: No, I don't think they approved that motion.

MS. BROUWER: I think, here, if you wanted to, you could simply make a motion to adopt the italicized language as the new alternative for this action.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That sounds great. Would someone like to make that motion? Steve.

MR. POLAND: **So moved.**

MR. BELL: Second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's seconded by Mel, and so we're adding this italicized language under Action 6. All right.

MS. BROUWER: Jessica, was the desire to include some language in there regarding the stock status, or do we just want to leave that the way it is?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have no idea. I'm going to go to the hands. Steve.

MR. POLAND: I had my hand lowered, and I really don't have a strong feeling one way or another, but, for consistency, and this is an assessed stock, and I don't see any reason why we couldn't include that language in there.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: A question for staff was going to be along those lines, and do we have another alternative in the document that speaks to payback provisions for overfished status, or the need to implement accountability measures because of overfished status? I'm just having a hard time flipping back and forth between documents and virtual screens.

MS. BROUWER: Yes, and me too, Andy, and so I would be happy, if you will allow me to pause my screen, to go dig that up. Okay. Are you all seeing what I have here? This is the decision document for Amendment 50, and these are the alternatives in a simplified language, and this is, obviously, not the way it's written in the codified text.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: I will scroll down, and so Alternative 3 begins with the triggers, and then below it is the accountability measure, what would happen, and it is actually not tied to the stock status, whereas the no action is this up here, and there is mention there of if red porgy is overfished.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Andy, any thoughts, based on seeing this?

MR. STRELCHECK: I am not seeing it markedly different than no action, and I guess I am seeing it as a little bit weaker version of no action, and, given the discussion during committee on the health and status of the stock, I am concerned about implementing a weaker accountability measure, given the challenges we've been facing with rebuilding this stock, and so I would speak against adding the alternative.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. 10-4. Here is the motion to add this new Alternative 6, and it's not necessarily making it a preferred, but it's just adding it, and you've already heard, from Andy, that he is likely going to vote against it. Any more discussion here on this new alternative? **Can I see a show of hands that are against this motion to add this new alternative to Action 6? It looks like we have one in opposition, and so that motion passes.**

Myra, I am going to skip that text below, because I feel like we've sort of dispensed with that, and I'm going to move to Draft Motion 12, which was to approve Amendment 50 for public hearings and direct staff to hold public hearings via webinar ahead of the September 2021 meeting. I just want to stop us here, and do we actually want them to have them before the next council meeting, or are we doing these hearings in conjunction with that council meeting? Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. I had a question about the public hearings and the analysis in the document, since we just approved a motion to add an additional alternative to Sub-Action

5b, and would there be enough time to analyze that alternative, the three-month season, and present that to the public for public hearings between now and the September meeting?

MS. BROUWER: Steve, I think so. I think this is not a big lift, and I think we would have enough -- At least have some quantitative analysis ready.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So then, Steve, I assume that means you want to stick to the original motion of having these public hearings via webinar ahead of the September meeting?

MR. POLAND: Well, I've got one more question. How many participants did we have at the scoping meetings?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We had one person that commented between the two days.

MR. POLAND: With that, I'm leaning more towards just having the public hearings at the September meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's what I was thinking, too. I saw that Mel put his hand up.

MR. BELL: Yes, I would concur with that. I think we would get more bang for our buck if we did it at the meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you. The one thing, just to make you aware, if we do have the public hearings during the September meeting, the public comment period normally happens mid-week, and so just be aware that, if we do it in September, we could potentially, and I don't know, schedule the Snapper Grouper Committee for Thursday, or you would have to table discussions until after public comment or somehow be able to allow you time to consider public comment before you discuss this amendment any further, and so that's all.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Also, this is in the form of a motion. Mel.

MR. BELL: I follow what Myra is saying, but, just given the history we've had with attendance, we might go to all that trouble and get skunked again, and so we could maybe work through the mechanics, as she described, in dealing with it at the meeting, and we might still have more participation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. All right. Myra, change that motion. The motion is to approve Amendment 50 for public hearings and direct staff to hold public hearings via webinar during the -- Well, it's not really via webinar. Okay. Steve.

MR. POLAND: I was prepared to make that motion, but it looks like the language is --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Go ahead.

MR. POLAND: **I move to approve Amendment 50 for public hearings and direct staff to hold public hearings during the September 2021 meeting.**

MR. BELL: I will second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. It's seconded by Mel. Any more discussion? **Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Then we moved into tilefish, and we talked about SEDAR 66, the fact that tilefish is not overfished and not experiencing overfishing. Our SSC Chair presented the SSC's recommendations, and the committee also discussed ways to improve data informing recruitment estimates.

**Then the committee made Motion 13 to initiate a plan amendment for tilefish to incorporate new ABC recommendation and consider revisions to allocations. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Then we moved into yellowtail snapper, and the council received catch level recommendations for yellowtail snapper during its December 2020 meeting. The Snapper Grouper AP discussed the yellowtail snapper fishery during its April meeting, and the committee discussed the AP's feedback and a tentative timeline of development and the suite of actions that were once considered for the fishery, and the committee provided the following guidance there on the screen, those five bullets, and I'm not going to read them.

Then we moved into the red snapper stock assessment, and so there was a lot of discussion on this. The red snapper stock in the South Atlantic is not yet rebuilt and is experiencing overfishing. This assessment suggested lower levels of overfishing in the terminal years and higher values of stock size relative to the benchmarks. The Science Center presented the assessment results. Our SSC Chair presented the SSC's comments and recommendations, and then council staff provided a presentation summarizing some takeaway points from the assessment and draft tasks for the committee to consider, informing their management responses to the assessment results.

The committee edited the draft tasks and provided the following guidance and direction, and this is very lengthy and covers a page-and-a-half, but it has to do with having a summer SSC meeting and points for those discussions, and I'm not going to read all of that, and then a short-term response, which is an options paper that will come back in September of 2021, and some bullets under that, and then a long-term response, which would be an amendment to follow the short-term response.

Then we moved down to hear more from the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel, their recommendations for items that were not covered in the previous list of items, and we'll hear more from the AP at our September meeting. The committee also talked a little bit about a slot limit for red snapper and heard some of the AP's recommendations for reducing discards in the long-term management response for red snapper.

Then the committee got updates on the red snapper and greater amberjack research projects. Then, under Other Business, the committee received feedback from NOAA General Counsel and decided that the gag grouper rebuilding timeline will be decided at the September council meeting. Then

there is a timing and tasks motion there on the board. Would someone be willing to make this timing and tasks motion?

MS. BROUWER: Jessica, sorry to interrupt, but I was just looking to correct the timing on red porgy, and so let me just do that before you make the motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sounds great. I don't see any hands, and I can go ahead and read this, and then someone can make it. **Direct staff to do the following: draft an options paper for the gag grouper and tilefish assessments for the December 2021 council meeting; work with NOAA General Counsel and SERO to develop options for rebuilding timelines for gag grouper for discussion in September 2021; request an assessment projection estimating the rebuilding timeline for gag grouper with no harvest allowed (landed F equals zero), but accounting for discard mortality; conduct public hearings for Amendment 50 during the September 2021 meeting; add language regarding SMZs being designated as Essential Fish Habitat-Habitat Areas of Particular Concern to Amendment 50; conduct preliminary catch level analysis for yellowtail snapper, including potential closures due to changes in catch levels, for consideration at the September 2021 meeting; schedule an SSC meeting in summer 2021 for the SSC to revisit results of the SEDAR 73 red snapper stock assessment and recommendations for the OFL and the ABC; draft an options paper to adjust catch levels and for red snapper, based on the SSC's OFL and ABC recommendations from their summer 2021 meeting, and revise sector allocations. Prepare this for review at the September 2021 meeting.** Would someone like to make that motion?

MR. BELL: **I will.**

MR. WOODWARD: I will second.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. The motion was seconded by Spud. Any discussion of this timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to the timing and tasks motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Mr. Chairman, that concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee report.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Jessica. Next in the queue is Habitat. Steve, are you good to go with that now?

MR. POLAND: Yes. We can knock that out.

MR. BELL: All right.

MR. POLAND: All right. The Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council met via webinar on the evening of June 17 and this morning, June 18. We started off with a report from the advisory panel. Chair Anne Deaton provided that report and recommendations to the council that came out of the AP meeting.

Next, staff provided an overview of the development of a habitat and ecosystem blueprint and establishment of a habitat and ecosystem blueprint workgroup, and we discussed the scope and process to develop an overarching document. They provided draft goals and objectives for this blueprint process, and the following motion was approved by committee. **Adopt these as goals and objectives of the Habitat Blueprint Program. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is

there any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing and seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Next, the committee discussed Coral Amendment 10, and we received an overview of the draft amendment and a summary of public comments from a public hearing that was held over the spring. **During that discussion the following motion was passed to approve the purpose and need statements in Coral Amendment 10.** Those are listed there. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, that motion stands approved.**

**Next, the committee approved the following motion, Motion 3, to approve action in Coral Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition to that motion? Hearing and seeing none, Motion 3 stands approved.**

With that, I will read the following timing and tasks motion and look for someone to make that motion. **Motion 4 is adopt the following timing and tasks: provide minutes of public meetings when rock shrimp was discussed in 2014 and provide information to council members on where to find research on sediment plumes.** Myra, I see you have your hand up.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Steve. I would just suggest another bullet under this motion to prepare Coral Amendment 10 to bring it to you to consider for approval in September.

MR. POLAND: Okay. **To prepare Coral Amendment 10 for consideration for approval at the September 2021 meeting.** I am looking for someone to make that motion.

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Chairman Bell. Is there a second?

MR. WOODWARD: Second.

MR. POLAND: Second by a gaggle of people. Any discussion? **Any opposition to approval of the timing and tasks motion? Hearing and seeing none, that motion stands approved.** Chairman Bell, that concludes the Habitat Committee report.

MR. BELL: Thank you. All right. We've got one last report, which would be the Executive Committee. John, have you got that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It's been posted. Do you have it, or do you guys need me to display it, Myra?

MS. BROUWER: Let me go find it, real quick. Give me just a second.

MR. BELL: I have only got one small laptop screen to work from here. My plan is we'll do this last report. If we need to take five or so, we can. I would like to allow the SERO reports to go next, because I know some people have to leave, and so that would be the next thing that we would need to queue up after the Executive Committee report, which would be to go to the service SERO reports, and we can take five in between.

It looks like we're queued up, and so recall that we had to jiggle around the schedule of the Executive Committee, to kind of handle the business, and so don't worry about where you were at the time or what dimension you were in.

The South Atlantic Council's Executive Committee met via webinar on June 15, 2021, although we did adjust the schedule as necessary. We received a report from John Carmichael on the Council Coordination Committee business. That report is in our binder, in detail. The next item of business was we reviewed the 2021 budget, where we were at this point, and we approved that, and then we went through the workplan review this morning, and you all recall, in agonizing detail I'm sure, the discussion of the workplan and all the challenges we face, and so the workplan will be a completely separate document attached, and so we don't need to go into the details of that.

I will point out that we did mention that we would consider holding a special topics Full Council webinar meeting to further discuss and consider approval of Coral 10 prior to the end of the current member terms, on or around August 11. Again, that's a scheduling issue. Consider holding specific-topic Full Council webinar meetings to address general business items and updates, such as recreational working group reports and the habitat blueprint, and so that's still using the ability to have these webinars. The ABC Control Rule is another topic that might work in there.

Consider dedicated webinar meeting to discuss long-term red snapper strategies, and we discussed that at the Snapper Grouper Committee. Consider delaying work on the wreckfish IFQ update, since it's not related to addressing stock status. Alternatively, consider addressing this topic on an every-other-meeting basis, and we captured that. Consider if efficiencies can be gained by combining some snapper grouper amendments that are on similar schedules and clarify timing for the council consideration of the Gulf-Council-led CMP amendments. Then that takes us to motions.

I will make this motion on behalf of the Executive Committee, and don't worry about where you were. **Move to approve the final 2021 operational budget, as presented. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion of that motion? **Any opposition of the motion? Hearing none, the motion passes.** Then I have a draft timing and tasks motion, which I will need to get somebody to make, please. Steve.

MR. POLAND: I will make it, Mel. **Move to approve the following timing and tasks: conduct an Executive Committee review of the CCC legislative policies document and prepare a draft for council approval by March 2022.**

MR. BELL: All right. Do we have a second?

MS. BECKWITH: Second.

MR. BELL: Anna seconds. Any discussion of the motion? **Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none and hearing none, that motion passes.** That concludes all of our committee reports. Now, if everybody is okay, let's take -- Do you need ten to reset? We can take a full -- Let's just take five, a quick head break, whatever you need, and then, if we could set up for the SERO reports, that would be great.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: I think we can go ahead and move towards getting Frank queued up and things ready, we can just roll when he's ready.

MR. HELIES: Thanks, Mel. Have you got me?

MR. BELL: Sure do. Thanks again, and I apologize for us running a little late, but we haven't been goofing off for the past four or five days. Start at your pleasure.

MR. HELIES: I will then. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Frank Helies with the South Atlantic Branch at the Regional Office. I look forward to being able to see everybody in person here soon, and these virtual meetings are something else, aren't they? I am going to keep this real short. It's six slides.

The purpose of this presentation is a couple of items. I'll remind the council of the requirement to review standardized bycatch reporting methodologies, provide the council the draft document, which is Attachment A5b in the Council II Session folder in the briefing book, if you guys would like to review that at your pleasure. I will briefly discuss the progress and timing of the review and try to get some feedback, if time allows, from you all.

Real quick, what are SBRMs? The definition of "SBRM" is an established, consistent procedure, or procedures, used to collect, record, and report bycatch data in the fishery. The purpose is to collect, record, and report bycatch data that, in conjunction with other information, are used to assess the amount and type of bycatch. It's important to note that the council has SBRMs for each of our FMPs.

The SBRM final rule was effective on February 21, 2017, and so we've been working on this for a couple of years now. We're required to review all of our SBRMs by February 21, 2022, and this review needs to be completed once every five years. There is four criteria that we need to look at, and the first one is characteristics of the bycatch occurring in the fishery, and this is mostly amount and type of bycatch, and we also have to look at the feasibility of the methodology from cost, technical, and operational perspectives. Basically, is it capable of being implemented? The last two bullets there are the uncertainty and how we use the data.

I am going to go into a little bit more detail on this slide, and so the format of the review document is it's basically separated into two sections. Chapter 1 provides background information on the SBRM final rule, and it explains the criteria for reviewing the SBRMs that were briefly discussed in the last slide, and it also gives an overview of the various reporting programs that we have in use in the region, and these are broken out by sector.

Then the rest of the document, Chapters 2 through 9, we dive into the individual FMPs, including the jointly-managed FMPs with the Gulf of Mexico, and these chapters are broken into five or six sections, depending on the complexity of the SBRMs we have on the books. The first section would be what is the SBRM that we have for the FMP, and, for example, several of the original FMPs implemented SBRMs for the fishery and some, for instance Snapper Grouper, have been modified over time. Many of the SBRMs were implemented through the Comprehensive Sustainable Fishery Act Amendment back in 1998 and 1999.

The next section, we describe exactly what methods are being used to collect bycatch data in the fishery, and it's important to note that SBRMs, in general, provide for a wide range of standardized options for collecting the data, and these include logbooks, observer coverage, state programs, and, more recently, electronic technology.

After we go through what the SBRMs are, we discuss the amount and type of bycatch in the fishery, and these sections are broken out by sector and component, and, for this review, we included data from 2015 to 2019, and these sections are similar to what we see in our bycatch practicability analyses that we include in the amendments, and you can reference the one in Dolphin Wahoo 10 as the latest example of a BPA we've completed, and so the data is very similar to what we include in the amendment. The final sections of the review for each chapter, we discuss the feasibility of the SBRMs, the uncertainty in the data, and how we use that data to assess the bycatch in the fishery.

You have seen this slide before in presentations that Rick has given on updates on SBRMs, and so, right now, we're in the council review stage, and we have had discussions on whether the council would like to see this document presented to the SSC. If that was to happen, it would need to happen in October. The council would finalize the review either in September or December, depending on whether you would like the SSC to look at it. After the council blesses it, the agency will make a decision, and we have to complete a decision memo and send it up to Headquarters.

At this point we don't -- We, preliminarily, don't believe we're going to need an FMP to amend the SBRMs, but we do need to -- If the council would like to look at modifying the way we collect bycatch data in any of the fisheries, we can address that in future amendments, and then we would need to come up with a plan for our future reviews. As I mentioned earlier, they need to be completed every five years.

Finally, some questions for you all to consider. First and foremost, any thoughts on the format of the review? Any changes that the IPT would like to consider before we present the information to you guys again, and whether or we not we feel that the document should go to the SSC, and we want to make sure we ask the SSC specific questions related to them. They're very busy, and they have a lot of assessments to review, and other actions that are of high importance for the council that it's working on, and so we want to make sure we're very specific about the questions we ask the SSC, when and if they review the document. I tried to run through that pretty quick, and we've had a long week here, and so I'm open to any questions, Mr. Chair.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Frank. I appreciate that. In looking at your three questions there, maybe the third one is the simplest to ask right now, because I don't know if people are able to comment on format or changes, but what about that SSC? Is this something we would want the SSC to look at, and then keep in mind that, as Frank pointed out, and we're all aware, they've got a full plate too, and so any thoughts on that one? Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Thank you for the presentation, Frank. You had mentioned you might would have some specific questions for the SSC, and what type of questions would those be?

MR. HELIES: Ideally, we wouldn't want them to get bogged down in the sections that describe the amount and type of bycatch, and we would really, ideally, like them to focus on the uncertainty in the way that we collect the data, and maybe questions on how we use the data, but I would probably focus on the last two sections there of the review criteria.

MR. POLAND: Okay. I guess, to Mel's point about everyone's plate full of work, are these questions that we feel the SSC needs to provide input on before we finalize this review?

MR. HELIES: I will let Jack or Rick help me out here. The rule requires the council, in consultation with the agency, to work with either the SSC or the Science Center to develop this review, and so I don't think we are required to present this information to the SSC. I know that you guys like to run quite a bit of your work through them, but I don't think it's a requirement of the rule. We do have Science Center representation on the IPT.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Thank you for that, Frank. I mean, I don't necessarily see a problem in asking our SSC to review this, and I think it's something we probably could work into their workload, Chairman Bell, and so I guess, if I'm leaning one way or another, I would lean to send this out to our SSC to review. I don't foresee it taking a substantial amount of time for them to review this.

MR. BELL: Well, and, as Frank said, with maybe some very specific focus to it, so they don't get bogged down, but I think that's something maybe we would have to have some discussion with the Chair, about how to present that to them and not make it an overwhelming task on top of other things that we've given them, but I can see some value in commenting on the aspects that Frank mentioned, perhaps.

I mean, that would make sense to me. We'll certainly explore that and try to make it happen, and I know we're on a tight timeline, and this thing has got to be finished by February of 2022, which we're kind of stuck up between now and December, but, I mean, I'm fine with allowing us to approach the SSC properly with it, and, again, not overwhelm them with it. Then, in terms of kind of how this works, back and forth, you mentioned changes for the IPT to consider, and is that something that -- I don't know, and, John, I would ask you, and is this something the IPT would have time to deal with, or how would we do that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I would ask Myra to perhaps consider that on the IPT and how we can get it in, and there's definitely a lot going on, and a lot of things to try and juggle, as far as timing and folks opportunities to review.

MS. BROUWER: I would agree with John. I think John Hadley and I maybe need to sit down and take another look at our workplan and see where we can fit some time for this.

MR. BELL: Okay. All right. Okay, and so that's certainly moving forward. Are there thoughts on the format of the review? I don't really have any feelings about that. It seems like the format is -- The process seems like it's kind of set, and are you talking about the actual document itself?

MR. HELIES: Thanks, Mel. I basically just drafted the template, the review document, and if the council had any specific comments on it. If not, we'll just move forward with the way it is, and that's fine.

MR. BELL: I encourage folks to take a look at that, certainly, as you mentioned. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I read the whole thing, and I just have some like editorial things that I was curious about, that I don't think that we need to go through it here. Is it best to email you, or how would you like to handle that?

MR. HELIES: Yes, we're open to any and all comments, suggestions, or edits that you would like to provide. Mike Schmidtke is the co-lead for the council staff, and so, if you would just like to include us on any suggested edits, go right ahead. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. That's good. Steve.

MR. POLAND: I was just going to speak to the format. I really like how it's broken out by FMP section, and this isn't necessarily really to the report, but just for my personal, I guess, reference, but I like the tables in here, where release mortality rates used in the most current assessment are recorded by species and by sector, and that's something that I find myself looking for quite often, and I like how it's presented.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to make sure that, for the record, Frank, next time we present the SBRM, you could just note, perhaps in track changes or whatever, any edits that Kerry or any other council member provided, so that we know what those edits are the next time the council sees it.

MR. HELIES: Thanks, Monica. That shouldn't be an issue at all.

MR. BELL: Okay. Frank, is that enough to work with right now?

MR. HELIES: Yes, and I appreciate the feedback. I guess you guys would potentially like this to go to the SSC, and I will work with Chip and Mike. If that's the case, we'll come up with some very pointed questions to them and make sure it doesn't take up a whole lot of their work time.

MR. BELL: Okay. Yes, I think definitely coordinate with staff, and there are multiple competing juggling schedules, and so thanks. Thanks for the report, and any further questions or comments for Frank? I don't see any. Thanks, Frank.

MR. HELIES: Thanks. My pleasure.

MR. BELL: That takes us to for-hire electronic reporting, and Karla Gore, I guess, is onboard. Go ahead and take it away.

MS. GORE: Thanks for having me. My name is Karla Gore from the Southeast Regional Office, and I'm just here to give you guys a quick update on the Southeast For-Hire Electronic Reporting Program. I put together this -- I just wanted to show you the number of permit holders who have created accounts, in either eTRIPS or VESL, to start reporting their trips electronically. For the South Atlantic, there's been about -- The number has increased a little bit since I put this together,

but there's a little over 500 South Atlantic permit holders using eTRIPS, and a little bit over 500 permit holders using VESL.

There's about 315 that have started the program, started the SEFHIER program using VESL, and we also have the South Carolina state program, which uses VESL, and that encompasses our charter vessels, and then we also have the Southeast Regional Headboat Program, which is also using VESL. In total, we have a little over 1,000 permit holders that have registered accounts with these electronic reporting applications. We're not sure that all of them are actively reporting, but they have at least taken the first step, and they have registered accounts.

You can see that the numbers for the Gulf of Mexico -- They're a little bit outdated right now, but we have about 105 permit holders in the Gulf of Mexico reporting using VMS, which is another option besides eTRIPS and VESL for those Gulf fishermen.

As you can see, a large number of permit holders have yet to sign up to report, and we're about 50 percent of where we thought we needed to be for the South Atlantic. We went into this thinking we had about 2,000 permit holders to get reporting, and we do expect a 20 to 30 percent permit latency rate, and so that might account for why we're not seeing the numbers that we had hoped to see, but we're also hearing from fishermen that they're choosing to kind of give up their permit, due to increased restrictions, and so they might have been state fishermen and had federal permits, but they just decided that they don't want their federal permit anymore. We're also hearing a lot of fishermen just really don't know about the regulations, or are unsure how to comply, and I will talk a little bit more about that in a second.

One thing I want to note though is that the permit holders who are out of compliance won't be able to renew their permits, and so we anticipate that, as permits come up for renewal this year, they will reach out to the Permits Office, find out they're out of compliance, and we'll be able to get them into compliance, if we haven't already reached out to them before.

I just wanted to emphasize that we are trying to reach out to fishermen who haven't established user accounts. We know who the permit holders are, and we've done a lot of outreach to try to reach them. We've been outreaching this program for over two years, with a really big push last December, and we realize that even that wasn't enough, and we're trying new and innovative things all the time.

Most recently, we sent out another letter, and this was targeting all the permits holders who haven't established user accounts, and so we felt like, if they hadn't established a user account, they haven't done the very first basic part of this program, and so we sent that letter out a couple of weeks ago, and we have been getting an increase in calls, and so I think there are people who just didn't know.

We sent out another Fishery Bulletin that reminded people that the program had started on January 4, and compliance is required, and we pointed them to different tools to get them into compliance, and we have -- Our compliance team, and our data team, have been reaching out to fishermen, just giving them calls and trying to help them get themselves into compliance, and that's been very helpful. We have the 1-800 number, and our customer service team is there from 8:30 to 4:30 every day, and they're there to help get people into this program, and so we walk them through the different options for applications, and they will help them set up their accounts, and they will help

them run through a test trip. Some of the calls have lasted two hours, but that's what we're here for, and we totally encourage fishermen to call us, so we can help them out.

We have also established a new for-hire Fishery Bulletin, and so this is just for for-hire sector, and this is a good way to communicate with the sector on news related to this program, and so, if you guys want to sign up for that, you can find the link to sign up for the bulletin on our website. We have also -- We did weekly webinars earlier in the year, and I think those got us through the end of March, and then we had a request from fishermen that we should continue the webinars, but maybe less frequently, and so we've moved them to monthly, and our next one is on July 13, and those are really just question-and-answer webinars.

We have SERO staff, ACCSP staff, which is the maker of eTRIPS, Blue Fin Data staff, which is the maker of VESL, and occasionally we'll have VMS vendors on the call, and it's really just to answer the questions that fishermen have as they're using the programs.

I just wanted to point out that we did have an issue, in the last month, that has come up, and it related to the dually-permitted GARFO and SERO permit holders, and eTRIPS is the application that allows those with both a GARFO and a SERO permit to see the questions for both programs in one form, and so they don't have to submit or report to GARFO and to report to SERO. They log in, and the system knows that they have both permits, and they see the questions for both forms.

I think this is a little bit surprising, for some of the GARFO fishermen, when they were logging into the app, because they were using it for a while, and there were new questions on the app, and so these questions include the economic questions, and there is additional depth questions that they weren't used to seeing, and so we heard a little bit from the GARFO fishermen that they don't want to report these socioeconomic questions, and these are the things like fuel used, fuel price per gallon, cost of charter, that kind of thing.

We also heard from the fishermen, the GARFO fishermen, that they don't want to respond to these additional questions when they're not fishing for a SERO-permitted species, and so we're trying to do a little bit more targeted outreach to the dually-permitted fishermen, to make sure that they understand the requirements. We did a lot of outreach, but I think it was early on, and people weren't paying that much attention, but, now that it's an active program and they're seeing changes to their forms, we're hearing a little bit from them, and so we do have another letter that's going out to the GARFO/SERO dually-permitted fishermen, to kind of explain the program a bit more and point them to resources that they may need.

Right now, if you have interactions with fishermen and they're not sure exactly what they need to do now, the most important thing is they should select a software, either eTRIPS or VESL, create a user account, and start reporting their trips. If they're not doing that, they're out of compliance, and they will probably end up getting a call from our compliance team, and then they might get into the situation where they won't be able to renew their permit.

If they have questions, there's a lot of information on our website. As I said, we have our customer service team that is always there and ready to answer questions, and we're continuing to hold those webinars. There's the number for our customer service line, and the website is there, and our program email address, and so, if anybody has any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

MR. BELL: Thanks for that, Karla, and, as you well know, education and outreach, and sometimes some handholding, is essential to this. Tony, do you have a question for Karla?

MR. DILERNIA: No, Mr. Chairman, not a question, but simply a statement. The economic reporting requirements to GARFO fishermen were a surprise, and they were objecting to it, and it was a topic of discussion at the last Mid-Atlantic Council meeting, and I anticipate the council will be sending a letter to SERO regarding perhaps exempting those fishermen from the GARFO region from those additional reporting requirements. I haven't seen the details of the letter yet, but I know there was a general agreement at the council table to address this issue, to contact SERO on this issue, and the letter will be going out. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for the heads-up on that, Tony. Any questions or comments for Karla? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know that this is a -- This reporting is early on in its stages, but when do you expect the council to maybe get a report on species caught or number of permits that have not -- You showed a slide earlier of the number of permits, or folks, that have participated, but I was just curious of how many permits are out there for the reporting part, and I might have asked this question before, and I can't remember the answer, but, if you catch other species, HMS species, are you mandated to report anything you catch under this reporting program? Thank you.

MS. GORE: The first -- I will start with the second question. Yes, if you catch -- This program, you're required to report anything you catch, regardless of where you're fishing or what you're targeting, and we do have -- So eTRIPS is able to -- If you catch an HMS species, and you're using eTRIPS, it's able to give you the HMS questions, and so you don't actually have to submit a separate HMS report. HMS will get a copy, and we'll get a copy of that report. VESL doesn't have that capability yet, and it's something that they're working on.

Then the first question about when we can do a report, I feel we're a few months away from that, for sure, and we have been having some issues with our data, and we're really just kind of fine-tuning and cleaning it up right now, but I think that I could probably say, by September, we could have something that would be maybe useful to the council, and I think I captured all of your questions. If I didn't, let me know.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: No, you did. I think this is -- It's a new program, and folks are understanding it, or trying to, and there will be some hiccups, but I think it's going to be something that's going to be able to shed some light, in the future, of the recreational industry, and particularly to catches and MRIP surveys and what's actually being caught, and so thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for that, Dewey. Anna and then Andy.

MS. BECKWITH: Thanks. I think, also, some of the charter folks are a little bit confused that they are reporting and then also receiving the regular call-in survey, and they don't quite understand that those two surveys have to overlap for some particular number of years, in order to verify one against the other, and so I wonder if there's not some small percentage of folks who think that they are complying, by reporting to the old way, when they receive those phone calls,

or those survey letters in the mail, that they're going to receive a call and not realize that they also have to be doing the logbook electronically, in addition to.

In terms of the economic questions, certainly the guys here are also a bit annoyed by some of those questions, and I think some of the suggestions that I've heard is that, if it was not for every trip, every time, if there was some percentage that was surveyed, that the information would likely be more accurate, and it becomes a bit of a nuisance if you are doing the same type of charter every day, for some particular season, and the answers will tend to be identical over that season, instead of maybe some sub-portion being surveyed that, if it's -- If they're not doing it all the time, they make take a bit more time to be accurate in it. Thanks.

MR. BELL: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Chairman. I wanted to go back to Dewey's comments, and I appreciate the question, with regard to when data can be presented, and I think we've all understood that there would be a ramp-up period with this program, and you just heard, a lot of outreach and education is ongoing right now.

I think, in terms of information that we can bring to the council, a lot of it is really kind of contingent on the questions and information that you want to see, and I would certainly say we're not in a position to start providing kind of detailed landings estimates and information at this point, but we certainly could provide some kind of summary statistics with regard to program participation and weekly reports, things of that nature that may be coming in, and, as, obviously, the program continues to build, and more people participate in it, we'll, obviously, hone-in on providing more specific detailed information, including those landings estimates that I'm sure are of interest to everyone.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Andy. Any other questions or comments for Karla? I don't see any. Karla, thanks for the presentation, and I know this will be an interesting process, as it moves along.

MS. GORE: It sure has been. Thanks for having me.

MR. BELL: Thanks for being here. We've got one more report from SERO, which would be Rick just presenting the landings update, and I would like to do that, and then I will pose the question to you. Are you good to go for the rest of the meeting, or do we need to take a half-hour or so for lunch, to let your minds clear? If we were to delay for the lunch, and go a little longer, are we going to lose anybody, other than the folks we've already lost? Okay. What I am thinking then is that we let Rick finish, and we can take like a half-hour, and people can have a quick lunch, and we'll come back, and then we've got council staff reports, and we've got our Outreach AP presentation, and we've got to discuss the item of Other Business, the EFP, and I think that's it, and so, unless there's -- Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just going to say, and I thought I mentioned this to you earlier, but I have a hard stop around 1:40, or 1:45, and I can't go any longer than that.

MR. BELL: Yes, and I was thinking that we were losing you at 1:00, for some reason, and that's not until 1:45?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, let's just press through. I will stop talking. Rick, if you're ready, roll the landings.

MR. DEVICTOR: All right. I'm all set to go. This is a short South Atlantic landings update. If you recall, we used to give landings at each council meeting and go through those, the ACL percentages and such. We did away with that, in the interest of time, and so what we do now is we provide a written report, in the briefing book, of landings at each meeting, and then we answer questions that may come up during the week.

What happened here was council staff requested that SERO give a presentation on the overages of ACLs, and I think that this came about because there was the delay, due to COVID, of receiving MRIP information last year, and then, also, when the recreational estimates came out, it did show that bluefin tilefish had exceeded their ACL, and so council staff wanted to see where we landed last year, 2020, in terms of those ACL percentages, and were AMs not triggered because of the delay in recreational data.

The council request was straightforward, just like I said, and it was to provide a list of stocks that exceeded their 2020 ACLs, both commercial and recreational, and then what were the effects on the in-season and post-season AMs.

Before we go through landings, we always give you some caveats, and so these landings are not final. Right now, they're just preliminary, and the recreational data for the stocks, presented here and on our website, are in CHTS units, and, of course, that's Coastal Household Telephone Survey. As I understand it, the data comes in FES, but the Science Center converts it to CHTS currency, and the reason for this is because our ACLs are still in CHTS currency, and it looks like dolphin and wahoo will be the first ones to go through to become FES.

Just like I said -- The landings are on our website. As you know, we get calls from fishermen, and they tell us that, hey, we're at 92 percent, and when are you going to close down, et cetera, and so we know that people use this website, the ACL monitoring website at SERO, to monitor what our landings are during the course of the fishing season, and then, of course, you can go back historically and look back a number of years, and the IPT will use that too, as they develop amendments.

Digging right in, I will first go through commercial and where we've exceeded the ACL, and so, of course, you see the species there, the percent of the ACL that was landed, and then that last column are the in-season, and so all of these species where we have exceeded all did have in-season AMs that were triggered, and so I won't go through these in great detail, and you can see what's on the screen. I will just kind of point out that you see Atlantic cobia there, and we went over by just over 35 percent. We are working on rulemaking for that, per the request from ASMFC. They worked on Amendment 1, Addendum 1, and they sent us a letter, and so we are working on rulemaking to increase that commercial ACL.

Then we have golden tilefish hook-and-line, and you can see that we were over by about 5.6 percent, and we did close down in July. Longline, that's the first closure that happens every year, and so you can see where that closed in February, but, again, if you recall back to March, we did

reopen when we looked at those landings and we knew we were under the ACL, but we did end up going over.

Triggerfish and snowy grouper are similar in many ways. We didn't go over by much, and you can see the 0.5 and 0.6. In-season, we closed down at the very end of the year there, and both, of course, have that split commercial season, where you roll over what was not caught in the first season into the second season, and so there were underages of those first season ACLs that we did roll over to the second. Then there is red snapper, and you can see that's a July opening, of course, and you can see when we closed that, and, finally, Spanish mackerel, and, of course, there is the Northern Zone, Southern Zone, and total, and we did go over that.

If you were to look at this table, I would say that SERO and the Science Center do a pretty good job on the commercial side of things, which isn't too surprising, factoring in when the data comes in, on most species. The cobia and Spanish mackerel, those are an additional challenge, and it has to do with the portion of those landings that are landed in state waters, and so what needs to happen is the Science Center needs to attempt to account for those landings when they're monitoring in-season, and a portion of each ACL may have been landed after the federal closed, if they were open in state waters.

There's the commercial overages. Then, just going on to the commercial AMs, you know AMs, and you talked a lot about AMs during the course of the week, and so you're familiar with these, but, just to remind you, of course, there is an in-season closure, which, of course, was triggered for these species, and so the post-season is to reduce the commercial ACL for the following fishing year by the amount of the commercial overage in the prior year, and so this is what we refer to, of course, as a payback, and so, if you're over by 300, you take off 300 the following year, but you can see those three bullets, and all three of these need to be triggered.

This is the AM for most of the species you manage, and certainly most of the snapper grouper species, and so, one, the commercial ACL needs to be exceeded, the total ACL needs to be exceeded, and it needs to be overfished. If you remember the two slides prior, the two species that are overfished that were exceeded were snowy grouper and red snapper, and you can see the note here. I went through the codified text, and there is not a payback for red snapper. It is an in-season closure, but there is not a payback AM for that, and so what is left is snowy grouper, and, again, that was 100.5 percent that was landed. Well, they were under on the recreational side, and so the total was not exceeded for snowy grouper, and so the bottom line is that, since all three criteria did not apply to the stocks with the payback AM in 2020, no commercial paybacks will be applied this year.

Moving to the recreational overages, we exceeded the ACL for three species, blueline tilefish, golden tilefish, and red snapper. You can see, on the screen, that blueline tilefish was 336 percent, and so that total ACL is roughly 50/50 between the commercial and recreational side. That recreational ACL is just over 116,000 pounds, and the total reported was just under 400,000.

I have information there on the right-hand side, because I figured there would be some questions, digging into the data a little bit more, and 87 percent of those landings were in Wave 4, and so, of course, that's July and August. 78 percent of Wave 4 landings came from Nags Head, North Carolina. 90 percent of Nags Head harvest in Wave 4 came from charter, and so the bottom line

to this is the majority of landings were from charter from Nags Head and during the summer for blueline tilefish. We looked into the PSEs, and that was 62 percent for Wave 4.

Next, we'll go on to golden tilefish, and you can see we went over by 25 percent there. Of course, that's a challenge, because that rec ACL is relatively low, and it's only at 2,316 fish, and what was reported caught was 2,894.

Then there's red snapper, and you can see that we went over by 44 percent on that, and that's part of the reason why we have one day shorter this year, because we do use catch rates from the prior year to determine how long the season should be open in this year, and, of course, we look at a combination of MRIP and the state surveys, such as the Florida state surveys, to determine the catch rates for that.

This is my final slide, and it's just looking, like I did with the commercial, at the recreational AMs and what were the effects, and so recreational is very similar to commercial, in a lot of ways. You do have in-season closures for that, and post-season, where commercial is a payback, and, in recreational, you have a payback, but you also reduce the length of the recreational fishing season, and those same three criteria need to be met, and so you need to have the recreational ACL exceeded, the total ACL exceeded, and overfished. For red snapper, in the codified text, in the regulations, it says the length of the recreational fishing season for red snapper serves as the in-season AM.

When you look at the three species that were exceeded, blueline tilefish, golden tilefish, and red snapper, blueline tilefish is not overfished, golden tilefish is not overfished, and, of course, red snapper, you do not have this sort of payback, and we specify the length of the season each year, and that is your AM. It's the same bottom line with this. Since all three criteria do not apply to these stocks with a payback, no recreational paybacks will be applied in 2021 for the three species where we had overages. Mr. Chair, that's it, and hopefully that answers the request of the council.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Rick. Thanks for pulling that together and for the presentation. I know Dewey has his hand up, and so, Dewey, do you have a question?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Can you go back -- I've got a few questions, and I know we're short of time, but I feel like this is really important to flesh out, and can you go back to page 6 of the presentation, and your slide up here for blueline tilefish? Your PSEs of 62 percent for Wave 4, is that both for-hire, or is that recreational? I mean, which one is it, private or for the charter boats?

MR. DEVICTOR: I would need to follow-up on that, Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I do not believe that that 62 percent of it is for the charter boats, and I noticed here that you have -- Given that the area north of Cape Hatteras, in the latest stock assessment, was given 30,000 pounds commercial, and 30,000 pounds recreational for this area, and that 87 percent, or almost 300,000 pounds come out of this area recreational, and how does that work with the stock? I just feel like that we're going down something here where there's no accountability measure.

The commercial side doesn't have a chance to exceed it, given the exception here, and where is the equitability going to come from at the council level? The commercial fishermen, in this area,

deserve to be able to fish on the abundance of the blueline tilefish, just like we're seeing the recreational industry, and so it's really frustrating, and the wonder that this can go on for years, and we're not going to be able to take advantage of all this abundance.

I just wonder, from the council's perspective, and from SERO's perspective, where is the relief for the commercial industry north of Cape Hatteras that has weathered this storm of no science and other things, and that we would like to participate in the abundance of this stock. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Dewey, for the questions. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Dewey, I can't speak to what the council wants to do about this, but I will note that, in the National Standard 1 Guidelines, they talk about a performance standard for ACLs, and they do say that, if the ACL -- If the catch exceeds the ACL for a stock, or stock complex, more than once in the last four years, the whole system of ACLs and AMs should be reevaluated and modified to improve the performance and effectiveness, and so I do think the council should keep their eye on this, going forward, at least for National Standard 1.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Given that, I mean, I believe, if you look back over it, that it's been exceeded quite a few times here, and so I don't know when that kicks in, and it's not to penalize somebody, but we've got a stock here that we used to fish on that we caught a lot more than the crumbs that we're given now, and we're seeing another sector that is enjoying the abundance of this stock. I mean, it's happening, and we would like to be afforded that same opportunity. We feel like we deserve it, and I'm just looking for some real substance and answers and how to fix this.

The science is lacking, and there's no doubt about that, but, heck, it could be four or five years before it ever catches up, and we would like to enjoy the prosperity that's out there now, and so it's been -- The ACLs have been exceeded, I suspect, in the last few years, and not just this particular year.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for that, Dewey, and, Monica, thanks for pointing that out. That's, obviously, something we should follow-up with you on, I believe. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel. To Dewey's point, he's exactly right, and I just pulled up our historical landings data for blueline tilefish, and it's been exceeded a number of years running, and I don't have the most recent 2018/2019 time period, but, going back to 2015, 2016, and 2017, regular overages were happening then, and so I think it would be worth the council re-looking at the accountability measures for blueline, and maybe we can incorporate it in with the other tilefish actions we're considering.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Andy. Given what it says, I think we do need to pay that some attention. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thanks. So, given that provision in the National Standard 1 Guidelines, I've got more of a process question, and so is that something that we the council need to keep track of, not only for blueline, but for all our species, or is that something that the service would notify us of, either via memo or letter or something, and then what type of statutory deadline, if any, is there for that review?

MR. BELL: Well, it's a good process question, and I don't know if anybody could -- Andy or Monica, I guess, if anybody has any other input on that, and, I mean, I certainly don't.

MR. STRELCHECK: I will jump in, and Monica might know more of the details, but I don't think there's, kind of procedurally, anything laid out, in terms of kind of whose responsibility, and certainly the service is the one that is the doing the monitoring, and we're bringing to you landings data, and I like the approach with this presentation that we're giving you, to let you know about the overages, and so I think this brings it kind of front and center for the council to be able to take a look at the time series track record and dig in even deeper, and we can certainly do a better job of kind of flagging these issues as they come up in the future.

MR. BELL: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to add to what Andy said, I don't know that there is a process for this. However, I will be happy to check with other attorneys who advise other councils, to see whether they have some sort of process, and we can check with the Fisheries Service Headquarters, to see if they're thinking about any kind of process. The guidelines have been in place now long enough that I'm assuming this kind of issue has come up before, and so we can figure that out, and, maybe at the next council meeting, bring back something a little more definitive.

MR. BELL: I didn't think we would be able to answer it here, but you're right, and, if you don't mind doing some more research on that, and we'll definitely need some advice on this in the near future. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Andy and Monica, thank you for that. I am curious in this, because I'm sure we have other stocks that might fall under that criteria, and is this -- I don't know, and I guess this might be something that would be tracked in the SAFE reports or something in other regions, and I'm not sure, but, any additional information, I would appreciate it.

MR. BELL: It's, obviously, not something we're tracking, and the service would need to be tracking it, as Andy mentioned, and this is -- I don't think we have an answer here right now, but, obviously, we need to pay this some attention, and we need to figure this out. Anything else on this particular topic or the report from Rick at this point?

MR. DEVICTOR: Mel, just one other thing, and, like I said before, we have historical harvest on our website, and so this really isn't just difficult to track, just in terms of at least overages, and so we could pull that information.

MR. BELL: Yes, and it's just we've never sat down and looked at it as a topic kind of thing, and so thanks for the report, and so okay. All right. Any other questions for Rick? All right. What I would like to do now is try to get definitely one more thing under our belt here, which would be the discussion of the exempted fishing permit that Chester brought to our attention, and Tony is prepared to speak to. I want to make sure we have some discussion on that before we start losing a couple more people. I'm not sure how staff would queue that up, but, basically, that would involve, I guess, input from Chester and Tony, at some point.

MR. DILERNIA: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to -- I have some notes here that I'm prepared to speak to that I believe can give a description of what the request has been. With your permission, sir, I could go into that now.

MR. BELL: If that makes the most sense. I know Chester brought it up, but if it makes sense for you to just explain what it is, because I think Chester wanted it to be discussed, and so that works, Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you very much. First of all, let me emphasize that I am providing this report in my position as the liaison from our council to your council, and so it is the liaison's responsibility to provide a very unbiased and fair and open presentation of the issue, and that's my intention. I hope that my personal views regarding this issue are not reflected in my report.

First of all, very quickly, for those who may benefit from it, a quick review of the experimental fishing permit process in the GARFO region, and let me make it clear that the council does not vote to approve or disapprove a permit for the experimental fishing permit. The EFP is issued by the region upon the request of an entity, and, in this case, the entity requesting the experimental fishing permit is Lund's Fishery in Cape May, New Jersey, and they have petitioned GARFO directly for a permit to conduct a purse seine fishery for threadfin herring in the Mid-Atlantic region.

Now, eventually, once the region publishes the notice of application of this permit, the council can review the application and make recommendations to the region, but, again, those are simply recommendations to the region, and they are not a yes or no to the region, but it's simply the council's views regarding this application.

So, what is the application that we have received? In the briefing documents that we received for the Mid-Atlantic Council meeting last week, Lund's Fishery was good enough to send a copy of its cover letter to the region describing the fishery, and the project is -- According to the letter, the project is scheduled to start -- They are asking permission to start May 2 or so of 2022, and the project end date would end approximately November 1 of 2022.

The project would take place during the period of the normal operations of the New Jersey Atlantic menhaden purse seine fishery, and they are requesting a 6.6-million-pound catch limit for the first year of the project. It would occur in the federal waters from Ocean City, Maryland to Montauk, New York, and within the management jurisdiction of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

The fishery would take place from three to thirty miles offshore, in water approximately less than thirty fathoms deep, and they expect to have -- Trips would be twenty-four to forty-eight hours in length, and up to five trips per week can be attempted. They anticipate -- In their cover letter, they state that an average trip can estimate landings of 80,000 to 100,000 pounds, and the description of the gear is a purse seine of approximately 2,000 feet in length, 180 feet in depth, and one-inch mesh.

Any bycatch will be recorded, although they anticipate very little bycatch, as it is anticipated, as in the case of the Atlantic menhaden purse seine fishery. The product, or what's been caught, will

go to the recreational bait markets, and those that are not good enough for the recreational bait market would go to zoos and aquariums.

That's why they're asking for an experimental fisheries permit, and now why they're asking for this permit is because, a few years ago, the Mid-Atlantic Council passed a forage fish amendment for all its fishery management plans, and one of the stated aspects of that amendment was to freeze the footprint of many of the forage fish or freeze the footprint of the harvest of any of the forage fish that are found in the Mid-Atlantic region.

Upon review, in the past, threadfin herring, in the Mid-Atlantic region, the approximate catch of threadfish herring has been around 17,500 pounds, and, if we froze the footprint, that's where we would be, and Lund's Fishery is asking for an experimental fishery permit to catch up to 6.5 million pounds.

Now, let me be clear that the amendment that the Mid-Atlantic Council passed said that there is the potential for a developing fishery if it can be demonstrated that the developing fishery would not have a detrimental effect on those species that the forage fish amendment is intended to protect, and the fact that threadfin herring has been approved to be a forage fish in our amendment demonstrates the fact that it's basically food for all the critters that we manage, many of the critters that you folks manage, and many of the critters that are managed by HMS, and so that's where we are right now, and it's been pointed out to me that there is a threadfin fishery that occurs in the Gulf of Mexico, and I'm not sure how many -- I think it's in the millions of pounds also, and I'm not sure about that. I only received that information earlier this morning. That's what I have right now, and I would be happy -- I will mute myself, or I will wait, in case folks have any questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BREWER: I don't have any questions. I do have some observations to make, however. What's being requested here is, as Tony pointed out, annually, 6.6 million pounds of threadfin herring. That's roughly -- The whole thing about they're doing it for the bait market and for aquariums is pretty specious, because 6.6 million pounds is thirteen-times higher, thirteen-times the amount, of all of the annual catch for, and we call them greenies, for greenies for the entire eastern seaboard, both commercial and recreational.

This thing is dangerous, because these fish are essentially pretty similar to menhaden. Most everything eats them, and, most importantly for us, the FWC did a study and found that about 59 to 60 percent of the diet of king mackerel are these fish and what we call cigar minnows. The current trip limit, under the amendment that Tony mentioned, is about 17,000 pounds, and they want to do sixty-times the current trip limit.

They don't have any observers, and they've got very little way of reporting what they're doing, and this is really kind of reminiscent of the EFP that was presented with regard to fishing in the -- Or fishing for swordfish off the east coast of Florida. At least that was supported, at first, by the university, and there's no university or other association that's sponsoring this, and there is no principal investigator. This is really a very, very incomplete EFP, and it only about a little bit over a page, and it contains little information besides what they anticipate catching.

There is no mention made of any kind of scientific effort, in terms of whether this level of catch is sustainable, and, as I said, this -- It's just amazing, to me, that they would even seriously consider this, and so I would like to make a motion that we send a letter to GARFO setting forth our extreme concern with this EFP request, and I don't know whether we want to say we don't want to see it, but certainly there are a lot of concerns, as this thing currently stands, and, with that, I will mute myself.

MR. DILERNIA: Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor just for a moment, just for a couple of things that Councilman Brewer --

MR. BELL: Okay. Since you brought this up, sure, Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you. It's not the total catch for the Mid-Atlantic region of threadfin herring is 18,500 pounds, and that's not a trip limit. That's the total catch in the past few years, and so the request of 6.5 million pounds is about a 336-fold increase over what the council, or the footprint that has been frozen by the council.

Also, we, the Mid-Atlantic Council, are going to be waiting for the official publication of the receipt of the letter, or the application, before we will be presenting, or reacting, to that publication, and so I'm not sure where we're going to be going with the letter at this point, and we can't really do anything until GARFO puts it out there officially and says, hey, what do you folks think about it. I will mute myself again, and I will be happy to answer any other questions that folks might have. Thank you, sir.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Tony. Chester, I'm not really comfortable with a motion right now, particularly if we're going to state that we have extreme concern, and I'm not even sure of the process of us commenting on this to another region. I mean, certainly, we probably can, but this is kind of thrown in as other business for informational purposes, I thought, at this point, and we could spend a great deal of time trying to debate this, and we kind of have -- We don't have the full picture at this point, and so I agree that it's something that has, obviously, piqued people's antenna, and it's something we need to pay attention to, but I don't feel real comfortable with a motion to send a letter right now with extreme concern and all that sort of stuff, and so, you know, that's just my opinion. Other council members may feel differently, but I just really feel like kind of getting into this really quickly, at the last minute, and we can't really give it the full consideration it might need to result in a letter. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. I would just like to clarify. To my knowledge, and I also believe that -- This is not a completed application that is being sent in for an EFP. It's a developing one, and so I think that -- Also, I believe that there is further analysis that was sent into the Mid-Atlantic Council that might not have been provided, but, to my knowledge, this is preliminary, and it hasn't even been sent in, or submitted, to GARFO yet, and so that might help somebody reach out and ask more about it, or whatever, before one forms an opinion. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks for that, Dewey, and I'm not saying that, at some point, a comment is not possible, but, right now, I'm not sure that's a good idea. Chester, I will come back to you. Let me go to Andy, in case he has some insight into this.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel. My recommendation is to wait, and it's kind of along the same lines as is being mentioned, that there is a process involved with EFP applications, and, just for the council's awareness, if the Regional Administrator deems that the request is appropriate and valid, then we would, essentially, move it forward for further consideration, but that triggers a whole process with the Federal Register and the proposal being summarized for that Federal Register notice and interested persons commenting for a fifteen to forty-five-day comment period.

I think there's going to be a lot of opportunity to comment on this if GARFO, the Regional Administrator there, deems it appropriate to move forward, and that Regional Administrator could say that it doesn't warrant further consideration, at which time the applicant and the affected councils would be notified in writing, and it would be unnecessary for us to comment on the proposal at that stage.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, Andy. That's helpful, and so that's the process. I think, perhaps, we're a little early in this right now, and so, Chester.

MR. BREWER: Thank you, Mel. I apologize. I thought this had been submitted to GARFO and that it was under consideration. If that's not the case, then I withdraw the motion.

MR. BELL: Okay. No problem, and you didn't really fully make it, and you just said you might, and so I think we're okay there. Okay. Well, if we're all clear on that, I think that we'll just kind of wait and see how this evolves, and, if something is brought to us -- If there is actually an EFP, then that would make sense. Okay. Any other discussion of that right now or questions? I don't see any. Okay.

What I would like to do, just because you guys have been so great, and we're pushing you, if we could just take a quick ten-minute break and let everybody recharge, and we'll come back, and we will have the council staff reports and the Outreach Communication Advisory Panel report, which will be given by council staff, and so you'll basically be hearing the voices of council staff for the rest of the meeting, and so just take ten, and we'll come back and knock this out. I appreciate you hanging in there.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: I've got 1:40, or after, and I know we've lost some people already, and so, being respectful of everybody's rest of the day, let's go ahead and get going. We will go through council staff reports, and so the first one would be the Executive Director. John, whenever you're ready.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am ready. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and welcome, everybody, back from the break. I only have a few things here, and we've covered so much during this week, and I have just a few other things to bring up. One is we're continuing to have monthly update meetings with NMFS and the national council chairs, vice chairs, and EDs.

They started during COVID, and everyone agreed that it's something we should continue doing. They're just informational, and there's no decision-making or anything, but it has certainly helped open the lines of communication with NMFS for keeping up with Executive Orders and policy directives and all the various things that are going on, and so I just want to remind the council we're doing that. If you see something, if you have a question about something, feel free to reach

out to me or Mel, and we're always glad to take things to that group and try to find out as many answers as we can.

The other point I will make is we have talked, and hinted, a few times about the September meeting, and our intention now is that we would hold that as an in-person meeting. It seems like COVID is getting to the point where we can do that. Mask orders are being rescinded and that sort of thing, and so it seems like folks who are vaccinated and can gather, and things are getting much more back to normal, and certainly, by September, we hope that is the case, barring, of course, any major explosions of some of those COVID variants that are out there, but it does look good, and so then we see the council meeting has always been our big milestone, in terms of starting to return to normal, and so we are also looking at the fall meetings with our many SSC and AP meetings that will be held, and trying to do as many of those in-person as we can as well, and so hopefully, the fourth quarter of this year, we're getting back to something quite a bit more normal.

I will comment on the agenda, just to make it clear, and we did mention this a bit in the Executive Committee report, but the Executive Order 14008 presentation on the Thirty-by-Thirty and the climate challenge is not going to be given today, because of the creation of the Juneteenth federal holiday today, and so it was a challenge to get federal staff available, and those staff there who were going to report on this are not available, and so we will look at scheduling this for a later meeting, and, as I have said earlier, we will continue to track the progress of that and keep you informed of the various report-outs that come and progress and opportunities for us to comment, both formally and informally, as that goes.

Then the last thing I want to do is it's quite exciting to recognize a couple of new staff, and so we have Allie Iberle, and I think most people are familiar with Allie, through her work in the Citizen Science Program, but she has come onboard here recently as tech staff, and so she will be starting to take a bigger role, and you'll be seeing her presenting amendments and working on that sort of stuff, and so she's going to be in tech staff and the FMP crew, essentially, and so we're excited to have Allie stepping up to that job, and we really appreciate her experience and abilities and all that she has done with us through citizen science, and we're excited to have her taking on this role.

The other personnel issue is that we have a new quantitative scientist who will be coming onboard in mid-July, early to mid-July, I think, if I remember the exact date, and this will be Dr. Judd Curtis. He currently works for Texas A&M, and he's an associate research scientist, and he's the Deputy Director of what's called the Center for Sportfish Science and Conservation at the Harte Research Institute for Gulf of Mexico Studies. He's a member of the Gulf SSC, and has been for several years, and he's participated in SEDARs, which is kind of really exciting to us, and he's worked on a lot of research projects related to descending devices and discard mortality, red snapper, cobia, and he's worked on a lot of reef and coastal pelagic species. He worked on the Great Red Snapper Count.

While he hasn't as much experience in the Atlantic, he has tons of experience in issues that are very near and dear to all of us, and so Judd has a BA in biology and environmental science from Clark University, and his PhD is from Texas A&M in marine biology, and I will just highlight one thing, a paper that he has published titled *Quantifying Delayed Mortality from Barotrauma Impairment in Discarded Red Snapper Using Telemetry*, and that's actually been used in informing discard mortality for SEDAR assessments.

We welcome Judd aboard, and we look forward to having him join our family, and join our team, and we're really excited with what he's going to bring to a number of the issues that are challenging to us on a regular basis, and Judd was going to be here today, but I think, as we have run late, I'm not sure that he is still available, and so I will just shout out to Chip, to get the latest on that and see if Judd was able to still be on here at this late hour.

DR. COLLIER: No, and, unfortunately, he had to check-off for another meeting, but he did send me an email in regard to what he would like to say. Basically, he said many thanks for this opportunity to join the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council staff. I am excited to begin working on fishery issues in the South Atlantic region, and I look forward to meeting all the council members at the next council meeting and council staff when I get to Charleston. Thanks, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you, Chip. Allie, I didn't know if you wanted to say a word. You're, in a way, new. You're new to full-time permanent staff, and you were on a temporary position there, and I wanted to give you the opportunity, if you would like, but, if you would rather pass and say hello to everybody in person in September, that's fine, too.

MS. IBERLE: I'm excited to be here and to start working with you guys on snowy grouper in September, and so hopefully we get to do that in person.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you, Allie. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the Executive Director report.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, thanks, John, and thanks for ending on that good news there, and we appreciate having Allie and Judd onboard, and Allie kind of knew what she was getting into, and I hope we didn't scare Judd to death, if he was listening to the meeting, and so any questions for John? I don't see any hands. Okay. Well, that would take us to our next item, which would be John Hadley will give us an allocation decision tool update.

MR. HADLEY: Sure. Thank you, Mel. This will be a brief update, and it's just a verbal update, but the team working on this allocation decision tool, which is made up of Christina Wiegand, Mike Schmidtke, Myra Brouwer, and myself on the council side, and then also partnering with Scott Crosson at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and we've been working to develop this tool.

We've come up with, essentially, a draft list of questions to help work through some of the allocation decisions, and this was reviewed by the Socioeconomic Panel, as well as the SSC, earlier this year, and we received great feedback from them. We're working to incorporate that feedback and come up with a revised version that will be sent out for full review by the Regional Office, as well as the Science Center, and so the target date there is to try to have something ready to go and out for review sometime in early July.

Additionally, between now and before the September meeting, we plan to have the decision tool reviewed by the AP chairs, for at least kind of the big finfish APs, if you will, and get input from the APs, in that respect, on the decision tool. One side note I did want to mention is that the Gulf Council, I believe, is undertaking a similar, I guess -- Well, basically, they're looking at taking a similar route and coming up with a tool to help the Gulf Council examine allocation decisions

early in the process, and so when they get a stock assessment and they're going to be making these allocation decisions before an amendment has been developed.

They're kind of going along the same route as we are, and I presented kind of the information on where the South Atlantic Council stands in developing the allocation decision tool to some of the Gulf Council staff that's working on this, and we're going to kind of keep the communication lines open, since we're both trying to kind of go for the same goal, and so we'll kind of keep each other apprised as the two councils move forward towards kind of the same end goal of coming up with an allocation decision tool that can be used early in the process. That's all I have for my update, and certainly I would answer any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, thanks for that, John, and we do appreciate the hard work of everybody involved in this, and I think the idea is to give the councils the ability to work a little more efficiently and effectively in all the decisions we've got to make, and so that's much appreciated, and I'm really looking forward to all of this, and I'm glad that we're coordinating with the Gulf as well. Any questions for John?

MR. HADLEY: If I could, I just wanted to remind everyone that the council will be seeing a draft version of this in September, and the target kind of final approval is -- The target final approval would be December, and so just a reminder that you'll be seeing more of this over the next couple of meetings.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, thank you. All right. If there are no questions for John, we'll go to our next item, which would be Climate Change Scenario Planning Update from Roger. Whenever you're ready, Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. Today, I'm going to be discussing the East Coast Climate Change Scenario Planning Initiative, and what I wanted to do is -- I'm just going to draw on the presentation that was just recently provided to the NRCC to be able to highlight some of the decisions that have been made and really give us a foundation of where things are going right now.

The presentation had been made to New England the Mid-Atlantic back in April of this year, as a baseline, and I think we had a workshop, earlier in the year, for the council members that gave some of the background on scenario planning, and so that was similar, but I think this gets into more of the actual status of where things are. The NRCC did meet in May, and John was able to represent the council and be involved in that discussion, too.

The whole intention there was to build on activities of the core team that had been advanced on moving this process forward, and so I wanted to touch on a couple of things that were brought forward, and the timeline started back in 2019, advancing with, as I mentioned, the presentations to the councils and now to the NRCC, with decisions at the NRCC meeting, and so one of the first things is the core team is the group that is the primary technical group that's putting together materials and coordination and scoping and really advancing some of the efforts.

One thing that occurred is the present core team has representation from the New England Council, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, GARFO, the Northeast Science Center, and ASMFC. Recommendations were brought forward on expanding that to potentially have Headquarters, National Marine Fisheries Service Headquarters, and possibly the Southeast Fisheries Science

Center, and I know Headquarters, I think, has responded, and they are still going to provide who, and I know, if Clay is on the line, if he hasn't already been contacted, Chris Moore, I think, is going to contact him directly about the involvement with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, somebody with climate change or fisheries science expertise, if possible, to expand the discussions.

To make this move forward, one of the things that happened is that there was support, through the Nature Conservancy, for securing of a contractor, and the facilitator for this is now Jonathan Star, and he's been working with the core team to advance activities, and now that is -- He's funded to advance support of materials, building all the way into the first stages of developing the workshops.

I think the other side of this had to do with potential other funding that may be occurring, and I think it is, and the National Marine Fisheries Service Headquarters, I think, will be providing up to \$200,000 to provide support for participation and outreach and other workshop expenses, and so that will be advanced, and there is discussion, through the NRCC, on smaller amounts of resources that could be funneled to support each individual portion of this, but, if there are any activities that are over \$50,000 or something, that would probably have to go back to at least some correspondence between the groups to advance this.

One other thing that was raised, and I think GARFO has been talking directly with SERO on possibly having some support to the core team from a detail from SERO, and I assume there will be discussions ongoing about what that will involve.

More importantly, what this has advanced is the core team has been working on moving this process forward, and one of the first things to advance this was to develop draft objectives and a focal question, to move things forward and to provide a foundation from which to begin the scoping process. There were draft objectives that were provided to the NRCC to explore how fishery governance and management issues will be affected by climate-driven changes in fisheries, particularly shifting stock availability and distributions, and to develop a set of tools and processes which provide flexible and resilient fisheries management strategies that effectively address uncertainty in the error of climate change. The NRCC supported these as initial objectives of the efforts.

In addition, there was creation of a focal question, and this is something to give a springboard from which to be able to focus on what type of context are you look at this, and that focal question developed was how will climate change affect stock distribution and availability and other aspects of fisheries over the course of the next twenty years, and what does this mean for effective future governance and management across multiple jurisdictions.

That's an important point, because it's not supposed to try to predict something at say 2041, and what it's trying to do is to anticipate what types of changes, and all different types of aspects, will affect the fisheries over the next twenty years, and that was also endorsed and addressed to advance the process.

Now, one thing else that was brought forward were some expected outcomes, and these were at least laid out to give a perspective of where this may go, and a set of scenarios that describe different ways that climate change could affect the future of east coast fisheries and understanding of the implications of these scenarios and the challenges and opportunities facing fisheries management in the future, including better understanding of the limitations of the current systems.

A set of near-term and long-term management priorities could help achieve fishery management objectives under a range of different future conditions, and policy recommendations for broader governance changes that would improve our ability to adapt to varying future scenarios, a list of data gaps, research needs, and monitoring need for changing conditions, and, finally, a framework for ongoing conversations and idea generation, with and amongst various stakeholders.

That brings us actually to the overall process, and the second attachment that was provided is this process document, and it has been updated based on some of the decisions that were made at the May NRCC meeting, but that's the framework for the entire process initiative, and it's a six-phase component. It lays out the different aspects, starting with where we are in this process right now, which is the first phase, or really orientation, and this first phase is where we've developed project objectives, and the core team has been established, and potentially -- Not potentially, but it will be expanded, based on the request to the other participants, and we have the facilitator that now is onboard and providing input and guidance.

One thing is a quick mention about the facilitator, in this case, is Jonathan Star is the individual that developed the climate scenario planning efforts for the Pacific Fishery Management Council, and so he is very aware of this specific type of effort, but in just a different region.

Phase 2 of this process is really the scoping phase, and that's where we're moving into beyond where we are right now, and so the core team is specifically working on a scoping process, a scoping plan, and I think we can call it an invitation to comment, and it is -- We will be meeting - - We met in March, April, and May, and we will be meeting next week, actually, to work further on the scoping process, and that process is actually going to involve two parts, one that will be like a kickoff webinar series that we will be use in all the regions online, whether it be recorded or not, and we will have some of those discussions next week, but then that will be followed up with, potentially, a reach-out on an online survey or online information-gathering effort that will really be the follow-up part that will shore up that.

This is where you really conduct the structured outreach process, and you're gathering stakeholder perspectives on key uncertainties driving changes in the east coast fisheries, as well as feedback on what I identified earlier, the project objectives, and what you are expecting out of this would be virtual formats that would be used, as I mentioned, both web-based, possibly recorded, presentations or followed up by the hands-on and input sessions that would come from a reach out on an online system.

That brings us to the third phase, which would be the exploration, and so, after we have that response, the whole idea from here is to identify and analyze uncertainties, and really identify the driving changes in the east coast fisheries, and what you're doing is setting the stage for actually the first workshops, and this would be informed by the scoping comments that you received, and that advances that, and the idea is that those workshops would be potentially held in the fall.

Phase 4 is the synthesis, which is the primary building phase of this effort, and so that's the actual full-blown workshop, where you would discuss the implications of different scenarios and come up with management responses and recommendations, and there is potentially one or two workshops that would support that, and so this an evolving and developing system. It's got the foundation of it, but there is some aspects that will have to be addressed as we move forward

through the system, and then Phase 6 really is just the big follow-up from everything, and what you do is you monitor, and, depending on the outcomes of the different phases, you involve key indicators in change and really look at how you go beyond even 2022, is what this is anticipated to go through.

I think most of the people that are involved understand that this is ambitious to advance this, but I think that we can get off the first steps, because most of it is going to be virtual, to kick off the initial scoping to move forward, and there's still some concerns about how much is happening later in this year, and so my guess is that most of it is going to happen in 2022.

One of the other aspects is I think the NRCC was comfortable with having a lot of the things keeping on moving forward with the core team advancing activities, to make sure that these different processes and timeframes get met and moved forward, with continuous updates and coordination with the partners, through the councils and ASMFC and GARFO and the Southeast Center and the Southeast Region.

As I mentioned, the real thing we're in right now is developing the actual scoping plan that is going to be discussed literally next week, and that is where we stand on the East Coast Climate Change Initiative, and I will probably -- As I mentioned, I showed you this document, and it will be updated based on some of the decisions that were made from the NRCC, and, with that, are there any specific questions on the initiative?

MR. BELL: Thanks for that report, Roger. Obviously, no small amount of work. Any questions for Roger as we move forward in this area? Okay. I don't see any hands. We definitely appreciate you staying on top of this, Roger, and it is, as you mentioned, something that is not just us and our council, but this is -- Everybody is going to be dealing with this for a while as we move forward in managing this, and so no hands, no questions, and thanks, Roger. If we could transition to our next item, and that would be a Citizen Science Update from Julia Byrd. Whenever you are ready, Julia.

MS. BYRD: Thanks, Mel. Again, I'm just going to give a quick update on what's been happening in the Citizen Science Program, really trying to highlight a few key things that have happened since you all met last in March. The first thing I wanted to do was update you guys some on programmatic-level activities, and the first one is we'll kind of build on some news that John Carmichael just shared, and it's about the Citizen Science Project Coordinator position.

As he mentioned, you know, we've been very lucky to have Allie Iberle working with the Citizen Science Program over the past eighteen months, and so she has now transitioned in a new position, a more permanent position, with the council, and so I just wanted to take a second to thank Allie for all of the valuable contributions that she has made to the Citizen Science Program, and especially the FISHstory project. We're certainly going to miss having her work so closely on citizen science activities, but we're really excited that she's going to remain a member of the council team and will be kind of just down the hall, so to speak.

I did want to let you guys know that we are working to hire a new Citizen Science Project Coordinator now, and that position will be funded through an ACCSP grant that we have received, and so we put a vacancy recruitment announcement out last month, and we got a lot of wonderful

candidates who applied, and so we'll be doing interviews in the upcoming weeks, and we're hoping to get someone onboard sometime in July.

Also, I wanted to let you guys know that our Citizen Science Operations Committee met this May, and they primarily focused on some work on our kind of initial evaluation plan, which I will give you a few more details about later in the presentation, and the Citizen Science Association also held a conference, a virtual conference, during the month of May, CitSci Virtual, and so staff participated in that, and Allie actually led efforts to put together kind of a poster presentation, as part of that, on the FISHstory project.

Then, also, I wanted to let you guys know, and I think I mentioned it in March, but we've been working with some of our NOAA colleagues and some of the co-authors who presented as part of our American Fisheries Society symposium last year to put together a prospectus that would -- A prospectus that we would submit to *Fisheries*, which is the American Fisheries Society's kind of journal publication, to put together a special issue that's kind of focused on how to better incorporate citizen science and other non-traditional data sources into assessment and management. That's what our symposium focused on, and so it would be working with kind of co-authors and folks who presented at that to put together this special issue.

We submitted a prospectus earlier this spring, and we just found out, last month, that the *Fisheries* folks were really excited, and thought this would make a great special issue, and so we'll be working to put together articles that will go through their peer review process in the upcoming months.

Then the last thing I just wanted to quickly mention on kind of programmatic activities is I will give one more shout-out to Allie, and April is Citizen Science Month, and so, for this April, she helped put together a social media campaign that tried to highlight some of the people who power our program, and so, if you didn't have a chance to check out some of the council's social media posts in April, I would encourage you to do so, because I think she did a great job pulling that together, and it's really wonderful that we're kind of able to highlight some of the many kind of partners and people who are helping, you know, power our Citizen Science Program.

Next, just a quick update on kind of our initial evaluation plan, and so, as a quick reminder, back in December, you guys gave support for an initial evaluation plan that we're working on with Rick Bonney, and what it's really trying to do is to collect some baseline information, so that we're better able to evaluate whether we're achieving kind of Goal Number 4 here on the bottom of this screen into the future, and so that goal is focused more on kind of learning and engagement and things like that. Rick had put together --

MR. BELL: Did we lose her?

DR. COLLIER: It sounds like she might have gone offline. Give her just a second. She usually pops back on pretty quick.

MS. BYRD: Can you all hear me now? It looks like my audio might have --

MR. BELL: Yes, we got you back. We just had a pause there for a minute.

MS. BYRD: Okay. Thanks, Mel. Sorry about that, guys. I just wanted to give you guys a quick update, and we've started on kind of Phase 1, which is the interview process, and so we've been working with the Operations Committee, and Rick Bonney has really taken the lead on putting together kind of an interview script that we're hoping to finalize in the next month or so, and then, earlier this spring, we also kind of asked you guys for suggestions of who may be good to talk to from our kind of fisheries community, as part of these interviews, and we were hoping to get suggestions on fishermen, scientists, and managers, and we're really thankful for many of you guys who provided such great suggestions, and so we're working to kind of finalize the folks we're going to do interviews with in the next month or two, and so Rick will hopefully get these interviews kicked off here later this summer.

Next is a quick update on the FISHstory project, and so, as you guys know, this is the project where we're using kind of historic photos to help us document historic catch and length compositions from the 1940s to 1970s. This project has kind of three components. The first component, which is digitizing these historic photos, has been complete for a while now, but I wanted to provide you guys a quick update on the other two components.

The second component is trying to collect information on for-hire catch composition, and this where we're working with the online crowdsourcing platform Zooniverse to help have kind of volunteers, or citizen scientists, help us kind of analyze, or classify, the information in these historic photos, and I am excited to say that, as of last month, for this pilot project, the data collection is now complete in Zooniverse, and so, over the spring, we've been working with our validation team to help verify some of the species IDs and counts and some of the trickier photos, and so the next step for this component of the project is really to kind of analyze all of the information that we've collected.

Then, for the third component, we were kind of developing a method to estimate the size of fish within these photos, and so the method has been developed, and it was reviewed by the SSC last fall, and we're pilot testing it on king mackerel, and, as of earlier this spring, king mackerel measurements have been complete on all of the photos that we have as part of this pilot project, and so the next step will be kind of analyzing that information to produce length composition estimates for king mackerel.

I just wanted to share a few quick project stats for the FISHstory project with you guys. Within our Zooniverse project, we have 2,120 volunteers participate, and they have made over 35,400 classifications. As part of this initial grant, we were hoping to analyze around 750 of the photos we had, and we actually had kind of two workflows within Zooniverse, and one was this count workflow, which was an easier workflow, where folks were helping us count the number of people and the total number of fish in the photos, and we were actually able to complete the classification of those photos for over 1,370 individual pictures.

Then, for the classify workflow, which was our current workflow, which folks helped us to kind of do species identifications and counts, we were able to actually classify over 715 photos, which, again, was our kind of goal, or target, for this project, and then, again, we've also completed king mackerel measurements in all of the 1,374 photos that we have as part of this project.

We were also able to continue to some outreach this spring, and we participated in Make it Count Monday, which is a livestream show that NC State University does with SciStarter, where they

highlight a different citizen science project each week, and so we were really excited to have FISHstory be a part of that.

As far as next steps for the project, we will be doing the analysis in the upcoming months, and then we're also looking for funding to kind of continue and expand this project. We think it's been really successful, and so we would like to be able to kind of complete the data gathering and classification of the photos we currently have in-hand, and we would love to expand the photos that we have as part of this project to different areas, and then, also, apply that length methodology we've developed to different species, and so take that beyond just king mackerel.

We had submitted a proposal this spring, and we're working very closely with Ken Brennan at the Beaufort Lab. We, unfortunately, just found out, last month, that we did not get that funding, and so we are continuing to look for other opportunities to expand and grow this project.

Then, moving on to the SAFMC Release project, just a quick update, and we're continuing to work with the graduate student at the College of Charleston, Nick Smillie, and, again, he is working on kind of helping to develop strategies to help kind of market these self-reporting fishing apps to fishermen, and, as part of his project, he's interviewed some of our SAFMC Release participants, and is working to analyze some of the MyFishCount survey data and marketing strategies that BeBe had put in place over the past year or year-and-a-half, and so he is actually going to be finishing up his work this summer, and he will be graduating at the end of the year, and so we're excited to see the culmination of his work.

We've also been working really hard to transition the SAFMC Release app under the new ACCSP citizen science app, SciFish, and so SAFMC Release will end up becoming one project under the SciFish app, and so, when this happens, we're going to be able to expand SAFMC Release to collect information on all shallow-water grouper, and not just scamp, and so we're in the final beta testing phases now, and so we're hoping that Release will launch within SciFish over the next month or so.

Then, as part of this SAFMC kind of Release work that we've been doing with ACCSP and the development of this new citizen science app, SciFish, we held a series of scoping meetings this spring, and I know that I've updated you guys a little bit on these, and so I will try to be brief, but, basically, this is going to help us figure out SciFish 2.0, so to speak, and so that's to develop this customizable piece, so that partners will be able to kind of build apps on the fly within SciFish to help address some of their data gaps and projects that they want to do using a citizen science approach.

To figure out -- Kind of help us build a roadmap for what this may look like, we held a series of scoping meetings this spring, and, at first, we gathered information from a really broad group of fishermen, scientists, and managers along the Atlantic coast, through an online questionnaire, and we did two virtual townhall meetings, where we kind of dug into the answers that we got through the questionnaire, to better understand the needs of the community, and then, this April, we held three kind of half-day virtual workshops.

For those workshops, we had kind of a core group of around thirty-five people, who were a mix of scientists and fishermen and managers from along the Atlantic coast. We had thirty-five people that actually represented kind of twenty-three different organizations across twelve different states,

and so there's a lot of interest among folks all along the Atlantic coast within our fisheries community of kind of further developing this app.

Just to give you a little idea of what we talked about at these workshops, the workshop was really focused on identifying kind of data gaps and deficiencies and which of those data gaps may respond well to a citizen science approach. The second workshop was focused more on what data are needed to kind of address those gaps and what data can be comfortably and reasonably collected on the water and that fishermen would be comfortable sharing, and then the third workshop really focused more on usability, how to make kind of the app as user-friendly as possible and then what would make someone kind of start and continue using the app over time, and so, right now, we're kind of synthesizing all of the information we gathered through these workshops, and we're putting together kind of a roadmap that will help us as we work on our FY 2021 ACCSP project, which is basically building this prototype for this customizable piece of the SciFish app moving forward.

I was going to do a SciFish demonstration for you guys, so you guys could see some of the changes to SAFMC Release and can see how it can switch between our project and North Carolina DMF's Catch U Later project, but I think, due to the time, I'm going to hold off on that. I am happy to do that at a future meeting, or I can even put together kind of a short video clip that can be shared with you guys, if that would be of interest, and so that's just a quick update on what's been going on in the program, and so I am happy to take any questions.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Julia. That's an amazing amount of things going on, and, yes, maybe if we could get a video or something later, and we can check that out, and that would be great. Any questions for Julia? It's a diverse amount of things, and so I will say that, of course, the council should be very proud that we're kind of on the cutting edge of taking citizen science to fisheries, and so it's really been a number of initiatives that we're kind of unique, and our program has been media stars lately, which is all positive stuff, and that's a good thing. Any questions? Julia, have you got anything else for us?

MS. BYRD: Nope, that's it. Thanks so much, and I appreciate you guys sticking around this late in the day. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Well, thank you. We appreciate the presentation. All right. The last item for staff reports would be Outreach and Communications Update, which is Cameron Rhodes, and then, after that, Cameron, I believe, is also going to do the Outreach and Communications Advisory Panel report, because Scott Baker couldn't be with us today, and so, Cameron, take us home.

MS. RHODES: All right. Will do, Mel. Thanks, guys. I am going to provide an update on a couple of different things that we've got going on on the outreach and communications side of things, and then, as Mel mentioned, I will present on the advisory panel meeting report, and so let's go ahead and dive in here with what we've got in this presentation.

For starters, as you guys have all heard, and you've been bombarded with information, but the Fish Rules commercial app is now out and available for download, and so that's super exciting, and this has been a long ongoing project, and it was definitely, I think, a bigger lift than either the Gulf Council or the South Atlantic Council staff really anticipated, but we're really excited to have it out there and available to people, so that they can hopefully have access to regulations in a way

that's a little bit more effective than referring to our website or referring to the recreational version of the Fish Rules app.

If you haven't downloaded the app, and you're not a commercial fisherman, I would still encourage you to do so, just so you can scout it out and see what it's like and get a feel for how we've laid everything out, and we think we've designed it in a way that will hopefully make things pretty easy for folks to get information, and there's also some really cool features in there, including an update on landings, and so we go in, every week, and update those landings, based on what's updated on the SERO website, and so we've been collaborating with Mary and others at SERO, in order to get those updates to happen, and that's been really nice, and it seems to be something that fishermen are referring to within the app as well.

As Rick mentioned earlier, they definitely get calls from fishermen asking questions about landings updates, and so it's really nice to be able to provide this to them through a mobile app, so that they have access to it in a much kind of easier, streamlined way.

We have been actively involved in trying to get the mobile app promoted and make sure that it gets into the hands of folks, and so we've been reaching out to different media partners, including folks like National Fishermen, to see if they would be interested in sharing information about the mobile app, and then we've also been working with friends over at SERO, to try and get a Fishery Bulletin up and running, and so we've been collaborating with a bunch of different partners, in order to make people aware of the fact that this app is now readily available for download.

Right now, I have it around -- Let's see. I think it's like 300 downloads on iOS, and I didn't get an update on the number of downloads for Android devices, and that is specifically for the South Atlantic side of things, and so that's really great, to know that people are downloading it. We definitely want to see those numbers increase, but we're pretty pleased with that start at this point, considering that we are targeting a more select group of fishermen, as compared to the recreational version of the app, which is really targeting this huge number of anglers across the entire United States.

We did -- We are looking for input from users, and so we're still open to any kind of edits, and this is going to be an ongoing project, and it's never going to be complete, and so there's always going to be room for improvement, and so, if you come across anything, and you would like to see some changes made, please let us know. We already have opportunities for how we can expand on our radar, and so the Gulf Council staff, and that would be Emily Muehlstein and Carly Somerset, we've been working together, to try and come up with ways that we can improve the app, and one of the first things on our list is to improve the managed areas portion of the app.

We know that we want to make that more interactive and dynamic, and so we're working with staff at both council offices to try and come up with a solution for that, as well as with folks at the Fish Rules LLC, to see if they can help us with any kind of porting in and API or anything like that, and so Roger and Chip from our staff have been helpful in that, and we just started that effort, and that will be ongoing for a while now, but we're looking forward to seeing that improvement, and we think it will make the managed areas section of the mobile app a lot more user friendly and, ultimately, more useful.

Then Fish Rules commercial has also been kind enough to offer us an API, where we would bring in all of the regulations that are in both the Fish Rules recreational app and the commercial app and be able to port those regulations so that they're on our website, and this will feed in really nicely to the website redesign, and it will make things so much more efficient, rather than updating regulations in multiple places, and we'll be able to do it in basically two stops, which is really a nice thing, and so we're hopeful to see that come together, and that's been a really nice offer that the Fish Rules team has provided to both the South Atlantic Council and the Gulf Council, and so that partnership is going really well, and we're excited to see all of that move forward.

Leading into the website redesign, we are currently just finishing up the discovery phase, and so the discovery phase is really essentially an audit, where our web developers that we have hired for this project, and that's Happy Prime, they provide a really in-depth document, and this document was ninety pages long, and it evaluated our website, and it evaluated the effectiveness, and it really went into detail on individual pages and what we could do better, in order to kind of improve our marketing strategy for the website and really try and tailor our language and tailor the way that we have our website laid out, so that it meets the needs of all of our stakeholders.

Basically, what we learned from this discovery is that we're pretty validated in what our original concerns were. We found out, through the discovery, that much of what folks who shared with us during the interviews, and so let me go ahead and say thank you very much, if you were selected to be part of the interview process, and we really appreciate your time doing that, and it ended up being super helpful for the discovery, and it really did shed lots of really great light on what we need to do, moving forward, and how we're going to approach this really gigantic project of this website redesign.

We really did learn that much of what we expected to be a problem on the website is in fact a problem, and it's creating issues for folks being able to navigate effectively and really being able to find the primary content that is of the greatest interest to them, and so we're really looking forward to seeing how we're going to approach this with Happy Prime, and they're mapping out plans now, and we're going to continue to work with them on how we can develop content and make things a little bit easier for folks, so that they can get the information they need from our website.

As we all know, all of us here are extremely reliant on our website, and the members of the public are as well, and so it's really important that we make sure that we're catering to all of our stakeholders and making sure that people can access the information that they need.

I should mention that this project will be going on over the next couple of months, and our target launch for the new website is scheduled for January of 2022, and it's possible that we'll see a pushback there, but we're going to be working hard to make sure that we can try and stay on that goal there and get you guys a new website to take a peek at, hopefully in the next couple of months.

There's also been some exciting Sea Grant projects that have been proposed, and these are not things that we're necessarily directly involved in, but we've been fortunate enough to be brought in on some of these discussions with the folks over at Sea Grant, and there's a Reef Fish Extension proposal that went around within the Sea Grant community, and there were two projects that were related to South Atlantic reef fish, or snapper grouper, species, and so these projects are basically being reviewed at this point.

They're scheduled to be awarded sometime in June or July, and so we should be expecting the results of whether or not those projects are going to move forward in the next month or so, and we provided letters of support for both of those projects, and I'm just going to provide a little bit of a brief overview of what each of these projects could potentially do for the South Atlantic Council.

The primary investigator over on one of the projects, which is this Extending our Reach project, is Dr. Marcus Drymon over at Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant, and, even though it is primarily a Gulf-focused project, they brought in all of the Southeast Region Sea Grant offices to participate in this, and so one of the things that the Sea Grant offices from North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida proposed was that they would, as part of this project, provide us with a fellow who would be working in the council office, basically working under our outreach team, and helping out with any kind of snapper grouper outreach and education initiatives that we might have.

Of course, you can imagine that we've been chomping at the bit to have this person come in and help us out with some of our best fishing practices efforts that we really want to see blossom, and so this is a really cool, exciting effort, and we don't know what's going to happen, and we don't know if this project is going to be funded, but it's definitely a really cool and neat opportunity, and we're super grateful to our friends at Sea Grant for thinking of us and wanting to work with us, to try and make sure that our needs are met and that they're helping us out in the best way we can, and so this individual would be working to basically provide a crosswalk of information between Sea Grant and with the South Atlantic Council, and so I think there are countless benefits associated with that, and I won't go into great detail here on what the proposed plans are under that project, but I just wanted to give you guys a general overview of what could happen if this project were to be funded.

In addition, there was another really great project that was proposed, which is a Sea Grant Reef Fish Extension Coalition project, and this is largely led by Dr. Sherry Larkin and Dr. Kai Lorenzen, and we were asked to provide a letter of support for this project. After reviewing it, we did, and, basically, what this project would entail would be us serving in some kind of advisory role and capacity with them, and so council staff will be involved in that effort, if this project were to be funded, and it had really great collaboration with the Nature Conservancy and other groups, and it seemed like they were moving in a direction that would involve lots of folks in part of this best fishing practices effort and how we can get stakeholders more involved in the discussion and get them more interested in best fishing practices as a whole.

Lastly, I will wrap up with the Marine Resources Education Program, and I just wanted to provide a quick update here. Kim Iverson passed along this information to me. If you guys have any detailed questions on MREP, I will definitely be tapping Kim, to see if she can chime in here, but I just wanted to let you guys know that the 2020 cohort was in fact affected by COVID-19, and that's no surprise, and so they were able to host the science workshop, because that occurred in February of 2020, but the management workshop was, unfortunately, delayed, and so there is a cohort of MREP students, if you will, that have not yet completed their course, but everybody is hopeful that that will in fact happen in the next couple of months, and hopefully they will be able to get something rolling shortly.

In the interim, they've been hosting dockside chats, and those dockside chats have led to some really interesting and fruitful conversations among lots of different folks, like the ones listed here, but also among the participants, and they were there to ask questions and engage, and it was a really nice way to loop people back into the MREP process and get people talking again, and so hopefully there will be some positive news on getting that management workshop planned in the coming months, but I just wanted to provide that update for you all, that there are some folks who still haven't completed that course yet. With that, that is it for me, as far as my update goes, Mel, and so I'll turn it over to see if there are any questions.

MR. BELL: Any questions for Cameron about any of that? Again, it's an amazing amount of stuff that goes on behind the scenes that most people may not think about, like maintaining a website, and that's critical to us these days. I don't see any hands, Cameron. I think they're smelling the bar.

MR. STRELCHECK: Mel, sorry to be between us and the bar, but --

MR. BELL: Hey, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: No question for Cameron, and I really do appreciate the presentation on the great work that's being done on outreach, and I just wanted to make a comment about the MREP program. For a number of years now, the Southeast Regional Office, Science Center, with our partners at the councils, have been cobbling together funds to support MREP. We have made a national-level decision, within the Fisheries Service, to support this at the national level, so that this can continue to remain funded, not only in our region, but more broadly, and so I'm excited that that's happening, and we were concerned, with erosion of funding over time, that we wouldn't be able to support that, but this really has been a great program, a very successful program, and it's just evidence by the number of applicants for council seats this year, and in past years, that have gone through the program, and so I just really appreciate the South Atlantic Council's involvement in MREP.

MR. BELL: Thanks for that, Andy. We really appreciate the support for that program, and you're absolutely right that it's a great program, and a lot of folks that go through it may end up on the councils, or the APs, and so it's very helpful, and so thanks for that. Any other questions for Cameron or anything else, before she shifts to the next topic? Okay, Cameron, and so I guess you're going to present the Outreach and Communications AP report?

MS. RHODES: That's right, Mel. Bear with me one sec, as I get everything up and running, and then we'll get the show on the road here. All right. Unfortunately, you're not going to get the calm and collected voice that is Scott Baker. You're going to get me instead, but Scott had some other things come up this Friday, and so I'm going to stand in here and provide the AP report for you all.

The AP met earlier this spring, and we met in April, and we had lots of new faces this year. As you can recall, you all appointed quite a few new members to the AP last winter, and so we had lots of new folks to orient and get used to our process, but it was really nice to have this variation of people, and, unfortunately, of course, we weren't in the room all together, but it was still nice to be able to meet online, and I know all of us are really looking forward to being able to get

together at some point with the advisory panel, as things start to open up a little bit more, but these are the folks who were able to attend, and we ended up having some really great conversation.

First up, the AP talked about the Citizen Science Program, and they received an update from Julia Byrd, and there were a number of things that came up, and I won't go into detail about the update itself, and that's something that you all have been briefed on, and all of that is captured in the report, but there were some interesting things that came about as part of the Citizen Science Program update, and you know, for the AP, we've got lots of different folks who sit at that table, and so we've got outreach and communication experts, as well as recreational fishermen and commercial fishermen, and so it can lead to some really interesting discussions and some varying perspectives.

One of the key things that did come up was questions about shark depredation and data collection, as part of the Citizen Science Program, and Julia noted that there is the potential for future efforts there and that there's going to be some modifications within SciFish, where people can report that information, but it's definitely something that continues to come up, regardless of what platform we're in, and we continually hear about questions about shark depredation and how that data can be collected.

We also received some really generous offers from NOAA Fisheries to help us spread the word about SciFish, which was really encouraging, and it's really nice when partners are interested and willing to share information on our behalf, so we can start to break out into some other channels that might not necessarily want to always hear from us, or might not be signed up through our channels, and so it's really helpful to have others participate in spreading the word.

We also got some really tough questions about app redundancies and differences between MyFishCount and SciFish, and this is something that, internally, as staff, we are working on, and that's stuff that we plan to address potentially in blogs, or in other platforms, but it's definitely something that we know is a reoccurring issue, and folks to have app fatigue, and there can be some confusion, and so we're going to work on making sure that our message is very clear and that we're still funneling people to MyFishCount, where appropriate, and making sure that they know that MyFishCount is available to them for use, but then there's also these other platforms that are available to them, and it's really up to them to decide which app is best suited for their needs, but we're going to do what we can internally to make that a little bit easier for people.

Then we also discussed the SciFish branding guidelines, in making sure that we laying everything out in a way that's going to be really clean and easy for other partners who might want to come onboard and set up a project within the app, and so the AP provided some really nice guidance on different tools that we should consider and different things that we should look into, in order to make sure that SciFish's branding guidelines are really up to par and going to be easy for folks to use, moving forward.

The AP also reviewed the commercial Fish Rules app, and they received a demo, and they were kind enough to provide some feedback, most of which was really, really positive, and it was definitely encouraging to see that folks were excited about the app, and that definitely came about from Shelley Kreuger, in particular, and Shelley said that she felt that the app was going to be really helpful for folks in the Florida Keys, especially those who might be dually permitted, and this could help clear some things up and make things a little bit less confusing, and so that was

really encouraging to hear, that these outreach professionals within our region were equally as excited about the app as our staff were.

They also asked questions about whether or not state fishing regulations would be included in the app, and, at this time, that's not something that is hosted within the app, but there's definitely plenty of room for expansion, and we encourage anybody who is interested in potentially signing on as an additional partner with the app to do so, and we definitely want to make this a platform that is reaching all of the stakeholders in a way that's most effective for them, and so, if that means having state regulations, or highly-migratory species regulations, included within it, that's absolutely something that the commercial Fish Rules app would be eager to host, so that it can become this one-stop shop for commercial fishing regulations.

If anybody here has questions about how you would go about doing that, feel free to reach out to me, and I can definitely get that conversation started and point you in the right direction, because I definitely think there's plenty of room for growth there, and that was something that the AP had strongly encouraged, and they wanted to see that happen, and they definitely supported that effort and that initiative.

Then we also heard that we should consider coordinating more effectively with the SERO Permits Office and making sure that they were aware of the commercial Fish Rules app and potentially having them share information about the two mobile apps when they're putting together permit applications and when they're communicating with fishermen, and that's something that's been ongoing. I know that Emily and I have both reached out, in some different capacities, and so we'll be working with the SERO Permits Office, and they've been kind enough to chat with us about this and come up with ways that we can get the information out there to folks, so that they know.

We also had some extensive discussion on this new approach to our newsletter, and so Kim has spearheaded the newsletter discussion, and she presented on this topic, and the feedback that was received was overwhelmingly positive. As you can recall, if you are receiving information from the council, and you're getting newsletters, we used to have a quarterly newsletter, and now we've shifted to something that's coming out a bit more frequently, and we call it the South Atlantic Bite.

It has shorter articles and little snippets of information, but then it can also host some long-form articles as well, and it's really been a nice way to get information out there quickly and effectively, and it makes the news that we share more timely, and so the AP members definitely felt very strongly that the distribution frequency and content was appropriate and that it was effective. We also received positive feedback on the Mark Your Calendar feature that Kim has established within the newsletter now, which is really nice, so people can keep tabs on what's coming up.

Then folks also mentioned that the newsletter had really great novel information, which was feedback that we hadn't really heard before, and so it was really nice to see that people were engaged and enjoying receiving this content, because they hadn't seen it anywhere else before, and then the AP suggested that we continue publishing Chair and Executive Director columns, and that's something that we will certainly consider down the road. We're still testing things out and seeing how things go with this new format, but it definitely seems to be working well, from both a staff perspective, and from a recipient perspective as well, and so good news all around there.

Then, at the end of the AP meeting, AP members are asked to provide updates, and those updates can be anything from a personal experience from a fishing trip and something that they're concerned about or information on an ongoing campaign, and we had some really great discussion, and folks came to the table prepared to share information with each other and get each other's ideas and feedback on different campaigns or issues that had arisen.

One of the big things that came out of that discussion was we had AP members who felt that the red snapper recreational season wasn't transparent, and so we had some good discussions about how we could go about making sure the information about the recreational red snapper season -- Making sure that it was adequately shared on our social channels, and then listed on our website as well, and so we've been tweaking some things and modifying some things in our mobile apps to try and make that information highlighted a little bit more strongly, and so hopefully that will alleviate some of these concerns that came about as part of the discussion during the AP meeting.

We also received an update on the South Atlantic red snapper count, and I won't go into detail on that, since you were provided an update earlier this week, and then FWC has some really neat initiatives going on, the kind of thing that I feel like an outreach and communication professional will just simply salivate over, and they are looking at influencer research within their charter fleet, and so we're going to be in touch with them, and they're going to be reaching out, and they've hired somebody who is going to be evaluating who the most influential members of the charter community are in Florida and then figuring out how it's best to contact those people and get them to engage with the rest of the charter fleet in the area.

We're really looking forward to seeing the results of that research, and FWC said that they would be glad to share that information with us, and so, once that's available, we'll definitely be tapping into that and seeing if we can use that for our own purposes and our own outreach needs.

Then, of course, North Carolina Sea Grant has been actively producing their Hook, Line, & Science blog, and that is definitely a really cool resource, and we've been fortunate enough to send blogs up their way, and they have published them, and they did a citizen science blog that was really nice, and so we're definitely glad to see that those efforts are still underway, and there are plenty of other updates that were provided during the AP meeting, and so, if you want to learn more about what was discussed, please take a look at the report, and there's definitely lots of good information there from all of the AP members. With that, Mr. Chair, that concludes my report.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you very much, Cameron, and, I mean, obviously, everybody that's still left here understands the critical nature of effective outreach and communication, because we manage these fisheries, but it's really all about people and being able to communicate what we're doing and what needs to be done to take care of our resources and our fisheries to people, and so we really thank the AP for all of their efforts there, and hard work, and we're so fortunate to have folks that are really good at this sort of thing, and so any questions for Cameron right now, questions or comments?

I know what you're thinking. Okay. That is our last scheduled agenda item. I have two other things that I want to touch on, briefly, but, before I do that, is there any other business that anybody wants to bring before the council? I can't see hands at the moment, and so if you've --

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mel, I had one more thing that I wanted to comment on.

MR. BELL: Yes, John. Go ahead.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We have the upcoming meetings, and you guys have the documents, and you can see that. Just one thing that I wanted to point out was a change. Our July seminar, rather than being on the deepwater corals and the ROV work, due to a conflict, it's now going to be on the release mortality of South Atlantic reef fish, and that will be Brendan Runde, Jeff Buckel, and Paul Rudershausen, and so we are glad to be able to get them lined up at short notice, and I think it's going to be a pretty timely topic, and so I just wanted to let you know that it's going to be a different topic than what we had listed in that document.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for that, John, and you all will modify the schedule accordingly, I guess, for folks that might check it out online. Okay. Anything else? I've got Andy and Chris.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel. I just wanted to give two quick updates for the council. One is we continue to wait on a decision about the Regional Administrator position at the Southeast Regional Office, and so I will continue to be serving in that acting role until a determination is made. Kim Amendola was serving as the Deputy Regional Administrator, and she has transitioned out of the position, and now Ginny Fay is going to be serving in that role for the next four months. For those that might know Ginny, she is our Habitat Conservation Division Director.

I also just wanted to mention that Mike Jepson, and some of you might remember Mike Jepson, and he is an anthropologist with our Social Science Branch at Sustainable Fisheries in St. Pete, and he has worked for us for I believe now twelve-plus years, but, at one point in his career, he was a fishery anthropologist at the South Atlantic Council, and he will be retiring as of July 3, and so I just wanted to congratulate him, and, for those that might know him, please reach out and offer your congratulations. That's all.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, thanks for that, Andy. I appreciate that. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I just wanted to wish Anna a farewell and wish her the best and thank you for her years of service. I really enjoyed working with her. Sometimes it's been a little back-and-forth, but, at the end of the day, we're good friends, and I just wanted to thank her and wish her the best.

MR. BELL: Thanks for that. That's one of my items that I'm getting to, and so thank you for that. Steve, something else?

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. I just wanted to briefly -- Since the deepwater coral presentation got postponed, I think it would be good to receive that presentation in August, if we can get with the presenters and schedule that, because I think it would be something good for the council to hear, as we go into our final discussions on Coral Amendment 10.

MR. BELL: That would, obviously, be pertinent as we move into September. Chip, to that?

DR. COLLIER: When Stacy was indicated that -- She had indicated that she was able to speak to the group, and she wasn't involved in another project, and she indicated that this project is going to be going on for a couple of months, and it's been taking a lot more of her time than she thought,

but I will reach out to her on Monday and just get a feeler if she thinks that she would potentially be able to do it in August.

MR. BELL: Okay. I appreciate that. All right. Is there any other business that anybody wants, before I get to my items? I don't see any hands, and so, yes, Chris mentioned that this is Anna's last meeting, and so, on behalf of the council and all of us, Anna, we're going to miss you, and we wish you all the best, and I really hate that we're not in person, but we've gone through this several times with a number of people leaving, and we weren't in person, and so we really hope to be in person in September, and you're more than welcome to come back, and all we can do now is give you a virtual hug, but, if you would like to come back and get an actual hug, we would be more than happy to see you then, or in December in North Carolina, but thanks so much for all of your efforts, and not just dolphin wahoo, but you've been a great help in all of the stuff that we've been involved in over the past nine years, and you and I were, I guess, cohorts in the council training program, and so we came on at the same time, and I have really enjoyed working with you, and I'm speaking for the rest of the council, and, I mean, we've enjoyed having you, and all the best to you.

MS. BECKWITH: I appreciate that, Mel. Thanks so much. It's always a pleasure to be a part of a group like this, and the relationships, I think, are the most important part of it, and certainly the work, but I think the relationships, and being in this virtual world certainly is something that we're all looking forward to ending, because I think there is a part of the specialness of being a part of this type of group that is missing. Everybody, from the council members to the staff, and, I mean, you guys have been phenomenal to work with, and, you know, hopefully this won't be the last time you see me, or work with me, and so I'll see you guys around.

MR. BELL: All right. I know it won't be. Also, Tony, if you're still with us, this is Tony's last meeting, and Tony is not on the South Atlantic Council, but, gosh, it feels like he's -- Like we've said before, he's family, and he's been with us for quite a while, and I appreciate you bringing the perspective from the Mid and working with us and helping us through things and sharing things that have been useful, and so it's been a pleasure. Tony, if you're still with us --

MR. DILERNIA: I'm still here.

MR. BELL: Okay, buddy. Well, just know that you may not talk like the rest of us, but we consider you family.

MR. DILERNIA: I'm glad that I have this opportunity to say thank you to you all for really making me part of your family. I've been at your table for about five years now, and you really have made me feel like family, and it's been both an honor and a pleasure to sit at your table and to work with you, and it really is a pleasure to have been working with you, and I guess the next time I'll see you folks is next time you meet in my adopted state of Florida, and I will be at that meeting, and I will make a point of being at that meeting, to see you all and to say thank you, again, for your friendship and for your support all these years. It's been a real pleasure, and I really thank you very much, Chairman Bell and the entire council.

Just a shoutout to Kim. I mean, the first time I ever showed up at a meeting, Kim made sure that I was all set and ready to go, and, also, I would like to point out that I have worked with three of your executive directors over the years, Bob Mahood, Gregg, and now John Carmichael, and I'm

very happy to see that he's become your executive director. I remember him as a young fellow, a young staff, and it's a true pleasure. You know, as a college professor, and as someone who is involved in trying to train people, to see John rise to this position makes me feel good, as well as to have my former student, Ira Laks, being one of your advisors, and so, again, thank you very much, Mel, and to everyone, and I will see you all soon. Thanks a lot.

MR. BELL: All right, Tony. Thank you so much and best of luck to you. One other thing that I just wanted to say was we do a tremendous amount of work, not just at these meetings, but in between, and so none of this is possible without the staff we have, and I mean the council staff, everybody on the council staff, and we're so fortunate to have them, but the Southeast Regional Office staff, Science Center staff, and those are all the people, and you don't -- Well, you don't see anybody at the meetings now, but you don't typically see them. They are behind the scenes, and they're doing all the stuff that needs to be done to get us to where we can make decisions and we can move forward on things, and so, just from me, just a big thank you to all of our staff, and also a big thank you to the public, to our fishermen, to our stakeholders, to all the members of the public that engage in these meetings and the council process, and we really appreciate your involvement, and so thank you. Steve, did you have something to add there?

MR. POLAND: I did, Mel, just briefly, and I wanted to congratulate Anna on nine years of being a council member. From the State of North Carolina's perspective, we really appreciate her service, and she's been a fantastic council member and representative of our stakeholders here in the state. Her knowledge and understanding, and her aptitude, definitely comes across in the way that she presents herself and participates at the council meetings, and we will sorely miss her here, from North Carolina, and so, Anna, hopefully, at the December meeting, we can all get together and give you a proper send-off. We can meet at a bar, or maybe we can cook a pig at my house and have everyone over, and I'm not sure yet.

Also to Tony, and I appreciate your service, and I have really enjoyed getting to know you, and I really appreciate your input and your insight, and you very quickly became one of my favorite Yankees, and so I will miss you, too. That's all I have, Mel.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Steve. Chris, one final word, or is your hand just stuck up? All right. I'm not going to hold us here too long waiting on Chris, and so -- Okay. Well, I think that's it. Again, we hope to see you all in the flesh in Charleston in September, and that is our goal, and so I have nothing else, and we will adjourn.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 18, 2021.)

- - -

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

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
August 4, 2021

## SAFMC June Council

### Attendee Report: Meeting (6/14/21 - 6/18/21)

Report Generated:

06/18/2021 03:12 PM EDT

**Webinar ID**

811-235-419

**Actual Start Date/Time**

06/18/2021 08:00 AM EDT

**Duration**

6 hours 60 minutes

### Attendee Details

**Attended**

Yes

**Last Name**

BROUWER

**First Name**

MYRA

Yes

BYRD

01JULIA

Yes

Bauer

Tracey

Yes

Beckwith

00Anna

Yes

Belcher

00Carolyn

Yes

Bell

00Mel

Yes

Bianchi

Alan

Yes

Brame

Richen

Yes

Carmichael

01 John

Yes

Chaya

01Cindy

Yes

Christiansen

00kyle

Yes

Clarke

Lora

Yes

Collier

01Chip

Yes

Conklin

00 THE REAL Chris

Yes

Copeland

00 Bobby

Yes

Cox

Jack

Yes

Curtis

Judd

Yes

DeVictor

Rick

Yes

DiLernia

00Anthony

Yes

Donaldson

Mary

Yes

Duval

Michelle

Yes

Fletcher

Brad

Yes

Foor

Brandon

Yes

Foss

Kristin

Yes

Gentry

Lauren

Yes

Goodhue

David

Yes

Gore

Karla

Yes

Grimes

00 Shepherd

Yes

Guyas

Martha

Yes

Hadley

01John

Yes

Harrison

BeBe Dalton

Yes

Hawes

Rachel

Yes

Helies

Frank

Yes	Hemilright	00 Dewey
Yes	Horton	Chris
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Hudson	Rusty
Yes	Iberle	01Allie
Yes	Iverson	01 Kim
Yes	Kaelin	Jeff
Yes	Karazsia	Jocelyn
Yes	Kellison	Todd
Yes	Killer	Ed
Yes	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Lyons Gromen	Pam
Yes	Malinowski	Rich
Yes	Marhefka	00Kerry
Yes	McCawley	00-Jessica
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Mendez-Ferrer	Natasha
Yes	Merrifield	Mike
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	Nix	Sara
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	Petersen	Andrew
Yes	Porch	00Clay
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Pulver	Jeff
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Ramsay	Chloe
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Rhodes	01Cameron
Yes	Roffer	Mitchell
Yes	Sanchez	John
Yes	Sapp	00Art
Yes	Schmidtke	01Michael
Yes	Scott	Tara
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Yes	Smith	Duane
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Stam	Geoff
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Strelcheck	00-Andy

Yes  
Yes

Sweetman  
Thompson  
Travis  
Vara  
WHITE  
Walia  
Waters  
Whitaker  
Wiegand  
Woodward  
berry  
brewer  
crosson  
emery  
griner  
poland  
sandorf  
thomas  
wilber

CJ  
Laurilee  
Michael  
Mary  
GEOFF  
Matt  
James  
David  
01Christina  
00 Spud  
james "Chip"  
00chester  
scott  
jeff  
tim  
00steve  
scott  
01suz  
pace