

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **FULL COUNCIL SESSION II**

### **Webinar**

**March 4-5, 2021**

### **TRANSCRIPT**

#### **COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Mel Bell, Chair  
Chris Conklin  
Anna Beckwith  
Dr. Kyle Christiansen  
Tim Griner  
Kerry Marhefka  
LT. Robert Copeland  
Art Sapp

Steve Poland, Vice-Chair  
Chester Brewer  
Dr. Carolyn Belcher  
Spud Woodward  
Andy Strelcheck  
Jessica McCawley  
Robert Beal

#### **COUNCIL STAFF**

John Carmichael  
Julia Byrd  
Kelly Klasnick  
Cameron Rhodes  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
Kim Iverson  
Dr. Michael Schmidtke  
Kathleen Howington  
Suzanna Thomas

Dr. Julie Neer  
Myra Brouwer  
Dr. Chip Collier  
Christina Wiegand  
John Hadley  
Roger Pugliese  
Cindy Chaya  
Allie Iberle

#### **OBSERVERS/PARTICIPANTS**

Shep Grimes  
Monica Smit-Brunello  
Duane Smith  
Dewey Hemilright  
Tony Dilernia  
Patrick O'Shaughnessy

Dr. Jack McGovern  
Dr. Clay Porch  
Rick DeVictor  
Dr. Erik Williams  
Dr. Genny Nesslage

Other observers and participants attached.



The Full Council of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Thursday, March 4, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: Good afternoon. Welcome back. We'll go ahead and convene Full Council Session II, and I appreciate everybody's patience. I know we're a little bit behind, but we had a lot of necessary discussion, and we accomplished a lot today, and we'll just see how this goes. What I would definitely -- Well, let's, first of all, call to order and approve the agenda.

Are there any adjustments to the agenda that anybody would like to suggest? I see none. I do have one other item under Other Business that I've made a note for that I would like to bring up when we get to Other Business, and that's basically just some discussion and feedback from you all on just the council meeting in general, the meeting structure and how it flows. That's all I have, and I don't see any hands for anything else. Other than that then, any objections to approval of the agenda, as it is written right now? I don't see any, and so, if there are no objections, then the agenda is approved.

I believe, under minutes, at the Full Council Session I, we approved three sets of minutes from previous Full Councils, and so I think that's actually already accomplished. If Myra or someone is there, you could correct me, but I remember that we did approve three different sets of previous council minutes.

MS. BROUWER: That's correct, Mel. You're correct.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Myra. I appreciate it, and so that's actually accomplished. So then what I would like to do is make sure we take the time we have today, and I wasn't looking to abuse you guys or keep you here late, and so, if we can definitely get through the reports that we have listed, that would be a good thing, and we can see how we're doing on time.

I forgot to mention one -- I did mention this at the very first council session, and this one adjustment would be, when we get to the NMFS SERO reports, following Protected Resources, we've going to have Pat O'Shaughnessy from NOAA OLE present at that time, and so that's a slight adjustment, but I had mentioned that at the very first session. Let's get into the first item, which is Council Staff Reports, and so Executive Director, and that would be John, if you are ready.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am ready. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a few things that I wanted to highlight in my report. As everyone probably pretty well knows, we're still operating in COVID mode, with staff primarily out of the office, and, of course, they're available to go in as needed, for technology and equipment and just a change of scenery, as long as they maintain the proper distancing guidelines, et cetera.

Kelly has been in the office there, and so he's been making sure that the server keeps running and the mail gets checked and the bills get paid and all that great stuff, and so we really appreciate Kelly being the guy in the office for us through all of this, but the good thing is that it does seem like the outlook is starting to get a little bit better on the horizon, with vaccines becoming available, and even here in South Carolina, potentially, before the summer, and we may have a shot at getting one, it sounds like, and so I think all of us here are looking forward to that, potentially being able to get back together and meeting in person.

Hopefully, if things continue as they are, we can definitely do that in September, and we're still keeping an eye on June, and we have not made a decision there yet, and so we may be reaching out to you, council members, before too long, to get a sense of how you feel about the likelihood of traveling in June, and, of course, we'll be considering can the feds travel, can the state folks travel, and certainly have folks been able to get their vaccinations, because I think all of that is important, or at least have vaccinations available to them.

That will be the considerations over the next few weeks, as we look ahead toward our June meeting, which is scheduled to be in Ponte Vedra, Florida, or at least that was the plan, and so COVID continues after a year, and it's quite a surprise, that we've had a year of these council meetings, but I think everyone has done an outstanding job of getting through this challenging, challenging situation, and we have done an amazing amount of business, and so thanks to the staffs, staff here and at the Regional Office and the Science Center, and all of you council members, who have certainly had the brunt of it during these council meetings, for doing this business in this manner.

I want to comment some on some of the things that are happening at the national level through the CCC group. Most of the attention right now is on the Executive Order that was released there at the end of January on climate resiliency. There are a number of sections in it, and there was -- The section that's getting a lot of attention nationally is on the conserving 30 percent of our lands and waters by 2030. There is a taskforce being created, and the Secretary of Interior is leading it, and the Secretary of Commerce will be commenting on it, and others can comment and be involved.

The big question, and it always comes up, and we still haven't heard an answer yet, is what exactly will be meant by conservation. Under the Magnuson Act, we manage and conserve. It's the Conservation and Management Act, and so we, by definition of what councils do, we manage conservatively, and we manage under the precautionary principle. How that factors into the discussion of Thirty by Thirty remains to be seen, but we are keeping up with it, and we're keeping an eye out for anything that happens, and we'll continue to forward information to you as it becomes available.

In that regard, another section of it deals with the idea of climate-ready fisheries, and this is a portion that's much more strongly directed to NMFS and the Secretary of Commerce, and so it comes right into our lap. Earlier this week, I sent out information on the comment period that NMFS has for the climate-ready fisheries section and about setting a meeting for them to present to us, and so that meeting will be on Monday, March 29, from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m., and it will be a webinar council meeting, and we'll receive a presentation from either Paul Doremus, who is the Acting Administrator since Chris Oliver left, or Sam Rauch, who will present on the climate-ready fisheries section and then begin taking our council comments. I expect, at that meeting, we'll have a general discussion, and then we'll probably ultimately write a letter, an official letter, of comment.

They were given sixty days to get started, and they started an initial comment period of thirty days, but they've said they will continue to take comment throughout the year, and I anticipate there being fairly brisk discussion on this at the CCC meeting in early May, and so just note your calendars, and we'll get out a notice next week, and the webinar link, et cetera. We've already submitted the Federal Register notice, and that was fast-tracked. I have never seen one get posted

for review the same day we sent it in, but, hey, whatever it takes, and I'm glad they were able to accommodate that scheduling and we can have that meeting legally on March 29.

Then the last item I will hit on -- Well, two more, I guess. The website redesign, and so we've talked about this quite a few times, and it is actually making great progress, and we have entered into a contract with the website design group, and they're really going to start this project in March. We've come up on their schedule, and they're going to get going, and we hope that it's pretty well done by the end of the year. We're really excited, and we look to more discussion on this. We'll be reaching out to the OC AP and then the council members, et cetera, as this goes on and as we start to really hone-in on what we're going to do with our new website.

We've got a lot of great guidance from council members and others in the past, and we have a pretty long wish list of things that we want to get accomplished, and so we're pretty excited about that, and, as part of this, we're also looking into how we manage the public comments, and so I think most of you all are familiar with the Wufoo form, but we have some potential to come up with some approaches that do a similar thing, but make it potentially a lot more user friendly for both those submitting and those reviewing the comments, and so we'll keep you posted on this as it develops, and it's a pretty exciting thing to finally be making progress on getting a brand-new website, and hopefully make it easier for all us.

The last thing I will hit on is, when we get around to the end of the meeting and looking to our upcoming meetings, we are entering into AP season, and so we have a bunch of AP meetings and other meetings and SSC meetings and SEP meetings, and just lots of stuff going on in April and May, and so it will really be a busy time for those of us at the council and for a number of you who keep a close eye on all these things and keep your ear to the ground about what's going on in our fisheries. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report, and I will be glad to take any questions on any of those.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, John. There's certainly a lot going on. Any questions for John about any of that or comments? I am not seeing any hands. Just one comment on the website revision stuff. I know, every time I go on the website, there's like a little survey thing, and I have filled that out a couple of times, but I feel guilty because I don't do it every time, but I guess that's not going to -- You're not missing data points because of that, I guess, and so it's no offense, but I'm just skipping it a lot.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I do the same. You can also give Cameron a note, if you want to, and say, hey, it's just me, Mel. I did that the first time, the first couple of times, I did it.

MR. BELL: I was doing it, and then I felt guilty when I wasn't, but then eventually I didn't care. Okay. All right. No questions for John? All right. Again, related to how meetings go, we'll just have to see what's going on in the world around us and what people can do in terms of travel and that sort of thing, and we'll be playing that by ear. All right. The next item, under Staff Reports, would be Allocation Tool Development, and that would be John Hadley.

MR. HADLEY: Thank you, Mel. I just wanted to give a brief update on this, and there's no attachment, and it's just a verbal update on the progress being made on developing the allocation tool, and specifically speaking to the allocation decision tree blueprint. As a reminder, this is a fairly small group on the council staff side, and we have Christina Wiegand, Mike Schmidtke,

Myra Brouwer, and myself. Then, also, Scott Crosson from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is also included on this development group.

We met earlier this year, to discuss the decision tree questions and blueprint, as we have it currently in this draft form, and, also, we got into a pretty good discussion on feasible timing and how to move this tool forward in development. We're going to -- We're aiming to have a product, or a deliverable, if you will, ready for the Socioeconomic Panel to review at their spring meeting, which I believe, off the top of my head, is April 13, but, anyway, they are meeting in April, and they'll be reviewing the draft decision tool and providing input on that, and we really have a series of --

After taking into account their input, and maybe likely making some edits and taking into account their comments, of course, there is a great deal of review that needs to be done of this tool, looking at review from the appropriate staff from SERO, as well as we would like to get some of our AP chairs to review it and provide input, and so looking at trying to have a deliverable ready for review, as I mentioned, this spring and review it over the summer.

As far as the council involvement, we were thinking about pushing back the other part of the deliverable to the council, if you will, and they got into a little bit of a discussion on that at Executive Finance, and the intent is to have a full run-through of the decision tool, maybe with an example species, such as the infamous shadow shark, at the September meeting, get the council's feedback, take into account that feedback and make any edits, have one last final review, and then the council would be examining the tool, with the intent for final approval at the December 2021 meeting. That's all I have for the update, and it's certainly a work in progress, and we're moving it forward.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, John. That could be very helpful for us. As we've seen, allocations are something we're going to be dealing with more often, and, interestingly enough, Spud and I were on a commission Executive Committee meeting at lunch, and the topic of how to transition a world, through allocations and stuff, from the commission's perspective, was I think a topic of discussion, or the primary one, and, of course, the council structure and the commission structure are two completely different critters, but it's kind of dealing with similar things.

I think the development of this tool, or this process, as just part of that, is potentially useful, and I could see, also, at some point -- Because I mentioned this, and, whether it's the commission or the council, you're trying to deal with the topic of allocations in fisheries. Those of us that wear a state hat, we have to live in both worlds.

We live in the world of the state fisheries at the commission, and we live with the council as well, and so you would think there would be some value, to the degree that Magnuson or the Atlantic Coastal Act allow you to learn sort of from each other and kind of develop maybe a reliance upon similar approaches, but that's just -- Coincidentally, that's what we talked about today at lunchtime, and so I find the development of this tool, for us anyway, useful, but it might be useful for other folks to see as well, and so thank you for that. Any questions for John or comments on the use of the tool? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you, Mel. I was just curious. Earlier, right before our lunchbreak, there was discussion from Kim asking a question, and also from John Sanchez, about -- I don't think it ever got answered, and it had to do partly with allocation and looking back at the history

of time on the commercial side, given this new MRIP methodology of accounting. When you go back and look, has anybody looked at if there was constraints on the commercial industry back then, when the recreational were catching fish, and now we know it's different, and is anybody looking at that, to bring that forward, to see a comparison? I don't think that ever got answered, and that would be under like the allocation issue, and I was wondering how the council is going to handle that or provide some thought for it. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks for the question, Dewey. I know, between Clay and John, I think they tried to address the question that Tim and John Sanchez had, and perhaps not to total satisfaction, but I don't think there was a simple answer to that, and, in terms of what has gone on and what is going on, I can't answer that. Is that something that, John, you or Clay want to take a stab at again or something? I assume, Chris, that you're not going to answer that question, but --

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mel, I will, to respond to Dewey, and, back when we first set up allocations and looked at historic time periods, and basing them for most fisheries, that was something that was considered, and, a lot of times, it went back to situations in fisheries where there weren't hard ABCs or allocations between most of the stocks. That was a relatively rare thing for South Atlantic fisheries, and so the fisheries were fairly free to function as best they could within the relative regulations that have been imposed upon them, and it really was beyond that could be done to look at the regulations and potentially what they hoped to do and what they actually did and all that sort of thing.

We used that longer historic time period to try and get a time when regulations were relatively light, before a lot of these new changes in the Magnuson Act started coming on about management by MSY and the focus on ending overfishing and all of that sort of thing. The goal was to try and get a time period when the fisheries were fairly free to find their own way, as best we could, and so we don't have as much of that allocation concern and potential regulatory impacts on one over the other across many of our species, and so, I mean, it certainly probably is the case on some. Then there were some that did have allocations, and, for the most part, the council tried to preserve at least the intent behind those allocations, if not the actual percentages of those allocations.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I appreciate that answer. Maybe I will talk offline or something, but I just was trying to figure out maybe not the allocation, but what was constrained by the commercial back in the day. Thank you, though.

MR. BELL: All right, Dewey. Thanks for the question, though. It's a legit question. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: What Mr. Sanchez brought up really brought a lot of light to my eyes, and I've been hearing a lot of dissatisfaction amongst the commercial sector in the South Atlantic about the allocation changes and whether this formula for reallocation and all this stuff is painting both sectors with the same brush, and it just doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

I mean, I think it's something we need to look at before, you know, it gets too far out of our realm, sometime in the future, and, whenever you guys are doing this allocation tool and stuff, I certainly would hope that especially Scott Crosson -- He's a good dude, and he's real smart, and you are too, John and Christina, but it's got to take into some sort of account if we're going to end up changing this further down the road, whether it's the outcome of some sort of litigation or if we can go ahead and get ahead of it and cover our ass. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: I just wanted to sort of refresh everyone's memory, and we're talking a lot about landings streams and historical data, and I sort of wanted to remind you that part of what this group is trying to do is create a tool that allows not just consideration of some of these quantitative landings streams, as well as biological factors, but also incorporates some social and economic information into allocation decisions. This allocation blueprint that we essentially present to you guys, after development, will follow a full range of different variables to consider, and it won't just be based on landings, as it has been in the past.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Christina. I appreciate the input there. Any other questions or comments related to the allocation tool development? All right. I'm not seeing any hands. Go ahead, John.

MR. SANCHEZ: What I was referring to is, as we look at and go forward on allocations, with these MRIP-CHTS to FES equivalent conversions, what I'm seeing that isn't happening is we're not converting the historical ABCs for those like time periods, and, in doing so, then the argument becomes, for fisheries, commercial fisheries, where they are fully utilized, and they're bumping up against their quota, would they have caught their quota had they not been constrained by virtue of being constrained by a more directly quantifiable method of reporting their landings, and, in my mind, until we back-calculate those ABCs and arrive at that number of, well, yes, if, on the one side of the equation, there's an increase, and a resulting newly-found increase in ABC, but the commercial sector could never have realized it, because it wasn't available to them then, how is it fair to allocate to the one side, when the other side didn't have the same benefit?

In my mind, we're going to have to back-calculate these ABCs to the FES equivalents. Otherwise, we can't have fair allocation deliberations. I hope that kind of breaks it down, dummies it down, to where everybody can understand where I'm coming from. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, John. I appreciate that input, and I think I follow you. I think, if John Hadley and Christina have kind of made note of that, as just something to consider, perhaps, as we kind of look at allocations. As I mentioned, we're not the only folks looking at allocations, or the allocation question, right now. All right. Anything else on that? John Hadley, are we good to go? Have you taken notes?

MR. HADLEY: I have. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Okay. All right. Let's go ahead and shift to the next item on the agenda, which would be Climate Change Scenario Planning Update. That would be Roger, if Roger is available.

MR. PUGLIESE: Good afternoon, everybody. I wanted to give you all a quick briefing and status report on the development of the east coast climate scenario planning process. There are no attachments, and we're really kicking off the process, to a great degree, right now, and so this is a follow-up from the initial work of the Northeast Regional Coordinating Council in 2020, from July into November, coordination through their scenario planning workgroup, and then the follow-up with one of the primary things was, after individuals and organizations identified interest in

moving forward with the planning process, the reach-out and creation of a climate scenario planning core team.

The members were notified, and that team is going to be the ones that are kind of doing some of the heavy lifting and the technical work identifying the logistics in the process, to develop and design kind of a roadmap for the planning process and develop key questions and objectives with the NRCC input and participating organizations. We are scheduled to have our first meeting coming up now, March 11, and materials are in process to be forwarded to us.

One of the activities that is going on in the background is this will be a process that is facilitated, and so they're working on securing that. Also, I think one of the developments is that TNC has been -- There was a proposal put together and funded to help support some of the background activities on this overall process. What that puts in motion is the opportunity to advance the process, and, really, what was identified earlier on and something that was embraced is about an eighteen-to-twenty-four-month process of input into creating, ultimately, a scenario planning product and report.

Members that were able to participate in the workshop in December of last year, that was sponsored on just overall climate planning and introduction of scenario activities, et cetera, there was some timing provided by Kiley Dancy with the Mid-Atlantic Council on some of the proposed opportunities timing to advance this process.

Really, the first one, as mentioned, is really kicking off getting this core team identified. The second is, as that is developed, to address some of the charges, and it would really lead into then a structured public input process, to get stakeholder information, which is anticipated -- Originally, it was looking at earlier in the spring of this year, and then in the summer, looking at identifying a lot of the major driving forces in the fisheries and preparation material and logistics and really supporting setting the stage for a scenario planning workshop, which potentially could occur in the fall of this year.

That moves on into later in the year, and then into 2022, where you would be looking at refinement and ground-truthing of draft scenarios, in preparation for actually a second workshop, and that workshop would identify implications and identify potential management response recommendations, in potentially the spring of 2022, and, really, the entire process moving into the fall or winter of 2022.

Some of the first timing I think is going to be a push, just because we need to get through the first process of getting some of the work done by the team to set the stage for even moving into the first workshops. However, in discussions with Kiley Dancy, I think they're still planning, at the Mid-Atlantic, and trying to push for moving into a fall timeframe, to at least get to that first building workshop.

I guess a couple of just related other activities to this is the Pacific Fishery Management Council is holding climate and communities initiatives, and that's an ongoing effort, identifying west coast fishing regional implications and actions, and then the Northeast Science Center is continuing a climate seminar series, and it's actually going on monthly throughout 2021. John has already touched on and highlighted the activities on the Executive Order that I'm sure will have some implications for a lot of this effort, but that's the main focus and what I wanted to get members

up-to-speed on, on where things stand with the east coast climate scenario planning process. Are there any questions?

MR. BELL: Thanks, Roger. I appreciate that update. Any questions for Roger? Again, this came up a little bit in commission discussions as well, but it's one of the factors in fisheries, whether you're state, whether you're regional, or whether it's federal, and this is something that we're all having to deal with, is the world that we might have started out our careers in, in terms of where lines were drawn and where fish behaved and stayed put -- That's not the same world that we're in now, and it seems that things are changing, and perhaps changing a little bit quicker than we might imagine sometimes, and all we have to do is -- In our time together on the council, that I've been here, I mean, we've dealt with the need to move cobia and watch cobia kind of shift or expand range and that sort of thing, and other species too that we've dealt with, and so this is only going to be an increasing -- An area of increasing focus for us, and we're just going to -- You know, we're going to have to deal with it at our level for federal fisheries or state and regional fisheries and that type of thing. Tony.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Some folks may know that, about eighteen to twenty-four months ago, I wrote an op-ed piece for publication in *National Fisherman* about how I -- One idea I had with regarding addressing shifting stocks and how the voting structure of some of the councils may have to change to address the concept of shifting stocks. I will be happy to send a copy of that to the office, and perhaps staff may want to distribute it to council members, to consider one scenario that I have outlined as they go forward and consider how we may want to address shifting stocks in the future.

I will send that down to John Carmichael, and perhaps he may send it around to the rest of the council members. I have sent it to the Mid-Atlantic Council members already, and they've seen it, and I will be submitting it to the Commerce Department also, under their request for addressing scenario planning and changes, and so you may see that it seems a little similar to the process that the commission uses, and I will just let it go at that, and folks can read it, and perhaps, if anyone wants to get back to me and share their thoughts, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Sure, Tony. Thank you. I would love to see that. I mean, we're just going to have to be a little bit better at thinking outside our normal box, because our box is moving, or changing, and it's not going to be a simple thing. It's not a static world, and it's just something we're going to have to deal with. Okay. Any other discussion on the climate change scenario? I don't see any hands. Let's go to our next item on the agenda then, which would be the Citizen Science Program Update and Julia Byrd. That would be Attachment 1 in your briefing binder under Council Session II.

MS. BYRD: Thanks for making a little time this afternoon for me to give you guys a brief update on what's been going on in the Citizen Science Program since you all met in December. The first thing I wanted to do was kind of give you an update on some programmatic-level things that have been going on. Our Citizen Science SOPPs have been updated with the new vision, mission, goals, and objectives that you guys adopted at your December meeting, and so those updated SOPPs are available on the Citizen Science webpage on the council's website.

We have also begun some initial work with Rick Bonney for kind of the evaluation proposal that you guys reviewed in December, and so we will be reaching out soon to kind of council members

and folks who are on citizen-science-related APs to get recommendations of folks that we may want to interview as part of that kind of initial evaluation proposal.

Also, the Citizen Science Association holds a conference every-other-year, and, this year, they will be holding their conference in May, and it will be held virtually, and we are going to be presenting a poster on the FISHstory project, and so Allie Iberle is leading the efforts to kind of pull that poster together, and we'll be presenting it there.

Then we've also been working and kind of exploring the idea of putting together a *Fisheries* special issue with some our NOAA colleagues, and the idea is that this issue would be based on the citizen science symposium that we helped coordinate at last year's American Fisheries Society meeting, and so that symposium was really focused on kind of how citizen science and other kind of non-traditional data sources could be better incorporated into assessment and management, and so we got a lot of really wonderful presentations, and so we thought that kind of pulling together a special issue on kind of what we learned through that symposium would help kind of share that information with a broader audience.

We have reached out to kind of several of the authors at the symposium and have gotten a lot of interest, and so, right now, we're trying to pull together a prospectus that we'll be submitting to kind of the *Fisheries Journal*, hopefully in the next month or so.

Then we've also been continuing our kind of citizen science outreach strategies, with our #CitSciFri social media posts and monthly email updates and information in the council's newsletter, but I also wanted to share with you guys that we're planning kind of an outreach campaign as part of Citizen Science Month, which is April, and so we're really going to try to highlight kind of all of the people who help power our program. If you don't follow the council on social media, I would encourage to do so in April, because we'll be sharing a lot of great information, and Allie Iberle is kind of leading the charge on our Cit Sci Month campaign, and we're working really closely with other members of our outreach team, as we pull that together.

Then I also wanted to make sure you guys were aware that NOAA recently released their citizen science strategy, and so we provided comments on this strategy last fall, but it came out last month, and there are a lot of areas of overlap with what NOAA has included in this strategy and with what the --

MR. BELL: She may have lost her internet again.

DR. COLLIER: Give her just a second. She usually comes back on.

MR. BELL: Got you.

MS. BYRD: -- is going to be coming out next week, and so it's on the kind of development of the council's program, Citizen Science Program, and so, once that comes out and is available online, we'll make sure to share it with all of you.

Switching gears a little bit, next, I wanted to talk a little bit about projects that are under development and some collaborations that we're working on, and I just wanted to kind of go over three projects, to give you an update on things, and so the first one is the diver observations of

data-limited species, or the SMILE project, and so this is something we've been working to develop with SECOORA and REEF, and it's to partner with recreational divers to collect information on some data-limited species, specifically kind of lengths from some of our snapper grouper species, and we're hoping to pilot this project down in the Florida Keys. We had submitted a grant in January, and, unfortunately, we found out this week that it did not get selected, and it was a pre-proposal that we submitted in January, and it wasn't selected for us to submit a full proposal, and so we're going to continue looking for funding opportunities there.

Then I also wanted to update you guys that, in December, I had shared some information about the eMOLT Program, which is a really successful kind of long-term citizen science project that was started by Jim Manning at the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, where kind of scientists are working with commercial fishermen to collect environmental and oceanographic data, and so there was interest in kind of bringing eMOLT down to the South Atlantic, and so they had applied for a couple of grants, and we have provided a letter of support, and we're very kind of interested in seeing if they can expand eMOLT down to our region. They submitted two proposals, and one was not funded, and I haven't heard about the other one yet, and so we were hoping to continue discussions with kind of Jim and others, to kind of hopefully work to bring eMOLT down into the South Atlantic region.

Then the last project that I wanted to update you guys on, and we kind of talked a little bit about it in Executive Finance, and so I'll be quick here, but it's the dolphin wahoo participatory workshops. Again, a series of workshops was held in March of 2020, in North Carolina and Virginia, and this project had kind of been put on hold as we were trying to wait to see if we could hold in-person workshops in south Florida, and so Mandy Karnauskas and Matt McPherson and are kind of leading these efforts with the Science Center down in Miami.

They reached out, a few weeks ago, to John Hadley and myself, and they were interested in trying to see if they could change the method, so that they could collect information from south Florida fishermen, since it looks like holding in-person workshops is still kind of a ways away, and so we -- John and I have helped try to connect them with fishermen down in south Florida and the Keys that may be great for them to talk to, and, again, a big thank you to the Dolphin Wahoo AP members and to the Florida council members, and Tom Twyford with the West Palm Beach Fishing Club. They have really been very helpful in sharing suggestions of folks that would be good for Mandy and Matt to talk to.

They started interviews a couple of weeks ago, and they are hoping to wrap up the south Florida portion of their work by the end of the month, and, again, we'll be kind of presenting on kind of their overall project, and so it will include the North Carolina/Virginia information as well as the south Florida information, to the SEP in April, and then via the seminar series in May.

Now I will switch gears, and we'll start to talk about our two kind of main projects that are underway now, and the first one is FISHstory. We continue to have a lot of interest in the FISHstory project that's online in Zooniverse. I checked last night, and, as of last night, we've had over 1,900 volunteers participate in the project, and they have made over 32,000 classifications.

In January of this year, we met with our validation team, and, just as a quick reminder, the validation team is made up of scientists and fishermen who will help kind of verify the species

counts and numbers that are in these historic photos when our citizen science volunteers disagree, and so they started validating kind of our live Zooniverse data in January, and that continues to be underway now. Then we are continuing to do some preliminary kind of live data analysis, to identify more photos that may need validation team review.

Then we've also continued on with the length analysis component of the project, and, again, we're kind of pilot testing the methods that we developed on king mackerel, and so we have completed king mackerel measurements for now over 700 photos, and so we'll continue working on that, and we hope to finish kind of the king mackerel measurement later this month, and then we've also been exploring some of the length analysis suggestions that we got from the SSC when they reviewed kind of the methodologies that we've developed at their October meeting of last year.

As far as outreach and promotion goes for FISHstory, Cameron Rhodes wrote a wonderful article on the project that was featured in the December 2020 *Seven Seas Media Magazine*, and so the link is in this presentation, and I encourage you to check it out. She did a great job writing about the project, and then I also wanted to mention another kind of outreach effort that we're doing that has occurred since the briefing book posted, and so, on March 15, we're going to be presenting on FISHstory as part of Make it Count Monday, and that is a livestreamed show that is run by North Carolina State University's Citizen Science Campus and SciStarter, and so this program that they run -- It's a weekly program on Monday evenings that focuses on teaching viewers about citizen science, and then they will highlight a specific citizen science project, and so they will be highlighting FISHstory on March 15.

I think it's really great opportunity, because the audience for Make it Count Monday isn't just folks within the North Carolina State campus kind of community, and it also has environmental educators across North Carolina as an audience, and so I think that will be really helpful in us trying to get FISHstory into more classrooms.

Then I also wanted to talk a little bit about next steps for this project. Our current grant funding for the FISHstory project is going to end kind of mid this year, and this has been a really successful project, and I think we're going to be able to kind of produce some really useful data, and so we've been looking for future funding opportunities, so that we're able to continue and expand this project, and so we actually have, this week, been working furiously with Ken Brennan from the Beaufort Lab Southeast Fisheries Science Center and Rusty Hudson, to put together a grant proposal to kind of do just that, to continue and expand the project, and so we'll be submitting that proposal tomorrow, and we'll let you know what happens there.

Next, I wanted to give you guys a quick update with what's going on with the SAFMC Release project, and so we continue to work on retention and recruitment of kind of fishermen participating in the program, and we continue to work with our graduate student, Nick Smillie, who kind of John mentioned when you all were talking about this seminar in Executive Finance, but his work is really focused on trying to identify best practices to market some of these kind of fishing self-reporting apps, and he is collecting information from kind of SAFMC Release participants as well as analyzing data that were collected by the MyFishCount team, through some of their surveys and in some of the outreach work that BeBe and Kelsey did, and so he has collected all of his data now, and so he's in the data analysis stage.

Then, over the past two months, or more than that, the past few months, we have really been focusing a lot of our time on our FY2020 ACCSP project that has kind of two components. The first component is we're kind of combining SAFMC Release with North Carolina DMF's Catch U Later app, under kind of the ACCSP umbrella, and so that's kind of one piece of that project. The other piece of that project is we're holding a series of scoping meetings to develop a customizable citizen science app.

We've been working on this kind of first component, and we've been working really closely with folks at North Carolina DMF and ACCSP and Harbor Lights Software to combine the Release project and the Catch U Later project under kind of a new ACCSP citizen science app, and, actually, kind of the development of that app can be seen as kind of a first step in developing this customizable citizen science app. By doing this, it's going to allow us to expand the data that's collected through the SAFMC Release project, to cover all shallow-water grouper and not just scamp, and so we're hoping to kind of launch Release under this new app in April of 2021, and so next month.

Then I wanted to take a second to talk a little bit more about this new ACCSP citizen science app and kind of talk a little bit more about kind of how this is going to work, and, before getting into the nitty-gritty, I first wanted to say that kind of this new app is going to be called SciFish, and our own Allie Iberle kind of led the charge in developing kind of the name and in the branding, the look, of this new app.

In April of 2021, when SciFish goes live, it will house two projects, and so SAFMC Release and Catch U Later will be housed under SciFish, and so, if you're a fisherman who is participating in any of these projects, you would download the SciFish app, and then you would be able to collect information on whichever project that you were an active participant in, and so we're working on a transition plan, and we'll be working very closely with the folks who have the SAFMC Release app, to transition them to start using SciFish, once it goes live later this spring.

Then, as SciFish moves into the future, there will be more projects housed under it from other ACCSP partners, and so, as we work to develop the customizable portion of the SciFish app in the future, partners would be able to kind of build their projects in this app on the fly, based on a pool of data fields that they could choose from. We're really excited about this project, and we have been really working with a wonderful team to get it off the ground and running.

Then I also wanted to take a second to talk a little bit about the second component of this project, which is we're holding a series of scoping meetings to try to collect information that will help us develop the customizable portion of this citizen science app, and so it's going to help us develop kind of SciFish 2.0. We have been really lucky to be working with an amazing team on this portion of the project as well, and we're working with an outside facilitator, Knowinnovation, as well as North Carolina DMF, ACCSP, Harbor Lights Software, folks from Georgia DNR, and folks from Rhode Island DEM, and so it's been a really wonderful group that are helping kind of plan and coordinate these series of meetings.

To kick things off, to start collecting information, we did an online questionnaire that went live in February, and it went to a very broad group of fishermen, scientists, and managers, and we are trying to initially collect information on what folks really want to see out of a citizen science app.

We had close to 200 folks respond to that questionnaire, and they provided some really useful information, and so now we're moving on kind of to the next step in this process, and we're holding kind of virtual town hall meetings. There are going to be two meetings next week, one on the 9<sup>th</sup> and one on the 11<sup>th</sup>, and what we're going to do at these meetings is dig a little bit more into the information that we got from the questionnaire, so that we can better understand user needs, and, when I talk about users, I'm talking about kind of fishermen who may want to use and participate in projects in this citizen science app, but we're also talking about scientists who may want to use the data that's collected through this app, and so it's really kind of a broad group of people that we're hoping to continue to get feedback on at these town halls.

Then the third step will be holding kind of a series of half-day workshops with a core group of forty folks that we have identified, and it's a mix of kind of fishermen and scientists and managers, to kind of help us determine, based on the input we're getting from the questionnaire and the town halls, kind of what are the shared data needs across the Atlantic region and what data fields would you need to collect to meet those needs, and so the idea is we're kind of building this roadmap, so that, when we start our FY21 ACCSP project, we'll kind of have the roadmap to build and implement this customizable citizen science app.

Then the last project that I wanted to give a quick update to you guys on is a project that's being led by The Natural Conservancy and Promoting Gray's Reef Through Engaging Georgia Anglers. This project originally was going to hold in-person meetings, but we've kind of had to shift gears a little bit, and so, now, we have shifted things, and we're developing an online resource that will allow fishermen to learn more about Gray's Reef and learn about best fishing practices and explore some citizen science data collection opportunities, and so kind of the SAFMC Release project, as well as MyFishCount, will be highlighted in this online resource.

We have been helping kind of gather and develop content that will go online in this resource, and the target launch date is going to be spring of this year, and it will be housed on the Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary webpage, and so that's a kind of quick update on everything that's been going on over the past few months, and so I would be happy to take any questions that you all may have.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Julia. So that's all you've been doing?

MS. BYRD: It's been a busy few months.

MR. BELL: There's a tremendous amount of stuff going on, and really cool stuff, too. Any questions for Julia about any of this? It's a quiet crowd, Julia.

MS. BYRD: No worries. If anyone has questions on anything in here, feel free to kind of reach out to me after the fact, too.

MR. BELL: All right. We do appreciate it, and it is some really impressive -- Gosh. We've got so many different things going on, but it is very impressive, and so thank you for all your hard work, you and other staff as well. Okay. If there are no questions, let's move to the next item, which would be the Commercial Fish Rules Demo, and I believe that Cameron is going to do that for us.

MS. RHODES: Yes. Thanks, Mel. I'm going to see if the technology is going to be willing to cooperate with me today, and so bear with me for a second, as I get everything up and running.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks.

MS. RHODES: I assume that everybody can see my screen, and everybody is looking at my phone and sees the raised-hands doc on the left there?

MR. BELL: Got it.

MS. RHODES: All right. Sweet. Let's run with it and see how long it will last. Thanks, guys. I'm just going to update you quickly on the commercial Fish Rules app and its ongoing development. Just as a little bit of background, we've been working with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council really closely, with Emily and Carly over there, to develop this commercial Fish Rules app, so that commercial fishermen can access regulatory information directly from the app, in a really clean and easy way, as opposed to how it's structured now within the recreational version of the Fish Rules app.

I am going to just hop directly in here, so you guys can see exactly what we've got going on and take a quick tour of what the app currently looks like. We've got quite a bit of time before we actually launch this, and we're hoping to get launch dates set for April 15, but I will circle back on some of those details after we walk through the app, now that we have the technology up and running and willing to cooperate for right now.

We designed the app with the specific purpose of making sure that it was set up so that you could go in based on what permits you have, and so, rather than being exposed to all of the commercial fishing regulations that apply to federal permit holders in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic, both regions felt that it would be more appropriate to highlight everything via what permits you have, and so the first thing off the bat is you're asked to add the permits that apply to you.

If you go to "add a permit" and click there, and it takes a little bit to load, because we've got lots of permits in here, as you can imagine, but the permits are currently organized based on South Atlantic, or, if you scroll down, then you hit the Gulf of Mexico permits. We're playing with some ideas of how we could structure this so it looks a little bit different, but that will come over time, and we are fully expecting to have multiple iterations of this, and we're looking forward to hearing back from beta testers as to how this worked for them, if it was easy, and so we'll be collaborating with lots of folks, to see if this is the look we want to go with.

You can either search for the permits you have, in the "search for permits", or you can just scroll through and see what applies to you. For the purposes of this demo, I'm going to go ahead and select the Atlantic dolphin wahoo permit. Now that's added to my list of permits. Anytime I open the app, that permit will be selected, and let's say that I also have a snapper grouper permit, and so I'm going to go back in and add additional permits to this list, and I'm going to scroll to the unlimited snapper grouper permit, and select that, and now that's also on my list, and so, again, any time I access the app, these two permits will show up for me. If I want to remove them, I select the minus sign, but, for right now, these are the permits that I'm going to go through for the purposes of this demo today.

Let's go ahead and select the Atlantic dolphin wahoo permit, and it's broken up so that you can access species regulations, permit conditions, or the managed areas that apply to this permit, and so, first things first, I'm going to show you guys the permit conditions, and these are all the nitty-gritty details that often apply to commercial fisheries, and we don't have this information represented in the recreational version of the Fish Rules app, but Emily and I, and Kim as well, we often receive questions relevant to these items, and they tend to be the trickier things, especially for anybody who might be a new entrant into the fishery, and so we wanted to make sure that we had this information spelled out here.

If you click on "at-sea observer", you get all the information relevant to the at-sea observer program. You also can click on something like let's say "turtle gear requirements", and it will give you some information on the turtle gear requirements and how they apply. Then we can also go into something like "record keeping", let's say, and so just brief little summaries of what somebody can expect, and then, if they need additional information, they can, of course, go and check out the Code of Federal Regulations, but we wanted to at least reference some of these topics within the app.

Additionally, if you go to "species regulations" here, you can click into Atlantic EEZ for Florida through South Carolina, and this is specifically designed to reflect the minimum size limit differences, and so you click on "Florida through South Carolina", and you will get information on the minimum size limit, and you will see these are buttons, and so, if you wanted to click on that for more information, you can get the definition of a minimum size limit.

Then there's also some additional information down here, and one of our big features, that we're really excited about, is this quota monitoring button right here, and this is going to be reflected throughout all of the species that we manage, and we're going to have these quota bars set in place, so you can see the percent harvested.

This is courtesy of our friends over at NOAA Fisheries, and the SERO folks have been really gracious and helpful as to getting us this information and figuring out if there's a way that they can automatically update this for us, rather than South Atlantic or Gulf Council staff having to do it, and so we are currently working with them to try and make that happen, and so that's good news, and it seems like a really popular feature thus far, with things that we've shown people here and there, from commercial fishermen, all the way to staff, and it definitely seems to be something that is a highlight within the app at this time. Emily and I get lots of questions about that, and so we felt that it was important to make sure that it was included in the app and that people could access that information readily.

Next, I'm going to hop out of -- Well, first, I will show you the managed areas. We have big plans for making this a functional map, where you could click in and actually navigate to the locations that apply to you, but, for the purposes of this round and getting the app out and trying to figure out the logistics of how we could get that to happen, we've broken things up based on state, and, that way, people can hop in here, and they can see the managed areas that apply within that state. If you click on one of these, you will get an image of that area, as well as some information, including coordinates and things like that, so that you have a better idea of what regulations apply to you as a commercial operator within those regions.

I will hop into snapper grouper next, and there's lots of species here. If it's a prohibited species, no harvest, then it's highlighted in red, and you can see we've got a long list here, and you can search in the search bar up top, but I will go ahead and click "greater amberjack". We've got the trip limit represented here, the size limit, fork length, and, again, that quota monitoring box, which is really a highlight, and then some other additional information that's within the app, and then, again, as I mentioned with dolphin wahoo, you can select permit conditions, to get a little bit more information on what applies, and, again, you can see the managed areas that apply.

We structured this in a way that we think is pretty clean, but we're really looking forward to being able to beta test this, and we're going to first beta test with staff, and everybody internally, to make sure all the content is good to go. As you can imagine, this is a pretty heavy lift, getting all of the commercial regulations within the app, and so we're definitely looking to our staff now to confirm that everything we have in here is good to go.

Then, following that, we will do beta testing with partners and with fishermen, and the goal is to get at least one representative from every commercial fishery that we have in the South Atlantic to participate in that, and I will definitely be reaching out to a number of council members, to see if you would be interested in participating in that beta test as well.

That's pretty much all I have. Again, I just wanted to mention that we are planning to launch on April 15, and so we'll have news releases prepared, and social media content to acknowledge that release and make sure that commercial fishermen can go ahead and download the app. It will be available in the Apple Store as well as the Google Play store, and that's pretty much all I have, as far as an update, Mr. Chair. If there's any questions, I would be happy to answer them now, but, for those of you who are commercial representatives, be prepared for me to be knocking on your door shortly to get you to help us out with beta testing the app.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Cameron. Again, that's cool stuff going on, and a reliance upon technology for this, and it's -- We've talked about ways to utilize the technology that we all seem to be carrying around in our pockets to better do our jobs and allow our fishermen and all to do theirs easier, and so any questions for Cameron or comments? Man, you all are quiet. Okay. I am not seeing any questions or any hands up, Cameron. Well, there's Chris. Chris took the bait.

MR. CONKLIN: Sign me up for this, please.

MS. RHODES: Will do, Chris. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Any other volunteers? Pat, go ahead.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I would like to volunteer one or two of my enforcement officers to help beta test this as well. I think it's an invaluable tool, and we get a lot of complaints from the commercial side about the complicated regs, and I think it would be great if some of my guys could actually beta test it as well, and so I am volunteering my folks.

MR. BELL: Good deal. That makes perfect sense, Pat. Thank you. Go ahead, Cameron.

MS. RHODES: Thanks, Pat. I will reach out and get a list, and I think we'll get some Law Enforcement AP members to take a look at this as well, and so I will definitely be reaching out to

you, to see who you would recommend to do that. Thank you very much. That will be a great help for us.

MR. BELL: Good idea. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm going to get in trouble for saying this on the public record, but I think this is even dummy enough proof for my husband, and I know he will try it. He's very technically non-advanced, and so I am super excited about this. It looks amazing.

MS. RHODES: Great. Thank you, Kerry.

MR. BELL: We won't tell him, if he's not listening. It has big buttons. All right. Thanks, Kerry. Anybody else have any questions or any comments on it? I think it's, again, the technology that's around us all the time, and so it's great to take advantage of it. All right. I don't see any other hands, Cameron, and so thank you so much for the presentation, and that's good stuff.

MS. RHODES: Thanks, Mel.

MR. BELL: All right. Moving along through the agenda, then the next item would be a report from our recreational working group activities, and I believe John is going to give that. It seems like we have an awful lot of working groups these days, but that's fine. That's how we get things done, and so whenever you're ready, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mel. I was just going to kick it off and then hand it over to the chair of our workgroup, Captain Spud. I will give John Hadley a second to get the report up, and so you got this in the late materials, and it's the FCII Report PvtRecCatchWorkgroup. The group met on February 17 and had a couple of very informative presentations and some great discussion, and so, Spud, if you want to go ahead and add to that and give your observations and thoughts.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, John. As John said, we met in February for our first meeting, and we've got a pretty diverse group of members, with a lot of accumulated experience and subject matter expertise, and so it's really important to have sort of the state perspective, the federal perspective, and the council perspective and all of that merged together. Probably our most significant accomplishment is that we actually reached consensus on refining our goal and a list of objectives, and this ensures that our efforts, for the remainder of this year, are going to be focused on producing an outcome that will be beneficial, and I will just point out a couple of things that I think are significant.

In our goal statement, it speaks to coordinated state and federal data collection, and so we're putting emphasis on the fact that we need to make sure that whatever we produce is going to be useful at the state level and at the federal level and that we do this in a coordinated manner. Also, focusing in on snapper grouper fishing, and, under our objectives, if you go down to the bottom, it talks about that we need to develop clear goals for data usage and outline the steps necessary for any state-collected data to be acceptable by MRIP and useful in the SEDAR stock assessment process and also contribute to better-informed decision-making at the council level.

Bev Sauls gave us a very detailed and informative presentation on the genesis and execution of the Florida Reef Fish Survey, and that was very helpful for those of us who are sort of outside looking

in to better understand how it was developed in the Gulf and then expanded over to the Atlantic, and particularly useful was sort of the juxtaposition of this with MRIP and how the two things are working, hopefully in a compatible form.

Dr. Richard Cody gave us a presentation on the rare-event workgroup, and this is something that the council has asked NMFS to look into, and it was pretty high-level and pretty heavy in a lot of mathematics, but it was useful and gave us some insight on the challenges of dealing with rare-event species, and then we came up with a pretty lengthy list of things for our future meetings, and you can see those listed in the summary report, and I have communicated with John, and we've got a couple of things that are sort of already in the queue, and one is probably, at our next meeting, we'll get a presentation on the large pelagic survey and how it's been redesigned and is there an opportunity to expand this down into the South Atlantic region, and then also a presentation on other mandatory federal private recreational angler permitting programs, because there's the Mid-Atlantic tilefish, HMS tunas, that sort of thing, so we can better understand what is in place and working in other areas.

Then, also, a question that came up is, with some of these species, could we increase the MRIP sampling effort and accomplish the same goal as creating a separate catch and effort, or supplementary catch and effort, program, and so that's one of the other things that we're going to be looking into, is is that possible, and, if so, what would be involved in that, but the real -- The focus is that we're going to spend our next couple or three meetings dealing with the what. What do we want to accomplish that is going to improve our ability to general reliable and trustworthy catch and effort information from the private recreational sector for snapper grouper.

Then, assuming we can identify that, then we'll get into the how. How do we do it? Is it going to be something that the state does? Is it going to be something that NMFS needs to do? Is it a collaborative effort? It's an ambitious undertaking, but we've got the right group of people, and I think we can make some demonstrable progress and come back at the end of the year, per our deadline, and make some recommendations for consideration, and so that concludes my report, Mr. Chair.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Spud, and I will say that Spud is not the guy that you want to use as an example for what retirement looks like, because Spud technically retired, and whether it's council or the commission -- I am not so sure he looks retired. Retirement doesn't look that good to me, good honestly, and so thank you, Spud, for all you do and for your work on this, and it's an important area and one that we're looking forward to the outcome of the working group, the product, and so any questions for Spud about the whole concept, the working group and what all is going on with it? You all aren't very inquisitive today. I'm on it, and so I know what's going on, but -- Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel, and thanks, Spud, for the overview. I haven't followed this working group closely, but I just would be curious to know who is participating in the workgroup, and is it a mixture of managers and scientists and others involved in data collection? I'm curious more of the representation, because you do have, obviously, very lofty goals and objectives and recommendations coming forward, and it seems like it's going to kind of take a diversity of disciplines to help with those recommendations.

MR. WOODWARD: I will miss somebody, and I'm sure we could probably pull up the membership, if we need to, but we've got Erik Williams, Mike Larkin, Bev Sauls, Luiz Barbieri from the State of Florida, we've got council members, we've got folks from the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, and we've got a good cross-section of folks who do the hands-on catch-and-effort data collection. We've got Jeff Black from ACCSP, and so I think we've got the right cast of characters, and so hopefully we can produce a useful outcome.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thank you for that, and, having dealt with regional management in the Gulf, and now we have five separate state surveys, I certainly have thoughts on how to proceed on the state survey front, if you guys make that recommendation, and so I will look forward to outcomes of that going forward.

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

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was curious. With that lineup there, is there anybody that -- Are there any commercial fishermen that have to operate under all these entities and different permit processes, to help maybe -- Just to bring another insight for discussion into this, because it seems like it's heavy with the -- I guess bureaucracy, and I was just curious about that. Is there any grounding closer to reality here that has evolved to help out?

MR. WOODWARD: Well, our focus is on private recreational anglers and addressing what most of us recognize is some needs, and even inadequacies, in how we're currently collecting private recreational angler catch and effort data, and so the focus is really on those, and so we don't have anybody representing the commercial sector, per se. I will say that the folks that are on there representing the state, and federal folks, they're cross-cutting, usually, into both areas. I mean, they understand commercial fisheries as well as recreational fisheries.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you.

MR. BELL: Dewey, I know you're really good at pointing out issues we have with the recreational data, from time to time, and so that's what this group is intended, to try to come up with some ways that we can make improvements there, and so but certainly the focus is -- The recreational private boat piece is the most complicated part of that whole picture, and so that's the intent of the group. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Chairman. I was just going to respond to Dewey's comments. Dewey, from NC DMF, we have placed staff on the workgroup from our license and statistics section who deal with the trip ticket program as well as our coastal angler program, and so they're pretty well involved in commercial reporting programs as well as the recreational reporting programs, and you're free to reach out to them if you would like, and you can just get with me offline, and we can chat about that.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Steve, and we've done that as well. We've got a representative on there from statistics and all, and they're the people that deal with recreational and commercial data, and so it's not just bureaucrats. We've got some folks that work with the fishermen work with the fishermen very closely, all the fishermen, and so that's useful, and so people that understand the technical side of things, from a state perspective. Any other questions for Spud or comments on the effort there that's underway? All right. I don't see any hands.

That takes us to reports, and here's -- Just so you all know what I'm thinking, because we need to make sure, for our committee reports, which we had scheduled for tomorrow, technically, that we have allowed time for staff and committee chairs to make sure they've got their reports worked out in final version and all, and, also, to prevent from rushing folks here.

As I told you, I would like to just knock off at 17:00 today, as we had it scheduled, but the idea would be that we'll kind of push through the Items 3, 4, 5, plus the addition of the NOAA OLE report, today.

We'll get those done, and we'll see how we're looking on time, and maybe we have time to do agency and liaison reports today, or our little other business item, but the idea would be to knock off at 17:00 today and reconvene in the morning, as scheduled, and be able to spend time going through the committee reports properly, because sometimes we have some discussion and things there, and so that's the plan right now. Let's go ahead and -- Does anybody feel the need for a break right now, or are we okay pushing through? No hands and no hollering. All right. Then let's go to Item 3, which would be NMFS and Science Center reports, and I guess that -- I don't have a person, but Clay, I assume, maybe.

DR. PORCH: Yes, that's going to be me.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Clay.

DR. PORCH: All right. Well, I will try and make it brief. As I've mentioned before, COVID has hit our operations pretty hard in a number of ways, including me. I got it myself, and I was not fully functional for about three weeks, and, as a consequence of that, I dropped the ball on sending this ahead of time. My staff put this spreadsheet together shortly after I asked for it, back in early February, and that was right about the time I ended up getting -- Actually, in late January, I got COVID, and so I completely dropped the ball, and I apologize for that, but I think this is pretty much what was asked for.

I will start with the commercial TIP sampling. As you know, COVID was really hitting us, I think, basically in March, but we did try and keep the sampling open through pretty much mid-June, and we just tried to implement some measure of social distancing, but we were still having port samplers get out into the field. Then the bar got raised on us, at the national level, and so we ceased sampling in mid-June. Once we had some mitigation measures in place, we started sampling a little bit in September, but then we had to suspend all sampling in December, after there was a resurgence in COVID cases.

The consequence of that for TIP sampling is we normally had been interviewing around a thousand trips, and it's down a little in 2020, because we weren't able to do complete sampling, and, of course, 2021 we haven't resumed yet, and so, when normally we collect somewhere in the range of 26,000 lengths, in 2020, it was down a little, and, again, we haven't collected anything this year. Unfortunately, there's really not going to be any sampling possible until some mitigation measures have been approved at the NOAA level.

It's a similar situation for headboat, except, because that involved samplers mixing with large numbers of people, we actually suspended that right away in March, and so no biological samples

have been collected from headboat since that time. We have a target this year of about 300. Normally, we would sample somewhere in the vicinity of 10,000 or 11,000 trips, and we're hoping to get 300 by the end of the year, but that's just a loose target.

The thing we have been doing is monitoring reporting compliance and trying to ensure that captains are reporting the trip-level catch and effort data, and we'll end up trying to come up with estimates in weight, and we'll just have to use weights from 2020, and something similar will have to apply to the commercial fishery as well. I won't go into all the details there.

As you know, we had to suspend our SEFIS fishery-independent sampling, and that's the trap and camera work, and the South Carolina DNR did not get state-level approval for them to do their part, and we also struggled to put together a team on our part, and, between the late timing of approval for us, it just really wasn't possible to get the minimum level of coverage that we needed to have a useful index, and so that was suspended as well.

We are planning to have the cruise in 2021, and I think, right now, six cruises are planned, and we should get, actually, pretty good coverage this year, comparable to what we got in 2019, and I think this is a real key, because 2020 was, in large measure, the year without data, and we didn't have as much fisheries statistics information, sampling, as we've had in the past, and no fishery-independent surveys, and so any assessments that have a terminal year of 2020 may as well have a terminal year of 2019, and that's why we had recommended moving some assessments later in 2022, so that we can actually have index and catch data in it.

As far as processing of otoliths and ageing samples, what we did have from 2019 and 2020, we've made good progress on, and I think we're pretty much on schedule. For some of the more recent samples though, we are starting to fall behind a little bit, and that's basically because we can't take the big, high-speed saws home, and so the only ones we can take are the lower-speed saws, and so everything is a bit slower until we can actually get full access to the facilities, which we're not permitted to do at the present time. There's a lot of details in there, for those of you who are more into the science end of it, and you'll see it over there in Column H, but I won't spend the time here, so that Mel can finish by 5:00 today.

Just to pick up with stock assessments, we have -- It says in the spreadsheet not a COVID impact, but I suppose in some sense there is, because we can't meet together, and there's a lot of inefficiencies that have cropped up in the system, and, believe it or not, some of these in-person workshops were actually more efficient than the series of webinars have been, especially for the research track assessments, but a bigger issue is that we did have a vacancy in the Atlantic Fisheries Branch, and we have just hired somebody, and that person is very good, and hopefully will hit the ground running, and so it's possible that it could lead to some delays in future assessments, but I think we're pretty much on track. Like I said, we hired somebody really good, but I don't think the start dates and all that are official, and so I will refrain from naming names or anything.

I mentioned already that we and the South Atlantic Council have preferred to avoid having 2020 as the terminal year for as many assessments as we can, simply because it was basically the year without data, and you may as well have a 2019 terminal year, and so I think I will leave it at that and ask if there's any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Clay, and we just kind of refer to 2020 as the year with a big asterisk beside it, and it's a mess. Sorry to hear about you getting the COVID, but we're glad you're here talking to us, and so that's a good sign. Any questions for Clay about what he's just presented? I know, from all of our different perspectives, we're all dealing with issues associated with this, and 2020 was a rough year, and so certainly, in terms of the sampling stuff, from our perspective, at our agency, we deal with all the same stuff, and I know everybody has, and so any questions?

Don't take my wanting to knock off at 17:00 for you all to need to rush or anything. We have time, and, whatever we don't finish today, we'll carry it tomorrow, but I definitely want to make sure that we were going to do the reports and all tomorrow, and so we're fine, and you can talk as long as you would like, or ask questions. I don't see any hands, and so, Clay, thanks for that. The next item I have is Commercial Electronic Logbook Status and Julie Brown, maybe, from the Science Center.

MS. BROWN: In keeping with my usual presentation, I am going to keep today's pretty short and sweet. All of the institutions cooperating on the commercial logbook program made pretty good progress this fall, even with the tremendous time and resources that were put into launching the for-hire and headboat logbook program, which, as you know, started their mandatory reporting for the entire fleet this January.

There have been instances where the commercial logbook was able to sort of ride their coattails, with getting updates to the database and application, and there have been times when we have willingly taken a backseat, due to the urgency of their needs and deadlines, and so, today, I'm happy to report that the commercial logbook program is just a few details away from beginning the recruitment phase for voluntary reporting in the commercial electronic logbooks.

Currently, the only application pending for approval for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center commercial logbook is eTRIPS. However, we are ready to begin cooperation with any other third-party application developers who wish to develop software for commercial logbooks. We have the technical requirements document, which is currently a guideline for creating an app for voluntary reporting. Again, stressing the "voluntary" part, because the mandatory reporting requirements have not yet been set by the councils, and we do expect that feedback from the voluntary portion of this program will be under consideration for that final technical requirement document that would outline the mandatory requirements.

For the past year, we have been able to use the view that was created by ACCSP to test the data flow, with occasional minor adjustments in that view. Down here, these bullets at the bottom, we have a functional application currently for reporting the no-fishing portion of the logbook requirements, and the eTRIPS application, which, as I said earlier, is the only software potentially, at this point, who might be approved for the commercial logbook, it is functional for the point of mapping variables, which we need. However, it's still undergoing some adjustments before we are going to have it available to our constituents for their permit compliance.

Like I said, the variable mapping is the biggest task right now for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and we do depend on the functionality of the mobile application for this assignment, and so what means is that tweaks or updates in the application do occasionally disrupt our ability to push data through and use it for mapping. However, these tweaks and updates are also improving

the user accessibility of the application, and so we do acknowledge that these are necessary, as well as accommodating the other partners' requirements.

We are also working to update our existing validations, which check the trip reports, and they are going to be reflecting the new set-based reporting, as opposed to the trip-based reporting that people are used to. Lastly, we have an update from ACCSP, where they have a new user account self-creation tool. The update is that it now allows for permits which are held by businesses, LLCs, or non-person entities to use this to sign up without assistance. This would be businesses that essentially don't have a birthdate, which was the former requirement of the self-creation tool. This was a major contribution from ACCSP, because a huge portion of the fleet, both commercial and for-hire, are this type of participant.

Given that we are so close at this time, we would like to begin the recruitment phase to get volunteers who are going to report their trips electronically when the application is ready to launch, and this reporting will be for compliance, and the participants will not have to do any duplicative reporting on the paper logbook forms.

All volunteers will initially be asked to participate in the discard survey, as well as the socioeconomic survey portion, of the logbook that most of our logbook reporters are already used to that, but we would have them do that as a mandatory function, if they decide to volunteer during this phase. For any software vendors who would be interested in developing an application for this voluntary reporting, and, again, I'm going to keep stressing voluntary at this point, I would encourage them to get in touch with myself or any other Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff member, who can point them in my direction, and we'll start setting them up with that technical specification document and begin collaboration for some new logbook software.

Here is a slide that I always like to include to remind everyone listening about the current commercial logbook reporting. As I mentioned earlier, we have available, for the last two years, an option for the commercial permit holders to create an account and report the no-fishing reports online, and the program is currently serving 374 users, when I created this for the briefing book, and it's probably closer to 400 now, with approximately five to ten new users signing up every week.

Because of this reporting availability and the COVID restrictions for personnel coming into and out of the office, we are no longer accepting faxes or emails of logbook documents. These rules have been in place for over a year now, and we also sent out a reminder of these rules in the annual December logbook mailing three months ago.

To summarize, we have the technical specifications ready, with the acknowledgement that these guidelines are for voluntary reporting, and the mandatory reporting requirements will ultimately be dictated by the councils. Our biggest task behind the scenes is using this mobile application to test data flow and use it to map the variables to our existing database. We have had a major accomplishment in the past few months by ACCSP, with this self-creation tool for new accounts, which is now able to accommodate a variety of permit holder types, and, with this in mind, we are ready to begin the volunteer recruitment phase prior to launching the electronic reporting of commercial logbooks, and that is it for me. If anyone has any questions, I will try and answer them.

MR. BELL: All right, Julie. Thank you. Any questions about what was presented? Dave Gloeckner.

DR. GLOECKNER: I think Julie kind of communicated this, but I just wanted to make it clear that ACCSP, when working on these logbooks, if they've got mandatory requirements, and pending mandatory requirements, those are the programs that go to the top of their priority list, and so, if the council moves on moving forward with creating requirements, that will probably bump this up in the priority list, because, right now, it's falling behind SEFHIER and falling behind the GARFO requirements that I think are supposed to be implemented this summer, and so I'm just kind of prodding a little bit.

MR. BELL: Okay. I understand. Everybody heard that. Clay.

DR. PORCH: I just was going to say exactly what Dave said, and I just wasn't sure if he was going to make an intervention or not, and so, yes, I just wanted to reinforce that point.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, Clay. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mel. I was just curious where the Atlantic is relative to the Gulf and how the coordination between the Gulf and the Atlantic programs are going to work. I'm especially curious about how this will affect folks in the Keys.

MS. BROWN: Right now, people with the federal Gulf and South Atlantic permits for certain fisheries are both under the same requirements, and we really, really hope that the councils will keep that intact and have the same requirements between the two areas. We have no intention of having different requirements based on the region, and we would like to keep it the same as it is right now. Does that answer your question?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes. Is one of them a little bit ahead of the other? Is the Gulf ahead of the Atlantic, relative to full implementation?

MS. BROWN: No. They both report to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and so there is no differentiation, as far as we're concerned, at this point. I'm not sure if they have begun drafting anything yet, and I don't think they have. I think they're on the same schedule as the South Atlantic.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you. That was going to kind of be my question, and so, as I was talking about this earlier in Executive Finance, part of the reason why we were kind of holding off was to get these technical developments done and get through this volunteer, but what I'm kind of hearing now is we need to get started with the process of the regulatory process from the council's end, so that we stay high on the priority list, and then the technical aspects will catch up, but I don't think -- If we're missing the boat, because we're not moving forward from a council standpoint, then I think we should rethink that and maybe have some more discussion about moving that forward faster.

I would hate to see this thing come online, and, as Jessica alluded to, you're going to have a real problem with dually-permitted guys, possibly, if it comes online in the Gulf way before it comes online in the South Atlantic, and I'm not quite sure, but I don't want to -- I don't want them to be sitting around waiting on us to decide that we want to implement this, and I would rather go ahead and start working toward it, and, when the program is ready, the program is ready, from a technical standpoint. Thank you.

MR. BELL: I appreciate the comments earlier, and you're right, Tim, and, given Dave and Clay's recent comments there, that would seem so. Dave, do you want to add something else to that?

DR. GLOECKNER: I think the only thing I want to clarify here is we have presented this to the Gulf Reef Fish AP, and they do have some questions about the app, and we didn't have one available to show them, which raised a whole lot of concerns, and I'm sure, if we present this, all of the requirements, without some kind of reference, like an app, that we can show how you do these or how you enter all of this, we'll probably have some of the same concerns from the South Atlantic as well.

I also want to make clear that this is a single logbook that will be able to capture the requirements at this point, the voluntary, and it will be able to capture the requirements of the HMS pelagic longline logbook, and it will capture the coastal, and so the South Atlantic snapper grouper and Gulf reef fish and dolphin wahoo and mackerel, and so it will capture everything for those fisheries, and it will also capture all the information for the wreckfish, other than the IFQ information, and so it will capture all the effort, and it will capture the pounds, as well as for the golden crab. At this point, this logbook asks for a lot of data, but I think we've made it so that a lot of the information can be machine generated, and so that takes a lot of the reporting burden off of the fishermen, and I just wanted to make that clear.

MR. BELL: We've heard that from the fishermen over and over, and they would greatly appreciate having the burden removed and simplifying their lives and the whole way they do business, and so I get that, totally.

DR. GLOECKNER: I just wanted to clarify that, but, yes, we're a little bit ahead in the Gulf, because we presented to the AP, but I think we can resolve that pretty quickly.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks. Point taken. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mel. I had a question, Dave or Clay or whoever, and, based on the comments here and the desire to do what we can to prod ACCSP to make this a higher priority and get it done, is it possible that, at the June meeting, you guys could report back to the council on what it is that we actually need to do to enable these logbook reports to be filed electronically, as opposed to on paper? We just sort of have a question, and it's never been really clear to me exactly what action the council needs to be taking, if we just assume that all we're going to do is take the existing requirements and let people file this stuff electronically.

MR. BELL: The mechanics of how, and who is the best person to respond to that?

MS. BROWN: Maybe I am. I probably could have been more clear, but the app is functional at the point right now where it collects all of the required data elements, and there are some logical

concerns in the app though right now, in terms of we need to solicit these things in the correct order, and the economic survey needs to come at the end, when you actually know how much gasoline you used, instead of at the beginning, when you don't know the answer to that question.

Those are the like cosmetic details that we're working on right now, and we don't want to put this app into people's hands if it doesn't make sense and makes us look foolish, and so those are the sorts of things that we're working on right now, but, in terms of all of the data elements that are required, it does have the ability to collect everything right now. Does that answer your question?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, not exactly. I am just sort of curious. Like does the council just need to put forth an action that says allow logbooks to be reported electronically?

DR. GLOECKNER: I think Monica may have her hand up to address that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Go ahead, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I believe that the council will need to do some sort of comprehensive plan amendment that specifies how this is going to go, and, right now, obviously, the Center collects, and the regulations require -- They require fishermen to report, and I think the language is something like on forms required by the Fisheries Science Center, but we've looked at that in the past, and GC's interpretation has been that, when those regs went into place, it was never envisioned that a fisherman could report electronically, and we would need an amendment to the FMPs to allow, or require, this electronic reporting.

I was going to suggest that, along the lines of I think what you did when the headboats switched over from paper to electronic reporting, there was, if you will, a comprehensive document that amended both the Gulf and South Atlantic FMPs, that then flipped the switch and required electronic reporting, and, to Jessica's point earlier, is the Gulf essentially -- My interpretation of your question was is the Gulf ahead of the South Atlantic on this, because of the fishermen in the Keys, and, at least, that way, if you had a document that you did along with the Gulf Council that just flipped the switch to require electronic reporting, you could ensure that it was done at the same time.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, Monica. It's never as simple as flipping a switch, is it? Andy, did you have something to add to this particular aspect of the discussion, before I go to maybe Chris and Cameron for a question?

MR. STRELCHECK: No, and I think Monica covered the points on that, and I have a couple of questions, but I'll wait.

MR. BELL: Okay. Chris, did you have a question?

MR. CONKLIN: No, and I was just going to say everything that Monica said, and she said it much better, and so thank goodness.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, you went to law school, too. Are you there, Cameron?

MS. RHODES: Yes, and so I just had a quick question, and apologies if I missed it as you were going through the presentation, but is there anything that council staff can do, as far as getting volunteers to participate in this? I think it would be relatively easy for us to reach out to our advisory panel members, and even council members on the call now, and I think people are really interested, and so is there anything that we can do, as part of our outreach and communications team, to help with this effort at this time?

DR. GLOECKNER: We would appreciate any help with outreach.

MS. RHODES: Absolutely.

MS. BROWN: Cameron, I can probably get in touch with you, either after today's meeting or tomorrow, to discuss exactly what you're talking about.

MS. RHODES: Okay. That sounds good, and it might be appropriate maybe even having kind of regular meetings to this effect, and so, yes, we can talk about this offline, but I know that Kim and I both would be very interested in making sure that we get you the people that you need in order to get it tested.

MR. BELL: Thanks for offering, Cameron, and you call can talk.

MS. BROWN: We are trying to stay away from the terminology of testing, because, at this point, we've already had our pilot study, years ago, and so we're not beta testing anymore, and we're going to hit the ground running when we put this in people's hands.

MS. RHODES: Whatever you -- I mean, you guys can brief us on whatever terminology is most appropriate, and we can deliver that to the people who need to sign up and volunteer.

MR. BELL: Good deal. Thanks. I appreciate the cooperation. Andy, have you got some questions?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, two questions. So the first goes to the Science Center. With the, I guess, data standards requirements, not so much applicable in the South Atlantic, but do they contemplate the use of vessel monitoring systems, because I see that as probably the main difference from the Gulf to the South Atlantic, in terms of the tools or ability to operate and report.

MR. BELL: Is that a Julie or Clay or --

MS. BROWN: Right now, the program doesn't have any plans to add additional vessel monitoring requirements onto any vessel that doesn't currently have that requirement. We would love for the people who do have that requirement though, however, if vendors that create that software would also like to create commercial logbook forms that they can add to their equipment, that would be awesome, but we have no plans to add any additional vessel monitoring to any fleet that does not already have that.

MR. STRELCHECK: That was why I was asking, is that we would -- It would be possible though to add forms for vessel monitoring systems to report through, and so that would be good. Then I

guess the other question is, Monica, you mentioned a comprehensive amendment. I know, with the for-hire reporting programs, we ultimately went down separate paths with the South Atlantic and Gulf Council, and we ended up with different outcomes.

Obviously, with the commercial program being in place for quite some time, paper-based, and having the consistency across geographies, is there a way to do a comprehensive amendment for non-jointly-managed FMPs? Certainly there are jointly-managed FMPs, where it makes sense, but could it be kind of one amendment done by both the Gulf Council and the South Atlantic Council?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, I think so, and I was reminded that the dealer electronic reporting requirements were similar, in the sense that it was one document that amended several FMPs, and that included FMPs that were jointly managed by the two councils and FMPs that were not jointly managed, and so, yes, I think there's a way to do it. Maybe what we ought to do is, at the next meeting, discuss how that could happen, and I could get with my counterparts in the Gulf, and we could kind of look at how we could do that and bring that back to the council.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think that's a great idea, Monica, and just kind of one final point. That's a great suggestion, in terms of kind of the contents of what would be in any sort of amendment or plan that we produced by the councils, and so certainly we can work toward that as well and bring that back for future discussion with the council, and the council can decide, based on the planning document that you have, where this gets prioritized.

MR. BELL: Good discussion. Thanks, Andy. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mel. Monica, you triggered my memory of the headboat situation, and so I looked back at that, and that was a joint South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico, and it amended our Snapper Grouper and Dolphin Wahoo, and then it did the joint CMP plan, and so that didn't get into the issue of say amending South Atlantic snapper grouper along with say Gulf reef fish, and so I think that should be explored, but one thing that was interesting to me on this was it had one action, and it said to require vessels to submit forms via electronic reporting.

Then there was a sub-alternative about staying valid with your reports, and so it seems that something that is one action might be something we can find a way to get started. If it's okay, what I would like to do is have us look into this, and we're looking into some other things, to report back on their feasibility and options in June, and I think we can look into this as well.

MR. BELL: That makes sense, John. The sooner we can kind of get the ball rolling, or define the ball and get it rolling, the better, I think, based on the discussion we've had. Any other -- This was a really good discussion on this, and I'm glad we had the time to do that. I appreciate the cooperation on moving this forward. Anything else on this particular item right now, questions or comments? All right. Seeing no hands, then we will shift over to Regional Office reports. The first one up would be, speaking of electronic-reporting-type things, for-hire electronic reporting, and I guess, if Karla is onboard, she's going to do that.

MS. GORE: Thank you for having me, and I think the last time I was at a council meeting was exactly one year ago, at Jekyll Island. I miss seeing you all in person. I am just going to give a quick update about where we are with the Southeast For-Hire Electronic Reporting Program. I

think the last time you heard about this was in December, which was right before we officially launched.

Just a quick overview, in case you forgot what it is, but the electronic reporting program applies to those with charter/headboat permits for Atlantic CMP, Atlantic dolphin wahoo, and Atlantic snapper grouper, and it requires them to report regardless of where they're fishing or what their target species is, anytime they're on a charter trip.

The regulations that we put together, or that we implemented, for this program changed a little bit for headboats, and so they changed the reporting day from Sunday to Tuesday, and headboat operators that are currently participating in the headboat survey will continue to participate in the headboat survey, and they will continue to do their electronic reporting using the app VESL.

The biggest change comes for the charter fishermen, and so this requires trip-level weekly reporting on approved software, and they are required to report all trips and all species, not just those trips targeting federal species, and not just those in federal waters, but any trips. Any species caught will need to be reported. They also will need to submit did-not-fish reports, and so, if there's a particular week that they weren't out fishing, they have to submit a report that states that, and, just like headboats, the reports are due on Tuesday following a fishing week.

Electronic reporting means that all of the reports need to be coming through an approved reporting app, and so, just like Julie was saying, we've been working with ACCSP, and we have approved eTRIPS/mobile and VESL, which is a product of Bluefin Data, for this program, and so eTRIPS/mobile has Windows 10, Android, and iOS platforms, and it's free. It's compatible with GARFO and HMS requirements, and then VESL has a computer-based web portal, an iOS and Android platform, and it's also free, and it's compatible with the South Carolina state charter program and the headboat survey. On our website, we have a list of these two apps, and we have links to the vendor websites, so people can go there and get set up with their accounts.

In I think it was 2019 and early 2020, we did a lot of in-person roadshows. We did some in the Gulf, and we did some in the South Atlantic, and we had South Atlantic Council staff working with us on that, especially Kathleen Howington. Obviously, in 2020, that wasn't an option for us, and so we did the best we could with our outreach, and so we had a bunch of webinars in December, and those were for Gulf state agencies, permit holders in the Gulf, South Atlantic permit holders, and Cameron helped us reach out to the communicators up and down the Atlantic coast.

We've done a bunch for law enforcement, and so, in January, we did a bunch for OLE agents, and then, in February, we've been doing a lot of webinars for JEA agents, and then we still feel like there is a need for more outreach, and we can't go out and talk to people in-person, and so, starting on February 2, and they will go through the end of March, at least, we've been doing public Q&A sessions, via webinar, every Tuesday night at 6:30 Eastern Time.

I just kind of wanted to give a little update on where we are with the rollout, and so, as I said, and I don't know if I said this yet, but the rules became effective on January 4 through the Atlantic, and, since then, we've really been trying hard to get people get their accounts and get them using the platforms, and so, so far, for VESL -- I didn't put the total in here, but I think we have about 550 total VESL accounts. Those numbers, if you add them together, aren't going to equal 550, but we don't have the breakdown for the regions, for the total number yet, and then, for eTRIPS,

we have a total of 996 accounts. We are working on some issues with the data flow, and, as of earlier this week, we were able to see about 2,450 logbooks submitted. We think there are more, but we're having some issues seeing it all.

I just kind of wanted to identify a few things that we heard, some issues that we had in our rollout initially. We have a customer service line, a 1-800 number, and we were getting a really high volume of calls in December and early January, a really high number of calls, and each call was really long. A lot of fishermen needed help with every step of the process, deciding which app works best for them, downloading the app, and actually using it to submit a trip, and so that took quite a lot of time, and staff was very busy with that.

Unfortunately, we did have some issues with call lines malfunctioning, and I think we've resolved all of that, and, as a solution, we created an IVR line, and I think that stands for interactive voice response. Anyway, basically, when a fisherman calls the phone line, it will say to press 2 if you have questions about monitoring, press 3 if you have questions about your data, and press 4 if you have general questions, so people can kind of direct their questions to the right person a little bit better.

We did have some issues with the actual application, and so the VESL app, which was created by Bluefin Data, requires that we manually verify the accounts, and so we had a lot of people requesting these accounts, and we had a little bit of a backup. I think, as of this week, the backup has been cleared, and we might have five to ten people waiting to be approved, but I just kind of want to point out that, once people go online to create these accounts, it's not an automatic instant process. They can't necessarily use it immediately.

Then we had some issues because, for the VESL app, we were -- We have a whole new app, or a whole new form, for the charter sector, but the headboat program had already existed before that, and so there were some issues where fishermen were getting confused with the headboat form versus the charter form, and we have worked with VESL, or Bluefin Data, to fix some of the issues, and we have communicated those fixes with fishermen.

The same thing with eTRIPS, and we've had some issues. I guess a couple of the main issues are just fishermen are a little bit confused on how to create their account and download the software. They're confused about a couple of the data fields that aren't also on the VESL app, and so we've been working with ACCSP to make the instructions more clear on the website. ACCSP has a 24/7 help desk, and Bluefin Data also has a help desk, and both of their help desk support teams have been great. I think fishermen really appreciate being able to quickly access them.

One thing that we heard, for Atlantic boats specifically, is a lot of fishermen were trying to find their end port in the data fields, and it just wasn't showing up correctly, and so, once again, we worked with the vendors to address this and resolve it, and I think things are much, much smoother, or at least what the fishermen are seeing is a little bit smoother.

I just wanted to run through, quickly, our compliance plan, and so we have -- I think, in the numbers that I showed before, we have about 1,500 permit holders who have set up an account, and we know we have a lot more vessels than that, and so we're working to try to get fishermen to understand the requirements and get set up with their account, and so we have a customer service team and an outreach team, and they are -- The customer service team is there every day, and

people can call, and they will help get their account set up, and the outreach team is holding these weekly webinars to answer questions that anybody has. We're also reviewing -- So we have a compliance tracking team, and they are focusing right now a lot on who hasn't created their accounts and reaching out to them, one-by-one.

I know we were focused on Mississippi the last couple of weeks, and trying to reach every permit holder in Mississippi. We started with Mississippi because it was a smaller pool of people, but we were able to reach all of them and make sure that they understood the requirements and get them the help they need and make sure that they got their account set up, and so we're starting next week in other states.

The other thing we have is a QA/QC team, and so the QA/QC team reviews the data for errors, and they make contact with fishermen if they do find any errors, and so one of the things that we found recently was a bunch of trips were coming through with no catch, and probably about 200 trips were showing up where they should have probably had some catch, but they hadn't reported catch. The QA/QC team has been reaching out to those fishermen, because we feel like it probably was an error, and maybe they didn't understand how the app -- How to input their catch, or they were just making -- Everybody seemed to be making that consistent error, and so we had really good conversations with fishermen about that specifically, and we were able to help resolve that, and things are getting better on that front.

With the help of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and their developers, we have built the Southeast Regional For-Hire Application, and we call it the SRFH Application. This is basically an interface that runs on the Oracle platform, and it allows us to run validations, view reports, identify the errors and make corrections, and, through this system, we can check for compliance, send automatic reminders on compliance, and we can flag vessels that should have their permit renewal put on hold, and we also log all of our correspondence in the system.

Right now, we're having the developers build us some views for port agents and the Office of Law Enforcement, and so they'll be able to, when they're out on the dock, open up the SRFH Application and kind of have a background of the particular vessel that they might be wanting to talk to.

Basically, this is what I just mentioned, is that the OLE and port agents can look at the application by vessel, and they can look at vessel metrics, and they can see how we've corresponded with that particular vessel, and they're also able to log their own correspondence. This will be a really good tool to increase communication between the SEFHIER program team and the Office of Law Enforcement.

This is just a screenshot of what it is going to look like, and it's still under development, but they're testing it now, and so, basically, an OLE officer or port agent could open it up, and they could see the information about the vessel and the permit, whether or not they're in compliance with reporting.

This is just what our correspondence portal looks like, and so a port agent, or Office of Law Enforcement Agent, could look at this and see all of the correspondence we've had with a particular vessel, and so they could click on -- Where it says "vessel official number", they could click there, and they could see every phone call that we've had with that particular person and the

outcome of those calls. Then, if they click that “follow-up” button, they could add their own information, and so we have access to see how the conversation continued.

Like I said, we’ve been talking with the Office of Law Enforcement about their enforcement plan, and, right now, it’s the initial program rollout, and the focus really is outreach and compliance assistance, and this is not a grace period. The Office of Law Enforcement wants to make sure that people understand that, just because the focus is on outreach and compliance, it does not mean that they’re not going to issue citations or that kind of thing. We’re trying to make sure that fishermen are aware of the program and the requirements, helping them get the information they need, and then they will follow-up with them on expectations that they’ll be reporting by a certain date.

Like I mentioned, we talked with the JEA partners, and the plan for them is to continue doing their dockside -- I forgot what they’re called, but boarding inspection reports, and submit those through the SERO Office of Law Enforcement, and then they will decide the next step to take with that.

Right now, the things that fishermen should be doing now, the very first thing, since this program was effective on January 4, is they should be selecting a software to use and creating a user account. We have a lot of information on our website, in the toolkit, and there’s informational videos, and we’re holding those webinars every Tuesday evening, but I think, really, we want to emphasize that they should have selected a software to use, and they should be creating a user account, and then we will be able to help with all the other stuff. We can help them -- Well, we can help with everything. We can help them decide which software works best for them, and we can help them create their user account, but they just need to reach out to us, and we’ll get them the help they need.

In the next few months, we’re really focused on the compliance assistance, like I’ve mentioned, and so the Southeast Electronic Reporting Team, and that’s our main focus, and OLE is helping, and port agents are helping, and state agencies. We will be rolling out an intercept survey, and this is for the Gulf of Mexico, and so we’ll be holding some training webinars for port agents and samplers in the next few months, and I’m not sure exactly when, and we are working on data-sharing agreements. Once we have a really nice, clean dataset that’s in ACCSP, we’ll be talking to those who need the data about sharing it.

I just out a few slides in, because we can’t see each other in real life, of our program team, and so me and Rich Malinowski have really been focused on this pretty much full-time for the last couple of years, and Rich more focuses on the Gulf aspect of it. Jenny Ostroff recently joined the team, and then you will recognize the faces across the bottom of Rick DeVictor, Peter Hood, and Jack McGovern, who are our bosses.

We have a compliance team, and so it’s led by Kendall Brancart, and, like I mentioned, they’re the ones that are checking to see who is in compliance and who is out of compliance and reaching out to fishermen to make sure that they get into compliance. The monitoring team is led by Anna Petracca, and she has Tammy and Vicky working with her. This is more related to Gulf VMS requirements, and so they’re really getting up-to-speed for when those requirements roll out.

Alicia Breton is our lead of our QA/QC team, and she’s working with Shannon Stotler and Chris Isom, and so she’s reviewing the data every single day and looking for errors. One of the main

focuses right now is really just to kind of solidify our data flow, because we are having some issues making sure that all the data is appropriately flowing into ACCSP.

Trevor Hope and Dylan Miller are our customer service team, and so, if you call the 1-800 number, you're probably going to get one of them first, and then we can't forget Mike Larkin, and he's in charge of the intercept survey, and it's mostly a Gulf of Mexico thing, but he's doing a lot of great work on that.

I mentioned that we're holding the Q&A webinars every Tuesday evening, and these are -- They haven't been super well attended, but the people who do come have really great insights, and we have representatives from every application there, and so we have somebody from Bluefin Data, somebody from ACCSP, and we've had -- Consistently, one of the VMS vendors has been there to answer questions, and so I definitely encourage people to come, and we've moved the time to 6:30 p.m. Eastern Time, to kind of accommodate those in the Central Time Zone a little better, and we will -- These are scheduled through the end of March, and we will continue them if people still have questions and want us to.

I have mentioned the 1-800 number a couple of times, and it's there on the top of the slide, and then we have a program email address that's monitored constantly, and then, of course, our website, where there's a lot of great information on our website. Anything and everything you need to know, you can find there. I highly recommend you looking it over, and we're always making updates to it too, as we hear from fishermen that they need different types of information, and we make updates and try to make it better. That's all I have. If anybody has any questions, I will take them now.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks so much, Karla. It's an awful lot of work, and I appreciate your efforts, and I'm really glad that you have that help line. We all know, that were involved in the amendment process and everything that we did to bring us to this point, that there's still implementation of something like this, and getting it up and actually running is never as easy as it sort of seems conceptually, and so thanks so much for all your efforts. Any questions for Karla on the update? I am not seeing any hands raised, and so thanks, Karla, for that, and we'll be standing by for this thing to get better and better. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel. I don't have a question, but I just wanted to put in another plug with regard to coordination and outreach, and so, as you just saw with the presentation, we're doing a lot of extensive efforts and trying to figure out ways to best reach the industry. One of the recommendations that we've received for Gulf fishermen was doing some coordination directly with the states and having the states potentially send out bulletins and that the for-hire fishermen might pay attention a little bit more to those notices than NMFS notices, and so I just mention that, and it's something that we will potentially be reaching out to the states to help coordinate a little bit further, with the direct contacts that you have for for-hire captains.

MR. BELL: Right. Andy, that makes sense, and we've got a little bit of a unique situation in South Carolina, in that we've had our own program up and running for a while, and so Amy Dukes is in daily contact with these people, and more, and so, from our perspective, it's fairly straightforward. Other states, maybe not so much, but I can certainly see how that would be beneficial, if folks can help with that. Any other questions or comments related to the update here? I am not seeing any hands, and so let's move along, if we could, under the SERO reports, and I

think Rick DeVictor is going to give us one on standardized bycatch reporting methodology. Rick, whenever you're ready.

MR. DEVICTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This will be short and sweet. We're on the agenda for each Full Council at each meeting, to give you a status update of standardized bycatch reporting methodology, or better known as SBRM, and, of course, those are procedures that are in place to collect and report bycatch data in a fishery, and it's mandated that the councils have these for each of their FMPs.

If you recall, I think it was last September where I gave a presentation on the details of the requirements and the final rule that went into place, in I believe it was 2017, and that final rule published, and it said that the councils, in conjunction with NMFS, must review SBRMs. At the time, I think I outlined the four factors that the councils and NMFS must look at when evaluating the SBRMs.

There is five years, and it needs to get done in five years, and so that's 2022, and so we formed an IPT, and we're using an IPT-like process to develop this report, and so it includes staff from SERO, the council, the Science Center, and NOAA GC. We're making progress on this, and there was a template developed and reviewed and approved for review, and we chose Dolphin Wahoo as the first FMP to use, and it just made the most sense, instead of diving right into Snapper Grouper and all the species.

Now we're moving on and working on the seven other FMPs, and we're currently on track to provide a draft document to the SSC in September of this year, and so, just real quick, the timeline, again, we'll get the draft document ready for review by the SSC in the fall, and then the IPT will address the comments on the review, and we'll go ahead and present this to the council in September or December, depending on what type of comments we get from the SSC, and then the council can modify the document as necessary. Then we'll address the council's feedback and then finalize the review and get the council to approve it, hopefully at the December 2021 meeting, and that's the plan.

To remind you, we'll get the review completed, and then the next step is for NMFS to review the review and work on a decision memo for submission to Headquarters, and this would outline if National Marine Fisheries Service believes that the SBRMs we have in place are adequate. Then, depending on what happens there, the council can see if they need to modify the fishery management plans. The final rule said that this has to be done every five years, and so the council, at some point, would want to talk about how to do the review and factor it in for every five years. That's pretty much it, and so we're making progress, and stay tuned, and so that concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Rick. I appreciate that. I know we've been dealing with this for a while, and I can't remember how far back that was, but I remember when this came up. Chip, do you have something to add there?

DR. COLLIER: You had mentioned that you were going to potentially bring this to the council in September. Would the SSC, the South Atlantic SSC, need to review this prior to it being brought to the council? Is that what you're envisioning?

MR. DEVICTOR: Yes, and I believe that's what the IPT talked about, and I'm not sure which comes first, the council or SSC, but I think what we talked about was to go to the SSC and then go to the council.

DR. COLLIER: We might need to have a special webinar.

MR. BELL: Okay. That's something that maybe you all can work out the flow properly and the way to do that, I guess, Chip. Maybe you and Rick can talk later. Okay. Other than issues with just on timing and the flow of all this, any other questions for Rick or any comments? Okay. I am not seeing any. We have two items left today, and I think we can finish this. We have the Protected Resources report, and you have that as Attachment 4, but I believe Jenny Lee is with us, and so, if she is available to give that at this point, that would be great.

MS. LEE: Good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me all right?

MR. BELL: Yes, Jenny. Thank you for being here.

MS. LEE: You're welcome. I know it's late, and so I will try to be quick for you. Let's get started. For the Endangered Species Act listing and rulemaking update, as you know from your last meeting, back on November 27, we published a proposed rule to designate critical habitat for five ESA-listed Caribbean corals within U.S. waters of Florida, Puerto Rico, the USVI, Navassa Island, and the Flower Garden Banks.

I am just updating you to let you know that the public comment period did close on January 26. We received 21,108 comments, and so, from here, the ESA requires that we publish our final determination within one year of the proposed rule, and so the final rule should be published by November 27, 2021, and so we'll take that off until it gets a little bit closer in the future.

Other ESA Section 7 related news, I have nothing to report new, really, on our ongoing shrimp consultation, other than we're working to complete that new biological opinion on or before April 30 for the court order. With dolphin wahoo, we're still underway on the draft biological assessment, and we're getting closer to having the information we need.

Really, the big consultation news is not actually a SERO consultation, but a Greater Atlantic Regional Office draft consultation. On January 15, a draft biological opinion was released by GARFO on the continued authorization of the American lobster, Atlantic bluefish, Atlantic deep-sea red crab, mackerel, squid, butterfish, monkfish, Northeast multispecies, Northeast skate complex, spiny dogfish, summer flounder, scup, black sea bass, and Jonah crab fisheries. Also, it was looking at the New England Fisheries Management Council's omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2.

GARFO, the action agency, did choose to make that draft biological opinion available for review, and the comment period is now closed, and GARFO is now working to review those comments, of which they have received over a hundred, and then they will be working on preparing a final biological opinion, and so I'm just bringing that up. As part of that consultation under the ESA, NOAA Fisheries identified that mortality and serious injury of North Atlantic right whales managed by GARFO need to be further reduced.

Therefore, NOAA Fisheries developed and is committed to implementing the North Atlantic Right Whale Conservation Framework for Federal Fisheries in GARFO to further reduce entanglements and mortality and the serious injury of North Atlantic right whales. If you click on the link there, or if you go online, you can read about that framework, which outlines the commitment of NOAA Fisheries to implement measures necessary to recover right whales through a phased approach and flexibility.

I will then move on to Marine Mammal Protection Act actions, and, of course, there is a related one to that bi-op. On January 15, the draft EIS and proposed rule to modify the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan was made available for public input, and so that comment period closed on March 1. They received, I believe, well over 170,000 comments, and so there is a link in your brief, if you want to find out a little bit more about those proposed changes, but we have them summarized in the brief as well. An additional round of public scoping comments in the summer of 2021 will address any potential risks to the Mid-Atlantic or Southeast Fisheries, and so just stay tuned.

Then, with respect to the North Atlantic right whale unusual mortality event, I see that I do have - I don't have any update on the preliminary estimate that was in your brief, but, unfortunately, I do have an update for the actual numbers there of mortalities and serious injuries. On March 28, officials confirmed that the North Atlantic right whale known as Cottontail, as you probably saw on the news, was found dead fifty miles offshore of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, and so that changes our count, and our total count now is thirty-four mortalities and fourteen serious injuries. If you want any details on those, again, I do provide a link in the brief if you want more detail.

Next up is the Pelagic Longline Take Reduction Plan proposed rule, and that plan did publish, and there was a team webinar on February 10. The public comment period closed on February 16, and we received sixteen comments on that proposed rule, and the key outcomes from the webinar will likely be posted in March, and so you can stay tuned to hear a little bit more about that.

There are no updates on the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Plan, and then, as far as the MMPA list of fisheries, normally, we mail out a marine mammal authorization certificate automatically every January, and, this year, NOAA Fisheries is continuing the authorization for 2020 into 2021, due to the COVID pandemic, and so, fishermen, if you have any questions, you're not receiving a new certificate, and you're just retaining the 2020 certificate.

Then, lastly, the 2021 List of Fisheries published in January, and your briefing said that it was under a regulatory freeze, but that now is out and available, and there weren't any significant changes in our region. Unless there are questions, that's all I have for you.

MR. BELL: All right, Jenny. Thanks for being here, and thanks for the report. Any questions for Jenny about anything in the report that she's covered, or any questions in general? I don't see any hands.

MS. LEE: All right. Well, you have a great evening. Thank you.

MR. BELL: You too, and thanks so much. All right. We have one last item today, if we can, and I promised the Office of Law Enforcement that they could brief along with all the other federal entities here, and so, Pat, if you're -- Do not feel rushed. We're not going to have liberty call until

you have had sufficient time to give your report, and so, if you're ready, Pat, just roll through it, and take your time. Don't rush.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Thanks, Mel. Thanks for shifting me from the end of the council to the end of the working day. I like that.

MR. BELL: I planned it that way.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I noticed. Our OLE report was submitted at the beginning of the week, and so everybody should have a copy. That's twenty-two pages long, and it covers the South Atlantic, Gulf, and Caribbean regions, and this is just a short South Atlantic summary that I will give now. Open incidents in the South Atlantic were 169. Action violations processed were forty-one, and that included summary settlements issued of twenty-eight, and there were thirteen cases forwarded to General Counsel.

The remaining incidents were either no violations, or they were handled with fixed-fines, compliance assistance, or written warnings. For this particular quarter, they ranged from summary settlements of \$375 for failure to retain in whole form up to \$2,500 for failure to take an observer onboard when required.

A quick snapshot of the summary settlements issued, again, there were twenty-eight total. Of those twenty-eight, fourteen were issued to recreational fishing vessels, ten were issued to commercial fishing vessels, and four were issued to shipping companies, and those were IUU and Lacey violations. Of those twenty-eight, five were seasonal closure violations, four were undersized, four were failure to take an observer, two were bag limit violations, and there was two Lacey Act violations, one an import violation and another for failure to have a Bahamian cruising permit. Two were for failure to report properly, one IUU import violation, a gear restriction violation, and, again, one failure to retain in whole form.

Then we had some increased sanctuary patrols that we did on a number of our vessels. There were three sanctuary drowning violations, one sanctuary closed area violation, one sanctuary anchoring violation, and one sanctuary discharge violation. Of the thirteen cases that were forwarded to General Counsel, those -- Again, our summary settlements are our tickets, or lesser offenses, and cases forwarded to General Counsel for NOVAs were thirteen in total, or more serious, and there were two issued to recreational fishing vessels, three to commercial fishing vessels, and eight were issued to merchant vessels. The breakdown, there were seven sanctuary area-to-be-avoided violations, three sanctuary prohibited activity violations, two gear violations, and one TED violation.

A couple of other OLE items are our new Cape Canaveral enforcement officer has completed his training, and he's already down on the docks and working with commercial, charter, and recreational vessels. I was just down there for a week-long op with him, and I can confirm he's down there, because I heard from a number of folks in the charter industry that he's already been checking sea turtle mitigation gear, a number of which was not found onboard some vessels, and so he's working to get them into compliance, and my phone started ringing as everybody was trying to get into compliance.

Similarly, we have a new Miami enforcement officer who commences his training on March 15, and our three South Atlantic OLE special agent hires are complete, and those names have been forwarded to HR. One will fill the vacant position in Charleston, South Carolina, and another will fill a vacant position in Miami, and one fills the new special billet in Miami that has been added.

I would like to point out that -- We discussed the Fish Rules app, but all of my officers regularly push the benefits to both the recreational and commercial captains to utilize the Fish Rules app, as well as for signing up for both text and email bulletin alerts from the Regional Office. Both are invaluable tools to gain compliance and stay abreast of changing regulations, particularly those that happen in-season.

The Office of Law Enforcement has convened a charter boat working group with the U.S. Coast Guard and some state representatives to address illegal charters, and it is a much bigger problem in the Gulf of Mexico, where charter permits are moratorium permits and no longer available for purchase, while, in the South Atlantic, they are still open access, and so it's not as hard to get one. However, the increased focus will also look at South Atlantic vessels conducting charters in federal waters without the required federal permits, as I still regularly see those cases come across my desk.

Finally, and one minute before 5:00 p.m., I would like to recommend that everyone take a look at that full OLE report of activity across the Southeast Division, as there are some interesting highlights on our work, including criminal cases, to include illegal coral harvesting that received over a year of prison time, as well as some other criminal cases. Our new Compliance Liaison Analyst, Matt Walia, now pulls these reports together, and they are getting more and more informative and more and more useful, and so I would highly recommend folks taking the time to read that, and that is all that I have to brief, and it's 5:00 p.m.

MR. BELL: Outstanding, and I'm serious. If you need a little bit more time, we weren't trying to rush you there. Honestly, what we're trying to do is move NOAA OLE a little more advanced into the program, and we'll talk about this some more tomorrow, about these ideas we have for how the meetings run, but I wanted to make sure that folks had an opportunity to interact with Pat and talk to Pat and ask questions.

In a physical meeting sense, it's easy to see Pat, because, the last time we may have all seen him was at the March meeting in Jekyll last year, when we were together, but, in the virtual world, it's a little stranger, but I wanted to make sure that, all the work they do and everything they've got going on, that we're able to interact with them and ask questions and they have an obvious presence in the meeting, and so that was the intent, and it was not an attempt to throw you up against liberty call, but you nailed it time-wise, and so are there any questions for Pat about anything? I know we've had questions earlier in the meeting, but, if there's anything that you would like to ask him right now, don't -- I mean, nobody is catching a flight, at least at this part of the meeting, Pat, and so all they're having to do is maybe go from their den or their kitchen to their living room, and so anything for Pat?

Pat, I am excited that you guys are able to have some new officers and some additional new hires coming onboard, and that's great. Super. Okay. I guess everybody is ready to have liberty call. Okay. Pat, if you're around tomorrow, I guess that's your call, and folks could even follow-up then. All right.

That's all that I had hoped to accomplish for today, and so the idea would be that, tomorrow, we would just finish out the rest of the meeting, which would be -- On your agenda, it would be Items 6 through the end, and so we would start out with committee reports in the morning, and then we'll do our liaison reports and other business and whatnot. John, is there anything else that I need to cover today? Are we good, assuming that John hasn't left already? Okay. Anything else today, guys? Are we good?

MS. BROUWER: I think we are, Mel.

MR. BELL: Okay. I'm probably the last one out the door. All right. Thanks so much, guys. You've done a lot today, and some of it wasn't easy, and I appreciate everybody hanging with us and working through things, and we got an awful lot done, and I appreciate it, and so we'll just see you tomorrow morning at 8:30, and we'll wrap it up. Have a good evening.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on March 4, 2021.)

- - -

MARCH 5, 2021

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Full Council of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened via webinar on Friday, March 5, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: Good morning, everybody. Welcome back to the final day here, and you guys have worked hard so far, and we're in a good spot right now, pretty much right on schedule, and so we're going to lead off with committee reports, and we'll have a couple of different spots that we'll need to address some things to finish up and clean up, but, getting started, the first one is Law Enforcement, which would be Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Law Enforcement Committee met via webinar on March 1, 2021. We asked for approval of the agenda, and we got into our subjects for the meeting, the first one being a report from Captain Scott Pearce of Florida, who is our Law Enforcement Advisory Panel Chair. He delivered a summary of discussions and recommendations on behalf of the AP, which met via webinar on February 1, 2021. Those discussions and recommendations were memorialized in a summary report that was included in our briefing materials.

Our second item for our agenda was a proposed change to the structure of the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. Back at our December 2020 meeting, the council briefly discussed possibly adding an ad hoc liaison seat to the Law Enforcement AP, so that a member from another advisory panel could assist as a subject matter expert during the AP's discussions, when needed. Council staff reviewed those recommended changes, including the Law Enforcement AP's recommendations.

The committee discussed possibly changing the structure to the LE AP to formally add such a seat, and, after discussion back and forth, the committee ultimately expressed support for inviting an appropriate advisory panel member to participate in discussions of the LE AP, when needed. The invited advisory panel member would not have a vote on the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel. Identifying the need for and the selection of the individual would be at the discretion of the Law Enforcement Committee Chair, the Law Enforcement AP Chair, and the appropriate council staff. There were no other items under Other Business, and, with that, the meeting adjourned, and so that's my quick report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Spud. Any questions? I don't see any. Thank you. Then we'll shift to next in line will be Habitat and Ecosystem which will be Steve Poland.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee of the South Atlantic Council met on March 1, 2021. The first agenda item was we discussed Coral Amendment 10. Staff provided an overview of the decision document, and the council affirmed their preferred alternatives in this document. **One motion passed to send Coral Amendment 10 out for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? The motion is approved by the council.**

Next, we reviewed the FEP II Roadmap, and staff provided an overview of the FEP II Roadmap, and the committee had considerable discussion on the items presented in the update and a discussion on the utility of this and how to advance items identified in the FEP II Roadmap into more actionable items by the council.

Next, staff provided an overview of the Habitat and Ecosystem Program Blueprint. There is a workgroup consisting of council staff and council members looking at the habitat program as a whole, with the end goal of bringing back recommendations to the council for long-term structuring and visioning of the habitat program. The committee provided quite a list of guidance to the workgroup, and you can see it here on the screen, and I'm not going to go through each individual bullet, but the discussion was good, and the workgroup has good direction to continue our work.

Next, we had a discussion on the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem Based Management Advisory Panel, and we looked at a draft list of agenda items and provided additional input to staff for filling out that agenda for the Habitat AP coming up in April, and the list of agenda items is here on the screen. With that, I need somebody to make the following timing and tasks motion. I can either read it, or, if someone wants to read it while they make the motion, and I have no preference.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm happy to make it, Steve, but I will let you read it.

MR. POLAND: Well, that wasn't my preference, but thank you, Anna. **So motion to adopt the following timing and tasks: modify Coral Amendment 10 to address committee recommendations and clarify that industry came forward before the previous amendment (Coral Amendment 8) was approved; describe and clarify SFAA designation; reword language for no action stating no SFAA exists in the OHAPC at this time and modify wording in the preferred alternative to clarify the allowable activity within the proposed SFAA. Schedule Coral Amendment 10 public hearings during the spring 2021 with the intent to**

**approve in June 2021. Continue development of the Habitat Blueprint with the provided guidance from above. Schedule and facilitate the Habitat and Ecosystem AP April meeting with agenda topics listed above.** That motion was made by Anna. Is there a second?

DR. BELCHER: I will second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Carolyn. I see Myra has a question. Go ahead, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Good morning, everybody. **I'm just pointing out that, during Executive Finance, we changed the timeline for this amendment, and so I would suggest striking down what it says there under Number 2 of with the intent to approve in June of 2021.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you for that, Myra. Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: Myra covered it. Thanks.

MR. POLAND: All right. Any further discussion on the timing and tasks motion? **Any opposition to the timing and tasks motion? Hearing none, this motion stands approved.** Mr. Chair, that concludes the Habitat and Ecosystem-Based Committee report.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Steve. Thanks, Myra and Andy. Good catch. Moving along, our next one will be Snapper Grouper and Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The Snapper Grouper Committee met earlier this week, and so we approved the minutes from the December 2020 meeting and the agenda that was modified with two items for Other Business. Then we looked at the status of amendments under formal review, and then we got into the snowy grouper stock assessment.

This was SEDAR 36, and it was conducted in 2020, and it basically showed that the stock remains overfished and is experiencing overfishing. A lower natural mortality at-age was likely the driver for the differences between SEDAR 36 and the 2020 update, and so, actually, what we were receiving was the 2020 update. After looking at a presentation about the stock assessment, and the SSC had already reviewed this, we also looked at an overview of snowy grouper landings and pertinent data, and then the committee made the following motion.

**Motion to instruct staff to initiate a full plan amendment for snowy grouper. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Next, we got into the wreckfish ITQ modernization amendment, and this is Amendment 48, and we talked about the timing of this amendment. Scoping was held during the public comment session, and no scoping comments were received. Then we talked about how a significant overhaul of the regulations was needed, and the committee provided these bullet points of guidance, and I will try to hit some of these points of removing *de minimis* allocation alternative in Action 1, explore allocations that would match expected recreational landings, and so the percentage going to the recreational sector. Then separate actions for a fishing year change and modification of the spawning season closure. We reiterated that a snapper grouper unlimited permit should be the one required to obtain the wreckfish permit.

We talked a lot about the electronic system and moving over to that electronic system from the paper system, continuing to develop actions and alternatives related to the VMS, considering current requirements for Gulf of Mexico IFQ fisheries, and hold a shareholders meeting after the June 2021 council meeting. We didn't make any motions. Greater amberjack, Amendment 49, we were presented data on greater amberjack landings and other relevant information. Then we started looking at the decision document. I'm sorry. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Jessica. In wreckfish, just real briefly, I just wanted to clarify the point I was making, and so we state the allocation maybe could be between 1 and 2 percent, and I think my intent was the potential that it could actually even be less than 1 percent, and I don't know if in fact that's the case, but I just wanted to make that clear for staff, as they analyze alternatives.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Andy. That was helpful, because I did not get that from the discussion, and so I missed that point before, and so I appreciate you bringing that up. All right. Back on amberjack, we looked at a document, and we looked at IPT recommendations, and I'm looking at some of our bullet points here. So the committee made some motions and provided some guidance that included some language under Action 2 about commercial -- Maintain current commercial ACL poundage and only vary the recreational ACL according to the increase in the total ACL. Then, for Action 3, remove Alternative 2 and revise the language to consider removing recreational ACTs for all species managed under the Snapper Grouper FMP. Then the committee made the following motion.

**Motion to select Alternative 2 under Action 1 as the preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

**The committee also made a motion to approve Amendment 49 for scoping. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Then we got into red porgy, Amendment 50, and reviewed some preliminary analysis and recommendations. Then we had the following guidance, and so, instead of making motions, we had all of these bullet points worth of guidance, and let me see if I can hit some points here in the guidance. Request that the IPT discuss possibly adding an alternative for catch level that reflects the rebuilding at T<sub>min</sub>. Incorporate reference to annual, the term "annual", OY in Action 2. Remove Action 4, and this is the revision of the recreational ACT, because, as we just mentioned in the amberjack amendment, we're going to remove this for all snapper grouper species, where it's not tied to a management measure.

We're going to modify alternatives for a recreational vessel limit, to include six, twelve, and eighteen fish per vessel. Include an alternative that explores options for different vessel limits for headboats. Remove the action to consider modification to commercial accountability measures. Direct the IPT to develop an alternative to modify recreational accountability measures to incorporate the multiyear running average and to direct the IPT to explore the use of the geometric mean versus the arithmetic mean for triggering recreational accountability measures. Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Jessica. That last bullet point, I had a question-mark, because, given the discussion under Dolphin Wahoo, I wasn't sure whether your intent was to direct the IPT to do this analysis of geometric versus arithmetic as well for red porgy.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a great question. Let's stop here and see what the council members think. Once again, we're having a discussion about geometric mean versus arithmetic mean, and this is for triggering the recreational accountability measures based on the discussions that we had yesterday, and what are the thoughts here? Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I mean, it can't hurt. I would be curious to see how it worked out. I mean, red porgy is going to be such an issue that I wouldn't mind looking at it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That sounds good. Steve, have you got anything to add here?

MR. POLAND: I mean, I think I'm fine. I mean, with this red porgy amendment, we have a little bit more time than we do with the dolphin, and the SSC is going to look at it in April, and so maybe we'll have a little better guidance on it before our June meeting, and so I don't see a problem with including it in here.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. That sounds good. Thank you for that discussion, and Myra just removed the question-mark there. All right. Then we got some updates on red snapper and greater amberjack research projects, and we talked about the money that was received. These are sister projects to the much larger Great Red Snapper Count that was conducted in the Gulf, and council staff are serving on the steering committees for these projects, and they will provide updates as these projects move forward.

Then we got into a discussion of the preliminary recreational landings and the 2021 red snapper season. We got a presentation about the recreational landings and the information that will be used to determine the duration of the 2021 recreational season, and the committee discussed several issues related to red snapper.

The SSC is scheduled to review the assessment at their upcoming April meeting, and they plan to provide recommendations to the council in June. The red snapper assessment will be presented to the council at their June meeting. Adjusting catch levels could be done via an abbreviated framework. However, sector allocations would have to be done through a plan amendment, and then the committee also discussed an approach where the red snapper ACL could be adjusted, possibly through a framework amendment and allocations addressed through a separate amendment, which is similar to something that the Gulf might be doing, and NOAA GC is going to provide further advice to the council regarding this approach. I am going to stop there and go to Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I just want to provide some clarification with regard to that fourth bullet, and so the Gulf Council is not pursuing a similar approach, and so they have the results of the Great Red Snapper Count, and the Science Center is doing an interim analysis, but the allocations for the assessment are not being updated to include MRIP-FES data. What the council is proposing is reviewing the allocations in a subsequent amendment after an annual catch limit increase, but it's not related to an actual assessment currently in the updating of the MRIP data.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Andy. Myra is capturing that. Based on the discussion that we had, we had some draft motions that we have added here to the document. Let me read it, and maybe we can discuss it, and maybe someone would like to make it. One of the draft motions would be to request that the SSC provide short-term management advice for red snapper, assuming recent high recruitment, and so the intent of this motion would be, at their April meeting, that the SSC would work on this. This is just making sure that they would give us something based on this recent high recruitment. Is there discussion on this particular draft motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: I think the idea there is to just make sure we're setting ourselves up to be able to move in a certain direction, if we can, and so it seems logical to ask them to look at that and be prepared to give us some advice on it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was thinking the same thing, Mel. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. I just wanted to ask Genny, since she's on, if this is enough of a direction to the SSC, because, to me -- I mean, I'm in support of the motion, but it seems kind of broad and open-ended, and I would like to hear Genny's perspective on this direction.

DR. NESSLAGE: Thanks, Steve. Is that okay, Jessica and Mel?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Of course. Go ahead.

MR. BELL: Please.

DR. NESSLAGE: Thanks. I just wanted to update the council that we had a sub-group of the SSC, the folks who were the panel members for the red snapper assessment, and they met -- I forget, and it was a few weeks ago, and they kind of pre-loaded some of the projections that we anticipated the SSC might like to see, so we could discuss them at our April meeting, and I believe that Kyle has already run those, and they included options that had the more recent higher recruitment, rather than the average from the -- The average recruitment, which is essentially from the stock-recruitment curve, and so is that the kind of information that you would like to see? Am I interpreting -- So we would be setting ABCs based off of a P\* that would be using the -- We would be considering, I should say, ABCs that would be set using projections, with a more recent higher recruitment, as well as the usual entire time series recruitment, and does that get at what you're asking about?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I was thinking both of those, using the regular projection for the longer time series of recruitment as well as ensuring that you would also run one based on this recent high recruitment.

DR. NESSLAGE: Yes, and we've already requested that, and I can't say how the SSC will react to that, but we will definitely be considering those at the upcoming meeting, and I don't know if Kyle has anything that he wants to add to that, but that's our plan as well.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Then, to answer Steve's question, Genny, I think that you think that this draft motion is okay?

DR. NESSLAGE: I am just taking a moment to re-read it. Does this actually ask us to do anything specifically, other than our regular review?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Are you looking at Motion 4?

DR. NESSLAGE: I apologize. I was looking above. I think that should be fine. I guess short-term -- It's always good to be a little bit more specific, depending on what you consider short-term management, and I don't want them to spin their wheels on that, if you have any advice for that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was thinking something like three years, but I will throw that out there for Andy, to see what he thinks about that.

MR. STRELCHECK: Erik is on the line as well, and I would say three, or maybe five, years, max.

DR. NESSLAGE: I am trying to -- Mike E., do you happen to have the file, the request, that the sub-group sent? I am trying to find the exact wording of the projection request that we sent to them. Sorry. I wasn't ready for this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can I go to Erik? Go ahead, Mike.

DR. ERRIGO: Just to respond to Genny, I believe they requested five-year projections for the higher-recruitment scenario, and, also, the standard recruitment scenario and longer-term rebuilding for red snapper.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Mike. Genny, if it's okay, I'm going to go to Erik and John.

DR. NESSLAGE: Yes, please.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Erik.

DR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Jessica. Just a quick follow-up about the choice between three to five years, and I think that largely is going to depend on when the next assessment is scheduled, because you, obviously, don't want to have basically no ABC set up without a new assessment coming onboard, and so you want to make sure that we have the next assessment scheduled in such a way that we don't run out of ABC settings from the SSC, but, generally, the other thing that I would just say is that, after five years, almost all of our projections start to become very uncertain at that point, and so, ideally, would like to keep all of our ABC advice from the projections to about five years.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Sounds great. Thanks, Erik. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I agree with Erik on the upper end, and I was going to say, on the lower end, I think you need to just make sure you bridge until a potential amendment that would likely need to be done to address overfished and overfishing, to be done in two years, and that may well do a number of things that require you to request some new projections.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I am going to circle back to Genny. Are you okay here, after hearing this discussion? Are you okay with the wording in this draft motion?

DR. NESSLAGE: Yes, and I think I know exactly what you guys are asking for, and we'll do our best to try and address this.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Wonderful. Would someone on the council like to make this motion? Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, ma'am. I will do it. **I will move that the council request the SSC provide short-term management (three to five years) advice for red snapper, assuming recent high recruitment.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I am assuming that Mel has his hand up for seconding?

MR. BELL: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Anything else to add here, while we're under discussion, Mel or Steve?

MR. POLAND: I was just raising my hand to second, and, also, I apologize to Genny. I didn't mean to put her on the spot, but I just wanted to make sure that we were as clear as possible when we were asking the SSC for this advice.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you, Steve. Any more discussion on Motion Number 4 here? **Any objection to Motion Number 4? I don't see any hands, and that motion is approved.**

Then here's another draft motion, and so this is based on the timing of possibly trying to bring something that would be final approval in June, as well as something on the longer term, a plan amendment, and a reminder that we're still waiting on something here from Monica, some advice, but there is a draft motion here. I will read it, and you guys can think about it.

It's to direct staff to begin an abbreviated framework for council approval in June to change red snapper ACLs under the current allocation formula if the SSC recommends that the ABC be increased. If an increase to the ABC is not recommended, develop a plan amendment to change the ACLs and allocations for council approval at a later date. Is there discussion on this? Mel.

MR. BELL: Again, this is just setting us up to be able to respond quickly and move in an appropriate direction, or a couple of different directions, if we need to, and I think Andy is the one that kind of brought this up, and so I think it's good for us to lay the groundwork to be able to move as expeditiously as possible.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes. Andy and then Monica.

MR. STRELCHECK: I'm going to let Monica speak first. Go ahead, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The way this reads, to me, it almost sounds like it's a conclusion that you can use an abbreviated framework, even though, Jessica, you just mentioned that my advice was that I wasn't clear that you could, right, and so, to me, it would be better to say "direct staff to

begin exploring whether an abbreviated framework for council approval”, something like that. We have to explore whether it’s an option available for you all, and then staff would bring it back, certainly. If it’s an option that is available, it’s going to be brought back to you in June.

My other point is this seems rather biased, doesn’t it? It reads that, if the ABC can be increased, you’re going to use a framework, but, if the ABC, or an ACL, cannot be increased, you’re not going to use a framework, and so I don’t know that that sends a great message to all of the public, and it seems like it’s already a foregone conclusion as to the direction the council is going to go, and I don’t believe that’s true, right?

We don’t have the information, and the SSC hasn’t looked at the assessment yet, and you don’t have the SSC’s advice, and so my advice would be to rework this motion somewhat, to make it more neutral, in my way of thinking, and, also, we need to explore whether this is even an option for the council to use.

MS. MCCAWLEY: These are good points. Before we go to Andy, let me see if I can clarify and see if this helps. I do agree that the first part of the motion needs to be reworked, no matter what, and so it was my understanding that, in general, we would be needing to use the plan amendment process, because we need to look at allocation, and so, normally, this would just be a plan amendment, but I believe that we’re also trying to say is there a way that, in the short term, aside from a full plan amendment, that there was a faster vehicle to possibly change the ACL, using the current allocation formula, which would have to be explored to see if we could even do it that way, knowing that we needed to adjust allocation through a full plan amendment. To me, it was trying to find a shorter process to do part of the things that we wanted to do, and we’re not even sure if we can. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Jessica. Monica made a lot of the points that I was going to make. I think we could potentially separate this into an action in this meeting and then, if we can’t do an abbreviated framework, an action at the next meeting, and so my thought, based on what Monica just said, is we could request staff to determine whether an abbreviated framework can be used to change 2021 red snapper ACLs, and, if it can be used, to bring that abbreviated framework back to the council at the June meeting, and that would be, essentially, what we would consider at this meeting, and then, obviously, if it can’t be used, and we have to take a longer-term approach for a plan amendment, that would be brought up as we discuss red snapper at the June meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right, and so Myra is typing that. While she’s typing, let’s go to Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just kind of responding to the points that Monica made, and I just was going to suggest some component in there that’s pending -- That there is pending further input or advice from NOAA GC, to kind of help us determine which way we were going to go, but I agree that -- Like you, I was thinking that we were going to have to actually do the -- We will have to actually do the plan amendment to deal with allocations and things.

That’s going to have to happen, but then what we were interested in is whether or not we had an option of expediting some activity related to increasing the ACL, in a framework sense, and so I think the wording you’re putting up there now -- That may solve it, but Monica has a very good point.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Can folks look at what Myra typed there and see if we think that that's reflective of the discussion, and so it's request that staff determine whether an abbreviated framework can be used to adjust catch levels of red snapper, and, if so, prepare such an amendment for council review in June of 2021. I think that that's pretty reflective of the discussion, but I guess I would look to Monica and Andy, just to make sure. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I was just going to say that I think that captures the spirit of what we were intending to do, to make sure that, as Mel said, set ourselves up to move forward as quickly as we can if we have the option, and so I can go along with that.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Spud. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I agree. I think that really captures what you have all been talking about, and I am very clear on the direction you want to go. I understand the concern about red snapper. I was just looking back over Amendment 43 and emergency rules and all kinds of things that we did in 2018, and so I understand the concern and that the council would really like to move on this, and so I think we'll look at all options, and bring anything back to you on the table that you can possibly use, and so I think what Myra just typed adequately covers it. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Monica. Myra, we're basically trashing Draft Motion Number 5 and using the wording that you have below. It's not written as a motion, or we're going to make it a motion. Would someone like to make this motion? Mel.

**MR. BELL: I move that we request that staff determine whether an abbreviated framework can be used to adjust catch levels of red snapper, and, if so, prepare such an amendment for council review in June of 2021.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Motion made by Mel. I heard other folks jumping in there to make the motion, and I'm going to take one of those as the seconder. Spud, I believe you were jumping in there.

MR. WOODWARD: That's right.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. So any more discussion on this? We've had some discussion so far, good discussion. **Any objection to this motion? That motion stands approved.**

Then we jumped into the agenda topics for the spring 2021 Snapper Grouper AP meeting, and we developed this list of topics that you see here, and I'm not going to go through all of these, and then we jumped into Other Business, and we had a couple of items under Other Business.

First, we talked about golden tilefish and the fact that it may be reopened for an additional eleven days, and this is the longline portion of golden tilefish, and this is an estimate, and subject to change, and we talked about the fact that fishermen indicated a preference for the fishery to be reopened in the days leading up to Easter which is April 4 this year, such as something on or around reopening on March 20. NMFS will work on this, to prepare and announce a reopening, as requested, in late March.

Then we got into vermilion snapper, and there was a lot of discussion about an emergency rule that was put in place in 2020 to increase the commercial trip limit to 1,500 pounds. This was to help mitigate impacts of the pandemic, and this rule is set to expire on March 31, and so there was some discussion about whether or not the emergency rule could be extended, and it was explained that it could not, without proper public notice and comment and without the council actively working on an amendment to address the emergency, and so neither of those two criteria have been met, and the council had modified the commercial trip limit for vermilion in 2020.

**The committee did make this motion, but we didn't actually take a vote on it, and so the motion was to increase the vermilion snapper trip limit to 1,500 pounds.** I guess, on behalf of the committee, I so move, even though we didn't pass this in committee. I think we need some discussion on this, and I guess one of my questions is, if pass this motion that indicates our intent to put this in place, does that mean that we can go back and extend the emergency rule? I think the answer is no, but that's just unclear to me. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You're correct. The answer is no. The idea, I think, would be to -- If you want to proceed with this, do you want to put it in a framework amendment or, as Myra mentioned, one of the amendments for snapper grouper that's already moving through your queue, although that will take a little bit longer to do. You could do a single-action framework, but that involves staff time and everything else, and so we cannot extend the emergency rule.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that clarification, Monica, and thanks for the reminder that we were unsure of the vehicle to move this if it passes, whether it's stand-alone, which, as you mentioned, will take more staff time, or does it go in with something else, and a lot of those things that we have on the table are full plan amendments, which are going to take some time, and so I guess that's yet to be determined about where the trip limit change would go. Is there any discussion on this? Is this something that we want to consider? Mel.

MR. BELL: Given the realities of what Monica just explained and all, I'm wondering if we could just tone this down to somehow almost -- We've put it on as something we would like to do, perhaps, but it becomes more of a direct staff to explore options or something, but, I mean, I'm not -- The way it's worded right now, it's just, boom, do it, and so it does seem rather definite, but, again, because it's not as simple and straightforward as we might like, and I don't know if the timing of it is really going to help, and I think the desire was for some more immediate relief, and so I'm not sure it's all that useful, other than capturing the fact that it's something the committee thought would be good to do.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Those are great points, Mel. I like the thinking there. Let's see what Kerry and Chris have to say. Let's go to Kerry first.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think, in all reality, if our intent was to have this in place and have some pandemic help, it doesn't seem like that's realistic at this point. If the intent is, long-term, we go back to looking at a 1,500-pound vermilion trip limit, that's a different story, but I'm begrudgingly -- I wish we could do this, but I completely understand why we can't, and we're begrudgingly okay with not trying to ram something through that really isn't going to get in in time anyway, and then, if we need to come back around and reassess -- I mean, we just put the 1,000-pound in place, and, with everything else on our plate, I think it's good to be realistic about this and not try to ram this through.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I understand, but I just definitely wanted to bring it to get on the record and bring it to everybody's attention, and it's something that we're going to be facing for quite a few more years, I guess, and it really stinks that there's not much more flexibility than the one emergency rule or whatever we had, and so just another way that our hands are tied behind our backs here.

During the pandemic, we displayed how important commercial fishermen are to feeding America, especially when grocery stores couldn't do it, and there's a lot of value to what we do, and we want to continue to perpetuate what little bit we have left, and I don't think that I need to make a motion to start an amendment to increase the trip limit, and I know that Kerry said we just put 1,000 pounds in place, but I think that's been at least half a decade, if not a little bit longer, but the effort just isn't there, and it's not coming down the pipe anytime soon, as far as somebody wanting to make a career in commercial fishing, because the limits are so damn low that it's hard to do. It's just unfortunate, but we'll keep chipping away at it on down the road, but I couldn't come to this meeting and not bring it up, and so thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chris. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It's been five years already. I guess time flies. What I wanted to say was I wonder if there's a little place where we keep ideas that the council sees as needs for Magnuson. I mean, in my mind, this is an issue that's going to come up in this changing landscape, and the deficit here is that the tool doesn't exist to do something quickly in a scenario where we really need something done quickly, and so I would love to just have it filed away somewhere and that, when the council has a chance to comment on Magnuson reauthorization, that we really do look at some more ways the council can be flexible. If it is time, Chris, to increase it to 1,500, which, of course, I would be in support for, then I would love to find the vehicle to do it, for sure.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Kerry. That's a great idea. Mel.

MR. BELL: I mean, I think we've certainly memorialized it in our discussions on the record here, and we don't have, I guess, an equivalent of the council sticky wall, where we throw it on the wall and it stays on the wall there or something, but I would agree that we hold that thought somehow, but I don't see a need to follow through with this motion, but definitely I think our discussion on the record here about it perhaps, and I will defer to John or staff, but perhaps it documents what the interest was, what the concern was, and that may be the way we do that.

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

MR. STRELCHECK: Just a comment, and so I really appreciated what Kerry had to say about flexibility here. I know we made modifications not too long ago with the vermilion snapper trip limit, and the goal is, obviously, to try to extend the season, but, obviously, we don't also want to have it as a limiting factor to harvest the catch limit. Because you have a split season, maybe there's some ways the council could consider going forward and adding some flexibility to changing the trip limit upward, in the event that quota is being kind of underharvested in the first

season, and so I know it adds some complexity to management, but maybe it provides at least a little bit of flexibility within the bounds we have to work with in the council process.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay, and so, Myra, procedurally, how do we want to handle this motion that's already been made? I don't think we need to vote on it, and do we need to formally withdraw the motion, or do we just not vote on it? Do we add in some points about what Kerry said about flexibility? What do we do here?

MS. BROUWER: My suggestion is I think if the maker of the motion -- If Chris wants to withdraw it, and we'll have the minutes to go back to, and I can flesh out the rationale, like Mel said, to sort of have it in our back pocket, and that would be my suggestion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. I already made the motion on behalf of the committee, even though it was Chris's original motion, and I'm fine if Chris has the ability to withdraw it. Mel.

MR. BELL: I think, technically, it belongs to the committee still, but, if you think about it, the committee is equal to pretty much the Full Council, but I think we would just have to all concur with that, and I think we would be fine.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Then I'm going to ask for -- I think we're in concurrence here, based on the discussion we've had so far, that we want to withdraw this motion. I see Chris's hand up.

MR. CONKLIN: I concur with Mel.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chris. **It sounds like we want to indicate that this motion was withdrawn.** Then, Myra, do we want to add a note about there was discussion about adding flexibility in Magnuson? Myra is getting that on the screen there. Kerry, what do you think about the way that's worded?

MS. MARHEFKA: I am totally fine with that. I was just wondering if -- To Andy's point, can we add a little bullet for the AP? I know they already have a lot going on, but to discuss sort of this -- Adding a higher trip limit at the first season and some of the -- Have them discuss, maybe, where we should be, not counting the pandemic, for this trip limit, and is that too much to push on them?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that idea. We can see that they have a lot of stuff on their list, and what we can do is I can work with Myra and the AP Chair, which I believe is still Jimmy Hull, and we can make sure that they can get all of this done in the timeframe that they've been allotted. If they can't, we'll try to figure out if some of these things could be done outside of the meeting, whether it's via email or if they need an additional meeting or if some of these things can be pushed to their fall meeting, and so I think that we can work with Myra to figure out if they have time for that, but I think it's great to add it to the list.

MS. BROUWER: That sounds good, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I appreciate that, and that's a real efficient group of advisors that we have there, and I'm confident that they can look at this for us. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chris, and thank you, Kerry, about kind of wrapping-up that discussion and thinking about how moving forward from where we are right this minute and how we can capture some things about changes in Magnuson, as well as seeing if we can get some additional feedback from the AP on this. The last thing that we have here is a timing and tasks motion. Is there someone that is willing to make the timing and tasks motion?

MR. WOODWARD: I will do it for you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Go ahead, Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: **I move council direct staff to do the following: request a presentation from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center on pilot longline surveys in the region to be delivered to the committee at the June meeting, if time allows; prepare Amendment 49 (greater amberjack) for scoping and conduct scoping hearings before the June meeting; schedule and facilitate a meeting of the Snapper Grouper AP with approved agenda topics in April; schedule wreckfish shareholders meeting after the June 2021 meeting; request that the SSC explore ABC recommendations based on recent high recruitment for red snapper; prepare an abbreviated framework to adjust catch levels for red snapper for review and approval in June 2021.** I think, the latter two, I think we may have addressed earlier, and I don't know if they need to stay or not.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Let's go to Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Spud and Jessica. **I was just going to point out that I did have question-marks there on those last two, and I think that, that very last one, I can probably just add "if appropriate", or something like that, to acknowledge that this is pending advice from the SSC.** Is that okay?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to second the motion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Then we'll count you as a second. Any more discussion here on this timing and tasks motion? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks. My team pointed out, with snowy grouper, that we will likely be sending the council a determination of overfishing occurring in the coming months, and my only concern is, if we don't take snowy grouper up until September, we potentially are losing four or five months on the clock for the two-year time window, and so I just wanted to acknowledge that. We're going to have Executive Committee discussion later, and we probably need to take a look at that carefully, to make sure that we can meet that two-year time clock.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a great point, Andy. I appreciate you bringing that up. **Myra is adding a bullet here to initiate an amendment to address snowy grouper, but I agree that we**

**probably need to look at the workplan chart again and see if something can be adjusted, because of that timing.** Let's go to Dewey while Myra is still typing.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you, Jessica. In the request for a presentation from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center on pelagic longlines, I realize that time in council meetings is very precious, and so maybe there could be like a summary of the results of the pilot program along with a presentation that is sent out to council and committee members, and so, that way, it would shorten the time, but yet it would have -- Folks could focus on it or read it over, since that's something that appears to be going forward in the future. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Dewey. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I just wanted to comment on snowy and the timeline and just say that, just because something is not coming before the council at a meeting, it doesn't mean that staff is not working on it. We're intending that snowy is starting now, to start working on it, to get some AP insight during that time, and so I don't envision this, with the way we're approaching the workplan now, that nothing happens on these amendments if there's not a council meeting coming up in another three months. We're really trying to do a little more work upfront on these things and get them in better shape when they come to the council, and hopefully reduce some of that endless council meeting discussion about things.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thank you for that. Clay.

DR. PORCH: Good morning, everyone. To Dewey's point, we would be really happy to make a presentation on the new longline survey. I wouldn't even call it a pilot anymore, and it's going to be part of our program permanently. This last year, we had some kinks to work out, but we've made some really important changes that I think Dewey and others would be interested in, and so we would be very happy to make a presentation at the next council meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Clay. **I see we've added a bullet here, and we've adjusted that bullet a little bit about snowy. The bullet we added was initiate an amendment to address snowy grouper and direct staff to ensure an appropriate timeline for development.** Do we need to remake this whole motion, or can we just indicate that we have added something to the timing and tasks motion, Myra?

MS. BROUWER: I think it's fine that you just acknowledge it, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion here on this timing and tasks motion? **Is there any objection to the timing and tasks motion? Seeing no hands, the timing and tasks motion stands approved.** That concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee report.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Jessica. We appreciate that and everybody's input and adjustments there. Let's go ahead and roll on into Dolphin Wahoo with Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met between March 3 and March 4, and the committee approved the amended minutes from the December 2020 meeting, as well as the agenda, and we began the meeting with a status of amendments under formal review, which

included Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 12 that adds bullet and frigate mackerel to the Dolphin Wahoo Management Plan and designates them as ecosystem components.

We then reviewed the updated Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan goals and objectives and made the following motion. **Motion 1 is accepted the IPT's suggested edits to the revised goals and objectives of the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. Direct staff to include the revised goals and objectives in Amendment 10 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

We then began our discussion on Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, and the committee reviewed public hearing comments, discussed the amendment, and provided the following guidance, as well as made the following motions. **Motion 2 was to approve the IPT's suggested edits to the purpose and need statement in Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 3 was to replace Alternative 2 in Action 5 with the IPT's proposed Alternative 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 4 was to accept the IPT's proposed Alternative 5 to replace the current Alternative 5 in Action 6. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 5 was to select Alternative 2 in Action 6 as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 6 was to accept the IPT's wording for Alternative 2 in Action 7. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 7 was to choose Sub-Alternative 2b under Action 7 as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 8 was to accept the IPT's suggested edits in Action 11. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 9 was to select Sub-Alternative 2d as preferred in Action 11. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 10 was to accept Action 12 to be included in Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 11 was to accept Alternative 2 as preferred in Action 12. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

**Motion 12 was to remove Action 13 in Amendment 10 and put it in 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.**

**Motion 13 was to approve all actions in Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, as modified, for review at the June 2021 meeting. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries.**

We had some additional direction to staff, the first of which was to develop a framework action to consider making the minimum size requirements currently in place for Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina apply throughout the management zone for dolphin, and the second was to develop a framework or other appropriate action to consider exempting the charter fleet from the dolphin vessel limit. I would also suggest that we, during consideration of that, would also consider exempting the charter fleet from the wahoo vessel limit, as part of the discussion. I suspect the charter fleet will expect that discussion to occur, and so, with the concurrence of the council, I would like to add to that to direction to staff, and so, when one comes back for consideration, we can also consider the other. Is that okay with folks? I am not hearing any opposition, and so let's go ahead and add wahoo to that as well. Perfect.

Then we had timing for the next Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel meeting, and we were in general agreement and tentatively scheduled that for spring of 2022. I am going to go back and go to Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: In addition to your recommendation about wahoo vessel limits, I would suggest that we modify Number 1 to say, "develop a framework action or other appropriate action". We talked, in the Executive Committee, about combining, potentially, these actions with other dolphin actions, and so it might make sense to do that.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. That change has been made. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I was going to ask if those were intended to be separate framework actions, deliberately, or if they could be done together, just for clarity's sake. Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: They're not -- I don't think they're intended to be separate, per se. I just think the conversations came up at different times. Okay. There was no additional business to come before the Dolphin Wahoo Committee. We have one timing and tasks motion. I would be happy to read it and then allow someone to make it.

**The timing and tasks motion is to approve the following timing and tasks: 1) continue work on Amendment 10 and prepare the amendment for a vote of approval for secretarial review at the June 2021 meeting; 2) prepare information on identified topics regarding the use of pelagic longline gear in the dolphin wahoo fishery, dolphin size limits, and exemptions to the dolphin vessel limit, and we'll need to add wahoo to that as well, onboard for-hire vessels. The council will review this information at the June 2021 meeting. John.**

MR. HADLEY: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify, very quickly, the identified pelagic longline gear topic, and that is intended to take up the actions that you removed from Amendment 10 and

had specified that you wanted to come back to review at a later date in another amendment, and so you're looking at approximately five to six actions in that case, looking at different use of pelagic longline gears and mirroring some of the HMS requirements, and so that's just a point of clarification.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. Sounds good. Is there anyone willing to make that motion, since I've read it? Myra, go ahead.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Anna. Just for my clarity, this is all to come back to the council in June, and I'm thinking we have already scheduled approval of Dolphin Wahoo 10, and it's going to take a big chunk of time, and so I just want to make sure that this is not something in addition that is going to come to Dolphin Wahoo, because that's going to be a really lengthy agenda.

MS. BECKWITH: I was thinking about that too, and I think -- Mel, do you have any suggestions?

MR. BELL: No, and I was just going to ask -- Since it has a date in there, I would ask about timing, from a staff standpoint, and an ability to do all of that, and then I would ask also if it -- Given what John had said, if we need to change any wording in there.

MS. BECKWITH: John, what are your thoughts?

MR. HADLEY: I think the wording is okay. I think clarifying the intent of what you would review in June -- In typing up the draft motion, the intent was to address what came up in Executive Finance, as far as -- I believe the idea was to come up with a plan of attack, so to speak, for how to handle dolphin wahoo going forward, the identified topics, and so that could either be handled through the Dolphin Wahoo Committee or Executive Finance. I think, as far as what the council would be reviewing, it would be a very short document that just specifies -- Essentially, it pulls out and reminds the council what you have identified for pelagic longlines as well as the topics that are addressed in the previous direction to staff that we just reviewed, and so it would be a very concise document to review and not an amendment-type of document or scoping-type of document.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay. That works for me. I have read the motion, and it's on -- But I need someone to make it, and so can someone volunteer, please?

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you. Do I have a second?

MR. POLAND: Second.

MS. BECKWITH: Thank you, Steve. Okay. Is there any further discussion on this motion? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion carries.** That concludes the Dolphin Wahoo report.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Anna. That's an amazing amount of work to be able to just read through that that quickly, and so thanks, everyone, for your contributions. We'll go ahead and go to Mackerel Cobia with Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council met via webinar on March 2, 2021, and the first item on the agenda that we discussed was Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34, and this is an amendment to update king mackerel management based on the most recent SEDAR update.

We went through the document action-by-action, and we provided the following direction to staff on the range of actions and alternatives, and you can see the bulleted list here. To hit the high points, we asked staff to consider a smaller range of buffers between the ABC and the ACL, and we did not support using a 1979 to 1983 range for setting allocations.

The committee did clarify that they would like to consider an allocation alternative that would hold the commercial sector poundage during the 2026/2027 and subsequent seasons equal to that of the current poundage of the 2020/2021 season. We asked for NOAA GC to examine and determine if cut or damaged fish caught under the recreational bag limit can be possessed and landed if they comply with minimum size limits. We asked them to clarify this at Full Council. I will pause, if Monica and Shep have that information available.

MR. GRIMES: I can give you the short answer, but I went back and looked at the regs, and I checked with the IPT, and we do read all the responses that I got -- I suggested that, no, the allowance for keeping cutoff mackerel does not apply to the recreational sector, because of the trip limits language that is used repeatedly throughout that section.

The only responses I heard from the IPT were in agreement, but the language from the provision in the regs reads that cutoff or damaged king or Spanish mackerel that comply with the minimum size limits in 622.380(b) and (c), respectively, and the trip limits in 622.385(a) and (b), respectively, may be possessed and offloaded ashore from a vessel that is operating under the respective trip limits, and so that language is what we read to apply to the commercial sector only, and I haven't gone back and researched the action that put those provisions into place, but that's how I read the CFR text. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: Thank you for that, Shep. Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: I wanted to seek some clarification on Bullet 3, and maybe I am misunderstanding the conversation we've had, but I guess my understanding, or thought, was that we would want to hold the commercial sector poundage, or that equivalent allocation, the same as it is currently whenever the ACL is changed through this amendment. Right now, we're saying 2026/2027, which is well out into the future, and so I wanted to get clarification on that.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Andy. I think Christina can provide some comment to that. Go ahead, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: If you will remember, the ABC/ACL for king mackerel has a decreasing yield stream, and so it decreases every fishing year, and so the goal was to make sure that the commercial fishing poundage was never at any point lower than what it is now, and so that would require us to hold the commercial sector to the poundage they're at now at the 2026/2027 season and then work backwards from there, to ensure that they're never lower than where they are now, and does that make sense? I'm still struggling with the easiest way to describe this situation.

MR. STRELCHECK: It makes perfect sense. Thank you for resolving my confusion.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Christina, and thank you for that question, Andy. All right. Is there any more discussion from the council on the clarification that Shep provided regarding cutup fishing in the recreational sector? Mel.

MR. BELL: Just I heard, the way Shep -- What he read was it says the fish can be cutoff if it meets the minimum length, if I understood that correctly, and so then what -- From an enforcement standpoint, that would mean that's what left meets the minimum length or somehow you assume the fish met the minimum length, and maybe I didn't hear that right.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. My interpretation of that is whatever is left of the fish has to meet the minimum size.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, that would make sense, and you would have over the minimum length.

MR. POLAND: Yes, and I know this will create some issues that we'll need to work through, because I know most of the states in the region have rules that require fish with a size limit to have the heads and fins intact, and so I think this is something that we need to continue to explore in this amendment, if we want to move in this direction. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just want to note that I heard what Shep said, and I'm going to be circling back with our law enforcement officers, because we were one of the ones that were interpreting it to apply to commercial and recreational, and so I'm on it.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. Any more discussion on that item? All right. **Seeing none, the committee approved the following motion to approve the purpose and need statement, and you can see that purpose and need statement here in the document. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? Hearing none, that motion stands approved.**

Next, the committee reviewed the draft actions and alternatives to include in the amendment, and, since this is a new amendment, we need to take action to add those draft actions and alternatives into the amendment. We have a proposed motion on the board to approve Action 1 and Alternatives 1 through 4 for inclusion in CMP Amendment 34. Is anyone willing to make that motion?

MS. BECKWITH: **I'm happy to.** Would you like me to read it?

MR. POLAND: Staff, do we need to read the entirety of the motion or just the motion language?

MS. BROUWER: I'm thinking just the motion language, Steve. I don't think you need to read all the alternatives.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Myra. Mel, go ahead.

MR. BELL: I was just going to read it for you, but, if you've got it covered, and Anna was going to do it, I guess.

MS. BROUWER: **The motion is to approve Action 1 and Alternatives 1 through 4 for inclusion in CMP Amendment 34.**

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

DR. BELCHER: I will second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you. Any discussion? **Any opposition? The motion stands approved.** Next, we have a draft motion to approve Action 3. Is anyone willing to make that motion?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes.

MR. POLAND: Fire away.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move to approve Action 3 and Alternatives 1 through 4 for inclusion in CMP Amendment 34.**

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

MR. BELL: Second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, we have Draft Motion 4 to approve Action 4. Is anyone willing to make that one?

MR. BECKWITH: **Approve Action 4 and Alternatives 1 through 2 for inclusion in CMP Amendment 34.**

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

MR. BELL: Second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. We're on a roll now. Any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, we have Draft Motion 5, and this is the motion to approve Action 5. Is anyone willing to make that motion?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, and I've got them all. Let's do this. **Approve Action 5 and Alternatives 1 through 4 for inclusion in CMP Amendment 34.**

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

MR. BELL: Second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Is there discussion? **Opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, we have Draft Motion 6. Anna.

**MS. BECKWITH: Approve Action 6 and Alternatives 1 through 2 for inclusion in CMP Amendment 34.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Anna. Do we have a second?

MR. BELL: Second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Is there discussion? **Opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** The committee also provided the following direction to staff to modify Alternative 3 in Action 2, the allocations actions, to consider multiple time periods, long-term and short-term and both, when considering TAC or ACL may have been restrictive in the past.

Next, the committee discussed Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 32, and this is a joint amendment with the Gulf of Mexico, and it is related to cobia management, and this is a response to results from the SEDAR 28 update. The following direction was provided to staff to consider separating the action dealing with possession and vessel limits, and this is Action 4, for clarity, and create a table and provide examples of actions that can be taken by each council under the proposed revisions to the framework action.

**The following motion was passed by the committee, Motion 7, to select Alternative 2 under Action 1 as the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any opposition? The motion stands approved.**

**Next, the committee passed Motion 8 to choose Alternative 3 under Action 2 as the South Atlantic Council's preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? The motion stands approved.**

**Next, the committee passed Motion 9 under Action 4 to choose Alternative 2b and Alternative 3b, Sub-Option i, as preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

**Next, the committee passed Motion 10 to approve the Gulf Council preferred for the Gulf Zone under Action 4. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

**Next, the committee passed Motion 11 to select Alternative 2 under Action 5 as the South Atlantic Council's preferred. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

The committee provided the following direction to staff. Direct staff to develop an alternative to address the Florida East Coast Zone sector allocations and update the current percent based on FES and other time periods, and this is for the IPT to discuss. All right.

At this point, the Mackerel Committee concluded, with the acknowledgement that the remaining agenda items would be covered at Full Council. We had two agenda items that we were not able to get to during the committee, and the first is the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel Structure and

then the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel Agenda Items. Christina, I will turn it over to you to go through the AP structure white paper.

MS. WIEGAND: Thank you. I will try to keep this brief, in the interest of time, but, if you will recall, the purpose of this white paper is to discuss ways to ensure that the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel is accurately representing both all of the fisheries that are under the CMP FMP as well as all of the different areas that are under this FMP, and so, just as a real quick reminder, the CMP FMP is a joint plan with the Gulf, and it extends all the way up through the Mid-Atlantic Council's jurisdiction.

There are two separate zones for management of king and Spanish mackerel, and the Northern Zone is everything from the North Carolina/South Carolina line north through the Mid-Atlantic Council's jurisdiction, and the Southern Zone is the North Carolina/South Carolina line south, through the Miami-Dade/Monroe County line. Then, of course, for cobia, we manage along the entire east coast of Florida, including the Keys.

The other important thing to note about the CMP FMP is that there are no state or sector-specific seats. The only thing is just a designated NGO seat, and I presented this to you in December, but, just as a reminder, here is a table that summarizes the current Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel membership, both by state and sector. Again, keep in mind there are no state or sector-specific seats. This is just the current representation on the council.

The Mackerel Cobia AP has not explicitly discussed this white paper, or ever been explicitly asked to discuss the structure of the advisory panel. However, they have brought it up a number of times, and there has been concern that landings are increasing further north, particularly in the Mid-Atlantic region, as well as all the way up into the New England region, and fishermen are actively targeting Spanish mackerel. There has also been discussion in the past on ensuring that there is some sort of Gulf representation on the AP, particularly when discussing ideas or amendments that could affect both Gulf and South Atlantic Council jurisdiction. Particularly for the king mackerel fishery, it's been brought up that there are some market interactions that interact between the two areas.

With that, I came up with a couple of different ideas for you to consider, in terms of expanding the advisory panel. You could add a new seat for a Gulf of Mexico representative, and, again, the Mackerel Cobia AP members have discussed in the past that this would be key to implementing effective regulations. You could request that the Gulf Council appoint an individual to permanently serve on the Mackerel Cobia AP, or, alternatively, a member of the Gulf Council's Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel, such as their chair, could be invited to participate in the South Atlantic Mackerel Cobia AP meetings when joint issues are discussed, such as CMP Amendment 32.

You could also look at adding an additional seat for a Mid-Atlantic representative, and we do already have one Mid-Atlantic representative that's appointed by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and so you could request that an additional representative be appointed to better represent the fishery, perhaps from a different state or a different area of the Mid-Atlantic region.

Then, again, in terms of -- The last option is, in terms of increasing representation from a regional basis, you could consider a New England representative. Anecdotal information does indicate that king and Spanish mackerel catches are increasing in the New England region. However, it's important to note that we don't currently manage CMP species in the New England region, and that's not under our jurisdiction.

Again, you've got these two options, where you could request the New England Council to appoint an individual to our AP, or, alternatively, you could ask that a relevant advisory panel member chosen by the New England Council be invited to participate in any discussions that are specifically related to climate change and movement of mackerel species into the New England region. I will also note that there has been discussion, at some point in the future, of putting together a separate AP to address climate change issues, and so that would be something to keep in mind as well.

Then, next, I'm going to go in and talk about ways to increase coordination with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, but, before I do that, I guess I will pause here, to see if there are any questions or discussion related to adding additional seats to the AP to represent these different areas.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Christina. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Steve, and so a couple of points here. I don't support adding a New England or a Mid-Atlantic person to this AP. I think, when we get to the discussion about ASMFC, that ASMFC can add it through their part of the process, and I come back to us not really managing into the New England area, and that's why I would rather this come through ASMFC.

FWC had a long conversation about whether or not a Gulf representative should be added, and so, initially, I was thinking yes, but, after discussions with Martha, the Gulf fishery is so diverse, and they have so many different zones, and they have traveling fishermen, and they have people doing the mackerel gillnet fishery, and so we couldn't figure out a way to just have a single representative from the Gulf that could represent all of those different aspects of the fishery, and so I'm just throwing that out there for what we were thinking when we discussed this.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. I agree with your opinion on inclusion of a New England, and we don't manage that far up, and I am interested to hear your thoughts on the ASMFC aspect. As far as the Gulf Council rep, I mean, with Option 2, just inviting the chair of the Gulf's AP, could that be an appropriate way to get input from the Gulf, and so the AP chair represents the entire AP, and he should be able to represent the opinions of the AP from multiple perspectives, and that's just a thought. Mel, go ahead.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say that I agree with Jessica on the New England thing, but, related to the Gulf as well, it seems like maybe working with the Gulf AP chair or something, you could ask for kind of a tailor-made representative, depending upon what the amendment is or what the issue is or something, because, as you mentioned, it's so diverse, but we would know what it is we're dealing with, and then we could kind of ask them for the right person, and it could be the chair or whomever to represent them, and it's just sort of on a case-by-case basis, I guess.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Mel. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think inviting the Gulf AP chair wouldn't necessarily hurt, but the issue is that, if the Gulf AP hasn't discussed what the South Atlantic is about to discuss, then that AP chair might be out on a limb, just because this fishery is so diverse, and it might be hard for them to fully know what all the different aspects are and what all the different opinions are across the fishery, unless the Gulf AP discusses it first and then says, hey, here is our various opinions on everything that the South Atlantic is working on, and then that person could bring it over to the South Atlantic.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. That's a fair point, and it sounds like we almost need to probably coordinate a little bit with the Gulf and their AP, if we're going to be discussing an issue that might bleed over into the Gulf, so they have time to discuss it as well at their AP. Christina, go ahead.

MS. WIEGAND: Thanks, Steve. I will note, and I didn't include it in this paper, because it's something that has been done a number of times in the past, and not since I've been with the council, but they have held joint Mackerel Cobia AP meetings before, and I think we need to be careful about this and make sure that -- You know, I don't want fishermen from North Carolina to feel like they have to attend a meeting that is meant to fully focus on Gulf cobia, which is not a fishery they participate in, for example, but holding joint AP meetings is an option that's been used in the past, and so I just wanted to note that as another way that's been used to sort of get around this issue.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Christina. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I like that idea that Christina mentioned, depending on what the issue is that's being discussed, and I also like what you said, Steve, about making sure we take the time to maybe allow the Gulf Council's AP to meet and discuss the item, just because, if we're going to bring the Gulf AP chair over, they need to have time to have a discussion and form an opinion that that AP chair could represent, and so I liked both of those suggestions.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Jessica. Any more discussion on this section of the white paper, before we move on? I feel like there you've got some clear direction there, Christina, on how the committee, or the council, I guess, feels on some of these proposals. Go ahead, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: One thing I would ask for is, since I'm taking notes in the document that you guys can't see on the screen, I just want to make sure that I am covering everything correctly. There is no support for adding a member from the New England region at this time, because we don't manage CMP species in that region, and, because the Gulf Council fisheries are so diverse, it would be hard to find one person to represent the entire CMP fishery, and so the recommendation is that, should chairs attend each other's meetings, we make sure that the Gulf Council AP has had a chance to discuss an issue in advance of attending one of our meetings, and that's something we would need to coordinate with the Gulf staff. Additionally, joint meetings could be considered, sort of on a case-by-case basis. Then the one other thing I would ask for guidance on is the additional Mid-Atlantic representative. Jessica, I think I heard that maybe you don't support that, but just some rationale from the council on whether they support that and why or why not.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Christina. I mean, everything I'm seeing here on the screen, to me, reflects our discussion. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: First, to everything else that Christina just said, where she's trying to reflect and recount our discussion, I agree with everything that she said. I just don't think we need to add another representative. I don't think we need to add somebody from the Mid-Atlantic. To me, what we're about to discuss here, that has to do with the ASMFC, I think we're going to be covered when we discuss that, and I have some ideas on how to work that, and so that's kind of why I would put that out there, that I see another path forward here through the ASMFC.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Jessica. Do you feel like you have enough, Christina?

MS. WIEGAND: I do. I feel like I've got the rationale that I need, and perhaps it's now time to get into those options for coordinating better with ASMFC.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thanks. Take it away.

MS. WIEGAND: The one thing I want to make sure that we're keeping in mind when we talk about coordinating with ASMFC is that they only manage Spanish mackerel. They do not manage Atlantic king mackerel, and they do not manage Gulf cobia, and so the species we have here is Spanish mackerel, and so Option 1 would be to develop a joint AP with ASMFC for Spanish mackerel. If this was the case, we may want to consider modifying the current Mackerel Cobia AP to only address king mackerel and Gulf cobia, and so we would essentially be creating two separate APs to function under the CMP FMP.

If the council does want to go down this road, they might want to consider including other jointly-managed species, and I believe black sea bass is the other species that the ASMFC manages as well as us, and this option would need a lot of further discussion and development and coordination with ASMFC staff as well.

Option 2 would be to identify sort of Spanish mackerel liaisons, or a Spanish mackerel sub-panel, for lack of a more appropriate term, and those sub-panel members would be made up of representatives from both the ASMFC AP and the Mackerel Cobia AP, and they could attend the others' meetings, when appropriate, based on issues that are being discussed.

Option 3 would be to simply hold a joint Mackerel Cobia AP and ASMFC Spanish Mackerel AP meeting when Spanish mackerel issues need to be discussed, and just to make it clear to other Mackerel Cobia AP members that, if they don't participate in the Spanish mackerel fishery, they are not required to attend this meeting.

This has been done in the past with the Spiny Lobster AP. I guess, two Novembers ago, we held a joint meeting with the Gulf Spiny Lobster and South Atlantic Spiny Lobster APs, and it was specifically to discuss the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, and so we did not require, for example, the representatives that we have in North Carolina and Georgia to attend that meeting if they didn't want to, since they don't -- They indicated that they don't actively fish in the Florida Keys, and, thus, had no input on the situation, and so the has been done in the past.

Then one last thing that I do want to note is councils that have appointees to other advisory panels, like the Dolphin Wahoo AP -- In the past, we have asked those councils to fund the travel of those additional AP members, and it should also be noted that the Mackerel Cobia AP used to have an additional five members that attended meetings as part of a cobia sub-panel that was disbanded when the council transferred management of Atlantic cobia to ASMFC, and so there are sort of, I guess, extra seats that the council was funding that they are no longer funding now, just when you're trying to sort of wrap your mind around what something like this may cost. With that, I will turn it back to you, Steve, for discussion.

MR. POLAND: Thank you for that, Christina. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Steve. So I would support Option 3, and I do understand that this is Spanish-mackerel-specific, but I actually like it that way. I almost would call Option 3 -- It's almost like you're pulling together this ad hoc group that is going to adjust, or talk about adjusting, specific issues, or responding to specific issues, and so I actually like that structure, that you're kind of pulling it together on an ad hoc basis, and you don't have this standing group that's going to meet two times a year, necessarily.

The reason why I like it on this ad hoc basis is we still have the issue with the Gulf, and so the Gulf and South Atlantic -- We're working on these FMPs together, and so the Gulf is not represented here, and so that's why I like Option 3, and it's more like this ad hoc group, and ASMFC can figure out who all they want to send to this ad hoc group that is pulling together our South Atlantic Council Mackerel AP, and then, also, the description we just talked about with how to get input from the Gulf, and we were kind of primarily talking about king mackerel, but, to me, that would also work, depending on what the topic is, in getting input from the Gulf and making sure that Gulf could meet on the items that we're discussing, and so I was trying to find a way that you could include the Gulf and get input from them, which I feel like we already talked about, and then a way to add additional folks along the Atlantic coast here, through ASMFC, on an ad hoc basis on Spanish mackerel.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Jessica. It seems like an appropriate way forward, and so, essentially, just special meetings, special joint meetings, between the two APs as issues arise, and we did talk about, previously, New England, and I am looking at ASMFC's Spanish Mackerel AP membership right now, and it looks like their membership only goes through the Mid-Atlantic, and so that still wouldn't get us our representation from those New England states, but I tend to agree with you, Jessica, that, if there is interest in New England in Spanish mackerel management, it's probably a little more appropriate for that to come through the ASMFC, as opposed to us, and so I'm anxious to hear what Spud has to say. Go ahead, Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Steve. For me, just a little background, so we can have some context with this. The commission, last year, decided to take the longstanding State and Federal Fisheries Management Board, which covered a multitude of species, and split it into a Coastal Pelagics Board, which will be responsible for Spanish mackerel and Atlantic migratory group cobia, and then the remainder goes into a newly-formed Sciaenids Board.

Well, right now, we don't really have a functional advisory panel for either of those boards, and so we were kind of waiting to see how this discussion would go, but we do have the responsibility, at the commission, to stand up an advisory panel for each of those newly-formed management

boards, and so we're going to do that, but I expect that, when we create a coastal pelagics board, it's going to be co-mingled with folks that have an interest in Spanish mackerel as well as Atlantic migratory group cobia, and so it doesn't preclude Option 3 being feasible, but it just means that it would be responsibility, I guess, back on the commission to tease out those members of that advisory panel, to interact with the council's advisory panel whenever it was appropriate.

I fully expect that our advisory panel for coastal pelagics is going to include representatives from the New England states, given the northward movement of these fish and the increasing effort and direction on Spanish mackerel up there, and so I don't have a strong feeling in opposition to Option 3, and I think we could certainly try it, but, at some point, the commission has got to act, and we've got to populate our advisory panels, and I just want to make sure that, when we do it, we do it in a way that results in the most effective interaction that we can have with the council, and so thank you, Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you for that, Spud, and I didn't realize, when I was looking at the ASMFC's boards and committees and panels site that they do have Atlantic cobia and Spanish mackerel listed, with an individual link to the advisory panel, but all that does is just take you back to the South Atlantic Board Advisory Panel, and so I apologize, and I thought the commission had already populated the advisory panels for those species, and so a question for you, Spud. So the new coastal migratory pelagics board at ASMFC, will it include New England states, or have you all not made it to this step yet, where states declare their interest in that board?

MR. WOODWARD: We haven't even had a meeting of the new coastal pelagics board yet, and so that's still sort of up in the future, but I wouldn't be surprised that some New England states would want to opt in, just recognizing that these fish are now occurring with enough numbers and enough frequency to justify their interest in it, and so we're sort of building the genesis of all that.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Thank you, Spud. Mel, go ahead.

MR. BELL: Spud covered a good bit of that, and the point is that the structure right now that the commission is using is still not fully set, and so that's still kind of a little bit of a moving target, but the point of this is to provide some mechanism where we can link folks together who are dealing with the management of Spanish, whether it's state waters or federal waters or whether it's across this regional line or whatever, and so it's to bring the right people together at the right time.

Option 3 seemed to be kind of the closest way, to me, to just kind of be able to do that without committing to a hard, firm structure, dealing with our hard-wiring, but you want to be able to be - - To have it so that, just like we were discussing, if the New England states do declare interest and want to be in there, you can include them somehow, but the point is to simply improve communication and visibility across all these lines that we have, so the right hand and the left hand know what each other are doing kind of thing, and this was a lightbulb moment for Spud and I sitting at the commission table going, wow, huh, wouldn't this be useful, if we could somehow figure out a way to improve communication and coordination and across those lines, and so 3 seemed to be the closest thing to that, to me.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Thank you, Mel, and I guess, if we decide to go the route of Option 3, we just need to recognize that the ASMFC CMP AP, or whatever the advisory panel body that's formed, is that we have that direct link there. All right, Christina. Go ahead.

MS. WIEGAND: Thanks. Again, I just want to make sure I'm accurately capturing the discussion, and so there seems to be a lot of support for Option 3, which is essentially pulling together representatives from all of the affected APs on an ad hoc basis to discuss Spanish mackerel issues. The thought is that, if they wanted to, the Gulf Council would be able to send representatives to this meeting as well and that working with ASMFC would help improve representation throughout the Mid-Atlantic region, and possibly the New England states, with a note that ASMFC is still working on populating their new APs with the new board structure that they have.

My suggestion would be -- I have sort of reserved a space under the timing and tasks motion for this committee report, and I would recommend putting something in there along the lines of have staff reach out to ASMFC and sort of discuss with them and give them a heads-up that this is what the South Atlantic Council has discussed and sort of begin working with them, to the extent possible at this time, on this sort of ad hoc structure, because they will, obviously, want to talk to the commission about it as well at some point, and so just to sort of begin working with their staff.

MR. POLAND: Thank you. I think that's appropriate, and I think there are some details that will have to be ironed out, like who pays for who to attend and that kind of stuff. Mel, go ahead.

MR. BELL: To Christina's point, I know the vice chair of the commission pretty well, and I'm sure we can make sure that communication occurs, and, also, this is about managing during change, and we can assume that certain things are going to happen, and other things might happen, or it might happen quicker than we're thinking, and so the idea is to have something in place that we're flexible enough to adjust to the changes that we're presented, in terms of what the fishery and the fish themselves are doing, and so I think we're on the right path here, and certainly we have the direct communication with the commission.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Mel. Everything I have heard is the vice chair of the commission is a pretty stand-up guy, and so I'm sure we'll have no problem working with him.

MR. BELL: He's retired, too.

MR. POLAND: He's got all the time in the world. All right. Any further discussion? All right. Fantastic. That was a good discussion, and I really appreciate that. Moving on to Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel agenda items, you can see here that we've got a draft list. We'll ask the AP to review Framework Amendment 10, which I guess that is now Amendment 34, for Atlantic king mackerel and CMP Amendment 32, and that's the joint amendment with the Gulf cobia. Update fishery performance reports, Christina, is that update all? If I recall, I think Spanish was updated last spring.

MS. WIEGAND: We could update them all, and this is something we've sort of been -- How we end up, and how regularly we end up, updating these fishery performance reports is a little bit FMP dependent, and, obviously, for example, with snapper grouper, we can't be updating each of these species on an annual basis, and that would be an unbelievable workload, but, for CMP, we can, because there are so few species, and, usually, we sort of run through the FPRs much faster than

we do upon the initial run-through, but one of the reasons we wanted to consider updating the FPRs is because the Spanish mackerel assessment was coming up, and so we wanted to make sure that we captured any additional changes or information from the fishery before we pass off the FPR to the analysts.

There was nothing else that I had listed, and this meeting is going to be April 6, and we plan for it to be a half-day meeting. I didn't know if, for example, you wanted the advisory panel to discuss the white paper or sort of everything that you all just discussed related to the structure of the AP and working with ASMFC, but I will open it up to the council, if there's anything else that you guys would like to add to the list.

MR. POLAND: Thank you. My internet blinked out, and I missed a little bit of what you said there, Christina, but I think I caught the gist of it. I am fine asking the AP to update the FPRs, because I would be interested to see some feedback as well on the impacts of COVID, specific to our mackerel fisheries, and I would be interested in hearing the AP's feedback on our discussion that we just had on modifying the AP structure and such. Anything else from the council? Have you got everything for that that you think you need, Christina?

MS. WIEGAND: Yes, sir. This looks great.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you. All right. We will move on into Other Business, and we did have one item of Other Business during the committee meeting, and Rick DeVactor from the Southeast Regional Office discussed some issues with tracking commercial landings in that Southern Zone and adjusted quota, and we had a brief discussion on this, and the committee decided to look at the adjusted quota system in our next mackerel amendment following the assessment, and that was everything that the committee discussed. We will scroll down, and I will give you a second to update the timing and tasks, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: Myra, where it says "white paper action", I would add in something that says "work with ASMFC staff on an ad hoc AP structure", or something like that. Sorry. I'm not always great at speaking my words, as opposed to writing them. Then we've already got the list of topics, and so you could probably just go to the topics listed above.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Christina and Myra. I apologize, and I didn't realize that you were driving the bus, Myra. I kept asking Christina to do things. All right. I will read the following timing and tasks motion, and then I would be interested in someone making that motion.

**Motion 12 is adopt the following timing and tasks: continue work on CMP Amendment 34 and prepare a draft for discussion and selection of preferred alternatives at the June 2021 meeting; work with Gulf Council staff to present information on CMP Amendment 32 to the Gulf Council and Gulf Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel; work with Gulf Council staff to continue development of CMP Amendment 32 for additional review at the June 2021 meeting; white paper action - work with ASMFC staff on ad hoc AP structure; and convene a meeting of the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel to discuss the topics listed above.**

MR. BELL: **So moved.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Do we have a second?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. Any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none that motion stands approved.** Mr. Chair, that concludes the Mackerel Cobia Committee report.

MR. BELL: Thank you very much, Steve, and thank you, everyone. Let's go ahead and take a much-needed break and come back at 10:45.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: I've got 10:47, and I think we've got a couple of folks still missing. Here's my intentions for finishing up. I've got a couple of reports to go through, and then we will shift to the agency and liaison reports, and we'll do the Gulf liaison and then the Mid-Atlantic, and then we'll shift to the federal agencies, including the Coast Guard in there, and then we'll cover state agencies and just maybe touch on just one aspect of Other Business, and then we're in the home stretch, and so thanks, everybody, for hanging in there.

This is the SEDAR Committee report, and the SEDAR Committee met on March 4, and the committee approved the minutes from the September 2020 meeting and the agenda, and we dealt with SEDAR 79, mutton snapper, appointments, and that was done in earlier closed session. We approved the terms of reference for SEDAR 79, mutton snapper, and we received SEDAR updates. The committee was provided an update on ongoing assessments and the schedules for SEDAR 79, mutton snapper, and SEDAR 76, black sea bass. Both assessments are scheduled to be delivered to the council at the June 2023 meeting. No other business was brought before the committee, and the committee approved the following motions.

**Motion 1 is approve the SEDAR 79 participant list table, as modified. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of that motion? Any opposition to the motion? That motion carries and is approved.**

**Motion 2 is approve the SEDAR 79 terms of reference. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion of the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries, and that's passed.** There were no timing and task motions made during the meeting, and so that concludes the report for the SEDAR Committee.

Now I will give the report for the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee met on March 4, and they approved the agenda and the minutes. Under Advisory Panel Policy, the committee reviewed and approved the revised draft of the advisory panel policy that addressed the guidance provided in December of 2020.

Then we discussed the council seminar series at-length, and we're really excited about that, and I think this will be a good opportunity for us to be able to communicate things a little bit better, internally and externally, and provide us some -- It's kind of a new avenue, and I think we had general agreement, or we had agreement, that that was a good thing to do, moving forward with that.

Then we had the workplan review, and the committee was provided an updated workplan that addressed the direction and progress from this meeting, and we've touched on a couple of areas where we're going to probably need to do some tweaking, and I'm not sure. Is this the appropriate time to discuss tweaking of that, John, or should we kind of move through the rest of the report first? Well, let's take care of the motions. We had a couple of motions.

**Motion 1 was to approve the AP policy, as revised.** Any discussion of that motion? **Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion carries and is approved.**

**Motion 2 is approve the council seminar series.** Any discussion of that motion? **Any objection to the motion? The motion passes and is approved.** Is that the end of the -- Okay. Good. It's blank after that, and so now we can go back and revisit discussion of the workplan. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mel, I was going to say that we have the guidance to complete, as the top priority, Dolphin Wahoo 10 for approval, and we have the guidance to evaluate the framework for red snapper, and, if it's considered legal, then to prepare an expedited framework and bring it to you in June, and then what we have said is we will also come up with a plan to look into those dolphin wahoo requests and see how they can actually be accomplished, a framework, and probably also consider implications of just folding that into the plan amendment that was penciled in as a longline topic.

To do all of that, we may have to make some sacrifices, and we've identified greater amberjack and the ABC Control Rule Amendment as ones where we may have to slow down or pause some of the effort. Then, as Andy noted, and as we talked about in Snapper Grouper, snowy grouper is soon going to get a letter, and it's going to start the clock ticking, and so we need to continue, probably, to do some work there and to start getting the information together and doing some of the preliminary work, so we can come to the council in September and actually have some information and some analyses to support the discussions you're going to need to have there to get that moving along quite quickly.

With that, unless there's something else that folks think we can do, I think that's about all we can say for now. My desire is that our staff will get up with the SERO staff leads very quickly and figure what all of this means, in terms of the workload for all those individual projects, particularly what sacrifices we may have to make on amberjack and the ABC Control Rule Amendment, and we'll also be requesting a pretty quick turnaround on the response regarding the red snapper and potential for the framework adjustment on the ABC, because we don't want to get staffs working on that if it turns out that's not even going to be legal.

MR. BELL: All right. Any other discussion? I think that kind of covers it, and the point is that the spreadsheet that we were modifying as we were going through the committee meeting is going to be modified a little bit further, as we just need to adjust to make sure that we can accommodate everything that we've established as priorities, and so I assume that we'll be seeing a new version of that, and so any other questions or anything that we need to discuss at the Executive Committee level?

I am not seeing any, and so that would conclude the report for the Executive Committee, and now we're going to get the -- This will be a report from the Council Session I, since we're dividing into multiple council sessions, and so this is Full Council Session I. The Full Council met on March

1, and we approved the agenda and the minutes from 2020 and November of 2020, the recreational topics webinar, and remember we had a separate Full Council meeting in November to deal with just recreational topics.

We had a lot of discussion about the ABC Control Rule Amendment, and I won't go into the details of all of that. The council staff presented an overview of the development of the ABC Control Rule Amendment, including language and IPT comments, and they reviewed how the ABC Control Rule is used in management. The council directed the IPT to remove the Coral and Sargassum Fishery Management Plans from the amendment, due to the lack of recent landings in these fisheries.

The council staff described the IPT discussions and recommendations pertaining to actions that consider revisions to the ABC Control Rule Action 1 and the council's approach for determining risk tolerance, Action 2, and the IPT recommended restructuring these actions such that complementary methods for determining assessment uncertainty and risk tolerance be prepared, while still defining clear roles for the SSC and council. The council agreed and directed the IPT to combine these actions, noting that the language should not be overly prescriptive. The council also directed the IPT to consider incorporating Action 3 addressing application of the ABC Control Rule to rebuilding stocks into the combined actions as well.

The council reviewed language for Action 4 addressing phase-ins of changes to the ABCs, and the council discussed that requirements and restrictions for phasing-in ABC increases are unnecessary and should be removed. Instead, the IPT should incorporate a statement more simply indicating that ABC increases may be phased-in. The council also revised the options considered under Sub-Action 4.1, Alternative 2, to allowing phasing-in of decreases only when the new ABC is 20 percent, 30 percent, or 40 percent less than the previous ABC. The council advised that, once the changes are incorporated, the language for this be incorporated into the draft amendment.

We had an EFP request, and this is one bit of unfinished business. Recall that we discussed the EFP that we were presented, and we were prepared to basically finish that, and we wanted to make sure that we had the opportunity for public comment, and I don't think we received any public comment on it. Before we dispense with that, John, do you have something to add there?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I did, Mel, and I had something that -- For some reason, I have this mental block on this little bit of business for Executive Committee and the workload, and it has to do with the -- I just want to go back to this before we get into the EFP and this last bit.

MR. BELL: Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: For almaco jack, there's been a request out there for a while to do a white paper, and it's suggested in the overview, but we never talked about it, and so I wanted to make sure that I just clear this with everyone. Our recommendation is that we fold that discussion of almaco jack into the pending in-the-future unassessed stocks amendment to deal with ABCs and ACLs, et cetera, on unassessed stocks. It seems like a potential good place to put that and to make sure that we actually do get the resources, at some point, to do it. I just wanted to make sure there's no objection with just folding that task into that amendment.

MR. BELL: All right. Any comments on that or thoughts on that or issues with it? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It sounds great to me.

MR. BELL: Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Jessica. I appreciate that, and I just wanted to make sure that I closed the book on all of that.

MR. BELL: Thanks, John. Good catch. We've got so many things going on. Okay. Then, in terms of moving forward with the EFP request, I remember Chester was prepared to make a motion, since it had the Chester seal of approval, and I don't know that we need that. I think the bottom line is we can just -- Let's see. How do we have this worded?

Well, NMFS SERO staff provided a briefing on a request to obtain an EFP to temporarily allow harvest of speckled hind in federal waters off of the South Atlantic. The samples would be used by Texas A&M University to assess the speckled hind population structure, connectivity, and life history. The EFP would be valid through August 31, 2022. SERO staff noted that NMFS would be accepting public comment on the EFP through March 12, 2021.

The gist of all of our discussions, I think, were that we were fine, and so I don't know that we need a motion for that, but we had no opposition to it when we discussed it, and so is there any further discussions on the EFP, or does that suffice, that it has our recommendation to move forward with it? Okay. I don't see any more discussion, and so that would be our recommendation then, and I don't think we necessarily need a motion for that, do we, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, I don't think we do. If you were going to perhaps have some major concerns and wanted some more information or such, then, yes, I would feel that a motion may be more in line.

MR. BELL: Right. This one seemed, from our discussions, as I recall -- I mean, this one seemed pretty straightforward, and everybody was supportive of it. Okay. All right. Then the Regional Electronic Technologies Plan, and we heard about that. SERO staff presented the history behind it, with the region's current vision for 2024, and they highlighted ongoing ET projects within the region. The agency is looking for any additional insights from fishery management councils as the plan is finalized. Updates to the plan will occur annually and allow for councils to address any new concerns. Certainly it's a growing and important area of improving our use of electronic technologies.

Then we received a brief on the Kitty Hawk Offshore Wind Project, and there wasn't a lot of discussion on that, but it was an interesting briefing on status and what's going on, particularly to the north of us. I believe that's it, and so that concludes the report for Council Session I. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Mel. I just had one question. Going back to that EFP for a minute, which I think it's a great use there, but I was kind of curious. Once he completes his work, what will happen to that data? Will that data ever be incorporated anywhere, or will the SSC be able to use that? Will SEDAR be able to use that? I mean, when a program like this is developed, and, at the end of the day, when they have come up with their conclusions for the age structure, or

whatever it is they are going to come up with, what happens to that data after that? I mean, is it ever going to be of any value that we can actually get some benefit from it? Thank you.

MR. BELL: I can't speak for the PI there and all, but the point is that, with something like that, yes, you would certainly hope to be able to rely upon it, and I'm sure it would be published in some form and contribute to answering questions that we need answered. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: When there's a project like this that you guys identify that's very important, this is something that we would like to incorporate into the seminar series and get it into -- The information in your hands and the SSC's hands, if it needs to go there, and that's one of the intentions of the seminar series. Thanks.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Chip. Tim, the idea is certainly to be able to rely upon it, and, again, depending on how it all works out and what is learned from it. Any other questions or discussion of Council Session I? I don't see any. That concludes all of the reports. What I would like to do is, as I mentioned, is go ahead and shift over to the Agency and Liaison Reports, and I mentioned the first liaison report would be for the Gulf, which I know we were provided a hard copy of that in our briefing binder, but that would be John Sanchez, if there's anything you -- John, you, obviously, don't have to read the report or anything, but is there anything that you want to cover or comment on?

MR. SANCHEZ: If the report is before you, and you're comfortable with that, then I can just do a real summarized version, or, again, if you're comfortable with that, then it's been a long, productive meeting, and I don't want to bore you with additional details, but it has been a pleasure visiting with you guys. Some of you I have met before, and it's nice seeing you again, and I appreciate you all having me, and so, Mr. Chairman, let me know how you would like to proceed. If the report in front of you is good enough, that works for me.

MR. BELL: I am fine with that, John. I think that's fine. It's been entered, and so it's entered into the record. If anybody has any specific questions about points in the report, and we do appreciate you being here, and we greatly appreciate your contribution, because I know you have weighed-in at times, and that was very helpful, and so does anybody have any questions for John about anything in the report or anything from the Gulf perspective that might be going on right now that he can help with? I am not seeing any hands, and so thanks, John. We appreciate the report, and we appreciate you being here.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you all for having me and a productive meeting. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Great. All right. Now we'll shift to the Mid-Atlantic, and that would be Tony, and I don't think we have anything to look at, and so, Tony, it's just all yours, as far as whatever you would like to pass along.

MR. DILERNIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would also like to say it's always a pleasure to visit with you. Even at times when we disagree, I know we respectfully disagree, and it is a pleasure to work with you on a professional basis, and I wish that I could say we were sitting together again, so we could see each other on a personal basis, and hopefully -- Perhaps maybe at the June meeting, which will be my last meeting, because I term-limit out in August, and so perhaps

I may see some of you. If there is a June meeting in person, I will get a chance to see you then. If not, at some other time in the future, perhaps we'll get together.

The Mid-Atlantic Council met on February 10 and 11 via webinar, and we were supposed to meet originally in North Carolina, but that didn't work out. It was a short meeting, and you can see it was only two days, and we only covered a few items. One of the items that we discussed in detail was the bluefish allocation and rebuilding amendment. The council and the commission Bluefish Board met jointly to review the public hearing document and the commission's draft amendment for the Bluefish Allocation and Rebuilding Amendment.

During the review, the council and the board recommended three modifications to the project. First, the council and the board directed the staff to incorporate decision trees indicating the flow of decision-making and the subsequent decisions that need to be made when an alternative is selected. This was done in response to concerns about the complexity of the amendment and the potential confusion about how decisions might be made.

Secondly, the council and the board agreed to incorporate additional information regarding what should happen if the rebuilding plan fails to achieve adequate progress towards rebuilding the stock. Finally, the council and the board approved revisions to the *de minimis* provisions and alternatives to provide states with a larger set of options. That was it for bluefish.

River herring and shad white papers, the council reviewed several river herring and shad staff white papers and approved two follow-up requests to the NOAA Fisheries Science Center. First, the council requested that the Center staff assist with scoping potential approaches to synthesize survey information in order to discern recent river herring and shad abundance trends, and it appears that we're seeing a recovery of both river herring and shad in the Mid-Atlantic and the New England regions, in the GARFO region.

Secondly, the council requested that the Center produce several revenue maps to consider whether to initiate an action to further explore potential time/area restrictions to further reduce river herring and shad interactions. Just, as a brief background, very often, river herring and shad intermix with Atlantic mackerel or oceanic herring, and there is a large bycatch of shad and river herring in those other two fisheries, and we have provisions to either shift, require vessels to shift, their areas of operation, or, in some cases, we have thresholds, where that fishery is actually shut down, and so we would like to look at what would be the effects on the revenue, should those actions be initiated.

Regarding right whales, we received an update on the proposed rule to amend the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan to reduce the impacts and entanglements of fishing gear on right whales in the U.S. The basic problems with the entanglements of right whales in the waters in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions are Jonah crab and lobster trap pots, the lines going down to the trawls, and the whales become entangled in that, and, if they end up dragging around those pots and those strings of pots for any length of time, they don't usually survive.

We had a little bit of an aquaculture discussion, and Danielle Blacklock, Director of NOAA Fisheries Office of Aquaculture, presented on aquaculture topics in the Executive Order, and it was Executive Order 13921, Promoting American Seafood Competitiveness and the Economic Growth, including aquaculture opportunity areas, or AOAs. We had a briefing on that. Two AOAs

have been selected for science-based evaluation and development, and we'll be getting more information on that.

There was also a presentation about the Manna Fish Farms, which is a proposed fish farm offshore of Long Island, and the folks from the Manna Fish Farms gave us a presentation on that, and, finally, in offshore wind, we got the same presentation on offshore wind from Rick Robbins et al. that you folks received at this council meeting.

We revised our SOPPs, and we increased the amount of paid paternal leave from six to twelve weeks with council staff, and, finally, the last item that we discussed was the council considered a motion to task the Ecosystem Committee to initiate a review of potential methods to address the management of species as a result of shifting stocks. I made mention of that earlier this week, and I will be sending to John Carmichael a copy of a paper, and it's an op-ed that I wrote a couple of years ago, and we asked the council to begin a review and comment on, because, as we all have been saying on the east coast, we have to address how to manage shifting stocks going forward.

The council, rather than convening a meeting of the Ecosystem Committee to just review my op-ed, we are going to -- We have a process that's going on, and we're working with the CCC and the commission to review shifting stocks and how to manage them, and so my paper will be referred to that committee.

The next meeting will be April 6 to 8, and we're supposed to be in New Jersey, but that's going to be a webinar. Recently, we have conducted hearings on the commercial/recreational reallocation of summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass, and the new MRIP data indicates that there is a potential to reallocate, and perhaps the commercial quotas were set too high and the recreational quotas were set a bit low, and so -- I say "perhaps", and so we have run hearings on the east coast. Well, actually, from North Carolina all the way up through Massachusetts on perhaps reallocating, and we're scheduled to discuss final action on that issue at the April meeting, and we'll see if we take final action or if there's still going to be continued discussion about that issue.

That's about it. If folks have any questions, I will be happy to answer them, and, also, I know Dewey is on the line here, if Dewey wants to jump in and add a little bit to my report, and I'm happy to defer to my esteemed colleague and friend.

MR. BELL: Dewey, do you have anything? Thanks, Tony. Dewey, if you would like to say anything, you can. If not --

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Tony has done an excellent job, as usual, and so I will let his comments and presentation be the rule of the day. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Dewey, and thanks to both of you guys. Tony, I wish we could be together, and it's been a year now, but hopefully we will sometime soon, and it's been a pleasure -- It is a pleasure having you guys, both of you guys, with us, and, I mean, you've become part of the family, and so we always appreciate your contributions.

MR. DILERNIA: Well, I do feel like I'm part of your family. You folks have been very welcoming to me, even when I come in with things that you folks may not like or agree with. Seriously. Which is very good, because we can agree to disagree, at times, and still, at the end of

the day, and that's the part I miss. At the end of the day, we could end up at Mahogany Ridge and have a cocktail and reestablish our friendships and express our mutual respect for each other.

Let me just add, also, that my inclusion to the South Atlantic Council as the liaison, I have, in my fisheries management career, and I started originally in the Mid-Atlantic in 1991, and I have covered every state on the east coast, from Maine to Florida, and so it has been a pleasure and an honor for me, and I have mixed feelings looking at the June meeting coming up. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Tony, so much. All right. No further discussion there, and let's go on to federal agencies, and so, Andy, do you have anything -- I'm assuming it will be Andy from the Regional Office.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel. I will keep my comments short, and it's been a long and productive week. I wanted to start off and just mention a few administrative transition political appointee updates. Gina Raimondo was sworn-in as our 40<sup>th</sup> U.S. Secretary of Commerce this past Wednesday. I don't believe a NOAA Administrator appointee has been designated yet by the President for consideration, and we're certainly waiting for designation of Chris Oliver's replacement, and so he stepped down on January 20. Paul Doremus is now serving as the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, until such time that a NMFS Assistant Administrator is designated.

I am, obviously, serving in the Acting Regional Administrator role, and I wanted to pass along that Roy is doing well and is enjoying retirement, and he emphasized to me how quickly he was able to forget about all of the complicated fisheries issues that we work on, but, overall, he's enjoying retirement. I will be serving in this capacity until such time that a Regional Administrator is more permanently designated, and my expectation is that decision will be reached over the next two to three months.

In my place, Kim Amendola, who many of you probably know, has stepped in to serve as our Acting Deputy Regional Administrator, and she'll be in that role until May, after which time, if I haven't changed back to the Deputy, someone else will be designated in that position.

In terms of a couple of programmatic updates, I just wanted to mention Atlantic cobia. If you recall, it's been removed from the CMP Fishery Management Plan, and it's now managed by the Atlantic States. The Atlantic States Commission recently amended their FMP to increase catch levels, based on a recent assessment, and, in late February, Bob Beal sent me a letter recommending changes to federal regulations for cobia. We have assembled a team to do some rulemaking, and we'll be making those changes through the Atlantic Coastal Act, and, in particular, increasing the commercial quota from 50,000 pounds to a little over 73,000 pounds.

The last thing I will note, and it was already mentioned a little bit, is, in terms of aquaculture, and so there's an Executive Order on Promoting American Seafood Competitiveness and Economic Growth, and I know the South Atlantic isn't working on a lot of aquaculture activities at this point, but we are, in the Southeast Region, working on the Gulf of Mexico aquaculture opportunity area, and this is one of two areas that was selected, and the other is southern California. We went out with a request for information in the Federal Register late last year, and we received public

comment during a sixty-day public comment period. We are now evaluating those public comments.

In the meantime, we've been working with NCOS to develop a draft atlas, which would essentially help us define the areas in the Gulf of Mexico that will be suitable for aquaculture and reduce risk to interactions with other species, as well as other industries, and we expect to begin developing a programmatic environmental impact statement for that work later this spring and into the summer, and that process will take several years. In the meantime, there is already new aquaculture opportunities being considered, and decisions will be reached on that probably by this summer, around the country.

The only other things I will note is one project and one, I guess, good-news story. I did receive, today, news about a sixteenth mom-calf pair for North Atlantic right whales, and so it has been a better-than-expected calving season for North Atlantic right whales. Unfortunately, we also had one of those calves struck and killed by a vessel near St. Augustine just a few weeks back, and so things are at least looking up a little bit for North Atlantic right whales after a number of tough years and numerous entanglements and deaths.

Then the last thing is that, beyond fisheries, our office works on a lot of habitat and protected resources issues, some of which you hear about and some of which you don't, and one of the main projects in the Southeast is the Port Everglades maintenance and deepening project, which would deepen and expand the entrance channel to Port Everglades.

Obviously, from a council perspective, it should be of interest to you. There's lots of coral and coral habitat surrounding that port deepening project, and so our habitat and protected resources teams have been working extensively with the Army Corps and others to develop strategies to mitigate or minimize the impacts associated with that project, and we just recently provided extensive input on an environmental impact statement for Port Everglades. I will stop there and ask if there's any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Andy. Obviously, there's a lot going on, and you stepped in as Acting at a busy time, but it's always busy, and I guess Roy is now my retirement hero, and he might be doing it right. Any questions for Andy about anything going on at the Regional Office? I am not seeing any hands, but, Andy, listen. Thank you so much for your participation in the meeting. It's been great having you, and you've contributed an awful lot, and we appreciate that, and we've enjoyed having you in this capacity.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel.

MR. BELL: If there are no other questions for Andy, we'll move along to the Science Center, which would be Clay.

DR. PORCH: I don't have much to tell you that Andy hasn't already, and so thank you for that, Andy. I will tell you that our organization realignment is nearly complete, and so we're completely changing the organizational structure of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center from a more geographic alignment to a matrixed alignment, with functional supervisory structure, and what that means is, instead of having multiple laboratories act fairly independently and do overlapping things, we're reorganizing so that we have supervisors who are experts in their field supervising

activities that are aligned with their field, and so we hope that will be much more efficient, and that's particularly true with our OMI teams, who do the IT and management and budget and that sort of thing, and so we've centralized that, in an effort to make things more efficient.

We also have just about completed our strategic implementation plan, and so I think you all are familiar with the geographic strategic plan, which is basically the frontend of a strategic plan that describes what our main priorities are, but then there's the whole implementation side of it, and the Center has never had a strategic implementation plan, and now we do, and we expect it to be fully operational in the next few months.

Other than, we're just navigating around some changes in our budget and trying to make sure we can cover all the core activities and dealing with all the impacts of COVID-19. None of our facilities are open right now, and they're all in what we call Phase Zero, which basically means that nobody can go into the building without special permission, and then we have to take a lot of precautions, and so, basically, that's reaffirming what I told you during the COVID presentation that I made. Hopefully, there is an end in sight, but, right now, we just don't know when we'll actually be able to get into the facilities and operate more efficiently, and I will leave it at that for the Southeast Center.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Clay. We always appreciate your contributions, and it's a big help. Any questions for Clay about anything going on Science-Center-wise? I don't see any questions. All right. Thanks, guys. Now what we will do is shift to the United States Coast Guard, and I assuming that Lieutenant Copeland is unmuted and onboard with us here.

LT. COPELAND: Good morning. I'm here. Thank you very much for your time, for this whole week. At this time, I don't have anything to further to pass, other than what's already been stated by my fellow federal agencies. I look forward to the next meeting, and thanks again for having me. If there are any questions, but that's all I have.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you. Any questions for the Coast Guard? I don't see any, and so, technically, I guess we covered NOAA OLE yesterday, and so unless there's anything else that Pat needs to present to us today, I think we're covered. That would take us to state reports. What I would like to do is start from the north and work south, because the FWC actually has something that we're going to put on the screen, and so, Steve, if you would like to start from North Carolina, that would be great.

MR. POLAND: Yes, sir. Like a few of those that went before me, I agree that we've had a very long and productive meeting this week, and so I will not do anything to delay its conclusion any longer than I have to. I will just hit some of the high points from our Marine Fisheries Commission meeting last week that might be of interest to partners in the region.

A lot of our Marine Fisheries meeting last week was around southern flounder management. Our Marine Fisheries Commission, at a previous meeting, requested that the division provide some information on allocation of the southern flounder fishery. We do not allocate, or typically allocate, fisheries in our state, and so this is kind of a new and novel thing for our southern flounder fishery management plan. A presentation was provided, and discussion, and the commission ultimately decided to move forward with a 70/30 sector allocation for southern flounder, 70 percent

commercial and 30 percent recreational, and this is roughly equivalent to historic landings in that fishery.

It was important for the commission to provide input on their desired allocation plan, so the division could continue work on Southern Flounder Amendment 3, and that amendment includes a broad range of management issues, including things like modifying slot limits and size limits and looking at commercial and recreational trip and bag limits.

A big item in this amendment is looking at the creation of a recreational ocellated flounder season, and so, basically, regulating flounder based on ocellatus on the skin, which denotes summer flounder versus southern flounder, and that's something that we've heard from the fishing public here in North Carolina, that they would still like to have access to the summer flounder, especially out in the ocean, under our current restrictive flounder management, and we typically don't manage flounder at the species level in the state, and so this is considering a change to that.

Other items in the amendment include looking at inlet corridors to allow further escapement of flounder during certain times of the year and looking at just modifying our adaptive management procedures for this species, and so, as the stock continues to grow and rebound, we can take more adaptive action to modify things like bag limit and size limit, and this is pretty much analogous to what we utilize at the council through like frameworks and such.

Other items discussed at the commission meeting included a request from the commission to consider rulemaking for circle hooks statewide. A couple of meetings ago, they asked the division to draft rule language to require the use of 2/0 or larger circle hooks state-wide when fishing with natural bait, and the agency provided draft rule language and information to the commission for their discussion, and, after a considerable amount of discussion, they eventually decided to not move forward with rulemaking on mandatory circle hook requirements and rather investigate hooking requirements and other modifications to tackle and release gears at a species-by-species level in our fishery management plans.

Lastly, from the commission, they initiated rulemaking to complement SMZ restrictions at our state artificial reefs, state reefs in ocean waters, and that rule is moving forward, and so, outside of the commission, the only thing I have to update from the division is I can't recall if, at the December meeting, if it was public or not, but our Division Director, Steve Murphy, has retired. He retired at the end of January, and we are currently advertising -- Or I think the advertisement period is closed, but we are currently recruiting a new Director for the Division of Marine Fisheries. We have an acting director in place, and, as soon as I know who our new director is, I will certainly introduce him to the council and our friends in the region, and that's all I have to report.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Steve. Any questions for Steve? Steve, I'm going to do mine next, but we manage flounder the same way you guys do, and it's just three main species of paralicthyid flounder, and so some of what you described there, some of the work that you guys may be doing on ID stuff, would be helpful. We will probably get up with you. Okay.

MR. POLAND: After that, Mel, Julia updated the council on the Catch U Later app that DMF is working with the council and the ACCSP on, and one of the purposes of that app is to collect information on the different paralicthyid species in the state and information on the accuracy of

fishermen identifying between ocellated and non-ocellated flounder, and certainly, once information comes in through that app, we would be more than willing to share it, and it might be an interesting topic for one of our seminars, even though it doesn't necessarily touch on council-managed species, but certainly it is something that our Citizen Science Program has spent a lot of time working with the state on.

MR. BELL: Right. Good point. Thanks for reminding me of that. Okay. From South Carolina, we've been dealing with the COVID situation, just like most of you all, and we've actually had a number of operations that we've kept going, or had to keep going, like our licensing and permitting office, and the statistics folks have been pretty much operating since day-one, and we've had to be creative, in terms of getting VPNs for people and doing some stuff from home, but we actually have had our license office reopened to the public, as of the first week of July, and so that's just something we've been able to do, but we still have to run things under tight protocols, in terms of access to buildings and things.

Field operations, obviously, were impacted mostly, like Clay was describing yesterday, and we deal with a lot of similar challenges to vessels, and we have adapted various protocols for different sized field parties, and, depending on vessel size, we're able to actually get a number of our programs back, the monitoring programs and the sampling programs, back in place, but the big challenge has been overnight trips on larger vessels, and that's something we haven't quite gotten back into yet, but we hope to soon, but we've maximized our day operations as much as we can.

This is something of interest for us, and the MARMAP and SEAMAP, of course, has been impacted by the lack of overnight trips, but they are planning to start reef fish cruises, pending guidance from senior leadership in the DNR Marine Division, as soon as we can develop safe protocols, and we hope to get back to sea for overnights, and so we're looking forward to that as soon as we can.

They have basically finished processing all ages and reproductive samples from SEFIS, and they are catching up with the remaining samples, including historical backlog, and they're on track with all of that, and so we've been able to access our buildings and labs, under strict protocols, and so some of the challenges I know that NOAA is facing were buildings are just completely off-limits, and we've been able to kind of -- Just due to different protocols in place, we've been able to do that, but, if we had to take equipment home and stuff, we would be doomed as well, and so we've been able to keep some things going.

The reef fish staff, of course, are involved in all the ongoing things that we're involved in here with stock assessments, and so you'll see a lot of names that you recognize from MARMAP associated with stock assessments.

We closed our shrimp season at the end of January, and, so far, knock on wood, it's March, and we haven't had a severe winter event, and so I think we're going to be okay, and so, right now, our initial sampling from our crustacean monitoring section indicates that we've got good numbers of white shrimp insider. As long as we can keep them alive and let them grow, then we should be in pretty good shape, and so I think we're past the window for severe winter events, and so that's good, and that is something that the council does -- Through the council's Shrimp Management Plan, we have been involved in responding to federal-waters closures in times when that has happened.

The artificial reef program has got various construction projects underway, as materials are available, and they, of course, are having issues with field operations a little bit, but, because we use these smaller boats and field parties, they're able to get things done. We hope to have a possible addition later this year, based on support from the folks that have supported us before in the deepwater marine protected area artificial reefs, and so, at this point, the Governor's Cup Billfishing folks are raising funds to try to get more material out on that deepwater MPA reef, and so, if it all works out well, we hope to do that towards the end of the year.

We do not have a commission, but we have a general assembly, and they are in session right now, and there are a couple of different flounder bills related to southern flounder issues floating through the general assembly, and I'm not sure how that's going to work out, but that's progress, and we have one bill that almost passed last year, but it kind of ran on the rocks because of COVID, and it's our cobia bill, and so this is simply to just help us realign completely with the ASMFC management plan requirements, but, so far, it has sailed through like it did last year, and we just got -- The whole general assembly schedule got derailed last year, because of COVID. That's about it for us. Pending any questions from you all, that concludes my presentation. I am not seeing any hands. All right. Then we will shift on down the road to Georgia then.

DR. BELCHER: Georgia, just quick for you all, we've been rocking right along. Obviously, we didn't lose a lot of time to COVID, and that still continues, and all of our surveys are pretty much up and running. They're still operating under all of their guidelines, as stated through the CDC, and our CARES money -- The first round of money, we ended up putting out \$1.5 million of the \$1.9 million that we received, and so we still have some additional funds that we're waiting to get some guidance on how we want to redistribute that, whether we just go ahead and wait until the next round comes out, or should we be looking at a different time window besides those initial three months that we were looking at. We're still waiting on that, to find out what is the best way forward for us.

Our 2013 disaster funds, we're still working on getting that out, and that's kind of been an interesting process, because ASMFC was the one to help us with those CARES distribution checks, and we're working through our own Atlanta office to do the 2013, which we have kind of hit a little bit of muddy water, and probably quicksand it feels like some days, because of the semantics of having to set these folks up as vendors in our system, as opposed to just being able to write some checks, and that has to do with the tax status that goes with it, and they have to fill out the W-9s, and there is a whole other realm of things that are in the financial office that I don't think any of us saw coming. Those are moving forward, and we've got the funds available, and they were actually given to us earlier this month, and so that's the one good thing.

For 2018, we're working on some outside-of-the-box ideas just besides direct payouts, and so we're kind of getting all of our ducks in a row, to prevent that, in our spend plan, and we're kind of excited about the opportunities that we're putting forward, and we will divulge more as we get a thumbs-up from everybody to move on.

The Golden Ray, not much has changed. I would love to tell you that we're like halfway through, and we're not. The third cut, they ended up with issues. It's right at the engine room area, and so it's been having all kinds of issues with breakage, and so they have decided to move forward and start back at the bow and do what would have been the fourth cut. The barge is due to come in

here in the next week, and they will hopefully resume cutting before too long on that. We're hoping that they will be done before hurricane season, but we'll see what happens.

Relative to our fisheries, whelk, we opened on January 1, and it will be closing on March 31. We're working jointly with folks in ASMFC to discuss whether or not they should be unified regulations across the states for this species, and, actually, it's a group of species for a lot of us, but their main concern is the channeled whelk, which, obviously, is not a big species for us in South Carolina and Georgia, and the knobbed whelk tends to be our number-one, as landed, but our fishery has pretty much all but dwindled down to nothing, and so I'm not sure how much the unified front will help with our fishery, but, if it helps the other fisheries, where they do have risk of overfishing and high pressure, by all means, we'll sit at the table with everybody.

Our jelly ball fishery has been kind of dormant, as the one processor we've got is changing his processing procedures. He had a facility in downtown Darien that is no longer there, and he moved, and they are having to work out some of the details of how processing is going to happen, and so state waters hadn't been requested to be opened in the last couple of years, but they required this year for the opening, which happened on February 26. It will also close on the 31<sup>st</sup> of March.

As far as shrimp, as of January 22, we had 2.31 million pounds, estimated at about \$11.4 million in value, which ended up being 23 percent above our five-year average for landings, and 15 percent above the five-year average for revenue. We were able to extend our season, and it will close automatically, unless we ask for the extension at the end of December, and we actually ended up extending it, with the idea of -- Last time, we set the date, when we start talking about the extension, but we were actually seeing some pretty healthy trend with it, and so we decided to keep it an open-ended closure. We can extend through the end of February, and so we let the boat go out and do the assessment in the middle of January, and, at that point, we were starting to see enough of a change that we decided to close at the end of January, and so our inshore waters have been closed since the 31<sup>st</sup>.

Then the last fishery that is maybe of interest is just dealing with the bluefish. Doug is still working with ASMFC and the Mid-Atlantic, with discussions about *de minimis* and the effects, and so we are still working under a temporary measure, where we're actually closing our state waters for two months, which meets the requirements under conservation equivalency of the reductions that we would need to make, and then, depending on the outcome of *de minimis*, we will either formalize a season or discuss what options we have going forward, if we don't end up with a *de minimis* path on that, and that's pretty much all that's been going on here, and so are there questions from folks?

MR. BELL: Thanks, Carolyn. Does anybody have any questions? If we had met in person in Georgia, we might all could have got a good deal on a used car, and I heard Doug has got a bunch of them in the lot there with low mileage and minor scrapes.

DR. BELCHER: They all pull to the right real bad though.

MR. BELL: Yes. Okay. I don't see any hands up, Carolyn, and so thanks so much, and you reminded me that we've been dealing with the CARES stuff too, and we've managed to work through CARES 1, and now we're facing CARES 2, son of CARES. Okay. That brings us down to Florida. Jessica, I believe we have something we're going to bring up for you all.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and thank you. I want to talk a little bit about something that our commission just passed. You might remember, if you've been on the council for a while, that, when the council discussed changes to mutton snapper regulations, and that was a joint amendment with the Gulf Council, and the FWC was working on it as well, and we had a number of joint workshops on this topic.

One of the hot topics during the mutton snapper discussion was a location, and you can see it there off of Key West, and it is called Western Dry Rocks, and it's a multispecies spawning aggregation, but, when the councils were talking about it, they were talking about it particularly to mutton, which is one of the main species that is spawning there, and the council had -- This area is in state waters, and so you can see it's ten miles southwest of Key West, and the council, particularly the South Atlantic Council, had written a letter to the FWC asking for a complete closure, or, at the very least, a seasonal closure of Western Dry Rocks.

Also, more recently, you might remember that Western Dry Rocks has come up as part of the discussion through the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, and the sanctuary was suggesting an area, and I will show you the difference between their area and the FWC area, but they were suggesting closures at Western Dry Rocks as well, and, when FWC commented to the sanctuary, we said, hey, it's in state waters, and it is fishing related, and let's let us take this item up and see if we can do some rulemaking on this.

A little bit more about this area, and so there are two boxes shown here on the screen, and there's a red box and a black box, and the red box is the area that the sanctuary put forward, and you can see it's a little bit bigger than the area that FWC put forward there, and FWC's box is the black box, and this is a one-square-mile area, and, technically, this area is called Boca Grande Bar, but a lot of people refer to it as Western Dry Rocks, and Western Dry Rocks is actually an area a little bit to the north and east of this, but people call this area Western Dry Rocks.

This slide is showing that there's a number of fishing boats, and you can see that they line up in areas where various species are known to spawn, particularly mutton snapper, black grouper, gray snapper, permit, and the two biggies that we were talking about at our commission were mutton and permit.

The commission ultimately passed a closure in this one-square-mile area at their most recent commission meeting, which was last Friday, and the closure is from April through July, and this will be in place for April of 2021, and the rule also included a sunset provision after seven years, but, if you will scroll forward a little bit, I want to show you -- This is just showing some oceanographic currents and how larvae spawned at Western Dry Rocks are distributed throughout the Keys, and so we'll just move forward a little bit more.

This is a table, and we like to call it the ketchup-and-mustard chart, because you've got the red and you've got the orange here, and you can see the April-through-July window that the commission ultimately took final action on last Friday, and you can see the various species that are spawning there, and so the four-month closure will really get to the heart of the spawning season for permit as well as the snapper season, and a little bit of the grouper, but grouper are already closed, through federal regulations, during the January, February, March time period.

I just wanted to put that out there, and this was something that the South Atlantic Council had asked FWC to address, and it was particular to mutton at the time, and then it came up again through the sanctuary, and the FWC took this up, and we did public workshops, and we have been talking about this for about five or six months or so, and they did take final action on this last week, and so I just wanted to put that out there.

Then one more item is, at the FWC's upcoming May commission meeting, I want to let the council members know that they will also be taking up goliath grouper again and considering whether or not they want to allow some type of limited harvest opportunity for state waters, and so that will be coming up again in May. We are trying to hold that May FWC meeting in person, but I guess there is a possibility that that meeting would be virtual as well, and so I'm going to stop there, with those two biggies, those two big items, and see if there's any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Any questions about those two biggies from FWC? The goliath discussions will be interesting, and we heard a little bit about comments on warsaw at our public comment. I am not seeing any hands, Jessica. Did you have anything else?

MS. MCCAWLEY: No, I'm good. That May commission meeting, whether it's in-person or whether it's virtual, you should be able to watch that meeting through the Florida Channel, and so, if you guys want to tune in and observe that discussion, there will be an opportunity for that.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you. With no further questions, we'll move along. Two things. one is I know John, I think, was going to discuss upcoming meetings, and we have that at the end, but I had one little thing to mention under Other Business, and it doesn't need to take any time, but is there any other Other Business that needs to come before the council at this point? All right. I don't see any other Other Business or hands raised, and so, really quickly, the one item that I just wanted you to think about has really got to do with meeting flow and when we do things.

This came up originally when we were still in the actual meeting together world, but David Whitaker and I were talking about this, and it was really an observation from him, was that the information we get from the different states or the federal entities, kind of at the tail-end of the meeting, a lot of times there's some really interesting stuff in there that, if we were -- Particularly, if we were together in a hotel for a week, you would have time to hear about what's going on, and it stimulates ideas and questions, and you have time to interact with those people from the different groups throughout the week and learn a little more, and maybe -- Because I heard some things today that I was like I've got to get with staff and get them to talk to folks.

The idea was, since we start out -- We've been starting out with a Full Council session, and one idea would be that we could kind of reorganize things a little bit, and maybe we do those initial agency -- State agency and federal agency briefs at the very beginning, not taking a lot of time, and, also, we could have anything that folks wanted to put down in a written form and actually submit it a little ahead of time, and we could have it as attachments in the briefing binder, but it would just enable us to perhaps have a little more exchange and discussion, and, again, it probably works better in the actual meeting world, which we're going back to, but it's just something to think about.

That's something the council senior leadership can kind of jimmy around with the schedule or whatever, but I just wanted to see -- I think a number of us have talked about it, and we've seen

some benefits to that, and I would just throw that out at you, to see -- Again, the idea would be -- One of the concerns is we don't want to get too bogged-down in it at the beginning of the meeting, because you know we always pile a lot on the meetings, but the idea would be to maybe do that upfront, and then we're also not in a rush at the tail-end to just kind of say a few things and catch a flight, which none of us have to worry about flights right now I guess, but so I would just throw that out there as something we're thinking about.

If you have any thoughts about that, if you think that might be useful -- Again, it probably has more utility for actually physically meeting together, but that was my only little bit of Other Business, was to just throw that out to you and see if anybody had any thoughts on that. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I like the idea, and I would even take it a step further and say you do some at the beginning and then, sort of in between committee meetings, you could even have some different stuff kind of downloaded, because sometimes we take a few minutes in between setting up for the different committee meetings, and that might be an opportunity for someone to give a report, and then you're not sort of downloading all this information into your brain in one shot, which certainly I agree with you that, at the end of the meetings, it can be quite hard to focus and absorb.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, thanks for that. Any other comments or thoughts on the concept? It isn't anything that we've got to vote on or do right now, but it's just ideas to maybe make it flow better. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I am giving you a virtual thumbs-up, since I can't give you a physical thumbs-up.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, it will be great when we can do physical thumbs-up again, and all the sidebar conversations that we have to have via text now, and that's complicated, because I'm a text troglodyte. All right. Well, that was it, in terms of Other Business. If nobody has any other thoughts on that, it may be something that you notice that we jimmy around with the schedule a little bit in the future, and, again, I'm looking forward to being able to actually meet physically together. All right. Well, John, if you wanted to cover whatever it is that we need to discuss about upcoming meetings, and that's the only thing we have left on the agenda.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Sure, Mel. I would be glad to, and so I will say you have the document there that gives a summary of the meetings that are coming up, and so I won't review everything there, but I do want to tell you a little bit about how we're trying to use this. I will highlight and get in another plug to mark your calendars for the webinar meeting that we're going to have on the 29<sup>th</sup>, from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m., to receive a presentation from NMFS on the Climate Executive Order and to provide them some feedback, and I would say provide some comments, in anticipation of us likely sending a formal letter of comment to NMFS on that, and so that's the 29<sup>th</sup>, the end of the month, from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m.

The next day, the 30<sup>th</sup>, will be the red snapper diet seminar, and I think this is going to be really interesting, using DNA to figure out what's in the gut, and it seems like a pretty fascinating advancement in the DNA sciences, and so I think that's going to be a pretty interesting seminar.

Then, as you go through this, you see all the various AP meetings and other things that are penciled in here, and there are some meetings that are listed just as TBD, and we're still trying to figure out the best dates, in some cases, for those APs to get together, but we're including them on here so that it can really help your planning process. I know that, often, as council members, you may get a comment or something from a fisherman, or they contact you and wonder when is an AP meeting or something, and so this at least gives you a chance to look and see everything that we have on the docket now for the year, so you can look at that and see if something is planned, and, if not, then, if there's a topic, then certainly let us know, and we'll figure out if an AP does need to meet.

I will also point out that we've expanded this a little bit beyond the year, to include the 2022 council meetings, the dates and the planned locations, and, again, this is just trying to get in here some of the questions that we get more often, especially about exactly which place we're going to be for our future meetings, and so I think we move around more in Florida and North Carolina, and so we're hoping that this will help with your planning process as well, to know where we are.

Who knows, and maybe you want to plan a week of family vacation before or after we're down in Key West or something, and so hopefully this gives you an advance look at what's coming up and helps in your planning process, and so, with those few navigational notes, Mel, and looking at the time, I will be glad to take any questions on any of these items. Otherwise, I think that about wraps it up.

MR. BELL: All right, and I really appreciate this document. It kind of helps you -- It's sort of your year at a glance, and all of us have pretty complex schedules, and so I do appreciate that. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Can you remind me, on March 30, what time the seminar is?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Is it 2:00, Chip?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and it's projected to be 2:00 to 3:30.

MR. BELL: All right. Any other questions about this document or for John at this point? All right. If there's nothing else that needs to come before the council, and nothing else to discuss, this is the part where we say goodbye, and the roadies start tearing things down, but the roadies have been out of business for a while, and so, anyway, thanks so much, everybody. You did a great job. There was a lot of hard work, and we dealt with a number of issues, and I just really appreciate everybody cooperating and working together, and so that's all I have, and so we are officially adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 5, 2021.)

- - -

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

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
April 16, 2021

# SAFMC March Council Meeting

## Attendee Report: (3/01/21 - 3/05/21)

Report Generated:

03/05/2021 07:38 AM EST

**Webinar ID**

663-361-235

**Actual Start Date/Time**

03/04/2021 07:53 AM EST

<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>
BRANTLEY	WILLIAM
BYRD	01JULIA
Bailey	Adam
Bauer	Tracey
Beckwith	00Anna
Belcher	00Carolyn
Bell	00Mel
Bellavance	Rick
Bianchi	Alan
Bonura	Vincent
Brame	Richen
Brouwer	01Myra
Brown	Julie
Bubley	Walter
Burgess	Erika
Carmichael	01John
Cathey	Drew
Caycedo	Mario
Cheshire	Rob
Christiansen	00kyle
Clarke	Lora
Conklin	00Chris
Copeland	Robert
Cox	Derek
DOVER	MILES
DeLizza	Richard
DeVictor	Rick
DiLernia	00Anthony
Dukes	Amy
Dunn	Russell
Errigo	01Mike
Finch	Margaret
Foor	Brandon
Foss	Kristin
Franco	Dawn
Gentry	Lauren

Glasgow	Dawn
Godwin	Joelle
Gore	Karla
Gray	Alisha
Grimes	00Shepherd
Griner	Tim
Guyas	Martha
Hadley	01John
Hart	Hannah
Hawes	Rachel
Haymans	00-Doug
Helies	Frank
Hemilright	Dewey
Hoke	David
Horton	Chris
Howington	Kathleen
Hudson	Russell
Hull	James
Iberle	01Allie
Iverson	Kim
Jepson	Michael
Karnauskas	Mandy
Kellison	Todd
Klasnick	01Kelly
LARKIN	Michael
Laks	Ira
Laney	Reid Wilson
Lee	Jennifer
Lowther	Alan
Malinowski	Richard
Marhefka	00Kerry
McCawley	00-Jessica
McCoy	Sherylanne
McGovern	Jack
McPherson	Matthew
Mehta	Nikhil
Merten	Wessley
Minch	Robin
Neer	Julie
Nesslage	Genny
O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Paffrath	Madison
Perkinson	Matt
Petersen	Andrew
Porch	00Clay
Prostko	Rachel
Pugliese	01Roger

Pulver	Jeff
Ralston	Kellie
Reichert	Marcel
Reynolds	Jon
Rhodes	01Cameron
Runde	Brendan
Sanchez	John
Sanchez	Joseph
Sapp	00Art
Schmidtke	01Michael
Scott	Tara
Sedberry	George
Seward	McLean
Shervanick	Kara
Simpson	Julie
Sinkus	Wiley
Smart	Tracey
Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Smith	Duane
Snyder	Ashley
Spurgin	Kali
Stam	Geoff
Stemle	Adam
Stephen	Jessica
Strelcheck	Andy
Surrency	Ron
Sweetman	CJ
TARVER	TIM
Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Travis	Michael
Vetter	Thomas
Walia	Matthew
Walter	John
Wamer	David
Waters	James
Whitaker	David
White	Geoff
Wiegand	01Christina
Williams	Erik
Willis	Michelle
Woodward	00Spud
berry	james (Chip)
brewer	00chester
colby	barrett
collier	01chip
crosson	scott
gloeckner	david

moss  
poland  
thomas  
vara

david  
00steve  
01suz  
mary

# SAFMC March Council Meeting

## Attendee Report: (3/01/21 - 3/05/21)

Report Generated:

03/05/2021 01:15 PM EST

**Webinar ID**

663-361-235

**Actual Start Date/Time**

03/05/2021 07:58 AM EST

<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>
BYRD	01JULIA
Bailey	Adam
Beal	00Bob
Beasley	Michelle
Beckwith	00Anna
Belcher	00Carolyn
Bell	00Mel
Bianchi	Alan
Brame	Richen
Brouwer	01Myra
Carmichael	01John
Chaya	01Cindy
Christiansen	00kyle
Clarke	Lora
Conklin	00Chris
Copeland	Robert
Cox	Derek
Dale	David
DeVictor	Rick
DiLernia	00Anthony
Errigo	01Mike
Finch	Margaret
Foor	Brandon
Foss	Kristin
Franco	Dawn
Gentry	Lauren
Godwin	Joelle
Gore	Karla
Gray	Alisha
Grimes	00Shepherd
Griner	Tim
Guyas	Martha
Hadley	01John
Harrison	BeBe
Hawes	Rachel
Haymans	00-Doug

Helies	Frank
Hemilright	Dewey
Horton	Chris
Howington	Kathleen
Hudson	Russell
Iberle	01Allie
Iverson	Kim
Jepson	Michael
Kellison	Todd
Krikstan	Catherine
LARKIN	Michael
Laks	Ira
Marhefka	00Kerry
McCawley	00-Jessica
McGovern	Jack
Meehan	Sean
Mehta	Nikhil
Mendez	Natasha
Minch	Robin
Neer	Julie
Nesslage	Genny
O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Paffrath	Madison
Porch	00Clay
Prostko	Rachel
Pugliese	01Roger
Pulver	Jeff
Ralston	Kellie
Records	David
Reichert	Marcel
Rhodes	01Cameron
Riley	Rick
Runde	Brendan
Sanchez	John
Sapp	00Art
Schmidtke	01Michael
Seward	McLean
Simpson	Julie
Sinkus	Wiley
Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Smith	Duane
Snyder	Ashley
Spurgin	Kali
Stemle	Adam
Stephen	Jessica
Strelcheck	Andy
Sweetman	CJ

Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Travis	Michael
Walia	Matthew
Walter	John
Wamer	David
Waters	James
White	Geoff
Wiegand	01Christina
Williams	Erik
Woodward	00Spud
Wyanski	David
brewer	00chester
collier	01chip
crosson	scott
poland	00steve
sminkey	thomas
thomas	01suz
vara	mary