

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL SESSION II

Webinar

September 16-17, 2021

TRANSCRIPT

Council Members

Mel Bell, Chair
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Tom Roller
Laurilee Thompson

Stephen Poland, Vice Chair
Chester Brewer
LT Robert Copeland
Judy Helmey
Jessica McCawley
Andy Strelcheck
Spud Woodward

Council Staff

Myra Brouwer
John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
John Hadley
Allie Iberle
Kelly Klasnick
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Suz Thomas

Julia Byrd
Cindy Chaya
Dr. Judd Curtis
Kathleen Howington
Kim Iverson
Dr. Julie Neer
Cameron Rhodes
Nick Smillie
Christina Wiegand

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick DeVictor
Dewey Hemilright
Dr. Genny Nesslage
Dr. Clay Porch
Rick Bellavance
Trish Murphey

Bob Gill
Dr. Jack McGovern
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Monica Smit-Brunello
Duane Smith

Additional attendees and invited participants are attached.

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Thursday, September 16, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: I will call this session of Full Council, Full Council Session II, to order. I know we had already approved the agenda for the first session, but are there any changes to the second session of Full Council that we need to address? I know we will try to remember to add, probably tomorrow, Cameron and Kim's outreach presentation, and then there were a couple of things that we rolled into tomorrow, into the Snapper Grouper part, that we didn't get to, and so I think we're in good shape. I don't see any hands, and so then let's get rolling with the first item, which is Council Chair and Vice Chair Election. I will hand the floor over to the Executive Director to run the Chair election.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. First, we'll elect the Chair, and then I will hand it over to the new Chair, and they will handle the election of the Vice Chair. The first question is are there any nominations for Chair?

MS. MARHEFKA: John, I will say that it is my sincere honor and pleasure to nominate our current Chair, Mel Bell, for the position of Chair of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Kerry. Are there any other nominations?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I will second the nomination, and I move that the floor be closed to nominations for Chair and that Mr. Bell be appointed by acclamation.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Jessica. Are there any objections to the motion? Hearing none, and seeing no hands, Mr. Bell, you are elected Chair. Congratulations on another term, and I will now hand the floor back to you.

MR. BELL: Thank you, I think. I will admit, if people can remember back to 1968, I had one of those LBJ moments, where I was wondering about this, and so thank you. Next is the election of the Vice Chair, and I open the floor for nominations.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, it is my honor and pleasure to nominate Carolyn Belcher for the position of Vice Chair of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Spud. Are there any other nominations?

MR. POLAND: Chairman Bell, I will second the nomination, and I move that the floor be closed to nominations for Vice Chair and that Dr. Belcher be appointed by acclamation.

MR. BELL: All right. Are there any objections to the motion? Seeing none, Dr. Belcher is elected Vice Chair. Congratulations, Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, I think.

MR. BELL: All right. We'll be fine. Thanks, guys. All right. Let's get into the agenda items here, and so, first, we're going to have a multiple-presentation coverage of protected resources. Up first would be Christina and John, dealing with the integration agreement.

MS. WIEGAND: Absolutely, and so we wanted to go back over the integration agreement that the council has with the NMFS Protected Resources Division in the Southeast, for two reasons. First, because we do have a bi-op that's getting underway for the dolphin wahoo fishery that Jenny Lee will go over a little bit later, and because there was some recent discussion at the CCC meeting regarding the procedural directive that ultimately led that integration agreement.

If you guys can think all the way back to 2015, you will remember that NMFS released a policy directive called "Integration of Endangered Species Act Section 7 with Magnuson-Stevens Act Processes". To sort of briefly summarize that, the directive is based on recommendations that came out of a working group, which included the CCC, on how to improve involvement of the fishery management councils in the ESA, Endangered Species Act, Section 7 consultation process, particularly when the fishing activity in question was going to be governed by council FMPs or it may affect endangered or threatened species or habitat that is under NMFS' jurisdiction.

That directive provided guidance on the development of the integration agreement between fisheries councils and the NMFS regional offices, which we do have, but, before I dive into the specifics of that integration agreement, I did want to turn your attention to Attachment 1b, which is the letter that the CCC wrote to Sam Rauch, the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, and, most importantly, it sort of detailed the experiences that the regional councils have had with protected resources and the Section 7 consultation process, and, based on those experiences, provided the recommendations that you see here on the screen.

With that, I will let John Carmichael, as well as Mel, who would have been at this meeting, provide you with any additional information or answer any questions about what happened during the CCC meeting that led to this letter.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Sure, Christina. Thanks, and I think you pretty well summed it up, and the letter does as well, is just that there's been just ongoing discussion with NMFS about these different things, and so issues were raised by some other councils, and I think the West Pacific perhaps was leading that, just about how the councils are interacting with Endangered Species, and they had reached out to all the councils to find out the types of experiences that other councils had with dealing with bi-ops and endangered species issues, and that led us to really recall this agreement that we had and to think that we should probably refresh that in the minds of the council and look at if we need to make some changes in it.

For one thing, we don't have the Protected Resources Committee now, and we do things through Full Council, and that's allowed, and so that's not really a major change, but the most important thing, obviously, is just reminding the council of this and trying to get some feedback from the council on how engaged you want to be on the different bi-ops and interactions with ESA and Protected Resources.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, that's a good summary. Any questions for John? I don't see any hands.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Well, if there are no questions, I can dive into the specifics of our ESA-MSA agreement with the Southeast Regional Office. Scrolling into this, one of the things that I would really like to focus on today is council involvement in formal consultations, and so,

once a consultation has been reinitiated, the council is notified about whether that's due to potential council action or due to external factors, such as a change in species listing or critical habitat or new scientific information in exceedance of the incidental take statement, et cetera.

At that meeting, where the council is notified that formal consultation needs to be reinitiated, they can discuss, with input from the Regional Office and NOAA GC, the level of involvement requested for the consultation. This hasn't been something that we've really delved into a lot, but, given that the dolphin wahoo bi-op is getting ready to get going, and we have some new council members, this seemed like an appropriate time to dig a little bit into these different levels of involvement that the council can request.

The first is Involvement 1, and this is sort of the status quo. The council receives status updates on the consultation at each council meeting, which you guys have been getting. If you remember, Jenny Lee is here every single meeting, during Full Council, to give you a protected resources update, and that update always includes information on any Section 7 consultations that are underway or may be beginning. That Level 1 involvement, again, is status quo, and it's not really anticipated to sort of slow the completion of the biological opinion.

The next level of involvement is Level II, and it includes everything from Level I, and, in addition, SERO, PRD, or the Protected Resources Division, can request information from the council on fishing practices, landings, other information, which may be helpful in developing the biological opinion, and, in certain situations, the council may wish to provide specific information to NMFS. This may result in a slight delay of the biological opinion, because it would require more time coming to the council.

Additionally, the council and PRD would agree on the expected timeline and delivery of the reasonable and prudent alternatives and measures. The council would review those alternatives and measures and provide input, but it is noted that review of those RPAs and RPMs by the council could delay the delivery of the biological opinion by at least three months, or approximately the time in between council meetings.

Under Involvement III, again, you get everything that you had with Level II involvement, and then, in addition, there would be agreement on the expected timeline and delivery of draft biological opinions. The council SSC would also review the draft biological opinion and provide input. Because the SSC only meets twice a year, it's thought that this could significantly delay the time to completion for the biological opinion, because there would need to be time for it to be presented to the SSC and also time for the Regional Office to respond to any recommendations or revisions to the analysis of the biological opinion.

MR. BELL: Christina, could you handle a question inserted at an appropriate point, if folks have a question, or do you want to get through the whole thing, or what's your preference?

MS. WIEGAND: This is a perfect time. I was actually going to pause here, because the rest of this really sort of gets into more detail about those different types of involvement and talks about how Protected Resources is involved in the IPT process, which they are, and they always provide analyses for all of our amendments, which you guys are familiar with, and so I will go ahead and pause here.

MR. BELL: Great. Laurilee, did you have a question?

MS. THOMPSON: I apologize. No, I don't. My iPad got pushed over on top of my keyboard again. I am so sorry.

MR. BELL: Okay. We're going to get you one of those little switch protectors, like they use to keep missiles from launching. Okay. All right. John has got something. What have you got, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Just a little bit, a little tweak, because it does affect, potentially, timing and how we deal with draft bi-ops, and it's the letter that was received from Sam Rauch and sent out - I think was it last week? It looks like I forwarded it around on the 14th, and so maybe that was this week, but, anyway, it's a response to one of the issues raised by the CCC, and it had to do with the councils getting access to the draft documents, and the recommendations of GC is that the council, and council staff is included in that, are essentially the same as the public, and so we cannot get any draft of the bi-ops until they have drafts that are ready to be publicly disseminated. The ruling is, essentially, that giving something to the council is equivalent to a public dissemination of information, and so that could affect the practical implementation of some of those timelines that are in there for those different levels, and that's just something to keep in mind.

MR. BELL: That's a good point. I guess, technically speaking, we're considered the public, but you can see how that might slow things down a little bit. All right. No other questions at this point from anyone? Okay. Christina, you can carry on.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. There wasn't much else in the document that I wanted to cover. Like I said, it also talks about the role of PRD staff on the IPT. Protected Resources staff regularly participate in our IPT, and it always includes analysis on how any actions may affect protected resources, and then the very last part just talks about the continuing agreement to update the council on protected resources issues at each council meeting, and that's, again, something we've been doing regularly. We always request information from the Regional Office, and Jenny is always happy to come to our council meetings and provide the information we've requested.

What I would like to do, if it's all right with you, Chair Bell, is to pause for a minute and let Jenny give you an update on where we stand with the dolphin wahoo bi-op. After she has given you an update, and you have an understanding of where we are, I think it would be helpful for the council to discuss the level of involvement they would like to have in that bi-op, keeping in mind that the council has a heavy workload, and that increasing involvement may also slow down the biological opinion.

Like John Carmichael just mentioned, there may be some residual issues with the ruling and the letter that was just sent to the councils regarding the considering giving the biological opinion to the councils and making it a public document, and so those are things to keep in mind, but, before we get into that discussion, I think it will be helpful for Jenny to give you guys some background on where the dolphin wahoo biological opinion currently stands.

MR. BELL: All right. That sounds great. Is Jenny onboard here?

MS. LEE: Yes, I am. Good afternoon. Because you have new council members, and it's been a while, to get everyone on the same page, at your request, I'm just going to briefly run through the consultation history and a little maybe preliminary assessment, to give you a feel for what might be coming.

Reinitiation of the Section 7 consultation on the Dolphin Wahoo FMP was actually initially requested by our Sustainable Fisheries Division, after several newly-listed species and listing revisions triggered the need, but, for us to formally initiate and start the clock, we have to have a complete initiation package, which essentially means that all the information on the proposed action in our action agency role details all the potential effects to species or its designated critical habitat.

The scope of this consultation will be the authorization of the dolphin and wahoo fishery through approval of the FMP and publication of regulations implementing a plan, including, as amended to-date, and then the proposed approval of and promulgation of regulations implementing Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10. For any of you that have been around the South Atlantic Council for a long time, maybe you had the pleasure of working with Margaret Murphy, back when she was on staff, and you recall she had prepared a biological assessment that was used for the first biological opinion.

The Sustainable Fisheries Division staff have been working to complete a new biological assessment, using that old one as a general guide and working on updating. I do have a copy of that draft, and I am working to assist and help in its completion and to evaluate if we have any additional data or analyses that we may need to request from our Center to work on the bi-op, but the take-home message, as Christina alluded to, is just that, really, we are now just getting moving, now that Amendment 10 is behind you and at the region, and so that's a little overview of just sort of where we are on the consultation.

Then just a little forward-looking, and what I can tell you, based on the draft bi-op, at least from my understanding of what I anticipate, and so the action area, of course, as you guys know, is the Atlantic EEZ, from Maine south to the eastern part of Florida. The draft biological assessment indicates that, of the species in the area, sea turtles, giant manta ray, our DPS for the scalloped hammerhead, and oceanic whitetip may be adversely affected through incidental capture in dolphin and wahoo fishing gear, and then sea turtles and giant manta rays may also be adversely affected if struck by a vessel in the fishery transiting to and from fishing grounds. Those are just kind of the potential effects anticipated.

You, of course, know that dolphin are primarily caught by trolling line or artificial bait near a floating object or over weeds, and so, because trolling involves moving bait relatively quickly, as opposed to leaving bait soaking in the water column, interactions with listed species are most likely very rare. Of course, we'll need to do that full analysis. Consequently, the small pelagic longline component of the fishery, and consideration of, again, the high-speed transiting vessels, those are the two potential effects, most likely, that result in some level of interaction.

Then you also know, through your recent work, that you do have -- The dolphin wahoo fishery is required, currently, to possess the same gear and handling and release requirements of HMS pelagic longline vessels, and they don't have the same hook requirements of the HMS pelagic longline fisheries, for reasons relative to target, potentially, and so I'm just trying to give you a

little idea of sort of the anticipated impact and kind of degree of significance of this consultation, and I think that's about all I have to say.

One thing I have discovered is that isn't a regulation requiring dolphin wahoo fishermen that use pelagic longline and do not have an HMS pelagic permit to take an observer, if selected, and so, as a result, we don't have observer data specific to those few vessels that exclusively fish for dolphin wahoo with longlines, and so we'll be looking at logbook data and considering other comparative data that we can use.

With that, I think that's about it, and so we're really just moving along here, and, regardless of, I guess, what level you opt for, I am happy to update you. I think the main reason why you haven't been hearing much on consultations is I haven't had a lot to report, in terms of progress on moving forward in active consultations, but I hope to have more for you soon.

MR. BELL: Well, thank you, Jenny. I appreciate that. Could you tell me a little bit about timing? What's the timing of the overall consultation? These things can take a while, obviously, but what's the -- How does this play out, on a timeline?

MS. LEE: Sure. As you know, the region is working on the dolphin wahoo package, and, most likely, when they have that ready to go, that would sort of be part of the initiation package, and then our actual -- Once we have the initiation package, a consultation is usually about 135 days, and so three or four months is kind of that timeframe, and so it depends on staffing and basically making sure that we have the information that we need to be able to complete the consultation.

MR. BELL: Okay, and I know, particularly for the folks that aren't state folks -- We work with different types of consultations, Section 7 stuff and all, and it's a process that does -- There's a lot of back-and-forth sometimes, and information, you need more information, and these things can take a little while, and that's why I was just -- For folks that aren't necessarily used to going through these, or in that world at all, just to kind of get a sense of how long things take. Any questions for Jenny? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thanks, Mel, and hi, Jenny. Thanks for that. I just had some questions, just trying to get my head around the timing of this, and so you said 135 days, and would that start from the time like Dolphin 10 is submitted, or is there some other point that says PR says, okay, now that has started?

MS. LEE: Well, really, it starts with that complete initiation package, and so I guess that is a PRD decision in terms of saying, okay, we have what we need, and, I mean, we're not sticklers on that, in terms of we know this is coming, and we're working as staff and moving forward with making sure that we have what we need.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. I've got you. Then so, if the council were to say pick this Involvement III, where it says that the council would ask the SSC to review the RPAs and RPMs, when would those -- When would RPAs and RPMs be available? I am just trying to get a sense of the timeline. If this 135 days starts in a month, you've got about four months. Is there time in there to fit this in, an SSC review?

MS. LEE: Well, it definitely would slow things down, as I think that document does indicate. I will say that, you know, the involvement of Level III is -- It's talking about an actual draft, and that guidance you just heard from Sam involves making sure it's basically a fully-cleared document, right, before it can be really released, and probably it's a Level II. I mean, before what we even have this document, what are able to do, more informally, rather than show you a draft, is just to give you an idea of the preliminary assessment indicates the extent of impacts, or here are our draft bycatch estimates that we're using in the bi-op, and then I think, again, with that Level II, it says we can share like we're in the middle of our consultation, and we're considering what reasonable and prudent measures may be appropriate.

Ideas that we are considering include, and share that way, versus have a document that is cleared and fully through, and so I find, if you're looking for input without delaying the consultation, there are things that can be done that will give you -- Personally, and I'm just going to say personally, but I think it will give you the information that you desire without an unnecessary review and bogging you down in perhaps -- In just timing of having -- Like I said, if it's an actual released draft and that kind of thing.

I apologize that I'm hesitant to say that here's exactly what will be done and that kind of stuff, but, with review and things that come up, it's just -- Personally, I am uncomfortable with having some on-record commitment of that, particularly because it's not just me, and it involves other people and the review and everything, but I do think, if you're interested in this, and I would add that the reasonable and prudent alternatives -- That would be if it were a jeopardy opinion, and, again, I certainly can't speculate, nor am I on the record saying that I'm really nervous about this.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Right. There's a lot of unknowns and known unknowns, and, no, I totally appreciate where you're coming from and trying to glance into the crystal ball and figure out how all of this is going to play out. I agree that just getting some sense of the RPAs, probably if the council were to choose say an Involvement II, is really the realistic approach not to think that we would have some formal draft that includes RPAs, because I just don't see that being very practical.

I guess I think that the council reviewing those -- There is an option that the council could get feedback from its SSC without having to go through the more formal SSC review that's proposed there in Involvement III. That's sort of my concern, I guess, as I look at this and hear what you say about the timing and the process. I guess I'm a little skeptical of Involvement III being very practical, and it would likely add considerable delay.

MS. LEE: I would just add that I would also consider -- I noted that, for the pelagic longline vessels that are dolphin wahoo exclusive, we don't have observer data, and so I think, when you're thinking about how much involvement you want, you want to be thinking about complex -- Do I think this is going to be something that warrants the time of our SSC or not, and how much review and consideration that will require their expertise, and I would give that some thought as well.

I did want to clarify, just because I know you all are so familiar with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and all the specific terms and definitions, but, for anybody listening right now, just the reasonable and prudent alternatives are only with jeopardy opinions, and it's an alternative that means something you have to do to get out of jeopardy.

Reasonable and prudent measures we have in all of our biological opinions, and those are reducing the impacts of the anticipated take, and so just keep that in mind, and I know, of course, this guidance here refers to both, because it's depending on whether it's a jeopardy opinion or not, but I just wanted to make sure that's clear, the distinction between those terms.

MR. BELL: Thank you. Andy, do you have something?

MR. STRELCHECK: I just wanted to add a little bit more perspective here, and so, with regard to the 135 days, I will readily acknowledge that the Regional Office right now has a significant backlog, and Jenny certainly does her best, as well as her Section 7 team, to turn consultations around as quickly as possible, but, a lot of times, we aren't able to meet those deadlines, just simply because of pressing workload and the amount of consultations coming in outstrips our capacity.

With that said, I think, from a council standpoint, my recommendation is to choose the lower or middle level of involvement. I think, from the standpoint of there is going to be something that's going to be complex, or controversial, or could result in some things that the council really does need to engage in more, that's an opportunity for me and Jenny and John Carmichael and others to be able to talk and figure out if the level of engagement is needed to be ramped up.

I think, based on what you've heard from Jenny over the time that she's presented to you today, as well as past meetings, I think she gives you a good assessment and read of kind of how the consultations and bi-ops are going and can also give you an idea of kind of if this more in the routine nature, the less complicated nature, and whether it's worth kind of spending a lot of time, effort, resources engaging in that, versus kind of letting the process proceed and not slowing it down through additional layers of review, and so that would be my advice, and it certainly can be kind of adaptive and dynamic with each and every consultation, but I see a lot of value in kind of getting a read of the complexity of the bi-op as it progresses and determining whether involvement needs to be scaled up, but starting from an area of lower involvement first.

MR. BELL: All right. Good points, Andy, and everything is not alike, and so, I mean, being able to kind of deal with different things that you're presented with and adjust accordingly makes sense. Okay. Any other questions for Jenny at this point? No hands. Then, Christina, where does that - - Do you pick this back up again, or what do we need to do next?

MS. WIEGAND: I have heard some discussion from Andy and John Carmichael already regarding sort of support for maybe Involvement II, but I guess what we're looking for next is either confirmation that that's the direction the council would like to go or discussion of other levels of involvement, and, really, we're just looking for direction to staff on what level of involvement you would like for the dolphin wahoo bi-op, specifically.

MR. BELL: All right. So specifically the dolphin wahoo. Well, I think John's comments about something at the II level made sense to me, and others may have some opinions here or not. Okay. Well, that's not much guidance for you, Christina.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, Mel, I guess I'm thinking what we've heard from past discussions of this, and what the council has said, I get a sense that the council would like to get some idea of what's going to be in the bi-op, RPAs, RPMs, et cetera, and to know how -- You know, sort of how it's coming along, which we do get.

MR. BELL: Right.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that, to me, sort of fits in an Involvement II, and then I totally feel like, depending on what we get for those -- You know, we have various expedited ways that we can get feedback on them from SSC advisors, et cetera, in time to potentially -- You know, if we get it in advance of the council meeting, we can get some feedback, and then the council can provide feedback at the meeting.

MR. BELL: Well, that makes sense. All right. Anybody have any other opinions or take on this? So we would, obviously, be involved, and not as intensely as an Option III kind of thing. All right. Christina, what's next?

MS. WIEGAND: All right. I will take that as direction that the council would like to have Involvement II for the dolphin wahoo bi-op at this point in time. If no one else has any other questions on the integration agreement or the dolphin wahoo consultation and bi-op, I can move us along to the next item, which is the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan discussion.

This is the presentation that you all received on Monday afternoon from Jessica Powell. I can pull up that presentation, but we've got Charlie Phillips on the line, who is the council's liaison to the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team, and so I'm going to turn it over to him to give you all his perspective on the discussions that have taken place at the TRT.

MR. BELL: All right. Charlie, are you with us?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. Can you hear me, Chairman?

MR. BELL: Yes, sir. Welcome.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's good to talk to you, and it's nice to be listening to you all working again. I listened to Jessica's presentation on Monday, and, as you probably remember, there's a lot of moving wheels, parts, going on right now, and there's a lot of webinars, and they are still working and fine-tuning their decision tools. I thought what I would probably concentrate on more is what goes on in our world, but there's still a whole lot we don't know yet.

There was a good bit of conversation about gillnets, and most of those were up in the North Carolina area, and the team has talked about endlines and the height of the nets and what degree of risk they would have, and I don't think there's any definitive answers on that yet, and I don't know that we're going to get any definitive answers, just because of the nature of the beast, but there was some talk about -- They need to get vertical lines out of the water, and that's the main goal.

There was some discussion about latent effort on some fisheries that weren't being prosecuted as much now as they were before, and maybe capping effort, and I am skeptical of that, because I know that a lot of our fishermen portfolio fish, and we move from fishery to fishery, but I can say that, but, on the other hand, I know that, if we start -- If any fishery takes off, especially if it's got a lot of vertical lines in the water, it needs to be looked at, to make sure it's not endangering whales.

We did some work on ropeless gear down here, I guess last year, on black sea bass pots, and that seemed to go very well. We had an experimental permit that we went offshore with, and Scott Buff worked on it some up in North Carolina too, and so Barbie on the team, and so is Scott Buff, along with myself, and we have all talked about different ways and the options of possibly using that as a tool, and that may actually allow some fishermen to fish some places that they didn't fish before, i.e., working with whales and doing it safely.

It's not very often that we figure out a way to do that, or not as much as we would like to, but, if we can figure out a way where fishermen can do something with black sea bass and ropeless gear, we may learn some things that would help other sectors and other places.

They have got some ropeless gear areas I think up in New England now, and so they're going to be trying it, to some degree, and how quick it will happen, I don't know, but there's still a lot of things going on, and the webinars are coming, and the scoping panel meetings are coming, and we've got I think meetings -- We've got several upcoming meetings, I think one in December and another one next year, and they've been trying to figure out when it's safe enough and the team is comfortable enough so that they can have some in-person meetings.

Just because of the size of the team, having an in-person meeting, where people can actually sit and talk -- It is going to be probably more productive than doing Zoom meetings. Right now, we do what we have to, but they have looked at things like blue crab traps and things, because there are vertical lines, and I think those are all going to be pretty much not going to cause a risk, or very, very, very minimal risk, and so, other than black sea bass pots and crab traps, we really don't have much down here. Since the whales are still on a downward decline, they're going to be looking at everything they can, and pretty much I think everything is going to be on the table, and so are there any questions?

MR. BELL: Any questions for Charlie? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Hi, Charlie. I was really glad to see that you were involved, and I'm very, very happy to see you hosting them there at your place in Georgia, and I was wondering -- You know, Jimmy Hull, he seems excited about it, and we don't have that many black sea bass fishermen left down here, and Jimmy is probably one of the only ones, but Raymond King, with the blue crabbers, out of Mayport -- To me, it seems like they could take those blue crab traps and just put them on a trawl line.

I mean, if these guys -- If they can fish traps for the golden crab out in the tide, in thousands of feet of water, it seems like the blue crabbers should be able to put their blue crabs on trawl lines too, and have you talked to them guys out in Mayport about getting rid of their buoy lines and putting their crab traps on trawl lines?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, and it's been in the discussion, and there is two schools of thought. One is a crab trap is really light, and, should a calf get entangled, it could probably drag a single trap, but, if it was to entangle in a trawl, then that's another matter, and so it's like you've got less lines if you do a trawl, say with crab traps, but, if they do entangle, by chance, then it's going to be a more severe entanglement, and I think the jury is still out on that. Clay, from Georgia, down at DNR, we bounce these ideas around, but, yes, they've talked about it, but, no, there's some really good

folks on the team. There's a lot of people that are knowledgeable, and they're looking at all of the possible options.

I've talked to Jimmy a good bit about the ropeless on black sea bass, and he's got his ideas on how it would work for him, where he works and how he works, and it may or may not work for everybody. Some people may decide they -- If it became an option of you could fish in the closed area with ropeless, or, if you didn't want to use ropeless, you just use the current regs, and I'm thinking that might be an option that folks could go to, but, yes, we've definitely talked about trawls for crab traps.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Charlie. Yes, I've heard that same exact discussion that you were talking about, is trawls versus singles, and the singles are potentially individually less of a problem, but, if you've got a bunch of them out there, then you've got a higher chance, or probability, of encountering them. Any other questions for Charlie? I am not seeing any.

MS. WIEGAND: Then now would be the time -- I've got the presentation that Jessica gave you all on Monday pulled up, and she is on the line, in case you have any questions, but I would ask if the council has sort of any recommendations that they would like to provide to the take reduction team at this time. If you will recall, when Jessica showed you the timeline on Monday, we're in the scoping phase of this process right now.

MR. BELL: All right, and, of course, for our fisheries, and you all talked about it a little bit, and black sea bass is one, and black sea bass is certainly not as big as it used to be, and we've dealt through with time/area sort of adjustments for that one, through amendments, but, I mean, the concept of ropeless traps sounds great, but, again, that's something that, if you were trying to do away with all your lines, that would be something you would go to, but I'm sure it's not a very cheap technology or whatever, but does anybody have any thoughts or comments that we can provide them, related to our council perspective for our fisheries that might be useful at this point? Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I had asked, during the presentation, regarding the inshore and offshore zones on the map, and I just wondered if there was any follow-up information on that.

MS. WIEGAND: Yes, and Jessica let us know that she was correct in saying that it's the hundred-fathom line.

MR. ROLLER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Okay, and so inshore of 100 fathoms, that's considered -- Okay. All right. Any other questions or input at this time? I am not seeing any. All right. Then we can go ahead and -- Tom, is that you again, or is that --

MR. ROLLER: Yes, it is me again. Just to -- I guess I would just provide the comment, from my experience in southeastern North Carolina, basically, south of Ocracoke, is, when you look at inshore and offshore, particularly in the vertical line fisheries, the hundred-fathom line is kind of interesting to me, because, if you really look at most of the effort, there's an extraordinary amount

of effort within five miles of the beach, but, other than that, it's mostly Lookout to the south, and there isn't as much effort, other than a few black sea bass potters, in my area, and so I just wanted to provide that comment.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks for that observation and comment. Anything else right now, folks? Okay. Then we can go ahead and get into the presentation.

MS. WIEGAND: This is the presentation that you guys received on Monday, and so, if there are no questions about the presentation, or additional comments or recommendations to provide to the TRT, then we can move to the last thing on the protected resources set of items, which is just the protected resources update.

MR. BELL: Okay. I got you. Anything on the presentation that we've actually already had access to? I don't see any hands. Okay. So we can go to the last item then.

MS. WIEGAND: I will make sure the few comments are captured and passed on to TRT staff, though most of them are on the webinar right now, and here is your protected resources update, and I will turn it back over to Jenny.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks.

MS. LEE: All right. Thank you again. This should be pretty brief here, and I'm just going to roll on through. We don't have an update on our determination of critical habitat for threatened Caribbean corals. We have a slight update on the five-year status review of seven threatened coral species, and that is just the status review is projected to be completed in the fall, this fall, and I think it said summer last time, and so just a little bit longer working on that.

Then we also have no change on our Nassau grouper critical habitat that we're working on, and I gave you an update already on Dolphin Wahoo FMP consultation, a lot of detail there, and the only other item under here is the GARFO biological opinion, which I don't usually share GARFO biological opinions, but, because this ties into right whale conservation and the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan, I thought it was important to let you know that that was finalized and released.

The way they do theirs is they have it all in one biological opinion, largely because of how their data is, but they also released the North Atlantic Right Whale Conservation Framework for Federal Fisheries in the Greater Atlantic Region to further reduce mortality and serious injury of North Atlantic right whales resulting from entanglement in the federal fisheries, and the conservation framework outlines commitments to implement measures that are necessary for the recovery of right whales, while providing a phase approach and flexibility to the fishing industries. Then, most importantly, you can see a link there, if you want more information.

Next up, Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team rulemaking, and so your document in front of you, due to the timing of when I provided that information, is now out-of-date, and the briefing states that NMFS expects the current rule to be finalized in 2021, but, since the briefing was prepared, that rule was finalized, and, in fact, council members and staff received an email the same day that that decision was publicly announced, on August 31, 2021, and so that is a final rule to modify the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan.

For those of you who didn't get that email, perhaps, entanglement in U.S. commercial fishing gear is a primary cause of mortality and serious injury to North Atlantic right whales, as we know. We're working with the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team, which I think you all know is a group of advisors consisting of fishermen, scientists, conservationists, and state and federal officials. We have completed Phase I of the modifications to the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan to continue to reduce whale entanglements.

The gear modifications required by that rule go into effect on May 1, 2022, which is the start of the American lobster and Jonah crab fishing year. The changes to the seasonally-restricted areas will go into effect thirty days after the publication of this rule, and the rule modifies regulations for, again, the Northeast lobster and Jonah crab trap and pot fisheries, as follows.

It modifies gear marking, to introduce state-specific colors for gear marks, and it increases the number of gear markings in the areas requiring marked lines, and it modifies gear configurations to reduce the number of vertical lines, by requiring more traps between buoy lines, and it requires weak insertions, or weak rope and buoy lines, and it modifies existing seasonally-restricted areas to allow ropeless fishing gear. It adds two new seasonally-restricted areas, and, following changes made by Massachusetts, it extends the Massachusetts restricted area and adds state waters north to the New Hampshire border. If you want more information on that, there is an outreach guide and videos, and they're all on the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan website.

Obviously, you had a presentation, but so, again, the focus now is Phase II for the remaining fisheries, trap and pots and gillnets coastwide, and there is a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement and a request for comments published in the FR on August 11, 2021. We are holding scoping meetings, and we just had, essentially, one, and the scoping period extends through October 21, 2021, and so, in that presentation you received, you had this information, but, again, in your briefing, there is ways you can participate, through public scoping meetings, call-in days, and your input through an email.

Early in 2022, the Atlantic Large Whale team will meet to discuss the results of scoping and make recommendations on new measures, and so NMFS will likely release the next proposed rule sometime in 2022, and so sorry if that was a little repetitive of your presentation, but just in case folks weren't all here.

Other than that, I just have a slight update on the North Atlantic right whale unusual mortality event, and we typically have this in your briefing. The last time I briefed you, from 2017 to 2021, I think there were thirty-two mortalities and fourteen injuries, and so it's now close to -- Actually, it was -- My apologies. I was looking at the wrong briefing. In June, it was thirty-two mortalities and fourteen injuries, and so that's what I wrote here. My apologies. The main point is now it's thirty-four mortalities and sixteen serious injuries, and so, course, it's still ticking up.

The Pelagic Longline Take Reduction Plan proposed rule development, we published a proposed rule, and the comment period ended back on February 16, and so we're working to prepare the final rule, and we plan to have that available by the end of the year. The list of fisheries for 2022, the proposed list that is, published on August 9, 2021, and comments were accepted through just shy of your meeting, September 8, 2021, and that's all I've got for you.

MR. BELL: All right, Jenny. We appreciate that update. Any questions for Jenny about any of that or anything in general, while we have her here? Quiet bunch. I think they're smelling the barn door. All right. Well, thank you, Jenny. I appreciate it.

MS. LEE: You're welcome.

MR. BELL: All right, and so that takes us through the things we had for today. We've got a little bit of time. Recall that, on Monday, I shorted Cameron and Kim out of their outreach and communications update, and so what I would like to do is -- If we need to take like five minutes, we can do that, and then we can come back and let Cameron and Kim give us that briefing, and then we may actually finish a few minutes early today, because there is really nothing that I can get started for tomorrow's session.

We'll just start and finish out tomorrow, and we had a few items, three, that we would kind of need to take into Snapper Grouper, and then Steve carried over dealing with the Habitat AP topics, and that would be when we get to the habitat part of tomorrow, and so that's my plan. Let's take five minutes, and then we'll hear from Cameron and Kim and finish the day.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: I think we have most people back. I know Jessica wasn't going to be here, and Steve got tied up in some state stuff, maybe, and so we can go ahead and roll, when you guys are ready.

MS. RHODES: Okay. I'm all set, and I know Kim is on as well, and we're going to tag-team this, and so I'm good to dive in, Mel, whenever you are.

MR. BELL: Okay. Super. Thanks a lot.

MS. RHODES: No problem. Hi, everybody. This is Cameron Rhodes, the Outreach Program Manager for the South Atlantic Council, and I'm just going to give you guys a brief update on some of the happenings with the outreach and communications program for the council, and there are some new updates that actually have occurred this last week that are not included in this presentation, and so I will touch on them as well, briefly, and there's some exciting news that I'm really glad to be able to share with you all today, and so let's dive in here.

One of the things that I think is probably the most intriguing project that we have going on right now, as far as outreach and communication is concerned, is our entire website redesign. That is underway, and it is going well. There have been numerous exercises that have been sent around that many of you participated in, and so thank you very much for your participation in those efforts, and those navigation exercises really helped us to better understand how a user might choose to use our website.

We had council members participate in those exercises, and we had advisory panel members participate as well, and then, in some cases, we even had people who were entirely unfamiliar with the council process try and dive in and navigate our website and figure out what kinds of search parameters were the most helpful, what kind of key words would be the most helpful for people, and so we really learned a lot from those exercises, and so a big thanks to everybody who

participated in those, because it definitely helped us get a better gauge of where we need to be with the site.

What I have on the screen for you here is not exactly what our site is going to look like, but it just gives you a general idea of the overall design and look that we're trying to achieve. We are definitely mirroring what you might see on the Pacific Fishery Management Council's website. It's the same developer, and we really liked that website, and so we're definitely taking some of the things that we enjoy from that site and the easy navigation there and trying to plug them in for our purposes and our website.

This project is going to be moving forward into early next year. Our original goal was to have a website launched sometime in early 2022, and we are still on track for that. Much of the heavy lifting, as far as basic content rollover, hasn't occurred yet, and we're just making sure that we have all of our taxonomies, which is really how we're going to be categorizing the website, how things are all going to be tied in together, so that it's a lot easier to find information that you might need.

All of that work is going to help us figure out what kind of content needs to shift over, and in what manner, and so we're still waiting for that, and that's going to be a heavy lift, going into the fall and into the early winter. We're hoping to do a content rollover that brings over information beginning in 2016, and then we'll backfill, as time allows.

We've been told, just by the incredible volume of information that is currently on the South Atlantic Council's website, that we might want to consider simply starting with 2021 and working our way backward as we can, over time, just because I think it's been pretty telling to see how floored even our web developers are by the amount of material that we have on our site, and so they're encouraging us to think about this in a way that allows us to move things over in a way that makes the most sense for us as staff and makes the most sense for our users as well, and so we definitely plan to backfill information, as time allows, but stay tuned for all of that, and we will keep you updated on our process and what all of this is going to shape up to look like in the next couple of months.

Then, internally, we have a team, and we haven't really been able to start meeting yet, but now we're getting to the point, come mid-September or late September, where we're going to start working on some of our content development and content review and trying to figure out what kind of information and language we want to have posted on our website.

The current site is pretty heavy, as far as wording goes, and it can be a lot to get through, and so we're trying to scale some things back, so that it's not so word heavy and instead is more visual and engaging in that way, and so, just as an update, and I don't really have much to share with you today, but I just wanted to give you guys an overview of what you can expect for this website redesign and how progress is moving along.

You will receive an update in December, where you will have an opportunity to actually play with the website and explore, and that's the goal that we have for the December council meeting, where, during the Outreach and Communications Committee meeting, you'll actually have time to play around in there, and we'll have our web developers on-hand to help answer any questions that might be well above my understanding of how websites work, and so stay tuned for all of that.

We're really excited to get this in front of you guys. I think it's going to be a huge improvement, and it's a really exciting project to have the opportunity to work on.

Next, you actually are going to get a more in-depth look at this I think tomorrow, is when that's going to be focused on, and I really just wanted to touch very quickly on the fact that there are some new position reporting requirements that are going into effect for Gulf permit holders in the next couple of months.

Initially, I was under the impression that they were going to be effective on December 1, and it seems that that date has changed, now that the final rule has published, and I believe it said December 12, maybe, and so there's going to be some new requirements for folks who are Gulf permit holders. This, of course, doesn't necessarily affect South Atlantic permit holders, but we do have quite a few people who are duly permitted, and so we will do what we can to share some information about this.

We will largely be directing people to the Gulf Council and to the Southeast For-Hire Electronic Reporting Program staff, so that they can get the help that they need, in order to get all of this up and running, but I just wanted you guys to see that there are a number of different outreach and communications efforts underway, in order to try to get this information out in front of people. I saw a Facebook post today regarding this information, and so it's definitely getting out there, and people are certainly aware of the fact that it's coming.

We do have an Outreach and Communication Advisory Panel meeting that's scheduled to meet in mid to late November, November 18 and 19, and we will be hosting that meeting via webinar, rather than in-person, and we've got numerous topics to bring before the advisory panel at this upcoming meeting. We're planning to do two half-days, so that the sessions aren't quite as long, but we can still cram in lots of good topics for the AP to discuss.

Some of the key things that I think would be of interest to you all is the social media policy, where we're going to be throwing some questions at our advisory panel members, to get their ideas on how we should go about constructing a social media policy, if they have anything that they can share from their agencies or from their experiences that will help us to figure out how we want to approach social media as an agency. If any of you are on social media, I strongly encourage you to follow the council's platforms. We're on Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook. We also have a YouTube channel. We're not quite as active on YouTube, but I definitely encourage you guys to check-in there as well.

I think it would be a really great thing, if you're somebody who has social media, that you go and check those out and see what comments are like, and what engagement is like, on our social media channels, because we will be having discussions with our advisory panel in the next month or so about this, and so stay tuned for that.

We're also going to give them a preliminary website review, where they're going to be able to provide us some insights on their experiences from an outreach and communications perspective, when playing around with this new website, and then one of the big-ticket items is we are going to be presenting a red snapper webpage, where we're basically creating a landing webpage that is chockful of red snapper information, because we do know that there is likely going to be lots of questions that come up regarding red snapper and the current situation, and, as a result, we want

to make sure that we have materials that are easily accessible, not only to you all as council members, when you get questions, but also to the stakeholder who might have concerns or might be confused about what's going on within the fishery.

We're hoping to have that landing page developed and fleshed out. Nothing too fancy, and we're talking a very simple structure here, but at least it will provide people with a nice one-stop shop for red snapper information, and so that is something that we're going to bring to the advisory panel, so they can let us know if that's something that is useful. If we need to make any kind of modification that would be of greater help to our partners, then we can certainly facilitate that through the webpage.

We're also going to be talking with them about a tackle shop push that we're going to be doing in the next couple of months. It's been really, really great to have Nick Smillie onboard with us, and he's chockful of incredible ideas, and so we are definitely going to take advantage of that, not only from a citizen science perspective, but also from a just general council needs perspective, and so we'll be chatting with the advisory panel members, who include not only just state agency reps, but we also have fishermen on there, as well as educators, and so we've got a good group of people who can help weigh-in on this and provide some perspective.

We'll be trying to craft how we want to go about engaging with different tackle shops throughout the region, and we're currently in the process, and Nick has really been leading this up, but we're currently in the process of putting together this tackle shop database, where we have a series of contacts that we can reach out to, and we're going to start to track how often we interact with those tackle shops, so that we have a better idea of which tackle shops are able to get information out to the most people, because that's definitely something we want to start utilizing more, is making sure that we're developing relationships with groups that have great influence within the fishing community.

Nick has been really great in helping move that along, and so have our state partners and Sea Grant partners, by sharing this database information with us, so that we can compile this comprehensive list for the region.

We're also going to be providing a Citizen Science Program update and a habitat program outreach and communication draft strategy, and we'll be sharing that with the advisory panel, as Myra mentioned earlier, and then one of the nice things that we really like to do is provide advisory panel members the opportunity to share updates, and that could be an update to something they've experience on the water, whether it be something with law enforcement or something they've learned from other fishermen at their local marina, but it could also be something that's an ongoing campaign that FWC might be running.

We allot some time for all of us to get together and basically have a show-and-tell kind of moment, where we can exchange information with each other, and it really helps us get a better feel for what's going on across the region, and so that's a nice thing that we've been doing in the last couple of years, and it seems to be well liked by the advisory panel members, as well as from a staff perspective, too.

Then one of the things in here that I definitely think is really exciting that I'm going to share with you right now, that I initially hadn't planned to really go in-depth about, is we just found out,

today, through a press release that was sent around from Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant, that there was a project funded through Sea Grant, and that project is really looking at reef fish extension for the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic, and our regional partners in Sea Grant for Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, were really, really kind of think about the council's needs, and so, as part of this grant, they have basically set aside a project in there where they are going to basically supply us a Sea Grant fellow.

We'll have a fellow for four years, and we're looking at two individual people, and one fellow will be on for the first two years, and a second fellow will be on for the next two years, and this person is really going to be primarily responsible for outreach and communication efforts on behalf of the South Atlantic Council, as well as Sea Grant.

They're going to be a really useful body for us, in that they're going to be able to help communicate what's going on with the red snapper count, as well as with the greater amberjack count, and so they're going to help us with disseminating that information and making it a little bit more palatable for the public, something that's a lot more understandable than what we've seen in the past with some of these kinds of things, and so we're really excited about this project and really eager to have this person come onboard.

I'm not sure yet on the timing for all of this. It's likely that we won't have somebody onboard until sometime late this fall, but I just wanted to give you guys a heads-up on that, because it's really going to be a big help to us, and we're likely going to be sending this person out on the road, so that they can interact with tackle shop owners, talk best fishing practices, talk snapper grouper issues, and really become a major point person for us, when it comes to outreach and communication, and so we're very excited about that. I see, Kerry, that you've got your hand up. I'm good to go ahead and take questions, whenever you're ready.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, Cameron. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Cameron, more kind of a comment than a question, and I'm telling you this, because, Kim, with all due respect, you're the young person in this scenario, and I know you all are going to laugh at me, and I said it to Julia and Carolyn last week, during our citizen science meeting, but I want to tell you that I think there's a real potential, and I know you all are going to really laugh at me, but for using Tik Tok as a form of outreach.

We'll talk about it sort of, and I will call you, and we can talk about it, but I just wanted to throw out there, to the council that -- As you all know, I am fortunate to have teenagers, and so that's why I know about it, but I am telling you that it is much, much, much more than teenagers and pranks. You can actually get a lot of really important information on there, and so I just wanted to give everyone a heads-up that I'm going to be banging the drum on that one a little.

MS. RHODES: Thanks, Kerry. I can attest to the benefits of Tik Tok. I think Allie Iberle and I both have an unhealthy obsession with the platform at this point, and I do have some concerns that I think we can talk about offline, and try and hash out how we would approach Tik Tok. I think it's a really great platform, and I enjoy it personally, but a lot of our engagement, across social media platforms, can be rather challenging, and so making sure that Tik Tok, if we use it, is handled in a way that it at least gets information out to the public in an effective way, rather than spreading misinformation, is a primary concern for me, but I think we can certainly talk about that, and I am

open to seeing some new things come across our table with this stuff, and I'm sure that Nick Smillie, who is the youngest of us all at the council office, might be interested in taking a look at some of that stuff too, and so we can definitely play around with that, and I welcome the discussion, because I think it could be really interesting, moving forward.

MS. MARHEFKA: Good points, and I really look forward -- My goal is really that you all are going to have to do some kind of dance that somehow relates to red snapper, and you're going to make it go viral. No, I'm kidding. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Kerry is just showing off at how cool she is, I guess. My total experience with Tik Tok is the -- That's it for me. I liked that, though.

MS. RHODES: I think we can definitely play with those ideas, and we certainly don't want to be unwilling to adapt to the times, and so I know that there's definitely been a major rush to start presenting content in a way that's of most interest to our stakeholders, and so I think it's definitely a good discussion to have. Then, as far as my updates go, that's it for me, but Kim is on, and Kim is going to chat with you guys about some other things that are going on in the outreach and communications world at the moment, and so, Kim, whenever you're ready, I will run the slides for you.

MS. IVERSON: Okay. Thanks, Cameron. Kerry, to that point, I am thinking a karaoke Tik Tok red snapper combination may be in order, and so just something to think about, as the older person that has seen you sing. With that having been said, I'm going to go ahead and talk to you, just briefly, about the Marine Resources Education Program, or MREP, yet another acronym, for our newer council members.

This is a program that we have been involved with, and I had to look back, since 2014, and the program began in New England, and it has spread throughout the Mid-Atlantic, the South Atlantic, and now is over on the west coast. It is a program designed by fishermen for fishermen, and, many years ago, Council Member Tony Iarocci came to our council and said that he had attended the New England workshop and was very excited about it, and, since that time, that program has migrated southward, and so it is a workshop-based program.

Ideally, we hold workshops, and the council is involved as part of the steering committee and planning team, and those workshops are planned in-person in the spring and again in the fall. One is the science workshop, and it's a three-day workshop that is usually held down in St. Petersburg, Florida. The science workshops involve NOAA Fisheries staff and council staff from the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and participants apply to attend the workshops, or attend the program, and they are selected, and they represent fishermen and fisheries from Texas to North Carolina.

Following the three-day science workshop, then the management workshop is held, another three-day workshop, and it's generally held at a hotel, where the fishermen and agency representatives and other folks that are involved in the program come together and have breakfast, lunch, and dinner and happy hours together, and it really offers a unique experience for all of the participants that are selected, and there's usually about thirty workshop participants each year within the program.

Of course, COVID has knocked our workshop schedule a bit, similar to our council meetings, and we're trying to adapt. The last workshop that was held in-person was right before things began to shut down with COVID, back in February of 2020, and we were able to get through our science workshop, and we're still trying to work with the 2020 cohort, as we affectionately call them, to finish up with our management workshop and to stay in touch with them. We've actually held a fireside, or dockside, chat last spring, and that was fairly well attended, and we appreciate everyone that was involved in that effort, but we had hoped to have a management workshop in the fall of this year, but that has been pushed back now.

A steering committee meeting was held back in August, via webinar, of course, and we're tentatively targeting a science workshop for February and another management three-day workshop for May of 2022. The Steering Committee continues to meet, and we're looking at options for maybe virtual workshops, but the in-person interaction for these workshops is so very important, and so it's very hard to duplicate that.

As you know, as council members who are going through the webinar process, it just does not leave a lot of time for informal discussions, and, for the MREP program, that is really, really important, that social time, that informal discussion between the fishermen and the scientists and the fishery managers. They all come together in a neutral environment.

The program is administered through the Gulf of Maine Research Institute, and it does provide that neutral environment for both fishermen from the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico Councils. The Caribbean Council also has a similar program, or is part of the MREP, but, because of language issues, they have a separate workshop, most of the time held in Puerto Rico.

What do we do as we can't have these workshops? The steering committee is looking at improvements to the agendas and the presentations that we've been having at our workshops, some new topics to consider, and we're looking at the council's Citizen Science Program as a possible new topic on the agenda for the science workshop and new presenters.

We have new council staff members, and NOAA Fisheries has new folks that can become involved and shadow some of the current presenters. Clay Porch and John Carmichael and Bob Gill and several familiar names and faces are involved at the steering committee level and have been strong supporters of this program. Kim Amendola and Andy Strelcheck at the Regional Office, and Rick DeVictor, and the list goes on, but this program has been strongly supported and has just really been successful, up until the time we had to stop our in-person workshops, and so we're moving forward, and we're hopeful for 2022, like most people.

I would invite you, if you haven't attended the MREP, the Marine Resources Education Program Southeast, if you haven't participated in the workshops, and you're interested, please let me know. Each year, a council member from each of the councils is allowed to attend, and so, as we move forward, if you're interested in that for 2022, please let me know, or John Carmichael, either one.

Next, Cameron, we'll wrap it up with scenario planning, east coast scenario planning, climate change scenario planning. I'm on part of a communications workgroup, and we've been collaborating on this effort to improve communications and make people aware of this effort. The New England and the Mid-Atlantic Councils, the public information officers and myself, are

involved, and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and NOAA Fisheries, are all working collaboratively on this effort.

Roger will give you a more detailed update on this effort tomorrow, but, as part of the communications workgroup, I just wanted to mention it. You should have received a copy of the news release that went out from our office back in August, publicizing the scoping webinars, and those scoping webinars -- I hope you were able to attend one, and they were well attended. I think over 136 attended the first workshop, forty-six the second, and then eighty-six, I think, on the third, and so fairly well attended, and I know some of our staff members attended, and some of our advisory panel members as well.

There is information on this project, and the Mid-Atlantic Council has gracefully agreed to support and provide a page on their website, on this unique effort of climate change scenario planning, and I would encourage you to go to that website, if you're interested. There is a twelve-question questionnaire available from the website, and we'll be publicizing that next week, through the South Atlantic Bite, encouraging all stakeholders to complete that questionnaire as part of the scoping process. Again, Roger is on the core team for this effort, representing the South Atlantic Council, and he will be giving you an update and be available to help answer any questions you may have tomorrow, and so that's all I have, Cameron, if anyone has questions.

MR. BELL: Laurilee, is that a question, or is that an accidental button again?

MS. THOMPSON: No, I really raised my hand this time. Thank you. That was awesome. Jimmy Hull highly recommended the MREP classes. Do you have hard dates on the February and May, or is it just sometime in February and sometime in May?

MS. IVERSON: Right now, we're looking at tentative dates, Laurilee, but I know we have another steering committee meeting next Tuesday, and, if those dates are firmed up a bit, I will be glad to share those with you, and, like I said, we're just very hopeful that we can have those in-person workshops.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you. Yes, I would be interested.

MS. IVERSON: We would love to have you.

MR. BELL: All right. Monica, did you have a question or a comment?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do, and it's a suggestion, I guess, as you redesign the website, which looks really great, by the way. I would urge you to I guess coordinate with the SERO, Southeast Regional Office, Sustainable Fisheries, to make sure that past FMP amendments and rules and those kinds of things are actually available on your website, or on their website, if you're going to refer it over to them, or have a link to their website.

Not all documents are, and I know that, when I have been looking for different things, I go to your website frequently, and I go to SERO's website, especially for old documents, because sometimes you don't know the right way to go forward if you don't know where you've been, and so looking at those older documents, and, by older, I could just mean the last amendment, and not just the 1982 Coral FMP, which, yes, I was looking at it, or trying to, last night, but, also, it's really great

for the public, for council members, for anybody to have access to that information. There's not really a library to go to to check out a book to get them all, and so, the more you can have that available, I think the better off the record is for council actions going forward, and it's really a great resource for the public, and so that's my plug. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Monica. That's a good comment. I have found myself looking for --

MS. RHODES: Mel, if I could respond to that.

MR. BELL: Yes, go ahead.

MS. RHODES: Thanks, Monica. I should have been more clear, and so all of the amendments will get moved over, and all of those links will be redirected, and so those won't be broken, and there won't be any issues there. It's really the briefing book content, since we're looking at anywhere from like seventy to a hundred documents, sometimes, in some of these briefing books, that we might choose to start with 2021 and work our way backward, but, as far as the amendments go, those will be moved over before the site is even launched, and so all of that library of information will be available to members of the public, as well as to anybody else who might be interested in using our site for access to those materials.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's great to hear. Thank you. Briefing books can be handy, too. I am getting greedy, and can't you do it all? I know you put a lot of information in your briefing books, and so I'm not sure how to go about doing that, and I understand going from now and working your way backwards. Maybe we could talk about it offline, on some various ideas. Thank you.

MS. RHODES: Yes, I would be glad to. I think the bottom line is I'm the one who is doing it, and so it's just a matter of how quickly I can get all of those things done and taken care of, because everything is going to be going through an entirely different process now. Briefing books won't be posted the same way, and they will be categorized differently, and so the intent is to have all of our briefing books available from our website, when possible, but I don't think that's going to be a realistic goal from the onset, but we can certainly try to prioritize council meetings, and then advisory panels, and then everything is available upon request, as needed, but I don't think it will be realistic to try and get all of those documents up on the site right away.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Cameron. Tom, did you have a question or a comment?

MR. ROLLER: Just a quick comment. Thank you all for this presentation, and this has been great. I am looking forward to the website and everything that it includes, and I'm sure it will be fantastic. Anytime I can put a plug in for the MREP program, I will go ahead and do so, because I think it is a wonderful program, and I'm looking forward to it getting back in place. For anyone who is interested, particularly members of the public as well, it's a great place to be a more informed stakeholder, and so thank you. As a last note, I just want to say that I do not share the Tik Tok enthusiasm, but, anyway, thank you.

MR. BELL: I understand. Okay. Any other questions or comments for Cameron or Kim? Again, what they're doing is extremely important to us, and we've talked about being able to communicate effectively new things to the public, ideas, and we were talking today just about things like nets,

use of nets and things, versus gaffs, but we communicate so much, and I do appreciate Monica's comments about the record, and that's what this is.

So much of what we do is built upon so much else that people have done before us, and these things have tracked along, and, in the perfect world, we would be able to access all of that in one-stop-shopping, sort of, and we're working on that, and we do appreciate everybody's efforts in pulling this together, and so great job. Any other questions?

I have got one more thing then that I would like to do, if Monica would help me out here. In shifting schedules around, and looking at different versions and things, I skipped Monica, but, if she's got the time right now to do a quick brief for us, regarding litigation, I guess, and I don't think that will take real long, and then I promise you that that will be it for the day.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, and I can do it very quickly. I looked through our cases, and I kind of narrowed it down to two that you would really perhaps be interested in, and one is the litigation involving the Gulf for-hire electronic reporting amendment, and so I just kind of wanted to bring you up-to-date on the status of that.

The Gulf for-hire reporting rule was effective on January 5 of this year, and I believe the South Atlantic's was January 4, and all the pieces of it were effective except that NMFS delayed the effective date for the vessel location reporting requirements, to allow more time for vendors to seek an obtain approval for those location units.

On September 14, which, yes, John, that was this week, NMFS announced that a final rule for the vessel location tracking reporting requirements for these vessels, charter and headboat, with the Gulf reef fish and Gulf coastal migratory pelagic federal permits will be effective on December 13 of this year.

Let's backtrack to August 20 of 2020, where several captains and owners of vessels with Gulf of Mexico for-hire permits filed a lawsuit in federal court in the Eastern District of Louisiana challenging the Gulf's final rule that implemented new electronic reporting requirements. The rule requires vessels with Gulf permits to submit an electronic fishing report via NMFS approved hardware and software for each fishing trip, to hail-out prior to departing for any trip, to declare whether, you're on a for-hire trip or another trip, and to use NMFS-approved hardware and software with GPS location capabilities that would archive vessel position data during the trip for a subsequent transmission to the Fisheries Service. The plaintiffs allege that the rule results in unlawful surveillance, violating the 4th, 5th, and 9th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and that it violates a number of other laws.

Briefing in this case, which is where the parties file their arguments with the court, is ongoing, and the briefing ends on December 20, 2021, and I just noted that the remainder of the rule is effective December 13.

The court also certified this, at the plaintiffs' request, as a class action lawsuit, which is kind of a different thing for us. All it really means is that it still proceeds on the same process, in terms of the arguments that get filed with the court, but there's a lot more notification, I think, that the plaintiffs have to do to try to notify who the entire class is and those sorts of things, and so stay tuned. At the December meeting, I will hopefully have an update there.

The other thing that I was going to mention was, and I believe I mentioned this before, but the State of Texas filed a challenge, back in September of 2020, against the Department of Commerce and others against a temporary rule, really, for Gulf red snapper that applied an accountability measure that would deduct some harvest in the private angling sector for the recreational red snapper fishery off of Texas, and Texas, obviously, alleged that that rule was a violation of various laws.

In that case, the court, on May 13 of 2021, granted Texas' motion to stay, but required Texas, and actually the parties, to file status reports every thirty days, beginning a couple of months ago, in June, and so that's an ongoing process too, and those are the only two cases that I will mention today, and, if there's any questions, be my guest to ask me, and I will try to answer them.

MR. BELL: Okay, Monica. Thanks for doing that for us, and, Tim, do you have a question?

MR. GRINER: Monica, was the Gulf lawsuit -- Were they challenging just the location portion of the requirement, or are they challenging the entire reporting requirement?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I am not as familiar as one of my colleagues is with that lawsuit, but I think it was the entire rule. It wasn't just a portion of it. I'm sure that, in terms of the unlawful surveillance, that would probably be the positioning location portion of it, but I believe they challenged the entire rule.

MR. BELL: All right. Any other questions for Monica, while we've got her here? Okay. Seeing no questions, then we can maybe knock off five minutes early, six minutes early, and so great job, everyone. We got a lot done today, and I appreciate you sticking with us. Tomorrow, we will pick up at 8:30, as scheduled, and we'll just complete the schedule, and we'll hopefully try to get you out as close to noon as we can. Any questions right now? You're awful quiet. All right. Well, thanks again, and we will adjourn for the day and pick it up at 8:30 in the morning. Thanks for your hard work.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on September 16, 2021.)

SEPTEMBER 17, 2021

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

The Full Council Session II of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened via webinar on Friday, September 17, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to Friday. On paper, we're pretty much on schedule. The desire was to try to finish up by noon, but recall that we've slid a few things into some of the committee reports today, and so it may take us a little longer. Also, I will point out that the FMP workplan review may be rather challenging, just given all of the things we're trying

to stuff into our schedule and move forward, and they're all important things, but we're going to have to make some decisions about priority and timing, and that may take us a little bit of time.

We've got like three things that I think we pushed into Snapper Grouper and two things we pushed into Habitat, and so, anyway, having said that, let's get at it, and so what we're going to do is committee reports, and we'll start out with Snapper Grouper. Jessica, whenever you're ready.

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

MS. BROUWER: Good morning, everybody. Sorry to interrupt, but, Mel, I wasn't sure if you would like to go over the Full Council items first, real quick, the Monday afternoon things, and I believe there was some guidance on the ABC Control Rule Amendment that you might want to mention.

MR. BELL: I didn't have that one written down. Do you want to queue that up, and we can knock that out first, before we get into committees? Does that make sense, from a timing standpoint?

MS. BROUWER: Sure. It's on the screen now, Mel.

MR. BELL: All right. That's actually the report from -- Splitting Full Council into two pieces is just a little awkward, and so we had some discussion on Monday about the ABC Control rule. Staff presented the most recent actions and alternatives language drafted by the IPT concerning the Acceptable Biological Catch Control Rule, carryovers and revisions, and the framework procedures. The SSC Chair provided the SSC's recommendations on the ABC Control Rule and carryover alternatives, and so we're bringing this back up again.

The council approved the approach of implementing carryovers through framework procedure and addition of an action to modify the framework procedures. The council also approved the most recently drafted language and directed continued development of the amendment. The council provided the following guidance, and so this was the direction to staff that we provided after the discussion we had at the very beginning of the meeting about the ABC Control Rule.

Our direction to staff is to continue development of the amendment using the SSC's recommended method for specifying ABC for unassessed species; pilot the SSC's recommended method for specifying ABC for unassessed species with a small group of species, possibly with a variety of characteristics, before applying broadly, and that was sort of lets kind of test-drive this thing some; remove Sub-Action 3.2, Alternative 3; and add Action 4, modifying framework procedures to include carryover. At this point, is there anything else? Myra, is that what we're kind of asking, if there is anything else, or is that good, or is that a complete list and good to go?

MS. BROUWER: Yes, I believe that's it, and it's just to review what you all did, if anybody has questions or anything needs to be clarified.

MR. BELL: So that's where we left it all the way back to Monday. Okay. Mike, did you have something?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes, and just kind of a clarifying question on my end, just to make sure that staff is doing the right thing, as far as this guidance. The piloting the SSC's recommended method,

I guess I had interpreted that to mean -- When we looked through the language, the language was broad enough to kind of give the SSC leeway to adjust their method as they're going along, to make sure that it's up-to-date with current research and all of that, and so I envision the pilot to be kind of that first run of species and to make it non-binding, but it wouldn't be something that's done before the completion of the amendment, because that would entail we need to form an SSC workgroup and we need to work through -- Like we need to do the entire process for a group of species, and that would entail a level of data gathering and a level of modeling, with data-limited models and testing and comparing. That, I'm not sure that we have time for, if we're going to move this amendment forward on the current schedule.

MR. BELL: Right, and that's what I recall. We wanted to move forward with this as quickly as we could, but realizing that, if you started getting down into specifics with trying to apply it with certain species, and then work it into that timing, we would be really dragging this thing out, and so I think, yes, the idea is to move as quickly as we can, but, at some point, be able to use it at the first available opportunity, once it's kind of up and running and we're happy with it. Is that -- I think what you just describe is what we said. Does anybody think differently? It's kind of a -- It's a pull between trying to get this thing going and up and running and be comfortable with it and a timing to actually work it into sort of production, I suppose.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Yes, and so the interpretation I am taking from that is we keep moving on the amendment and, I guess, the first round that the SSC does of their unassessed stocks method -- The first round is going to be let's look at the results, and we're not going to be bound to apply that first round, until we're content with this is the method that we're going to move forward or develop any tweaks or whatever, but all of that would be under the envelope of the amendment is already passed by then.

MR. BELL: Okay. Are we good then?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: I am good. Thanks.

MR. BELL: Okay. All right, and so that was the direction to staff there. Then, under Allocation Decision Tool, remember we had a lot of discussion of the decision tool. The direction to staff is general approval of the approach as developed and to continue development of the allocation decision tree tool; consider next review of the decision tree approach at a special meeting, rather than at the December 2021 meeting; as part of the review, use greater amberjack as an example species; while climate change is an important consideration in management, readily available information on climate change, as it pertains to sector allocations, does not fit well into the decision tree approach and do not include climate change in the initial version of the approach, but consider incorporating it into future versions.

We had a lot of discussion on that, about availability of data and that sort of thing, and just kind of overcomplicating the tool, and so anything else then that we need to capture there? I don't see any hands. Going through the rest of Monday, we had the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Update, and we had an update, which then we kind of followed-up yesterday with some additional discussion of that, and Charlie gave us an update from the most recent meeting and all, where they were going, Charlie Phillips, during Session II, which we started yesterday afternoon.

Then we had the congressional brief and the Citizen Science update, and so that's a quick review of what took place in Council Session I and a little bit yesterday, and that then takes us to the first item we had on my list, which was the Snapper Grouper Committee, and so, okay, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel. The Snapper Grouper Committee met this week, and we approved the minutes from the June 2021 meeting and the agenda for this meeting, and we had one item concerning blueline tilefish that was added for discussion under Other Business, and that item, along with a couple more, were items that were on our list to come back to, and so we will stop on that, as well as a couple of other items, when we get to it.

For the snapper grouper two-for-one discussion, the committee reviewed the information describing the background of the provision, a preliminary evaluation of trends in the commercial snapper grouper fishery, and the initial input from the Snapper Grouper AP, and the committee provided the following guidance.

There was direction to staff to provide additional information on leased permits and associated landings; the maximum time period allowed to purchase an additional SG 1 permit when a non-corporate SG 1 permit is purchased; potential optimum yield in the fishery, and this would include an update on the previous work completed on the topic; corporate ownership of permits; and the 225 trip-limited permit, looking at the landings, the utilization, and the ownership type, corporate versus individual.

The committee also asked the Snapper Grouper AP to provide feedback on the topic and wanted them to have the similar background information that -- They wanted the AP to have the similar background information that was presented at the September 2021 council meeting and include discussion questions that were part of the information paper and generated through the committee discussion. The committee also asked to provide a white paper for review on this topic at the December 2021 meeting.

Then the committee went into greater amberjack, which is Amendment 49, and, following the most recent stock assessment of greater amberjack in April of 2021, scoping hearings were held via webinar, and the AP discussed the amendment and developed recommendations. Staff provided an overview of the scoping comments and the most recent draft language and analysis by the IPT. The AP Chair presented the AP's comments and recommendations, and the committee made the following motions and provided the following guidance.

Motion 1 is move to add a constant catch alternative to Action 1. Revise the greater amberjack total annual catch limit and annual optimum yield. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? **Is there any objection?** All right. **That motion carries.**

There was also direction to staff to use the 2.8 million pounds, which was the middle value from the years in the Action 1 Preferred Alternative 2, as the value for the first three years and then reevaluate landings for later years.

The committee made another motion, Motion 2, to move to accept the range of alternatives for Action 1. Revise the greater amberjack total annual catch limit and annual optimum yield for analysis. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **Seeing none, that motion carries.**

The committee made Motion Number 3, which is move to accept the range of alternatives for Action 2. Revise sector allocations and sector annual catch limits for greater amberjack for analysis. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. Then there was direction to staff to apply the allocation decision tree to greater amberjack as a test comparison of the Action 2 alternatives.

The committee made Motion Number 4. Move to accept the range of alternatives for Action 3, which is removing recreational annual catch targets, from the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan, for analysis. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **That motion carries.**

The committee made Motion Number 5, which was move to add an action to Amendment 49 to consider changing the commercial and recreational size limits for greater amberjack. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **That motion carries.** Direction to staff was provided to initially consider minimum size limit ranges of twenty-eight to thirty-six inches fork length for each sector.

Then the committee made Motion Number 6, which is move to add an action to consider increasing the commercial season trip limit for Season 2. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **That motion carries.** We provided direction to staff to develop alternatives based on the advisory panel's recommendation of 1,200 pounds, the same as Season 1.

The committee then made Motion Number 7, which is move to add an action to consider closing the recreational sector in April. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **That motion carries.** We also provided direction to staff to research the management history related to the April closure, and just a reminder that the spawning occurs January through June, with peak spawning in April and May, and that came from SEDAR 15.

Then we jumped into snowy grouper, Amendment 51, and the council received the results of the assessment and the SSC's recommendations for overfishing and acceptable biological catch levels back in March, and so, at this meeting, Jimmy Hull, the AP Chair, provided comments and recommendations from the AP, and staff presented an overview of the options paper.

The committee discussed the AP's feedback and a tentative timeline of development and the suite of actions being considered, and the committee provided the following guidance: direction to staff to continue to specify the recreational ACL in numbers of fish; to review the post-season recreational accountability measures; and bring the options paper to the October 2021 Snapper Grouper AP meeting, prior to consideration for scoping. Have the Snapper Grouper AP discuss the pros and cons of either reducing the commercial trip limit or creating a commercial spawning season closure as potential options for Action 3; consider the recommendations from the recreational working group on a deepwater stamp or endorsement for snowy grouper and other deepwater species; and consider a modification to recreational management measures.

The committee then jumped into yellowtail snapper, which is Amendment 44. This amendment is being developed jointly with the Gulf Council, as the species is considered a single stock across

both councils' jurisdiction. However, the committee only reviewed information for the South Atlantic at this meeting. The committee provided the following guidance: direction to staff to add an option for constant catch total ACL that is under the lowest recommended ABC; request feedback from the advisory panel, or panels, on potential trip limits during spawning season (May 15 to July 31); a trip step-down after 75 percent of the ACL is met; a trip limit for part-time fishermen, which is 500 or 400 pounds; and a trip limit for multiday fishermen, which would require VMS for dually-permitted vessels at 3,500 pounds per week. Also, direction to take the amendment out for scoping and obtain additional feedback from the Snapper Grouper AP, Gulf Reef Fish AP, and the Gulf Council.

Then we got into the red snapper assessment response. This is following the results of SEDAR 73, and we got a presentation from Genny Nesslage, the SSC Chair, since they had a meeting in July, and the committee chair provided a statement concerning the assessment results, the SSC recommendations, and potential management responses, and the committee agreed to the following general plan of responding to the most recent assessment results and other issues in the fishery.

There were a list of actions that are there that we talked about for council consideration. Based on the discussion, I believe that we agreed that we want to complete all five of these actions, and so, just to try to skim over what those five actions were, one was to initiate a framework action to reduce discard removals, and this is really looking at the entire snapper grouper fishery. Increase outreach and data collection, and this would support outreach activities on best fishing practices and look to promote that Release app.

Number 3 is to create a council workgroup to lead this MSE approach to develop management strategies that reduce discards and increase landed yields across the entire snapper grouper fishery, while balancing the needs for fishery access and resource use, while preventing overfishing and rebuilding overfished stocks, and the direction to staff was to try to come back with a plan for the council to review in December, including timeline, costs, and potential participants.

Number 4 is to prioritize a research track assessment for red snapper at the next available opportunity. This would potentially replace the white grunt assessment, but that would be up to the SEDAR Committee. It would consider new data sources, including for-hire reporting, Release reports, and the Florida State Reef Fish Survey. It would look at descending device usage and best practices adoption and consider alternative assessment methods that may address the ongoing inability of the current model to estimate stock productivity and resolve issues and uncertainties in prior assessments that were noted by the SSC in peer review.

Then, finally, Number 5 is initiate an FMP amendment, and it would do a number of things, like revise MSY, ABC, ACLs, and allocations. It would incorporate recommendations from the South Atlantic's recreational workgroup and the Joint Section 102 Working Group that's joint with the Gulf Council. It would incorporate results of the MSE project and consider additional recommendations of the Snapper Grouper AP.

The committee provided the following guidance to staff to develop a framework amendment that explores and considers changes to the following management measures for the South Atlantic snapper grouper fishery: gear modifications for single-hook rigs, larger hooks, leader

modifications, natural bait prohibition; also looking at time/spatial closures of the snapper grouper fishery based on current data; and consider slot or maximum size limits.

There was direction that, in the development of the framework amendment, reference commentary from the fishery through previous visioning efforts and characterize effects by sector and component, including private/for-hire. Direction that, if persistent difficulties prevent quick implementation of the framework amendment, to fold those changes into the plan amendment. See Action Number 5 that we just talked about.

Also, there was direction to consider adjusting the SEDAR schedule for a research track assessment of red snapper to replace the scheduled assessment of white grunt and adjust the timing such that the red snapper assessment would be after the expected completion of the South Atlantic red snapper count, which is slated to end at the end of 2024. Also, direction to begin work on a management strategy evaluation of the snapper grouper fishery and a longer-term plan amendment that would use the SSC recommendations, results of the MSE, and any information on effects of the framework amendment to adjust catch levels for red snapper and adjust management measures for the snapper grouper fishery.

Then we jumped into wreckfish, which is Amendment 48. A reminder that a review of the wreckfish ITQ program was completed in 2019, and Amendment 48 proposes to modernize the fishery based on those recommendations. Development of this amendment will take significant council and staff time, and staff presented several different timelines. Also, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center indicated that the wreckfish shareholders could participate in a voluntary pilot program for the commercial electronic logbook, and the council provided the following direction to staff.

Not listed here is the fact that we selected Option a, which was to continue with the entire amendment, and I have to flip back to see exactly what Option a said. Option a, which was the IPT's preferred, it says that the amendment, basically as a whole, would come to the council every meeting, or every other meeting, depending on the workload, which is similar to the first bullet that we have there, but just being clear that this is the whole amendment and not pieces of it.

I am going to go back to the top bullet there, which was our original direction, to bring Amendment 48, once again the whole amendment, back to the council for discussion every other meeting, or every third meeting, depending on amendment progress and council workload. Also, direction to convene a meeting of the wreckfish shareholders this winter to discuss the commercial electronic logbook and Amendment 48 progress, and then Mike was just typing there that we had selected Option a for this timing, and Option a was the whole amendment coming at every meeting, or every other meeting, depending on the workload. All right.

Then we jumped in red porgy, which is Amendment 50. Staff presented an overview that constituted the public hearing presentation for this amendment, and the committee reviewed proposed actions and corresponding analyses and provided additional rationale for preferred alternatives and made the following modifications.

The committee made the following motion to deselect Alternative 4 under Sub-Action 5 as preferred. I am not going to read the whole action there. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any objection?** All right. **That motion carries.**

Then the committee made Motion Number 9 to move Alternative 2 under Sub-Action 5b to the Considered but Rejected appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion carries.

Then the committee made Motion Number 10 to move Alternative 3 under Action 6 to the Considered but Rejected Appendix. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion carries.

Then the committee made Motion Number 11 to select Alternative 4 under Action 6 as the preferred, as modified. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? All right. That motion carries.

Then we went on to gag grouper. The SSC had provided recommendations for catch levels that are dependent on the rebuilding timeframe that was selected by the committee, and further clarification was needed on legally-feasible rebuilding timeframe options, and NMFS staff clarified the following points concerning rebuilding of gag grouper.

Because gag grouper can be rebuilt in ten years or less, the rebuilding timeframe must be ten years or less, as required by the Magnuson Act, the first year of the rebuilding is the first year that revised management measures are implemented, and the council is not bound to manage the fishery according to a rebuilding probability of 70 percent, but probability of rebuilding must be at least 50 percent.

Then the council provided the guidance, as direction to staff, to request additional catch projections at average and recent low-recruitment scenarios with the probabilities of rebuilding in ten years of 70 percent and 50 percent for review at the December 2021 council meeting.

We then were provided a brief on this exempted fishing permit, so that we could discuss this before we got to public comment, and, Mel, I think this is a separate item under Full Council, and I think it's after the committee reports that we're going to talk about this, and I assume that you want to leave it there.

MR. BELL: Yes, that's fine. We can leave it where it is in the schedule.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Got it. All right, and so there's a project summary in the committee report, and then we went into the discussion of vermilion snapper trip limits. This is based on a September 16, 2020, temporary emergency rule that NOAA Fisheries announced to increase the commercial trip limit for vermilion snapper from 1,000 pounds gutted weight to 1,500 pounds in federal waters of the South Atlantic region. The temporary rule has expired, and it reverted back to the 1,000 pounds gutted weight, and so, at the council's request, the AP discussed, at their April 2021 meeting, whether more permanent action should be taken to change the commercial trip limit through an amendment.

Council staff presented a summary of the council's previous request for the temporary rule and recent commercial landings data, and our AP Chair presented the AP's comments and recommendation, and the council provided the following guidance. With coming reductions coming to other species, effort could shift to vermilion snapper. Just a note there and then direction

to staff to schedule the AP to reconsider their recommendations on vermilion snapper with additional context of the information presented at the September council meeting, including future changes to red snapper and gag grouper management. Develop projections for comparison of closure dates for the current 1,000-pound trip limit with no step-down, the AP's recommended 1,500-pound trip limit with a step-down, and a 1,250-pound trip limit with no step-down. Ask the AP does the AP still recommend implementation of a step-down in the commercial trip limit, how high of a priority, or how quickly should changes to vermilion snapper be considered, and what are the potential benefits, risks, and preferences of a longer season versus a higher trip limit to different demographics in the commercial fishery.

Then here's an item that we need to review and finalize today, and so we did go over an initial list of topics for the Snapper Grouper AP meeting that will convene in October, and there is a lengthy list that you can see on the screen there of topics, and both myself and Kerry worked with Mike and Myra on this list. We tried to, down there in italics, under this broader discussion of approach to snapper grouper management, tried to give some feedback on what the big broader discussion was here relative to red snapper, trying to add in what is the highest priority for management, what would the commercial fishery prefer on certain topics, describing the effect of commercial and recreational dive effort on local populations of grouper, et cetera, and so lengthy discussion on that.

Also, vermilion snapper commercial trip limit, and then some updates, and so this is a lot of information here that the AP would have to get through, and I know we really want them to look at all of these things. I think it's the intention, if the council would give us the liberty to do this, that Kerry and myself can work with Myra and Mike and Jimmy Hull to try to make sure we think we can fit all of these things into the meeting that is one full day and two half-days.

It's a lot of things we want them to talk about, and maybe we can look at, after we set the priorities, what is coming to the December meeting and what might come to the spring council meetings that could possibly wait for the AP to review at that time, and so I will pause there, to see if there's any hands or comments on this lengthy list, but we hope to refine this a little bit more in the coming weeks. Mel.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Jessica. Obviously, that is a very ambitious list, and I think it would make sense for us to have some discussion about overall priorities and how things order out time-wise and then allow you guys to work cooperatively with the chair and kind of figure out how to package it and cram it all in there, but that makes sense to me.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Mel. I see Andy put his hand up.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Jessica, and I'm certainly fine with you working with the AP chair and others to help kind of whittle down this list. I think a lot of it comes down to kind of timing, as to when we need their input, and one thought that I guess I had was, given that we're still in a virtual environment, are there things that we could have the AP meet on at some later date, in between the October meeting and whenever they would meet next spring, and I know that's additional workload for council staff and others running that meeting, but, timing-wise, there are certainly things on here that I think are less urgent for us to get input back on, but that might be a solution to be able to reduce the amount of work for this upcoming AP meeting.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Andy. Mike, maybe you can capture that as a note to consider an additional AP meeting after the October meeting and before their March meeting. Also, of course, budget-wise, the Executive Committee would have to look at the budget and figure out if we even have the money to do something like this. I think it's a great idea, especially since we're still in the virtual environment, and maybe there might be a possibility, before March, that they could have an in-person meeting. Kerry, what have you got?

MS. MARHEFKA: That's a great idea, and maybe, if we can afford it, what we can do is have maybe even a one-day meeting that's outside of the regular AP meeting, where they do discuss some of the bigger-picture issues, and that's how we move forward with this, so that they can really think big and dream, but I would think that would have to happen after they got all of the information about what's really coming down the pike, so they have that information to then step back and talk amongst themselves about a path forward.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's a good point. I foresee more discussions on this topic with you and myself and council staff and Jimmy Hull, to try to figure out the best way to slice up this list, I guess. Mike is making some notes there, and so a couple of things that we didn't get through during the committee meeting that we said that we would take up at Full Council. One of those items was updates on the red snapper and the greater amberjack research project. Myra, were you the one that was going to give us the update on that?

MS. BROUWER: I am going to tell you about red snapper, and Chip is going to cover amberjack. Are you ready for me to give you the update on red snapper?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I sure am, as long as this is Mel's intent, that we would cover these items right here.

MR. BELL: That was the idea.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Great. Go ahead, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: It will be very quick. I don't have any visuals for you. This is the project that would estimate the red snapper abundance in the South Atlantic, and Dr. Patterson is the lead principal investigator on the project, and he presented a more detailed update to the steering committee on September 3, and so that's what I am basing this update on.

The plan is for Dr. Patterson to deliver a presentation to the council in December, if the council wishes for that. At that point, there will be more information to report, and so, as I go through this, I encourage you to jot down any questions you may have for Dr. Patterson in advance of him presenting more details on this to you in December.

The study team for this project is quite large. It includes partners from all over the South Atlantic region, and many are folks that we all know very well, and, just to remind you, this study has four main objectives. The first one focuses on determining distribution and density of red snapper in unknown or on unconsolidated habitats, and this is being done using ROV surveys, all the way from North Carolina through the Florida Keys.

Objectives 2 and 3 each would produce an independent estimate of red snapper population size for ages-two and older. The first objective uses a genetic close-kin mark-recapture approach, and the second one develops an integrated model that is based on SERFS trap camera and the ROV survey data, and then, finally, the fourth objective would integrate those two population estimates with a stock assessment model.

As of the date that Dr. Patterson gave us the report, the team had completed 201 out of 280 ROV surveys, and so they have already covered the surveys off of North Carolina and Florida, and they're going to sample focusing off of South Carolina and Georgia, I believe, in October, and they have partnered with nine for-hire vessels to do this work, and this effort is also obtaining information on habitat.

The fin clip collection for the genetic work is going very well, and their target fin clip sample was around 3,700, and they estimate they're going to have nearly double that. Samples have been collected from all kinds of sources up and down the coast, and so that seems to be going really well. The close-kin mark-recapture study is on track as well. Dr. Patterson provided some details on markers and kinship analysis and other very technical bits, and he also mentioned publication of a paper on epigenetic ageing of reef fishes that showed a strong relationship between predicted age and observed age, and so that's going to be really good for estimating age when otoliths are not available, and so for like discards.

The integrated modeling portion of this study is also on track, and so, overall, everything seems to be going well, is either on schedule or ahead of schedule, and there's also going to be a website that was part of the proposal for this project, and that's coming at the end of this month. There is also going to be a new request for proposals for the additional funding that's been made available to augment what's being done through this project, and the steering committee is working on that RFP right now, and so that's my quick update for you all. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Myra. Did you say that Chip was going to give us the amberjack update?

DR. COLLIER: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. Go ahead, and then we'll see if there is any questions on either one of those updates.

DR. COLLIER: Okay. Mine is going to be a little bit shorter than Myra's. Similar to the red snapper count that's occurring in the Gulf and the South Atlantic, there was a multifaceted project that was funded to research greater amberjack. One of the biggest differences that is occurring for greater amberjack is this project is being done simultaneously in the Gulf and South Atlantic by the same team, and, earlier, or I believe it was last month, the project -- It was announced who was going to be leading this project, and it's Dr. Sean Powers out of the University of South Alabama, and he assembled a team throughout the Gulf and South Atlantic, and also the east coast, with a variety of researchers coming from thirteen different universities.

In order to accomplish this project, they are utilizing a variety of techniques in order to estimate the abundance of greater amberjack in the region, and they're going to be doing surveys of anglers, and I believe that some of this work has already been done through the University of Florida, but

they're also going to be mapping and doing surveys of areas, tagging individuals, and collecting eDNA.

They're going to be getting started on this project soon, and we're going to be getting a briefing on how everything is going shortly, and the Steering Committee will be getting a briefing on that, and I will provide you guys an update on this in December, as we have more information, and that is it for me, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chip. Thank you, Myra. Any questions from the council on these two updates? All right. No hands on that, and now we'll go into Other Business, which we also did not have time to cover earlier in the week, and the one item that we had under Other Business was regarding blueline tilefish, and I hope that Dewey is still on the line, and I'm going to go to Dewey so that he can talk to us about blueline tilefish.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you, Jessica, and thank you for putting this on the agenda. I don't know how many folks have seen the various emails I've sent out since April 15, and it has to do with the continual overages of the recreational ACL for blueline tilefish the last five years, and, on the average, they're catching a-hundred-and-ninety-some percent of their ACL, and the commercial industry would love to share in the abundance of all the blueline out there, tilefish, and we're being constrained, and probably one of the biggest questions, or a couple of questions that I have, is whose wheelhouse in leadership is this to look at the recreational overages and constrain the catch and close the seasons, the same fair and equitable as happens to the commercial side?

I understand MRIP, and I understand the different waves and the time it takes, but this has been going on for five years, and, like I said, the abundance of blueline are thick, and we would like to share, the commercial industry -- We would love to share in the same thing at the same time, and whose job is it to look at these ACLs and to change bag limits or seasons, and I was wondering why that hasn't happened, because, clearly, when you look at the recreational AMs, and I don't know if anybody would be able to put them up this quick, but, when you look at the AMs, it says a lot about the AA and the RA, and it doesn't mention the council, particularly the AMs.

I was just wondering whose job is it to handle these, and when is it going to get handled or addressed, because definitely the fair and equitable part -- It should be, you know, we've got a lot of issues with different things, like lack of science, funding money, or just all in general, but one should at least be fair and equitable in the ACL application and the AMs, and I would look forward to hearing from Andy and the council leadership as to why this has not happened yet, and hopefully we can, going forward in the future, could address this issue so that both sides can share in the resource. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Dewey. I see that Andy put his hand up. Do we want to go to Andy first?

MR. BELL: I think so. I think Andy can help to get this thing started, in terms of the explanation.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay.

MR. STRELCHECK: Jessica, maybe wait a minute. My neighbor's lawn company is next door, and so it's a little loud, and so give me a second. Sorry.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Okay. That sounds good. A couple of thoughts here, while we're waiting on Andy, and so there are some things that are underway that the council is working on, including that recreational workgroup. Also, now that we're going to be looking at the snapper grouper fishery as a whole, I'm wondering if blueline actually -- If some of these issues get addressed under that overarching look, and I believe we also had a recreational AM amendment that that joint workgroup with the Gulf Council was looking at as well. Before I go back to Dewey, Andy, are you good to go yet?

MR. STRELCHECK: Sorry about that. First, thank you, Dewey. We've had a good exchange of emails over the last few months, and I know that Rick DeVactor has also shared some emails back with you. There's a lot of kind of complexities to this one, and so I will try to cover some of the challenges, and so, obviously, as the council knows, blueline has a short fishing season, and so it's hard to, obviously, manage the recreational landings and determine whether or not catch limits are being exceeded or not until after the season has actually taken place.

Dewey is exactly right that, in recent years, the recreational ACL has been exceeded, and the nuanced part of a lot of this is -- There's a couple of things. One, Dewey, I know you pointed to like this year, for example, landings exceeding the catch limit, but you were looking at data on the MRIP-FES website, and that's not the data that we're currently using to, obviously, monitor the quota, and so a direct response to your question.

In our wheelhouse, the Regional Office, the National Marine Fisheries Service's monitoring of the catch limit is to determine, obviously, what's being landed, and so we do monitor that in the Coastal Household Telephone Survey units. Regardless of what units you monitor in, Dewey is exactly correct that the catch limit has been exceeded in recent years.

There are buffers between the overfishing limit and ABC and ACL, and so those buffers have been large enough that, in 2018 and 2019, the stock was not considered to be undergoing overfishing, and so, even though the recreational catch limit was being exceeded, the stock was not undergoing overfishing. That will not be the case for 2020. Commercial landings typically get finalized around this time of year, and, based on both the commercial landings and what was reported last year for recreational landings, we expect the overfishing limit to have been exceeded.

The other, I guess, component to this is, in order to institute the accountability measure for blueline tilefish, and, Monica or Rick, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the stock has to be overfished, and so, if it's not overfished, then we're unable to implement an accountability measure, and so my recommendation is to have the council review and look at the accountability measure for blueline and consider making changes to that accountability measure.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Andy. One thing, before we go back to Dewey, that I wanted to point out is, in the past, we've had some discussions about the amount of landings coming from state waters off of Florida, because we had inconsistent state regulations with what the federal changes were, and I just wanted to let folks know that FWC did go consistent in 2020, and those new rules were effective January 1, 2021, and so there's now consistency between our state-water regs as well as the federal waters regs. I'm going to go back to Dewey and then to Laurilee.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you, and thank you, Andy, for explaining some of it. Hopefully I will be making another request to look at how much buffer there is, because the overages on the average of almost 100 percent over, and so there must be a heck of a buffer between the overfishing limit. The second thing is this has been continual for five years, and nobody has questioned or did anything about it, and the 2021 year -- I would bet money that it's going to be close to, if not more, than the 2020 year, and I understand that the squeaky wheel gets the grease in the involvement of particularly the council stuff, but the fair and equitable representation of applying the AMs to the commercial industry should be at least strived to be the same in the recreational industry.

When you look at the trending of the years and the different waves, it just begs you to differ how much longer is the can going to be kicked down the road, and not only is the science -- I know that takes time to get developed or looked at, and we're not due for another stock assessment, and probably management measures, until 2025, and so I hope the heck that the commercial industry, and folks off of North Carolina, both industries, doesn't have to wait until 2025 to get a massive quota increase, or a quota increase, based on a stock assessment.

Recent trends in the first year of the blueline deepwater survey is producing CPUEs of one-fish-and-a-half for four hooks, which is astounding numbers, over a fifty-mile area, and so the sharks are going to continue to get thicker. Folks in the recreational industry are going to continue to catch more blueline tilefish, and the commercial industry would love to share in that fair and equitable distribution, and I would hope that something could be done for the year 2022 to fairly and equitably distribute them AMs the same as has been placed on the commercial industry, and I look forward to continuing to work on this issue, to see that fruition to come about, and, also, for the development and the work being done on the deepwater survey that would help produce the true abundance of blueline tilefish north of Cape Hatteras. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Dewey. Before we go to John, and then we have a number of other hands in the queue, I thought of another amendment that is coming. The golden tilefish amendment should be coming, following that stock assessment, and so that could be another vehicle to address some things, but let's go to John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Jessica, and just a quick question for Andy. Based on what you said about 2020, and looking ahead to the next quarterly FSSI update and you all's reporting to Congress, can we anticipate that there's a good chance that blueline tilefish will be listed as overfishing?

MR. STRELCHECK: We need to finalize the landings. As I said, commercial landings are just finalized around this time for the year prior, and we would deliver a letter to you, if it is overfishing, and update the report to Congress and the quarterly FSSI.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thanks.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, John. Thanks, Andy. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I am just starting to try to figure out what's going on with the golden tilefish, but, just looking at the chart here, I see that, at the end of May/June, the total reported fish was 2,539 fish, and their ACL is 2,316, and they had already exceeded. They were up to 110 percent

of their ACL, and they fished all summer long on them, and they're not going to be shut down until September 20, and so I don't know what kind of buffers are there in golden tilefish, or I don't have my facts yet, but I just wanted to point out that it appears that something similar is going on with golden tilefish, and I'm sure the numbers are pretty high, because they have fished on them all summer long, even after exceeding their ACL. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Laurilee. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would be very interested if we could kind of dig into these buffers a little bit, because that's very interesting, and I know we have struggled with the previous stock assessment on the bluelines, and I doubt the next assessment is really going to get us where we need to be, or shed any more light, but where do we go or how do we see about -- Where can we inform ourselves better about these buffers that are existing in the recreational sector, and, actually, for both golden and blueline? I think Laurilee brings up a good point there, but I am not sure where that information is.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Tim. Let's go to Chip.

DR. COLLIER: When we come to you with the SSC recommendations, quite often, we will provide you with the OFL level and then the ABC level, and that buffer between those two is the value that's being talked about right here, because, quite often, the ACL is set equal to the ABC, and so the only buffer that's set in there is the difference between the OFL and the ABC.

The way that the control rule is currently set up is it does include some risk and some scientific uncertainty, and so, as you're talking -- As you will hear discussions during the ABC Control Rule development, you're going to hear some discussion of both scientific risk and -- Sorry. Management risk and scientific uncertainty, and so one of the goals of the ABC Control Rule is trying to separate those out, and where the value is actually coming from is the development of the P*, and that is used to create the buffer between the OFL and the ABC, according to the ABC Control Rule, and I see some other hands are going up, if I'm not speaking about it properly, but, if you want to ask more about it, Tim, we can definitely talk more about it.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Chip. Let's go to Rick and then Monica.

MR. DEVICTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. Tim, I just wanted to point out that I was looking at Regulatory Amendment 25, and you recall there was Abbreviated Framework 3, most recently, and, before that, Regulatory Amendment 25, and I saw the statement in there, when you were talking about total ACL, and it says that the total ACL is 78 percent of the ABC, and it goes on to describe that that buffer was put into place to account for landings in the Mid-Atlantic region, and so I just wanted to point out that that's what I found about the buffer in the recent amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Rick. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to reiterate, or, really, back up what Rick is saying, Tim, that information ought to be included in the beginning, probably Section 1, of any amendment that dealt with any of these species, for example with blueline tile, like Rick was just saying, and so we could actually pull some of that information out and send it around, I guess, if you didn't want to look at each individual amendment.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Monica. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think another concern, for me, is that this is going to end up, down the line, meaning a reallocation, because we're held to a hard limit, and the recreational sector is not, and, when we go back and look at catch levels, five years from now, are we really going to take into account the fact that all of those years were overages, where we were held hard to that limit, and this is a problem that I think we're going to have throughout the entire snapper grouper fishery, and it just concerns me that, really, what we're doing is reallocating, by letting these overages continue.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Kerry. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: If my understanding of what Chip said, that there was a 22 percent buffer, and I don't have it figured out exactly, but the Mid-Atlantic got 57 percent, and the South Atlantic got 44 percent, based on the survey work that was done north of Cape Hatteras for the 2017 pilot program that the Mid-Atlantic did, and so, if there's a 22 percent buffer that is given, and I might be wrong, and I will carry this offline to further make sure of the clarity of it, but 22 percent is -- They are catching over that, and so I don't see how the two buffers haven't been exceeded, or the buffers haven't been exceeded, but we can carry that offline, because this also has an effect for the Mid-Atlantic, the way that it is proportioned out, based on that survey.

Something else that I also mentioned, or will bring up, is that the survey that's being done currently right now in the South Atlantic, the deepwater survey, there is not one being done in the Mid-Atlantic, because they didn't see many blueline tilefish, and so I guess we have to wait for three years, from the SSC stuff, and there's got to be a survey done in the Mid-Atlantic again to see what's the difference in this proportion split, and so I've still got a lot of questions, and I will be fleshing them out in the future, to get a better understanding.

I am kind of laughing, because it's difficult to follow this process, and it's real difficult, because there's a lot to it, but one thing that would be good is if the fair and equitable part is applied to the recreational AMs that has been in place, the same that is happening to the commercial side. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Dewey. Let's go to Clay, and then we'll go back to Laurilee, and then I will try to wrap this discussion up.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to address Dewey's point, which I think is extremely important, and we've been talking with both the Mid-Atlantic Council and the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, and both have agreed, in principle, that we need to extend that deepwater longline survey all the way up the east coast, both from a climate change perspective and just to understand the distribution of the stock and ultimately incorporate that information in stock assessments, and, of course, it's relevant when you start talking about allocations between the different council jurisdictions. We are actively pursuing that. I can't give you a timeline, but I certainly hope that, within the next year or so, we can begin implementing this expanded survey.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Clay. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I want to echo that I support what Kerry said, because the commercial fishery is held in, and they're constrained by all of these limits of fish that we're allowed to catch, and the recreational industry is just out there out of control, catching as much as they can, and I don't think it's fair that, with the new way that we're measuring the recreational fish, based on their efforts, fishing effort, and it doesn't seem fair that -- We're not comparing apples-to-apples when we're comparing a highly-constrained commercial fishing industry to an out-of-control recreational fishery and you're counting their fishery efforts, and it just -- We have to stop fishing, and they don't, and it doesn't seem right. I don't want to see this turn into a reallocation effort, because we're not comparing the same things. You're comparing a highly-regulated, highly-constrained, highly-accountable industry to one that we just don't know what they're doing. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. I appreciate that, and I feel like we've kind of gone beyond blue line here, and now we're just kind of celebrating a bigger problem, but I will go to these last remaining hands, and then we really need to wrap this discussion up. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks. I just wanted to know -- Clay was mentioning about the ability to maybe do another survey or whatever, and I know this might not be the right spot, but I was just thinking about it, and is there any way that we could direct some of those funds or some of the resources over to looking at our deepwater -- Not even deepwater, but our SMZs that we created that have a sunset clause, I think, to close again in 2027.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for that question. We'll see if we can get an answer on that. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just real quick, and then this will help you a little bit, and so, going back to the establishment of the OFL from the SSC, the OFL, if I am understanding this right, it already has -- I don't know if "buffer" is the right word, but it has already taken into account some scientific uncertainty in the process, as well as management risk, and so does the OFL already have -- I don't know if "buffer" is the right word, but does it already have some mitigation or some buffer already built into it, and then we've added another layer on top of that, with the difference between the ABC and the OFL? Is that correct?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I will start, and then Mike can fill in. The difference between the OFL and the ABC is the scientific uncertainty. The difference between the ABC and the ACL is the management uncertainty. Let's go to Mike and then Clay.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thanks, Jessica. The OFL is the level of fishing, and that's the highest level that you can go. If you're above that, then you're overfishing, and so that doesn't have the buffer built in. That is the overfishing level, and then we build in a buffer between the OFL and the ABC, typically, and the ABC can go no higher than the OFL. We normally have a process, which is the ABC Control Rule, for setting the ABC, with some buffer beneath the OFL.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Clay.

DR. PORCH: To answer Dewey's question, we're barely scraping together enough funds to do the longline survey as it is, and we use our cooperative research program for that, and so I don't see diverting funds to focus on the SMZs, but, as we expand the survey, and it includes that area,

we may be able to get what Dewey is looking for from the same data series, but I don't see just diverting funds.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks. All right. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: That was Chris Conklin that was talking about the SMZs and not Dewey.

DR. PORCH: Sorry about that.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: No problem, but something else to think about is the blueline tilefish is a three-fish bag limit, and, if my memory serves me correct, that three-fish bag limit has been in place for seven or eight years. Well, it's my belief that these fish grow up and get bigger, and so, if you keep the same bag limit for three years, and these fish are growing up and getting bigger, we're seeing it, and the citations, the more citations -- North Carolina had to increase the citations from ten pounds to twelve pounds, I believe it was, and so what happens when the fish grow up?

You keep the bag limit the same, and the season stays the same, and you have no way of knowing the effort, and so it's almost like a perfect conundrum here of this happening, and I do appreciate the council's time and SERO's time on this issue, and I look forward to a continuation of solving this issue and getting a better footing of fair and equitable distribution to both the recreational and commercial resource, particularly through the harvest of blueline tilefish. Thank you.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Dewey, and thanks for your willingness to dig into some of these issues outside of the council meeting. I have mentioned a couple of things that are going to be coming back, and there is a recreational AM amendment out there, and there's two different working groups out there, and we're going to be starting another one that's going to look at this MSE, and also a golden tilefish amendment will be coming that could be another mechanism that we could dig into this.

Does council staff want to add anything to this discussion or make a suggestion about these items that could possibly be a way to look at blueline or the timing? I don't see any hands from council staff, and so I feel certain that we'll likely pick up this discussion as part of other discussions moving forward, but Andy put his hand up here.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am, obviously, not council staff, but, Jessica, you mentioned, obviously, the different vehicles we could potentially address this, and I think it makes a lot of sense to consider this in the golden tilefish amendment, and I would recommend that, but certainly, if there's other options that might be coming faster, then we could consider that as well.

The other thing that was suggested to me by Monica is I think staff can work with -- My staff can work with council staff, and we can put together a short summary document, kind of the issues, to help, I think, with the broader understanding of kind of where we're at, what was described today, the buffers, et cetera, and so that, I think, will be helpful, and we can certainly bring that back at a future council meeting for discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Andy. That is much appreciated, and Mike is typing that up on the screen, and so I appreciate all the good discussion today. It sounds like some of this discussion will go offline outside the meeting, and then we have a couple of vehicles with which to bring

things back, but I appreciate Andy just volunteering to put together a summary of this for a future council meeting, and so thanks for that good discussion.

Now onto the last thing that I think will come before the Snapper Grouper Committee today, and that's this timing and tasks motion. This motion needs to be made. I can read it, and then maybe someone can make the motion.

The draft timing and tasks motion is to conduct additional analyses and draft a white paper on the two-for-one commercial permit policy and review at the December 2021 council meeting; add actions to Amendment 49 considering changes to size limits, the Season 2 commercial trip limit, and closure of the recreational fishery in April, and that's the greater amberjack amendment; add constant catch alternatives to the actions addressing annual catch limits in Amendment 49, which is amberjack, and Amendment 44, which is yellowtail snapper; conduct scoping meetings for Amendment 44, which is yellowtail snapper, before the December 2021 council meeting; begin work on a framework amendment that explores and considers changes to management measures that would reduce discards in the South Atlantic snapper grouper fishery; begin work on a management strategy evaluation of the South Atlantic snapper grouper fishery and a long-term plan amendment that would adjust catch levels for red snapper and management measures for the snapper grouper fishery; change the frequency of Amendment 48, and, once again, Amendment 48 is wreckfish, review by the council to every other meeting or every third meeting, depending on amendment progress and council workload; convene a meeting of the wreckfish shareholders this winter to discuss the commercial electronic logbook and Amendment 48 progress; request additional catch and rebuilding projections for gag grouper for review at the December 2021 council meeting; develop projections to compare commercial closure dates for vermilion snapper under different commercial trip limits; and convene the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel in October. That is the timing and tasks motion, if someone would like to make it. I will add here that we just had discussion on blueline, and we also just had a discussion on possibly another Snapper Grouper AP meeting, but that's partly dependent on budget. Would someone like to make this timing and tasks motion?

MS. THOMPSON: **I will make that motion, the list of timing and task projects.**

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, Laurilee. Mel, is that a second?

MR. BELL: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Any more discussion on this timing and tasks motion? Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I might have missed it, and this might be self-understood, or explanatory, but you had talked about, obviously, or we talked about, the delay, or not the delay, but the moving-up of the red snapper research track assessment. To me, that's a decision that has to be discussed with the SEDAR Steering Committee, and so I just want to make sure it's clear that that would be something that could be addressed at the upcoming October SEDAR Steering Committee meeting and bring back to the council any outcomes of that discussion.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Great point. **I just verbally mentioned that because that wasn't typed out in the document, and, Mike, do you mind amending this motion to add that the red snapper**

assessment needs to be considered at the upcoming SEDAR Steering Committee meeting?
All right. That's going on the board there. Thanks for bringing that up, Andy. I am assuming that the motion maker, Laurilee, and the seconder, Mel, are okay with modifying this motion.

MS. THOMPSON: Absolutely.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Anything else? Andy, is your hand still up, just accidentally, or do you have something else?

MR. STRELCHECK: I took it down.

MS. MCCAWLEY: All right. Thanks, Andy. Any more discussion on this timing and tasks motion? **Any objection to this motion? I don't see any objections, and this motion carries.** Mel, that concludes the Snapper Grouper Committee report and business, and I'm going to turn it back to you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Jessica. I appreciate that, and I appreciate the additional discussion on blueline, and we do appreciate Dewey's homework. He does an awful lot of homework. We could go ahead right into the next item, which would be the Dolphin Wahoo Committee report, and then, maybe after that, we'll take a quick break, and so, Kerry, if you would like to go ahead, if you're ready.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am ready, Mr. Chair. Thank you. The Dolphin Wahoo Committee met on September 15, and so that was the day before yesterday. Sorry, but it's been a long week. The committee approved the minutes from the June 2021 meeting and the agenda.

We talked about the status of amendments under formal review. As you all recall, we were updated on the status of Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10, which revises the total ACL, sector allocations, sector ACLs, recreational AMs for dolphin and wahoo, and it also contains the actions that will allow for the retention of dolphin and wahoo by trap, pot, and buoy gear onboard a vessel, the commercial limits, onboard a vessel with those gear. It removes the operator card requirement and reduces the recreational vessel limit for dolphin from sixty to fifty-four fish, and that amendment is currently being prepared for formal submission to NMFS.

We also looked at the information paper on the minimum size limit for dolphin, retention limits onboard charter and private vessels, and for-hire captain and crew bag limits. At the June meeting, the committee directed staff to prepare information on an amendment that would consider extending the minimum size limit for dolphin that is currently in place from Florida through South Carolina and to extend that northward; specifying different retention limits for charter and private vessels for both dolphin and wahoo; and removing or reducing captain and crew bag limits.

The committee reviewed the information paper on those topic and provided the following guidance on the initial range of options to consider in the amendment. The first was all done as direction to staff, and we directed staff to modify the applicable range of the minimum size limit for dolphin. We're including a range of options that would extend that size limit through North Carolina only, from North Carolina through New York, and all the way up through Maine.

We also talked about establishing separate recreational retention limits for dolphin onboard charter vessels and private vessels. We want to look at considering the same limits for headboats that would apply to charter vessels and considering the same retention limits onboard for-hire and private vessels. We indicated that we would like to include increments that are divisible by six, and we want to consider different retention limits by mode, with the range of bag limits being five to ten fish per person and vessel limits being thirty to sixty fish per vessel.

We talked about establishing separate recreational retention limits for wahoo onboard charter vessels and private vessels, but we decided not to further consider this topic in this amendment, and, finally, we talked about reducing or removing the for-hire captain and crew bag limits. We decided to continue consideration of removing or reducing captain and crew bag limits for dolphin only, and we want to consider a regional approach for Florida only.

Then, out of order, and I think I asked for a motion, and so forgive me that it's in a wonky order, but we made a motion to add two representatives to the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel to represent the New England region. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any objections? Hearing none, that motion carries.

There were no items discussed under Other Business, and then we moved on to timing and tasks, in which I will offer a motion on behalf of the committee to approve the following timing and tasks: prepare an options paper covering topics identified for the next amendment to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP for review at the December 2021 meeting; work with the New England Fishery Management Council to identify potential new representatives for the Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion on that? Any objections? Hearing none, that motion carries. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my committee report.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Kerry. I appreciate that. Let's go ahead and take -- Let's take a twelve-minute break, and so I've got that you will come back at 10:05, and we'll reconvene in Mackerel Cobia. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: I think I see a majority of the hands there, and so, Steve, if you would go ahead and work us through the Mackerel Cobia report.

MR. POLAND: Absolutely, Chairman Bell. The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council met via webinar on September 16, 2021, and the committee approved the minutes from the June 2021 meeting and approved the agenda for the committee meeting.

The first item discussed by the committee was a review of Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34. This is an amendment updating king mackerel management based off of the most recent SEDAR update as well as modifying management measures for the king mackerel fishery and for Spanish mackerel.

The committee provided the following direction to staff. For the new constant catch stream alternative proposed under Action 1, set the catch level equal to the 2026-2027 ABC, and we'll talk about that in a few moments. Work with the IPT to add additional language and/or a new action that looks at removing the 5 percent undersized king mackerel allowance for the commercial sector, and ask the public for input on proposed changes to the minimum size limits for recreational and commercial Atlantic king mackerel and proposed changes to the cut/damaged fish regulations during public hearings.

During committee discussion, the following motions were approved. **Motion 1 is add an alternative for a constant catch stream.** The motion was approved by the committee. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

Next, we have a draft motion in front of you for the council to consider, as well as draft language for Alternative 5, and I will read new Alternative 5. The total annual catch limit and annual optimum yield of Atlantic migratory group king mackerel is equal to the updated acceptable biological catch level of 21,800,000 pounds. This is a constant catch value for 2022-2023 and subsequent fishing years, or until changed by a future management action.

If you recall, our direction to staff was to develop draft language for Alternative 5, and we would review and discuss and potentially add that alternative to the amendment at Full Council, and so, with that, we have a draft motion on the board. What is the pleasure of the council? Is someone willing to make that draft motion? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I didn't raise my hand. My hand got caught, and I was texting someone when that came up, and so I will let Jessica go. Sorry.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That's okay. I am willing to make that motion. **I move to approve Alternative 5 under Action 1 for inclusion in Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. Mel.

MR. BELL: That's a second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Is there any discussion? **Is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

Next, the committee made the following motion for Action 2. **They moved to remove Alternative 4 and Alternative 6. 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 made Motion 3 to select Alternative 1, no action, as the preferred alternative for Action 2 and remove Alternative 2. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

Next, for Action 3, the committee moved to select Alternative 2 as preferred under Action 3. **On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, that motion stands approved.**

Next, Motion 5 is to select Alternative 2 in Action 6 as the preferred alternative. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved. With that, we have a draft motion to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34 for public hearings. Is anyone willing to make that motion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have my hand up.

MR. POLAND: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 34 for public hearings.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you. Mel.

MR. BELL: Second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel. Is there any opposition to the motion, or any further discussion of the motion? **Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** Next, the committee reviewed Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 32. This is a joint amendment with the Gulf, in regard to Gulf cobia management in the Florida East Coast Zone, as well as updating the CMP framework procedures.

The committee reviewed the amendment and reaffirmed the selected preferred alternatives and provided the following direction to staff: to work with FWC staff when scheduling public hearings/listening stations for CMP Amendment 32. The suggested locations to include the Florida Keys, Jupiter, Port Canaveral, and Jacksonville. Then the following motion was approved by the committee.

Motion 6 is to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 32 for public hearings. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved. There was no other business to come before the Mackerel Cobia Committee, and now I will ask if anyone is willing to make the timing and tasks motion.

MR. BELL: I've got my hand up.

MR. POLAND: Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we continue work on CMP Amendment 34 and prepare a draft for discussion at the Gulf Council's October 2021 meeting and the South Atlantic Council's December 2021 meeting; work with FWC and Gulf Council staff to conduct in-person public hearings for CMP Amendment 32 prior to the December 2021 meeting; and continue work with Gulf Council staff on CMP Amendment 32 and prepare a draft for discussion and consideration for formal approval at the December 2021 meeting.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica.

MS. BROUWER: **I was going to add public hearings for CMP 34, now that you have approved them, to the timing and tasks, if that's okay with you.**

MR. POLAND: Yes. All right. **So conduct public hearings for CMP Amendment 34 is added to the timing and tasks motion.** Is there a second for the motion?

MR. BELL: Second.

MR. POLAND: Any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** Chairman Bell, that concludes the Mackerel Cobia Committee report.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Steve. Nice job with that. Now you can shift personas and become chair of Habitat and Ecosystem and present that one.

MR. POLAND: All right. The Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council met via webinar on the afternoon of September 16, 2021. The committee approved the agenda and minutes from the June 2021 meeting.

The first item discussed by the committee was consideration of Coral Amendment 10. Staff reviewed the decision document, including analyses and input from the advisory panels, as well as public comment. **The following motion was made to approve the revised purpose and need statement in Coral Amendment 10. On behalf of the committee, I so move.** Is there any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.**

Next, the following motion was made, Motion 2, to approve Amendment 10 to the Fishery Management Plan for Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live Hardbottom Habitat of the South Atlantic for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair the authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text. On behalf of the committee, I so move. Because this is a final action vote, I believe we need to take a roll call vote of the council. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thank you, Steve. I just wanted to bring up a couple of things that I think I would appreciate it if we could have a little bit of discussion and make sure that the record is very clear on this. The first thing is Roger mentioned, and you saw it in the decision document that he put forward, that, under the action, which would allow some trawling by rock shrimpers in this area, there's a statement that it's the council's intent that, when a rock shrimp vessel is within the proposed SFAA, the vessel would continue to transmit a minimum ping rate of one ping per five minutes.

I would appreciate a little bit of discussion on that, and I believe that's the council's intent, and that would mirror what's in place right now for rock shrimp vessels who have rock shrimp onboard when they transit the Oculina Habitat Area of Particular Concern, and that's the vessel VMS transmission rate, is once every five minutes. I want to make sure that it's clear on the record that that's absolutely your intent as well, and then I have one other thing, but maybe, if we could hear discussion on that first, that would be great. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Monica, and I've got a question about that. Is the language correct that a minimum of five minutes, or should it be no more than a maximum of five minutes between pings, or is the intent pretty clear that it's, at least with the language, that it's every five minutes, not to exceed five minutes?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I think you could have discussion on that, and, the way it's written now, that's what would go in the codified text, is that the transmission rate is, and you have that codified text in your briefing book too, would be once per five minutes. If you want something different, then you could discuss that.

MR. POLAND: Mel, go ahead.

MR. BELL: We had some discussion on this, and the idea was to match the language that we already had, and I think the one every five minutes is indeed our intent, and it would, like Monica mentioned, it would be exactly what we already have in the language for vessels transiting with shrimp onboard, and so that makes sense.

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

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just going to say that, yes, it's my intent that the ping rate would be one ping --

MR. POLAND: It sounded like you got cut off right there at the end, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That it would be the ping rate that Monica described, which was, I believe, at least one ping per five minutes.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I agree. The only question I have is that we increase the ping rate during transit, to make sure that it was obvious that we were transiting, and there's a slower ping rate when they're fishing, and so I'm not sure if -- If you want to know when they're fishing in the fishery access area -- You wouldn't be able to tell the difference between whether they're fishing or whether they are transiting, if it's the same ping rate as the transit. I don't know if that makes a difference or not. I don't think so, but I just wanted to point that out.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Laurilee. Tim.

MR. GRINER: To that point, unless I'm missing something here, the ping rate can be the same, but the position of the boat will tell you the speed that the boat is working, correct?

MR. POLAND: Is there anyone on staff or invited participants who can answer that?

MR. PUGLIESE: From the system, the system would be able to record exactly what it is, and so you're just getting more pings in that area and a finer resolution of information.

MR. POLAND: All right, Roger. Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: That was the exact point that I was going to make, and so it's just going to give you more coordinates in which to determine how quickly that vessel is transiting and whether or not it's consistent with fishing activity versus transiting through that area, and so the ping rate has nothing to do with whether or not we can monitor fishing effort. It really depends on then the details of what that data is telling us and how quickly that vessel is operating in that area.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Andy. Mel.

MR. BELL: Andy covered it. It's really that a higher ping rate gives you better track resolution.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you. Is there any further discussion on the intent of the five-minute ping rate? Monica, I think you had another item that you wanted to discuss.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I did, and that was good discussion, and I appreciate it, for the record. The other point that I think it would be a little bit helpful to have some discussion on is, you know, there has been a lot of discussion, if you will, about what the council, in the past, promised to do, and it's centered around Coral Amendment 8 and whether certain coordinates should have been included for the Oculina HAPC or whether they shouldn't have been included and what the fishermen wanted, and so it's good to have that discussion now, but I want to make sure that the council understands that -- This particular council, right now, is not bound by what a -- I don't think it was a promise, but what an intent was from a past council.

You're making the decision on approving, or whatever your vote is going to be on Coral Amendment 8, on the record before you. I think there's been a good record that Roger and the fisheries staff have developed, in terms of what the document -- All the information the document contains and all that, and so I just want to make sure that you all understand that this is your decision, obviously, and you're not bound by anything that a past council said it would do, other than, sure, you're going to consider what they suggested you do, and you're considering that, and you're looking at it right now, in terms of what's before you in Coral Amendment 10, and so just so the record is clear on that. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Monica. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks, Steve. I want to remind folks that Roger had sent around a summary that FWC staff had prepared of all the council and committee discussions on the rock shrimp access at this eastern boundary of the Oculina HAPC, the northern extension, and so I would like to -- We looked at all of the transcripts, and I wanted to call your attention to a couple of items in that summary document.

Based on the discussion at the last council meeting, we highlighted some items from the December 2013 and the March 2014 council meetings, and so those are where Mike Merrifield talked about the harvest being around \$1 to \$2 million of rock shrimp and requested that the council revisit these points, and so this is after the amendment was finalized in March of 2014. Mike Merrifield provided some trip tickets for a particular time period of harvest prior to the area being closed, and then the particular point that Monica is referring to actually happened at June of 2014, in Full Council, and I will summarize, from the transcript.

Dr. Crabtree noted the good relationship with the rock shrimp fishermen over the years and noted that this closed area was likely going to have more impact than they expected. He noted that he had heard enough to at least go back and take another look at it. He noted that it's all about balance and would like to re-look at this area. I agree with Monica that the statement is about going back and having another discussion about this particular area.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. Mel.

MR. BELL: Jessica did send that around, and her summary of 2014, and there you go. That's right from the meeting, and so, obviously, this council is under no binding -- There was nothing binding in anything that was said back then. All that was said was that, yes, we would work with the industry, and they were cooperative, and we would look at it.

Like a lot of things, it has just taken this long for it to work through the process, and we do appreciate everybody's patience in that, and certainly some things have been said about Roy's commitment to that, and certainly the current RA is under no obligation to follow through in anything that the previous RA said, and so we're really living in the world now that this is about making a decision now based on all the factors now, and we were certainly under no obligation to do this, based on anything that was said back in 2014 or prior, and so this council -- I think maybe Jessica and I are maybe the only ones that were on back then, and so it's a new council. It's a new RA, and it's a decision made now, based on all the facts now.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Mel. Is there any further discussion? I am not seeing any hands. Again, we've got the motion on the board, and this will be a roll call vote, and so whenever staff is ready.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay, Steve. Thank you. I will do the roll call vote, and it is alphabetical, with the Council Vice Chair and Chair coming at the end. We will start off with the roll call vote for submission of Coral 10. Brewer.

MR. BREWER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Griner.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Helmey.

MS. HELMEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Marhefka.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: McCawley.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Poland.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Roller.

MR. ROLLER: No.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Strelcheck.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **Mr. Chairman, the vote carries with one no vote and no abstentions.**

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, John. Next, the committee received an update on the Habitat Program Blueprint Workgroup, and the workgroup has been meeting periodically throughout the year, and hopefully we'll have a blueprint document for the council to look at either in December or March for the following year.

Next, there was one item of business that we were not able to cover during the committee meeting, and we will discuss it now, at Full Council, and that is to provide input on the Habitat and Ecosystem Advisory Panel's fall meeting slate of topics. This was an item that we did not have time to cover during the Habitat and Ecosystem Committee, and we decided to address it now at Full Council.

As you see on the screen, there's a list of potential topics for discussion at the next Habitat and Ecosystem-Based Advisory Panel. I will read through the list, quickly. **We have briefing on committee actions from this meeting, status of amendment development of Coral 10, status**

of NOAA Fisheries South Atlantic Climate Vulnerability Assessment and South Atlantic Ecosystem Status Report, NOAA Fisheries HCD EFH consultation update, presentation from NCCOS Wilmington-East Mapping, presentation from BOEM on offshore wind activities in the South Atlantic region, beach dredge and fill policy statement update, development of a South Atlantic Council habitat blueprint and AP input, and east coast climate scenario planning update. Are there any additions to the list of topics or any deletions? If there are none, I would entertain a motion to approve the list. Mel.

MR. BELL: **I move to approve the following list of topics for the Habitat and Ecosystem-Based Advisory Panel meeting.** I don't need to read those again, because you just read them, but as you just read into the record.

MR. POLAND: Yes, I think that's fine. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I was seconding it.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Carolyn. Any further discussion? **Any opposition to the motion? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** That leaves us with the following timing and tasks motion, and is someone willing to make that motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: **I move to adopt the following timing and tasks: prepare Coral Amendment 10 for submission to the Secretary of Commerce; coordinate with Habitat Ecosystem Advisory Panel Chair in planning for November 2021 AP meeting.**

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

MS. MARHEFKA: I will second.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Kerry. Any discussion? **Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion stands approved.** Chairman Bell, that concludes the committee report for the Habitat and Ecosystem-Based Committee.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Steve. Well done, and, again, we will miss your mellow voice during Mackerel Cobia and Habitat and Ecosystem, and so thanks for all you've done with those committees. There's a lot of challenges, and a lot of hard work, and I really appreciate it.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel, and I will miss the work of the council, working with you all.

MR. BELL: All right. Okay. Let's jump to the next item, which is the Full Council II report. I will give the Full Council Session II report here. The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened on the afternoon of September 16 and the morning of September 17, via webinar. The council approved the agenda with minor modifications. Council Chair Mel Bell was re-elected for another term, and Dr. Carolyn Belcher was elected Vice Chair.

For protected resources, staff reviewed the Endangered Species Act/Magnuson-Stevens Act integration agreement between the council and NMFS SERO, focusing on the level of involvement the council can request when formal Section 7 consultation is reinitiated. Jenny Lee from SERO PRD provided an update on the dolphin wahoo biological opinion, which is currently underway.

The council requested involvement at Level II for the dolphin wahoo bi-op, and remember that was sort of the, I guess, medium level.

Charlie Phillips, the council's liaison to the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team, presented his thoughts on recent take reduction team discussions on ways to reduce the risk of mortalities and serious injuries of North Atlantic right whales and other large whales caused by entanglement in commercial trap and pot gear and gillnet fishing gear along the U.S. east coast.

The council reviewed the take reduction team's scoping presentation given by Jessica Powell from SERO PRD on Monday and provided the following input. We didn't have a whole lot, but here's what we had. The council is supportive of continued discussions on the utilization of ropeless gear for black sea bass pots, and there is a significant amount of effort nearshore, within five miles of the beach, when compared to waters farther offshore, and that may be from various gears and not the black sea bass pots, necessarily. The deadline to submit written comments to the Atlantic Right Whale Take Reduction Team discussions is October 21, 2021, when comments can be submitted to them. Jenny Lee also briefed the council on other protected resource topics of interest to the council.

Then we made up for something that we had pushed off, which was the outreach and communications update by Cameron and Kim, which they gave, and we received, and so there's the details of what we talked about, and you all remember. There's a lot of good work there, very important, and then we received a quick litigation brief from Monica Smit-Brunello from NOAA General Counsel. She briefed us on a couple of pending litigation cases in the Gulf of Mexico, and that seems to be it, and that's what I recall is the last thing we talked about, and so that ends my report. Any questions or any comments? All right. Thanks for that.

Now we will go to the next item that I have on the agenda, unless I'm missing something, and so this -- Remember -- You're looking at something different, but I still had in here that we needed to -- Remember Rick gave us a discussion of the exempted fishing permit during Snapper Grouper, and that was the effort to try to identify sharks that may be involved in shark depredation, and he went through the request and all, and so we did that early, so that was a potential topic that we could have received public comment on, and so we wanted to make sure the public had the ability to comment on that.

I don't think we received a lot of comment on it during the public hearing, but are there any other thoughts from you all related to the exempted fishing permit discussion? You recall what that effort was, right? I think the general idea is, fine, great idea, and we didn't have any -- We had no objections, obviously. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: No objections from me. I mentioned, when we talked about this earlier in the week, that I had met with Matt, the requester, and I also mentioned that he might need to modify his request, based on the death of one of the captains that was involved there, but I think it's a great project, and I don't have any reservations. I am good recommending this.

MR. BELL: All right. Any other comments on it? I do agree that, given all the attention on shark depredation right now, if we can acquire some useful data from it, that would be great. Chester.

MR. BREWER: I am sure that NOAA is not going to have any problem with this EFP. I don't know whether the proper procedure is for us to send some sort of a formal notification that we support this effort or -- You know, we've got -- Andy is right here, and whether we should just tell Andy, or I don't know what the proper procedure is if we want to support this thing.

MR. BELL: I would defer to staff on that, Chester, if John wants to answer, or somebody, but I think, in the past, sometimes we have had particular issues with something, and we have sent letters and commented, in a formal sense, but I'm not sure if we always capture that in a letter, which is certainly fine, and it's a very simple letter that we support it, or have no objection. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think you've done it in a variety of ways. I think, if you felt strongly that you really liked the EFP, or really disliked the EFP, I think in those instances is when letters have been sent, and John would know better, or Myra would know better, but I think, if you put your recommendation on the record here, that would be sufficient.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think Monica summed it up well, Mel. It really has varied with situations, and probably, to some extent, the timing that they're dealing with, and so I think, if you support it, you just make a statement here to that effect. If the council is happy with that, then that would suffice.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, unless there are any other comments on it, or objections to it, or issues with it, then I will just say that we are supportive of it, and that's on the record, and we'll leave it at that. All right. That's sufficient for that item, and we can go to the next item, which would be the FMP workplan review, and this is where we need to roll up our sleeves a little bit and mention that we've got an awful lot of stuff that we're trying to cram into a limited amount of time.

As Andy mentioned this morning, related to AP work, we might find ourselves relying upon the virtual technology, meeting technology, that we have become fairly proficient with to try to expand our hours of available work time together, but realizing that people have their regular jobs and other things to do, and so it's just a growing list of things that require attention, and we've got to figure out how best to coordinate all of that, and so I will stop talking and turn it over to whoever is driving this, John or John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It's John driving it, Hadley in this case. If you're confused about the ordering, that's on me.

MR. HADLEY: I will go ahead and kick off the -- Just kind of to orient everyone on kind of the revised workplan, this is taking into account kind of -- Staff and some of the council leadership got together and put our heads together on a potential revision of the FMP workplan. This version is included in your late materials folder, if you want to follow along outside of the webinar and look at it otherwise, but, overall, it's been reorganized a bit, particularly up top, looking at the FMP items.

I will scroll over here, and you have kind of a look at the current workplan and then the future FMP items, and, additionally, you have your amendments with statutory deadlines up top, and so you can see that you have red porgy, snowy grouper, and the gag assessment response, and then, moving further down, everything is sort of grouped by FMP at this point, and so you have Snapper

Grouper up top, followed by CMP, Coral, your ABC Control Rule, and Dolphin Wahoo. Then you have some of your assessment responses there at the bottom.

One thing of note, and we'll start towards the top here, and the red snapper response and kind of a snapper grouper omnibus have been rolled into one item at this point, and I know, based on the Snapper Grouper Committee guidance, that may change in the future, but I think, for now, there are several items that are kind of going to be part of this red snapper and greater snapper grouper fishery discussion, and so those have been rolled into one item, and, looking specifically at the December meeting, that is a pretty large item, and we're looking at probably a half-day to sort of wrap everyone's heads around that and come up with a full plan to move forward, and so that's one of the major changes that was made. Also, wreckfish has been moved to every other meeting, and I just wanted to note that there, and so skip a meeting and then come back to wreckfish, and that's another change that has been made.

Moving down, you can see this is the workload sub-total, and so you're at approximately a six or so, and we're looking at eleven FMP items, which is a little bit higher than the council's target of eight, but that's where it stands at this point. Kind of the notable changes here have been the removal of wreckfish for December, as well as removal of consideration of the ABC Control Rule for December, and so that's the major change there, and potentially freeing up a little bit of time.

As we scroll down to the bottom, you have the other items, and this is where we did move a few things over for the FMP workload, but the other items have sort of crept in there, and there are a few other items that need to be added for the December meeting.

Of note, the SEDAR Committee will need to meet in December, and so that's an item that was added. The Habitat Committee was shifted over to March, instead of December, to free up a little bit of time. The Outreach and Communications Committee meeting was added to the December meeting, and that was previously left off, and so that's an item that was added to reflect the council's meeting workload, and then we also took the allocation decision tree, as well as the habitat blueprint, and we took that off of there, noting that that will likely be addressed at the special meeting after the December meeting, potentially January or February.

The joint recreational workgroup, that will likely be tied up into that greater snapper grouper/red snapper discussion, and so that's just simply put as an update rather than an item that will take up specific council time, and that's kind of rolled up into that earlier item there, and then we also added an item for the snapper grouper two-for-one evaluation, since that was the committee's guidance, that you do want to take another look at that.

Long story short, we do have -- When everything is sort of added up, looking at the different time blocks, the total is at a 9.5, and, again, the target is eight. There has been some discussion that maybe we can get a little bit more time out of the next December meeting, potentially starting on Monday morning or something along those lines, so that we can squeeze in some of these additional items, and I believe that's about it. There's one thing, and we did add the SBRM topic to the other activities, since that's something that the council will need to address in December.

With that, I will turn it over. Again, we're pretty tight on time, but it does appear that it is a doable work schedule for December, and we can make it happen, again with the idea that we will be fairly

tight on time and likely have to maybe start the meeting on Monday morning, rather than waiting until Monday afternoon, for that December meeting. With that, I will turn it over.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, John. Remember that other constraints we have, of course, is we have a limited number of staff, and SERO has a limited number of staff, and it's just you finally - You've got so many things going on, and it's not just a matter of how fast the council and council staff can move, because there are other -- The Science Center, and there are other factors that get involved in all of this, and we can't create time. Well, the only way we can create time is like you were saying, and that is to try Monday morning, to add a little bit of time there.

Then potentially there may be things that require maybe a good bit of discussion that we can pull into a special meeting, a whole day or a half-day, two topics, half-day and half-day, that sort of thing, but you just see what we're dealing with right now, with all the things we've identified, and that's just the reality of the situation. We try to not redline it, but we're kind of running redlined a little bit, but we did -- I think we're doing fine with this meeting, and so far we've managed to get through everything for this one, but just things to think about. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel. I will defer to John. It looked like he had his hand raised first, before me.

MR. BELL: Okay. John, do you want to go first?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Sure. That's fine. I was just going to highlight, for our SEDAR representatives, which will be you, Mel, and Carolyn, for our meeting that is coming up, the few items down there, and I guess they're 25, 26, and 27, which is the upcoming assessments, pushing that window out a bit farther, and the point I want to raise is, if you notice, we're scheduled now to get the scamp response to the operational assessment -- We've been planning on getting that in October, and I think a few folks know, from some of the planning that's gone on since that review has been done for scamp, that might be pushed back a little bit later.

We're going to discuss this at the Steering Committee, and I want to show why I feel like it's important for us to encourage and ask that the Science Center make sure that's available for our October 2022 SSC meeting, because, if not, we're going to be in another scenario where, at our spring SSC meeting, we could have three assessments.

If you look ahead, we're expecting to have mutton done in January of 2023, black sea bass in March of 2023, and those would come to our SSC at their spring 2023 meeting, and so, if scamp gets pushed back and isn't available for our October 2022 meeting, then we would be dealing with three assessments, and we just went through that, and we know how hard that is, and it also makes a big choke moving through the entire council process, as we try to deal with three assessments and three amendments potentially dealing with assessment issues all on the same timeline. When we get to the SEDAR Steering Committee, we're going to need to strongly request that get done, and here is the reason why.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, John. Andy, do you want to go ahead?

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Mel, and thanks for kind of acknowledging earlier just the challenges with workload and balancing not only the council staff time, but the Regional Office

staff time. Just a couple of things to be aware of. We are down both an analyst and an economist right now, due to a retirement and an employee leaving the agency, and so that impacts, obviously, not just the South Atlantic Council's workload, but our Gulf and Caribbean workload as well, but we will continue to work toward filling those gaps and holes and try to find others that can assist us.

In the meantime, I guess, looking at the schedule here, I know there was differences in perspective and opinion, in terms of dolphin wahoo, and I don't see the same urgency on that one as maybe others do, and I certainly could see that one being pushed off, at least as an options paper, for another meeting and not brought back to us in December.

Then, in terms of kind of the meeting itself, starting it earlier on Monday, I mean, that's certainly an option, but we receive a lot of updates and get a lot of kind of presentations throughout the council meeting as well, and those are very valuable and helpful, but I wonder, if we're needing some time, and more time to work on some actions during the council meeting, if some of those could either be moved to a written report or shifted to an every-other-meeting cycle, and so something like that.

MR. BELL: All right. Good suggestions, Andy, and I agree that the updates are an important part of us staying informed of everything, but perhaps we could occasionally save a little time by turning those into reports that we all receive in between or something, but that's an idea, and I would also agree on dolphin wahoo. I mean, I know we've got things to do there, but I don't -- This is just my opinion, and I don't mind kind of moving that a little bit if we need to, and, like you said, perhaps we kind of start out a little slower with it, just to allow other priorities to jump in that we need to really sink our teeth into in a more immediate sense. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I raised my hand to say that exact same thing. I think, if we have to push something, that's exactly what we need to push.

MR. BELL: All right. John Hadley.

MR. HADLEY: Since we're on the dolphin wahoo note, and kind of looking at it here on the screen, the AP is still scheduled to meet in the spring, and that meeting could occur after the council's March meeting, and so, looking at this cell on Row 21, this options paper and potential scoping document, this could be pushed to March without really making any major adjustments to the schedule of that amendment, and you could still get AP review after the council reviews it in March, kind of basically sending that document onto the AP and getting the input, and so I'm just throwing that out there, if that is desired.

MR. BELL: Okay. That sounds reasonable to me. Again, I'm not speaking for everybody, but does anybody have any thoughts on that?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I have my hand up, but I guess that people can't see it, but I was going to say that I like that option that John Hadley just presented for dolphin.\

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

MR. WOODWARD: I support that too, Mel. I think that makes a lot of sense, given what we've got on the potential agenda for December.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Spud. All right. John Hadley, I think there seems to be kind of a consensus in that direction, so far, of people who have commented, and so why don't we try that? Any other things that anybody sees related to priorities? Again, this is what we know of right now, and we just kind of start working it through as best we can. As you see, we're projecting all the way out to 2023 on some things too, and so it's a constant balancing act, and sometimes things pop up on us. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just going to say that I appreciate this look at this list, and it actually - - Although it looks full, it doesn't look quite as bad as I thought it was going to look. I appreciate staff taking the time to go through everything and take a critical look and place all the items on here. I had a running list of all the different new items that were coming out of especially the Snapper Grouper Committee, and it looks like all of them are on here, and so I think all the things that we discussed this week appear to be on this list, and I just appreciate running through this and appreciate staff taking a critical look at this.

MR. BELL: I agree, Jessica, and it's not simple, and I remember when we kind of first started doing these sorts of things a while back, and it was a little simpler, it seemed like. I remember there was a list we would get, and we would just kind of vote the priority on it, and the spreadsheet has become much more complex now than it was when we sort of started this visual process here. Any other thoughts on the plan, as we're looking at it right now? Again, it's never sort of etched in stone, but this is the best, I think, we've got right now, moving forward, again trying to balance. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am just wondering, and is it an overly simplistic rookie view to look and see that, sort of once we get past these king mackerel and cobia amendments, that, maybe for a while, we can be, by like late 2022, pretty snapper-grouper-centric and really get into the meat of sort of the omnibus and the overhaul, and do we see -- Is there a possibility of other things come down the pike with mackerel and cobia, and I guess -- What else would we have? Spanish mackerel, I guess.

MR. BELL: As we gave some thought to this, and we'll call it the omnibus approach or whatever, but the big-picture approach, or the big-picture visioning, kind of a visioning-based approach, and that was certainly going to require a good bit of concentrated effort in pulling a number of things together, and so it will take some time, when we get to that, and you're right. As some things clear off, then it kind of clears the deck, a little bit, to enable us to do that, and so that would be my hope, is that we can clear the deck a bit and then really focus on something like that, because that is, obviously, a big item for us.

We have gone through periods of snapper-grouper-centric focus before, but I think that the approach we discussed, where we're really looking at pulling things together in a big-picture sense, I think that, yes, that would be my hope that we could do that. John Carmichael, did you want to say something first?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I was going to say, to Kerry, once we get the Spanish mackerel assessment, that will probably be the CMP focus for that group of species, and, when we see that that's really

going to happen, that could shift up into this committee-type approach, especially if you guys like this viewpoint of ordering a bit more by committee, and it's been more chronological in the past.

Then the other point is, with dolphin wahoo recreational measures, if we have more discussion of that in March -- If you look down, you notice we have there, right below the green line, we have the potential new project of dolphin longline starting at that same time. Once you scroll down, you will see that we already have a workload crunch in March, and we may need to delay some of those things below that green line to really better balance out the overall workload.

If we slow down on the rec measures, I think that's going to have consequences for when we potentially start this dolphin longline project, and, Kerry, I think, also, you pointed out the CMP, where we're kind of clearing out, and that does give us a little more breathing room, if you look into the latter part of 2022, when we're able to start some of these new projects, and the so prognosis is kind of good, once we get through the next few meetings, although I will say that's often our outlook, and we seem to be forever chasing that rainbow.

MR. BELL: We are ever the optimists though. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Mel, you mentioned that we used to use a more simplistic form, and I can only imagine that, if you're new to the council process, you're probably looking this like, omg, what in the world, but the more simplistic version that we used to use didn't include, for example, these items that are shown on the screen below the green line, and we weren't really adequately accounting for the fact that we need to meet say the SEDAR Committee, or we need to do say AP or SSC Selection, and so it made it look like we had a bunch more available time slots and could do a lot more work than what we could really do.

I think, by adding in those items that you see on the screen, now we have a better representation for how we can cover these items during the full council meeting week, and so I know it seems overwhelming, but I think that this is a good planning tool and more representative of all of the things that the council needs to do during each one of the council weeks.

MR. BELL: Good point, Jessica, and that's what it was. We literally were just looking at the plan amendments and prioritizing plan amendments, but, as Jessica said, this is more the complete picture, because all of these other things take time and staff effort, and so this is a very good representation more so of the total workload. Steve.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Mel, and I certainly realize that any of my comments on planning, after today, are probably moot, but I just wanted to take the opportunity to make one last plug for the Spanish mackerel assessment response. That's something that we've heard from a lot of the fishermen, not only in my state, but in the Southern Zone as well, and they view that as a high priority, and I would just encourage the council to maintain that as a high priority, but my expectation is, with the Cobia Mackerel Committee, is that, once Amendment 34 and the Gulf cobia amendment is dispensed of, that that's really the only thing on the horizon.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Steve, and, yes, I do understand that priority for them. Chester.

MR. BREWER: I just wanted to caution against de-prioritizing, if that's a word, the issues with regard to longlining dolphin. It's already been pushed back twice, and I was at the HMS Advisory

Panel last week, and I was struck with the fact that one or two of the blue-water fishermen, and that's the big longline folks, offshore, were complaining that some of the actions that were being contemplated by HMS was going to cut into their dolphin catch.

The truth of the matter is that we've been concerned, since the beginning of that FMP, that the longliners were going to direct on dolphin and that it would become something besides a bycatch for them, and that's not something that we need to think may happen anymore, but it is happening, and we need to get a handle on it real quick. Thank you.

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

MS. MARHEFKA: I don't want to debate that point, because I think we'll have plenty of time to do that, but I would say that maybe what we need to do, as some of these competing needs arise, is maybe have some objective criteria and some subjective criteria and sort of distinguish them, because we need to triage this situation, clearly, and I think that, when you look at triaging these species, we have to deal with the majority of the species that are undergoing overfishing, and we need to do rebuilding plans, and that's all, right now, in the snapper grouper complex, and so I think that that absolutely should take priority, objectively, over a species that is not -- That just got its ABC raised, and so that would be my argument for making sure that we prioritize snapper grouper over the dolphin wahoo issue, and then my second thing is a question.

I feel dumb for asking this, and maybe, Steve, you can help me remember, but we've gotten a lot of public comment about new entrants and competition in the gillnet fishery, and was that Spanish mackerel, or was that king mackerel? It's down in Florida, and we've received some public comments, but I don't think we've ever addressed it as a council, and so I was just curious if that would -- If we're talking about Spanish mackerel, if that would come up then.

MR. BELL: To that, Kerry, maybe that was Spanish, but I will defer to staff. Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: Kerry, you're correct. That was Spanish mackerel. The fishermen, particularly down in Florida, have expressed concerns about increasing effort in the Spanish mackerel gillnet fishery offshore, and so, yes, I imagine that's something that will be addressed in the Spanish mackerel amendment, along with, like Steve mentioned, a number of other issues that Spanish mackerel fishermen are currently experiencing.

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

MR. HEMILRIGHT: In the discussion for the dolphin longline, you may be able to go look at the data, the landing data, anything that's been available for the last five or ten years, and, even though it might not put some minds at ease, comments before me, and the data available, I think there's a different picture painted, and so it might would help you look at the timeframe of the needing to address something, or not to address something, based on the known data that's available. Thank you.

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

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was going to just kind of reiterate what Kerry said, and she's absolutely correct here. Our biggest, most pressing issues right now are the snapper grouper

complex. I really feel that our dolphin wahoo is the one species that we don't have an issue with, and it's kind of in the best shape of almost any fish we have out there, but our snapper grouper is where we're really coming to the end of the road here, and so I really think we just really need to bear down and focus on these real problems that we have in the snapper grouper fishery. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Tim. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: That's a phantom hand. My hand is not raised.

MR. BELL: Okay. That's a very nice-looking phantom hand there. Okay. Yes, we could take all day and kind of debate the pros and cons of some of this, but I think, at this point, let's kind of move along. Is everybody comfortable with this plan, particularly as we approach the December meeting? Are we good to adopt this and move on? John Hadley.

MR. HADLEY: I just wanted to remind everyone that we will be having more of a long-term planning discussion in December, and typically that takes place at the December meeting, where we'll really jump into the 2022-2023 workplan, and so there will be another shot at this, and we were just kind of discussing that maybe we can bring back the prioritization survey, where council members have a little bit of homework at the end of the day on Thursday to help with that planning discussion, where you will be sent a survey, and you can help with just general prioritizing, so we can see where some of these longer-term items fall, kind of on a consensus basis, and so I'm just putting that out there as a plug for the discussion we'll be having in December.

MR. BELL: Okay, John. Yes, that's another way, just like we used to, and perhaps adapted to the current spreadsheet that we have, but certainly that would help kind of assess where folks seem to be, related to moving on things. Okay. Do we need anything on this, John Hadley or John Carmichael? Are we good to go right now?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am good. Mr. Hadley?

MR. HADLEY: I'm good. I think we've got a plan for moving forward. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks, guys, and I know this is an awful lot of effort, and the plan itself is a -- It's a plan, and it's a somewhat fluid document, because we'll find ourselves, at the next meeting, talking about things that have popped up that we weren't thinking about before, but this is a good way to track it, and, as Jessica mentioned, it's now a lot more robust than it used to be, and so that's terrific. Okay. We can go to our next agenda item, which would be Council Staff Reports, if we're ready for that, and it's John Carmichael first.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am here, and we are ready. The first thing I will hit on is just the welcome to our new members, as we've done, and just because it came up in the Habitat Committee, I will give an update on the committee membership updates. Because normally we -- As I said, we go through the committee revisions when we get new members, because we have to assign them to committees, et cetera, and we send out notice, through our directory, of all of those changes, and it gives the information and contact for the new members.

We held off on doing that a little bit in this meeting, because we were having the elections, and because we knew we were getting a new North Carolina representative, and so we were really trying to reduce confusion, but, at least for Habitat, that apparently created a little bit of additional confusion, unfortunately, and that's the only committee that has changed membership, and it added a few folks that weren't on there before, because it pretty much included everybody but I think our Coast Guard and Regional Administrator, and so they were added to that committee for this.

The committee list that you see on all your agendas were up-to-date, and we will have a revised directory going out next week, which will have all of this documented and official, et cetera, and then I think what I will do, in future years, is just send out a memo to all the council members that says, okay, here's the outcome of all the committee changes, et cetera, as they are going into this meeting, so you see that for all of the committees and not just the ones for this meeting, where you see it listed on their agendas, and so I apologize for any confusion that that might have caused, and we'll try to get more on top of that next time around.

Then, with that, I will just hit on the COVID, and we are planning all of the meetings to be remote now through the fall, up until the council meeting in December, and a decision will be made on that as things get closer, and, as usual, we'll continue to monitor the COVID situation and council attitudes toward travel, et cetera, and we're still sticking with the intention that our first in-person meeting should be a council meeting.

Then, as far as staff being into the office, we started to come back into the office one day a week, on Tuesdays, when we have our staff meetings, in August, and, with the way that COVID went in South Carolina, in Charleston in particular, and finding that we were requiring to all be sitting around the room in masks, we have now fallen back to the full everyone working remotely, and people still do come into the office, and the office had never been officially closed, and so people have always been able to access the office, distancing and wearing masks, et cetera, but be able to use the resources, such as the internet connection, et cetera, or just to get away from landscapers that might be in your or your neighbors' yards, which we all experience at times.

That's where we are, and we're continuing to monitor the situation, and we're really looking forward to getting back to the office in some normal way at some time and seeing everybody without all wearing masks and that stuff, and so that's the COVID update.

The other issue that I will bring up is the Council Coordination Committee. They are meeting in mid-October, and this will be a hybrid meeting. Quite a few councils are not attending in person at all. The West Pacific, the Caribbean, and the Gulf, from what I understand, are all participating remotely, and our Chair and Vice Chair are participating remotely as well. One of the challenges for us, in our area, is that this CCC meeting was scheduled on top of the ASMFC meeting, and so it's certainly an issue for folks like Mel.

One of the topics that will probably be important at the CCC meeting though is the Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization. There are a number of bills that were out there, and the CCC has a Legislative Committee that started looking at those, and they focused on the Huffman bill, and, if you recall, Senator Huffman had done listening stations and stuff around the nation a while ago, trying to get feedback from fishermen and others on things to consider in a reauthorization act.

That bill has been moving ahead in Congress, as you know from the reports that we send out from Dave Whaley, who is supported by the councils through the CCC to inform us on things going on up there in D.C. The Legislative Committee of the CCC started looking at that, with an idea of developing positions that would be discussed at the meeting in October.

Since that time, Congress asked that we provide feedback by the end of this month on that bill, and so we're going to have to do something prior to the CCC meeting. Jessica and I and Mel will be talking about this some next week, getting together to try and just review it from a council perspective. We're going to have a very short turnaround, and so just be on the lookout for an opportunity to comment, but know that it's not going to be near the type of timeline that we would normally like, just because we basically were given a few weeks' notice that they were going to be requesting comments prior to the CCC meeting, and so, unfortunately, that is what it is, and we'll just try to work through it and keep everyone informed as best we can.

Another issue that we'll be discussing is a tech memo on developing catch limits for data-limited species. It's been in the works for a long time, and this is another one that we'll be sending some comments in to NMFS at the end of the month. They wanted something from the councils before the CCC, and our SSC has not been able to talk about it in detail, but NMFS has told us they will take comments through some months into the future, and even following the CCC meeting, and so that's another one that is still on our horizon.

In terms of the Kitty Hawk wind project, there was a -- I think they started -- A formal comment request went out through the Federal Register, et cetera, and so a letter was sent from the Chair about two weeks ago, giving some comments on that, and really focusing on the discussions the council has had over the last couple of years, as we've had regular updates on that from Rick Robbins, and so certainly the record built in the past was helpful for developing that comment letter.

As I said, we're working on initial comments on that Huffman draft, and we'll get that out to you as much as we can, and then the last thing I'm going to highlight then is we are finally fully staffed, You have heard mention of CitSci new staffer Nick Smillie, as Julia introduced him in the citizen science report, and then we have Judd Curtis, who is our new technical staff person on the science team, and I think I was going to hand off to Chip for a sec, to let him give us a few comments about Judd, but we're glad to have Judd onboard, and it's great to be fully staffed, looking at the workload that we have lying ahead of us. Chip, with that, to you.

DR. COLLIER: Thank you, John. I just wanted to give a brief introduction to Dr. Judd Curtis. At the last meeting, we introduced Judd as a future employee, and now he's been working with council staff since early July. He moved up to Charleston. Prior to coming to the South Atlantic Council, Judd worked at Texas A&M Corpus Christi, where he worked within the university's Harte Research Institute for Gulf of Mexico studies.

Judd has a variety of experience, and it ranges from oysters to cobia to red snapper, and so he's covered habitat, CMP species, and, in the Gulf, they were called reef fish, but, over here, they're called snapper grouper species, and so he has a lot of experience that can be very beneficial to the South Atlantic Council, and he also worked on the Gulf's Reef Fish SSC, and she does have experience working with stock assessments and also working with SSCs, and so he brings a wealth of experience and knowledge to the South Atlantic Council.

In addition to the experience we talk about here, he has some genetic experience as well, and that's probably going to become more and more important as we look into some of the more genetic techniques that are potentially involved in describing populations, and so Judd is going to be working on a variety of issues for the South Atlantic Council. His main item that he's going to be working on is the SSC, and he's going to be the lead for the SSC, but he's also going to be doing analyses and helping with MSEs, as you guys have discussed already.

You can see a couple of papers that we have up here that he has published recently, talking about descending devices and then looking at the late mortality of barotrauma for red snapper, and so, if you have any questions about some of these topics, or if you would like to get to know Judd a little bit more, just reach out through email, or you can call the office and get up with him. With that, welcome, Judd, and thanks for coming over.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Chip. I appreciate that good and thorough overview of Judd, and, as you all see, he's got interest and research that definitely aligns with our needs. I see that Judd has got his hand up, and so go ahead.

MR. BELL: Go ahead, Judd. You can prove that you're a real person and not just an image.

DR. CURTIS: Thanks, Chip, for the introduction, and, as you mentioned, I'm coming from a background in some reef fish research and CMP estuarine species in the Gulf of Mexico, and I'm real excited to come out to the South Atlantic and tackle some of the fisheries issues that have been well described this week, and there seems to be a lot to do, and so it's exciting.

I learned a lot this meeting, and so I thank the council members for sharing a lot of their historical information. For me, it was really informative to see where fisheries, the state of the fisheries, have come from and where we're trying to get them to go, and it really stimulated a lot of great discussion throughout the week, and so I'm looking forward to meeting all of the council members, hopefully in-person, at the next meeting in December. As Chip said, if you have any questions, feel free to reach out to me, either through email or phone. Thank you very much.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Judd, and, indeed, we're looking forward to meeting you. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I just wanted to offer to Judd that I know, right now, our meetings aren't in-person, and it's really hard to get to know industry members and other fishermen, and if, at any point, you want introductions and a tour around the docks or anything like that, I am sure that any of us would be happy to do that for you, especially those of us that are local.

DR. CURTIS: Thanks, Kerry.

MR. BELL: All right. John, are you finished then with your part?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chair, the one last thing is that, as we know, climate change and the Thirty-by-Thirty initiative, et cetera, is also a big topic nationally, and that will be discussed at the CCC, and Roger is our point of contact on really all things related to that, and so that concludes my report, and he's up next to fill us in on the scenario planning effort, which fits into all of this area-based and climate change response.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks. Roger, whenever you're ready.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. Good morning, everyone. I wanted to touch on some advancements on the east coast climate change scenario planning efforts. Climate change planning activities, we just launched a series of three webinars that were held on August 30, September 1, and September 2, and each webinar was structured the same, and we had over 200 people attend, with I think 137 on the first webinar, forty-eight on the second, and eighty-nine on third webinar.

We had participants that were recreational and commercial fishermen, fishery managers, scientists, NGOs, the public, and a fairly broad group participated in the overall activity. The webinars began with basically an introduction to the core team members, and we provided an explanation for the purpose and justification for conducting the work, and that was followed by a description of the scenario planning, explaining the basic principles and benefits of using this specific technique.

The presentation also outlined the detailed objectives and focus and expected outcomes of the initiative, and, finally, we explained the process and described how participants can be involved throughout the entire effort. Recordings of each of these presentations are provided on the webpage, and Kim had identified the webpage and then the different materials, such as this brochure right here, has the links directly to the climate webpage, which we're running through the Mid-Atlantic Council's site at this time.

Much of the webinar itself was spent in breakout groups, and so we had the introductions, and then we went to -- I think the most was three, and we were actually planning up to potentially four, when the numbers started getting high, breakout groups for those sessions. Participants provided input on different activities, one being what they were seeing, and participants are already seeing numerous effects that could be attributed to climate change, including species distribution, shifts in seasonal spawning, smaller size of fish, development of novel communities, water quality issues, water temperature changes, habitat distribution shifts, and human impacts, such as hardening of shorelines. Participants also commented on the broad nature of the investigation, which is typical for an overall scenario planning effort like this.

There were a number of comments to request that scenarios describe habitat conditions in ecosystems, rather than just focus on individual species, as well as social and economic factors that impact the communities should also be included in those overall discussions.

There were requests to ensure that the scenario creation process involved the broadest range of stakeholders, from fisheries participants through various representatives of all the coastal communities, also. The webinars are really only part of the scoping process, and, as Kim indicated earlier, that was the teaser to set the stage for then the next stage, which is soliciting input directly through a questionnaire. As part of the South Atlantic Bite, I think Kim is going to have the notification about the availability.

This questionnaire is available through September 30, and we're encouraging everybody to be able to participate and provide -- Hopefully we get a good showing for the South Atlantic. I think we had fairly good representation during the overall webinars, but this is a good opportunity to provide input directly into this process, and it's important, because what we'll do is we're going to now analyze these questionnaires to be the springboard to provide an overall summary of the overall

scoping phase, and it really sets the stage for how we take this information and begin to then move toward a workshop and actually development of -- Design a workshop to create the scenario framework.

That is really where we are right now, and so the next stages are going to be, as I said, wrapping up this scoping by getting the webinars -- I would encourage members and others to participate, and we will continue to move forward this important collaboration effort that's going on for the entire Atlantic coast, and that's what I have today for east coast climate change scenario planning.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Roger. I participated in one of the webinars myself, and I am really glad to see this effort underway, because it's something that is going to affect all the councils, and I think, from our east coast perspective, we've all got to be communicating up and down, and it was good to see -- There was a lot of discussion of the science and all, but we did have some management input there, and there were questions asked about what folks were seeing. It was an awful lot to cram into the fairly short webinar, but I'm really glad this is underway now, and so kudos to those that got it going, and so thanks. Thanks for the report, Roger. All right.

The next item on the agenda would be our NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center report, and the first thing we're going to talk about is commercial electronic logbook update, which I guess would be Julie Brown, perhaps.

MS. BROWN: I will try and keep it short and sweet, with questions and discussion at the end. Again, I am Julie. The council requested that I give updates this time, particularly related to any changes that came up with the Gulf Council's logbook program, and, since we intend to keep the logbook reporting requirements consistent between the Gulf and the South Atlantic, that would be everything. Everything relating to the Gulf also relates to the South Atlantic.

We've been giving similar presentations to the Gulf, and, a couple of months ago, some of the advisory panels gave some feedback about our intended transition to these higher-resolution location points. It looks like this is going to need to be an ongoing negotiation and transition, instead of the sort of giant leap forward that we had envisioned. For reference, on the left, we've got the type of analysis that we can currently perform using the paper logbooks, one-by-one-degree grid, and this particular example is red snapper. On the right, we have the much more advanced spatial analysis that assessments probably need to start looking like, going into the twenty-first century.

Other fisheries, other regions, are already starting to transition to these higher resolution location points, and so we're going to have to work closely with the advisory panels and do some outreach to land on the right amount of resolution that is needed for the science without putting additional burden on the industry, and also keeping consistent with the reporting in other fisheries. Just as an FYI, I think one of the conclusions of the Great Red Snapper Count was that there were portions of the range that were actually being underutilized by the fisheries, and so better science doesn't always necessarily mean bad news. In fact, it could mean great news.

In the short-term, we've got this mandatory reporting deadline coming up on November 10, and that is for people in the Northeast region who have GARFO permits. Normally, that wouldn't affect the Southeast Regional Office too much, but we're bending over backwards to try and get the e-logbook software able to give these dual-permitted people compliance in both of their regions

where they owe logbooks, and so there is this portion of the GARFO fleet who have say dolphin wahoo permits, or maybe they have HMS permits, and we don't want these people to be out of regulations if they don't submit an additional Southeast paper logbook. That's the short-term goal that we have for these dual-permitted people.

The long-term goal is to get a little more streamlined reporting between the regions and the different sectors. People have all sorts of multiple permits on their vessels, and, right now, each one has a slightly different flavor of logbook reporting. A big part of our job right now is making sure that we accommodate these people and make sure that all of their reporting requirements are taken care of according to the current regulations.

Specific to just the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, we're combining several data collection devices all to one electronic source, and so we've got the coastal fisheries, and that includes South Atlantic and Gulf, and we've got the wreckfish logbook, and we've got the HMS logbook, and we've got the golden crab logbook. At some point in the future, we even hope to fold in the menhaden logbook. We've also got the surveys that a portion of our fleet participates in, and that would be the discards and the economic survey, and then, lastly, we have the no fishing reports, which are straightforward, but we definitely want to make sure that we get everything all taken care of in one system, one with user name and one user sign-in, to keep it simple.

Here's where we currently are. For this November 10 deadline, for users that have both GARFO permits and SERO permits, we're going to have an electronic logbook ready that implements exactly what is collected on the paper logbook, and so these people won't have to submit multiple reports and have multiple reporting deadlines.

In the meanwhile, we're going to have this process of negotiation, where we need to balance the burden and scientific needs. We're going to work with the council APs, and we'll probably do some outreach with the constituents, and then, also, making sure that we're keeping in constant contact with other agencies, to kind of keep the ball rolling toward this one-stop reporting concept. In the meantime though, we still have this fully-functioning paper logbook, and so anybody who decides to report electronically will be doing so voluntarily. Finally, we want to get a joint resolution with the Gulf and South Atlantic that would keep everything consistent, as it has always been.

With recruiting volunteers, right now, we're focusing on people that have those dual permits that I was talking about, but we will eventually start folding in more volunteers with different permit types. For anyone out there who might be listening, who might be thinking they would like to develop a logbook app for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, I will just say that, with this latest change in the reporting elements, we are going to have to re-draft that technical specification document, and so just be patient. Lastly, the pilot report is currently in the public tracking system for documents, and so that will be available soon.

This is the slide where I always like to take the opportunity to remind anyone listening about the current reporting options at SEFSC. For several years now, users have had the ability to sign-up for an account, where they can submit the no-fishing reports online and get immediate compliance. We have over 400 people using this now, and it's really easy and convenient, and it can save you a huge headache if you're missing reports around the time of your permit renewal, and so I really encourage anyone listening, or who has permits, to sign-up for that service.

In light of that option, and also in light of the staffing restrictions, with people and COVID and the work-from-home people aren't in the office, we are no longer accepting faxed reports for the no-fishing. We have never accepted it for the fishing trip reports, but just don't fax anything. Right now, your options are to create an account and do the no-fishing online or use the traditional mail system for those no-fishing reports.

To summarize, in the short-term, we're sticking with the current paper logbook reporting resolution or the electronic logbook, and so, for instance, a user would say that I fished for five hours in this general region, instead of saying I started fishing at X, Y, Z date, time, latitude, and longitude, and I stopped fishing at X, Y, Z date, time, latitude, and longitude, and the transition between these two levels of resolution -- We're not shelving it, but we're just going to slow it down. It's going to be a transition, and we're hoping that people will actually see that it's easier, with the technology, once they get used to it, but it's going to be a transition, like I said.

In the short-term, we're working to accommodate these dual-permitted people for their November 10 deadline. Ongoing discussions, I think I covered that, and we'll start recruiting volunteers who have just Southeast permits after we get to those dual-permitted people who have that deadline creeping up on them pretty soon. I think the next slide is questions. Any questions?

MR. BELL: All right. Any questions for Julie? Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Julie. That was really helpful, and I have two questions for you. Can you go back to the flow chart of timing, a couple of slides ago? Thank you. For the workshop outreach, I see that you have the Reef Fish AP. Do you intend that to cover also the South Atlantic Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel?

MS. BROWN: We want to get as many APs involved as possible, yes.

MS. MARHEFKA: Awesome, and so that was just a wording thing. My second question will probably make you want to pull your hair out, but do you see the possibility, in say like the Phase II, once this has all been implemented, of ever having an option where you may be able to sort of check a box if the producer is also the dealer, such that it eliminates -- At least, obviously, price data would have to be entered, but it eliminates the double reporting, and there's a lot us now I think that are selling our own fish, and the double reporting between SAFIS and our vessel logbooks, and do you think that's ever possible?

MS. BROWN: That's interesting. It's not something I have really thought about, and so I can't say that that's something that would happen anytime soon, but I will definitely add that to the docket of things that we need to consider.

MR. BELL: All right. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks. I got kicked off for a couple of minutes, but I came back on and heard the presenter talking about dually-permitted something, and I was wondering if this was going to be a way for -- Like, if I have a commercial boat, and we run charters in the summertime, can you report your charter fishing through this system as well?

MS. BROWN: Yes, and so, right now, you -- Under the eTRIPS software, which is the only one that is currently, in the short-term, being considered for the commercial logbook, you pretty much would just push a toggle button that says you're either for-hire fishing or commercial fishing, and the application would populate the questions that you need to answer according to that.

MR. BELL: All right. Does that answer it, Chris?

MR. CONKLIN: Yes, and I'm good. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thank you. Dave Gloeckner, I just saw your name there. Do you have something to add?

DR. GLOECKNER: I think the answer for Chris was yes, and, also, I think I wanted to address the dual dealer and vessel reporting, and I don't think we've really tackled that yet, and it is kind of specific to the Southeast. I don't see a lot of that happening in the Northeast so much, and so I think, historically, HMS -- Well, not HMS, but SEFHIER and the Northeast have had regs going through that has driven ACCSP's development work, and so, once we calm down here and get some of these vessel reporting systems in place, we can probably start working on trying to tackle those dual dealer and vessel instances and see what we can do to reduce some of the workload.

At some point, we expect that the vessel report should be able to talk to the dealer, as long as all the electronics are worked out, so that those reports go in immediately, and the dealer has access to it and can just add their information, but I think we're probably years away from that.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Dave. There are, obviously, a lot of different nuances to the way things are constructed in the different regions, and we do have dual folks here, for sure. Kerry, to that?

MS. MARHEFKA: I just wanted to thank Dave, and I appreciate that, and I realize that it's probably not the highest priority, but it's definitely something that is becoming increasingly common in this region, and I am starting to see it, personally, in other regions too, and so, down the road, that would be awesome.

DR. GLOECKNER: We will do everything we can to try to reduce the burden and streamline this stuff. I appreciate it.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Dave. I appreciate that. Any other questions of Julie on the presentation? Not seeing any, thank you, Julie. What I would like to do right now is just take a quick ten-minute break, since it's been a while since we took a break. Why don't we just be back at high noon? It's obvious that we're not going to finish at noon, but take until noon, and come on back, and then we will push on through. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: Let's go ahead and get back into it here, and we'll try to work through the remaining items on the agenda. Next, we have Southeast Region Climate Team and Climate Regional Action Plans for the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic, and it may be a tag-team effort, or Roldan Munoz may be giving that.

DR. COLLIER: Roldan is going to start off, and, after he's done with his presentation, we'll take control back, and, that way, you'll be able to see hands.

MR. BELL: Thank you.

MR. MUNOZ: My name is Roldan Munoz, and I'm located in Beaufort, and I'm a marine ecologist with NOAA Fisheries. Together with John Quinlan, we are the POCs for the Center's Southeast Region Climate Team, and I will be talking to you today about the Climate Regional Action Plans for the Southeast.

Just a quick outline of the talk, we'll talk about the NOAA Fisheries Climate Science Strategy, and we'll talk a little bit about the first regional action plan and achievements associated with that. I will discuss then the second version, what we're calling RAP 2.0, and then I'll introduce the climate and fisheries initiative, which is a new effort associated with the regional action plans, and then I will just briefly introduce the Southeast Region Climate Team.

Back in 2015, NOAA Fisheries released their climate science strategy, and sort of the full document is on the left, and highlights from that document are on the right here, and both of these are available at the link on the bottom, and what the National Climate Science Strategy did is it reflected a proactive approach to increase the production, delivery, and use of climate-related information to fulfill our mandates.

Seven major objectives were identified in that climate science strategy, and they work on the national level, and they are associated with increasing resilience with changing climate and ocean conditions. Now, this climate science strategy is implemented across regions of NOAA, through local regional action plans, which we'll be talking about today.

Some people may have seen that initial document, the climate science strategy, and these are the seven objectives. They are interdependent, and they sort of build on each other, with sort of the lowest level being building and maintaining adequate science infrastructure, supporting the ability to track change, understand what's changing, and project future conditions. With that foundation, eventually, we can get to the point where we're able to adaptively manage issues that are happening and ultimately arrive at climate-informed reference points.

Now, the Southeast Regional Action Plan, the first version, was developed following an in-person workshop in St. Petersburg, I believe, where we had representatives say from the Caribbean, from the Gulf of Mexico, from the Southeast, and there was even some Northeast representation, to give that perspective, and so then a collaborative process was involved, and I have the Southeast Center and the Southeast Regional Office bold here, as the leads, but, also, AOML was involved, as well as the councils and the general public.

Two regional action plans were developed, one for the South Atlantic and one for the Gulf of Mexico, and then there were sixty-eight actions identified in the South Atlantic and sixty-two for the Gulf. The numbers in parentheses reflect high-priority actions, and then both of these documents were published as tech memos that some of you may have seen, again available at the link on the bottom here.

Just to sort of recap some of the priority actions and accomplishments, I have actions in italics, and that reflects priority actions that may not be completed, and then accomplishments are in regular font, but you will be hearing about -- This is from the first action plan, and you will be hearing about climate vulnerability assessments, and so those have been undertaken and are nearing completion in both the Gulf and the South Atlantic.

You will also be hearing about an ecosystem status report for the South Atlantic that is nearing completion, and another priority action was to establish a regional climate team, consisting of representatives from the Center, the Regional Office, and *AOML*, which I will note is in italics here, and *AOML* was involved in the first regional action plan effort, and we have reached out to them as well for the second effort, which I will describe shortly, but we do need to strengthen the ties and have sort of a regular sitting member on our team, and so “*AOML*” is in italics there.

Next, environmental covariates are beginning to be included in some stock assessments, for example the Atlantic multidecadal oscillation, which is involved in sort of catchability with bluefin tuna and swordfish, and red tide that has gone into play for grouper in the Gulf of Mexico, and then larval transport, oceanographic processes affecting larval transport and recruitment, have factored into red snapper and grouper in the Gulf.

Another priority action from the first RAP was to hire a management strategy evaluation specialist, and one of her duties will include developing climate-ready harvest control rules. Then another - - Next on the list here was to develop a monitoring plan to support climate science needs, and so a plan is being developed, but that is not completely executed yet, hence the italics for “execute”, and I will point out that there is a synthesis that will be released with regard to all the actions and progress from all the different regions of NOAA, and that will be coming out later this year, or early next year, and that’s the NOAA Fisheries Climate Science Strategy five-year synthesis report, and so that will be forthcoming.

In terms of RAP 2.0, I will note that this document reflects priority actions and issues in our region from 2022 to 2024. Now, there are also actions and issues that are a component of RAP 2.0 that reflect longer-term priorities, and I will talk about those on the next slide, but RAP 2.0 is -- Development is in progress. It was developed in a similar manner to RAP 1.0, except that, due to COVID, we did not have an in-person workshop. Instead, a series of questions were circulated to staff at all levels of the organization in the Center and the Regional Office, and we have also sent these questions to the councils, and the questions concerned climate issues in the region and the general importance of particular major climate topics with the respondents.

This document, in contrast to RAP 1.0, covers -- It’s a single document that covers the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico, and we’re starting to include issues with the Caribbean as well. However, there are region-specific action items associated with the document, and so, if someone is particularly interested in one region or another, they’re able to focus on their region of interest. To give you an idea of the timeframe, we’re having this draft RAP 2.0 submitted to Headquarters by September 30, at which time it will go into the Federal Register and receive public comment as well, and it will also be published as a technical memorandum.

In terms of issues and high-priority actions for the RAP 2.0, here we have regular font indicating those near-term priority actions and then italics indicating the longer-term actions, and so we do

intend to hold a regional climate change workshop, and that will be virtual, and it will take place later in the year, this year or early next year.

We have a project that we're improving the understanding of environmental drivers, say on growth and recruitment of harvested species, and that is taking place in the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. There is another project that is using the coastal surveys to detect species distribution shifts, say of dolphinfish in the South Atlantic, and that's a joint project with the Center, AOML, and North Carolina State University.

Then the Regional Office is beginning to, and continuing to, incorporate environmental variables, say in NEPA documents and Endangered Species Act documentation, and we have just heard about the east coast climate change scenario planning workshop, and that's certainly an important action item for the region, and then, while stakeholder engagement with fishermen has taken place, say with red tide in the Gulf of Mexico and dolphin wahoo in the South Atlantic, we do want to expand that stakeholder engagement, say with participatory modeling, and then this last item is developing a comprehensive and collaborative monitoring program for climate.

Now, the region recognizes that we're lacking this comprehensive monitoring program, and this would be --- Compared to other regions of NOAA, and this would be conducted and designed in collaboration with the Northeast Center, and it would include sampling nutrients at the nutrient level all the way up to the protected resources level. This is a substantial sort of missing component for the region, in terms of supporting climate efforts, and it would also support this Climate Fisheries Initiative, which we'll discuss here.

The Climate Fisheries Initiative, if you think about the objectives that are associated with the National Climate Science Strategy, the CFI, as its known, would go into that lowest objective of infrastructure, and what this is, it has sort of three main parts. This is an across-the-nation effort, and it's a funded effort, although we're still waiting on sort of exact funded amounts, but this will happen, and so it's a cross-NOAA effort to build a national operational modeling system, using the sixth version of the ocean model, which would then enable a fisheries and climate decision support system.

Now, that decision support system will be for specific regions, but they will also be tied and coordinated with efforts taking place at the national level, and, with Components 1 and 2, the idea is to be able to produce relevant climate products for stakeholders and managers, such as indicators for ecosystem status reports and species distribution maps, and the whole point of the CFI is to reduce impacts from climate change and increase resilience to the changing ocean.

Again, more information about the CFI, Climate Fisheries Initiative, is available at the link on the bottom of the screen here, and so, as I said, the CFI is a funded effort, but we're still not completely set on the funding amounts, but, when fully funded, these are the kinds of products and goals that the CFI includes, and so, at specific regions, NOAA expects to be able to produce hindcasts, forecasts, and ecosystem projections to aid in the management of our living marine resources.

There would be cross-NOAA regional teams that are taking this information, and these products, from sort of the -- From the modeling and then translating that product to stakeholders and managers, working with managers and stakeholders, to feed back to the modeling team what is needed, and so there's a back-and-forth, in terms of the products that are available and then the

products that are needed, and so, at the same time, there will be web portals associated with the CFI that will allow access to these products, and so we would be talking about the fact that, at the region level, there would be early warnings and longer-term projections of changing conditions, such as heatwaves, hypoxic events, the harmful algal blooms, and acidification.

Then I would like to just briefly finish with the fact that the Regional Climate Team is currently composed of staff from the Center and the Regional Office, and we do intend to expand to have staff from AOML on the team as well, and we have biweekly meetings, and our work consists of formulating the climate regional action plans as well as various climate-related taskers from headquarters, and then, in terms of membership, these are the staff involved from the Regional Office and from the Center, and people are welcome to contact us for climate-related matters, and I will wrap it up with that. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thank you. Any questions for Roldan about that? It's a tremendous amount of stuff going on right now, and, as you can see, this is an area that we'll be dealing with for the foreseeable future. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: That was a mistake. That was another attack on my keyboard by my iPad.

MR. BELL: I am going to get you one of those little safety things. Clay.

DR. PORCH: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to say that Roldan and his team are really doing some great work here and moving the region forward in terms of dealing with climate science and all of its implications, but one thing we're hamstrung by now at this point is being able to collect all the data to do all the things that we have in this grand list.

I mean, you saw that there is some great proposals for doing some early-warning climate modeling and all that sort of stuff, but you still need the data to understand the ecological interactions, and, in many cases, you're just not going to be able to model your way out of everything, and we really want to know where, for instance, stocks in FMPs actually are, and, not only that, but maybe some of the other stocks that are not in FMPs, and so talk about forage stocks or even the mesopelagic community. We're seeing, for instance, big changes in the Gulf of Mexico loop current, and, along the same time, we're starting to see big declines in key components of the mesopelagic community, which, of course, is forage fish for tunas and protected resources.

My basic pitch is here that I think we need to present a united front, and we need to step up our game, in terms of surveys, both collecting new physical information, but also surveying more species and basically trying to establish a baseline now and have the data for us to develop sort of empirical harvest control rules in the future, and so, if we see indices of things going down, it may very well be due to climate change, but the bottom line is, if we have an index that says things are going down, regardless of the cause, we have the information to act on it, and so I think it's really important for us to advocate for collecting more and better data, including, in particular, expanding our fishery-independent surveys.

MR. BELL: Right. Good point, Clay. That's a good assessment of reality. Our world and the decisions we make are driven by data, data, data, data, and data, data, data costs money, money, money, but Clay is absolutely right. I mean, that's -- Before, just dealing with simple -- I will call them simple stock assessments, and we always had challenges there with data, but this is a whole

other field of data that needs to be incorporated, and it's got to be collected, and you've got to be able to count on it. John Carmichael, I will go to you first, and then, if that's actually Laurilee, we'll go to her.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mel. Thank you, Chip, for correcting my typing, and I did want to echo said, that it's great to have plans, but, here in the South Atlantic, we're well aware that we really struggle with the resources to just monitor the fish populations, much less to try to cover the nutrients to the protected resources.

As I like to say, a bit tongue-in-cheek, the reality is, as we even look forward into climate change and area-based management and Thirty-by-Thirty and all that, here in the South Atlantic, we're struggling mightily to keep up with the principles from the SFA from over twenty years ago, and we've got sixty-seven stocks that we manage, and seventeen of those are informed by statistical stock assessments. I know some of the new members probably aren't aware of that, but that means that our number of unassessed stocks that we're dealing with is fifty, by far the majority of it, and so, yes, we need the data that Clay just mentioned. We desperately need that data.

One of the things we've been concerned about here is seeing funding go to regions that don't have as many unassessed stocks to dive deeper and provide even greater resolution, while we're still over here waving our flag and going, hey, we're still trying to catch up with the SFA.

Then the other issue that has come up with these regional-based approaches is how we deal with the climate change realities, how we deal with the things that are crossing over these political boundaries that we've created that decides the Southeast Region ends at the North Carolina/Virginia line, but we know that stocks like dolphin don't care about that, and CMPs don't care about that, and Snapper Grouper increasingly don't care about that boundary. We've talked about blueline tilefish doesn't care about that boundary.

One of the issues that has come up is making sure that there's coordination between evaluations like this and on habitats that apply to species that are coordinated between what's going on in say the Northeast region and what's going on in the Southeast region, so that we're not potentially coming up with differing opinions and strategies related to say habitat for something like a dolphin, which has a very wide range. Those are just sort of my two thoughts on this, knowing that, as Clay said, it's great to see the progress, but we still have a long way to go.

MR. BELL: Good point, John. Yes, the system of governance we have, in terms of the lines we've drawn, years ago, obviously the lines are not respectful of what's going on in the real world, and so we will have to cope with that. Laurilee, is that really you?

MS. THOMPSON: Yes, my hand is up for real this time. I see this as a huge opportunity for citizen science input, at least as far as like the estuaries, and I will give you an example. Our Indian River lagoon system here, it's in a tragic place.

We've had hundreds of manatees starve to death, and we've lost all of our seagrass, and we're experiencing endless harmful algal blooms in the estuary itself, and, this summer, and this was the first time I'm aware that this happened, we had a massive die-off of glass minnows, and that may seem insignificant, but these glass minnows start out in the estuary, but then they move offshore, and then they're food for all of the predatory fish that are offshore. If we're experiencing massive

die-offs of glass minnows in the estuaries, that is going to potentially impact the food source for the bigger fish that are offshore.

The national estuary programs are collecting massive amounts of data, and it seems like there could be a way that they could report these things that are going on, at least in the estuaries, to NOAA Fisheries, so that at least you have a record and a handle of what's happening in the estuaries, as it will eventually relate to what's going on offshore. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Laurilee. Clay, did you want to respond to that?

DR. PORCH: Yes, and I absolutely agree with Laurilee on that. I think there is a role for citizen science. I mean, we have to do it in a smart way, but I know that my staff have been working with the State of Florida and NCOS and the Florida Watermen's Association and other stakeholders to find a way, for instance, to get real-time observations on the water for red tide intensity and dissolved oxygen levels, even to the point of buying individuals dissolved oxygen meters and other equipment, and then they can report that information on their cellphones, and, ultimately, what we would like to do is have all that information available on a website, in real time, so that people can see exactly what the distribution of red tide is the intensity and all that.

I think the same kind of principles can be used in many places, just taking advantage of having so many people out on the water and able to sample, where we can't necessarily be, and so I think that's -- I support that idea, and I think that many, many people agree with it, but it's just finding the resources to make that happen and collate all that information, and it's just going to require many different organizations to work together effectively, since no one of us have the resources to do it by ourselves.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Clay. That's good observations. The whole idea of citizen science is to be able to actually help, and it's a matter of, like you said, doing it correctly and having the money to do it correctly. All right. Any other questions right now? Then we can move to the next topic. Seeing no hands, thank you, Roldan, and let's go to the next agenda item, the U.S. South Atlantic Ecosystem Status Report, and I believe that's Kevin Craig.

DR. CRAIG: I am going to give an overview of the ecosystem status report that we've been developing for the South Atlantic region. This is the first attempt at developing an ecosystem status report for the South Atlantic, and so I will talk a little bit about what an ecosystem status report is, and these are fairly new for our region and for the council. I will give an overview of what we have -- What is involved, or what we have in the South Atlantic ecosystem status report, and then I will talk a little bit about how ESRs can be used to support management, mostly drawing on examples from other regions.

An ecosystem status report is basically a synthesis of scientific information on a range of ecosystem components, and this includes both climate drivers, like AMO, that Roldan referred to earlier, physical and chemical pressures, like sea surface temperature and ocean acidification, all the way up to fisheries and including human communities. I think of it as a one-stop shopping place for ecosystem information, and we try to compile that in a standardized and easily-accessible format in one place.

This is a core component of the EBFM roadmap, and it's also part of the Southeast Region's EBFM implementation plan, which was published in 2019, and it's a core activity in the climate science strategy, as well as various other planning and management documents.

There is three general objectives. The first is to provide a broad-level overview of the current state of the ecosystem, where the ecosystem is now, relative to where it has been in the past, and we use an indicator approach for that, and so indicators are basically quantitative time series, often at an annual or a monthly time scale, and we try to develop these for a region, at a regional scale, and so we develop these indicators to reflect what's happening in the South Atlantic region as a whole.

The second objective is to transfer that knowledge to managers, to provide context and information for decision-making, and I will talk a little bit about how that's being done in other regions, and then the third, more general objective, is just to provide a framework for communication and information exchange among scientists, managers, and stakeholders.

Where are ESRs being done? They're being done in all of the large marine ecosystems in U.S. waters. In the North Pacific, there is a number of ecosystem status reports that have been ongoing since the late 1980s, or the early 1990s, in some cases. The New England and Mid-Atlantic regions started their ESRs in 2009, and the California Current started in 2012, and so all of these are done on an annual basis. They are updated annually, to try to provide the most recent information, and they are presented, or provided, to councils and other management bodies in a variety of formats.

In our region, the first ESR was done in the Gulf of Mexico, and that was completed in 2013, and it was updated in 2017, and the South Atlantic is near completion. It should be available in a matter of weeks, and then we also have an ecosystem status report being developed for the Caribbean, and that's being done in conjunction with the development of a fishery ecosystem plan for that region. I don't know when that will be available, but probably sometime in 2022.

The way these reports are structured, they are pretty similar among the different regions. There are seven basic categories in the report for the South Atlantic. It includes a number of large-scale climate drivers, like AMO and AO, things that basically set the table for the physical environment in the region, and we also track a number of physical and chemical pressures, things like temperature and ocean acidification and sea-level rise, habitat state, and so a number of species spend some portion of their life history in near-shore or estuarine waters, and so we track things like wetland coverage and seagrass and oyster coverage.

We have indicators related to lower trophic levels, and so primary productivity and secondary productivity, which, ultimately, determines the amount of energy that's available, through food web interactions, to support many of the harvested species that we care about, and we track a number of upper trophic levels, mostly from our surveys, and so things like fish abundance and fish diversity, patterns in recruitment and biomass that are coming out of the stock assessments and so forth, and then the last two categories, ecosystem services and human dimensions, are more related to the role of humans, or the use by humans, of the ecosystem, and so we track landings, revenues for various fisheries, the status of protected species, trends in demographic trends.

The four states in the South Atlantic, I believe, are among the top twelve in the nation, in terms of rate of population growth, and so more people are moving here, which translates into increasing pressure on coastal resources.

We also track trends in fishing effort, where we can quantify that, and a number of economic indicators related to use of the marine environment, as well as the number of social indicators, which are measures of the engagement, or reliance, of communities in the region on recreational and commercial fishing.

This is straight from the report. This is the table of contents, and I don't expect you to read this, but you can see what we're actually tracking in each one of these categories. There is about forty-five separate indicators overall, and that includes 151 time series, and so that's because we often have multiple indicators, or multiple time series, of the same metric, to see if they corroborate each other or not, and, in some cases, we're able to break some of these indicators down regionally, and so, for example, by state or, in some cases, by county.

It's a pretty comprehensive report. It's about 100 pages in length, and we are looking for ways to condense this information, and we've been working with some folks in the Northeast who are producing state of the ecosystem reports, which are basically a condensed, more digestible version of an ecosystem status report.

We've had a lot of engagement with folks and organizations in the region and so we've had contributions from most of the labs within the Southeast Center, as well as the Regional Office. We work with some folks from the National Ocean Service. For the last two or three years, we've been trying to develop much stronger ties with AOML, which has a lot of oceanographic expertise, and we've had involvement of virtually all of the state agencies in the South Atlantic region, as well as a number of the universities, and so over fifty individuals, twenty-three organizations.

Given the breadth of the report, we established an editorial team, and it has five editors that range from oceanographers to fisheries biologists to social scientists, and they are coming from three different agencies, NMFS, NOS, and AOML, that are helping to oversee the development of the report.

That's, in a nutshell, what an ecosystem status report is, and I did just want to give a couple of examples, because you will see these again. We do try to report these indicators in a standardized format, and so this is one example of sea surface temperature in the South Atlantic, and the time series is in black, and so you can see how sea surface temperatures have changed from 2003 to the end of the time series in 2018.

The dashed line is the long-term mean of the time series, and the solid line is the one standard deviation, and then we color-code the time periods that are above or below that one standard deviation threshold, and so you can think of these green areas as time periods when sea surface temperatures were particularly high, and the red areas is time periods where sea surface temperatures were particularly low, and then we do some statistics on the last five years, just to get an idea of what the trend is. Is it an increasing trend or a decreasing trend or stable?

Then there's a short writeup associated with each indicator that basically describes how it was developed and how we're interpreting it, and so, in the case of sea surface temperature, you can see there's a pretty strong indication that temperatures have increased since 2014. We had some very warm years in 2015, 2016, and 2017, and that increase has occurred primarily in winter, and

also in summer, but we're not really seeing these low winter temperatures that were pretty common in the early to mid-2000s.

There is some suggestion that temperatures have gone down recently, but they're still above the long-term average, and this is corroborated by a number of other indicators related to temperature, and so we are seeing indications from multiple sort of independent datasets that temperatures are increasing in the region, and that has a variety of implications for the physical environment and things like upwelling and primary productivity and things at the base of the food web that ultimately drive the productivity of harvested species.

We also try to synthesize across these indicators, and so, as I mentioned, there's a lot of information in these reports, and we do try to condense it, so we can start to look at how the ecosystem may be changing overall, and so this is from our principal component analysis, which basically takes all of those physical and chemical indicators, sea surface temperature among them, but also ocean acidification and sea-level rise and various measures of the Gulf Stream, and condenses them into a single number for each year.

The point that I want to make here is that you can see there's a lot of variability, particularly in the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s, but, in terms of the oceanographic environment, we're seeing some of the most extreme conditions in the most recent years, and so that's another indication that the oceanographic environment is changing, and then we can look at that in relation to similar analyses for things like upper-trophic levels, and so this is including a lot of the snapper grouper species and other species that are monitored by surveys in the region, and there is not a one-to-one correspondence between these, but you can see that the more extreme years, in terms of these upper-trophic-level indicators, are the most recent years.

We don't know if that's actually a causative relationship or not, and I don't want to imply at this point that it is, but it does suggest that multiple components of the physical environment and the upper-trophic-level community are changing, and those changes are occurring primarily in the most recent years. This is another aspect of the report where we try to synthesize this information and make sense of it from more of a holistic perspective.

Just in the last few minutes here, I wanted to touch on how ESRs are used, or could be used, to support management, and so this is from a survey that was done as part of a national EBFM workgroup that met last year, and it was a very simple question to all of the different centers that are producing this reporting, is how is your ESR being used, and what's it being used for?

The gold standard is that these be used as an operational report, and so to help inform management decisions directly, and that's being done for about 50 percent of the ecosystems that have these reports, and here's some of the uses. They are being used to help interpret results from single-species stock assessments, and they're being used in risk analysis. Hawaii is using theirs in their state Thirty-by-Thirty process, but we're not quite there yet.

I mean, almost of the regions are using these for information or as a contextual report for managers, and so they're being produced and provided to councils, but it's providing more of a context to help inform discussions around management decisions, as opposed to being directly used to make a management decision, and then, in some cases, they provide a venue for synthesizing scientific information and developing hypotheses that others can investigate more directly, and so we've had

a number of directed projects that have come out of the information that was developed as part of the ecosystem status report.

Then they also provide a public outreach function, and so, for example, the Gulf of Mexico has a nice website, where you can both download the full report, if you want to see the whole thing, or they provide the key indicators, and you can actually look at particular indicators or download the data for those indicators from that website, and so it's publicly available.

Here are a few ways that I think these can be used. There are examples, as Clay and Roldan both alluded to, of using indicators related to the ecosystem directly in stock assessments, and so I think of this as on the frontend of the science to management continuum, and probably the best example is red tide, and so there was an index of red tide severity that was developed, and it was included directly as a source of mortality in several grouper assessments, and it helped to explain some of the changes in the indices that the assessment was having a hard time fitting, and so it actually improved the quality of that assessment.

There are a lot of challenges involved in including ecosystem information directly in a stock assessment, but this information can also be used to inform decision-making from stock assessments that don't necessarily include ecosystem processes directly, and so I think of this more as affecting the backend, and so more of the decision-making process. The example I've got here is for the Bering Sea, and you can see the statements from the SSC and the council. Basically, the ecosystem status report gets presented, alongside the stock assessment results, to the council.

In this case, there was indications, from the ESR, that krill abundance was declining, and so food for pollock was declining, and so food for pollock was trending down. Arrowtooth flounder, which is a predator on juvenile pollock, was trending up, and the council made a decision to use a more conservative TAC, in that case, and so, in this case, the TAC is more conservative, but it could easily go the other way. If things are trending in a different direction, then you could be more liberal, in terms of the allowable catch, or the target fishing mortality. There are examples where ESRs have been used on the backend, to help inform the decision-making, as well as on the frontend, to help improve the assessment model itself.

The other example is in -- This is something the Mid-Atlantic Council is doing, is developing ecosystem-level risk assessments, and so this basically takes information from the stock assessments, the ecosystem status reports, and information from the climate vulnerability analysis could be included in this as well, and it's a way to start to rank different species in terms of risk, risk from climate, risk from overfishing, risk from other sorts of processes, and that can be used to help inform additional studies, or further evaluations, and I think the Mid-Atlantic is using it as a way to determine where to focus their management strategy evaluation efforts.

There is potential applications to climate change scenario planning that Roger talked about earlier, and so I think these can be used to help develop these risk assessments and plan for what may happen in the future under sort of changing environmental conditions.

They also have implications for outputs from our stock assessments and what do our reference points mean, or what timeframe should we be calculating reference points over, and they could be useful in projections. Most of our projections don't currently consider potential future changes in the environment, and then they have implications for what we can expect from rebuilding plans,

and so how has the capacity of the ecosystem to support fisheries changed, and that would be relevant to what we could expect to occur from our rebuilding plans.

Those are just a few of the potential uses, and I think I will stop there. As I mentioned, the report will be available in a matter of weeks. We are looking for feedback on the report, and so we will be asking for that, and there will be an opportunity for that, for the council to provide some feedback, and we're looking forward to engaging on some of these ecosystem issues and making this information increasingly relevant to some of the decisions that the council is charged with, and so I think I will stop there, and I will be glad to take any questions.

MR. BELL: All right. Thank you, Kevin. That was very thorough, and I appreciate the report. In the interest of time, has anybody got any very quick questions for Kevin at this point, because we're needing to kind of roll through a number of other things here. Okay. I am not seeing any, but, Kevin, thanks so much for giving that. I know that's a lot of work, and it's an impressive area right now, and so thank you so much. Let's go ahead and move to the next presentation, the Fish Climate Vulnerability Assessment and Mike Burton, I believe. You can fire when ready.

MR. BURTON: Good afternoon. My name is Mike Burton, and I'm a research fishery biologist at the Beaufort Lab, and I've been there a few years. Today, I would just like to provide you with an update, or an introduction, depending on where you come in for this, on the progress on the South Atlantic Fish and Shellfish Climate Vulnerability Assessment, or CVA.

Quickly, what is a climate vulnerability assessment, hereafter called a CVA? A CVA is just simply a tool to determine the likelihood that a species productivity, abundance, or distribution is likely to be affected by a change in climate. As you've heard earlier from Roland, they were identified as a priority action item in the NOAA Fisheries Climate Science Strategy, and they have also been identified as priority items under the South Atlantic RAPs and the South Atlantic EBFM implementation plan.

They have been widely used in terrestrial systems, historically, and, since 2015, with the publication of the NMFS Climate Science Strategy, quite a few of them have been completed for marine systems by the agency. There are currently completed CVAs for the northeastern U.S. continental shelf, and they were the first, the Eastern Bering Sea, the California Current ecosystem, and I believe the Pacific Islands has completed theirs, or is near completed, and the Gulf of Mexico has been completed and is in review, and we're working on the South Atlantic region, with the final report writing. Also, additionally, I believe several National Marine Sanctuaries have done their own CVAs, and I know that Gray's Reef did one a few years ago.

A conceptual framework combines the biological sensitivity of a species with the environmental exposure of that species to a changing climate, and this results in an overall climate vulnerability ranking. CVAs use existing knowledge from the scientific literature, and, where that is lacking, they will use expert opinion of the expert scorers. They use quantitative data, when available, and qualitative information when quantitative data is lacking.

Briefly, the steps in the CVA process, first, we have to assemble a panel of expert volunteer scorers, and you can see them all listed here. The large number of people without asterisks by their name served as expert scorers on our panel. The ones with asterisks by their name were not

scorers. Some of them came to our in-person workshop, and they all contributed to the effort in other ways, and so it was, by and large, a team effort.

The next step was to identify which species we were going to include in the CVA, and we initially started with sixty-seven species, to represent a wide swath of functional groups that you see listed here, and we wanted to make sure that we included a vast swath of the ecosystem, if you would. After some back-and-forth, and some input from some of our non-agency partners, we had suggestions to add some additional species, and so we added four more species, for a total of seventy-one.

The next step was to nail down what the sensitivity attributes were that we were going to use. Now, this was not a problem, because these are fixed across all CVAs, and what a sensitivity attribute is, is it represents the biological traits for a species that are indicative of the ability, or inability, of that species to respond to environmental change, whether they thrive or whether they are affected negatively by environmental change. These twelve attributes listed here, and I'm not going to read them all off, but they encompass the entire breadth of a species life history, from egg to feeding to reproduction to death, by either natural or fishing mortality.

The next step was to identify which exposure factors we were going to use. These are the factors that describe the degree to which a species will experience change under a changing climate, and so these exposure factors are allowed to vary between region, and so you'll have certain things in different regions that might be relevant to that region, but not other regions, and an example would be sea ice extent. It's clearly very relevant in the Eastern Bering Sea, and it's not all relevant in most other places, at least yet, but we chose sea surface temperature, air temperature, pH for ocean acidification, precipitation, salinity, and then currents and upwelling.

The top five factors are what we call quantitative factors, and we actually had data to download for those factors, and then the bottom two were qualitative. We had to develop written qualitative exposure factors to aid the scorers in scoring those factors. The exposures for the quantitative factors were generated from a suite of global climate models, and it ranged from eleven to thirty-five models, depending upon which variability.

The RCP 8.5, or the representative concentration pathway, was the model of greenhouse gas emissions that was used, and RCP 8.5 is considered the status quo projection, and it's also sometimes called the worst-case scenario. It basically assumes no change in present emission practices, and so climate modeling was done using standard anomalies, which is basically a future period minus a past observed period of data, and then, as I said, the exposure to currents and sea-level rise were evaluated through literature reviews and experts, and these were manually scored by the reviewers.

Briefly, scorers assessed the overall vulnerability to climate change, which was a product of the sensitivity and the exposure, and so they had to score the sensitivity attributes, and they scored the two qualitative exposure factors. The global climate model scored the five quantitative exposure factors, and those were combined and multiplied by each other to come up with an overall vulnerability, and, in addition, scorers scored the potential for species distribution change.

This was based on a subset of four of the twelve sensitivity attributes that were relevant to the potential for a species to change its distribution, and these were based on adult mobility, larval

dispersal, habitat specificity, and temperature sensitivity, and, if you think about it, just briefly, it makes sense that something like a dolphin or a wahoo, which is highly mobile and probably has widespread larval dispersal in the open ocean, is kind of a habitat generalist and has a broad temperature tolerance, is probably going to be more likely to change its geographic distribution than something like an oyster, which is fairly limited in what it can do to respond to climate change.

This is a rubric that, just basically, I want to set you up for the results that you're about to see. This is how the scoring was done, and it scored sensitivity and exposure in bins, from low to very high, and they were told to spread their -- If there was uncertainty in what score they wanted to give to something, they were told to spread their scores across these bins, and so they had five tallies, and they could spread them across all four bins, and you will see some of these results a little bit later, and then those products, or those sensitivity and exposure scores, were multiplied by each other, and, depending on what the product was, it ended up in one of these boxes.

We go from the lowest vulnerability, the bottom-left-hand corner, to the highest climate vulnerability in the upper-right corner, and so keep this in mind, and I'm setting you up for the results slide, which you're about to see.

This is the results slide, and there's a lot of information here. These are all seventy-one species and where they fell out as a result of our scoring. I will give you a disclaimer first, in that, the way that they're ordered within their boxes are from highest vulnerability in the upper-left of a given box to the lowest vulnerability in the bottom-right, and so, for instance, Nassau grouper would be the highest vulnerability in that box, and golden tilefish the lowest.

Red, of course, is very high vulnerability, and green is low vulnerability, et cetera, and so the takeaways from this -- I guess that was the disclaimer. The takeaways are that the highest vulnerability species are primarily made up of diadromous species, invertebrates, and some of the deepwater demersal fishes with a history of exploitation, such as blueline tilefish and golden tilefish, and, also, some of the most historically-exploited tropical reef fishes, such as Nassau grouper and goliath grouper, and there's a reason for that. The population growth rate and the stock size status are figured in as a sensitivity attribute, and so something that's exploited is probably scored to be sensitive on that end, and that could factor into the overall vulnerability.

Another take-away is all of the shark species were found in the high or very high category, and this is likely because of population growth rate. They are long-lived and slow-growers, and their reproductive output is fairly low, and, if you layer exploitation in on top of that, well, then they might be vulnerable to disruptions from climate, and they may be less likely to recover from the climate disruption, because of their life history strategy.

That's a brief look, and I have given you, attached, I think in the briefing book, a PDF of all the species narratives, where you can look at the individual species scoring in more detail and see what contributed to their final scoring ranks, and so I won't spend any more time on this, or, actually, I will, because I wanted to set this up by saying that I'm sure one thing you will notice is that everything seems to be jammed far over on the very high category, and the reason for that is this, salinity.

Scores were done using a logic rule, such that anything that had three or more very high scores from the five scorers was automatically put in the very high category, and so no matter what the

arithmetic mean of what was, and we expected, and we got, very high exposure scores from the global climate models for sea surface temperature and ocean acidification. What we didn't expect was a very high exposure score for salinity, but this is a look at the global climate data for salinity, and this is the look at the anomaly, the fifty-year future period, if you would, minus the fifty-year past period, and you can see that salinity is projected to be substantially higher than it has been historically, especially off of south Florida, but actually all the way up through the Carolinas or whatever, and so the very fact that we had three very high exposure factors kicked everything over into the very high category on that results table, with the exception of that one species, which I think is sturgeon, and it was close. It just missed it by a tenth of a point or so.

In addition to just the overall climate vulnerability, as I said, we asked the scorers to score the potential for species distribution change, and this kind of basically followed the same thing that we just saw in the overall vulnerability.

The things that had a high potential for species distribution change seemed to be the free-swimming things, the pelagics and whatnot, and the things that had a very low potential for species distribution change, not surprisingly, were diadromous fishes, a lot of the invertebrates, and so I think the take-away from this slide is that a majority of the species, and I think it's forty-one, or forty, out of the seventy-one species were found to have a high or very high potential for species distribution change. You will note that the only one with a very high rating was dolphin, and I know there's quite a bit of discussion on the council about distribution shifts in dolphin and that being a concern.

Just quickly, some of the key take-aways from this were the most impactful exposure factors were sea surface temperature, salinity, and ocean acidification. I didn't put it on this slide, but the most impactful sensitivity attributes were population growth rate, stock size status, habitat specificity, and so those were things that factored into the overall vulnerability ranking as well.

Twenty-two of the seventy-one species were very high, and, again, made up primarily of anadromous fishes, invertebrates, and deepwater demersals. Twenty-four species had high vulnerability, and there was quite a wide swath of coastal and reef fishes scattered throughout those, and twenty-five of the species were moderate vulnerability, and the pelagics probably had the lowest vulnerability.

Distribution change, the majority had a very high or high potential for change, and so, just in closing, I will say that the CVAs are designed so that they can be conducted iteratively, and they can and should be updated in future years. Ways that they could be updated could include inclusion of extra species, things that, after the first go-round, you find that are relevant and you would like more information about, so they could be included.

Another thing that could be done is that different exposure factors, if determined to be relevant, could be added in, and an example of this that we've gotten some feedback on, in other presentations on this, is the inclusion of bottom temperature, and that wasn't included because the resolution in the modeling just wasn't all that good at the time that we started this, but, if it gets better, that could certainly be included and would be more relevant for some of the deeper-water fishes.

This is an example of what I will call a vulnerability narrative, or a species narrative. The text in this -- This is just an example, and this is cobia, and the text on the right is found within a three to five-page species narrative that we did for each of these species, and the graphic just kind of summarizes the scoring, and so you will see the mean scores are in the first column, next to either the attribute or exposure factor name. The colorful plot on the far right is the distribution of the twenty-five scores. There were five scorers, and each scorer had five tallies, and so you can see that that's how the scores were spread out.

Then, also, I would like to point out that the column in the middle -- I haven't mentioned that yet, but that was a data quality score. We asked the expert scorers to score the quality of the data that was used in the species profiles that they used to come up with their scores, and from a scale of a zero to three, a zero being almost no useful data and three being very good information. This is one way we think that we can identify data gaps in the life history of the fish that still need to be addressed.

How can CVA results be used? I know there's a lot of interest in that, and you've heard some of this in the other presentations. We can identify stocks that could benefit from incorporating environmental parameters into assessments, identify gaps in information for use in setting research priorities, like I just said, and identify stocks that can benefit from monitoring, to better predict when expected climate impacts might occur for a given species.

On the management side of the house, CVA results could potentially be fed maybe into environmental impact statements or biological opinions or risk assessments. One thing that has been done, the third item down, the results from our CVA, the fish vulnerability scores, were provided to the socioeconomic shop down in Miami, because they're doing a community vulnerability assessment for fishing communities, and that was ongoing when I created this, and that was Matt McPherson and his shop, and I'm not sure if they have finished that yet or not, but that's a use for a fish and shellfish CVA.

Then, of course, you've already heard about the climate change scenario planning efforts. CVA rankings in the Mid-Atlantic were applied directly as risk ranking criteria into their efforts, and I'm sure there is other ways. I don't know all the ways that CVA results can potentially be used, but here's a few ideas, and so, anyway, I will stop there and try to answer any questions you might have.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Mike. That's very thorough, and that's an awful lot of work, again, as well, and I appreciate you including the potential management applications there at the end, and that's where this is all going to make sense. In the interest of time, I would like to -- If you've got a question you need to ask Mike right now, we can do that, but I would suggest that maybe you try to reach him offline, or via email or something, and I am sure he would be willing to answer any questions you might have, which would probably take a little while, and so let's just go ahead and move to the next presentation, since we have several more things to knock out here, which would be Todd Kellison and a brief Atlantic Coast Science Coordination Workshop Summary. Todd, if you're available.

DR. KELLISON: Thanks, Chairman Mel. Thanks, everyone, for giving me the opportunity to provide what will be brief presentation on the NMFS Atlantic Coast Science Coordination Workshop, which we held virtually a month ago, August 17 through 19. As implied by the name

of the workshop, the workshop was focused on coordination, specifically these two sub-bullets here, and so the major objective of the workshop was to assess the degree of coordination of our agencies science activities across regional and regulatory boundaries along the Atlantic coast and to identify opportunities to improve or enhance that coordination, and, thus, our related support for fisheries and protected species management along the Atlantic coast, and that's more broadly within this first bullet, within the context of the changing climate and the changing ocean ecosystems and changing species distributions.

The workshop was sort of inward focused for our agency, and the majority of participants were National Marine Fisheries Service personnel, but we also were grateful to have participation from representatives from all three Atlantic coast fishery management councils, as well as the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, and also participation from staff from state agencies, representing key data collection efforts, and there were some participants from academia and the industry.

The focal topics for the workshop, and so the workshop spanned three half days. The first day of the workshop, we focused on these first three bullets, and we first talked about what we know about changes in ocean ecosystems and lower trophic levels along the Atlantic coast and what we anticipate happening in the coming years. We then talked about what we know about changes in species distributions, and also what we don't know about changes in species distributions, and what we anticipate happening in the coming years. Then we ended the first day with a discussion about blueline tilefish, particularly focused on the distribution along the Atlantic coast and what we know about how their distribution has potentially changed.

The second day focused on our agency's science and data collection efforts, and we had presentations and discussions focused on fishery-independent surveys, coastal shark surveys and science, fishery-dependent surveys, marine mammal and sea turtle surveys and science, and social sciences and human dimensions.

Then, on the last day of the workshop, we talked about stock assessments, and we had a session where we heard from the management participants and their perspectives on the challenges of managing species across regulatory boundaries and potentially shifting spatial distributions, and we talked about species distribution modeling, and then we ended with a discussion of state of the ecosystem and ecosystem status reports.

Briefly, the format of the workshop was that, for each focal area, we identified leads, from both the Northeast and the Southeast Fisheries Science Centers, prior to the workshop, and we asked those leads to coordinate, considerably, prior to the workshop, both a prepared presentation on the focal area, but also to assess -- To evaluate and assess the degree of coordination, cross-regional coordination, that is currently occurring in that focal area and to identify opportunities for improved coordination. In that manner, a lot of the effort was done prior to the workshop, and that enabled us to have some productive discussions during the workshop.

Anticipated outcomes from the workshop, and so we're sort of still compiling these, but I would say that the sub-bullet there, enhance cross-regional coordination, has already occurred, in some instances. There is a good amount of cross-regional coordination and consistency in efforts within all of these sub-bullets, but, in many cases, there are definitely opportunities to improve that coordination, and so some of that improvement has already occurred, just because of

communications that happened in planning for the workshop, but I anticipate that it will continue to occur as well, and we asked the leads for each of these focal areas for the workshop to contribute their highest-priority opportunities, or greatest opportunities, for enhanced coordination, and we're in the process of compiling those.

We've heard from most of the leads, but we're still waiting, of course, for a few, and, similarly, we asked the management participants to weigh-in on perspectives from their agencies on greatest challenges to management across jurisdictional distributions and shifting species that could be addressed with stronger science, and we're in the process of compiling those, and we've heard from most of the participants, but we're still waiting for a few.

The next steps, once we do compile all that information, will be to summarize the outcomes from the workshop, summarize the greatest opportunities for enhanced spatial collaboration along the Atlantic coast, and the greatest management challenges that could be addressed through strengthened science, and then we'll communicate that both within our agency and to our management partners, but we don't want the -- We'll probably end up with a formal report for the workshop, but we don't want the workshop to be just a workshop that ended in a report, and so we hope that the recommendations will be actionable, and we think it's likely that we'll have a follow-up workshop to focus on the highest priority opportunities and management challenges that were identified during the workshop. With that, I will stop and try to address any questions, if there is time.

MR. BELL: All right. Thanks, Todd. I appreciate you doing that, and I'm looking forward to this carrying through. Are there any really quick questions for Todd at this point? If not, we can certainly -- Todd is certainly reachable via email, and you can get up with him offline, I know. All right. We've got two more things we need to accomplish, both from SERO and both dealing with for-hire electronic reporting. I think the first one, the program update, were we going to drive that for Michelle? Is that what you all are doing?

MR. HADLEY: Yes, we are, and it should be on the screen shortly.

DR. MASI: Thanks. Hi, everyone. I am Dr. Michelle Masi, and I'm the new SEFHIER Program Manager, and I just wanted to take a quick moment to say that I am looking forward to working with the South Atlantic Council, and also our for-hire constituents, to make this program successful. What I wanted to do today is just show you where we're at with the implementation of the SEFHIER program to-date.

This slide provides an overview of the number of permit user accounts that are set up with each reporting platform, and the platform type is listed in the rows, with the permit type in the columns, and the numbers in black are the number of active permit accounts as of August 1, and the numbers in orange are showing the increase in the number of accounts since the last time this information was presented to the South Atlantic Council, which was in May.

Some major things to take from this slide here are that we do still see the number of accounts increasing since the last time this information was presented, and that's a good thing, and so we definitely want to take a moment to thank all of our constituents who have already registered with one of these approved vendors.

The bottom total row is showing that we have a total of 1,209 permit accounts set up in the South Atlantic, and that is an increase of 223 accounts since May. Also, in the total row for the South Atlantic column, you can see we have 968 permit holders that have yet to register with an approved vendor, but, given that we are expecting about a 20 to 30 percent permit latency, we are getting pretty close to having about 70 percent compliance with the program at this point.

In total, for both the Gulf and the South Atlantic, we have 1,658 SERO permit holders, and that's including Gulf and South Atlantic dually-permitted vessels who have yet to register with an approved vendor. However, following our June Fishery Bulletin, we did see an increase of 332 newly-registered vendor accounts, and, as of August 1, we have over 2,000 registered permit accounts, but noting here that the number of permit accounts does include both permit holders and captains, and so the number of registered user accounts to permit holders is really not a one-to-one relationship. As I mentioned on the previous slide, we are expecting that 20 to 30 percent permit latency.

To-date, we've had about a thousand users that signed up with a reporting platform account, but they either never reported or stopped reporting after that, and SEFHIER staff have begun reaching out to these constituents, to inform them that they are currently out of compliance with the program. Now, on a positive note, in July, we had 730 South-Atlantic-only permitted vessels and about 900 dually-permitted vessels submit a trip-level declaration or logbook report to us, and we are anticipating to have an increase in participation with the program as permits come up for renewal.

In regard to the specific outreach efforts to reach our constituents who are not complying yet, we are hosting several VMS requirement webinars for constituents this month, and we actually already hosted two of the webinars listed, and the two that had already occurred, including one yesterday, had about ten constituents at each, and we did -- These were live events with our constituents, and we had some really great questions from those that did attend, and so I highly encourage any of our other constituents who are interested in learning more about the VMS requirements to attend one of the two remaining webinars this month.

In October, we're also hosting two SEFHIER constituent calls with Mr. Andy Strelcheck, our Regional Administrator. That first call will be on October 7, for Gulf constituents, and then the second call will be on October 14, for our South Atlantic constituents. These calls are really just to get an opportunity for constituents to get some one-on-one time with either Andy or myself, to ask questions or just provide program feedback, and so Andy and I are certainly looking forward to chatting with folks on either of these days.

As a note, you can find the registration information for our upcoming outreach events on our website, the SEFHIER website, as well as it does get announced in SEFHIER-specific Fishery Bulletins, and I have more information on where you can find that information towards the end of the presentation.

I am going to skip over the past webinar bullets there, just because I am conscious of time, but I did want to say that, in orange there, that, if anybody has any feedback on how to better reach our constituents, since you can see that some of our past webinars had low attendance, please reach out to me, through email, and I am available readily at michelle.masi@noaa.gov, and I would love to hear your feedback.

In regard to some of our additional outreach efforts, on July 12, we sent a reporting requirements letter to our dually GARFO and SERO-permitted vessels, to remind these constituents of their permit requirements, and we also worked with VESL and eTRIPS developers, and so now both platforms are sending notifications to app users when an update is pushed out to the apps, and we're regularly mailing SEFHIER program toolkits to constituents, upon request, and you can also find those toolkits on our SEFHIER website, under the guides and tools section, and, finally, we're also pushing out regular website updates, including updated answers to frequently-asked questions. For anyone who doesn't have it yet, the SEFHIER website URL is at the bottom of this slide.

On this slide, I just wanted to take a minute to review the VMS requirements for our Gulf for-hire constituents, and so the VMS rule published this week, and its effective date is December 13, and so that means that, by December 13, our Gulf for-hire-permitted vessels will be required to have a type-approved VMS unit that includes a GPS device affixed to the vessel that, at a minimum, archives the vessel position data for submission to NOAA Fisheries.

We currently have two cellular VMS, or cVMS, units that have been type approved, and that's the Faria ETERM and the CLS NEMO. The last bullet here is just a reminder that the hail-outs and VMS units are expected to provide better data on fishing effort and allow for better enforcement of fishing regulations in the Gulf. The list of the type-approved VMS units is available on our SEFHIER website, and also at the link provided at the bottom of the slide.

This slide covers some general SEFHIER discussion items. The first bullet is just a note that SERO received letters from the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council regarding concerns over the four additional economic questions, and our response letter is available in the briefing materials.

For constituents who have a GARFO/SERO dually-permitted vessel, the VESL reporting platform -- It's not currently certified with GARFO, and so, at this time, these dually-permitted vessels can use eTRIPS to satisfy both the GARFO and SERO permit requirements, but, as a reminder, to meet the requirements of both programs, you must fill out the approved form when you offload the catch, and you must submit the form within forty-eight hours of the trip ending. Finally, for our constituents catching HMS species, if the constituent is using the VESL app, then they will still need to complete the HMS electronic logbook. If they are using the eTRIPS app to report, then the app will prompt for the HMS-required questions, and so only the one submission would be required to be in compliance.

That was a lot of new and important information on the SEFHIER program, and so what I wanted to do now is just provide an opportunity, I guess, to remind constituents who have yet to register what they should do now. First, you should select a reporting software, and, for our Gulf constituents, you will also need to select and install a VMS unit before December 13, and then you will need to create a reporting account for each vessel or user.

The third thing is that you should review the SEFHIER program website, and, also, on there, you can find the informational videos and the SEFHIER-specific program toolkits, and, finally, for the Gulf for-hire constituents, they should also check that their landing location is approved, and, if it's not approved, then please submit a landing location request form for approval.

If constituents have questions about the SEFHIER program, we highly recommend that they start on our website. I did provide the main SEFHIER web address on Slide 5. On there, under the news and announcements section, you can sign up to receive the SEFHIER-specific Fishery Bulletins, which is what we use to announce things like upcoming webinars, constituent calls, our regulation updates to the registered constituents, and we do that through email.

Then, under the Guides and Tools section on our website, constituents can find informational videos in the South Atlantic toolkits, and we also list upcoming webinars on our webpage, as well as the registration information, and the relevant forms can be found in the forms section, and then, if constituents still have questions, you can reach us at our SEFHIER customer support number, or the email address listed, and, also, anybody is welcome to reach out to me directly anytime.

With that, I just wanted to take a moment to acknowledge the dedication of our SEFHIER program staff. They are definitely a positive and dedicated bunch, and I know that each one of them is working hard every day to help our constituents be successful and in compliance with the SEFHIER program.

Also, I just wanted to say a special thanks to our for-hire constituents, especially those that continue to work with our program staff to improve the SEFHIER program, and I want to just take a moment to note that I am relatively new, and I've only been with the program for a little over two months, and so I have other folks on the line that can help, if council staff can be prepared to unmute them, and that would be Jack McGovern, Andy Strelcheck, and potentially Karla Gore, if she's on. With that, I would open the floor to questions. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Michelle, for that presentation, and welcome to SEFHIER. You have certainly got your work cut out for you, but this is a growing program, and we want it to grow. I think, unless somebody has a specific question right now, based on what was presented, it might be best to ask Michelle questions via email, or some other mechanism.

Now, the last thing we have on the agenda is actually -- Michelle mentioned the letters that we received from New England and the Mid regarding some issues, and I believe, since Andy had to leave, because of a commitment to another meeting, I think Jack is going to be here to at least kind of lead the effort in kind of kicking this discussion off, and, as Michelle mentioned, Jack could also handle any questions you might have, and so why don't we go ahead and do that, shift to the last item, which would be the discussion of the letters. Jack, have they got you unmuted?

DR. MCGOVERN: Am I unmuted? Can you hear me?

MR. BELL: You appear to be, since we are talking now. It's good to hear from you.

DR. MCGOVERN: Okay. It's nice to hear from you too, Mel. I will just start this off. We got a letter from the Mid-Atlantic Council about I think the economic elements, and we responded to that, and I think Monica has some points that she will comment, regarding those data elements, and so I will turn it over to Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Sorry to be the last person on the agenda, but I just wanted to give you a quick overview of how we got where we were a little bit, and we have some new council members. Just briefly, several years ago, the council developed a for-hire electronic reporting

amendment that primarily focused on charter vessel reporting, but it also cleaned up some issues in the headboat reporting too, and this amendment amended the Snapper Grouper FMP, Dolphin Wahoo FMP, and the Coastal Migratory Pelagic FMP.

The amendment was submitted to the Fisheries Service, and it was approved in June of 2018, and then there was rulemaking to implement the amendment. The purpose of the amendment was to increase the accuracy and timeliness of landings, discards, effort, and socioeconomic data for these federally-permitted for-hire vessels that participate in South-Atlantic-managed fisheries, and the need was to improve charter vessel and headboat fishery data use for management and to improve the monitoring and compliance for these vessels in the South-Atlantic-managed fisheries.

The actions actually -- I would like to read them, so that you have a little bit of context for what we're going to talk about, and the preferred alternative required that federally-permitted charter vessels, while operating as a charter vessel, submit fishing records to the Science Center weekly, or at shorter intervals, if notified that they are shorter, and they do so via electronically, and that would be on NMFS-approved hardware and software, and they would report all fish harvested and discarded on all trips, regardless of where the fish were caught.

That was actually the action, right, and then the council also discussed some core data elements that they thought would be very good for the Service to collect, and those included things like the start time and end time, the location of where you fished, and the kind of target species, the fish you kept, the fish you discarded, or the numbers, actually, and then some socioeconomic or economic information, like the charter fee, the amount of fuel used, fuel price per gallon, and then there was also a mention that there could be other kinds of economic data or release and discard information, a variety of things.

The core data elements were not included in the action, specifically so that, if those data collection elements had to be changed, at the Center's request, or I guess at SERO's request, then that wouldn't need an amendment to change all these FMPs, but the council wanted to be involved in seeing what kind of data elements would be requested, and so, at that point, the council said, in the amendment, that they expect to be included and given an opportunity to participate in the process for determining changes, if changes are needed, if NMFS determines changes are needed, and the council's expectation for involvement includes the opportunity for participation, review, and comment by the council's APs, relevant APs, and its SSC, if needed.

The rulemaking was really where the devil met the details, and I think I made that up, but, whatever that is, the devil is in the details, but it was very difficult to try to implement the plan in such a way that it would also not be burdensome on the fishermen, or overly burdensome on the fishermen.

One thing that the South Atlantic Council really wanted was that, if a one-stop reporting situation was possible, they would like that for their dually-permitted permit holders, and, by dually-permitted, I am talking about a permit holder who holds either a snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, or coastal migratory pelagic permit, but then also a permit from another region, whether it's from the Greater Atlantic Region or from the Gulf, and so, in attempts to try to figure out how fishermen would not have to submit multiple reports for all those different FMPs, SERO staff worked with ACCSP staff to try to figure out a way that the fishermen could enter their data, just once, and then

that would be sufficient to satisfy all the FMP requirements. I should say that the ACCSP is the data collection platform which the Service is using.

Ultimately, the reporting requirements, or the need to file these reports, are really based on the permit, in the sense that, if you have -- I will use dolphin wahoo, because I think that's a good example. If you have a dolphin wahoo permit, then you're going to be required to report all these core data elements that I kind of really mentioned, and John Carmichael might get into them a little bit further, but remember that the Dolphin Wahoo FMP goes up through Maine, and so I think some fishermen who are north of the South Atlantic were probably surprised, or they complained or discussed with their council, their relevant council, that they weren't happy with these additional reporting requirements.

I think that then was the basis for some of these letters that you received, and the region received, one from the Mid-Atlantic Council and one from the New England Council, and so I guess I will leave it at that, and maybe John wants to discuss, or maybe Jack discuss, this further, but that kind of sets the stage a little bit for how this all came about. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right, Monica. I will also mention that, at least earlier, Rick Bellavance from the New England Council, was on the meeting today, and so he might be available for questions, if we need him, but, John, do you or Jack want to kind of follow-up?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think Monica summed it up. That's the situation as we understand it, and I would really be interested in hearing, given the late hour, sort of where Rick stands on things, since they had penned the letter questioning some of the variables and the requirements of this reporting.

MR. BELL: Okay. If we could -- Have we got Rick unmuted?

MR. BELLAVANCE: Good afternoon, council members and Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for the opportunity to weigh-in here. Can you hear me okay?

MR. BELL: Yes. Thanks, Rick, and thanks for hanging in there with us. I apologize for running late.

MR. BELLAVANCE: No problem. It's a common occurrence at these council meetings all over, and ours is no different. Thank you very much, and I thank Monica for her great presentation and a really good explanation of how the process came to be and where we are now. I just thought I would take a quick minute to sort of give some background on the letter that the New England Council sent to your council.

Basically, it was the result of some fishermen up in the New England region that did notice the new requirements, and these are folks that have dolphin wahoo permits, as well as their GARFO permits, and they were a little bit surprised by the additional elements that they need to submit on their VTRs, once the rule went into effect. Our council talked a little bit about it, at our June meeting, and we thought it would be good to send a letter off to you guys, just letting you know that we're hearing it from our constituents, and one specific question that came up, over and over again, was, if a fisherman doesn't catch any South Atlantic species, how is the information in the additional fields actually used in the management of that species?

We'll use dolphin for an example. If a fisherman doesn't catch any dolphin for the year, but he has a permit, and he enters all that extra information, whether it's catch and effort related or the socioeconomic stuff, is that relevant to the management of dolphin and wahoo? I think that was really the crux of the concerns. The New England fishermen have been doing vessel trip reports for quite a while and, since 2018, electronic vessel trip reports, and they didn't, I guess, expect, or anticipate, having additional elements added to their trip reports, and so their initial concern was, well, how is this used, and what's the importance of it, and so I don't know if there's someone that can answer that question, so that I can bring that back to our council, for starters. Then I just have one more quick comment after that, if that's okay, Chairman Bell.

MR. BELL: Sure. Please, Rick.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Okay, and so my other comment is, personally, I am a huge fan of electronic trip reports. I submit them fully, and our council does as well. We're not interested in trying to dictate in any way what another council feels is important for data collection to manage their species, but we would like to create a dialogue, a cooperative dialogue, back and forth as we work to improve these systems.

It was a pretty heavy lift to get all of these systems up and running across the different regions, and I think we've got a really good handle on it, to get the tools up and running, but I am hopeful, and I think our council is hopeful, that this isn't going to be the end of it and there will be continued improvement to these systems. I think Monica mentioned trying to make it as easy as possible for the fishermen, on the for-hire side and eventually on the commercial side, and so we would like to just continue the dialogue and be part of any process that comes about for improving these systems, as time goes on, and so just wanted to offer that to your council as well. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. Well, thank, Rick, and I can tell you, as chair of the committee that dealt with that amendment for it seemed like forever, the scenario that you described is nothing any of us ever envisioned. You know, we were very focused on improving data collection efforts, obviously, in our own region, and we knew we had -- Particularly, we actually started out as a joint amendment with the Gulf, and so we were kind of attuned to the Gulf and, of course, our area, but, again, the scenario of someone catching a -- Who just happened to have a dolphin wahoo permit, basically targeting bottom fish off of New England, and then being required to report to -- That just sort of never went through our minds at the time.

Related to Rick's question specifically about use of those data, is that something, Jack, that you or Rick could address, and I totally agree with staying -- Basically staying involved, since we have a system in place that impacts everybody from Maine to Florida, or, actually, Maine to Texas, I guess, if you think about it, and we definitely need to stay in close communication, as this thing grows and evolves, but, to Rick's specific question, Jack or Rick or -- Maybe not Monica, but is that something you all can address?

MR. DEVICTOR: I can just touch upon it. We did respond, and this is in your briefing material, in June of this year, to the councils, and we kind of went over this some in our response, to how this additional information would be used and what is the need to collect this, and, in that response, we sort of highlighted that, as we work on our amendments, and just trying to better understand the fishery impacts to our fishermen, that that was a big part of this. We're just trying to understand

the potential impacts of proposed management measures, and that was the first thing that we wanted to highlight.

Our information for this industry is often outdated, and we don't have a lot of the price and revenue and fuel costs and such, and so we were told, by our economists, that this would be very useful information to collect, and then, also, that disaster -- We highlighted that this information could be used in assessments of disaster recovery, and they typically use this information, but maybe the council would like a presentation, or more information, at a future meeting, on more detail as to exactly how this information is used, particularly for say a fisherman in the Northeast that's not catching dolphin wahoo, but has this South Atlantic permit.

MR. BELL: Right. Okay. What I was looking for, and, Monica, maybe this a question, but the way I will phrase is so we see what the issue is up there, and I fully understand what they're talking about, and, I guess, Jack or Monica, is there a path to a remedy for them that we can see? Is it through continuing to work together as this grows and evolves? Is there a way to kind of achieve some remedy for them, based on the problems that they have brought us, either Jack or Monica?

DR. MCGOVERN: I can go first, Mel, if you want.

MR. BELL: That would be fine. Thank you.

DR. MCGOVERN: I was just going to say some of the same things that Rick did with regard to the need for the economic information. We heard, from doing amendments over the years, how much it's needed, and I was talking to John and Myra last week, and we were mentioning that, probably fifteen years ago, we had an amendment that we did, and I had to use Gulf data for for-hire analysis, and our economists got pretty beat up for doing that, and we had to tell him that he had to do that, because we didn't have the data for doing the analysis for the South Atlantic.

Also, Rick mentioned fishery disasters, and we're having more and more fishery disasters, and the economic information is really important for doing those fisheries disasters and figuring out the value of fisheries, but, with regard to moving forward in some kind of a way on this, I think that this could be an agenda item for a council meeting, where all the data elements could be discussed and have an economist present to discuss the value of those and how the council wants to move forward on that. Monica may want to add to that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: If I may, and so I understand, and I appreciated too actually, the idea from the New England Council about having consistency across really the whole east coast. I think that would be very beneficial. The council's amendment mentioned, and stated specifically, in the preferred alternative, to report all fish harvested and discarded on all trips, regardless of where the fish were caught, and so, to the idea of why do I need to report -- If I have a dolphin wahoo permit, why do I need to report other fish that are not dolphin wahoo, or, if I do not catch any dolphin wahoo on that trip, and so I understand that.

I think it's a little tricky though, because the regulations, for example, I think for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, or CMP, require that all fish that are caught be reported, all fish harvested and discarded, and so that's kind of hard-coded into the regulations. The type of information collected, other than that, in terms of like the economic information, is not hard-coded into the regulations. They are part of the core data elements, but, again, I think, if the council wants to change those,

then that's the process, and maybe they suggested that some of these be changed, and then we start that dialogue where the council gets involved with the region, and you can talk with your counterpart councils up north and figure out a way forward, and then we can look at that.

Remember that this has only been in place for the South Atlantic Council since January 4, I think, of this year, and you just got a presentation on how many people are reporting and how many are not reporting and that sort of thing, and so, if the council is interested in going forward to see if they can make some changes, or suggest some changes, then, sure, we can figure that out going forward.

MR. BELL: Okay. Monica, that would be -- Let's say we get together, as councils, and we figure out what we would like to do, what might be the best path, and then we feed back to SERO, and that's -- Then you all can act, or are you talking in the form of there actually has to be an amendment or something, or can we just communicate that, effectively, to you all, and then you would be able to act on that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Mel, you're going to love my answer. It depends. It depends on exactly what kind of changes are asked for, and I think then that would be a dialogue that would probably involve the Center and the Regional Office and the councils in trying to figure out a way forward, if you wanted to make some changes. I mean, as I just read, your amendment and the regulations both say that you're going to report all fish harvested and discarded, and so, if you have a dolphin wahoo permit, even if you catch other fish, it's all fish harvested and discarded.

Now, if we want to try to figure out that that meant only dolphin wahoo, well, then we're going to have to look at that, and I'm really hesitant to say, sure, we can do that right now, because of the way the regulations are written and the way, in the rulemaking, there were comments given to the Service that, hey, you're collecting too much information, or we don't want to give you this economic information, that sort of thing, and all those comments were responded to, and so we've got a record there as to why we are where we are, and so I think it just does depend, and maybe you want to start this dialogue, and then we'll figure out where to go.

MR. BELL: Okay. That is, obviously, not something we're going to decide the fine details of today, but I think there is a potential path forward to making this better, and, as you said, it depends on what it is we want to do, or what we agree on, and so I understand that. I am not sure which Rick that is, whether it's DeVictor or Bellavance, but a Rick has had a hand up.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for the time you spent on this issue. I really like the path forward that you folks are suggesting, and I look forward to being able to participate in any future dialogue, for sure. Maybe offline -- In the interest of time, maybe offline, I could work to just try to get an answer to bring back to our council, and the biggest question that came up, over and over again, was what happens to the information that the folks up in New England send down to you guys, and is that used in the economic analysis to assess disaster relief or assessment purposes and all that stuff.

If you've got a hundred VTRs with just groundfish landings on them, does all that economic information go to manage dolphin wahoo, or whatever species, and so that's really an important and common question that was asked, and, at some point, after the meeting, if we could just follow-up and try to get a way to answer that for my report to the council in a couple of weeks, that would

be awesome, and, again, thank you so much for taking time out of your agenda to talk this through. I appreciate it.

MR. BELL: Okay. No problem, and thanks, Rick, for being here and enduring the schedule a little, and, yes, we can certainly discuss that specific question. I don't think we're going to answer that right here now. Chester, have you got something?

MR. BREWER: Very quickly, I promise. The information that's being asked for is important, not just from the standpoint of disaster relief, but, every year, there's a report that comes out that talks about what are the economics of recreational fishing, and how much money changes hands, and how much money is rolling around because of recreational fishing, and information like this is very important to answer that question, and so I applauded it, when I saw that this was being asked, and I said, that's great, but apparently some folks don't like it, and so, I mean, we can spend a little bit of time on it, but I wouldn't spend a lot.

MR. BELL: Certainly I agree that the economic information is important, and we actually saw it come into play in 2020, during the CARES Act initiatives and all, where the realization was that we have this fishery that has a lot of value, and it's been impacted, and what sort of data do we have, and so it does come up, and it is actually used. I think, the specifics about the question that Rick had, maybe we're not really probably in a place to kind of deal with that right now, but I see Geoff White's hand up. Jeff.

MR. WHITE: Mel, thank you, and council members, and thank you for recognizing me. This isn't a comment specific to the letters or the data fields, but I would like to make a comment about, a supporting comment, on one-stop reporting. There are other systems working on OSR, and yet, today, the use of eTRIPS aligns the South Atlantic, the HMS, and the GARFO data requirements, and the intent there is to reduce the industry burden and to improve the quality and completeness of the data, while also improving the efficiency of that coastwide data collection.

The last few agenda items have brought this up, and, therefore, I just kind of support all applications working towards the OSR guideline, because, technically, from a data flow and an application standpoint, we are on the cusp of implementing, by November 10 of this year, the ability for a one-stop report, of one application, for a multi-permitted trip, and that is commercial, charter, SERO, GARFO, HMS, and I am excited about this, and I certainly appreciate all the efforts by the councils and the regulatory agencies to get these things on the books and their staff and all involved to kind of get us up to this point and make it so the electronic reporting answers the questions that today meet the regulations.

It gives us the flexibility to make these changes in data collection as the decisions are made, and so, again, thanks to all involved, and I'm really excited that OSR has come up over the last couple of agenda items, and I look forward to the future of how this goes. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Okay, and thanks, Geoff, and thanks for all that you guys do at ACCSP. That's a big load, and we certainly appreciate everything you do. John Carmichael.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mel. I guess I just want to -- When we do talk about this, I think we do have to focus in on kind of the issues that Rick was raising and we see in the letters. One is disaster declarations, and the disasters we normally deal with, the hurricanes and such, are

very geographically oriented, and so I think there is a legitimate question there about how someone like Rick, reporting even dolphin harvest off of Georges Bank, is going to factor in to say disaster evaluation, and so I think we have to make sure we're clear about that.

Then I think the other issue is, as he mentioned, reporting this variable for a trip that's only groundfish, and that fish is never going to come into any of the analysis that we would do about dolphin wahoo, perhaps, because it didn't land any dolphin wahoo. We always have the issue with the fact that fishermen can have a permit that they very seldom end up in a situation where they actually are using that permit, essentially, and I think that's the crux of this issue and where we need to think about.

Is there some way to avoid imposing extra burdens on folks when they are not interacting with our fisheries or using essentially our permits, as it were, and it sounds like there may be ways, and I appreciate Geoff bringing up those points as well about one-stop reporting as something we've all wanted, and it's the answer to many of these problems, and I think the technology is out there that lets us tailor these things, as needed, for each individual situation.

When we do that, we probably all have to some sort of cross-council discussions about what we really need in these different variables, to make sure that we're all on the same page, so we don't create a whole bunch of little scenarios like this, where one council is asking for something slightly different than another.

MR. BELL: Thanks for that summary, John. I think that's -- I think, like you said, we have a way forward, and we can kind of figure out how best to deal with this and work with our councils, and we can make improvements, and there's a path forward. We're not going to solve it today, but we do appreciate the questions, and there may be other things that pop up, and who knows, as we get this thing up and running. All right. Anything else regarding for-hire right now? I don't see any.

The only thing we have left is a little discussion of the next meeting, but, for Other Business, I have one thing. Does anybody have any other business to come before the council? I don't see any hands, and my one thing that I wanted to bring up is just a clarification of something. This morning, when we had the Habitat and Ecosystem Committee report, they were working off of probably the first draft of the report, and so, basically -- Normally, we would capture all of the approved motions, and we also capture all of the motions that were made that weren't approved.

What you saw in the draft report this morning was the approved motion that came from the committee yesterday regarding approval of Coral Amendment 10. What you didn't see was the motion that -- There was a substitute motion made at one point, by Andy, regarding delaying the whole concept and waiting for some more exploratory work to be done, and that was discussed for quite a bit, and all of that discussion, the motion itself, the vote on the motion, is all captured in the actual record of the meeting itself, and so it's all 100 percent captured.

We will, in the final version of the committee report, make sure we include that draft motion in there, as having failed, and so just to clear that up, and it wasn't in the draft this morning, when Steve went through the report, but it will be in the final version, and so it will be captured, and so I just wanted to make that clear. Any questions about that? I don't see anything. If there's no other business, John, did you want to briefly discuss the next meeting?

MR. CARMICHAEL: In the interest of time, I will channel Andy Strelcheck from earlier and say you have the report, and it's written before you, and it summarizes the meetings over the next year, and our next series of council meetings, where we hope that they will be, COVID depending, and who knows at this point, but, to the extent we have dates, they're in there, and, as I said, the meetings this fall, of our APs, et cetera, will be held virtually, and so hopefully this brings you up-to-speed, and that concludes my report on that, Mr. Chair, and I appreciate all that you have done, and welcome to our new Vice Chair, Dr. Belcher.

MR. BELL: Yes. Welcome, Carolyn, to that job, and welcome to all the new council members, again, and so that's all I have. Everybody have a safe drive, wherever you are, a safe walk from the kitchen, but I really appreciate everybody's hard work on this and hanging through, and I am sorry about going over, but, as you can see, we do try to cram a lot into a reasonably short period of time. Thanks a lot, and we'll hopefully see you in-person in Beaufort in December, and so this meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 17, 2021.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
October 28, 2021

SAFMC September Council Meeting

Attendee Report: (9/13/21 - 9/17/21)

Report Generated:

09/17/2021 06:59 AM EDT

Webinar ID

262-125-515

Actual Start Date/Time

09/16/2021 08:00 AM EDT

Duration

9 hours 25 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	BROUWER	MYRA
Yes	BYRD	01JULIA
Yes	Badolato	Matthew
Yes	Belcher	Carolyn
Yes	Bell	00-Mel
Yes	Berry	James
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Blough	Heather
Yes	Brame	Richen
Yes	Brennan	Ken
Yes	Brogan	Gilbert
Yes	Brooke	Sandra
Yes	Bruce	James
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Carmichael	01 John
Yes	Carnes	Justin
Yes	Chaya	01Cindy
Yes	Clarke	Lora
Yes	Coleman	Heather
Yes	Collier	01Chip
Yes	Conklin	00 THE REAL Chris
Yes	Copeland	01 Robert
Yes	Corey	Morgan
Yes	Cox	Derek
Yes	Cross	Tiffanie
Yes	Curtis	Judd
Yes	Dale (NMFS SERO)	David
Yes	Dantuono	Bill
Yes	Darrow	Jamie
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	Dixon	Michael
Yes	Doten	Madeline

Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Fitzpatrick	Kelly
Yes	Flora	Corrin
Yes	Flowers	Jared
Yes	Foor	Brandon
Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Franco	Crystal
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Gill	Bob
Yes	Glasgow	Dawn
Yes	Glazier	Ed
Yes	Godwin	Joelle
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Gorham	Bill
Yes	Griffin	Charles
Yes	Griner	00 Tim
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Hart	Hannah
Yes	Hawes	Rachel
Yes	Haymans	Doug
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Helmey	Judy
Yes	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	Herrera	John
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Hudson	Rusty
Yes	Iberle	01Allie
Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01Kim
Yes	KELLY	BILL
Yes	Karazsia	Jocelyn
Yes	Keener	Paula
Yes	Killer	Ed
Yes	Kramer	Rob
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Laney	Wilson
Yes	Latanich	KATie
Yes	Lee	Jennifer
Yes	Lewis	Savannah
Yes	Marhefka	Kerry
Yes	McCawley	00 - Jessica
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Meehan	Sean
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Mendez-Ferrer	Natasha
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna

Yes	Merrifield	Mike
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	PHELPS	MARK
Yes	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	Pannell	John
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Phillips	Charlie
Yes	Pierce	Brett
Yes	Poholek	Ariel
Yes	Poland	00Stephen
Yes	Porch	Clay01
Yes	Powell	Jessica
Yes	Prewitt	Brian
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Puglise	Kimberly
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Ramsay	Chloe
Yes	Rapp	Amber
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Reynolds	Jon
Yes	Rhodes	01Cameron
Yes	Roller	Tom
Yes	Sanchez	Nacho
Yes	Schmidtke	01Michael
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Shervanick	Kara
Yes	Smillie	Nicholas
Yes	Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Yes	Smith	Duane
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Sramek	Mark
Yes	Stemle	Adam
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Strelcheck	00-Andy
Yes	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	Thompson	00Laurilee
Yes	Travis	Michael
Yes	Trego	Marisa
Yes	Vara	Mary
Yes	Walia	Matt
Yes	Wamer	David
Yes	Weissman	Dani

Yes	White	Geoff
Yes	Wiegand	01Christina
Yes	Wolfe	Wes
Yes	Woodward	00 Spud
Yes	Zamboni	Katharine
Yes	Zoodsma	Barb
Yes	Zou	Chao
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	crosson	scott
Yes	emery	jeff
Yes	locke	charles
Yes	moss	david
Yes	sminkey	thomas
Yes	smith	douglas
Yes	thomas	01suz
Yes	thompson	mary jean
Yes	walter	John
Yes	wilber	pace

Council Meeting

Attendee Report: (9/13/21 - 9/17/21)

Report Generated:

09/17/2021 02:08 PM EDT

Webinar ID

262-125-515

Actual Start Date/Time

09/17/2021 07:57 AM EDT

Duration

6 hours 8 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended

Yes

Last Name

Asci

First Name

Sam

Yes

Aukeman

Trip

Yes

BROUWER

MYRA

Yes

BYRD

01JULIA

Yes

Bailey

Adam

Yes

Barbieri

Luiz

Yes

Belcher

Carolyn

Yes

Bell

00-Mel

Yes

Bellavance

10-Rick

Yes

Berry

James

Yes

Bianchi

Alan

Yes

Blough

Heather

Yes

Brantley

William

Yes

Brogan

Gilbert

Yes

Brown

Julie

Yes

Bruce

James

Yes

Calay

Shannon

Yes

Carmichael

01 John

Yes

Carnes

Justin

Yes

Chaya

01Cindy

Yes

Clarke

Lora

Yes

Collier

01Chip

Yes

Conklin

00 THE REAL Chris

Yes

Constant

Tony

Yes

Copeland

01 Robert

Yes

Corey

Morgan

Yes

Coutre

Karson

Yes

Craig

Kevin

Yes

Curtis

Judd

Yes

DeFilippi Simpson

Julie

Yes

DeVictor

Rick

Yes

Dixon

Michael

Yes

Doten

Madeline

Yes

Dover

Miles

Yes	DuBeck	Guy
Yes	Dunn	Russell
Yes	FRANCO	DAWN
Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Flora	Corrin
Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Gill	Bob
Yes	Gloeckner	David
Yes	Godwin	Joelle
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Griner	00 Tim
Yes	Guyas	Martha
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Hart	Hannah
Yes	Hawes	Rachel
Yes	Haymans	Doug
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Helmey	Judy
Yes	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	Horton	Chris
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Hudson	Rusty
Yes	Iberle	01Allie
Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01Kim
Yes	KELLY	BILL
Yes	Karnauskas	Mandy
Yes	Kellison	Todd
Yes	Killer	Ed
Yes	Kramer	Rob
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Laney	Wilson
Yes	Latanich	KATie
Yes	Lawler	Sean
Yes	Lee	Jennifer
Yes	Loftus	Andrew
Yes	Lyons Gromen	Pam
Yes	Malinowski	Rich
Yes	Marhefka	Kerry
Yes	Masi	Michelle
Yes	McCawley	00 - Jessica
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Mendez-Ferrer	Natasha
Yes	Merrifield	Mike

Yes	Mroch	Ray
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Muñoz	Roldan
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Pierce	Brett
Yes	Poland	00Stephen
Yes	Porch	Clay01
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Quinlan	John
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Ramsay	Chloe
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Rhodes	01Cameron
Yes	Riley	Richard
Yes	Roller	Tom
Yes	Schmidt	Eric
Yes	Schmidtke	01Michael
Yes	Scott	Tara
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Slayden	Natalie
Yes	Smillie	Nicholas
Yes	Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Yes	Smith	Duane
Yes	Spooner	Ellen
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Sramek	Mark
Yes	Stemle	Adam
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Strelcheck	00-Andy
Yes	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	Thompson	00Laurilee
Yes	Vara	Mary
Yes	Walia	Matt
Yes	Wamer	David
Yes	Whitaker	David
Yes	White	Geoff
Yes	Wiegand	01Christina
Yes	Wolfe	Wes
Yes	Woodward	00 Spud
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	burton	michael
Yes	colby	barrett

Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes

cox
crosson
emery
huffman
moss
sminkey
thomas
thompson
walter

Jack
scott
jeff
mark
david
thomas
01suz
mary jean
John