

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COBIA COMMITTEE

**Westin Hotel
Jekyll Island, Georgia**

March 8, 2022

TRANSCRIPT

Committee Members

Spud Woodward, Chair
Mel Bell
Robert Beal
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Trish Murphey
Laurilee Thompson

Tom Roller, Vice Chair
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Chester Brewer
LT Robert Copeland
Judy Helmey
Jessica McCawley
Andy Strelcheck
Dewey Hemilright

Council Staff

Myra Brouwer
John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
John Hadley
Allie Iberle
Kelly Klasnick
Roger Pugliese
Nick Smillie
Christine Wiegand

Julia Byrd
Cindy Chaya
Dr. Judd Curtis
Kathleen Howington
Kim Iverson
Dr. Julie Neer
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Suzanna Thomas

Attendees and Invited Participants

Leann Bosarge
Shep Grimes
Dr. Genny Nesslage
Capt Scott Pearce
Monica Smit-Brunello

Rick DeVictor
Dr. Jack McGovern
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Dr. Clay Porch
Dr. John Walter

Additional attendees and invited participants attached.

The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Hotel, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Tuesday, March 8, 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Spud Woodward.

MR. WOODWARD: We will go ahead and proceed with this morning's meeting of the Mackerel Cobia Committee. Just as a reminder of who is on that committee, just about everybody, but I will list the names anyway. Tom Roller is Vice Chair, Tim Griner, Trish Murphey, Mel Bell, Kerry Marhefka, Chris Conklin, Carolyn Belcher, Judy Helmey, Jessica McCawley, Chester Brewer, Laurilee Thompson, Andy Strelcheck, Robert Beal, Lieutenant Robert Copeland, and our Mid-Atlantic members Dewey Hemilright and Joe Cimino.

The first item of business is Approval of the Agenda. Any recommended modifications or changes to the agenda? I don't see any, and so we'll consider the agenda accepted. The next item is Approval of the December 2021 Committee Minutes, which everybody had available in the briefing book. Any modifications, edits, or corrections to the minutes? Seeing none, we'll consider the minutes accepted by unanimous consent. All right. At this point, I'm going to turn it over to Rick for an update on amendments submitted to NMFS.

MR. DEVICTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Not much to say on this one, and it's another amendment in rulemaking here, and so this is Amendment 32, and this has to do with Gulf group cobia, and this responds to SEDAR 28, and so it changes ABCs, ACLs, ACT, and deals with the FLEC Zone apportionment between the two management zones, the Gulf Zone and the Florida East Coast Zone. It also changes the minimum size limits in the FLEC Zone and possession limits and vessel limits and such in both zones.

The Gulf approved this at their October 2021 meeting, and the South Atlantic -- You just approved this at your last meeting, and so the amendment was sent to National Marine Fisheries Service for consideration of approval and rulemaking in February, and so we're working on the proposed rule and NOA now, and so look out for a Fishery Bulletin announcing those comment periods.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thank you, Rick. Any questions for Rick on that? We appreciate it. All right. The second agenda item is Review of CMP Amendment 34, and this is one that we've been looking at for the last several meetings, and we're at the point where we're getting ready for formal review, and so, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Christina to take us through it one more time.

MS. WIEGAND: Thank you, Spud. Good morning, everyone, and so this is, again -- Just the quickest of backgrounds, and, like Spud said, we've been through this amendment a number of times, but this one is addressing Atlantic king mackerel and the updated SEDAR 38 stock assessment, and it also considers a couple of changes to management measures, based on recommendations from your Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel.

Our objectives for this meeting, I'm going to go through the draft council rationale, to make sure that there is nothing else that you guys would like to change or modify. We're going to review some input that we got from the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel on the cut and damaged fish action in this amendment, and then you're at the point where you'll be considering approval for formal review.

Once you guys have approved it for formal review -- This is a joint amendment with the Gulf Council, and so we will be taking it back to them for their April 2022 meeting, where they will consider it for formal review, and, if both councils concur and approve for formal review, then we will transmit this to the Secretary sometime in the spring of 2022.

Here is the purpose and need statement, and I'm not going to read through it. It's unchanged from the last meeting, and there is no action necessary on it at this time, and so, jumping into Action 1, Action 1 looks at revising the acceptable biological catch, total ACL, and annual OY for Atlantic migratory group king mackerel, and this is in the amendment in order to update catch levels based on that SEDAR 38 update assessment and the SSC's recommendations. Your current preferred alternative is Alternative 3, which would set at 5 percent buffer between the ABC and ACL, and you can see the numbers that that would result in in this table right here.

Scrolling down to the draft council rationale, it's noted in the amendment that the council chose to place that small buffer between the ABC and the ACL based on a recommendation from the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel to be precautionary, due to uncertainty with the new MRIP-FES numbers and the substantial increase in ABC that this fishery was seeing, and it's also noted that the council felt the buffer was appropriate for this stock, because of that substantial increase, and one of the things we wanted the council to talk a little bit on the record is why they felt a buffer was appropriate for Atlantic king mackerel, due to some uncertainty with the FES numbers, but may not be appropriate for some of the other species that you guys manage. If there is any other input on that, we would appreciate that.

MR. WOODWARD: Okay. Any feedback for Christina on that, some comments maybe in support of this rationale from committee members? We don't need a lengthy diatribe, but maybe just something we can get on the record. We've had previous discussions about it, obviously, on the record, but any final words on this that someone is willing to offer? I guess everybody got talked out at Dolphin Wahoo. Okay. Well, I guess everybody is satisfied with it, and comfortable with it, and so we'll move on.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Then next up is Action 2. This looks at revising sector allocations and the sector annual catch limits for Atlantic migratory group king mackerel. Again, remember that this is an iterative action, and so it is based off of the preferred alternative in the previous action, and we've talked about this a couple of times, but it's one of those no-action action situations, and so the council's current preferred alternative is the no action, which would retain the current sector allocations of 62.9 percent to the recreational sector and 37.1 percent to the commercial sector.

If you look down here, you can see the actual numbers that would result for the commercial and recreational sector under Preferred Alternative 1. If you look at Table 5, you can then see the allocations for the commercial Northern Zone and the commercial Southern Zone, and, if you will remember, the council chose not to modify allocations for the commercial zones, based on input from the Mackerel Cobia AP that the current percentages were appropriate.

Then, if you will remember, there is two seasons for the Southern Zone, and so you've also got allocations between Season 1 and Season 2 for the commercial Southern Zone, and you can see those numbers in Table 6, and that brings us to the draft council rationale, and the council has said, on the record thus far, that Atlantic king mackerel is sort of a management success story and that

it would be beneficial to preserve the historic makeup of the fishery, and, additionally, in recent years, the commercial sector has come close to meeting its ACL, whereas the recreational sector has stayed well below their ACL, and so maintaining those allocations that were set back in the 1980s would shift a little bit of poundage towards the commercial sector, and, again, noting that maintaining the current percentage allocations would not result in a closure, or is not anticipated to result in a closure, for either sector. That's the current rationale on the record. If there's anything the council would like to add or discuss more, related to this action, now is the time.

MR. WOODWARD: Any comments on this? Is everybody satisfied with the rationale statement? I think it's sufficiently explanatory, because it is a reallocation, and so we'll make sure we've got that captured. I think we had it in some of our previous discussions. Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Spud. I am supportive of the rationale. I guess I just wanted to note that, I think in this instance, the reason I'm supportive is exactly how we've laid it out, and we have a commercial sector that's bumping up against their catch limit, and we have a recreational sector that hasn't. Although this is a reallocation, because we're not adjusting the allocation due to the new FES numbers, neither sector is predicted to -- Or at least the recreational sector is not predicted to exceed the catch limit, going forward, and this is a success story. Certainly allocations can be reviewed and reconsidered in the future, but I think maintaining the allocation as-is for right now is appropriate. I would not support something like this if both sectors were bumping up against the catch limit.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Andy. Anyone else? I don't see any hands, and so we'll move on to Action 3.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Cruising on to Action 3, this is the recreational annual catch target action, and, again, this is a catch limit action, and so it's based on the previous two actions, and so your current preferred alternative is Alternative 1, which would simply revise the annual catch target to reflect that updated annual catch limit from the previous action, using the formula that is currently in the CMP FMP, which is that ACL times one minus the PSE, or 0.5.

Again, Table 8 shows you the actual recreational ACT numbers that you would see with that, and, again, the draft council rationale here is fairly simple. It maintains -- The current preferred alternative would maintain the method for setting the ACT that's been in the CMP FMP since Amendment 18, and it just updates it based on the new catch levels.

MR. WOODWARD: This one is pretty straightforward, but I will offer a chance if anybody would like to make any comments on it, but I don't think we'll have any. I don't see any. Okay. We'll move on.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Next up is Action 4, which looks at increasing the recreational bag and possession limit in the EEZ off of Florida. Your current preferred alternative would increase the daily bag limit off of Florida to three fish per person, from two fish per person, and the draft council rationale we have here is that the current preferred alternative would create consistency in the recreational bag limit in federal waters throughout the king mackerel management jurisdiction and would provide the same opportunity for harvest throughout that management area, and, again, this is based off a recommendation from the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you. Another one that's fairly straightforward. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one thing that you might want to note in there is this is one where they haven't been achieving -- The recreational sector has not been achieving its catch limits under the lower bag, and the catch limit is associated with OY, and so this would be in furtherance of allowing that sector promoting its ability to harvest its portion of optimum yield.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thank you. I see Christina is capturing that. Okay. Any other comments on this one? We're not going to talk about the next one. No, but we have to talk about it, and so the next one might prompt a little more conversation, as it has prior to this meeting, and so the next one is Action 5.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Action 5 looks at modifying the recreational requirement for king and Spanish mackerel to be landed with heads and fins intact, and so the current preferred alternative would allow cut or damaged fish that are caught under the recreational bag limit that comply with minimum size limits to be possessed and offloaded ashore, and the council has currently selected both sub-alternatives, allowing it for Atlantic king mackerel and Atlantic Spanish mackerel.

Just to be clear with the intent of this, the intent is that the portion of fish that's left must meet the minimum size limit, and so, arguably, the fish would have been larger than the minimum size limit before it was cut off, and so I am going to go ahead and pause here. We did bring this to the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel for their input, and I'm going to let Captain Scott Pearce talk about what the Law Enforcement AP discussed during their meeting.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Good morning, everybody, once again. I will go over what we discussed, and I'm just going to read to you the notes from the meeting, and then I would be happy to try to field any questions or clarify anything that you hear within this.

The Law Enforcement Advisory Panel was asked to comment on Action 7 in CMP Amendment 34, which considers allowing recreational fishermen to possess and offload ashore cutoff or damaged Atlantic king and Spanish mackerel that comply with the minimum size limit. Note that this provision already exists for the commercial sector, and the AP had the following comments.

There was general concern that allowing retention of cutoff or damaged fish in the recreational sector for king and Spanish mackerel will create the expectation that this practice should be allowed for other species. King mackerel are not difficult to identify, but other species may present identification issues that would make such an allowance problematic.

AP members offered that officer discretion is generally the norm, as to whether a fish that has been depredated is allowed to be retained under current regulations. Officer discretion is based on the totality of the circumstances and should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Officer discretion does not replace enforcement as an option, but rather gives the officer flexibility to utilize education or warnings as a tool. Officer discretion should not be utilized in place of regulations or policies as a normal procedure. The stakeholder must always be educated based on the regulations and not discretion. Over the years, knowledge of certain discretionary considerations can be lost, and it is best to address inconsistencies through regulation or policy.

The reason that section came up, when we first proposed it to everybody, the first response was, well, we can use good officer discretion to look at these fish and see what has happened to them and work with it, but we discussed it out, and we said what we really need to let the council know is what is the conflict between the state waters and federal waters, and so, technically, although officer discretion can be used, it's not something that -- If this is going to become a norm in federal waters, it's not something you want to utilize to allow that transit in state waters, and you either need to fix your state regulations or not allow it.

Like, in Florida, we have that transit policy, and so, if you are in federal waters, and you're harvesting Spanish mackerel, or king mackerel, and you get some that have suffered depredation issues, then we'll allow you to transit across state waters with those fish, but, if you stop and fish, and they're onboard, then, technically, you're going to be in violation of our state whole condition regulations.

Then, of course, that's where you would say, okay, how do I use discretion, and, well, if I see clearly that these fish would meet the minimum size limits, and they were depredated, then I could issue a warning and allow them to possess them, but I can't continue to do that forever, and so the direct conflict with this would be that the states don't have consistent regulations that would allow this activity. It's not whether it's a good or bad thing, but it's just that's the conflict, and so that's where the discretion thing came in.

It was noted that the commercial sector is already allowed to retain cut or damaged fish that meet the minimum size limit requirements, and the states agree that there are no enforcement issues right now with that regulation, and it has not been a problem. Some South Atlantic states currently have avenues in place to amend regulations quickly to match those in federal waters, and so that was to say, if this does happen, then the states may agree to do that, to match it up.

If the proposed change is implemented, education and outreach to the angling public will be important, to emphasize that the retained portion of the depredated or damaged fish still must meet the recreational minimum size limit and show visible signs of damaged caused by depredation. One of the terms we hear are "cutoffs", and I think it needs to be clear that that term -- I don't like that term, because it's insinuating that you can cut away the bad portion and leave the remaining carcass.

If this were to happen, we need to be able to clearly see that this fish was attacked by a shark, or some other form of predator, and so we can say, okay, this was a depredation issue, and, as long as it meets that minimum size requirement, and there's enough fish left that we can determine that, then we're good, but those were, overall, the major concerns, and the challenge, the big challenge, for the council and the states is that the regulations, right now, don't match up.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Scott. It was obviously a lively discussion at the AP, and it's quite a conundrum for us. It's an example of you know what you want to do and why you want to do it, but we face the possibility of creating yet another conflict between federal waters management and state waters management, and so are there questions for Scott, or comments? I've got Carolyn that had her hand raised a while ago, and so I'll go ahead and call on you.

DR. BELCHER: Actually, my comment piggybacks off of what Scott had just said, because I noticed, in the language, we had the specifics of talking about cutoff, and then "damaged" being

in parentheses. If you come down through the text, the first line of the discussion, you see where it's "cut/damaged", and so, if the language there is "cut", that kind of, to me -- I thought maybe that came out of the commercial regs, the idea that if you're cutting it and using it for bait, but "cutoff" and "cut", to me, have very different meanings, and so, if the language is inconsistent, I think you're leaving that door open for what's the interpretation of cut.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks. Yes, I think you've got a good point there, and we need to look at -- I mean, is there a -- We've already got this in existence for commercial fishing, and is there a standard definition that's used? I mean, is there a definition of record that's used to describe the situation that we talked about? I'm going to call on Carolyn for that, and then I'll come back to you, Jessica, and then Chris.

DR. BELCHER: So I did go back and look at the FMP, to see, because that's -- Again, thinking commercial and the idea of cut being a process on theirs, it is referred to similarly as to how we have it with the cutoffs and then, in parentheses "damaged", and so "cutoff" is the phrase that's there, and it's not "cut".

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Scott, to that?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Again, when I look at these terminologies from a law enforcement background, looking at -- I'm not so worried about the commercial sector, and I think you all are very versed in what these terms would mean and what the point is, but, in the recreational sector, I could see people misinterpreting, if we're not very clear and it's not this is exactly what this means, and so that's the minor issue that I have with that, and I think it's easily fixed.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Jessica, and then I will go to you, Chris.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I had the same concern that Carolyn was bringing up, but I will take it a little bit further. "Cutoff" makes it sound like a clean cut with a knife, and what we really mean is damage from predation, and so I'm just wondering if there's different phraseology that we can use here so that it doesn't -- It indicates what we're really seeking to solve here.

MR. WOODWARD: Shep, do you want to address that, and then I will come back to you, Chris.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I was looking at the draft reg text, which is in your briefing materials as well, and we used "damaged". I mean, this hasn't been a new provision, and, honestly, I don't know how enforcement has been dealing with it, and I don't see "cutoff" or "damaged" defined in Part 622 of our regs, and I can keep looking for it elsewhere, but that could be something we could add to the reg text, if that's what the council wanted.

MR. WOODWARD: Scott.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: When you hear the term "cutoff", and I've heard that throughout my career and my life, when people talk about losing a fish based on predation, and it's like, yes, I got a cutoff, and it's kind of a slang term, I think, that was developed to insinuate that, but I still think that -- You've got to bear with me, and, from my law enforcement mind, I look at how people can try to manipulate certain things, and, when I see "cutoff", I want to see something that really, really

points out that this has got to be a depredated fish. It's got to show signs of damage and depredation, and so I want to eliminate that as an issue. I am speaking for the AP.

MR. WOODWARD: Go ahead, Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I mean, does it really matter if someone has a portion of the fish that's over the legal size limit, what happened to the back of it, I mean, theoretically? I mean, if somebody -- If a shark bit it off, or a barracuda, and then somebody wanted to cut the rest of it off, and it's still over the legal size limit, what's the problem? It seems like we're reading way too far into this, and, I mean, if you want to look at the definition of how we talk about other stuff, landed with head and fins intact and all that, well, theoretically, you can cut the fillets off and still be within compliance of that definition.

What about a commercial fisherman cutting the guts out of all his fish? I mean, nobody says anything about that. Just I don't think it's that big of a deal. If you have a portion of the fish that's over the size limit, clearly I wouldn't worry about it. I mean, nobody is going to sit there and saw it off anyways, but, I mean, maybe it's a concern, but, if it's a legal fish, it's a legal fish.

MR. WOODWARD: I agree, and I think -- I wish we lived in a world where specific words didn't affect outcomes the way they do, but they obviously do, especially in the law enforcement realm, and so are you going to comment on that, Scott?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I was just -- The biggest thing is consistency, and so, to me, when you're looking at it -- I agree, and, I mean, you're right, if that fish meets the minimum size limit, and I can identify it, but I'm looking at, you know, consistency across-the-board, and I'm looking at accountability, and, again, you have to bear with my law enforcement mind, but, if we're going to allow something like this, it needs to be very clear, and especially if this were to -- If, at some point, we start to see this trickle down into other areas, we need to have a standard that it's accountable to, and that's the standard that I think we need to clearly identify, that these fish were depredated, if that's the right word.

MR. WOODWARD: Go ahead, Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: That's why I wanted to put that on the record, because I think it should be our intent to simplify it, to make it easier for law enforcement, that it should just be a legal-sized fish, and then you guys won't have to worry about the rest of it, and it doesn't put you in a tough spot.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I will just add that, across-the-board, for the AP, for the Law Enforcement Advisory Panel, they all agreed they wanted to be able to identify the damaged -- What was remaining, the carcass that was remaining, and so we want to be able to see that that was damaged due to depredation.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, the intent of allowing this in the commercial fishery, I assume, was for the same purposes, and was it fish depredated, or was it fish damaged from gear? I mean, I wasn't here when that all happened, and so what was that rationale, and why was that terminology used? Go ahead, Shep, and then I will come to you, Judy.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I don't know, and I wasn't around at that point, but, I mean, it seems to me that the fish has been caught, harvested, and bitten in half, and it's taken, and it's dead. You're either going to discard it and waste it or you're going to keep it and make some use of it, and I presume that was the logic underlying the commercial retention, and it seems, to me, it's really less of a minimum size limit issue, based on what Chris was just saying, right, and you have enough fish there to know that it's over the size, and it's a maintaining the fish intact issue, right, and why do we do that? We do that for species ID and the other things that were associated with it, and so I think that's really where I would focus the need for it, or the potential need for it. Thank you.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Judy, and then I will come back to you, Trish.

MS. HELMEY: I kind of agree with Chris. If the fish is legal, the fish is legal. Even if the tail is cut off, any way it's cut off, it's still legal, and I think that we should kind of look at it that way.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to add that we've been working on a rule in the state, and we just use the word "mutilated", and, actually, that rule is pretty flexible to allow for cut bait or depredation, and so we've got some flexibility built in there, but I don't know if that word helps, but I'm kind of with everyone else. If the chunk is meeting the minimum size limit, the chunk is meeting the minimum size limit, whether it's cut or chewed.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Scott.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I wanted to just -- I think Shep made a good comment too, and, you know, it's about the whole condition requirements. It's about existing regulations that are in place, and so what we're asking is that we can clearly see that this is what -- This gives us the ability to navigate those whole condition requirements, and so I get it that the fish is legal size, whatever is remaining, is left, but, again, you're asking us to have an exception to whole condition, which we don't, and so, by leaving those -- By clearly seeing this fish was a depredation, it gives us more to work with that, and, plus, I'm thinking down the road.

I mean, we're all thinking down the road with this, and where is this going, and we want to make sure that we're consistent, that we hold people to a certain standard. If we're going to allow something, there has to be certain elements there that we can clearly stand on, and that's why we want to not see clean cut offs, and we want to see where that fish was -- Where the depredation occurred and be able to identify that clearly.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Chester, and then I will go to you, Dewey, and then back to Judy.

MR. BREWER: I was thinking about what Trish said, and, in IGFA, the word that is used is "mutilated". If a fish is mutilated, it can't be recorded for a record. As a matter of a fact, if you're in a tournament, and you bring in a mutilated fish, it doesn't count towards getting any of the prizes, but the word that is used is "mutilated", and, I mean, there are all kinds of variations that you hear, like wheel cut and different tail wrapped and all of these different terminologies, but the one that is used, that is consistently used, throughout the IGFA, is "mutilated".

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thank you. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: It's always fun listening to a conversation on how do we fix something, or allow people to keep a mutilated fish or something, and so why don't you just say that the fish has to be maintained in its landed form, or the fish has to be maintained in its mutilated form? I mean, does that work, to get -- Or the "bite-off" word, or, I mean, something similar to that, and it has to be maintained, and that means you don't do nothing with the fish. You don't cut it off or trim it up or anything like that, and so why couldn't that be inserted as language, and does that suffice, and maybe throw in there -- I guess this is for the folks and not for enforcement, the commonsense aspect, which the enforcement officer will have to be able to look at it, but just it has to be maintained in its landed form upon the vessel, mutilated form upon the vessel, something like that language.

It should be kind of like you don't touch it, and you bring aboard this vessel. If it meets the minimum size, you throw it in the box, and you don't cut it up or trim it up or whatever like that, and, I mean, is that kind of like a one sentence that's simple enough to suffice, but I'm just throwing that out there.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, Dewey. Judy.

MS. HELMEY: I guess I have a question. We caught a fish last year that had its head and its tail cut off, and it ended up on the hook after that happened, and so we had a section that was legal. It's a good fish story, but it actually happened, and so -- I have a picture, and so what would that mean? Would that be a legal fish?

MR. WOODWARD: I think, in the context of what we've been talking about, as long as whatever existed of the fish met the minimum size, and it doesn't specify whether it's from the head back or the tail forward, and so it would be whatever -- As long as you could identify it to species, and that's the other element of this, too. Back to you, Scott, and does the word "mutilated" give better clarity, versus "cutoff"? I mean, obviously, "cutoff and damaged" already exist in the CFR, but we're fixing to consider applying this to thousands and thousands of people with highly-variable knowledge and understanding the regulations, and so is "mutilated" understood enough, do you think, in common language in the world out there, and has enough specificity for law enforcement purposes?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: I think the fact that it's being used in the IGFA, and that's pretty standard, and I think it's a term you can work with. I still think you need to really stress that there needs to be -- That the remaining portion is fully identifiable and meets the minimum size limit, but the mutilation could be defined to mean through depredation or something like that, and I think that would be a good -- That would work.

MR. WOODWARD: Okay. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think, in that respect, it's all about the definition, whether you call it damaged or mutilated or whatever, but the point is to have a definition in the regs that identifies that that damaged portion of the fish, "mutilated", or whatever term it's going to be, is for, I don't know, and however we decide to define it, and it must be left in that condition. Thank you.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: So we're trying to make it easy for enforcement, by just saying anything over the legal limit, and the Florida and other states' laws, in state waters, that read different are making it difficult, and that's the conundrum. Then we've made -- States make exceptions and all kinds of different scenarios and stuff, and why couldn't the states just get onboard and make it easy for enforcement?

MR. WOODWARD: Well, that's a big question, and it covers a lot of territory in a lot of ways, and I think, if we go forward with this, and it does become in effect, then it does cause the states to have to revisit their landed whole requirements and decide whether or not they need to be modified, and then, as we've already talked about in this committee, at the state level, do you broaden that to include more than just king and Spanish mackerel, and it sort of -- It's like everything we touch, and it always end up having some ripple effect, in some directions we know about, and often times in directions we don't know about, and so, Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Spud. We're actually doing this at the state level right now in the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission, and we found that our state statute defined that you could not possess mutilated fish if it applied to a size limit or a bag limit, and what happened was, when we had a bag limit applied to spottail croaker, people use those as cut bait a lot, and then, in the analysis of the rule, we found that we needed to change that, and so the Marine Fisheries Commission has initiated rulemaking to kind of broaden that, right, because we've always looked at it as a case-by-case basis.

For example, we allowed mutilated striped mullet and hickory shad, but not American shad, because we looked at it from a fish-by-fish, and so this rule that we're going forward with, which will take a couple of years, will give our director broader authority to allow for the possession of mutilated fish or to allow certain fish to be used as bait, right, and so we've already -- I just wanted to point out that we've already started to engage in that process.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thanks. Christina, it sounds like "mutilated" is preferable to the current "cutoff and damaged". Shep and then Andy.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am looking through the regs now, and "mutilated" is already used in the context of snapper grouper, and it's related to powerheads, right, and you can't possess a mutilated fish, and I think that's a different enough concept, it seems to me, that you would want to stick with "damaged". I would prefer to see you recommend whatever definition you have for the term "damaged", rather than going to "mutilated" and convoluted those concepts within the existing regulations. Thank you.

MS. WIEGAND: Sort of playing off of what Shep said, I would just like to note that, if you change the language in the alternative to "mutilated", or something else, because this action only addresses the recreational sector, you will then have language that is inconsistent between the commercial sector and the recreational sector, and maybe that is something the council is comfortable with, but just as a note. The action, as it stands right now, addresses the recreational sector only, and not the commercial sector.

MR. WOODWARD: So I believe you said, Shep, that there is no definition of “damaged”.

MR. GRIMES: That’s correct, and then there is no definition of “mutilated” either, but the terminology is used in other parts of the regs dealing with powerheads and spearguns.

MR. WOODWARD: Okay. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I guess I just want to put this out as a point of clarification. For me, where the concern was is, as looking at the document as we have it, the fact that “cutoff” and “cut” were interchanged, and like, to me, if you’re going to define “cutoff” and then, in parentheses, “damaged”, that’s kind of a one-for-one swap, and so, if we use “damaged” to substitute as “cutoff”, that’s okay, but, as the dialogue was going through, and you look at the discussion specifically, people started truncating it to “cut/damaged”, which, to me, had a completely different connotation. As long as we’re clear with what we’re saying a cutoff -- Again, if there’s an equation of cutoff equals damaged, with the parenthetical, I don’t see why that’s harmful, but it’s just that, again, say “cut” -- I have a very different understanding of “cut”.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I certainly am supporting the language as written and proposed. I think we’re making maybe a bigger deal than, in reality, what’s going to happen here, and certainly, from the commercial sector, and I recognize it’s different, but we haven’t had any long-standing problems, as best I can tell, from what I’ve heard from enforcement with regard to the regulations for commercial.

I think, Carolyn, your point is well taken, you know “cut” versus “cutoff”, and what does that mean, and, at the end of the day, kind of like getting back to what Chris said, it doesn’t really matter if we have someone that has cut off a damaged fish, as long as it’s a legal size limit, and that’s in violation of potentially maintaining heads and fins intact, and we wouldn’t be able to verify that the fish was damaged, but it’s still accomplishing what we’re trying to accomplish here, which is that the fish is of legal size and is being maintained, obviously, rather than discarded overboard.

MR. WOODWARD: All right, and so how do we assure that the meaning of “damaged”, “cutoff and damaged”, is clear enough so that law enforcement can use that term? I mean, is the supporting discussion in this amendment adequate to define it in the context of how it’s being used, or does some other additional action need to take place? I mean, this is to you, Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Well, we could define it, and staff could do it. My suggestion is, if you want a definition of “damaged” to be added to the regs, say, okay, staff, go talk to Rick, and they can send something off to Scott Sandorf, and we could develop a definition in the regs that would say -- My expectation would be that it’s limited to the mackerel cutoff provision, right, and it will be damaged for purposes of this section of the regulation, and it means X, Y, Z. Then they could bring that back by Full Council, and we could have a discussion of it, and then, if you approve the regs, it would be in the regs, and you don’t need a new action under an amendment to develop a definition to identify a term that’s been clearly addressed throughout all of the development of this amendment.

MR. WOODWARD: How does that sound, Scott, to maybe go down that path?

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Yes, I think that would be good, and I think that, no matter what we do with the definition, it's just really going to be getting the education to the public on what we are looking for when we board the boat and check the boat, and that's the big thing.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thanks. That was good, necessary discussion on that, but we are back to the fundamental question here of are we going to stand with this preferred, realizing that it is going to create conflict with state law, that will then have to be managed in both education and outreach and possible changes at the state level? Scott.

CAPTAIN PEARCE: Just to clarify that conflict, and, those of you from the states, you know this already, but the other states' law enforcement basically said, outside of discretion, possessing these fish in state waters would be a violation, and so, right now, there is no provision, for most of the states, that would allow people to possess those fish in their states, outside of an officer using discretion to allow it. In Florida, we'll allow the transit, but you can't stop and fish in state waters.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just in response to that, I mean, we deal with this all the time. We pass amendments and regulations that are different from state regulations, and then we work with the states to align those regulations. The question will be whether or not there's going to be alignment with these regulations going forward, and we heard from Jessica, earlier today, about them adopting dolphin regulations that are different from ours, right, and so the State of Florida has reached out, and they're a member of this council, and we'll work with them to potentially align them, and we may or may not align those regulations, and I don't think that's a reason not to move forward with this, and I certainly think, as well, that the applicability to other species is not a reason to move forward with this, though we do need to consider this kind of on a case-by-case basis and look at the species that we're managing here, first and foremost, to make this decision.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Thanks. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I just have a question. When this goes through, when will the rule actually be a CFR rule? What date are we looking at, ish?

MS. WIEGAND: As always, that's sort of to be determined. Assuming the council approves it at this meeting, and the Gulf Council approves it in April, and we're to get it transmitted by May or June, it may be another six months after that, before NMFS can go through their regulatory process to get it implemented, but that is -- I know a lot of it depends on what else is on their plate and other obligations that they have at the federal level, too.

MS. MURPHEY: So the earliest is maybe sometime in 2023?

MS. WIEGAND: I would say the earliest.

MS. MURPHEY: Middle 2023? Because I guess what I'm asking is --

MS. WIEGAND: I don't want to speak on behalf of NMFS and how long it's going to take them to get through their process, with the other priorities that they have, in terms of implementing amendments.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and there are some what-ifs here, in terms of timing, but she has laid out, I think, a kind of reasonable timeframe, that this would take us until the end of 2022 and into 2023 before it's officially implemented.

MS. MURPHEY: My point was that this mutilated finfish rule that the commission is working on with the division -- We're heading in that direction, but it will probably be 2024, and so we may have a little bit of a lag, but I think we'll still support going forward with this, this particular option.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. I don't see any interest in changing the preferred, I don't believe, and so we're making a conscious decision, and why don't you review the rationale for us, to make sure we're comfortable with that.

MS. WIEGAND: The rationale sort of covers a lot of what you guys have discussed during the meeting, but the goal would be to create consistency between the commercial and recreational measures related to possession and offloading of these cut and damaged fish, and, additionally, the selected preferred alternatives would address the increase in shark and barracuda depredation that's been reported by stakeholders.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Where did we leave off on the definition thing?

MR. WOODWARD: Christina has an idea.

MS. WIEGAND: I would say, if it's helpful, given the discussion that you all have had around the table, I think we could work with Shep and put together a definition of "cut (damaged)" that may function for you all and bring that back at Full Council for you to consider, if that's something that the council is still interested in us developing.

MR. GRIMES: The only think that I would add to that is please make sure that Rick and Scott Sandorf and SF folks are involved.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say, for consistency within the document and all, and even when you were just talking, you said "cut" and, if we could just make sure we're consistently using whatever term if it we're going to define consistently through the document, then that would help.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Chairman, and SF feedback here, and one other thing that we didn't think about, or I wasn't thinking of, is so we're going to define "damaged", and do we intend that to apply only to the recreational sector, or is that going to apply to the damaged fish that the commercial sector could bring back? My thinking would be that we would just define

“damaged” in that that’s a damaged fish for purposes of this restriction, and that’s going to apply to any vessel that hits the dock with that damaged animal onboard.

MR. WOODWARD: That was my understanding, and that’s why I asked the question about the origins of “cutoff (damaged)” in the context of commercial fishing. Was it intended to mean something different, in terms of the condition of the fish, but I don’t think it does, or does it? Christina just went --

MS. WIEGAND: That regulation was put on the books well before my time, possibly before I was born, and so we can go back and look up specifically why that regulation was put into place, but I believe it had to do with fish that was damaged by gear and not depredation, but we can provide that rationale by Full Council and make sure my memory is serving me.

MR. WOODWARD: But I do think, and I will speak on behalf of the committee, that we would want that definition to apply across both sectors, if at all possible, to have one and not two separate definitions of “cutoff (damaged)” for specific to a sector, and, I mean, I think it needs to be an all-inclusive definition, as much as it can be.

MR. GRIMES: I guess we can think about that and make a decision on that when the definition comes back, and maybe look into it. I had not understood the commercial damaged fish, and I thought it was the same thing, the bitten off, and I didn’t know that -- I don’t know what potential the gear presents to cut the fish in half, but I guess we’ll -- I think we get the definition and then think about it some, and maybe we think about it at night or something, but, when we come back to Full Council, we can figure that all out.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I am just going to ask, in the draft council rationale, do we need to add a -- Or should we add a sentence about the conflict of state regulations, something like the states understand that there is a conflict and that states would accommodate, or something, and is that needed?

MR. WOODWARD: I don’t know. I would hesitate to put something in there like that. It’s almost kind of like we’re going to do this, and we don’t care, you know, whether it creates a conflict or not, but, anyway, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree with you, Spud. I don’t know that I would add that. States would have to make multiple changes, and we can’t necessarily commit our commissioners to specific actions, and so I would avoid it.

MR. WOODWARD: As Mel knows so well, sometimes things even go the other direction, you know, and so --

MS. MURPHEY: That’s fine, and it was just a question, and so I was just clarifying, but that’s fine.

MR. WOODWARD: I think it’s implied that we hope that states will respond to this in a manner that alleviates, or reduces, the conflict, but time will tell. Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: That it would create a conflict between federal waters and state waters is noted in the effects analysis, as well as the discussion of this amendment, and so it may not be specifically in the council rationale, but it is mentioned throughout the amendment.

MR. WOODWARD: Okay. Any final words on this part? Chris. Final word.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes, final word, and I just want to reiterate that I intend to carry this over to snapper grouper as well.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks for the warning. I think this is a perfect example that it's the old conundrum we always have between the spirit of the law, the intent of the law, the letter of the law, and the application of the law. You know, we get tangled up in that quagmire quite a bit, and so, all right, Christina, and I think we're hopefully at the point of action, and thank you, Scott.

MS. WIEGAND: We do have a draft motion in here for the committee to approve this amendment for formal review, but I think that perhaps the path forward that I may recommend is to wait on that motion until Full Council, and we'll have you guys review the definition that we put together for damaged fish, and then you can consider taking final action, if that's something the committee is comfortable with.

MR. WOODWARD: Is everybody okay with that, given how important this "cutoff (damaged) fish" definition seems to be? Then we'll just wait, and, if we can't resolve that, then we'll deal with it at Full Council. Okay. Any last things on this, Christina? All right. Very good. All right. Our next agenda item is an update on CMP Amendment 33, and I think we have -- It's going to be Matt Freeman, I believe, and we've got him here virtually, and so, Matt, can you hear me?

DR. MATT FREEMAN: Yes, sir. I can hear you.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. We'll turn it over to you.

DR. FREEMAN: All right. Perfect. Similar to what Christina covered with CMP 34, and I know you all have seen this before, the background for this, the document is based off the 2020 Gulf king mackerel update, in this case SEDAR 38U. CMP 33 has currently two actions in it, the first covering catch limits, OFL, ABC, and ACLs, and the other covering sector allocations between commercial and recreational. As a reminder, and we'll see this again shortly, the sector allocations are 68 percent recreational and 32 percent commercial.

The purpose and need, the purpose here is to revise the catch limits for Gulf king mackerel, and, again, to review the recreational and commercial allocations in response to the updated stock assessment.

In Action 1 here, where we're looking at the OFL, ABC, and ACL, these were set in CHTS, and so, as you all know, we're looking, with multiple species, at converting these catch limits over to FES, and so the total ACL for the fishing year 2019/2020 and beyond is 8.55 million pounds landed weight. Alternative 2 is looking at revising the OFL and ABC, and in turn the total ACL as well, and setting that in FES. The total ACL here, looking at a potential implementation date for the 2023/2024 year and beyond, would be set at 9.99 million pounds whole weight.

This shows the recent landings history for the two sectors in CHTS versus FES, and, if you look at the last three columns in particular, you can see the total landings for the recreational and commercial sectors, and then, in comparison, that total, incorporating those numbers in FES, and then the last column is showing what that percent increase is once we've incorporated FES.

Again, recent landings history, when we look at the percent of the ACL landed, again focusing primarily on the last three columns, we can see that the commercial sector has been landing, or coming very close, to their sector ACL. In comparison, the rec ACL has been a fair bit below their ACL, and then that last column is showing the total ACL landed for both sectors.

Action 2, as I mentioned, would be modifying the sector allocations, and so Alternative 1 is our no action, and so we would maintain that 32 percent commercial and 68 percent recreational sector allocation for Gulf king mackerel, and Alternative 2 provides a couple of different options here using a percent of average difference between the total landings from the 2016/2017 through 2019/2020 fishing years, using that MRIP-FES data and the total simulated ACL for Model 2 in Appendix B. Option 2a would reallocate 25 percent of that average difference from the recreational sector over to the commercial sector. Option 2b would be 50 percent, 2c would be 75, and 2d would be 100 percent.

Here, with Alternative 2, we see that the average difference for those four years, and I am looking at the top-right column, would be just over four million pounds, and so that's what we're looking at potentially reallocating from the recreational to the commercial sector.

If we look at the second-half, or the bottom-half, of the table, in Alternative 1, where we would be retaining, that shows a recreational ACL and commercial ACL, and then Options 2a through 2d, and here are our resulting comparative allocations, and so, for the rec sector, it would decrease to 58 percent, and commercial would be 42, and 2b would be 47 for the rec, 53 for commercial, and 37 for the rec sector and 63 for the commercial, and, lastly, 27 percent for the rec sector and 73 percent for the commercial.

When we look at the average landings for the two sectors, in this case with the rec coming from the FES, and we compare that to what the sector ACLs would be, we see that, with 2a, again holding sort of that average landings, the rec sector would be catching 80.8 percent of the rec ACL. Under 2b, it would be 98.4 percent, and then, as you can see highlighted in red, Options 2c and 2d would show an overage in comparison to the new rec ACL.

If you look at the commercial landings compared to the proposed ACL, under all of the options, the predicted commercial landings would come in just shy, or potentially two-thirds to almost a half, of that commercial ACL. I will come back to the part highlighted in red in just a moment.

Again, just a reminder that, if we look at the commercial catch, versus release, over the past few years, you will see that the total harvest has declined, and then, proportionally, the amount that has been released alive has also shown a decline in recent years.

The next few slides relate to the motions that the council made, the Gulf Council made, at its January meeting. The first was to move Options 2c and 2d of Alternative 2 in Action 2 to Considered but Rejected, and, if you remember, those were the two that I had highlighted in red,

which suggested that the average rec landings in FES would exceed that potential rec ACL. The justification here is that the Gulf Council wants to still keep the recreational season open year-round, while potentially exploring the allocation adjustment between the rec sector and commercial, and so they want to try to avoid those recreational quota closures.

This was a substitute motion to a different motion, and this was to request presentations of the New England and Mid-Atlantic research set-aside programs, to be given at a future council meeting, for consideration, and so, here, the Gulf Council is interested in learning about research set-asides for expanding funding for council-identified research needs.

Here, this was to remove Action 1 from CMP Amendment 33 and start a new framework action, and the Gulf Council, in making this motion, was interested in moving faster on implementing those updated catch limits, and, again, where they're looking at the OFL, ABC, and ACL, and thinking that any future change to sector allocation can be implemented without affecting change to catch limits. In essence, Action 1 and Action 2 of the current CMP 33 don't have to proceed together. That is where the council is right now, and I will pause there, if there is any discussion or questions.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Matt. We appreciate that. Any questions for Matt about his presentation? I don't see any, Matt. Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: So, like Matt said, he went over those couple of motions that the Gulf Council passed, and this is similar to Amendment 34. Right now, it's a joint amendment between the two councils, and so it's always helpful to make sure that the South Atlantic Council and the Gulf Council concur, and so I have draft motion language, if the council is interested in also passing a motion to move Options 2c and 2d of Alternative 2 to the Considered but Rejected appendix. Again, like Matt said, those were those two options that were in red where it showed that projected landings for the recreational sector would exceed the proposed allocation.

Then there's also a draft motion here to remove Action 1 from Amendment 33 and to start a new framework action, and, just so that this council is clear on what that would mean, if those amendments were split, there would be -- I believe it would be Framework Action 11, and that would then become a Gulf Council amendment only, and it would not require South Atlantic Council approval. However, Amendment 33, which would retain the allocations action, would still require South Atlantic approval, and so I just sort of proposed these motions as options for the council to consider, if they would like to be consistent with what happened at the Gulf Council's January meeting.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Christina. Any questions about Christina's explanation for the necessity of these draft motions? If not, I would entertain making a motion on behalf of the committee. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I did have a question. It says that the SSC recommended to do Action 1, and don't we have to like listen to them?

MS. WIEGAND: Action 1 would still be done, and it's one of those situations where the CMP framework procedure allows for certain actions to be taken by one council unilaterally, whereas other actions have to be taken with both councils agreeing, and what splitting out this does is it

would just move Action 1 into a framework amendment, and so it would still be done, and everything would be updated based on the SSC recommendations, but it would just no longer require South Atlantic action, because it falls under one of those things that the Gulf Council can do unilaterally.

MR. WOODWARD: Go ahead, Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Then I was wondering what this research set-aside that the Gulf was talking about, and, I mean, they're going to go catch it and sell it and add to their party budget, or what does that mean?

MS. WIEGAND: Matt, I will go ahead and turn that over to you, if you want to explain the research set-aside, or we can listen to me muddle through it.

DR. FREEMAN: You may do a better job, and I'm kind of a newbie with the research set-aside programs. This motion came up during discussion of CMP 33, and the council is simply just wanting to get additional information at this point, and I wouldn't even say, necessarily, that it's for consideration with CMP 33, but, again, right now, we are tentatively scheduled to have presentations from both the New England and Mid-Atlantic Council staff at the Gulf Council's June meeting, and, just to add a little additional information to what Christina mentioned, if the Framework 11 were to proceed, the Gulf Council is also anticipating examining that at their April meeting, and June meeting, and then CMP 33, I believe, would not come back to the council, in terms of the reallocation, until the June meeting, but, Christina, if you're more familiar with the research set-aside program -- Like I said, I have very limited knowledge of it, and so please feel free.

MS. WIEGAND: Chris, did that address your question, or are you looking for more information on what a research set-aside program might be?

MR. CONKLIN: I'm good with it. I mean, I just wanted to highlight -- You know, how much more research do you need to do on king mackerel? It's like one of the oldest fisheries we have, and the most abundant, and something is kind of fishy.

MR. WOODWARD: I am going to call on Dewey, because Dewey is very familiar with RSAs, but I think this was just -- They had a bucket to carry this in, and they threw it in there, and I don't think it's specific to king mackerel, but, Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Presently, right now, the RSA program is suspended in the Mid-Atlantic, and we're looking at going through committee right now to maybe start it back up, and what it is, it's setting aside up to 3 percent of the ACL, total ACL, that can be used for research, and a set-aside quota is what it is, and that's what the RSA is, and, in the past, there was some shenanigans that happened with certain species and different players and stuff like that, and so it got suspended in the Mid-Atlantic in 2014, but it's also a way for academia and outside individuals to take part of that research set-aside and to do research that would help in different fashions, and each council, I believe, has a different approach to it, but that's what it is in the Mid-Atlantic, and it was up to like 3 percent of the thing.

In some species, for instance spiny dogfish, and it's not a very valuable fish, and so it doesn't have a lot of people chomping at the bit, versus maybe summer flounder or scup or black sea bass, or scallops or something like that, where this is some value in that research for individuals, or academia, to use, and so that's a little overview.

MR. WOODWARD: Thanks, Dewey. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks for explaining that, and I think academia ought to work on the buffers and not on the commercial and recreational quotas, personally.

MR. WOODWARD: There is that Chris that's got to say what he thinks. Remember he told us that earlier, which is good, and this is why we're here. All right. Could you bring those draft motions back up? I will open it up to the committee. Is anyone willing to make this first draft motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. **I move to move Option 2c and 2d of Alternative 2 in Action 2 to Considered but Rejected.**

MR. WOODWARD: All right. I have a motion, and we have a second from Carolyn. Any discussion on the motion? **Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.** All right. We have a second motion. Mel.

MR. BELL: All right. **I move to remove Action 1 from Amendment 33 and start a new framework action.**

MR. WOODWARD: All right. We have a motion, and a second from Carolyn. Any discussion on this motion? Go ahead, Chester.

MR. BREWER: It's really a question. By approving this motion, that pretty well takes us out of Action 1, right? It ain't our -- That's not our ballgame anymore?

MS. WIEGAND: Correct.

MR. BREWER: Thank you.

MR. WOODWARD: All right. Any other questions or discussion on the motion? **Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.** All right. I think that takes care of that. Thank you, Matt, for being with us and giving us that update. All right. I think that is it for the agenda. Any other business for our committee? Seeing none, we will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 8, 2022.)

- - -

Certified By _____ Date _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
May 5, 2022

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2022 CMTA MEMBERS

MACKEREL CMTA
TUES, 3/8/2022

CMTA Mel Bell, Chair
SCDNR-Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
217 Ft. Johnson Road
Charleston, SC 29422
(843)953-9007 (ph); (843)953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

CMTA Judy Helmey
124 Palmetto Drive
Savannah, GA 31410
(912) 897-4921
JudyHelmey@gmail.com

CMTA Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair
GA DNR - Coastal Resources Division
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520
(912)264-7218 (ph); (912)262-3143 (f)
Carolyn.belcher@dnr.ga.gov

CMTA Kerry Marhefka
347 Plantation View Lane
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
(843)452-7352 (ph)
KerryOMarhefka@gmail.com

CMTA Robert Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
1050 N. Highland St. Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 22201
(703)842-0740 (ph); (703)842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

CMTA Jessica McCawley
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
620 South Meridian St
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850)487-0554 (ph); (850)487-4847 (f)
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

CMTA Chester Brewer
4440 PGA Boulevard, Suite 600
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
(561)655-4777
wcbsafmc@gmail.com

CMTA Trish Murphey
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
P.O. Box 769
3441 Arendell Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
(242) 808-8011 (O); (252)241-9310 (c)
Trish.murphey@ncdenr.gov

CMTA Chris Conklin
P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
(843)543-3833
conklinsafmc@gmail.com

CMTA Tom Roller
807 Deerfield Drive
Beaufort, NC 28516
(252) 728-7907 (ph);(919)423-6310 (c)
tomrollersafmc@gmail.com

CMTA LT Robert Copeland
Seventh Coast Guard District
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
(305) 415-6781(ph); (786)457--6419(c)
Robert.R.Copeland@uscg.mil

CMTA Andy Strelcheck
Acting Regional Administrator
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
(727)551-5702
Andy.strelcheck@noaa.gov

CMTA Tim Griner
4446 Woodlark Lane
Charlotte, NC 28211
(980)722-0918 (ph)
timgrinersafmc@gmail.com

CMTA Laurilee Thompson
P.O. Box 307
Mims, FL 3274
(321) 794-6866
thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com

Delvey Demibright (Mack Crake)

Dr. Clay Perch
Shep Grimes
Dr. Jack McGovern

Dr. John Walker
Capt. Steve Raica
Rick DeVigtor

Monica Cruz-Burillo
Dr. Gerry Aquilino
LT Patricia O'Shaughnessy
Debra Lopez (CMTA Council)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COUNCIL MEMBERS continued

Deirdre Warner-Kramer
Office of Marine Conservation OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W. Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
(202)647-3228 (ph)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

*Crntc
CHAIR*

~~Spud Woodward
860 Buck Swamp Road
Brunswick, GA 31523
(912)258-8970 (ph)
swoodwardsafmc@gmail.com~~

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Representative
TBD

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2022 COMMITTEE MEMBERS continued

MACKEREL COBIA

• Spud Woodward, Chair
• Tom Roller, Vice Chair
• Robert Beal
• Carolyn Belcher
• Mel Bell
• Chester Brewer
• Chris Conklin
• LT Robert Copeland
• Tim Griner
• Judy Helmey
• Kerry Marhefka
• Jessica McCawley
• Trish Murphey
• Andy Strelcheck
• Laurilee Thompson
Mid-Atlantic:
✓ Dewey Hemilright/~~Joe Cimino~~
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

SEDAR

Mel Bell, Chair
Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
Andy Strelcheck
Staff contact: Chip Collier

SHRIMP

Carolyn Belcher, Chair
Laurilee Thompson, Vice Chair
Chris Conklin
LT Robert Copeland
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
Andy Strelcheck
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

SNAPPER GROUPER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
LT Robert Copeland
Tim Griner
Judy Helmey
Trish Murphey
Tom Roller
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Spud Woodward
Mid-Atlantic:
Dewey Hemilright/Earl "Sonny" Gwin
Staff Contact: Mike Schmidtke

SPINY LOBSTER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Chester Brewer, Vice Chair
Chris Conklin
LT Robert Copeland
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Staff: Christina Wiegand

Dewey Hemilright

Michelle Duval

Joe Cimino (NJ state rep)

Earl "Sonny" Gwin (MD)

David Stormer (DE state rep)

MACREREL CMTB
(TUES, 3/8/2022)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

~~John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net~~

Deputy Director - Science

~~Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net~~

Deputy Director - Management

~~Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net~~

Citizen Science Program Manager

~~Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net~~

Outreach Program Manager

~~Cameron Rhodes
cameron.rhodes@safmc.net~~

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

~~Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net~~

Fishery Scientist

~~Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net~~

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

~~Dr. Judd Curtis
Judd.curthis@safmc.net~~

Citizen Science Project Coordinator

~~Nicholas Smillie
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net~~

**Fishery Economist &
FMP Coordinator**

~~John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net~~

Staff Accountant

~~Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net~~

Fishery Scientist

~~Allie Iberle
Allie.iberle@safmc.net~~

Fishery Social Scientist

~~Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net~~

Public Information Officer

~~Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net~~

SEDAR

Administrative Officer

~~Kelly Klasnick
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net~~

SEDAR Program Manager

~~Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net~~

Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist

~~Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net~~

SEDAR Coordinator

~~Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net~~

SAFMC March Council

Attendee Report: Meeting (3/7/22 - 3/11/22)

Report Generated:

03/08/2022 07:08 PM EST

Webinar ID

914-670-795

Actual Start Date/Time

03/08/2022 08:01 AM EST

Duration

9 hours 19 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	BROUWER	MYRA
Yes	BYRD	01JULIA
Yes	Bailey	Adam
Yes	Batsavage	Chris
Yes	Beckwith	Anna
Yes	Berry	james
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Bolitho	Leah
Yes	Bonura	Vincent
Yes	Brame	Richen
Yes	Bubley	Walter
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Chaya	Cindy
Yes	Conklin	00The Real Chris
Yes	Copeland	00 Robert
Yes	Crosson	Scott
Yes	Curtis	Judd
Yes	DOVER	Miles
Yes	DOVER	MILES
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	FRANCO	DAWN
Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Foor	Brandon
Yes	Freeman	Matt
Yes	Garrett	David
Yes	Glasgow	Dawn
Yes	Glazier	Ed
Yes	Godwin	Joelle
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Guyas	Martha
Yes	HARRELL	RYAN
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Harrison	Alana
Yes	Heffernan	Katie
Yes	Helies	Frank

Yes	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01 Kim
Yes	Kelleher	William
Yes	Kittle	Christine
Yes	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	Krikstan	Catherine
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Larkin	Michael
Yes	Latanich	Katie
Yes	Lupton	Dee
Yes	Mahoney	Andrew
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Merrifield	Mike
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	Merten	Wessley
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Murphy	Rob
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	OShaughnessy	Pat
Yes	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Rawls	Kathy
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Reding	Brandon
Yes	Reeder	Kelly
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Scott	Tara
Yes	Shults	Byron
Yes	Sinkus	wiley
Yes	Smart	Tracey
Yes	Smillie	Nicholas
Yes	Spanik	Kevin
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Sramek	Mark
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Stormer	David
Yes	Thomas	01 Suzanna
Yes	Travis	Michael

