

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COBIA COMMITTEE

**Westin Jekyll Island
Jekyll Island, Georgia**

March 8-9, 2023

TRANSCRIPT

Committee Members

Tom Roller, Chair

Robert Beal

Gary Borland

Tim Griner

Kerry Marhefka

Dr. Carolyn Belcher

Laurilee Thompson

Dewey Hemilright

Spud Woodward, Vice Chair

Mel Bell

Chester Brewer

Judy Helmey

Jessica McCawley

Andy Strelcheck

Trish Murphey

Skip Feller

Council Staff

Myra Brouwer

John Carmichael

Dr. Chip Collier

John Hadley

Allie Iberle

Kelly Klasnick

Roger Pugliese

Nick Smillie

Julia Byrd

Cindy Chaya

Dr. Judd Curtis

Kathleen Howington

Kim Iverson

Christina Wiegand

Dr. Mike Schmidtke

Suzanna Thomas

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick DeVictor

Frank Helies

Jamal Ingram

Nikhil Mehta

LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy

Dale Diaz

Dr. John Walter

Dr. Jack McGovern

Thomas Newman

Monica Smit-Brunello

Other attendees and invited participants attached.

The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Wednesday, March 8, 2023 and was called to order by Chairman Tom Roller.

MR. ROLLER: All right, everybody. I want to call this March 2023 Mackerel Committee meeting to order. My name is Tom Roller, and I'm a council member from North Carolina, and I'm a full-time for-hire fisherman. Just real quickly, as we commence this meeting, I just want to remind the council how important Spanish and king mackerel are to our fisheries. They are, arguably, the most important recreational and commercial finfish that the council manages, as they are first and third in commercial ex-vessel values and first and second in landed pounds, and, when it comes to recreational, they are two and three in directed trips, following only dolphin, and these are from John Hadley's 2018 economic report.

With that being said, the first order of business is to approve the agenda. Do I have anybody who wants to make any modifications or any changes? Seeing none, we can approve that by consensus. The second order of business is our transcript from December of 2022. Is there any edits, or changes, that need to be made? Seeing none, we can approve that by consensus.

Now, as a matter of -- I think we're going to make a -- Since we're kind of limited on time before public comment, I believe we're going to do the stock assessment first. The first thing we're going to do is we're going to hand this over to Dr. Jeff Buckel to do his presentation.

DR. BUCKEL: Thank you, Tom. I've got a little timeline slide to kick-off the Spanish mackerel operational assessment, where we've been, in case -- We've kind of had multiple things happen over the last close to a year now, and so, in August of 2022, the SSC reviewed SEDAR 78, and we had several issues with the assessment. We presented that to you in September of 2022, and, at that meeting, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center let the council, and the SSC, know that there were known issues with the MRIP landings and that they wanted to provide revised -- Get revised MRIP landings for Spanish mackerel and provide that to the analyst.

That was done in October of 2022, and the SSC reviewed the revised SEDAR 78, with that change in MRIP, and those MRIP landings really didn't change that much, and so there was no major change in the SEDAR 78 results, and so we still had those same issues that we had based on our August 2022 review. I presented that to you in December of 2022, and also let you know that there was a Spanish mackerel workgroup that had been put together and that they were going to be meeting later in December, and they did meet, and they developed terms of reference for a rerun of the SEDAR 78 assessment, and so that was the plan, and that workgroup included SSC members, council staff, and Erik Williams from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

Then, in January of 2023, we had a -- The SSC had a webinar, and we reviewed and accepted that workgroup's terms of references for the rerun of SEDAR 78, and those terms of reference are on the next slide. The first two -- I am not going to read these, and the first two have to do with the magnitude of natural mortality and then how the natural mortality distribution could be treated within the Monte Carlo draws, Number 1 and 2, and then the third one had to do with the high value of MRIP landings of Spanish mackerel in 2020, how to deal with that, with using a three-year average, and then there were some alternatives within that, how to handle that within the assessment, but all related to that 2020 value, MRIP value. Then the fourth term of reference had

to do with how to handle recent average recruitment in the model, and so those were the terms of reference that were approved in 2023.

After I left the council meeting in December, there was a motion to direct the SSC -- This is your motion to us, but to direct the SSC to provide catch level recommendations for Spanish mackerel in our April 2023 meeting, either from the updated SEDAR 78 assessment or using a data-limited approach.

This is from our January 2023 webinar, and the SSC's statement was the rerun of SEDAR 78 OA, based on the workgroup TORs, should be prioritized, to ensure that it is available for review during the April 2023 SSC meeting. A determination of stock status and the setting of ABCs are dependent on these new model runs.

We also discussed alternative methods of setting ABCs, in case that was not possible, and the first alternative method of setting ABCs would use the rerun of the operational assessment, but, instead of using results of projections to get at ABCs, we requested equilibrium OY and yield at 75 percent FMSY in the model output, and they were included in SEDAR 78, but we had also requested them for the rerun, as potential ways, or methods, to set ABCs, and then we also discussed data-limited approaches, and the conclusion there was that older DLM methods used to set ABCs for some species in the past, in past years, no longer represent BSIA, and so, for many species, we've used the third-highest landings approach as a DLM method to set ABCs, and that's been shown, through simulation and other research, that it's not -- That it doesn't lead to sustainable fisheries, and so these other DLM methods besides that would have to be evaluated before they're used.

Just the motion that was provided to us from you in December of 2022 that we needed to come up with something in April of 2023, and the response from the SSC is that the council needs to acknowledge that, if the SSC rejects the rerun of the OA, or the original OA, and instead recommends a data-limited approach, that that analysis will take more time to accomplish than rerunning the OA, based on the new workgroup TORs. The data-limited approaches also may require a larger P*, resulting in a larger ABC buffer and lower catch levels.

Those were the notes from our January 2023 webinar on this, and, as several of you have seen, we just got a memo, that was just brought to my attention at this meeting, that the rerun of the operational assessment will not be possible by our April meeting, and so the full SSC will have to consider other approaches for getting an ABC at that meeting, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

MR. ROLLER: Are there any questions for Dr. Buckel? John.

DR. WALTER: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I think the memo from the Science Center to the Regional Office, or to the council, is posted, and I will just follow-up with that memo, and I think people should be able to see it, and we considered the recommendations from the SSC, and we think that those would warrant having to go back into the SEDAR process and can't be accomplished in the timeframe that is available to us, and many of those explorations are exploratory and won't necessarily give new guidance for catch levels, and we can't do them in time, and so what we recommend is that the ABC advice be based on the existing assessment, in some manner, and I think there's a proposal on the table that might work, in terms of using the existing assessment and equilibrium benchmarks, with the rationale being that the stock is above BMSY, and so, if you're

fishing at MSY, you're unlikely to be overfishing, in which case, if the projections are not deemed reliable, which it's quite often that's the case for a lot of our stocks, or they're either uncertain or not reliable, that one could revert to another, using the models in a different way, and, in this case, the equilibrium benchmarks might provide a path forward for an OFL and an ABC, and they might do the job. Now, it would have to go back to the SSC for that consideration.

The other consideration of the center is that the model may be good at getting stock status, and, often, our models can get the relative stock status, but then taking that extra step of projecting -- Well, the data doesn't always support robust projections, and so that, I think, is something that should be considered. Thanks.

DR. BUCKEL: Thanks, John. That's helpful, and, if you go back to my presentation, and you go back to that slide right there -- This is something that the SSC did discuss in the January webinar, to request those metrics from the rerun, but, because those had also been discussed for using out of SEDAR 78, without the rerun, and so that's -- We'll focus on that discussion in April of 2023, and we'll report to you in June, to see what the full SSC says, but that's certainly one option, for sure.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Dr. Buckel. I'm going to move to Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Tom. By the way, that motion actually said that Jeff Buckel was to do it, and not the SSC, just so you'll know. It says here, when you go back to what we just had, and so request equilibrium OY and yield at 75 percent FMSY for a rerun, and so, if we don't do a rerun, are there likely to be issues with the validity of those metrics, based on that original run?

DR. BUCKEL: That's why I can't say that we'll definitely -- That the full SSC will go with that, because we need to have a thorough discussion about the issues that we had with SEDAR 78 and to determine if, you know, the main issues were with that high 2020 MRIP value, and its impact on the projections, then that's -- If that is the main issue, then this would deal with that, because it's not using that 2020 MRIP value for the projections, and so it's just -- That is where -- We had already had that discussion, and focused on these metrics as potential ways to get ABCs, to avoid that 2020 value, but we also need to talk about the -- There were also concerns about the natural mortality and how that might impact this, and so we'll see what the full SSC has to say.

MR. ROLLER: Do we have any other questions? I know this is a pretty contentious topic, and so I'm expecting to hear some conversation. Go ahead, Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I do have to say, in the fact that the SSC recommended that two things be considered moving forward, and, basically, the memo has taken some of the DLMs off the board, and I would like to hear what the SSC would propose in the absence of those methods being available to them.

DR. BUCKEL: So in the absence of using any DLM?

DR. BELCHER: My understanding was, my understanding in reading it, was that DB-SRA and DCAC were basically recommended against from the Science Center as well, and so my question is that, if those are taken off the table, what other options would we have for data-limited

approaches, or would we only fall back to the other one, which means we really don't have many other ways to look at these data, and so I would be interested to see what the SSC has to say about that, too.

DR. BUCKEL: Yes, and I'm interested to see what the full SSC has to say about it as well. I'm sure there will be some lively discussions on it, but it's -- If the SEDAR 78 is considered BSIA, then that's what we'll -- We'll work with that, and that last bullet that you just saw -- That will probably be the approach that we utilize to develop the ABC, but, again, there may be some other folks on the full SSC that have other data-limited approaches that we could talk with the Center about using, and so that's, you know, I guess, to be determined, once we get the full SSC together. I personally don't know of others, but other members of the full SSC might have some other ideas.

MR. ROLLER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: So this is a question, and it's -- Maybe it's a process question, and so, when the SSC goes back, when they meet in April, they'll make a determination whether that stock assessment is good for management, right? Okay, because, when I read the letter, it kind of -- The letter kind of makes it sound like it's been decided, and so I was just kind of wondering, and has it been decided here through this letter, or will you guys actually discuss it and make a determination, because that was confusing, when I read that last sentence.

DR. BUCKEL: Folks can correct me here, but I think the full SSC -- If they feel that there's discussion about SEDAR 78, and they feel that it can't be used to get an ABC, then that would -- Then that's where it would be rejected for setting the ABC.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to say thanks, because that would be my assumption too, but the letter just confused me a little bit, but thank you.

MR. ROLLER: I've got Andy and then John.

DR. WALTER: Let me just clarify that the center has not determined that it's BSIA, and that determination would be done at the end of this process, that the eventual catch advice is based on BSIA, which this assessment and this process would all be part of. The center is recommending that the stock assessment, right now, be used, given that it's unlikely that any of the data-limited approaches would meet the quality and information content that is in currently SEDAR 78, and that's what we're stating in this letter, and so, specifically, the current assessment is superior to any product that can be derived from any of these simple approaches, which would include even other DLM approaches, and I think that's consistent with the scientific literature, is that you use the approaches that encompass, and incorporate, a whole lot more information than falling back to a DLM approach, and so that's our position. We will give the determination of BSIA later on in the process. Thanks.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, John. We've got a couple more minutes here before our hard stop, and I was curious if there's any more questions or comments. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: John, I just had a question, in regard to that, and the procedural guidance that was given, when you're looking at changing from an assessed stock to an unassessed stock, says the council should go down a tier if the stock assessment -- Well, there's a series of things that they

could do. One is the council has the ability to accept the stock assessment, and the other is to go back to a previous stock assessment and use that, and then the next one down is to use the ABC Control Rule, dropping down a tier. I'm just wondering what would be the next tier down, in a situation like this, in order to provide an ABC recommendation? Does that make sense?

DR. WALTER: I'm going to probably have to phone a friend on that one, in terms of where you go below that, and so I can't answer exactly, and maybe there is some guidance in the National Standards that we can get to, but I don't know.

MR. ROLLER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I might muddy the waters a little bit further, and I am not the friend that he wanted to phone, but we have shared, at the SEDAR Steering Committee, a best scientific information available framework, and so I think one of the issues, a question here, is kind of how is that determination reached, and the SSC, under their purview, provides the advice and recommendations to the council, essentially to meet the guidelines of the best scientific information available, but it's ultimately the Fisheries Service, the Science Center's, final determination, with regard to BSIA, right, and I think we certainly lean heavily, when the SSC makes recommendations, in making that determination, and we don't necessarily want to get sideways in this instance, and so the question really becomes, based on the scientific advice and other information from the SSC that will come forth, what the recommendations would be and whether or not, you know, we would view that as inferior, if they decide not to use the assessment and go to some sort of data-limited method, but there is a distinction there, in kind of the nuance, in terms of the determination of best available science, that I think is important to point out and that has to be considered, obviously, in this process, going forward, and we have remained largely in lockstep with SSC recommendations, with nearly every assessment that I can think of, going back in time.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Andy. We've reached our hard-stop moment, and we can continue this conversation, if needed, and I'm just going to pass it over to the Council Chair.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. We're going to move into public comment, and, depending on how long public comment lasts, we may revisit coming back to the Mackerel Cobia Committee after public comment. We've just got to see what time we finish up, and then we'll poll the group and see what we want to do after that, and so public comment starts at 4:00, and so fifteen minutes of break, until we're ready for public comment.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. ROLLER: With everybody back at the table, I think -- I want to make sure that we had enough discussion regarding the stock assessment, and Dr. Buckel isn't going to be here tomorrow, and so I would like to see if there's any further questions that we could continue with that conversation. Okay. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I don't know if this is the right place or not, but I think we wanted to talk about how we might address this in the context of the SEDAR schedule, if we're going to have to have another -- I mean, just looking ahead, assuming that we're going to have to have an updated

assessment maybe earlier than what we had previously anticipated, then, you know, how do we put ten gallons in a five-gallon bucket?

MR. ROLLER: We've got Chip coming up here to address that. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Maybe, I guess, a little more context for this, and so let's just assume that the SSC figures out a way to extract something out of this that gives us some catch advice, and does that negate the need to accelerate the next assessment, or does that affect it all? Do we still need to do an assessment quicker, in order to have better catch advice? I think maybe that's the context for this.

DR. COLLIER: So here is the current SEDAR schedule, with just drafts going out to 2027 and 2028. Based on the recommendations that you guys made at the SEDAR Committee, we removed white grunt, and it's still in blue, but there is no species in those slots, and so you could consider whatever you want from here. I do have -- If you scroll down a little bit from here, there is a list of all the species that you guys manage, when they were last assessed, which stock assessment was in there, and whether or not they have an upcoming or ongoing operational or research track assessment in there. Highlighted in blue, those are the ones that were recommended for 2026, to help you with any guidance that you might need.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say, to Spud's question, whatever the SSC comes up with -- If they come up with a solution, do we need to worry about getting Spanish on that schedule really quick, or should we plan for that in the -- You know, do we need to or not, and that's what -- It all depends on what the SSC comes back with, I guess, right, and is approved.

MR. ROLLER: Jessica and then Spud.

MS. MCCAWLEY: It's not answering Mel's question, but I'm wondering, since we just made changes on amberjack, could Spanish mackerel go in place of amberjack, and that's just a thought.

MR. ROLLER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I guess another question, maybe, and I keep putting Jeff on the spot, but, if we accelerate this, and we move it up, are we going to get information that's going to help us address some of the issues in that timespan, or do we actually need more time to get information that may help that assessment be more representative and accurate, and so I guess that's -- You know, it's one thing to put it on the schedule, and then is that actually going to help us produce a better product in the end?

DR. BUCKEL: I think, looking at the TORs, right, those were specific to -- We kept those short, because we know it was for a quick rerun of the SEDAR 78, and so it wasn't an exhaustive list of what could be done for TORs for a brand-new assessment, and so, you know, it's hard to answer without the full SSC, but the things that are on, you know, the list there, the natural mortality, and, of course, we would have more MRIP years, and Judd has looked at 2022, the preliminary estimates for 2022, and those did come back down to what we saw in 2019, and so it's not been that, you know, that continuous increase, and so more years of MRIP, and then a big one that will have an impact, and that can be explored now, without waiting for new data, is the natural mortality research that that working group did, and they found that there was evidence that natural mortality

for Spanish mackerel looked to be low, what was used in SEDAR 78, but, again, the caveat being that, you know, without the full SSC, and thinking about a full assessment and not just a rerun of the existing OA.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think the most useful advice you guys could give us, as far as going to the steering committee and prioritizing, would be, you know, what order would you like research tracks after red snapper, and so, right now, you have greater amberjack, and then you've got a space, and so, if you feel like Spanish mackerel should go before greater amberjack, and then greater amberjack go, that gives us a way of working this out within the schedule that we get and dealing with whatever happens over the next few years, and so I think that's the real question, is do you consider Spanish mackerel a bigger priority for a research track than greater amberjack.

MR. ROLLER: I'm going to go to Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Just a reminder that there is the greater amberjack abundance estimate that's going on, and that should be completed in 2025. As you get further and further away from that project being completed, those estimates of abundance are getting older and older and might not be as informative.

MR. ROLLER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I am also wondering, and does pushing out Spanish -- Is there any outside potential that we would have more information about what is possibly this expansion/northern shift, or is that just a pipe dream that that's even remotely possible in the next assessment?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think it's remotely possible. I think, if this were -- If Spanish were identified as a species with concerns there, we could perhaps make a request, through the agency, for, you know, more attention on that, and looking, you know, harder at say Northeast data. I know they are working on plans to try and better connect the different survey methods in the two regions, which is an issue we've raised for a while, particularly on what they call the DISMAP tool, which is distribution mapping, and efforts are underway to do that, and so I guess I'm cautiously optimistic that we may have a little bit more about that, particularly if we highlight that now, and that gives a number of years to get that information.

MR. ROLLER: Go ahead, Mel.

MR. BELL: Did I understand -- So we can't run two research tracks at the same time, or they can't overlap, and, I mean, there's a little bit of overlap with the tail-end of red snapper and the amberjack, but, if you were to put -- If you were to do a research track and put Spanish where greater amberjack is, could you then do amberjack as a research track in 2027, or would that be overlapping and you can't do that?

DR. COLLIER: Well, I'm not on the SEDAR Steering Committee, and so I will say all you can do is ask, and, if they say push it back a year, they say push it back a year, and so, you know, ask as optimistic as you want to be, and then, you know, you might have to deal with things moving around a little bit.

MR. ROLLER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. I'm just asking, because I brainstorm, and you guys have seen my storms, and so would this be a species that might be an MSE species, to do something similar to dolphin, and it might make it quicker, and, you know, you're not going through the full research track timeframe and everything, and there seems to be a fair amount of knowledge of -- You know, it seems to be a data-rich species, really, even if we're struggling with this assessment, but, anyway, I just wondered if that may be another avenue to go, is a Spanish mackerel MSE.

MS. WIEGAND: In terms of whether an MSE process would be faster, that's certainly not my area of expertise, and I will lean on others to talk about how an MSE process would compare to a research track stock assessment process. I will say that, later on in this meeting, we're going to talk about port meetings, which is decidedly not an MSE, but it does give the council the ability to gather some additional qualitative data to go along with a sort of future research track assessment.

MR. ROLLER: Go ahead, Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Just to build on that, if you look at the schedule right now, we have the dolphin MP MSE that's already in there for potential review, and I wouldn't recommend us trying to get ahead of that one, and it would be good to have the Science Center go through those thoroughly and see what the CIE reviewers have to say about it and us learn from that.

MR. ROLLER: Bob.

MR. BEAL: Thanks, Tom. You know, I can't comment on amberjack versus Spanish mackerel and a prioritization. That's up to the council, and amberjack is not a commission species at all, but, from the ASMFC perspective, you know, we would support a Spanish mackerel assessment sooner rather than later, whenever we can get it on the schedule. I think it's an important one, and the shift, or expansion, as Kerry mentioned, is an important thing, and we're trying to figure it out, you know, as we heard in public comment, and we all know the northern sector quota is getting landed earlier and earlier, and why is that, and the South Atlantic sector, you know, wasn't landed for one year, and is that a signal, or is that just an outlier, and there's a lot of questions on this species that I think we can shed some light on it, through a research track assessment, and so I think, again, we would support going sooner rather than later, and I think, I'm confident, we can get support from the Mid-Atlantic states for scientists and biologists to help out with the sampling and modeling and, you know, some of the efforts that would take place.

That's not to -- I don't want to dump a Mid-Atlantic problem, or a developing problem, on the South Atlantic states and the Science Center having to fix it, and I think we can get some help from up north to shed some light on this, or at least provide some data to this assessment, and so, you know, the commission is ready to help out, whenever it's ready to go through a research track.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Bob. I'm going to go to Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: To answer the question, based on Chip's comments about the greater amberjack count, or whatever we're calling it, and that data possibly getting older, I would not, at this time, support Spanish replacing that amberjack spot on the research track, and I know that's the question at-hand, and so I just wanted to address that, and that's my perspective.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Kerry. I mean, I really -- Bob's comments really resonated with me, simply for the fact that it's such an important fishery, and we're between a rock and a hard place, and we've really got to figure out what's the best thing for us to do for our fishermen here, particularly since this is such a climate-impacted fishery, or at least it would appear. John.

DR. WALTER: I was also weighing Trish's comment about MSE, and thinking about how that would be applied, and I think the council is going to want to judiciously apply that tool, that has got a lot of benefits, but it's also very time consuming, and I think it's going to need to have a clear objective as to what the purpose of that is and what type of management procedure it's designed to test, and then what kind of uncertainties you want that management procedure to be robust to.

I think it's kind of crystalizing here that this might be one species that's really climate impacted, and so developing a robust management procedure that can address that might be a key need out of this that maybe the traditional stock assessment approach is going to -- Well, we know the traditional stock approaches get really challenged if a species is moving substantively, and so that might be a good angle, or avenue, to go into, developing a management procedure for stocks that might be moving across boundaries.

It's not clear, and I think probably there are going to be new developments coming forward with the climate scenario planning, and hopefully the climate, ecosystem, and fisheries initiatives that have been working their way through a lot of our strategic planning processes that might be able to help with that, but I think, at this point, it's hard to say that we have the resources, or the knowledge, right now of how to start that up right away, but I could see, in a couple of years, there probably will be developments that will support that. Thanks.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, John. I'm going to go to Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, I think we're sort of at a little bit of an impasse here, and maybe we see what happens with the SSC, and see whether -- I mean, I guess there's always the possibility of a rejection, you know, but let's just assume that there won't be, and that we'll get something out of it, and maybe what John is talking about is, instead of trying to shoehorn this into a conventional SEDAR process, where they never seems to be enough capacity to meet all the needs, maybe that's what we need to do. Maybe we need to create a pilot project that uses Spanish mackerel as a test case for how to manage a stock that is much more dynamic than what it has traditionally been, in terms of its temporal and spatial distribution, and maybe that would be a good test case, and throw some resources at it, and try to do that in the interim, and that's just a suggestion, as an alternative, because it seems like there's not enough room here, and so that's just food for thought.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Spud. I'm going to go to John Carmichael.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I think those are good points. You know, I kind of encouraged, a couple of times in the scenario planning, of like, if you want a case study to evaluate, Spanish mackerel would be an ideal one. I think, from the steering committee and scheduling perspective, it seems pretty clear that you guys want greater amberjack and Spanish mackerel done in that time.

The schedule rules are such that that's not something that is really likely to happen, but, then, again, it may be important to express that that is what the council desires, and it just tends to

underscore what Spud said about there's just not enough capacity to meet the needs that we're facing, and particularly with -- You know, ideally, research tracks don't overlap, and, as you see, that's already having to be relaxed some, just to come close to meeting your needs, and so I think it could be important to bring that and continue through with the scenario planning, as we work on that, and keep, in the back of our minds there, that, yes, maybe Spanish mackerel is something to get some sort of collaboration between the Northeast and Southeast, as to how to deal with a stock that's showing such changes in its distribution.

Then I think, as Spud said, a bit of waiting and seeing, and let's see what the SSC says about Spanish, and maybe we can ask the SSC for some -- To weigh-in on this, you know, Spanish versus amberjack, and what do they see, and, you know, what do they see as potential risks if Spanish pushes back to like 2027 for a start, and I think we probably have time, Chip, to get some insight from there, before we really have to settle on which species there for that research track, as long as we know there is a research track, but I think there's definitely kind of a nod towards greater amberjack needing to go there, mainly because of the count, and that does carry a lot of weight, in this case, and that's why that was scheduled there.

DR. COLLIER: Even if the stock assessment is accepted, I think a research track is a warranted assessment for Spanish mackerel, and so, even if it's accepted in January, maybe it relaxes the need to get it done immediately, but it still would end up on the schedule as a research track.

MR. ROLLER: So what's the pleasure of the committee here? Where do we go from here? Go ahead, Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: What John said.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that's guidance that I feel that we have to take to the steering committee, and I trust staff to get that down in the committee report like that, and that should help us.

MR. ROLLER: I'm seeing a lot of nodding heads. Is there any more comments, or discussion, that we need on this, or can we move on to the next agenda item? All right. Well, let's move on. I think the next thing is going to be pretty brief, and we're going to have Rick DeVictor do his thing. We're going to do his updates on amendments recently submitted to NMFS.

MR. DEVICTOR: Council staff has this information in the overview document, the dates and such, and so this is for CMP 34. If you recall, that amendment would increase Atlantic king mackerel ACLs and ABC, and so the NOA published at the end of January, and that comment period was through March, and then the proposed rule published in February, and that goes through March also, and so those two comment periods are open right now on CMP 34.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Rick. We're planning to wrap up around 5:30, and so I don't know we have enough time -- Obviously not to discuss port meetings, but I was wondering if John Walter might be able to discuss tournament landings. Are you -- I was told you would be ready, maybe.

DR. WALTER: I've been waiting all day for this.

MR. ROLLER: Well, you've got the floor.

DR. WALTER: All right. Let me pull up my notes. All right, and so I have to thank my staff, who pulled together a lot of these things, and it brings back memories of when I was actually the lead analyst on SEDAR 38, where we first actually incorporated a tournament fleet into the model, because there was a lot of data from tournaments, from a project that was done by the University of Maryland, to actually go to the tournaments to collect that data, and we had that fleet broken up.

What was not -- Then the tournaments were assumed to be 3 percent of the total private recreational catch, and that was based on the project by Mike Wilberg and Tom Idhe. However, we didn't have the data broken up that well back then, but that's just kind of like a historical view of it, and those tournaments back then were targeting the largest king mackerel, and so it actually had some really good data in it on maximum sizes and maximum ages and an asymptotic fleet.

I think there were four questions that we were asked to answer, what are king and Spanish mackerel tournament landings over the past ten years, and how are landings accounted for against the annual catch limit, and so, right now, we don't have those landings yet, and we're working on trying to get that time series, but probably it's going to be a relatively low fraction of the total catch. I don't -- I am talking mainly about king mackerel, and I don't know that we even would have Spanish mackerel tournaments, and I don't think there are specifically too many Spanish mackerel tournaments, like there are king mackerel tournaments.

The landings are actually flagged differently by state, and I will go into that in a minute, and then the second question was how are the tournament fish that are donated to a dealer reported on a federal dealer permit, and I think the concern is that those fish may be counted against the commercial annual catch limit, when they are caught in the tournament and donated.

In Florida, if it's reported on a trip ticket by a dealer, it's not considered for ACL purposes, and Florida has some specific flags that allow those to not count against the commercial ACL. In South Carolina, when we talked to them, they said that they don't have a flag for tournament landings on their trip tickets, and so, in South Carolina, it's not known whether they are or are not counted. In Georgia, there is no means to flag the tournament landings in trip tickets, and so they might actually be counted on the annual catch limit, and so those are two kind of like flags that we need to follow-up on. Then, in North Carolina, the landings can be identified based on the permit number assigned to the tournament. However, neither NOAA nor ACCSP has been receiving a list of these permit numbers, and so those landings may also be included in the ACL, and so we've got a couple of things that we need to follow-up on. It's still unlikely to be a substantial amount, because remember that 3 percent is assumed to be pretty low, 3 percent of the private rec.

Then, is there a box for the dealer to check, denoting the fish are from a tournament, and, then, as I denoted, yes, indeed there are, and there's markers in at least some of the states, and so we're working on trying to be able to then make sure that we pull those out, but we've got to follow-up with South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina. Then a question is can those landings be isolated, so the council can see the total number and weight of tournament fish per year that are donated to dealers, and, again, we don't have that right now, and we're going to work with the ACCSP technical committee to make sure those potential landings can be easily identified in the data, and there's a meeting next month where our team will bring that up to that group and hopefully be able to come back to this group with what those numbers are.

That's the answer, as we've got it now. Now, that's half the story. That's the commercial landings, which I think was the big concern, but, also, with regard to recreational fish, they are flagged in tournaments in the MRIP data, and so, from the standpoint that the recreational catch is accounted for in the standard MRIP sampling, they would be then fully accounted for there. The issue would be, if we've double-counted for those fish and then taken them out of the commercial ACL, and that sounds like it would be South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina where that might be an issue. Any questions?

MR. ROLLER: Any questions from anyone? I'm looking around. Go ahead, Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I think this is where the disconnect is, because Georgia is -- We issue permits for the tournaments, and we do get the receipts back on that, but there's no check-box for anybody to put in anything that says it goes from a tournament. Kerry and I had talked, back in December, that the SAFIS doesn't have anything in their dealer reports to check-off for tournament-caught fish, and so the states could probably give it to you. I mean, I feel like, in all confidence, Julie can give you the poundage. It's just we have no way, based on how that database is set up, to put a flag to it.

MR. ROLLER: Go ahead, John.

DR. WALTER: Yes, that's exactly the problem, is that there isn't that flag, and, if it could be done after the fact, so that -- Perhaps what we should do is follow up online with each individual state, to find out how that could be rectified, either after the fact or like by tracking the vessel ID and then maybe the landing time.

MR. ROLLER: Okay. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: In talking with Julie, again, Julia Califf, who is over our commercial stats group, there was discussions with ACCSP about there being a check-off for it, but I don't know where the communication dropped, or it didn't get done, but there has been conversation, a couple of times, about this being added as a check-off, and so it may be worth bringing everybody back to the table, because I know it has been talked about.

MR. ROLLER: I've got several names on here. I've got Tim and then Dewey.

MR. GRINER: John, I was just going to confirm that North Carolina has no way to distinguish. On my dealer trip ticket, there is no way to distinguish whether it's a tournament fish or not, regardless of a permit number or anything else. Once it goes into my dealer report, it's part of the ACL, the commercial ACL.

MR. ROLLER: I will go to Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Do the tournaments have to register in each state, similar to what HMS does, if there's a marlin tournament or something, and does anybody know that answer? Every state knows that they had a tournament, and that tournament has got to turn into that state that they had fifty vessels, one vessel, and this was the amount of fish that was landed, and so the states know

that, but it's just deciding on, once the state, or whoever takes hold of that fish, it goes into commerce, which they're allowed to, but how does it get reported?

The states already know the pounds, each state that -- I mean, they issued a permit for the tournament, and they've got to report. The tournament has got to report, after a certain amount of days, and they're going to have the weights of all the fish, and the pounds, and so why don't we go to each state and say what's your pounds for these permits, for your fish during that tournament, and you add that up, and then you figure out what John is going to look at in the future of how is it getting sold and how it is getting recorded there. That way, you've got two checks and balances, and does that sound -- I mean, is that right?

DR. BELCHER: Well, I don't know that there's a check or a balance. I mean, that's the problem, is that the states could probably give you that information. The tournament gives you basically the copy of the receipt, where the pounds have been transitioned over, and it's not based on unit effort of boat and pounds landed per vessel, and it's basically the total amount that transferred from a tournament to a dealer.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: But that would give you an idea of where to start from, and then you go to the dealers, or look at in the federal system, and say, wait a second.

DR. BELCHER: But that's the point, is it's not in the federal system. There is no check-off in the federal system to validate it with. It just -- It gets transferred to the dealer, and they can't check a box that says it came from a tournament.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: How about if that tournament, with that permit, has got to tell who they're going to sell the fish to?

DR. BELCHER: They do that.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: They do?

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: So you know what dealer it went to.

DR. BELCHER: Yes, but there is no check-off. What I'm saying is, once the dealer has it, and he's entering it from his system, there's nothing that he can put that flags it as being tournament fish.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Then it's a counting mechanical problem.

MR. ROLLER: I've got a couple of things. First of all, Mel, was your comment on this?

MR. BELL: Yes, and I was just going to be real clear that we do not allow the sale of tournament-caught fish, and so that ain't going to happen, legally. We have no legal mechanism to allow recreationally-caught fish to enter commerce in South Carolina, and so we should be a zero, hopefully.

MR. ROLLER: So, Jessica, you had something that you wanted to clarify on this?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so, for Florida -- First of all, there is a permit that they have to apply for, and I actually sign all of those permits myself, and so we have a record of those, but, on our state trip ticket system, they get a special code, and so it's recorded in our state trip ticket system what tournament it comes from, how much it is, et cetera, and so we do have a recording of this through our state system.

MS. WIEGAND: Just as a note, in terms of the permitting of tournaments, the federal language, for CMP specifically, in reference to sale of tournament-caught fish, does say that it has to be a state-permitted tournament, and so, arguably, if this is happening, the tournament should have a permit.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Christina. My list of names is as follows, and I've got Gary and Laurilee and then Spud. Did you want to comment, Gary?

MR. BORLAND: Yes, just real quick, and I didn't understand what the scope of this looks like, how many pounds this actually represents, and what kind of problem it is and how we -- I guess I don't understand how we can't allocate it back to the rec, and so I'm a little lost on how this is getting out of whack.

MR. ROLLER: I agree with that, and I think that's the question. It's like how big is this catch in general, right, and some of us think it's big, and some of us think it's quite small. Go ahead, Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: All right, and so I have a question for Tim, and then I will make my comment. Are those fish being donated to you, or are you buying them?

MR. GRINER: No, and so my understanding of this is, and I don't really participate in this, to tell you the truth, but the tournament sells the fish to a licensed dealer like me, and he then takes that money and donates it to charity, and is that correct?

(The response is not audible on the recording.)

MR. GRINER: He donates that money to charity, but the dealer now has the fish, and they are on the market for sale. That's my understanding of it. Now, the way that it gets fuzzy here is, when I fill out a trip ticket, typically, you would put in the fisherman's name, the fisherman's license, the vessel, and the vessel ID, all of those items, and so I'm guessing, with a tournament, there is some type of tournament name, with some type of license or number or some kind of identifying number, that would then go into that trip ticket. The problem is I think that what John is saying is there's no way for them to know that that's not just a regular old fisherman, instead of a tournament.

MS. THOMPSON: The reason I asked is because, you know, I was talking to a fish house owner from -- She's from the Grand Banks, and she said that what happens with these tournaments, and she said there's a lot of them, is that the one fish dealer that gets the fish -- They pay less than market price for the fish to the tournament, and then they turn around and they sell them for less than what they should be, and it hurts the other fish houses, and it reduces their ability to compete,

and then they can't sell their kingfish that they paid a higher price for to their commercial boats. I know that doesn't have anything to do with how the fish are allocated to the commercial or the recreational, but it's still -- How fair is that, that a big load of kingfish gets dumped on the market at a lower price that makes it harder for the other fish houses to compete?

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Laurilee, and, you know, on that point, this is something that I heard from AP members, and it wasn't necessarily about the allocation, but it's that this fishery is a -- It's a market-dependent fishery, and it can be flooded very easily, and that sometimes that was the case, and it would change prices for people, but Christina is going to comment, and then we're going to move to Spud.

MS. WIEGAND: I just want to very quickly note that, after some of the discussion that you all had in December related to how sale of fish caught in a tournament works for CMP fisheries, the National Marine Fisheries Service did put out a Fishery Bulletin that's really an excellent guide to how this process is supposed to work, and so I just wanted to let you guys know that that information was put out as a guide to help you and any other stakeholders that might have questions.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Christina. Finally, Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Well, I think, to get to what Gary was talking about, you know, I participated in tournaments from the late 1980s to the early 2000s, and I think, generally, across-the-board, participation in tournaments, and the number of fish being landed in tournaments, has declined significantly from what it used to be, and I know, at home, now they're forty-boat tournaments, when they used to be 175-boat tournaments, and so, in some ways, I think maybe this is much ado about nothing, but, obviously, we want fish to be categorized properly.

Just to further complicate it, when you look at the recreational side of this, and the MRIP methodology, a dockside clerk may or may not intercept tournament-caught fish. Sometimes they actually leave a tournament site, because they don't want to introduce that bias into it, and so, in terms of how they're accurately enumerated and categorized, it's really -- It's a little shaky on both sides, but I think the mechanism there is they are in place to ensure that every fish that's sold gets properly credited to its point of origin. It's just making those linkages between established processes and making sure that it gets done, but I don't think it's what it used to be, and it probably never will be.

Just for those who weren't part of all this, this was all put into place to ensure that HACCP regulations and other things were put in to ensure protection of public health, because, you know, there was not uniformity in the way these fish were being handled, and so it's a good process, but, again, I think, you know, we need to keep it in its proper context, for what it really means.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Spud. I've got three names. I've got Trish and then Bob and then Dewey.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to add to what Tim was saying, and so you're right, and we have a -- We have a recreational fishing tournament license to sell, and so that tournament gets a license number. Then, when they sell those tournament catch to a federal dealer, like Tim, Tim has to record that license number, and so that's our, quote, unquote, flag, though it's not like a big,

red flag, but we have worked -- Our trip ticket program folks have, I think, been working with NOAA to -- You know, we've got the list of tournament numbers, and we can pull that data and send that on, and so we have the ability to separate it out. We probably just need to coordinate better, or more, with NOAA to do that, and I think they have been working -- Our trip ticket program has been working on that.

MR. ROLLER: Go ahead, Bob.

MR. BEAL: Thanks, Tom. Just real quickly, to follow-up on Dr. Belcher's comment a little while ago about ACCSP special codes, or disposition codes, the SAFIS program does not have that included right now, and so it's not there yet, not an option. However, the commercial technical committee is meeting in April, and this is on their agenda to talk through, and so it may get added really soon.

MR. ROLLER: Okay. I'm going to go to Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was just wondering, and why -- How long has this -- Why is king mackerel caught recreational during tournaments allowed to be sold? During marlin tournaments, they give the fish back to the participants, and I just wonder why -- What was the outcome, or the reason, for allowing a recreational-caught tournament fish to be put into commerce that competes against the commercial fishing industry, and I'm just curious if anybody has got an answer, a good answer, for why that is.

MR. ROLLER: I've got three hands that popped up, really quick, and I saw Spud, Gary, Chester, in that order. Are you okay with that, Chester? Okay. Go ahead, Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: It was as much about preventing waste as it was anything, because everybody doesn't consider a king mackerel to be a desirably edible fish, and so you had fish being landed, and people didn't necessarily want them, but they were marketable, and so there was an opportunity there to put them into the market, to have those fish consumed, and not be necessarily wasted, and, plus, there was a -- You know, most of these tournaments were raising money for charity, and it was a mechanism to add to the money they generated to go back to charities.

MR. ROLLER: Go ahead, Gary.

MR. BORLAND: Yes, and so, to continue on Spud's, my experience with all the tournaments in the Southeast -- Not all of them, and I shouldn't say that, but, with most of the tournaments in the Southeast, there is a charity piece, and people -- They set the tournament up to draw more participants that you donate your fish, and it doesn't have to be just kingfish, and it's dolphin, and it's wahoo, and it's kingfish, and they then, in turn, sell them to raise more money for the charity, like he said, and so that's part of it. There is people, and I have watched it, and there is people that carry them home too, and they don't all get donated. The people that want them take them with them, or you can donate them to the charity, and so they leave it up to typically the rec angler to make that decision.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Gary. Chester.

MR. BREWER: To answer Dewey's question, Dewey, those fish -- When they're coming from the recreational fishermen, they're not sold. They are donated, and they are donated to a commercial fisherman, and the commercial fisherman is the one who takes the fish to the fish house and sells the fish, and then he makes a donation back to charity. That's the way it works in Florida, and it's been -- At first, I was like, you know, kind of a snob, or a purist, and, to me, a recreationally-caught fish was a recreationally-caught fish, but, as Spud said, there is a whole lot of people that don't want to eat the kingfish, and I am one of them, and so you're taking something that otherwise might go to waste, and you're using it to generate funds for -- At the ones that I've been involved in are some very, very good charities, and so you kind of turn a little bit of a blind eye, but that's -- You know, it works out well.

MR. ROLLER: Go ahead, Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Chester, my recollection is also that there was like an informal workgroup that was formed that included recreational people and commercial folks, like Bob Jones, because of the HACCP concerns, and I thought that this big group met and made a recommendation to the council on how to do this.

MR. BREWER: Following-up, I think that was -- I was at that meeting, and I believe that meeting focused, and there may have been a little bit about tournament, because Bob does not want fish on the market that is going to poison people, and that's really not good for business, and so he had that concern. Also, the meeting was about whether or not, and this was Ray --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Markham.

MR. BREWER: Not Markham. The guy that's a charter guy out of the Keys. Anyway --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Ray Rocher.

MR. BREWER: Yes, Ray Rocher. Ray Rocher wanted to have, you know, crew sales of a recreational bag limit, and that was the main thing it was about, but, yes, you're right that there was a meeting.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Chester. There have been some really great discussions, you know, and this has gone on a lot longer than I thought it would. I think, in the least, it would also be a good subject for the advisory panel to consider, and maybe we should bring it up when we reach that point. We are after 5:30, and this is the last call for any comments on this subject, and I will pass it over to the Chair.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thanks, Tom. I'm looking over towards John and Myra et al. for tomorrow, and so we have -- Obviously, Christina still has the port meeting discussion, and we can start at 8:30 tomorrow with that, or do you think we need to start earlier? We've got Habitat tomorrow.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We have three-and-a-half hours scheduled for Habitat. We may be able to trim that down a little bit. You were thinking a pretty good discussion though on the --

MS. WIEGAND: A half-hour.

DR. BELCHER: So I have to take two bullets from Andy if I say we start at 8:00 tomorrow.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It may run late tomorrow.

DR. BELCHER: I will let that be to the group. Would you rather run late or get up early?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think 8:00 is fine, if you want to start at 8:00.

DR. BELCHER: Why don't we go ahead and start at 8:00 then, and that will get us a little bit ahead again, and, if we bank more time, it just means that we get out earlier on Friday. All right, and so I'll see everybody at 8:00, and we'll finish with Mackerel Cobia.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on March 8, 2023.)

- - -

MARCH 9, 2023

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

- - -

The Mackerel Cobia Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened at the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Thursday, March 9, 2023 and was called to order by Chairman Tom Roller.

MR. ROLLER: I am going to reconvene the Mackerel Cobia Committee, and so we've got a couple of things left on the agenda, carried over from yesterday. The first is we're going to see a presentation about the mackerel port meetings, and we also, after that, are going to look at topics for the advisory panel to discuss this spring. Go ahead, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: Good morning, and so, first thing, let's start with port meetings for, right now, king and Spanish mackerel, but we're going to talk about the suite of species in a second, but, to remind you all sort of how we got to this idea of wanting to conduct port meetings for the CMP FMP, mackerel cobia, the AP has brought it up a number of times during their meetings, in April of 2019 and October of 2022 specifically, and so their most recent AP meeting.

They would really like the council to set up a series of port meetings, to try to gather more information on the king and Spanish mackerel fisheries, and certainly, in the past, this council has acknowledged the importance of gaining a comprehensive understanding of that fishery, but it's just been sort of about finding the right time for port meetings, and so we brought this idea to you in December, and you agreed that it seemed like, with sort of the variety of things going on with the fishery, now might be the time to start conducting these port meetings.

Just to remind you a little bit of sort of the various things we have under discussion for this fishery, first, and perhaps most important, in terms of port meetings, is revision to the objectives in the

CMP FMP. These haven't been revised since the mid-1990s, and so, as you guys have started talking about allocations, you've also started talking about the goals and objectives.

We've already made a couple of changes thus far. You can see, in this table, there are sort of all eight objectives, and Objective 1 and Objective 3 were recently modified by this council. They're the ones in blue, and then Objective 5 and Objective 7, which you see in yellow, those are ones that were recommended for removal by the Gulf Council. This council ultimately decided to sort of pause conversation on these objectives, because you felt like you might want to conduct port meetings, gather a bit more information from stakeholders, before making any sort of large, robust changes to the objectives of the fishery.

You've also, of course, got your Atlantic Spanish mackerel assessment response, and we'll hear more about that in June, but we do have sort of like the tentative development for that amendment here, assuming that you do get catch level recommendations in April, and this amendment sort of moves at the fastest possible pace, which may or may not end up being the case, but you would be looking at sort of running that amendment through the beginning of 2025, before taking final action, which does give us some time to conduct these port meetings before you would need to take final action on that amendment.

Then, additionally, there are a couple of other activities that aren't on your workplan right now, but have been brought up by various stakeholders in the Mackerel Cobia AP, one of which was that letter that you all talked about at the December meeting related to little tunny, false albacore, and whether or not they were in need of federal conservation and management, and then the other one is the king mackerel fishery. During their October meeting, the Mackerel Cobia AP did request that the council begin work on an amendment that would remove that split season that's currently in place in the southern zone, and I sort of will note that king mackerel, in particular, has been subject to a lot of sort of small amendments, making small, incremental changes, that has resulted in fairly complex management, and so the stakeholders felt that it might be helpful to sort of take a holistic look at that fishery, to try to simplify management in a way that would still work for fishermen.

Like I said, at the December meeting, we didn't really have sort of an in-depth discussion what you guys would like to achieve with port meetings, and so that's really what we would like to get at today, and so we're going to start with beginning to answer some of these key questions, and I know some of these questions are very broad in nature, but, once staff gets sort of a better handle on what this council would like to achieve with port meetings, we can then drill down a little bit more and then present you guys with a more fleshed-out plan for how we would like to conduct these.

Then some just logistical decision points, and what fisheries do you want to include in port meetings? How do you want to refer to this process? Is the sort of tentative timeline, working with the Spanish mackerel amendment, what you guys would like to see, and so, with that, I'm going to sort of start us with the first big-picture question, and that is, you know, broadly, what would you guys like to achieve by conducting port meetings?

We've talked a lot about this idea of needing a comprehensive understanding of the mackerel fisheries, and so what information do you guys feel like you're lacking, and, in particular, I feel like this could tie back to those management objectives that we just talked about, and one of the

things for you all to consider would be do you want to start by having just this council talk about the goals and objectives, and then solicit input from stakeholders, or would you like to start with stakeholders and gather their information and then bring that back and then have a discussion about objectives?

There are sort of pros and cons to both of these, evaluating the objectives first is sort of time and cost-effective, but soliciting input from stakeholders first would promote transparency, and it may allow them to bring forward some creative strategies to meet those objectives, and so I'll sort of stop there with the objectives question, and then, once you all have had a chance to discuss and provide input to staff, we can move forward.

MR. ROLLER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you, and so I really like the idea of having the fishermen talk about these objectives, and I'm fine with them taking -- We'll call it the outdated objectives, or the ones that have been in place for a long period of time, and I'm fine with them taking those, but, since the fishery has likely changed significantly since then, to kind of give us ideas, or give you guys ideas, and then maybe they can be crafted into new goals and objectives. I also like the fact that we're focusing on both king mackerel and Spanish mackerel.

I guess my question is I have trouble figuring out, in my mind, how this would work with king mackerel, since it's, you know, really linked to the Gulf, and the Gulf fishery, and I can tell you that, when we were at some of those red snapper workshops, or the cobia workshops, that there are people giving us feedback on king mackerel and their opinions on how to manage the fishery even in the Gulf, and so I will just put that out there, that I want to take those comments from them, but then I can't figure out how we would pass that over to the Gulf and how that would get resolved.

MS. WIEGAND: I think that's an excellent question, and, sort of later on in the document, we discuss what fisheries we want to be involved, and that was sort of one of the questions. The goals and objectives of the CMP fishery are for the FMP, which means that any modifications to them do also have to be approved by the Gulf Council, and so, again, there are sort of pros and cons of wanting to discuss Gulf migratory groups as well, and we would have to involve the Gulf Council, and we would -- You know, we have not spoken to them yet, to know where this may fall in their priority list of things they're working on, and that also may extend the timeline.

You guys have already asked that we go sort of all the way up through New England, working with ASMFC, and then adding the Gulf would be an additional layer to that, but, again, they are - - It is a joint FMP, and certainly, particularly in Florida, for the king mackerel fishery, there's a lot of interaction between Gulf king mackerel and Atlantic king mackerel, but then, of course, we can't just stop with Florida, and you've got the entire Gulf that you would need to involve, and so that's certainly a possibility, something we would need to bring to the Gulf Council, which we can do if that's something that this council is interested in.

MR. ROLLER: I've got Andy and then Trish.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am supportive of the port meetings, and I like the idea of, obviously, including both king and Spanish mackerel in the conversations. In terms of the objectives, I think we need to play a role in kind of reviewing the objectives, but I see it more as an iterative process,

right, and I don't necessarily think that we need to revise the objectives and send them out for comment, but we probably need to provide some input and review of those objectives first, see if there's anything that we want specific comments on, and then, based on the port meetings, fishermen input, we can help to revise, shape, those objectives further, based on that input.

In terms of the Gulf, we're hearing a lot of the same -- Or we're hearing different concerns, but similar concerns in terms of the abundance and distribution of king mackerel changing, or they're just absent from certain areas, and so I think it would definitely be worthwhile exploring whether the Gulf Council would be interested in partnering on some port meetings and working with the South Atlantic Council, even at some smaller scale. I like that idea.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Andy. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to say that I was thinking a good way to set this up is, and maybe we can kill two birds with one stone, is use the current objectives as a lead-in to get input on the fishery, because, you know, there is a lot of, just for lack of a better term, buzz words in each of the objectives that could get discussions going, and I think, either directly or indirectly, you would get input on objectives, and then that would also just help focus the discussion.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Trish. I think that's a really good point, I mean, because one of the things we've heard from our fishermen on the AP is that this is one of our region's most valuable fisheries, and it's changing really quickly, and so, you know, it's time to take a fresh look at everything. Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think port meetings, especially if we extend them all the way up into New England, can help maybe fill the void of what we think we know is going on, but really don't fully understand what is going on up there and how important are king and Spanish mackerel now, and how important may they be in the future, you know, if their presence up there is going to be the new normal and not just some ephemeral thing. I think the challenge is to make sure that we get the kind of participation that we need in those states, to get as much information as we can, so that, when we start looking at, you know, how do you distribute opportunity and access in a fair and equitable way.

MR. ROLLER: That's a great point, Spud, and I think we can bring that up when we look at what species to do, particularly for the Northeast. John.

DR. WALTER: Thank you, Chair. I like this initiative, and I think it's a really good step forward. I think that there could be some synergies with how the dolphin wahoo workshops went, and how they went from eliciting conceptual management objectives and then trying to turn those conceptual into operational ones, and perhaps it would also be good to have a process for how this information is going to be incorporated and spelled out to people, because our stakeholders' time is too valuable to not have it pretty clear how and where it's going to fit in, and I think we're at the point, or soon to be at the point, where we can have that process spelled out, or a roadmap probably, for maybe the snapper grouper MSE, and maybe that's a roadmap that could be sketched out, at least conceptually, for how this information might feed into a management procedure, several years down that line, that we kind of talked about a climate-ready management procedure for this species. Maybe having that synergy with the existing processes might help people see where it may eventually go. Thanks.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, John. I've got Mel.

MR. BELL: Thanks. I think -- I guess, as just part of how we would do this, is we would take the structured questions, and, in other words, it's kind of like how we do the fishery performance reports, you know, where we're working with the APs, and we ask them specific things, but I guess I would envision there would be -- If you had some structure to it like that, where you ask them the same questions, and then you're going to get different responses, based on where they happen to be, whether they're, you know, at one end of the coast or the other.

Certainly, you know, we've got the objectives, and so one thing we could look at, perhaps, is their perception of how we're doing on specific things in those areas, but then it's just sort of their sense of what do you see as the issues where you are with this fishery, but just keep it structured, and that helps you pull the data together, and then it would help us to be able to kind of figure out how to use what we've learned, but that's where I was kind of going back to the fisheries performance report process that we follow, something like that, but we ask everybody pretty much the same thing, the same way, and then try to keep them -- You know, they will wander around, and say whatever they want to say, but I guess is that kind of what we were thinking, something like that?

MS. WIEGAND: Yes, and so that's -- I mean, I don't want to sort of speak ahead of broader conversations that I think we'll want to have, as staff, on how to best structure these, but, yes, I think we are likely to end up with a situation similar to that. The goal, today, was really to sort of have you guys give us the big picture of what you want, and then, you know, staff will go back, and we'll put together what sort of structure we think will work best to reach those goals that you guys have laid out today, and then we'll bring that back to you in June, for you to discuss and approve, but I think you and I, Mel, are thinking along the same lines of sort of the best way to structure this type of meeting.

MR. ROLLER: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: With a port meeting, would there be any -- I know, looking here, you're going to be asking questions, for the stakeholders, of what they want, or are looking at, but would there be any data provided to them, as a snapshot of what's actually happening up-to-date, the best available, that could be of what's happening, landings, states, trips, and different things, to give them something to go by and not just them telling you what they think they want and all that, but, that way, you've got two things together, the reality and what they're saying also, and how it parses together.

MS. WIEGAND: Absolutely, Dewey, and so we already have -- Chip has already put together fishery overviews for both the king and Spanish mackerel fishery, and we would, obviously, update those before going out to port meetings, and then one of the things that sort of other staff members have recommended is I know the dolphin wahoo workshops had a really great sort of one-pager, with information that was also provided at the meeting, and so that's also something that we would consider, but we would certainly be providing them up-to-date information to help guide their discussions.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Just to follow-up, on that one-pager, which was very helpful for the dolphin presentation and stuff, I would recommend doing that, to go out to stakeholders and all that stuff, to tell about the meeting and what it's going to be about and all that stuff. I think it's a great idea.

MR. ROLLER: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: Thank you, and, also, we could look at all the data from all the tournaments, from what was caught on all the tournaments, because, you know, from the past to the future, from what is happening currently, and we don't have as much participation as we used to have, because we don't have as many fish as we used to have, but you will notice that -- Maybe, if you look at the tournaments a little bit further to the north, you might find that there is more fish, and there might be more participation, in both fish and fishermen, during that time.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Judy. I mean, personally, I think back to the dolphin workshops and how -- Particularly, like the one-page documents provided really -- It spurred some good conversation, you know, and, in the first round of workshops, we really got some good information from stakeholders about how they were seeing the fishery change and the importance of markets and whatnot. Do I have any other hands up for discussion? Then we'll move on.

MS. WIEGAND: So the one other thing, in terms of sort of the broader what would you guys like to get out of this goals, is I would love if you could have a bit more discussion on what sort of you guys -- What information you feel like you would need to have a comprehensive understanding of the mackerel fisheries, and this is sort of, I guess, a phrase that I've used a lot, and a phrase that's been used by the AP and you all, and so, again, this can be a very broad conversation, and staff will bring you back structure in June, but are there specific pieces of information you feel like you are missing from stakeholders that would help you have this full, holistic view of the fishery, sort of some of the things that we were thinking, off the top of our head, with stakeholder perceptions of management performance, more information about how exactly they're using the resource. Spud already mentioned, you know, how species movement and expansion may affect the future of this fishery, or these fisheries, and then, sort of similar to what we ask in the fishery performance reports, a description of current fishery dynamics and things like that.

MR. ROLLER: Mel.

MR. BELL: So one thing that has always impressed me with this fishery, when you consider it from the Gulf into the Atlantic, or at least I thought, is sort of the complexity of the commercial component and the way things move, and they move over time, and they move over location, and it's -- It's, you know, multiple markets, but they kind of feed into the same market, and that's just -- I can remember, when we were dealing with some stuff in the past, and looking at that, and listening to the fishermen about how there's a very mobile component to some of this, and it just sort of flows with the fish, but I've never --

Because now you're talking about, you know, a market for one fish, over time and over areas, just kind of understanding the timing of everything and how that works, and particularly then, when it comes up in our waters, how that plays out and the market, as we're talking about things like, you know, tournament-sold fish and all and how that can play into pricing and affecting markets for commercial stuff, and so I would say -- I have just always thought this was kind of a complex

fishery, related to market conditions and fishing pressure, and because it moves, and so some clearer picture of that, in my mind, would be helpful for us, just understanding it.

MR. ROLLER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I agree with everything Mel is saying. I feel like there's some of these fishermen that are mobile, and then others that are not mobile, and they're just capitalizing on the fishery when it is in their area, and I think about the people that were at the red snapper workshop, and they were talking about the Gulf, the gillnet fishery that's happening kind of in southwest Florida, and people seem to want to comment on that, and so I would love to hear more about that.

Then, since Spanish mackerel, especially during certain times of the year, is more in state waters than it is in federal waters, I am wondering if there's a way to bring in people from state agencies to be a part of this, or to be there to listen as well, because it seems like there are going to be some components of this, especially on the Spanish mackerel side, that not only will be important for ASMFC, but I think that it would be important for the states to understand that as well, because they might need to change regulations as part of this, too.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Jessica. Before I go to Andy, I just wanted to bring up a comment, and I think it's related to this. One thing I have heard from stakeholders is just a general concern of the movements of these fisheries, particularly from the commercial community, and what does that look like for these permit holders, you know, because all of our states have very complex and different licensing programs, and I think it would be helpful to gather that, or discuss that, and just see if these fishermen feel like if they can move with the fish or -- You know, imagine if king mackerel move north, and most of our permit holders are in Florida, and what does that look like, right, and in the Gulf. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: One of the things that I haven't heard so much over here, but may be relevant still, is, when we were talking about reallocation, or potential reallocation, in the Gulf, this issue came up between the dynamics of kind of recreational and commercial fishermen and how they use the king mackerel resource, and, with recreational fishermen, there was a lot of discussion about kind of the optimization of yield, that they don't need to fully harvest their catch limit.

You know, we heard a lot yesterday about not every fisherman likes to eat king mackerel, right, and so they go out and have a good fishing experience and catch-and-release king mackerel, and so I think, from a potential for future allocation -- Kind of information allocation decisions with this council, it would be helpful to kind of better understand those dynamics and the choices that anglers make relative to commercial fishermen, that are trying to maximize their harvest and quantity of fish being caught.

MR. ROLLER: That's a great point, Andy, and I think that also applies to Spanish mackerel as well, right, particularly given that it's the topic of the day, and so I'll go Dale and then Jessica.

MR. DIAZ: I am mostly talking about king mackerel here, and I do think it's a good idea if the South Atlantic and the Gulf can cooperate, and we're hearing, from people that come to give public testimony, and people that I talk to on breaks, and I'm talking about good fishermen that know how to fish for Spanish mackerel and have done it long-term, that there's something going on with it. I'm sorry. I meant king mackerel. There is something going on with king mackerel in the Gulf.

We're hearing it over and over again, and I agree with a lot of what's been said, and we do have a lot of east coast fishermen that travel into the Gulf, historically, and that's something that has been part of the Gulf fishery for a long time, and they're very mobile, and I do know that some of the folks, during public testimony, brought this up, and they felt that idle iron being removed in the Gulf of Mexico could be a big problem.

There is a lot of oil rigs that have outlived their useful life, and they're being pulled up, and I'm not talking about on a small scale. I'm talking about on a large scale, and so there's a tremendous amount of habitat that has come out of the Gulf. I don't know how much that's got to do with the current things that we're hearing from fishermen right now, but it certainly could be an issue, and, lastly, we did do a bag limit analysis, following up on what Andy said, and, at one point, we raised the bag limit for recreational king mackerel in the Gulf, and we did a bag limit analysis, and the analysis said that people probably wouldn't keep any more than they were already keeping at the time, and I think that, once we raised the bag limit, it never changed very much. I mean, people generally keep one or two, and a higher bag limit was not something that very many people took advantage of in the Gulf. Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: I mean, we're seeing the same -- We're hearing the same thing from many of our stakeholders in king mackerel in the Southeast, right, that fishermen are not catching them where they should be, or they're not catching the number, and, I mean, the council just received a comment from Jack Cox saying the same thing, that we're seeing a decline, or it's not reflected in the stock assessment. I'm going to go to Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: A couple of people have brought it up, but I don't see it up there yet, is the tournaments and kind of what people's opinions are about how tournaments might be affecting the fishery. Are they increasing, or are they decreasing, and I just would like to hear more opinions about that.

MR. ROLLER: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: I would like to add that, off of our coast, off Savannah, and we fish for king mackerel in the winter, I mean in the early winter, when they make their run through the Savannah area, and we did not -- We haven't had a good king mackerel run in probably a couple of years, and the Spanish mackerel that we have, that normally come in March and April and May, and are here from June all the way to the hot months, we haven't had that in a while. You know, you might have isolated catches here and there in our area, but it's been very bad, and I haven't been seeing the squid come in like I normally see, and so they used to follow the squid, and they also used to follow the glass minnows, but I don't see as much of that going on now as I used to, and I used to get a lot of pictures of the squid, when they would turn red when they got angry, and we're not seeing that anymore off our coast.

MR. ROLLER: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Glass minnows come out of the estuaries, and, last year, we had a big algae bloom that killed millions, literally millions, of glass minnows. They looked like little white marbles floating on the surface, because their stomachs blew up, and they turned upside down, and

so, again, the impact on estuaries, water quality, leads out to, you know, impacts on fish in the ocean.

MR. ROLLER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was also thinking that it might be good to hear, and we may hear it anyway, but how these fisheries interact with other fisheries, because I think king and Spanish interact with bluefish, and I'm sure there's maybe other species that is interacted with, you know, between other councils and the ASMFC as well.

MR. ROLLER: Commercial and recreational. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The gear, and so that's another thing I would like to hear, have they changed the gears, and, in Florida, they often use this modified cast net in one portion of the state, and so I would like to hear a little bit more about how the gears have changed over time and what gears they're currently using.

MR. ROLLER: Bob.

MR. BEAL: Thanks, Tom. Just not a specific question for the port meetings, but just kind of an ASMFC perspective on all this, and, you know, the commission is kind of on hold until the stock assessment work gets completed, but our Coastal Pelagic Board, which is the board that maintains the Spanish Mackerel FMP, is fully ready to react and work in cooperation with the council in any way that makes sense, and, you know, as we move toward these port meetings, the commission, and the member states, are ready to help out with setting up the meetings, and staffing the meetings, and doing whatever it takes, especially the Mid-Atlantic and southern New England area, where, you know, staff here may not have as much experience and that sort of thing, and so, you know, we're absolutely set up to help out and cooperate and, you know, sort of develop a complementary management program that spans state waters and federal waters, and so we're just doing -- We're in a similar spot to the council, waiting on the assessment advice, to see where it goes.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Bob. Anybody else? Tim.

MR. GRINER: I think it would be interesting to get some feedback on this idea of catch-and-release in both Spanish and the king. I'm not real sure how that actually works, but maybe some of the recreational guys could hone-in on, you know, is that a big component, and is there a lot of catch-and-release going on in the Spanish mackerel fishery, and in the kingfish, and I just don't know how that works or how you do that.

MR. ROLLER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: The size of the fish that they're targeting in certain times of the year, and I think this was a big thing for Ben Hartig, when he was on the council, and talking about how that changes, depending on the time of year and the various fisheries, and I think there are some fishermen that are only targeting certain sizes at certain times of the year, and so I would like to understand how that's different.

MR. ROLLER: This has been a good discussion so far, and it's been pretty comprehensive. Does anybody have anything else they would like to add? I would just say that I appreciate Tim's comment about looking at catch-and-release, and I can say, particularly on Spanish, there's a lot of catch-and-release in that fishery. Should we move on?

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Thank you, guys, and so the next thing I wanted to talk a little bit about is what is the desired product, or outcome, of these port meetings? I think we've talked about this a little bit, but sort of what was being suggested was that staff could develop a final report that, you know, sort of includes notes and summaries from all the conducted port meetings, and then, in addition to sort of these summaries and information on a lot of the things that you just listed, we could do a thematic analysis that would identify sort of themes and patterns that you were seeing at all of the port meetings, to perhaps guide you in the objectives discussion, and so that's what we were sort of throwing around as the output of this, but I wanted to sort of pause and make sure that that's something that you were comfortable with, or if you would like to see something else, so that we can consider that when creating a more specific structure for these port meetings.

MR. ROLLER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I think that what you just stated sounds good. I was thinking of the report-out of the participatory workshops from the dolphin, and how it was arranged and written out, and you actually probably have an outline right there to kind of follow, you know, what report comes out of this, but I liked how that was very organized and informed, informative.

MR. ROLLER: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I was just wondering, and I probably forgot it, but are these port meetings - When does the SSC meet next, and what's the schedule for providing what the stock assessment is, before you go out to these port meetings, and so folks are going to be anxious and wondering what's going to be the ACLs, and what's going to happen there, and how are you going to do that, because I don't think it would be really good to go out to port meetings until something is rectified and a path forward is chosen by the managers.

MS. WIEGAND: I completely agree, Dewey, and that's something that this council was pretty adamant about at the December meeting, and so the SSC is supposed to review and discuss in April and provide this council catch level recommendations at your June meeting, and so, also, at the June meeting, we would be bringing you back a bit more formalized outline of how we would like to conduct these port meetings, and so certainly the intent would be to not go out to port meetings until there was catch level advice for the Spanish mackerel fishery, given that that will likely inform some of the discussions that these stakeholders are going to want to have at the port meetings.

MR. ROLLER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: One of my thoughts is how will this be presented to ASMFC, or the states, and I think that the states could get it, you know, through the council process or through the ASMFC process, and so I'm just hoping that there's a nexus, for this final information, with some of the other entities that might need to change regulations as well.

MS. WIEGAND: I think, first things first, would be, you know, Bob has expressed that ASMFC is very much ready to be involved in this, and I think we would, I would assume, want to make a presentation, at some point, to their Coastal Pelagics Board, and then sort of it would be on staff to talk to the Gulf, perhaps get on the Gulf Council's agenda to talk about this, and then have them express the extent to which they would like to be involved. I guess my -- We're getting into a bit of the logistics here, and my question would be how soon do you guys want us to try to have those conversations? Would you like us to go ahead and move forward with talking to them now, or do you want to wait until you have a bit more structure for how these are going to function, which we'll be providing you in June, and so at what nexus would you like them to get heavily involved in the conversation?

MS. MCCAWLEY: So, on the Gulf side, I think -- Of course, Dale can take this back to the Gulf Council meeting, but I think that, if it's possible to give some sort of short update to the Gulf Council, so that, if they have additional input here, and, I mean, we have a joint plan with them, that they could provide those additional inputs early on in the process, before it's completely figured out, and so I would say, at least for the Gulf, I would bring them in sooner rather than later.

MR. ROLLER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: The same thing for the commission, and I think the sooner the better, as Bob said, to benefit from the capacity that the commission has got to help structure this and execute it in the Mid and New England, and I think there will be -- I don't know if we're having a Coastal Pelagics Board meeting in May or not, but we could, you know, if we -- Because, you know, the commission is going to be reacting to whatever the SSC does as well, you know, in terms of the stock assessment, and so, yes, I think the sooner the better, for coordinating on design and execution.

MR. ROLLER: Bob.

MR. BEAL: Thanks. Just to follow-up on Spud's comments, as of right now anyway, we don't have a Coastal Pelagic Board scheduled for our spring meeting, which is the first week of May, and maybe there is some value in waiting until our August meeting. The council will have their June meeting, and we'll see where the stock assessment is, and then we can, you know, report that out to the board. John came to the commission's annual meeting in November and reported-out the status of things as of November, but, you know, things are going to hopefully change between now and our August meeting, and so I think there maybe some value in that updating on the progress of stock assessments and get some perspective on where these port meetings are going and that sort of thing, and the August meeting, time-wise, might be a little bit better.

MR. ROLLER: John Carmichael.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I was going to suggest that, because, as Bob mentioned, I'm on the Pelagics Board at ASMFC, and I feel like giving them more details in August may be better. If we get the assessment information, and you guys have a chance to consider that and flesh the plan out more, and that may work for the Gulf, to actually go and maybe present this at their August meeting, and I think, between now and then, we should provide the report from this group, from this committee, to both the Gulf and Atlantic States and just sort of say, hey, you know, this is what we've talked

about, and what we're thinking is we would like time on your August meeting agendas to come and talk about this, after the council has fleshed out the plan a bit more at our June meeting.

MR. ROLLER: Just to bring it up for discussion, what about inviting other AP members, like Gulf AP members, to our virtual AP meeting?

MS. WIEGAND: I will say, to provide a bit more information that might help that discussion, what we're thinking of, in terms of the AP meetings this year, is to do a virtual AP meeting in April, that's just like a quick, half-day webinar, to bring the AP members up-to-speed on what's going on with port meetings, and get their input, so that you guys have that when you discuss it in June, and then to have the AP meet in-person in Charleston after the June meeting, assuming that we then have catch level information for Spanish mackerel for them to discuss, and so that's what we're thinking about, in terms of Mackerel AP meetings this year.

I guess I will say, to Tom's point, back in 2020, or 2021, one of things that this AP discussed was the need to have more collaboration with the Gulf Council and the ASMFC's Spanish mackerel stakeholder group, and so you guys sort of set up a broad policy that, when there were issues on the agenda that would affect Gulf fishermen, or would be relevant to some of the ASMFC Spanish mackerel members, that you would invite them to participate in the port meetings, and so I can dig back up that discussion, but that is something that this council has discussed before.

MR. ROLLER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I know this might be jumping ahead, but probably going ahead and just, you know, coordinating with the Mid-Atlantic and New England, if we're going to go into those areas, and they may be interested in a presentation, you know, like the Gulf and ASMFC, and so I'm probably pointing out the obvious, but I would just go ahead and flag it.

MR. ROLLER: Anybody else have anything to add? Gary.

MR. BORLAND: My head is spinning, but one of the things that I was just thinking about was how do we, at these meetings, bring up the acceptance, or the appetite, for some of these tournaments going to catch-and-release, instead of kill tournaments, and how is there -- Is there acceptance from the recreational fishermen to go that way?

I mean, the only thing limiting tournaments today is the number of weekends in the year, and marinas to which they can execute them, because I can tell you that, every week, I get more sponsorship requests, and so I heard everybody in here talk about kill tournaments, and it seems like everybody doesn't like them, you know, people catching fish and not using them and people catching fish and killing them just to win a tournament, and then, if there wasn't a way to get rid of them, they would throw them away, and so I just think there's something that maybe -- I'm not sure it's the job of this council, but how do we open up that conversation to help the fishery? Like I said, my head has been spinning a million miles an hour since we went down this road. That's just food for thought.

MR. ROLLER: It would be interesting to just get feedback, in general, of like how would people feel about that, and would it be palatable, or how do they feel about it in general.

MR. BORLAND: I think it's interesting, Tim's comment about how do they even release these, and it's going on every day, right, and you see videos, and you see YouTubes, and you see the tournaments today where people are coming up with ways to release these fish, whether it's Spanish mackerel or kingfish, boat-side, or even on the boat, and I think it needs to be explored and get the conversation going, about going a more conservative route with some of these tournaments.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you for that. Do we have anybody else that wants to comment, before we move on? Okay.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so now we're going to get into some of the more straightforward questions, less big-picture, the first question being what fisheries would you want to be involved in the port meetings, and it seems like definitely Atlantic king and Spanish mackerel, and I've heard there is interest in working with the Gulf, to include Gulf king and Spanish mackerel, and my next question would be this is a plan that does still include cobia, Gulf cobia, and is there an interest in including Gulf cobia in these discussions, and then little tunny, and this council has had a little bit of discussion about, again, whether or not that species is in need of conservation and management, and if that's something you would like to be discussed at these port meetings.

MR. ROLLER: Before I go to you, Jessica, I just want to bring up a thought about the inclusion of little tunny, false albacore, which has, you know, been discussed here a lot at the council and at the AP level, and, particularly when you look at the Mid-Atlantic and the Northeast, it's a really important fishery, and it's one that gets fishermen to come out and talk, and I think, if it's included in this, we'll get a lot more participation from that mixed-use fishery, particularly from the recreational side of things. It's also of great interest in the State of North Carolina and our commission. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I personally don't think that Gulf cobia and little tunny should be part of this, and I think that you could take up more than a week's worth of time just talking about king and Spanish mackerel, and we haven't really talked to people about that in a while. I don't think it's bad to accept comments on any other topic, whether it's little tunny or cobia or other things, and we could figure out, based on those additional comments that are coming in, or comments on other species, you know, how to put that in the parking lot and then figure out how the council wants to move forward with that, but you're going to open up the biggest can of worms every on cobia.

I mean, I feel like we just got through some amendments on that with the Gulf, and it took a long time, and there's a lot of opinions on that, and I just think that it should remain separated. I kind of feel the same way about little tunny. That is not -- At least down in Florida and the Gulf of Mexico, it's not a big fishery that is gaining the type of popularity, notoriety, as it is in other areas, and I am wondering if there's another process for little tunny, just like maybe there's another process for cobia.

MR. ROLLER: I've got a lot of hands. I'm going to go just down the line. I'm going to go Tim, Mel, Andy.

MR. GRINER: I would wholeheartedly agree with Jessica. I think, you know, the Atlantic king and Spanish is where we really need to focus and hone-in on. That's where we're having the issues, and, gosh, I would hate to open up this cobia discussion again, and, as far as the little tunny,

you know, we just decided that we weren't going to do anything with that, and so why would we even bring it up, but, yes, Atlantic king and Spanish is where our issues lie, and I think we've really got to hone-in on those. Thank you.

MR. ROLLER: I'm going to go to Mel.

MR. BELL: My concern, I think like Jessica's, was sort of dilution of what we really need to focus on, but I agree that the people that are likely -- Some people are likely to show up to talk about mackerel are going to want to talk about little tunny, or perhaps cobia, and so, if there's a way to at least -- So we structure what we're trying to get out of them, and we focus on the mackerels, but, you know, if there's some way that we can at least capture, you know, without diluting the focus, to capture comments or capture interest or something, and then get the conversation back on mackerel, that would be better, but, I mean, because we're obviously going to be -- We still have to deal with the Gulf cobia, a piece of us anyway, and then the little tunny is not going away, and particularly as we move up the coast, and you're right. I mean, it's going to keep going on, but I think, if we could focus this primarily on the mackerel, and kind of try to keep it to that, that would be a good idea.

MR. ROLLER: I think there's a happy medium somewhere here, to also offer that conduit, and, I mean, from my experience, with particularly the New England and Mid-Atlantic fisheries, it's a mixed fishery, and, like I said, I think we'll get a lot more interest in that if we offer that conduit for people to talk about it. I'm going to go to Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I agree with a lot of the comments that have been said. You know, it's one of those where we want to take advantages of economies of scale, with travel and resources and people coming to meetings, but I'm fearful that, if we put too many species in this, it's going to water down the information, and maybe be less focused, with regard to the input and recommendations we get back.

I like the idea of focusing on king and Spanish as kind of our impetus for this, and then maybe, at the tail-end of the meeting, some other opportunity where we could get feedback on some of these other species, as time allows, but I would hate to take away from kind of the focus of the entire workshops up and down the coast.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Andy. We'll go to Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Well, I was just going to -- I am good with dropping cobia, and it sounds like that would be crazy, but little tunny -- I think where we're heading here, and it sounds good to me, but just, for little tunny in North Carolina, since North Carolina has an interest now in little tunny, and we're looking at different options for rules and everything, and, actually, that -- When we discussed that, that motion actually passed unanimously on our commission, and so I would like to keep little tunny in the discussion, and I think, too, the further north we get, we may get less input on Spanish and king, and probably more input on little tunny, as we move further north, and that's my take.

MR. ROLLER: I mean, not putting Bob on the spot, and I know the ASMFC has some interest in little tunny, and bonito as well, and so it's been, you know, part of a discussion point, and, you know, when we talk -- At least when I talk with, you know, my community, and fishermen in that

area, it's all kind of -- It's all mixed together, right, and so I'm just looking for the ways to get a really good vision of these mixed fisheries, and we mentioned bluefish prior. Go ahead, Bob.

MR. BEAL: Thanks. Just to follow-up on your comment, you know, the commission did have a conversation about Atlantic bonito at our February meeting, and so, you know, we're going down that road, or potentially going down that road, too, but, again, I don't want to dilute these hearings too much. You know, if we're trying to get Spanish and king mackerel comments, and we throw in these other critters, it may dilute the comments, but, if there's something at the tail-end, just to kind of wrap-up the meetings and get a little bit of comment on little tunny and bonito, then maybe that's a good way to do it, but I would just hate -- I just wouldn't want to see those species overwhelm the core of what we're trying to get at here.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Bob. Christina had an idea that she wanted to talk about.

MS. WIEGAND: I think this is something that we, as staff, can go back and talk about. I agree that there are likely going to be some shifts in what people would like to focus on based on where we are on the coast, and so, based on what I'm hearing around the table, it seems like the idea would be to keep king and Spanish mackerel fully as the focus, but perhaps have a plan, sort of in our back pockets, sort of, to speak, that -- When Gulf cobia or little tunny come up, so that we can maybe gather a little bit of information on sort of why those are coming up, within the context of king and Spanish mackerel, and then still have that information for you, but be able to facilitate the conversation back towards king and Spanish mackerel. That way, we're not losing that information, but we're prepared to gather it, but not make it the focus, if that doesn't sound too convoluted.

MR. ROLLER: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Let me understand this. We're going to go out with Atlantic king and Spanish, and then you ask the folks, hey, do you got any other species that you want to talk about, or are we going to be saying, hey, we need your input on little tunny, because the South Atlantic Council has decided that it needs management, and the State of North Carolina is looking at it, and so how do you gauge this, because, when you look at the landings of little tunny, and Tom made reference to the Mid-Atlantic and New England, it's recreational fisheries, where they're most occurring in that particular part, and some off of North Carolina harvest the catch, but I'm just wondering how much -- How do you go out to the public, given that the focus on this is Spanish and king mackerel, and, I mean, I think you just should allow people -- If they decide to talk about little tunny at the end, let them talk about it, but how much -- You know, how much presentation are you going to be giving on little tunny, and where it is going to come from, and how is the data being looked at?

MS. WIEGAND: My thought, and, again, I think I would want to discuss this sort of with the broader staff that have more experience than me conducting these types of meetings, but my thought would be, especially given that you all have asked for information on how king and Spanish mackerel fisheries are interacting with other fisheries, and it's certainly possible that Gulf cobia, or little tunny, could be brought up, and we've already sort of pulled information on little tunny, and have it in a fishery overview, just like we have information for king and Spanish mackerel, and it's the overview we presented to you in December, and so my thought would be to keep that information in our back pocket, have it available to provide should, during discussions

of king and Spanish mackerel, particularly how they interact with other species, result in things like Gulf cobia and little tunny being brought up, and staff would be prepared to gather than information, provide information as it comes up, sort of organically, during these discussions.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Christina. I'm going to go to Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I think what you laid out, Christina, sounds great. I just kind of wanted to add, kind of reiterate what you said, and, you know, here's an opportunity to be proactive on a fishery, and we are gathering information, and we plan on having a fishery performance report in three years, and so, you know, I think this is just another way to kind of stay proactive, and, you know, we're not implying management here, and it's just another opportunity to just keep an eye on everything, but what you've proposed I think works. I like it.

MS. WIEGAND: All right, and so the next thing I want to talk to you guys a little bit about is how do you want to refer to this process? We've been calling it port meetings, and I would say, you know, staff is certainly comfortable with the term "port meetings", but I wanted to make sure that you guys were sort of cool with that language, making sure that we're sort of differentiating it between a lot of the other things that have gone on in the past that are similar to this, or are currently ongoing, and I'm speaking specifically of the dolphin MSE, the snapper grouper MSE, as well as in past council snapper grouper visioning, and so "port meetings" is sort of a new term, but I wanted to make sure that you all were comfortable with that term, as a way to sort of differentiate this process from some of the other stakeholder-driven processes.

MR. ROLLER: I am seeing some nodding heads, but no hands. Judy.

MS. HELMEY: Thank you. Could you give me the definition of a port meeting?

MS. WIEGAND: My thought is we're trying to meet the fishermen where they are to have these conversations.

MR. ROLLER: You know, one thing I have always thought, just sort of when we have -- You know, what I've learned is, obviously, MSE is a very specific process, and the visioning is a specific process, but, also, the word "workshop" is always a good one too, because it's more vague. I am not suggesting a change here from port meetings, but just for food for thought. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I talked to Christina a little bit about this. Way back a very long time ago, we did something called "informal meetings", at the beginning of the very, very controversial marine protected areas amendment, before we were even ready to -- You know, we were trying not to draw boxes on maps, but discuss the concept, without it getting heated, and I think that that's -- I think this is the next sort of iteration of that, and I like the name of "port meetings" better, and I think, if it's "workshop", people will associated it with sort of like the dolphin ones, that are a little further along in the process, where what you're trying to let people know is sort of where you are in the process, right, that kind of meeting, and that's why we have scoping, versus public hearing, versus whatever, and I like the idea of a port meeting, and I hope, if we do in this in the future, we continue to use that terminology of being like very early on in the process, pre-scoping. That's why I would hesitate to use "workshops", because they're already being used in a different linear part of the process for dolphin.

MR. ROLLER: That's a fair point, and you're making me like the term "port meeting" a lot more. Go ahead, Judy, and then Dale.

MS. HELMEY: How about "mackerel port meetings", so they'll know at least what the meeting is about?

MR. ROLLER: Good point. Dale.

MR. DIAZ: I don't know if this is to your name, what to call the meetings, but, in the Gulf, we have this tool that we deploy, and it's called the Fishermen Feedback tool, and Christina might be familiar with it, but that is a way that we have tried to quickly gather the information in the past on something that we want information, and we try to use that information, as much as possible, in management, where possible, but there may be some opportunities to try to use this Fishermen Feedback tool in the Gulf also, to jumpstart this, and so thank you.

MS. WIEGAND: I will say that I really like that idea, Dale, and sort of thank you to the Gulf Council for pioneering the Fishermen Feedback tool, and we've actually started, and are getting close to, implementing what we're calling Saltwater Conversations, which is a very similar tool, sort of based off the ideas that the Gulf Council originally had, and so we're fortunate in that both councils have this tool that might be able to help jumpstart this, and so credit where credit is due, and thank you to the Gulf Council for starting that.

MR. ROLLER: I am starting to hear that everyone is really happy with "mackerel port meetings", and so I am seeing a lot of nodding heads, and so good. Do we want to move on?

MS. WIEGAND: This is sort of the last thing to discuss today, and I will say that we can have some sort of broad discussions about your concerns, and then staff can go back and discuss this a little bit more, and bring you stuff in June, because I think this is where things could get a little challenging, and it's how these meetings will be structured and facilitated.

Similar to the way that visioning was done, the idea would be that staff would conduct these meetings in the key coastal communities, and it would be open to the public. Stakeholders would be invited to participate, and we would be relying heavily on our AP members, as well as council members, to sort of help us reach out to stakeholders and let them know that these meetings are going on and then to be present at the meetings, while we're conducting them.

Some of the things we're going to have to grapple with are should meetings for king and Spanish mackerel be held separately. Based on some of the information that you guys have sort of asked us to gather from stakeholders, it seems like it may be ideal to hold them together, and to hold meetings together for each sector, but certainly input from you on that would be welcomed.

The other thing we're going to have to grapple with is key fishing times for these species don't necessarily line up. When the king mackerel fishery is kicking-off, you might not have the Spanish mackerel fishery, and the recreational and commercial fisheries occur at different times, and so not so much a discussion point, but something that we wanted to let the council know and acknowledge that we're going to have to work pretty hard to structure these meetings at a time where it's going to be -- To schedule these meetings at a time where it's going to be convenient

for stakeholders to come, given that at least one of these fisheries is kicking-off at any given point in the year, and so that's something we'll work on, but certainly any input from you all is helpful.

Then, again, like I said earlier, the idea is that we would have all interested stakeholders attend, and port meetings would be held in sort of key communities along the coast, based on where the landings are high, where permit concentration is high, and staff will sort of work to identify the key areas up and down the coast, certainly talking to our AP members and working with the Gulf and ASMFC. I will just pause, real quick, to see if anyone has any thoughts on that.

MR. ROLLER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: I think, just to be practical, I think you need to have both species together, and I think it's challenging enough to get people to come to these meetings, and, the more we parse it out, probably the more attendance and participation will be, plus, I think there's enough overlap between the way these fisheries operate for these two species that it makes sense to have them together. The timing thing, that's just going to be a challenge, you know, and, generally, probably, you know, the winter months are when people are most likely to not -- I mean, obviously, there's exceptions to that, but most people have availability to attend meetings.

MR. ROLLER: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: It might be something that you have meetings structured so that they like start at six o'clock at night, because that gives people opportunity -- I know, particularly Hatteras, North Carolina, it's very important for king mackerel, for all of Dare County, and it gets focused down there in October and November and through the winter, and so, if you had it at six o'clock at night, that gives them ample opportunity maybe to come in a little bit earlier and be ready for a meeting, a fishery meeting, a port meeting.

MR. ROLLER: Judy and then Mel.

MS. HELMEY: That's a very good idea to do, and I agree with Dewey, but what about being able to call-in, because a lot of people might not be able to make it to the meeting, and they still might be fishing, and maybe give a way to call-in and make their comment, too.

MS. WIEGAND: That's something that I think staff can discuss how we would want to facilitate something like this, and I think part of what's going to be different about these meetings, compared to sort of normal scoping public comments, is the idea is not so much to have fishermen get up and make comment and sit back down, and it's much more about sort of a two-way dialogue between, you know, you all, as council members, and us as staff, and the fishermen and each other, and so I'm not sure how we would facilitate having people both in the room and online, but that's certainly something staff could discuss.

MR. ROLLER: Mel.

MR. BELL: Well, Judy was kind of going where I was going, and, you know, I know this is about being in-person and the interaction and that sort of thing, but then I also know we've been occasionally disappointed by turnout at meetings, and so I was trying to maximize input somehow, and so I was -- Whether it was the ability for people to call in and participate or provide input on

very specific questions or something, and I am just trying to maximize what you're getting, but I realize it's a little bit different dynamic, but I just was trying to not -- I am positive that we're going to get good turnout, but I've just been around for a while, and I've watched this.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Mel. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I was just going to agree with Dewey on timing and everything, and, probably at least for North Carolina, the Hatteras area, again, winter, after Christmas, through that timeframe in March, and then a question. How many are you talking about and your staff capacity to do these? I am concerned about that, because, at the same time, I'm thinking definitely the Hatteras area, and probably the Wilmington area, in North Carolina, but that's two meetings in one state, and is that too much? Anyway, just to throw those two venues out for North Carolina, but I am concerned about your capacity.

MS. WIEGAND: I certainly appreciate that concern. In terms of specific locations, I think one of the things we'll do is, you know, looking at landings, permits, discussions that have been had with fishery performance reports, and around this table specifically about key communities that you all know, and we'll present those to you in June for comment, to make sure that we're sort of hitting the right areas.

In terms of staff capacity, my hope would be that, in addition to our staff, that there is ASMFC staff that would be willing to help, and then, depending on the extent to which the Gulf Council to be involved, staff there that would be willing to help, and so, hopefully, between all of the groups that are interested in being involved in these port meetings, we would have the staff to properly facilitate a meeting.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think the other councils to the north are also interested, and, you know, there's growing interest in the Mid-Atlantic and New England, particularly in Spanish, and, you know, I've talked with Chris some about this, and I know they're interested in helping us out with their staff, where they can, particularly as we cross over into their area, and so we'll have a lot of help.

MR. ROLLER: I guess I've got two names, and I've got Dewey and Jessica, but, before that, I just wanted to go to that point, and where are we looking to have this boundary? Are we talking about going all the way up through New England, and I saw the management area line is Rhode Island, right, and so what's our -- I just wanted to get some clarification of what our plan is, because there seems to be a lot of these fish being caught in Massachusetts, in particular.

MS. WIEGAND: Just to provide some background on that, your current management jurisdiction for king and Spanish mackerel does go through the Mid-Atlantic Council's jurisdiction, and so that's through that New York/Connecticut/Rhode Island line that's out in the water, and so, if you're thinking about driving up 95, it's to New York, and that's where you stop. There was interest, in December, at this council, of continuing that all the way up through New England, given that we have heard -- We've seen some landings, and that the ASMFC does manage all the way up through New England, and so there was a desire, in December, to sort of do the entire Atlantic coast, but I certainly would welcome more discussion on that, if that is no longer the intent.

MR. ROLLER: I've got three names, and I'm going to go to Dewey and then Jessica and then Bob.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Given they're in-person meetings, maybe you would have a webinar, and you would have your in-person meetings, and then you would set a date for one webinar, but I think the basis that's really good is your one-pager explaining what this is about can get attention, and can bring out the folks, and it depends on -- You know, don't tell them the sky is falling, because that would really get them out, but just a few different things, and, also, you might enlist the help of some Atlantic states, when you get further up above, and get their input, from the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and members that sit on there, about some of their input, given that this is going to be ten months away, or something like that, and there's a lot of planning there, but I would recommend, also, when you're in-person, to have at least webinar that folks like Judy was talking about, or somebody that has looked at this, after the end of all the in-person meetings, that they could attend, and you all could explain, maybe with a video tutorial or something like that, and that seems to educate kind of quick and good.

MR. ROLLER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Back on, you know, how to staff these and who can help, I think that the state agency folks -- I know that we would be willing to send people to help run these meetings, and I think it would -- In order to do it great, you would want to have multiple people there to try to help capture what people are saying, since we're kind of meeting people where they are, and so I think that state folks could help here.

MR. ROLLER: Bob.

MR. BEAL: Thank you. Just thinking of the northern end of this, I think we could probably stop at the south shore of Massachusetts, you know south of Cape Cod, and they're not -- Spanish mackerel, as far as I know, aren't really getting past Cape Cod, up into the Gulf of Maine waters, and it's too cold, and so I think, you know, the southern end of Massachusetts is probably a good spot to draw a line and stop there.

MR. ROLLER: I've got Judy and then Monica.

MS. HELMEY: I think we have to remember that, you know, you fish on the coast, but they don't live on the coast, and so you really -- The fishermen don't live on the coast, and some of them have to travel hours before they can get to where they fish, and so you might want to get their information, and it might be just important as all the information that you're going to get for somebody who is local, and so the webinar is a great idea, or have a question-and-answer sheet, and that might be a good idea, but you really do need to get all the information you can, based on people who live away from the coast. Also, how are we going to stop them from talking about red snapper?

MR. ROLLER: Christina just has a point on this.

MS. WIEGAND: One of the things that I want to note, before we get too excited about the idea of a questionnaire, is things like that are very challenging for the council to do, because they require Paperwork Reduction Act approval. However, we are in the process of getting that approval for

the Saltwater Conversations and Fishermen Feedback tools that would hopefully feed through, and we would be allowed to utilize those tools as a way to sort of gather information, similar to what Dale was talking about, and so I would say we might not be able to create anything new for this, but you guys have discussed sort of a similar questionnaire-type thing that we're already in the process of getting approval for that might be useful.

MR. ROLLER: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thank you, Christina, for covering the questionnaire aspect. Since your fishery management plan goes through New York, if you're going north of that, you may, just as a courtesy, want to talk with the New England Council, and let them know what you're doing, and maybe they could help get the word out, in some way.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Monica. Do we have any more comments on this? I think we've covered it pretty well.

MS. WIEGAND: All right. Well, the very last thing on this topic is one of the things that I did want to note, especially given the scale I think these port meetings are going to be, is that how would you guys like this process to interact with Spanish mackerel? It's not something that has to be decided on now, and it might be a more appropriate conversation for the June meeting, once you know what you're going to be getting out of the SSC in April, but, if the Spanish mackerel amendment moves at sort of the fastest pace it possibly can, which it may or may not, we would need to sort of conduct all of these port meetings by the end of 2023, the beginning of 2024, so that you guys could have information from that to consider before taking final action on Spanish mackerel.

I have some concerns that that might be too fast of a timeline, and so, again, it's not something we necessarily need to discuss right now, but it's certainly something that I would like you all to keep in mind come June, when we're talking about much more structure for this and we have more information on that Spanish mackerel stock assessment from the SSC.

Then, last, but not least, just sort of next steps for you all, based on the information that you guys have provided, and we'll develop that structure, and we'll talk with the Mackerel Cobia AP this, and begin coordinating with, you know, ASMFC, the Gulf, Mid-Atlantic, and New England Fishery Management Councils, as appropriate. That's it for port meetings, unless people have more.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Christina. Does anybody have any other comments? I have one back-up comment, and I will just say that, when it comes to North Carolina, the Morehead City area is always a great location place, too. We have three real distinct flavors of fishing in our state, and that's one of the three. We have many, right, and we have many, but, if you want to group them, it always seems like that three is a good place to start. With that, I think we can conclude port meetings. All right. We've got one other item of business for the Mackerel Cobia Committee, and that is to discuss topics for the spring Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel.

MS. WIEGAND: Again, just as a reminder, the idea for the April meeting is for it to just be a half-a-day webinar and then to have this AP meet in-person post the June meeting, when we have more information on Spanish mackerel. What we have on the agenda for that half-day webinar

right now is the mackerel port meetings, having them review the council research recommendations, and then talking about some of the impacts of the space center operations that this council has talked about, and so that's all we have on there for this just simple half-a-day webinar meeting.

MR. ROLLER: One thing I want to bring up, and I'm not sure that we want to put it on this half-day, because I think the port meetings will probably take up a lot of that discussion, is, you know, it had been brought to me that people did want to discuss this tournament landings issue, but my concern is, without actually having landings to discuss, it's just going to be more of a similar sort of kind of theoretical conversation. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes, I agree, and I don't -- I think that is way too short of a period of time, and so, if we can put a pin in it and stick it under June, I think the list there is more than enough for a half-day.

MR. ROLLER: I completely agree. Thank you for that. I am seeing some nodding heads. Is there any other discussion or concerns here? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: So you're saying that you're having a half-day advisory panel meeting for Spanish mackerel for --

MS. WIEGAND: We'll do just a half-day meeting in April to talk about these three topics, but then, once you guys review the response from the SSC in June, we would bring this AP together again for an in-person meeting, and usually it's a day-and-a-half, and the subject of that meeting would be the Spanish mackerel stock assessment, in addition to any other things this council feels are appropriate to bring up at that time.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: So, at that point, the tournament could be brought up at that, and there would also be data to provide, because I think, right now, with the questions surrounding the tournaments, it's not crystal clear, to me, exactly how it all operates, and I had a few folks text me, or email me, about, you know, is the check made out to the tournament, or is it made out to the person that's selling the fish, and do they -- I mean, there's just a lot of ambiguity, and a lot of gray areas, and I don't think it's crystal clear, and that needs to be totally looked at, along with the part of what's being caught, how much, how many tournaments are in different states, how is it progressing, and so I think that would definitely be put on the agenda for a full day-and-a-half AP meeting.

MR. ROLLER: Is that something that we would want on our agenda for the June council committee meeting to discuss? I just feel that, to continue discussing it, we need more concrete information, and so I am seeing some yes. Go ahead, Christina.

MS. WIEGAND: I guess I'm going to look down at the agency end of the table, and do you believe that you guys would be able to provide the sort of data that we discussed yesterday by the June council meeting? Is that something that is feasible? For the tournament landings.

DR. WALTER: I don't know, because we have to have the conversation with ACCSP and two of the states, and so I can't answer whether we are going to be able to provide that.

MR. ROLLER: So how about, at a minimum, an update of where we are.

DR. WALTER: We can do that.

MR. ROLLER: Thanks, John. Any other comments, before we close out the Mackerel Committee? Seeing none, we can adjourn this committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 9, 2023.)

- - -

Certified By _____ Date _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
April 17, 2023

SAFMC 2023 Mar Council Meeting (3/6/23 - 3/10/23)

Attendee Report:

Report Generated:
03/13/2023 08:45 AM EDT

Webinar ID
199-009-555

Actual Start Date/Time
03/08/2023 07:37 AM EST

Duration
10 hours 6 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	Addis	Dustin
Yes	Allen	Shanae
Yes	Bailey	Adam
Yes	Batsavage	00Chris
Yes	Beal	Bob
Yes	Bell	00 Mel
Yes	Berry	James "chip"
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Borland	Gary
Yes	Brennan	Ken
Yes	Brouwer	Myra
Yes	Bruger	Catherine
Yes	Bubley	Walter
Yes	Byrd	01Julia
Yes	CONKLIN	00The real CHRIS
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Cenci	Chris
Yes	Cermak	Bridget
Yes	Chaya	01Cindy
Yes	Christoferson	Jill
Yes	Corbett	Ellie
Yes	Cox	Jack
Yes	Crosson	Scott
Yes	DeFilippi Simpson	Julie
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	Dixon	Michael
Yes	Dover	Miles
Yes	Dukes	Amy
Yes	Ferguson	Raven
Yes	Fernandes	Glen
Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Fisher	Jeff
Yes	Fitzpatrick	Eric

Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Franco	Dawn
Yes	Franke	Emilie
Yes	Fredrickson	Ivy
Yes	GLOECKNER	DAVID
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Ghosh	Gautam
Yes	Glazier	Edward
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Gray	Alisha
Yes	HARRELL	RYAN
Yes	HEMILRIGHT	DEWEY
Yes	Hadley	John
Yes	Harrison	Alana
Yes	Hart	Hannah
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Helmey	Judy
Yes	Heyman	William
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Huber	Jeanette
Yes	Hudson	Joseph
Yes	Hull	James
Yes	Iverson	Kim
Yes	Johnson	Ethan
Yes	Kappos	Maria
Yes	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	LARKIN	Michael
Yes	LaVine	Britni
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Locke	Charles
Yes	Lowther	Alan
Yes	Marhefka	00Kerry
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Meehan	Sean
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	Morales	Harry
Yes	Muffley	Brandon
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	OFarrell	Halie
Yes	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	Peterson	Benjamin
Yes	Pierce	Brett

Yes	Pitts	Nicole
Yes	Poholek	Ariel
Yes	Ponte	Marisa
Yes	Pope	Scott
Yes	Ramsay	Chloe
Yes	Rathke	David
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Roller	00Tom
Yes	Salmon	Brandi
Yes	Sauls	Beverly
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Smart	Tracey
Yes	Snyder	Dave
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Yes	Travis	Michael
Yes	Uchino	Pepper
Yes	Vecchio	Julie
Yes	Walter	John
Yes	Wamer	David
Yes	Waters	James
Yes	White	Geoff
Yes	Williams	Erik
Yes	blough	heather
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	collier	chip
Yes	griner	tim
Yes	hallett	robert
Yes	howell	steve
Yes	moss	david
Yes	sandorf	scott
Yes	thomas	01suz
Yes	vara	mary

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2023 COMMITTEE MEMBERS continued

MACKEREL COBIA

Tom Roller, Chair ✓
Spud Woodward, Vice Chair ✓
Robert Beal ✓
Carolyn Belcher ✓
Mel Bell ✓
Gary Borland ✓
LT Cameron Box ✓
Chester Brewer ✓
Tim Griner ✓
Judy Helmey ✓
Kerry Marhefka ✓
Jessica McCawley ✓
Trish Murphey ✓
Andy Strelcheck ✓
Laurilee Thompson ✓
Mid-Atlantic:
Dewey Hemilright/Skip Feller ✓ both
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

SEDAR

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

SHRIMP

Laurilee Thompson, Chair
Mel Bell, Vice Chair
Gary Borland
LT Cameron Box
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
Gary Borland
LT Cameron Box
Chester Brewer
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
LT Cameron Box
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Staff: Christina Wiegand

Dewey Hemilright

FVTarbaby@embarqmail.com

Michelle Duval

Michelle@mellivoraconsulting.com

Scott Lenox

fishinoc@hotmail.com

Earl "Sonny" Gwin (MD)

sonnygwin@verizon.net

Jack McG.
Rick DeVic
Jeff Buemel
Frank Heikes
Nik Mehta

O'Shaughnessy Skip Feller
SFeller3@verizon.net
Jamal Ingram
John Walter
Thomas Newman

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net
843-302-8435

Deputy Director - Science

Dr. Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net
843-302-8444

Deputy Director - Management

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net
843-302-8436

Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd
julia.byrd@safmc.net
843-302-8439

Fishery Scientist II

Dr. Mike Schmidtke
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net
843-302-8433

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net
843-571-4370

Communication and Digital Media Specialist

Nicholas Smillie
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net
843-302-8443

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

Dr. Judd Curtis
Judd.curtis@safmc.net
843-302-8441

Staff Accountant

Suzanna Thomas suzanna.thomas@safmc.net
843-571-4368

Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net
843-302-8432

Fishery Social Scientist

Christina Wiegand
christina.wiegand@safmc.net
843-302-8437

Fishery Scientist I

Allie Iberle
Allie.iberle@safmc.net
843-225-8135

Citizen Science Project Manager

Meg Withers
Meg.withers@safmc.net
843-725-7577

Public Information Officer

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net
843-224-7258

SEDAR

SEDAR Program Manager

Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net
843-302-8438

Administrative Officer Kelly Klasnick

kelly.klasnick@safmc.net
843-763-1050

SEDAR Coordinator

Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net
843-725-7580

Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net
843-302-8434

SAFMC 2023 Mar Council

Attendee Report: Meeting (3/6/23 - 3/10/23)

Report Generated:

03/13/2023 09:03 AM EDT

Webinar ID

199-009-555

Actual Start Date/Time

03/09/2023 07:17 AM EST

Duration

8 hours 54 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended	Last Name	First Name
Yes	Aukeman	Trip
Yes	Bailey	Adam
Yes	Beal	Bob
Yes	Beaty	Julia
Yes	Bell	00 Mel
Yes	Berry	James "chip"
Yes	Bianchi	Alan
Yes	Borland	Gary
Yes	Brennan	Ken
Yes	Brouwer	Myra
Yes	Bruger	Catherine
Yes	Byrd	01Julia
Yes	CONKLIN	00The real CHRIS
Yes	Calay	Shannon
Yes	Cathey	Andrew
Yes	Chaya	01Cindy
Yes	Coleman	Heather
Yes	Cooksey	Cindy
Yes	Cox	Jack
Yes	Crosson	Scott
Yes	Dale (NMFS SERO)	David
Yes	DeFilippi Simpson	Julie
Yes	DeVictor	Rick
Yes	Dieveney	Beth
Yes	Dixon	Michael
Yes	Dover	Miles
Yes	Dukes	Amy
Yes	Dyar	Ben
Yes	Ferguson	Raven
Yes	Fernandes	Glen
Yes	Finch	Margaret
Yes	Fisher	Jeff
Yes	Fitzpatrick	Eric
Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Franke	Emilie

Yes	Freeman	Matt
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Gervasi	Carissa
Yes	Glazier	Edward
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Guyas	Martha
Yes	HEMILRIGHT	DEWEY
Yes	Harrison	Alana
Yes	Hart	Hannah
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Helmey	Judy
Yes	Heyman	William
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Hudson	Joseph
Yes	Iverson	Kim
Yes	Keener	Paula
Yes	Kelly	Bill
Yes	Keppler	Blaik
Yes	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	Kramer	Rob
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Marhefka	00Kerry
Yes	McManamon	Danielle
Yes	McWhorter	Will
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Merino	Joy
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	Muffley	Brandon
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	OFarrell	Halie
Yes	Oden	Jeff
Yes	Oliver	Ashley
Yes	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	Pierce	Brett
Yes	Pitts	Nicole
Yes	Poholek	Ariel
Yes	Rathke	David
Yes	Roller	00Tom
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Shim	Kyuwon
Yes	Smart	Tracey
Yes	Snyder	Dave
Yes	Spurgin	Kali

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2023 COMMITTEE MEMBERS continued

Mackerel
Cobia
3/9/2023

MACKEREL COBIA

Tom Roller, Chair ✓
Spud Woodward, Vice Chair ✓
Robert Beal ✓
Carolyn Belcher ✓
Mel Bell ✓
Gary Borland ✓
LT Cameron Box ✓
Chester Brewer ✓
Tim Griner ✓
Judy Helmey ✓
Kerry Marhefka ✓
Jessica McCawley ✓
Trish Murphey ✓
Andy Strelcheck ✓
Laurilee Thompson ✓
Mid-Atlantic: ✓
Dewey Hemilright/Skip Feller ✓
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand ✓

SNAPPER GROUPE

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Gary Borland
LT Cameron Box
Chester Brewer
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

SEDAR

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

SPINY LOBSTER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Chester Brewer, Vice Chair
LT Cameron Box
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Staff: Christina Wiegand

SHRIMP

Laurilee Thompson, Chair
Mel Bell, Vice Chair
Gary Borland
LT Cameron Box
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
Andy Strelcheck
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

Dewey Hemilright

FVTarbaby@embarqmail.com

Michelle Duval

Michelle@mellivoraconsulting.com

Scott Lenox

fishinoc@hotmail.com

Earl "Sonny" Gwin (MD)

sonnygwin@verizon.net

Skip Feller

Sfeller3@verizon.net

Rick Derctor
N:K Mehts
Frank Helms
Jamal Sigmom
Dr. Jack McGowan

Pat O'Shaughnessy
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. John Watter
Dale Diez

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
(3/9/2023)
Mackeral
Cob. 9

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director
John Carmichael ✓
john.carmichael@safmc.net
843-302-8435

Deputy Director - Science
Dr. Chip Collier ✓
chip.collier@safmc.net
843-302-8444

Deputy Director - Management
Myra Brouwer ✓
myra.brouwer@safmc.net
843-302-8436

Citizen Science Program Manager
Julia Byrd ✓
julia.byrd@safmc.net
843-302-8439

Fishery Scientist II
Dr. Mike Schmidtke ✓
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net
843-302-8433

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator
Cindy Chaya ✓
cindy.chaya@safmc.net
843-571-4370

Communication and Digital Media Specialist
Nicholas Smillie ✓
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net
843-302-8443

Quantitative Fishery Scientist
Dr. Judd Curtis ✓
judd.curtis@safmc.net
843-302-8441

Staff Accountant
Suzanna Thomas suzanna.thomas@safmc.net
843-571-4368

Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator
John Hadley ✓
john.hadley@safmc.net
843-302-8432

Fishery Social Scientist
Christina Wiegand ✓
christina.wiegand@safmc.net
843-302-8437

Fishery Scientist I
Allie Iberle ✓
Allie.iberle@safmc.net
843-225-8135

Citizen Science Project Manager
Meg Withers
Meg.withers@safmc.net
843-725-7577

Public Information Officer
Kim Iverson ✓
kim.iverson@safmc.net
843-224-7258

SEDAR

Administrative Officer Kelly Klasnick ✓
kelly.klasnick@safmc.net
843-763-1050

SEDAR Program Manager
Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net
843-302-8438

Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist
Roger Pugliese ✓
roger.pugliese@safmc.net
843-302-8434

SEDAR Coordinator
Kathleen Howington
kathleen.howington@safmc.net
843-725-7580