

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
MACKEREL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Beau Rivage Resort & Casino Biloxi, Mississippi

October 24, 2022

VOTING MEMBERS

Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
Susan Boggs.....Alabama
Billy Broussard.....Louisiana
Tom Frazer.....Florida
Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
Bob Gill.....Florida
Michael McDermott.....Mississippi
Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
Bob Shipp.....Alabama
Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
C.J. Sweetman (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
Troy Williamson.....Texas

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
Phil Dyskow.....Florida
Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
Greg Stunz.....Texas

STAFF

Matt Freeman.....Economist
John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
Mary Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
Jessica Matos.....Administrative and Accounting Technician
Natasha Mendez-Ferrer.....Fishery Biologist
Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
Carly Somerset.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Chester Brewer.....SAFMC
Janet Coit.....NOAA
Peter Hood.....NMFS

1 John Walter.....SEFSC
2
3 - - -
4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Table of Motions.....4
6
7 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and
8 Next Steps.....5
9
10 Review of Coastal Migratory Pelagics Landings.....6
11
12 Public Hearing Draft Amendment 33: Modifications to the Gulf of
13 Mexico Migratory Group King Mackerel Sector Allocation.....12
14
15 Draft Framework Amendment: Modifications to the Gulf of Mexico
16 Migratory Group King Mackerel Gillnet Fishing Season.....35
17
18 Adjournment.....39
19
20 - - -
21

TABLE OF MOTIONS

PAGE 10: Motion that landings reports be provided to council committees twice per year in April and October. [The motion carried on page 12.](#)

PAGE 16: Motion to remove Objective 3, as it is redundant with the newly-added Objective 9. [The motion carried on page 17.](#)

PAGE 17: Motion to amend the language of Objective 1 to read as follows: The primary objective of this FMP is to achieve and maintain optimum yield, to allow recovery of overfished populations, and maintain population levels sufficient to ensure adequate recruitment. [The motion carried on page 17.](#)

PAGE 18: Motion to delete Objective 5. [The motion carried on page 18.](#)

PAGE 30: Motion to add a new Alternative 4. Alternative 4: Modify the sector allocation for Gulf king mackerel by reallocating to the commercial sector 15 percent of the average difference between the total landings from the 2016-2017 through 2019-2020 fishing years using Marine Recreational Information Program's (MRIP) Fishing Effort Survey (FES) data and the total simulated annual catch limit (ACL) for Model 2 in Appendix D for the predicted total landings by sector and the total projected ACL. [The motion carried on page 31.](#)

PAGE 37: Motion to make Option 2 the preferred. [The motion carried on page 38.](#)

- - -

1 The Mackerel Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
2 Management Council convened at the Beau Rivage Resort & Casino
3 in Biloxi, Mississippi on Monday afternoon, October 24, 2022,
4 and was called to order by Chairman Kevin Anson.
5

6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
7 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
8 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
9

10 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** The current Mackerel Committee, Mr. Anson is
11 Chair, Mr. Geeslin is Vice Chair, Mr. Schieble, Ms. Boggs, Mr.
12 Broussard, Dr. Frazer, Mr. Gill, Mr. McDermott, Dr. Shipp, Mr.
13 Strelcheck, Mr. Williamson, and Dr. Sweetman. Mr. Anson.
14

15 **CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. That will take us
16 to Adoption of the Agenda, which is Tab C, Number 1. Are there
17 any changes that need to be made to the agenda? Is there any
18 opposition to accepting the agenda as written? Seeing none, the
19 agenda is adopted. Moving on to Item Number II, Approval of
20 June 2022 Minutes, Tab C, Number 2, are there any edits that
21 need to be made to the minutes? Mr. Gill.
22

23 **MR. BOB GILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On page 53, line 31,
24 "Chairman Riechers" should be replaced by "Dr. Freeman".
25

26 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Did staff get that? Can you repeat
27 it one more time, Mr. Gill?
28

29 **MR. GILL:** Certainly. Page 53, line 31, replace "Chairman
30 Riechers" with "Dr. Freeman".
31

32 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other edits to the minutes? Seeing none,
33 is there any opposition to accepting the minutes with the one
34 correction? Seeing none, the minutes are adopted, with the
35 correction. Item Number III on the agenda is the Action Guide
36 and Next Steps. Dr. Mendez-Ferrer, if you can read those,
37 please, or at least the first one.
38

39 **DR. NATASHA MENDEZ-FERRER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Agenda Item
40 IV will have a review of the coastal migratory pelagics
41 landings, and so this will have Mr. Hood, who I believe is on
42 the line, providing an update on the status of CMP landings in
43 relation to the ACLs, and this is for information only, and no
44 action is needed at this time by the committee.
45

46 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you. Mr. Hood, Peter, are
47 you on the phone?
48

1 **REVIEW OF COASTAL MIGRATORY PELAGICS LANDINGS**

2
3 **MR. PETER HOOD:** Yes, and so I guess, Bernie, if you're running
4 the machine, if you could pull up Tab 4, or Number 4. For this
5 meeting, for our coastal migratory pelagic species, we're just
6 going to go over tables, and we don't have any figures, and the
7 reason for this is a couple of reasons.

8
9 One is, with Hurricane Ian, it kind of slowed things down, and
10 this requires a data request, and we had several other data
11 requests that went in, and so, for example, for gray triggerfish
12 and for pompano, and our LAPPs Branch folks had to work on
13 those, and so it didn't leave them with much time, but one of
14 the things that also is coming to light is that, when we
15 developed those figures that we've been providing, it really --
16 It takes a bit to generate.

17
18 It requires a data request from the Science Center, and they are
19 QA/QC-ing their data, and the data always changes, and so it's
20 not like we have some static spreadsheet that we can pull data
21 from, and then our branch has to take the data and process it
22 for creating, you know, these tables, as well as figures, and,
23 as I mentioned, our branch staff also have to, you know, process
24 other data requests, for actions from all the councils, and not
25 only the Gulf, but the South Atlantic and the Caribbean.

26
27 One of the things that we would like to do is we will still
28 provide these tables, but, in the future, maybe fewer
29 presentations with the landings figures, showing the monthly
30 landings and stuff, and, you know, what we're thinking is maybe
31 once, in April, where you would have all of the previous year's
32 finalized, or nearly-finalized, landings, so that we could look
33 at performance of our different fisheries, when it comes to
34 landing different species.

35
36 Then perhaps, in August or October, we could provide a mid-year
37 report, and that would show, you know, performance within a
38 current fishing year, and so that's just something to think
39 about, but I think it would make things go a little bit easier,
40 and, on our side, we would be a lot more efficient, and so,
41 anyway, just going through these tables, and, again, these are
42 tables that you were seeing back when Sue Gerhart was the branch
43 chief.

44
45 You can see that, for king mackerel, for 2022-2023 preliminary
46 landings, since that season starts, for the Western Zone and the
47 Southern Zone, on July 1, and then, for the Northern Zone, on
48 October 1, we don't have much, obviously, and the ACLs are --

1 We're not even close to really making a dent in those.
2
3 If we scroll down to the next table, the one entitled "2021-2022
4 preliminary landings", you can see that, last year, for our
5 different zones, Western, Northern, and Southern, for the year,
6 we only harvested about 55 percent of the ACL, and we did go
7 over for the king mackerel Southern Zone, and I think you've
8 seen that in previous presentations, and we will be deducting
9 the overage from their quota for this upcoming year, and so
10 we'll be working on that.

11
12 These are king mackerel landings, and these would be through
13 Wave 3, and so that would get us through the 2021-2022 year, and
14 you can see our preliminary landings show that only about 20
15 percent of the ACL was caught, and, Bernie, if you just keep
16 scrolling down, and you can go past this next table. Keep
17 scrolling down to our stock ACLs, and so this is -- We have
18 Spanish mackerel, and Spanish mackerel's fishing year goes from
19 - Let's see, and I think it says it on there somewhere, but,
20 yes, April 1 through March 31, and so, you know, we really just
21 have one wave's worth of landings there for 2022-2023, and so
22 they haven't really harvested a whole lot of their ACL yet.

23
24 Then, for cobia, cobia is a January 1 through December 31
25 fishing year species, and you can see that we're only -- If we
26 take cobia commercial landings, which are through mid-October,
27 and then our cobia recreational landings, which is basically
28 Waves 1 through 3, we're only at 11.8 percent of the ACL, but
29 we'll have to wait and see what happens with our -- With the
30 following waves, you know, Wave 4 and on, which we haven't --
31 We're just getting some preliminary numbers now, and,
32 unfortunately, we didn't have time to incorporate those into
33 this presentation. I think that's it, for me, and I would be
34 happy to take any questions.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any questions for Peter? Peter, I thought I
37 heard you say that you were proposing to make a change to how
38 the landings are provided, and basically have those at two times
39 a year, as far as the graphics that you normally would provide,
40 and that is in fact a proposal, and are you looking -- If that
41 is a proposal, are you looking for comment from the committee?

42
43 **MR. HOOD:** Well, that's just an idea that we have, and we think
44 it would help. It would make things more efficient, in terms of
45 the meetings. We would be spending less time going over
46 figures, which, particularly on the recreational side, since,
47 you know, we're running, you know, two months or so behind a
48 wave, it's kind of hard to have, you know, really up-to-date

1 landings there, and, if we can just focus on two times a year, I
2 think we can really provide some good information on fishery
3 performance, and it would allow you then to also spend more time
4 on other activities within a council meeting.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you. I have a couple of
7 folks, first Bob and then Mr. Strelcheck.

8
9 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and we've had this
10 discussion before, at probably Full Council, if I remember
11 correctly, and we've batted it around, but it seems, to me, that
12 Peter is absolutely right that we spend a lot of time looking at
13 information, which is available on their website twenty-four-by-
14 seven, and so not only the prep time that he's talking about,
15 but we waste council time.

16
17 We've got the same landings report, with different species, in
18 the Reef Fish Committee, and it's a whole lot longer, and it
19 usually has all the graphs that they have to make for that, but
20 we have that information readily available to us all the time,
21 and so we're interested, for whatever reason, in that data, and
22 it's there for us to look at, and I fully support his approach,
23 and I would even make a motion, if that's what you wanted, but
24 to limit the amount of landings reports we're requesting of the
25 agency and that efficiency.

26
27 We tend to dwell on things that we want, but do we really need
28 it, and the answer is, no, we don't, because it's available
29 elsewhere, and so I would urge us, both at council, which is
30 probably where we're going to have to talk about it, and
31 recognize that we're creating, unnecessarily, a time sink, in
32 the Mackerel Committee and the Reef Fish Committee, and we could
33 us that time for a whole bunch of other things, as we've
34 discussed in the past, that we don't have time for, and we
35 talked about that, for example, relative to the IFQ program, but
36 we don't allow ourselves time, because we spend it on things
37 like this, and so I think that's a well-placed request, and I
38 fully support it.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Andy.

41
42 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** I agree both with Bob's and Peter's
43 comments, and I think certainly what we can commit to, if the
44 council is agreeable, and, you know, our landings are updated on
45 a regular basis on our website, and so that link is available
46 whenever the council wants to review the landings.

47
48 I can be prepared to talk about specific issues, fisheries,

1 where we may be bumping up against catch limits, when we're not
2 presenting the full suite of landings during a council meeting,
3 and then, whether it's once or twice a year, whatever
4 periodicity the council decides, we can agree to provide a
5 summary of landings at those meetings.

6
7 To me, it's really important, I think, to have the full annual
8 landings, you know, in place, to give you a summary of what
9 happened the prior year, and then, for particular fisheries
10 where we know that, you know, the landings might affect
11 reopening of the fisheries, to be able to line up, you know, any
12 sort of presentation of data following the season, so that
13 you're advised on the latest and greatest information. Thanks.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I have Susan next, but, first, I just wanted to
16 get a clarification, and so what I thought I heard Peter ask
17 for, or propose, was for the graphics portion of the
18 presentation, and that this would still be provided on a regular
19 basis, and did I mishear that, and, Peter, you can certainly
20 jump in, but are we still going to get the landings at every
21 committee meeting, and we just wouldn't get the graphics, except
22 for twice a year, or is it everything that we wouldn't review
23 but two times a year?

24
25 **MR. HOOD:** Well, I think what we can do is we can always provide
26 you with the landings and provide you with these landings
27 tables, and then -- You know, then, in terms of graphics, and
28 trying to look at landings by wave and by month, provide those
29 twice a year, but we will always provide you with these
30 landings.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Okay. Thank you.

33
34 **MR. HOOD:** In a tabular form.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you for the clarification. Andy.

37
38 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, and, to that point, I think it goes back
39 to what's the purpose, and do you want us to just provide them,
40 and they're in the briefing book, but we don't review them and
41 discuss them, and we certainly can do that, but we're
42 essentially then making a redundant step, in terms of what we
43 already have available publicly, right, and so, to me, it's
44 simply we'll show you where our link is on our webpage, and, if
45 you want to review them for the committee meeting, and discuss
46 them at that point, you would raise it during committee.

47
48

1 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you for that. Susan.
2
3 **MS. SUSAN BOGGS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and what I remember,
4 from the last meeting, was that we asked that that's fine, that
5 we don't go through this step, but, in our briefing book, that a
6 link be there, so that it reminds us, draws our attention to,
7 hey, these landings are here, and then I would just ask, if we
8 have a question about the landings, once we approve the agenda,
9 to maybe say if there are any questions about the landings, and,
10 if not, we move on, but I thought we had discussed that each
11 briefing book would have a link, so that it would be easily
12 accessible for us to go review those landings.
13
14 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right, and so any other comments on this
15 topic? Dr. Sweetman.
16
17 **DR. C.J. SWEETMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think this
18 conversation makes sense, from a practical perspective, in terms
19 of time management, but I am wondering, as we're working through
20 certain amendments, or if a species is overfished or undergoing
21 overfishing, if, at that time, it makes sense to have a little
22 bit more of a detailed description, whether it's graphically or
23 via a table, to try and understand what is currently ongoing in
24 a fishery, just to help the council move forward with some of
25 these amendments here without losing any of this information
26 that we have.
27
28 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I guess -- I mean, the agency staff can produce
29 those, I mean, as a case-by-case basis occurs, and maybe we
30 could request it at that time, and have a little bit more detail
31 for that particular species, if in fact that were the case for
32 that particular moment, but, I guess, Dr. Simmons, do you need a
33 motion from the committee to, you know, go with a certain
34 direction, as to how the information is to be presented, or,
35 based on the comments here, you will go ahead and make those
36 changes for a future committee?
37
38 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
39 think, based on the amount of discussion that we've had between
40 our staff and the agency staff, a motion would be great.
41
42 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I am looking for -- Mr. Gill.
43
44 **MR. GILL:** There's an old saying that says never volunteer for
45 anything. **I move that landings report be provided to council**
46 **committees twice a year in April and October.**
47
48 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a motion on the board. Is there a

1 second to the motion?

2

3 **MS. BOGGS:** I will second it for discussion.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. We have a second. Susan, did you
6 want to -- Do you have a question?

7

8 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, so I would like to see -- I mean, that's okay,
9 but do we need to give direction to staff to provide a link in
10 briefing books, because we don't want that to get lost. I mean,
11 I have the link saved on my computer, but not everybody does,
12 or, if you have someone in the audience that's trying to follow
13 along, they may be wanting to look at the landings, and so that
14 does that need to be a part of this motion, Carrie, or would
15 that be something separate?

16

17 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I think we can add it to the
18 motion, but I think, perhaps, where it says, "landings report",
19 you could say "landings figures", right, because -- Then we just
20 provide the link for the landings on the agenda. I guess that's
21 a question maybe for Mr. Hood and staff, is it seems, to me,
22 sometimes, when we check those landings websites, some things
23 aren't up-to-date, and can we make sure that that happens before
24 we put the link in the briefing book?

25

26 **MR. HOOD:** Mr. Chairman, I can answer that.

27

28 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Go ahead.

29

30 **MR. HOOD:** Our landings are updated as landings come in, and so,
31 you know, I think that the Wave 4 data is, you know, being
32 processed right now, in our office, and so, you know, that
33 information will go up soon on our website, and the commercial
34 landings are, you know, updated through mid-October, at least
35 when we made the table, and they may be updated to a later date
36 right now, and I'm not sure. I haven't gone on the website, but
37 we certainly update those as soon as we get that information,
38 and so it's basically the latest and greatest. Thank you.

39

40 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Susan.

41

42 **MS. BOGGS:** So back to this motion. Should we add the annual
43 catch limits landings, and then would this be for both CMP and
44 reef fish?

45

46 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Well, it says "council committees", and so, I
47 mean, not Mackerel Committee. Certainly we'll be bringing this
48 up at Full Council, and so it would apply to any and all

1 committees, I think, at that point, where we review landings, is
2 the way I read it. Andy.

3
4 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I was going to say that, and then I guess one
5 of the other things that I think we struggle with is we
6 wordsmith alternatives quite frequently, and I think it's very
7 clear, in terms of the direction to staff, that landings reports
8 be provided twice a year, but then we would be providing this
9 link the other times of the year, and so I would encourage us to
10 not maybe get hung up on every detail, with regard to how we
11 word alternatives, going forward, and figure out how we can at
12 least provide that direction to staff, so that we can move
13 motions like this quickly. Thanks.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Any other discussion on the motion?
16 Mr. Diaz.

17
18 **MR. DIAZ:** I am kind of thinking out loud here, and so I just
19 asked Dakus if Texas landings would be ready, where we could get
20 like a full idea of what's going on, and, Dakus, don't let me
21 put words in your mouth, but I think he said that, by April, we
22 could get landings through November 15 from Texas, but it
23 wouldn't be through the end of the calendar year, and so I don't
24 know if that has any bearing on your conversation. Thank you.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Well, I mean, it does and it doesn't, I guess.
27 I mean, you know, as Peter mentioned, at least for the federal
28 landings, you know, they only update it when they get landings,
29 and so I guess that would then apply to any of the states that
30 are providing landings as well, that they would update, and
31 whatever the schedule would be would be when they update it, and
32 just the timing of the council meeting, I guess, and, as long as
33 they're done, you know, on a regular basis, we'll have the
34 latest and greatest, as to when they have it, is the way I look
35 at it. All right. Is there any other discussion? **Is there any
36 opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion is approved.**

37
38 That takes us, I think, to our next item, which would be Item
39 Number V, and that has Dr. Freeman under here, Public Hearing
40 Draft, Amendment 33, Modifications to the Gulf of Mexico
41 Migratory Group King Mackerel Sector Allocation. Dr. Freeman,
42 when you're ready.

43
44 **PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT AMENDMENT 33: MODIFICATIONS TO THE GULF OF**
45 **MEXICO MIGRATORY GROUP KING MACKEREL SECTOR ALLOCATION**
46

47 **DR. MATT FREEMAN:** Okay. Great, and so, from the action guide
48 for this item, it says that staff will review the action and

1 alternatives in the public hearing draft and also review the
2 joint FMP objectives. Staff will present motions from the South
3 Atlantic Council's September 2022 meeting. The committee should
4 discuss the action and corresponding analyses and determine if
5 any modifications are needed.

6
7 If appropriate, the committee may select a preferred alternative
8 and direct staff to schedule public hearings after the December
9 2022 South Atlantic Council meeting. Staff is recommending
10 virtual public hearings and utilizing the Fishbrain and Fish
11 Rules apps, based on little to no attendance for in-person
12 public hearings on other king-mackerel-related documents. I
13 will give staff a moment to open up the presentation.

14
15 These first few slides I know council members have seen several
16 times already. As a remember, for the 2020 SEDAR 38 update,
17 Gulf king mackerel is not overfished nor experiencing
18 overfishing, and so the proposed modification is looking at
19 sector allocations between commercial and recreational, and that
20 is currently at 68 percent recreational and 32 percent
21 commercial, which has been in effect since 1985.

22
23 In considering that reallocation, it's being considered to
24 address the differences in sector landings relative to the
25 sector ACLs while accounting for adjustments in the historical
26 recreational landings, due to the replacement of MRIP-CHTS data
27 with MRIP-FES data.

28
29 I will laugh and say that anyone who was here a few years ago,
30 when I got to go through the Reef Fish FMP objectives, we're
31 still continuing to look at them for CMP, and so, prior to the
32 discussion that the council had this summer, the last time these
33 were modified was back in 1992, with CMP Amendment 6, and that
34 simply increased the number of objectives from seven to eight.

35
36 A NMFS procedural directive does provide recommended practices
37 during an allocation review, which includes reassessing FMP
38 objectives, if they are not current, clear, or measurable, and
39 so, in particular, I think the "current" part, that we can
40 definitely highlight that there.

41
42 The next few slides go through the eight objectives, and, rather
43 than read through them all, I will simply just leave that slide
44 active for just a few seconds, if people need to refresh their
45 memory before we go into the motions. Again, just reiterating
46 this is a total of objectives, and so I put four on each.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a question. Susan.

1
2 **MS. BOGGS:** Do we want Matt to finish this presentation before
3 we ask questions or ask as we go?
4

5 **DR. FREEMAN:** I am fine taking questions during.
6

7 **MS. BOGGS:** So I did have a question about one of the
8 objectives, Number 3, to provide necessary information for
9 effective management and establish a mandatory reporting system
10 for monitoring catch. I don't think we really met that
11 objective, and, I mean, we have the commercial sector, and we
12 have the charter fleet that is now with their data collection
13 system, but how is it being monitored -- I guess is it MRIP that
14 we're looking at for the recreational sector on this? Is that
15 the reporting system?
16

17 **DR. FREEMAN:** Maybe should have waited to get the questions,
18 because I was going to say that the South Atlantic actually made
19 a motion regarding Objective 3, and so let me revisit that once
20 I get to the next slide, and that was perfect timing to segue
21 into it.
22

23 The Gulf Council made a motion, at its June meeting, to add a
24 new objective, and that is that sub-bullet to achieve robust
25 fishery reporting and data collection systems across all sectors
26 for monitoring the coastal migratory pelagic fishery, which
27 minimizes scientific, management, and risk uncertainty. If you
28 recall, that was brought forward to mirror the language that is
29 in the Reef Fish FMP objectives, and so, when I presented to the
30 South Atlantic Council, at its September meeting, they concurred
31 with that idea for a new objective, and so that will be added to
32 the document, as a new objective.
33

34 Following that, they made a motion to remove Objective 3, as
35 they felt that it was somewhat redundant with that newly-added
36 objective, since they both deal with reporting systems, and, in
37 this case, the new one goes a little bit further, in terms of
38 achieving it, and it also addresses the data collection, and,
39 again, stressing that it's across all sectors.
40

41 The other motion that they made was to amend the language of
42 Objective 1, and so I've highlighted the additions and deletions
43 here, and so the way it read previously was that the primary
44 objective of this FMP is to stabilize yield at the maximum
45 sustainable yield, allow recovery of overfished populations, and
46 maintain population levels sufficient to ensure adequate
47 recruitment.
48

1 They modified to read: The primary objective of this FMP is to
2 achieve and maintain optimum yield, to allow recovery of
3 overfished populations, and maintain population levels
4 sufficient to ensure adequate recruitment.
5

6 Just to provide a little background, in terms of their
7 discussion, the reason for that is that Standard 1 from MSA
8 reads that conservation and management measures shall prevent
9 overfishing, while achieving, on a continuous basis, the optimum
10 yield (OY) from each fishery for the U.S. fishing industry, and
11 so they felt that the wording would be better suited to refer to
12 OY, instead of MSY. Before I move from this slide, I will need
13 a motion from the committee in response, and I do see Mara's
14 hand raised, and so I will pause there.
15

16 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Mara.

17
18 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Thank you, and just a question. I understand
19 why they wanted to change it to refer to optimum yield. Did
20 they talk, at all, about why they would leave in the part to
21 allow recovery of overfished populations? I mean, at this
22 point, right, none of the three stocks are overfished, and so
23 they're recovered, and I'm just wondering if anybody gave any
24 thought to that or it was just focused on the optimum yield.
25

26 **DR. FREEMAN:** It was focused on the optimum yield, and I will
27 note -- I was the one who brought to their attention the
28 language from MSA, referring to OY, and so I will take the blame
29 that I kind of put some of the focus there, and they perhaps
30 didn't consider the remaining language, and I see Ms. Boggs'
31 hand is raised.
32

33 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Susan.

34
35 **MS. BOGGS:** So does this not include cobia, which is overfished?
36

37 **MS. LEVY:** My bad. You are correct.
38

39 **DR. FREEMAN:** Then I retract my statement that I take any blame.
40 Thank you, Ms. Boggs, for the save.
41

42 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, you know that I stay so confused up here, and
43 I missed this slide, evidently, when I was going through all
44 this, and so I apologize, and so you're saying you need a motion
45 to adopt all of this?
46

47 **DR. FREEMAN:** The first one is simply letting the Gulf Council
48 know that there is a new motion, and the South Atlantic adopted

1 the one that the Gulf Council put forward in June, and so it
2 would be up to the committee, and you all may want to make two
3 separate motions, potentially, one to remove Objective 3 and
4 then a second to amend the language of Objective 1. Do you have
5 a follow-up question?
6

7 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Go ahead.
8

9 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, don't we have to adopt the new Objective 3,
10 and I agree with this, because I looked back, and I remember
11 when Ms. Bosarge said it needs to mirror what the Reef Fish FMP
12 is, and so I'm glad that they did this, and so -- But do you not
13 need --
14

15 **DR. FREEMAN:** At the top, that would be Objective Number 9, and
16 so we've got a new Objective Number 9, and so, moving forward,
17 we would remove Objective 3, and everything would get reordered
18 at that point.
19

20 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** So, yes, that's what we need to do, and so did
21 you want to go ahead, Susan?
22

23 **MS. BOGGS:** Sure, and I apologize. I understand now, and we've
24 already adopted the first, and now we need to -- **I would like to**
25 **make a motion to remove Objective 3, as it is redundant with the**
26 **newly-added objective. Objective 3 is to provide necessary**
27 **information for effective management and establish a mandatory**
28 **reporting system for monitoring catch.**
29

30 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right, and so staff is getting the motion
31 on the board. It is on the board, technically, but they're
32 putting it in a different location. Is there a second to the
33 motion? C.J. Thank you. All right. There's a motion to
34 remove Objective 3, as it is redundant with the newly-added
35 objective, and then Objective 3 is to provide necessary
36 information for effective management and establish a mandatory
37 reporting system for monitoring catch. Are there any comments?
38 Mr. Gill.
39

40 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. **I would suggest a friendly**
41 **to "the newly-added Objective 9", so it's clear as to what that**
42 **objective is.**
43

44 **MS. BOGGS:** **I'm fine with that.** I wasn't sure what number it
45 was.
46

47 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** C.J., you're okay with that? **Okay, and so**
48 **we'll add to change that to "newly-added Objective 9".** Any

1 other comments on the motion? **Is there any opposition to the**
2 **motion? We have one opposed.**

3
4 All right, and so, as Dr. Freeman said, in order to be
5 consistent with the South Atlantic, as we move forward with this
6 document, is there anyone else who wants to make a motion
7 relative to modifying the language in the Objective 1? Michael.

8
9 **MR. MICHAEL MCDERMOTT:** I will make a motion to amend the
10 language of Objective 1 to read as it's written on the board
11 there.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you.

14
15 **MR. GILL:** Second.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** It's seconded by Bob. Thank you. I think the
18 motion is to amend the language of Objective 1 to read as
19 follows, and we need to get that cleaned up a little bit. Is
20 there any discussion on the motion, while this is being put up
21 on the board?

22
23 All right, and so I think we've got it finished. **To amend the**
24 **language of Objective 1 to read as follows: The primary**
25 **objective of this FMP is to achieve and maintain optimum yield,**
26 **to allow recovery of overfished populations, and maintain**
27 **population levels sufficient to ensure adequate recruitment.**
28 Any discussion? **Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the**
29 **motion carries.** Dr. Freeman. Mr. Gill.

30
31 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we leave objectives,
32 the way I read Number 5 is that's outdated and no longer
33 required. I would defer to the experts on that, but, if that's
34 so, I am prepared to make a motion to delete it.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I think you're correct, as I read it, that it
37 might be redundant. I guess, Dr. Freeman, you have, in the
38 guide, the action guide, that you talked about public hearings,
39 and so any modifications that we make -- I mean, they're going
40 to have to go back to the South Atlantic Council, will they not,
41 in order to be consistent?

42
43 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, sir, and so, currently, we are slated to
44 bring this document to the South Atlantic Council at its
45 December meeting, and, if anyone wants to confirm, but I'm
46 guessing that, if there's any further modifications to FMP
47 objectives -- I think it would still be fine to continue that
48 discussion while the public is considering the action within CMP

1 34, and I think that discussion can continue.
2
3 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Bob.
4
5 **MR. GILL:** Are you waiting on me, Mr. Chairman? **So I move to**
6 **delete Objective 5 as outdated.**
7
8 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a motion to delete Objective 5. Is
9 there a second? Susan, you seconded?
10
11 **MS. BOGGS:** Second.
12
13 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I don't think it needs much discussion. Bob,
14 did you want to discuss it? No? Okay. Any other discussion?
15 We'll make sure we get it on the board first. All right. **There**
16 **it is, to delete Objective 5. Hopefully that's clear enough,**
17 **what it means and ties to, but is there any opposition to the**
18 **motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.** Susan.
19
20 **MS. BOGGS:** I am not sure if I'm on the right track with this,
21 but Objective 7, and I had a note about Number 5, if it had
22 still applied, and so then, if I look at Objective 7, to provide
23 appropriate management to address specific migratory groups of
24 king mackerel, and why would not add, there, Spanish mackerel
25 and cobia, because it's -- Or just specific -- Provide
26 appropriate management for CMP, and I don't understand why king
27 mackerel, and is there some background there of why that's just
28 being singled out?
29
30 **DR. FREEMAN:** I see that Andy has got his hand raised.
31
32 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and, I mean, keep in mind, Susan, that,
33 when you're amending the plan, you're not always dealing with
34 all of the species at once, and so I think this is just a
35 summation of all of the objectives that were added over time
36 being brought together, and that's why you're seeing certain
37 species identified, rather than the collective group of all
38 coastal migratory pelagic species.
39
40 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Susan.
41
42 **MS. BOGGS:** So would it be appropriate to amend that objective
43 to be more broad, or just to remove it, because that's what we
44 should be doing anyway.
45
46 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Andy.
47
48 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Certainly if it's the broader objective to

1 manage the fishery, fisheries, in that same way, yes, then it
2 would be appropriate that you could broaden it and modify it,
3 and I think that's the point I'm making though, is that we were
4 specifically modifying those migratory groups, I'm sure, in a
5 king mackerel action, right?

6
7 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Susan.

8
9 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, I am going to offer up a motion to amend
10 Objective 7, and I'm not exactly sure how to -- To amend the
11 language for Objective 7 to read: To provide appropriate
12 management to address -- Well, hang on a minute. I guess to
13 address specific migratory species of king mackerel, Spanish
14 mackerel, and cobia, because, I mean, this -- I asked this
15 question earlier today, before the meeting, about the difference
16 between the Mackerel Committee and the Migratory Species
17 Committee, and so I don't want to confuse the two. To provide
18 appropriate management for king mackerel, Spanish mackerel, and
19 cobia.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** So staff is trying to catch up here, Susan, and
22 do you want to try to -- Do you want to go ahead and re-read
23 that?

24
25 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, what I would like to do here is add Spanish
26 mackerel and cobia, because I think that is one of our
27 objectives, is that we need to appropriately manage those
28 species. I am not exactly sure -- I don't know if you would say
29 specific migratory groups of king mackerel, Spanish mackerel,
30 and cobia, since you've got your Atlantic and your Gulf and your
31 mixing zones, and I'm not exactly sure how would be the
32 appropriate way to word that, and so I am looking at staff for
33 maybe some assistance.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I wonder if you could just leave off any
36 reference to those species, since they are already identified in
37 the CMP, and just say specific migratory groups, and just leave
38 it at that?

39
40 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, and that's when I made the comment. We have
41 our Mackerel Committee, and we have our Migratory Species
42 Committee, and so does that -- Maybe I need to wait until Full
43 Council and have some discussion, but I just don't understand
44 why -- I understand what Andy says, and that's really how I
45 figured it came about, and that's why we're here now, is we're
46 trying to kind of clean up what has happened over the years, but
47 we've removed Objective 5, which addresses the Spanish mackerel,
48 and so I hate to leave them completely out of our objectives,

1 but nowhere in here do we address cobia, and I can wait until
2 Full Council.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Simmons.

5

6 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just
7 a suggestion, and could we just say to address specific coastal
8 migratory pelagic groups? I am looking back at Ryan, since he
9 has probably the most historical knowledge of the different
10 groups for management of the CMP species, to see if that makes
11 sense.

12

13 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** I caught the last nine words of that, Dr.
14 Simmons, which is just enough for me to get in trouble.

15

16 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** The motion.

17

18 **MS. BOGGS:** Mr. Chair, I will wait until Full Council and work
19 with staff and try to bring something back that makes a little
20 more sense. Thank you.

21

22 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Any other -- Dr. Freeman.

23

24 **DR. FREEMAN:** Sure. Given that there was a little bit of a lag,
25 I did at least, for the last objective, try to see if there was
26 any discussion in CMP Amendment 6, and it said to optimize the
27 social and economic benefits of the coastal migratory pelagic
28 fisheries, and so, actually, can we -- I am kind of curious why
29 7 was -- It was older, and I haven't -- Unfortunately, because
30 the internet is slow.

31

32 The rationale there was that this new objective provides a goal
33 to enhance economic benefits to all groups, and so perhaps what
34 was suggested -- We might can modify that language for Objective
35 7 to be similar to Objective 8, perhaps.

36

37 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you. All right. I don't see
38 any other hands, and do you want to continue with the
39 presentation, Matt?

40

41 **DR. FREEMAN:** Certainly. I think we're all caught up on this,
42 and certainly, if anyone has additional thoughts on the FMP
43 objectives for Full Council, that gives us more time to revisit
44 those. We can move to the next slide, the purpose and need,
45 and, if you recall, this was updated at the June meeting.

46

47 There was an addition, that last part that says, "aim to
48 continue to achieve optimum yield from the Gulf king mackerel

1 stock", and so that was added in June, and, when I presented the
2 purpose and need statements to the South Atlantic Council in
3 September, they were in agreement with those.

4
5 Moving forward, a lot of this will look familiar to council
6 members, and this looks at recent landings history, as well as
7 the percent of the sector ACL landed. As you will note, in the
8 third-to-last column, for the commercial sector, the percent
9 sector ACL landed, where it has gone above the commercial ACL,
10 those are highlighted, and so you will note that the commercial
11 sector, in recent history, has exceeded, or come very close, to
12 their sector ACL, and then, in the second-to-last column, for
13 the recreational sector, they have been slightly less than half
14 of their sector ACL, in terms of their landings.

15
16 Alternative 1, as usual, is our no action, and, in this case,
17 this would maintain the current sector allocation, which I
18 mentioned previously is 32 percent commercial and 68 percent
19 recreational.

20
21 With Alternative 2, here, we are looking at modifying the sector
22 allocation by reallocating to the commercial sector 25 percent
23 of the average difference between the total landings from the
24 2016-2017 through 2019-2020 fishing years, using MRIP-FES data,
25 and the total simulated ACL from Model 2, which is located in
26 Appendix D, for the predicted total landings by sector and the
27 total projected ACL. The resulting sector allocation would then
28 be 42 percent commercial and 58 percent recreational.

29
30 Alternative 3 takes a similar approach, except, in this case,
31 instead of reallocating to the commercial sector 25 percent of
32 the average difference, here it's reallocating 50 percent of the
33 average difference. The resulting sector allocations for Gulf
34 king mackerel would then be 53 percent commercial and 47 percent
35 recreational. If we move to the next slide, there's sort of a
36 summary there of that.

37
38 Okay, and so that bottom table goes through the three
39 alternatives and then shows what the sector ACL would be, as
40 well as the sector allocations, and so, again, Alternative 1
41 would be 68 percent rec and 32 percent commercial, and
42 Alternative 2 would be 58 percent rec and 42 percent commercial,
43 and Alternative 3 would be 47 percent rec and 53 percent
44 commercial.

45
46 Again, the council members have seen this table before as well,
47 and I will go through it again, but the top portion is looking
48 at the average recreational landings from the last four fishing

1 years, the time the document was started, which was 2016-2017
2 through 2019-2020, and that was roughly 4.6 million pounds, and,
3 if we compare those average historical landings, in FES, to what
4 is proposed for the rec sector's ACL under Alternative 2 and
5 Alternative 3, that's 80.2 percent and 97.6 percent, and I do
6 want to clarify, again, that this is not -- This entire table is
7 not projecting forward what might occur, and this is simply sort
8 of backward-looking, in comparison to what is being proposed.

9
10 The middle portion of this table is taking the average
11 commercial landings from that simulated Model 2 in Appendix D,
12 and, in essence, as you all saw just a little while ago, the
13 commercial sector has been constrained, at times, by its ACL,
14 and so Model 2, in that case, the ACL, as simulated, was higher,
15 and so, here, the predicted commercial landings for those four
16 years would have been 4.1 million pounds.

17
18 In comparison to the commercial sector ACLs, under Alternative 2
19 and Alternative 3, those landings would result in 97.3 percent,
20 proportional to the proposed ACL, and 78.2 percent of the
21 proposed ACL under Alternative 3.

22
23 The bottom portion of the table, similar to the top portion,
24 looks at what was actually landed, and so the average commercial
25 landings for those four years was about 2.85 million pounds. As
26 a percentage of the proposed commercial ACL under Alternative 2,
27 that is 67.3 percent and 54.1 percent, and, if we go forward
28 another slide, again, this shows the Gulf king mackerel bag
29 limit distribution from the 2015-2016 through 2019-2020 fishing
30 years.

31
32 It is weighted more towards one king mackerel per person, and
33 keeping in mind, of those years that's looking at the bag limit
34 distribution, the rec daily bag limit increased to three fish
35 per person per day during the 2017 fishing year. However, the
36 king mackerel per person is still skewed towards one per person.

37
38 This is an old request from a council member, but we did keep it
39 in though, and it looks at the recreational catch, versus
40 release, in FES, over a five-year time period.

41
42 These are some tentative next steps that the committee and
43 council can consider, which is selection of a preferred
44 alternative, as well as approval for public hearings, and those
45 could potentially occur as early as January of next year. The
46 next steps, at this point, more closely, time-wise, would be to
47 bring CMP 33 back to the South Atlantic Council at its December
48 meeting, to see if they would also select a preferred

1 alternative, and approve public hearings, based off of what the
2 Gulf Council does at this meeting. At a minimum, it appears
3 that I will need to still bring CMP 33 back to them for
4 consideration and modification of the joint FMP objectives.

5
6 If those public hearings are held, we could potentially bring
7 CMP 33 back to the Gulf Council at its April meeting, to go
8 final, and to the South Atlantic Council at its June meeting, to
9 go final, and so that's the end of the presentation, if there's
10 any questions or discussion.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Mendez-Ferrer.

13
14 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Before the committee goes back to making
15 deliberations with the questions that Matt just presented, I
16 also wanted to let you know that we have scheduled a CMP AP
17 meeting for December 1 of this year, and we're planning on
18 presenting this document, to gather feedback from the AP.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you, Dr. Freeman. Mr. Gill.

21
22 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One question I have is why
23 is the fishing year 2020-2021 not included in the document?

24
25 **DR. FREEMAN:** Certainly, and so that's a great question. That
26 was at the time that the IPT started, and one of the discussions
27 is usually sort a terminal year for data, and so that was the
28 most recent, at the time, and that was when the -- That was the
29 last year that we used, in terms of our data analysis, and so a
30 follow-up?

31
32 **MR. GILL:** To that point, it's one thing to have a terminal year
33 for data for assessment purposes, and it's another thing in
34 terms of consideration of what the management issues ought to be
35 relative to it, and I think this document is incomplete, and not
36 ready for public hearings, until that portion is in there for
37 council consideration as to how to handle king mackerel relative
38 to the most recent landings, rather than something that is two
39 or three years old.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Go ahead, Bob.

42
43 **MR. GILL:** I don't want to hog the conversation, if someone else
44 has something to say.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I don't see any -- I see a hand now. Mr.
47 Williamson.

48

1 **MR. TROY WILLIAMSON:** To add to Bob's point, the 2019 and the
2 2020 season were COVID years, and so I think that, you know,
3 there were probably less fishermen out there, and the data for
4 that year is probably an anomaly.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I've got a couple of folks. I've got Susan and
7 then Dr. Frazer.

8
9 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, I would argue just the opposite, Mr.
10 Williamson. During COVID, I can tell you that our fuel sales,
11 at our fuel dock, in March and April, surpassed June and July of
12 any prior year, and people were out fishing, and so, if
13 anything, I would think that that's probably, you know, very
14 telling of actually what was happening, because I feel like
15 there were more fishermen out on the water than there have ever
16 been.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Frazer.

19
20 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and so I agree with
21 Bob as well. I mean, there's a couple of things that we do
22 know, right, and so, prior to the 2019 year, you know, we had
23 about 2.3 million pounds of fish that were harvested by the
24 recreational sector, and then, for 2019, it was 1.6, and, even
25 without that missing year, right, when we look at the update
26 that was just provided by Peter, we're down to 1.1 million
27 pounds, and so there's clearly a trend, right, in the
28 recreational catches, and I think it's reflected over the last
29 decade or so.

30
31 When I'm thinking about this particular amendment, and this
32 particular action item, I see a couple of things that are worth
33 considering, you know, a continued decline in the recreational
34 catches, and, this past year, some declines in the commercial
35 catches, and, in particular sectors, a continued discussion, in
36 the public comment periods, about a reduction in the size
37 structure, and potential concerns over recruitment, and so I
38 want to see all of that data, to be honest with you, to kind of
39 fully evaluate where we are with this amendment, before we -- I
40 mean, we can still have a discussion about picking a preferred,
41 but these are things that I'm thinking about, and that's why I
42 think that they are important.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Andy.

45
46 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Tom raises a lot of good points, and I guess I
47 did want to go back to Bob's comment, and I think this is the
48 challenge, as we work through the management process, because

1 we're very deliberate, and it takes a long period of time,
2 obviously, to work on these actions, and then the data become
3 stale, right, and so we're then in a situation where we're
4 having to potentially add a year of data at a time, you know, in
5 order to keep it up-to-date.

6
7 In this instance, there's some things that are changing in the
8 fishery, obviously, that could be relevant, obviously, to our
9 decision about how to allocate king mackerel, and I think that's
10 important to consider, in terms of where both sectors are at, in
11 terms of harvesting their quotas, but I do caution, I think, the
12 council, with regard to kind of this rolling changing of the
13 data, because that puts a lot of additional burden and work on
14 staff to then keep up the data, obviously, with the actions.

15
16 Maybe the solution is we move through things quicker, if we can,
17 and keep that data as closely aligned with the management
18 approach, but, in terms of the actual alternatives, I think it's
19 really important that, you know, if you look at that four or
20 five-year time period that's summarized in the amendment, you
21 might reach one conclusion, but then, you look at kind of the
22 more recent harvest rates, and both sectors aren't harvesting
23 their quotas right now, and the question is then does it make
24 sense to reallocate, and, if so, what does that reallocation
25 look like, or should we be reallocating, based on conservation
26 and management, and so I think I just would encourage the
27 council to kind of think about that as we go through the
28 selection of a preferred alternative.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I have a couple of -- Dr. Freeman and then
31 Susan.

32
33 **DR. FREEMAN:** Bernie, could I get you to scroll back up a couple
34 of slides for me? It's the one that had the columns. Perfect.
35 I did want to note, just offhand, like if you look at the rec
36 sector, that second-to-last column, in the 2019-2020 fishing
37 year, you saw it was 27.9 percent, and the previous year was --
38 I think it says 39.5 percent.

39
40 It's perfect timing that Peter just gave a presentation on the
41 landings. If you refer to the 2020-2021 final landings for the
42 rec sector, that percent of landings to ACL was 29.8 percent,
43 and so it falls pretty much in range, and, if you look at the
44 rec column as a whole, it's actually very much on the lower end
45 of that scale, and then it's certainly preliminary at this
46 point, but, preliminary for 2021-2022, the percent to ACL is at
47 20 percent right now. We're not seeing -- Even if we were to
48 update it, I don't think it's any massive change, really, from

1 what we're seeing historically.

2
3 It would take me a little bit longer to get the commercial,
4 because they have it broken out by component, and so I would
5 have to figure it out for the whole, and certainly, if the
6 committee would like, I can talk with someone from SERO, and we
7 can put that together for Full Council, if needed.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Well, I certainly, you know, going back to Dr.
10 Frazer's comments, and Bob's comments, and then Andy's comment,
11 I certainly understand both sides, and, you know, obviously, in
12 an ideal world, we like to make decisions on the, you know, the
13 most complete and the newest set of data, but there is the
14 challenge of, you know, trying to work through the management
15 process and make decisions, you know, on a timely basis.

16
17 I am afraid that, if we always are trying to look for that next
18 iteration of data, that there will be desire, amongst some
19 members, to delay and such, in order to get that next set of
20 data, to try to help their side or -- So, you know, I would just
21 provide those comments, and so I have Susan up first, and she
22 had her hand up a little bit ago, and then Dr. Frazer.

23
24 **MS. BOGGS:** So, along those same lines, and I understand what
25 Mr. Gill is saying, but we do have the data. I mean, it may not
26 be in this document, but we do have the data available, and we
27 can go, and we can look, and we may have to look a little
28 harder, just like them not providing these reports anymore, and
29 we're going to have to go online, and we're going to have to
30 look, and we're going to have to get the data, and it's the same
31 concept. You're wanting the most up-to-date data, and, well,
32 there it is, and all you have to do is click on that link that
33 they're going to provide, and we'll have it.

34
35 To Andy's point about moving a little faster, I guess maybe we
36 have to look a little harder, and we have to say, okay, we have
37 2019-2020, but, over here, we clearly have the next years that
38 we need to make a decision, but look at CMP 11.

39
40 We finally got it passed, and it started for fishing year 2021-
41 2022, but it's going to start with 2023-2024 going forward, and
42 so I agree that we need to figure out how to move a little
43 faster, and I used to hear this phrase all the time at this
44 table, kicking the can down the road, and, if it's to the
45 benefit of someone, that's what we tend to do, is kick the can
46 down the road.

47
48 This is an uncomfortable conversation, and we did it during red

1 grouper, and we're going to do it with amberjack, and we're
2 going to do it with all these species coming down the line, and
3 I will be the first one to say that I'm not a big fan of FES,
4 but that's what we've got to do, and we've got to find some
5 compromises, but for us just to continue with we need more,
6 more, more, that's just a stall tactic, in my mind. Thank you.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Frazer.

9

10 **DR. FRAZER:** Just let me clarify, and I certainly don't want to
11 discount what Andy said, and so I'm not all about, you know,
12 trying to work with a rolling document forever and ever and
13 ever. What I am saying is that we have a document in place, and
14 clearly Mr. Gill recognized that there was some data, more
15 recent data, that are available, and I think we're compelled to
16 look at the data, and that's all that I'm asking, and, as we
17 move out into a public hearing, this document can stay the way
18 that it is, in my view, right, but, as part of the presentation,
19 we can provide that updated material.

20

21 My only point was that it's relevant data, right, and so we need
22 to know what those most recent catches are, because they're
23 consistent with a trend, right, and it doesn't -- It's saying
24 that things are continuing to go in the same direction, and it
25 allows us to bring up some other things that should be discussed
26 in a public forum, and so I don't think that anybody is -- You
27 know, there is not hard differences here, to be honest with you,
28 and I think everybody wants -- We recognize that there is, you
29 know -- We have to draw the line somewhere, with regard to the
30 document, but, as Susan said, it doesn't preclude us from
31 looking at more recent data, and we should do that, when we have
32 the opportunity.

33

34 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** My comment to that would be just that, I mean,
35 it's one thing to add extra data in, but, if the data -- The
36 data should really only be in there if it helps support the
37 action items and decisions, or recommendations, that are made on
38 those action items, and so, if we add the extra data, but yet
39 none of our action items change to reflect the extra data, then
40 what's the point, at that point?

41

42 I mean, people might ask the same question you are asking of,
43 well, you had the most up-to-date data, and why didn't you make
44 the decision on the most up-to-date data, but yet we didn't do
45 it, and we've used previous iterations, at least up to where we
46 are with the document, and so that's all.

47

48 We are at two minutes over our allotted time. The Chairman has

1 said that we can continue, but he wants to me to be as efficient
2 as possible in trying to get us through the rest of the agenda,
3 and so are there any other comments, or discussion, on this
4 particular item? We still need to address a preferred, if we
5 want. Mr. McDermott.

6
7 **MR. MCDERMOTT:** I was going to ask a question about these
8 alternatives. It looks like, in the first alternative, there is
9 no reallocation, and the second one is 25 percent, and the third
10 one is 50 percent, and was there some kind of reasoning as to
11 how we arrived at the 25 and 50 percent options?

12
13 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Well, there was. I mean, it was -- As I
14 recall, it was based more on the reality of the data. Ryan.

15
16 **MR. RINDONE:** Can you pull up the actual action and
17 alternatives? That will make it easier to explain, wherever
18 that is in the -- Just go to Chapter 2, I guess. Okay, and so,
19 when we had originally wrote this, it was a few meetings ago,
20 and the idea that we were asked to do was to look at the amount
21 of fish that were going unharvested and to compare that against
22 the Science Center model that was done to simulate what the
23 catch limits could have been, had we -- Had we used in FES in
24 the last SEDAR assessment, which is SEDAR 38, and that used data
25 through I think it was 2012.

26
27 If we scroll down a little bit, to get Alternative 3 in there,
28 Alternative 2 says we would look at moving 25 percent of the
29 average difference of the total landings from the 2016-2017 to
30 2019-2020 fishing years using MRIP through that simulation, and
31 the reason why we used 2016-2017 and 2019-2020 is that, in CMP
32 Amendment 26, we redrew the line from where the Gulf and
33 Atlantic migratory groups of king mackerel were thought to be
34 and when they were thought to be there.

35
36 Before that, there was this giant mixing zone that went up the
37 east coast of Florida that was then constrained, during the
38 wintertime, to be south of the Keys and then partly up the
39 southwest coast of Florida, and, actually, Dr. John Walter's
40 analysis of the commercial trip ticket data for that assessment
41 was what led to the contraction, and much better specification,
42 of where those fish actually are and landed.

43
44 Now that mixing zone only occurs south of the Keys in the
45 wintertime, and the amount of mixing down there is just not near
46 the quantity of fish and the volume of area that it was
47 previously estimated, and so it's a much smaller mixing zone.

1 Through that Amendment, through Amendment 26, the Gulf and South
2 Atlantic Councils agreed that the Gulf Council would manage
3 kingfish to the Dade-Monroe County line year-round, and that
4 was, in part, because of the gillnet fishery that occurs in
5 southwest Florida, and so it's a historic Gulf fishery, and so
6 the councils just agreed to let the Gulf be in charge of that
7 area, with respect to that.

8
9 That's why we don't use anything prior to 2016, because, prior
10 to 2016, it was a completely different spatial management setup
11 that we don't use anymore, and that the best science doesn't
12 support, and so that does kind of limit us, in terms of the
13 years that we can look at, but it also has the benefit of being
14 a more recent time series, and we have a lot more confidence in
15 our most recent data than we do data from like 1981 or something
16 like that.

17
18 Alternative 2 just says use 25 percent of that average
19 difference, and Alternative 3 says use 50 percent, and there's
20 not a very specific reason why we picked 25 percent or 50
21 percent, and we considered, at -- Or the council, at one point,
22 considered 100 percent, but, ultimately, decided not to go that
23 route, and one of the main things that the council has repeated,
24 with respect to any consideration of reallocation here, was to
25 make sure that, whatever happened, that the recreational sector
26 would still have enough of an ACL to remain open year-round,
27 since it's been open year-round for decades, at this point, and
28 so the idea was not to rock that particular boat, if you get my
29 meaning.

30
31 If we scroll down to the tables, Bernie, between those two
32 tables, you can see the demonstration of how all that shakes
33 out, and that Science Center simulation for what the catch
34 limits would have been, had we used FES in SEDAR 38, can be
35 found in one of the appendices, and, Matt, I don't recall which
36 one, off the top of my head, but --

37
38 **DR. FREEMAN:** E.

39
40 **MR. RINDONE:** Appendix E, but, here, you can see the effect of --
41 - In this table right here, the effect of moving 25 percent of
42 that difference, or 50 percent in Alternative 3, and what that
43 results in for the recreational and commercial allocations.

44
45 If you change the percent difference that's shifted, that will
46 change the allocations, but this was -- All this work, using
47 this model simulation, using it in a way that we did, this was
48 all at the explicit direction of the council, through multiple

1 rounds of discussions, when we were in the earlier developmental
2 stages of this document.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Go ahead.

5

6 **MR. MCDERMOTT:** Well, it doesn't appear that there was, you
7 know, any particular reason, as Ryan just said, of why we chose
8 25 and 50 percent, and my concern is, if you take out the 2020
9 year, I don't want to be in a situation where the recreational
10 sector is now overharvesting. **I would move that we add a fourth**
11 **alternative that shifts 15 percent to the commercial sector.**

12

13 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Is there a motion?

14

15 **MR. MCDERMOTT:** It is.

16

17 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Okay.

18

19 **MR. MCDERMOTT:** Of course, using the same time series, the 2016-
20 2017 to 2020.

21

22 **MR. RINDONE:** Just to clarify, to add an alternative to -- Can
23 you scroll back up a little bit, Bernie, on the original
24 document, just so I can say it out loud and make sure this is
25 what Mr. McDermott wants?

26

27 To modify the sector allocation for Gulf king mackerel by
28 reallocating to the commercial sector 15 percent of the average
29 difference between the total landings, et cetera, and so like
30 the whole rest of the language would essentially remain the
31 same.

32

33 **MR. MCDERMOTT:** Except for the last sentence I believe would
34 then change.

35

36 **MR. RINDONE:** Right, and so we can leave that last sentence off,
37 and maybe it would be cleanest -- There we go. Maybe that would
38 be the cleanest thing to do. Then just change "25" to "15"
39 percent in the motion.

40

41 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Okay, and so we have the motion on the board.
42 **It's to add a new alternative, Alternative 4, and it would be to**
43 **modify the sector allocation for Gulf king mackerel by**
44 **reallocating to the commercial sector 15 percent of the average**
45 **difference between the total landings from the 2016-2017 through**
46 **2019-2020 fishing years, using the Marine Recreational**
47 **Information Program's Fishing Effort Survey data and the total**
48 **simulated annual catch limit for Model 2 in Appendix D for the**

1 **predicted total landings by sector and the total projected ACL.**
2 Is there a second to the motion? It's seconded by Mr.
3 Williamson. Any discussion on the motion? C.J.

4
5 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Just a question, and so a point of clarification,
6 for me, really, and, Mr. McDermott, are you thinking a 15
7 percent average difference, or are you talking a 15 percent
8 average change in the allocation?

9
10 **MR. MCDERMOTT:** No, and 15 percent of the average difference,
11 which it would essentially be the same as Alternatives 2 and 3,
12 but just 10 percent less than Alternative 2.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other discussion on the motion? Andy.

15
16 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I guess a point of clarification as well, and
17 so Alternative 2, if it was selected as the preferred, shifts 25
18 percent, and it still doesn't indicate that the recreational
19 sector would be catching their catch limit, and so can you
20 explain the rationale again for the 15 percent, versus 25
21 percent, or even 50 percent?

22
23 **MR. MCDERMOTT:** Well, I believe, with Alternative 2, using that
24 same time series, it would put us at like 88 or 90 percent of
25 our ACL, and so, you know, if we were to have a substantial
26 swing, like we did down in 2019 and 2020, and if we would have a
27 swing the other way, and I just am concerned that then, you
28 know, we would be facing a closure.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other discussion? **Is there any opposition**
31 **to the motion? One opposed.** All right. **Seeing none, the**
32 **motion carries.** Dr. Freeman, is that -- We need a preferred.
33 Is there any interest in selecting a preferred, or is it kind of
34 we don't need to do that now, and do we need to have the
35 analysis done for this? Mara.

36
37 **MS. LEVY:** I am not going to answer that question, but I am just
38 going to say, when you bring this to Full Council, right, I
39 think consider -- We just talked about the data lag and how it's
40 becoming stale, and now we've added a new alternative that's
41 going to require an update to all the analysis that has already
42 been produced.

43
44 I'm not saying not to do it, but you're then looking at further
45 delaying the amendment, and it's not so much the data that goes
46 in the tables, right, the landings data, and you can throw that
47 in, but it's the data that the staff have to get and then use in
48 the analyses, and the economic analyses, in particular, I think,

1 gets complicated, and, the more you keep adding years in, you
2 prolong the process, and so I'm just throwing that out there.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Mara. Susan.

5

6 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, I mean, I just sat here and calculated, from
7 2012 to 2020, and I didn't go back and add 2020 and 2021, but
8 the sector, as a whole, on average, has landed -- Or not the
9 sector, but the stock as a whole -- Right at 59 percent has been
10 landed, and so an overage is not something I am real concerned
11 about in the immediate future.

12

13 I mean, I don't have a lot of heartburn on your motion, Mr.
14 McDermott, but, again, it drags out longer and longer, and, as I
15 said, I think at the last council meeting, this council can make
16 a change, if they decide to make a change, and I know this isn't
17 the discussion that we're having right now, but there's a
18 problem with king mackerel, and the commercial sector seems to
19 be able to catch them, and so are they better fishermen than the
20 rec sector? I don't know, and I don't think so, but there's a
21 problem there.

22

23 To see that, this year, we've only caught, what is it, 20
24 percent, to-date, and, I mean, there's an underlying problem
25 here, and so I think prolonging this allocation discussion
26 doesn't address the true problem that we have, and I don't think
27 any of the two -- Either of the current -- Or three
28 alternatives, I should say, are going to hurt the fishery one
29 way or the other, because, right now, it's poor.

30

31 I mean, the only sector that's even bumping up against their
32 quota is the commercial sector, and I'm not saying throw all the
33 extra fish to the commercial sector, and I don't think that's
34 the right answer either, but, to prolong this allocation issue,
35 I don't think it helps us to get to the underlying problem,
36 which is going to be discussions we have to have coming up soon,
37 is what has happened in the king mackerel, and climate change,
38 the warming waters, freshwater, algae blooms, and all those
39 things I do think --

40

41 I think our whole Gulf reef -- Well, Gulf ecosystem is topsy-
42 turvy right now, and I think we're going to see a lot of these
43 kinds of changes, coming forward, and, how we address them, I
44 don't have the answer to that, but I do think prolonging this --
45 If we're going to prolong it, I just say do away with it,
46 because it's not going to get any better, in any direction,
47 allocation, the fishery itself, and so I don't know what the
48 answer is, but those are just my two-cents' worth.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Mr. Dugas.

3
4 **MR. J.D. DUGAS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on your
5 committee, but I do have two questions for staff. I believe
6 that the allocation review for mackerel is every six years, and
7 maybe it's 2025 is the next -- I think I'm saying this right,
8 where we are forced to look at allocations, and I would like to
9 confirm that, and then I have a second question.

10
11 **DR. FREEMAN:** I would have to verify the year on our website,
12 and so I can't answer right off the top of my head, but
13 certainly that policy that the council adopted -- Yes, there is
14 a time criteria, and I can't remember the exact wording, but it
15 was added in that certainly the council can revisit allocations
16 sooner, based off of input, and I believe it was something along
17 those lines.

18
19 **MR. DUGAS:** So we're not forced to take action, is I think what
20 I'm understanding, and my second question is usually Alternative
21 1 is no action, status quo, and it's usually not an alternative
22 that we can choose, and so my question is, can Alternative 1 be
23 chosen at this time?

24
25 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Ryan.

26
27 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes. A clarification, and so there's a difference
28 here, right, and, when we do like most of the reef fish ones,
29 and we've been looking at the reallocation for the reef fish
30 species, we were operating in time series there where we were
31 able to back-calibrate things.

32
33 In the case of -- We were also dealing with though, between the
34 recreational and commercial sectors with kingfish, you have
35 different sizes of fish that are typically targeted and retained
36 by each of the fleets, by a function of where and how they fish
37 and when they do it.

38
39 With kingfish, it doesn't really matter whether it's a
40 recreational or a commercial fisherman, and the practice is
41 generally the same. You're trolling for them, or jigging for
42 them, but, either way, you're targeting hook-and-line, and,
43 you're targeting the same fish, generally speaking, in the same
44 areas, and so the selectivity and retention curves are
45 indiscernibly different, and so, because of that, it doesn't
46 make any -- Like we don't have to do any new projections or
47 anything like that, if we're looking at different sector
48 allocations for kingfish, because it all comes out the same.

1
2 Also, we can't back-calibrate to the original reference period
3 that was used for kingfish, from 1975 to 1979, because there was
4 no formal Gulf-wide recreational data collection program at that
5 time. The one that did exist -- Really, in 1979, it was MRFSS,
6 and it wasn't fully implemented across the Gulf, in a consistent
7 way, until 1981, and it continued to undergo changes all the way
8 through 1985.

9
10 1986 was the first year that the whole program was uniform
11 across the Gulf, and so the reference period here that we have
12 for kingfish -- We can't calibrate to it, but the main thing for
13 why it doesn't make as much of a difference, and why Alternative
14 1 is still viable, is because of the no difference in the
15 selectivity and the retention curves, and so we don't -- It
16 doesn't have an effect, in terms of changing what the
17 projections would be, if you move fish to one side or the other.

18
19 Alternative 1 though also represents what you guys have already
20 approved in the last framework action that you did, following
21 the SEDAR 38 update, and so Alternative 1 is a viable option to
22 choose here, and you've already chosen it previously, in the
23 last framework action, following the last stock assessment.

24
25 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other discussion? Susan.

26
27 **MS. BOGGS:** One of the things, and one of the reasons, I was
28 really taking a hard look at maybe feeling like we needed to do
29 something with this, because it was 2016-2017 when the
30 commercial -- The commercial sector lost fish back to the South
31 Atlantic, and so, you know, that was something that I took into
32 account, that they already reached -- They bump up against their
33 buffers, but it's because their allocation came down, because
34 part of their allocation was moved back to the South Atlantic.

35
36 I think there's a presentation, and I don't know that Matt is
37 going to go through it, but it does talk about and specify all
38 the different reasons why you can reallocate, based on our
39 allocation policy, but that's something that I think that the
40 council should consider, is that change that took place in 2016-
41 2017 for the commercial sector.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right, and so we're still at a point, and,
44 again, we can, you know, carry this over to Full Council,
45 potentially, about the preferred, and I don't see anyone else
46 really raising their hand, and so that might be something that
47 we can bring up at that time, and so, Dr. Freeman, are you
48 finished with your portion of the agenda?

1
2 **DR. FREEMAN:** I believe so.
3

4 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you. So that will take us
5 then to our next item, Dr. Mendez-Ferrer.
6

7 **DRAFT FRAMEWORK AMENDMENT: MODIFICATIONS TO THE GULF OF MEXICO**
8 **MIGRATORY KING MACKEREL GILLNET FISHING SEASON**
9

10 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Please bear with me.
11 Daycare germs are ruthless, and so I'm a little bit out of
12 breath. Agenda Item Number VI is Draft Framework Amendment:
13 Modifications to the Gulf of Mexico Migratory Group King
14 Mackerel Gillnet Fishing Season.
15

16 For this portion, staff will review the action that will remove
17 the regulatory language restricting the Gulf king mackerel
18 gillnet component from prosecuting the fishery during weekends
19 and observed federal holidays. Due to the fast-paced nature of
20 the fishery, representatives of the Gulf king mackerel gillnet
21 component requested this change to enhance the efficiency and
22 reduce the economic burden on the fishermen, and so the
23 committee should discuss the document that we're presenting and
24 select a preferred option, in anticipating of taking final
25 action in early 2023.
26

27 What we have included in the briefing book for this meeting is a
28 Draft Chapter 1 for an abbreviated framework that would modify
29 the language in relation to the fishing season for the gillnet
30 component for Gulf king mackerel.
31

32 Fishing for Gulf king mackerel with runaround gillnet is only --
33 If we scroll down to where that Figure 1.1.1 is, it's only
34 permissible in the Gulf Southern Zone, and so, in this zone, for
35 the commercial sector, we have the handline and the gillnet
36 component. The current commercial season for the gillnet
37 component begins in January, the Tuesday after the Martin Luther
38 King Jr. Holiday, and it is open on that first weekend following
39 the MLK holiday, but it is closed every subsequent weekend and
40 observed federal holiday.
41

42 This is a small group of permitted fishermen, and there are
43 sixteen active permits, and it's a fishery that is very fast-
44 paced, where they have usually like spotter planes that are used
45 to locate large schools of mackerel, which are then targeted by
46 the fishermen, using the gillnets.
47

48 These weekend closures were created because of the fast pace of

1 the fishery, the high catch rates, and they could be landed very
2 rapidly, and so, in the event that the quota were to be met when
3 federal offices and NMFS would be closed, on the weekends or
4 observed federal holidays, and we didn't have someone in the
5 office to be able to implement that change, but, the way that
6 the fishery is currently prosecuted is these fishermen really
7 know what they're catching.

8
9 The fishery also has a post-season accountability measure, in
10 which, if they go over the quota, then there's a payback
11 provision, and so there's really no incentive in going over the
12 quota, because that means that they have less fish to catch the
13 next year.

14
15 We received a request from representatives of the gillnet
16 component during the April 2022 council meeting, which is why
17 the council directed staff to work on a document to remove that
18 language from the regulatory text, and so that's why we're
19 bringing this document to you.

20
21 Some of the concerns that were brought up is that, in the event
22 that the fish were to be landed -- Right now, the closure, the
23 weekend closure, begins on 6:00 a.m. of the Saturday, and so
24 this does not allow time for the fleet to return from the
25 fishing grounds and offload their fish, if they did not catch
26 anything until Friday night, and so we have included the
27 regulatory language in here that we would need to modify.

28
29 If we scroll down to Table 1.1.1, here, in 1.1.1, we're
30 including the landings from the sector. Since the
31 implementation of the post-season accountability measure, the
32 gillnet component has marginally exceeded their quota three
33 times, and so, in the following table, 1.1.2, we can see that
34 this happened in the Fishing Year 2018-2019, 2020-2021, and
35 2021-2022.

36
37 One thing that I do want to note is that there is a discrepancy
38 on this document, with the landings for 2018-2019, between both
39 tables, but we will correct for the next iteration of the
40 document. The correct landings for that fishing year is the
41 631,000 that you see in this table that we're showing right now.

42
43 If we can scroll down to the purpose and need, right now, the
44 purpose of this document is to allow the Gulf king mackerel
45 gillnet component to continue to fish from the season start date
46 until NMFS determines that the gillnet quota has been met, and
47 the need is to increase the Gulf king mackerel gillnet
48 component's efficiency and reduce economic burdens on fishermen,

1 while managing to achieve optimum yield, in accordance with the
2 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

3
4 I can stop here, if the committee has any edits or comments to
5 the purpose and need. Otherwise, we can go to the two options
6 of the different paths that we can take for this document.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Does anyone have any comments about the purpose
9 and need? Please continue.

10
11 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** All right, and so this is kind of a
12 different issue from what we usually hear. In this case, we're
13 looking at a fleet that wants to be efficient and have their
14 fishery close a little earlier, to be able to catch their fish
15 in a more fast -- In faster, more efficient way, and I should
16 mention that many of these fishermen also prosecute stone crab
17 and spiny lobster, and so there is no way to prosecute both of
18 those at the same time, and gillnets take a massive amount of
19 space in the boat, and so, once they're done with their quota
20 for kingfish, they can proceed and continue fishing for stone
21 crab and spiny lobster.

22
23 The two options that we are including here is Option 1, to
24 maintain the current weekends and federal holiday closures for
25 the gillnet component for Gulf king mackerel, being that the
26 gillnet component is open on the first weekend following the
27 Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday, and it's closed also on weekends
28 and observed federal holidays, or Option 2 is to remove the
29 weekend and holiday closure for the gillnet component for Gulf
30 king mackerel, and we can be able to provide what the codified
31 text will look like at a later meeting, and so, right now, we're
32 looking for direction from the committee on if we want to be
33 able to modify this language.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Mr. Gill.

36
37 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. **I move that the preferred**
38 **option is Option 2.**

39
40 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Preferred option meaning -- I think it's a
41 little premature for a preferred at this stage, when we don't
42 have any analysis, and it's probably a simple analysis, but --

43
44 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** So we're planning to take final action in
45 April, but one of the discussions that we had in our IPT meeting
46 was that it would be appropriate to select a preferred.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right, and so there's a motion. There's a

1 second by C.J. While it's being put on the board, Susan.
2
3 **MS. BOGGS:** So the king mackerel fishery in southern Florida, is
4 that prosecuted in state waters or federal waters? I know most
5 of our king are caught -- Well, these days, there's no king
6 being caught, and so never mind.
7
8 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Ryan, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe
9 it's prosecuted in both state and federal.
10
11 **MR. RINDONE:** The gillnet fleet? Federal waters.
12
13 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Federal waters.
14
15 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other discussion on the motion? Andy.
16
17 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I just wanted to speak in support of the
18 motion. I had a conversation with Bill Kelly, months ago, about
19 this very issue, and I think this makes a lot of sense, and this
20 is somewhat outdated, given how we used to collect landings
21 statistics, and we have a very close relationship with industry
22 members, the gillnet fishermen, and get reports regularly, in
23 terms of their landings. Even though they've had some overage
24 in recent years, they have a payback provision, and so I would
25 support the motion.
26
27 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other discussion on the motion? **Seeing**
28 **none, is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no**
29 **opposition, the motion carries.** That takes us -- Dr. Mendez-
30 Ferrer, anything else?
31
32 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** No, and that's it. For the next time that
33 we bring this to the committee, we will be bringing Chapters 2
34 and 3, which have the analyses, so that we can go over that, and
35 hopefully go to final action, and then, that way, it will be
36 implemented for 2024.
37
38 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. That takes us then to the final
39 item on the agenda, Other Business, and there wasn't any, as I
40 recall, when we opened up the committee, and is there anyone
41 else that has any other business at this time? Susan.
42
43 **MS. BOGGS:** It's not other business, but, based on the motion
44 that Mr. McDermott made, with discussion of Amendment 33, will
45 we hold off on discussing public hearings, or what to do with
46 that, until full committee?
47
48 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Simmons.

1
2 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I
3 think we really need to select a preferred alternative, before
4 we go out to public hearings, and we do need to do that at Full
5 Council, hopefully, and then decide what type of hearings you
6 would like to have.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. I don't see any other hands up, and
9 so, Mr. Chair, that concludes the Mackerel Committee.

10
11 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on October 24, 2022.)

12
13

- - -