

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL COMMITTEE

Webinar

SEPTEMBER 28, 2020

**VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 Robin Riechers.....Texas
- 11 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 12 Susan Boggs.....Alabama
- 13 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 14 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS
- 15 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 16 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
- 17 Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 18 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 19 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
- 20 Troy Williamson.....Texas

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 23 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 24 Phil Dyskow.....Florida
- 25 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 26 Lt. Nicholas Giancola.....USCG
- 27 Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
- 28 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
- 29 Greg Stunz.....Texas

**STAFF**

- 32 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 33 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 34 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 35 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
- 36 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
- 37 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 38 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 39 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 40 Jessica Matos.....Document Editor & Administrative Assistant
- 41 Natasha Mendez-Ferrer.....Fishery Biologist
- 42 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 43 Kathy Pereira.....Meeting Planner & Travel Coordinator
- 44 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
- 45 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 46 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Administrative & Human Resources Assistant
- 47 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative & Communications Assistant
- 48 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

1 Carly Somerset.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist

2

3 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

4 Anna Beckwith.....SAFMC

5 Peter Hood.....NMFS

6 Paul Mickle.....MS

7 Clay Porch.....SEFSC

8 Joe Powers.....GMFMC SSC

9

10

- - -

11

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.....5  
8  
9 Action Guide and Next Steps.....5  
10  
11 Coastal Migratory Pelagics Landings Update.....6  
12  
13 Review of SEDAR 28 Update: Gulf of Mexico Migratory Group Cobia  
14 Assessment.....9  
15     Stock Assessment Report.....9  
16     Presentation and SSC Recommendations.....9  
17     Something’s Fishy with Cobia Document.....21  
18     Stock Assessment Executive Summary.....26  
19  
20 Other Business.....27  
21  
22 Adjournment.....28  
23  
24                   - - -  
25

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

PAGE 23: Motion to direct staff to start a plan amendment to reduce the fishing mortality in the commercial and recreational cobia fishery in the Gulf of Mexico, which will include bag limits, vessel limits, size limits, seasons and catch limit options. The motion carried on page 24.

PAGE 27: Motion to request an analysis of king mackerel sector landings and quotas for the past five to ten years with recreational landings and quotas in FES currency. The motion carried on page 28.

- - -

1 The Mackerel Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management  
2 Council convened via webinar on Monday morning, September 28,  
3 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Robin Riechers.

4  
5 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  
6 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
7 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**  
8

9 **CHAIRMAN ROBIN RIECHERS:** I am calling the virtual meeting of  
10 the Mackerel Committee to order at about eleven o'clock or so.  
11 With that, look at the agenda. The agenda is in Tab C-1, and  
12 it's on your screen as well. Do we have any changes?  
13

14 Let me go ahead and read the members of the committee, just so  
15 we have that in the record as well. My Vice Chairman is Mr.  
16 Anson, and we have Ms. Boggs, Ms. Bosarge, Dr. Crabtree, Mr.  
17 Diaz, Mr. Dugas, Ms. Guyas, Mr. Sanchez, Mr. Swindell, and Mr.  
18 Williamson. Those are the members of the committee. Now we'll  
19 turn to Adoption of the Agenda. Do I hear any changes to the  
20 agenda? Does anyone have any modifications to the agenda?  
21

22 **MR. JOHN SANCHEZ:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to add something  
23 to Other Business, a data request for king mackerel.  
24

25 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay.  
26

27 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you.  
28

29 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** The agenda is amended with a data request  
30 from Mr. Sanchez being added to Other Business. With that  
31 amendment, do I hear any motions to approve the agenda?  
32

33 **MR. SANCHEZ:** So moved.  
34

35 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** I have a motion and a second to approve the  
36 agenda. Is there any dissenting opinions about approving the  
37 agenda? We will do it that way. Okay. The agenda is adopted  
38 as amended. Next, we will look at the minutes, and the minutes  
39 are in Tab C-2. Does anyone have any changes, corrections,  
40 deletions, or additions to the minutes? Hearing none, then, by  
41 affirmation, we will approve the minutes as written then.  
42

43 Next, we go to the Action Guide and Next Steps, Tab C-3. I may  
44 not get this right, and so please correct me on the name, if I'm  
45 not pronouncing it right, but Dr. Mendez-Ferrer.  
46

47 **DR. NATASHA MENDEZ-FERRER:** Very good. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
48 For today's mackerel agenda, we will begin with Item Number IV,

1 which will be an update on the status of the coastal migratory  
2 pelagics landings relative to the ACLs, and this will be done by  
3 NMFS staff, and this is informational only, and no action is  
4 required by the committee.

5  
6 Following, we will have Agenda Item Number V, which is the  
7 Review of the SEDAR 28 Update for the Gulf of Mexico Migratory  
8 Group Cobia Stock Assessment, and, for this item, we will have  
9 SSC representative, Dr. Joe Powers, summarizing the data, the  
10 model, the results, and the projections resulting from the SEDAR  
11 28 update stock assessment for Gulf cobia.

12  
13 Council staff will provide an overview on the Something's Fishy  
14 results, and the SSC will also review their deliberations and  
15 assessment, including projections and overfishing limits and the  
16 acceptable biological catch recommendations. Just to let you  
17 know, the projections and catch recommendations included for the  
18 SEDAR 28 update are based on the Marine Recreational Information  
19 Program Fishing Effort Survey. The committee should direct  
20 staff to initiate the appropriate management actions to end Gulf  
21 cobia overfishing.

22  
23 Finally, the Science Center and council staff will discuss the  
24 draft of the stock assessment executive summary, and this is a  
25 summary that kind of includes the information in a more  
26 digestible format, and this type of document will continue to be  
27 used as we review other stock assessments, and so we require  
28 some feedback on what's included in this document as we move  
29 forward. Then, for Other Business, we will discuss what was  
30 just added in the agenda, and so the discussion about king  
31 mackerel, and that is it. Thank you.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Thank you, Dr. Mendez-Ferrer, for the Action  
34 Guide and Next Steps. Next, we are turning to Tab C-4, Coastal  
35 Migratory Pelagics Landings Update, and someone from the  
36 Southeast Regional Office is providing that.

37  
38 **COASTAL MIGRATORY PELAGICS LANDINGS UPDATE**

39  
40 **MR. PETER HOOD:** Let me briefly go through the catch landings.  
41 First, we will start out with king mackerel commercial, and,  
42 basically, you can see that we are close to the ACL, at 98.7  
43 percent, and, for the gillnet fishery, down below that, you can  
44 see it's 98.4 percent, and so we stayed under the ACL.

45  
46 Then, comparing that to last year, it's very similar, and we  
47 were at the same percent, 98.7 percent, and we were over a  
48 little bit with gillnets, but that was adjusted downward for

1 this year, and we were able to maintain ourselves below the ACL  
2 for the gillnet fishery.

3  
4 If you scroll down, we'll get to the recreational side of it.  
5 Right now, we don't have Wave 3 data, which is May through June,  
6 and March and April, Wave 2 data, and that's somewhat limited,  
7 the information that we have, and you can read that paragraph  
8 below, but we have headboat landings, LA Creel landings, and  
9 Texas Parks and Wildlife Landings will be coming soon, and so  
10 we're below what we would expect to see, with reported landings  
11 about 786,000, and so we're well below the ACL. However, we'll  
12 have to wait and see when we get that Wave 3 data, and then I'm  
13 not exactly sure how Wave 2 will be approached, but,  
14 undoubtedly, we'll have some estimate of landings for that.

15  
16 You can see that, like last year, and I talked about how we  
17 don't have landings from Wave 2 and 3, and you see that, last  
18 year, we caught about a million pounds, and so those are  
19 important waves for this sector, and so it will be interesting  
20 to see what shows up then.

21  
22 These are stock ACLs. For Spanish mackerel and cobia, we have  
23 divided it out by commercial and recreational landings, and you  
24 can basically see that we're well below the ACL, but, again, we  
25 don't have those recreational landings, and so it's kind of  
26 tough to tell where we're at with comparison to the ACL. This  
27 is what we had last year, and so, last year, for both of these  
28 species, and, again, we're well below the ACL, and, this year,  
29 it will likely be the same.

30  
31 Now I'm going to go over a series of figures, and these were --  
32 We had put these together for the August meeting, and what we  
33 wanted to do is just sort of show you how does this year's  
34 landings -- How do they stack up relative to previous years, and  
35 so here we have king mackerel landings, and these are for each  
36 year and what would have been presented at the August meeting,  
37 and so it's through that time period, and you can see that --  
38 Basically, it's all the different fisheries and zones, and so  
39 the hook-and-line zones and then the gillnet zone.

40  
41 With the exception of the Northern Zone, we're either pretty  
42 close, and the Northern Zone was down a little bit, and I'm not  
43 exactly sure what happened this year, but it is down.

44  
45 This is king mackerel landings, and I believe this is  
46 recreational, and you can see we're well off, but, again, we  
47 don't have those waves.

48

1 This is cobia, and you can see that, last year, in August, we  
2 were below 2018 and 2017. In 2020, we don't have much there,  
3 but, again, we're missing some important waves, where we don't  
4 have any data, and so it's tough to make that comparison there.

5  
6 This shows Spanish mackerel, and you remember that the Spanish  
7 mackerel season goes from April 1 to March 31, and so, this  
8 year, we've probably got a pretty good sampling of what's been  
9 caught, because COVID probably had a minimal impact on Spanish  
10 mackerel, and I'm not sure why landings for the 2019/2020  
11 fishing year are that much higher. I did reach out to one of  
12 our analysts, and he indicated that he wasn't sure, and it's  
13 something that we are going to look into, and I believe that's  
14 all I have.

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Any questions of Peter regarding his report-  
17 out? I will give anyone time to get their hand up, if they are  
18 wanting to here. I am not seeing anybody. It looks like Ms.  
19 Boggs.

20  
21 **MS. SUSAN BOGGS:** I do have a question on one of the slides, and  
22 let me get back over to it. On page 3, where it talks about the  
23 stocks for the Spanish mackerel, you have got your landings for  
24 the commercial, and you don't have landings yet for  
25 recreational, but your total reported is less than your  
26 commercial, and is that a typo?

27  
28 **MR. HOOD:** To be honest, I'm not sure what happened there. Like  
29 I mentioned, we were getting some landings through LA Creel and  
30 from the headboats, and so I don't know why that wasn't added up  
31 to that time period, and I'm sorry, and I will investigate that,  
32 Susan, and I will try to get back to you on that.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Susan, does that answer your question  
35 sufficient enough at this point?

36  
37 **MS. BOGGS:** Yes, it did. Thank you.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Next up is Kevin.

40  
41 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you. Susan asked one of the questions  
42 that I was going to ask, but then, also, Peter, when you make a  
43 statement in these tables that 2020 recreational landings  
44 include data from MRIP or MRFSS calibrated to MRIP, and is MRFSS  
45 -- Is that the Coastal Household Telephone Survey data that's  
46 being calibrated for MRIP, or -- MRFSS is an old term, and I'm  
47 just trying to get some understanding.

48

1 **MR. HOOD:** Thank you for that question. Basically, in  
2 monitoring ACLs, we try to monitor it in whatever units, or  
3 currency, that the ACL is in, and we have some ACLs, and I  
4 haven't gone back to figure out which particular ACLs are  
5 representative of this, but there are some ACLs that are still  
6 in MRFSS units, and, obviously, we haven't had a stock  
7 assessment, and so we haven't been able to do a conversion to  
8 FES units, and so that is why that statement is in there. It's  
9 sort of a general statement, a catchall, just to make sure that  
10 we remind ourselves that we have several different types of  
11 currencies that we use to monitor our ACLs.

12

13 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you.

14

15 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Next up, I see Mr. Rindone has a comment or  
16 a question.

17

18 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** It's just to Kevin's question, and thank you,  
19 Mr. Riechers. Any species that we have a stock assessment for  
20 that has a terminal year of 2013 or earlier is likely still in  
21 the MRFSS currency. Anything that is 2017 or earlier is likely  
22 still using the Coastal Household Telephone Survey for measuring  
23 effort, and the stuff that we've since updated from then,  
24 beginning with red grouper, uses FES, just so that you guys can  
25 pair a timeline with data currency. Thank you.

26

27 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. Any other questions of Peter or the  
28 Southeast Center on these tables and updates? Hearing none,  
29 then I think we will move on. That will take us to a suite of  
30 tabs under Tab C-5, starting with Tab C-5(a), and I believe Dr.  
31 Powers is going to handle both C-5(a) and C-5(b), both of those  
32 two items. Dr. Powers.

33

34 **REVIEW OF SEDAR 28 UPDATE: GULF OF MEXICO MIGRATORY GROUP COBIA**  
35 **STOCK ASSESSMENT**  
36 **STOCK ASSESSMENT REPORT**  
37 **PRESENTATION AND SSC RECOMMENDATIONS**

38

39 **DR. JOE POWERS:** Good morning. C-5(a) is the stock assessment  
40 report itself, which you can refer to, but let me go to the next  
41 one, C-5(d), the actual presentation. The SSC was given the  
42 presentation about the stock assessment, and the key things to  
43 remember in this particular stock assessment is it was an  
44 update.

45

46 I would just kind of mention there what does an update mean, and  
47 it's basically you're keeping things pretty much the same, and  
48 you're updating the catches, and you are trying to keep model

1 parameters and variances and so on and so forth consistent, and  
2 so there isn't -- It is a scaled-down version compared to a  
3 research track or that sort of thing.

4  
5 If you go to the next slide, the real key point here's are the  
6 FES update, and so, yes, for this particular update, you're  
7 using data through 2018, compared to what was done previously,  
8 and the key point is the Fishing Effort Survey, incorporating  
9 that, as Ryan Rindone just mentioned previously.

10  
11 There are some other relatively minor adjustments, in terms of  
12 how you estimate the growth, whether it's internal to the model  
13 or external, and the selectivity in the particular assessment,  
14 and so let's go to the next slide, where the key points are in  
15 terms of commercial and recreational, and this is still scaled  
16 on equal footing, and so you can see the landings, and this is  
17 predominantly a recreational fishery, and there are some  
18 commercial landings, and they are included, of course, but the  
19 dynamics are driven by the recreational.

20  
21 There are discards of both commercial and recreational, and,  
22 again, look at the scale here for discards in terms of millions  
23 of pounds, and they're rather small for the recreational, and  
24 they're even smaller for the commercial, and so they're not  
25 included in this particular slide, but you can see there that,  
26 over the more recent history of the recreational, there isn't a  
27 lot of trend in the catches. There's a lot of bouncing up and  
28 down.

29  
30 The ultimate review of the assessment is here, and you have that  
31 long burn-in period, where there are some estimates of what the  
32 historical catches have been over the previous eighty or a  
33 hundred years, but the real meat of the assessment starts in  
34 about 1980, when you get the data, and you can see there that  
35 the spawning biomass is less than it should be, in terms of the  
36 SSB at MSY, as it turns out, but it's not overfished. In other  
37 words, it's above the MSST level, but you can see there that it  
38 has kind of bounced around over the last twenty years, and it's  
39 a more or less stable situation, but not exactly what you would  
40 want it to be.

41  
42 If you go the next slide, if you put it in the more recent years  
43 there, and you can see it a little bit better. Remember that  
44 horizontal line is the MSY level, but it's still above the MSST  
45 level.

46  
47 If you look at this in terms of a COBI plot, you can see, on the  
48 lower-right-hand side, the not overfished conditions, not

1 undergoing overfishing, but it progressed through to about 1980,  
2 and then, since 1980, you've got, again, that bouncing around.  
3 If you go to the next slide, again, you can see the scale a  
4 little bit better.

5  
6 The 2018 point, and it's hard to see there, is in that pink  
7 area, and not the red, but in the pink, and it's that little  
8 square there, and so, basically, we're saying that the fishing  
9 mortality rate is a bit higher than it should be, and the  
10 biomass is above MSST, and so that is the status that we have  
11 with this.

12  
13 In terms of the dynamics of recruitment, again, and this sort of  
14 reflects what I said before about since 1980, there hasn't been  
15 a lot of deviations, and it's up and down, and so you can see  
16 there that the average recruitment over that time period has  
17 been relatively stable, with perhaps a bit lower levels in the  
18 early 1980s.

19  
20 The recent average is not too much different than the long-term  
21 average, as you can see there with the line, and this comes in  
22 in terms of how you do the projections, which we used the recent  
23 average, but, again, it doesn't make a lot of difference there.

24  
25 The real key points are here, and this gives the actual  
26 statistics, and the key points are is the stock overfished, and  
27 no. The current level is less than SSB at SPR 30, which is the  
28 FMSY proxy, but it's greater than the minimum stock size  
29 threshold, that 1.1, and so the stock is not overfished.

30  
31 In terms of the overfishing, again, the fishing mortality rate  
32 is about 44 percent higher than the MFMT, the fishing mortality  
33 rate at FMSY, and so you can see there, right above the red  
34 entry there, it says F current over MFMT is 1.44, and so, yes,  
35 it is overfishing.

36  
37 Therefore, based on this, and review of the presentation and  
38 review of the stock assessment report itself, the council  
39 determined that this is the best available information and that  
40 the stock is not overfished, but it is undergoing overfishing,  
41 and that was the crux of the conclusion about the status that  
42 the SSC made.

43  
44 There were a couple of projections that were done prior to the  
45 meeting, in terms of -- Prior to the SSC meeting, and one of  
46 them was that the F 30 percent SPR, which is equivalent to an  
47 overfishing level, and, if you look at the left, that's the  
48 yield stream for 2015 through 2030, and you see the ups and

1 downs there.

2  
3 2015 through 2018 was the actual catches that occurred, and then  
4 the projections through the particular point there, and the  
5 optimum yield is the lower dotted line, and the consequences of  
6 that, in terms of the status of the stock, is on the right-hand  
7 side, and you can see there, in the red, the dotted line in the  
8 lower part of the red is the minimum stock size threshold, and  
9 the stock is operating above that, and, depending on which of  
10 these projections you choose, it approaches, or exceeds, the  
11 biomass at 30 percent SPR.

12  
13 This left the SSC with some issues, in terms of how best to  
14 incorporate uncertainty in this particular stock assessment.  
15 The analysts, and the Center themselves, had recommended that  
16 there was a fair amount of uncertainty there that was not  
17 incorporated in certain areas of the model, and so that should  
18 probably be incorporated, in terms of how you adjust the ABC/OFL  
19 sort of continuum.

20  
21 The SSC did a quick review of, if we used the ABC control rule,  
22 Tier 1, and went through that process, you would get a  $P^*$  of  
23 about 0.398, which would be -- It should be 39.8 percent, but  
24 the probability of overfishing should not exceed that level,  
25 but, based on both the recommendations of the Center and the  
26 conclusions of the SSC, they felt that this did not adequately  
27 describe the uncertainty.

28  
29 Therefore, the SSC suggested that the updated yield stream be  
30 based on 75 percent of  $F_{30\% \text{ SPR}}$ , and that would  
31 incorporate a better understanding of the uncertainty, and so,  
32 therefore, there was the next slide, and we had a motion, and we  
33 give the motion there, which gives all the details.

34  
35 It basically is defining the OFL over the 2021 to 2023 period  
36 time is about three-million pounds, and so starting at 3.03 and  
37 3.31 million pounds whole weight, and that the ABC is 2.34 up to  
38 2.78, and this is based on that 75 percent  $F_{30\% \text{ SPR}}$ .  
39 These are, as I recall, above the current -- The current catches  
40 are below what these projections are, but this is the basic  
41 endpoint of the determination of the SSC, in terms of OFL and  
42 ABC.

43  
44 If we show on the next slide, if you incorporate those into the  
45 projection of the graph, this is essentially where those yields  
46 are, and it would be relative to the recent history since 2015,  
47 and recalling again that the last estimate that was in the  
48 assessment is 2018. That is the essence of the SSC's

1 information here, and are there any questions?  
2  
3 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Does anyone have some questions of Joe? It  
4 looks like Dr. Frazer has his hand up. Tom.  
5  
6 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thanks, Robin. Joe, I just have a quick  
7 question, and so the SSC kind of agreed with the Science Center  
8 that to use 0.75 as the SPR 30 percent, and so that's a more  
9 conservative approach, right, to dealing with the uncertainty,  
10 and so, when you look at -- Is that right?  
11  
12 **DR. POWERS:** It incorporates more uncertainty, and uncertainty  
13 has a lot of other connotations, and so --  
14  
15 **DR. FRAZER:** Where I am trying to go with that is -- What I want  
16 to ask is now you've got some OFL stuff for 2021, 2022, and  
17 2023, and they are increasing, and I guess, if you would have  
18 gone with the approach previous to the 0.75, what would those  
19 numbers have looked like? That will help me understand a little  
20 bit better.  
21  
22 **DR. POWERS:** I think it would also have been increasing, but --  
23 Well, if those projections turn out to be correct, it would be  
24 increasing, but slightly more rapidly increasing.  
25  
26 **DR. FRAZER:** Thank you.  
27  
28 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Let me help to rephrase that, Tom. You said  
29 it would be increasing, Joe, more rapidly, and so we won't use  
30 the term "conservative", but, as Tom is suggesting, it basically  
31 flattened out the projection a little bit more, not having it  
32 rise quite as quickly, in that three-year period, and I just  
33 wanted to make sure that we got that correctly from you, Joe.  
34  
35 **DR. POWERS:** Yes, that's correct. It's also one of the reasons,  
36 because it is increasing, the SSC, by choice, limited the time  
37 horizon to three years, and so, in other words, we're only  
38 making the recommendation for those three years, and, obviously,  
39 if nothing changes after three years, you would keep that level  
40 in there, but it is sort of hedging the bets a little bit, in  
41 terms of the SSC, about how much into the future we want to make  
42 projections.  
43  
44 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay.  
45  
46 **DR. FRAZER:** Thanks, Robin, for clarifying my question. Thanks.  
47  
48 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Thank you, Tom. Next, we have Mr. Diaz.

1  
2 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess this -- I  
3 might be getting ahead of us a little bit, looking at the  
4 agenda, but this question, I guess, is for Dr. Mendez-Ferrer, or  
5 maybe Dr. Crabtree.

6  
7 If you all would just refresh our memory, and so it looks like  
8 we've got a situation where cobia is undergoing overfishing, and  
9 I believe that's going to require us to take some action, and so  
10 could you all speak to that a little bit, Dr. Crabtree or Dr.  
11 Mendez-Ferrer?

12  
13 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Yes, you are correct, Mr. Diaz. We will  
14 need the committee to provide guidance to staff on developing a  
15 document to address overfishing.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** All right. Next on the list then is Ms.  
18 Bosarge.

19  
20 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This question is  
21 probably for Dr. Powers, and so, when I read the SSC summary  
22 paper, it states in here -- It says that overfishing has  
23 occurred every year from 1975 through 2018, with the exception  
24 of 1993 and 2009, and so round about forty years, forty-plus  
25 years, we've been overfishing. I wonder, did you all have a  
26 discussion about the fact that we have managed to overfish for  
27 forty years, but the stock is not in an overfished condition  
28 yet? It just seems strange to me that you would overfish for  
29 that long.

30  
31 **DR. POWERS:** It keeps us from achieving that MSY level, but it  
32 can remain stable, and that's exactly what is happening in this  
33 particular case, is the fishing rates are fairly high, but it  
34 hasn't been causing a collapse or anything like that, and so,  
35 relative to the minimum stock size threshold, the stock has  
36 bounced around between the MSST and the MSY level over that  
37 period of time, and so it's not unique, and it doesn't fit well,  
38 in terms of -- As you mentioned, why do you call it overfishing,  
39 when it never gets to being overfished over a long period of  
40 time, but you can have a stable condition like that, where the  
41 stock is stable at a level that is less than desired, but it's  
42 still not overfished.

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Next up is Ms. Guyas.

45  
46 **MS. MARTHA GUYAS:** I am trying to make sense of the OFL and ABC  
47 projections. Of course, we're moving from the old survey to  
48 FES, and so I think this is an increase. I don't have the

1 current OFL and ABC in front of me, but it's not really, because  
2 it's apples and oranges. I don't know if Dr. Powers or Ryan or  
3 somebody can give us a sense of how much of a cut this really  
4 might be or what's the difference between where we are and where  
5 we're going with these catch level recommendations.

6  
7 **DR. POWERS:** I will defer to Ryan, but, I mean, basically, the  
8 catches themselves have been, as mentioned before, below the  
9 ACL, the current ACL, but, Ryan, did you want to make a comment  
10 about that?

11  
12 **MR. RINDONE:** Sure. If we were looking at SEDAR 28 compared to  
13 the update, the projections that are coming out of the update,  
14 it constitutes about a 30 percent, give or take, reduction from  
15 what would have come out of SEDAR 28 if SEDAR 28 had also used  
16 FES, if that makes sense.

17  
18 Just to add a little bit to what Dr. Powers said about the  
19 discussion that the SSC had around why they selected three  
20 independent years instead of constant catch and 75 percent, that  
21 uncertainty in the projections was something that the SSC didn't  
22 think was being fully captured, and so they went with that more  
23 conservative approach, or they went with the approach they  
24 chose, and they are more considerate of the uncertainty, and how  
25 about that?

26  
27 They went with annual recommendations for catch limits, as  
28 opposed to constant catch, because the stock is an overfished  
29 condition, and it is, at present, being exploited at that level,  
30 and so, by going with an annual approach, instead of constant  
31 catch, it allows for the management to be a little bit more  
32 precise, rather than just using the average of the three years  
33 that they usually collect for a projection period. Thank you.

34  
35 **DR. POWERS:** Ryan, you said it was in an overfished condition,  
36 and you meant overfishing.

37  
38 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, sir. That's correct, an overfishing  
39 condition. Thank you.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Next up, I see that -- Martha, go ahead.

42  
43 **MS. GUYAS:** Thanks. Ryan, I think you just said that, relative  
44 to where landings are now, the OFL and the ABC are pretty  
45 similar to that, because it's basically what we're catching now?

46  
47 **MR. RINDONE:** No, ma'am. It will constitute a reduction, and so  
48 the council will have to -- In the actions that you guys

1 consider to end overfishing, you will have to consider things  
2 that will invariably reduce fishing mortality.

3  
4 **MS. GUYAS:** Okay, and so we need a 30 percent reduction, and  
5 it's a 30 percent reduction off the landings and not the OFL and  
6 ABC? I am just trying to just get this straight in my head,  
7 because I know we haven't been catching the ACL in the fishery.

8  
9 **MR. RINDONE:** Right, and, basically, what we have discovered,  
10 through doing the assessment, is that what we have been catching  
11 has still been higher than what we should be removing from the  
12 stock in order for the stock to reach the spawning stock biomass  
13 level at MSY, and so we're below that, but we're above spawning  
14 stock biomass at the minimum stock size threshold, and so we're  
15 in that flux area, but we're flirting with it, and so we  
16 definitely need to be thinking about ways to reduce fishing  
17 mortality in a measurable way to allow the stock to get away  
18 from approaching that overfished condition. We're not there  
19 yet, but, if we continue with our current level of landings, we  
20 will eventually get there.

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Ryan, I think Martha's question, and we may  
23 be getting it on the screen, and I don't know, but I think her  
24 question really deals with not the -- Is the 30 percent that you  
25 discussed off of the ABC projection, or is it off the current  
26 level of landings, which would mean it's more than 30 percent,  
27 since we're landing below the ABC now? I saw Martha shaking her  
28 head, and so she --

29  
30 **MR. RINDONE:** The projections call for about a 30 percent  
31 reduction, give or take, from what they would have been from  
32 SEDAR 28. Now, what you're seeing on the screen here is a table  
33 that we have requested, and this shows the general increase in  
34 the estimate of spawning stock biomass that would have come out  
35 of each assessment had the assessment used commensurate data  
36 currency, and so, like a SEDAR 28 that used FES equilibrium  
37 yield, if you look all the way to the right there, would have  
38 been 4.87 million pounds whole weight, and the equilibrium yield  
39 coming out of the SEDAR 28 update is giving us considerable  
40 reductions for what we can take for cobia.

41  
42 We are going to need to reduce landings from what they are now,  
43 what we're catching now, by around a third, in order to be able  
44 to achieve a level of landings that's going to be commensurate  
45 with the projections that we have from the update that is going  
46 to keep us from continuing to approach that overfished  
47 condition, and so basically to start heading back up to  
48 increasing spawning stock biomass towards the level of spawning

1 stock biomass at MSY.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. All right. I've got a couple of  
4 people on the list here. Next up is Dr. Porch.

5  
6 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** Thank you. I wanted to come back to Ms.  
7 Bosarge's concern that the stock has been undergoing  
8 overfishing, but yet isn't considered overfished, and Joe's  
9 comment is exactly right, but I wanted to add something to it,  
10 and maybe you could go to Slide 6 of the SSC presentation.

11  
12 I think a key point here is that we have to recognize that we do  
13 not declare a stock overfished until it's well below the actual  
14 biomass reference point that corresponds to the SPR of 30  
15 percent.

16  
17 As you can see here, the stock has actually been below the  
18 biomass that would achieve an SPR 30 percent for that forty  
19 years, but it's just that we don't want to declare a stock as  
20 officially overfished, where we have to have a rebuilding plan,  
21 until we're sure it's well below that level, and, if you look at  
22 the MSST level, then the stock appears not formally overfished,  
23 but just keep in mind that we deliberately lowered the bar, or  
24 raised the bar, in terms of determining whether a stock is  
25 overfished, and so MSST is well below the biomass that  
26 corresponds to SPR, and so that's why that happens.

27  
28 The definitions aren't exactly in sync. We add that buffer with  
29 MSST because we don't want to declare a stock as being  
30 overfished just because there is some natural fluctuations, like  
31 maybe a couple of years of low recruitment. Some years you have  
32 high, and some years you have low, and so we build in that  
33 buffer of the MSST, and does that make sense?

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Yes, Clay, and I think that's helpful. Next  
36 up is Mr. Anson.

37  
38 **MR. ANSON:** A little bit of a follow-up to Martha's question.  
39 You know, we did the framework action to increase the minimum  
40 size, and it was implemented this year, and I think the  
41 projections at the time that we were looking at, when we made  
42 that increase, was a 10 percent reduction for commercial  
43 landings and about a 26 percent reduction for recreational, and  
44 so I'm just wondering if --

45  
46 I mean, as we sit around talking about ways to address this, I  
47 mean, I think we've already made some proactive attempts to try  
48 to reduce the landings, and I'm just wondering, Ryan, if you can

1 recall, and is that based on FES landings for the recreational  
2 side at the time, or were they using older landings, and so  
3 we'll still have to dig a little deeper?  
4

5 **MR. RINDONE:** Mr. Anson, that was using the Coastal -- Well, no,  
6 that would have been using the MRFSS data at the time, because  
7 this update assessment constitutes our migration from MRFSS to  
8 MRIP-FES, and you're right about those estimated numbers.  
9

10 The thing to remember about those estimates for reduction in  
11 fishing mortality by fleet is they assume that everyone who was  
12 catching a thirty-three-inch fish would -- Like basically the  
13 probability of catching a fish at thirty-six inches and  
14 retaining it by fleet, and so the commercial fleet has a higher  
15 probability of catching a larger fish than the recreational  
16 fleet, based more on just generally being in deeper water and  
17 more recreational effort being concentrated closer to shore.  
18

19 That's why the projected reduction in fishing mortality was only  
20 10 percent for commercial and 26 percent recreational, but there  
21 is still a fair amount of uncertainty that floats around those  
22 estimates of reduction in fishing pressure, and, just as a  
23 reminder to you guys as to why you didn't go higher, as you move  
24 into the larger sizes of cobia, you start to disproportionately  
25 target the female spawning stock biomass portion of the stock,  
26 and the discussion at the time, for Framework Amendment 7, is  
27 you guys had expressed some reticence for shifting fishing  
28 mortality closer to -- More so on the females, especially if the  
29 goal was to try to help rebuild and protect the stock.  
30

31 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Thank you for that, Ryan. Kevin, did that  
32 cover your question? Do you have a follow-up?  
33

34 **MR. ANSON:** No, I don't.  
35

36 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. We've got a couple more people on the  
37 list to speak, and we are nearing our time, Mr. Chairman, and so  
38 I am mindful of that as well. To some degree, some of the --  
39 Tom, go ahead.  
40

41 **DR. FRAZER:** I was just going to say if the questions could be  
42 handled in fairly short order, let's go ahead and take them.  
43

44 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. Mr. Swindell, you're up next.  
45

46 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** My question really is, as I look at this  
47 chart, and maybe in the late 1980s on to 2019 or so, we haven't  
48 been that concerned about it, and the stock is still there, and

1 it's still not being overfished, and so was there a significant  
2 environmental happening that occurred that maybe we need to be  
3 more concerned with, rather than the fishing aspect of this?  
4

5 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Dr. Powers.  
6

7 **DR. POWERS:** I think we're all sort of hesitating. From a  
8 scientific standpoint, from the SSC standpoint, certainly  
9 environmental issues perhaps could have caused it, but we really  
10 don't have any way of telling, because you're dealing with a  
11 forty-year period there, and, whatever the environment was  
12 during that forty-year period, there isn't a lot of variation  
13 that is indicated by this particular graph, and so, yes,  
14 compared to the 1920s or something like that, the environment  
15 may be different, but we really have no way of knowing.  
16

17 Given the situation as it stands from 1980 through 2020, the  
18 environment that we're dealing with, that's the level of  
19 productivity that we're dealing with, and so that becomes de  
20 facto, and it's almost a standard, but, still, your point, I  
21 think, is important, that periods of low productivity and high  
22 productivity occur in fisheries that are independent of fishing.  
23 It's just that, in this particular case, this period -- This  
24 reflects the fishing that has gone on in that period of the  
25 environment. Thank you.  
26

27 **MR. SWINDELL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
28

29 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Next up is Ms. Boggs.  
30

31 **MS. BOGGS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a quick question. I  
32 know, in the Atlantic, the cobia, most of them are caught in  
33 state waters. How is that in the Gulf of Mexico? Is it more  
34 caught in state waters or federal waters or both?  
35

36 **MR. RINDONE:** The majority of cobia caught in the Gulf are  
37 caught in federal waters. The majority of cobia that are at or  
38 above the size limit are caught in federal waters.  
39

40 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** All right. I am turning to the committee  
41 here, and, obviously, if we want to direct staff here in  
42 committee to begin work on an action to end overfishing, we  
43 would need to do that. If not, we've got a couple more items on  
44 our agenda, and I'm going to move on to those, if we don't have  
45 a motion that we would like to put on the board at this point in  
46 time. I think people are trying to understand this and the  
47 recalibrations of data and all the things that are going into  
48 this. Dale, go ahead.

1  
2 **MR. DIAZ:** I do think that we need to start an amendment, and I  
3 was just typing one to send to the staff, but I can call it out,  
4 if that would be easier, whichever way you would like me to do  
5 it.  
6  
7 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Natasha, you were about to say something?  
8  
9 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Yes, Mr. Chair. About we go through the  
10 Something's Fishy results, and that could help you also --  
11 Provide some guidance before we write the motion.  
12  
13 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay, and so you want to go through that?  
14  
15 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Yes.  
16  
17 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. Well, I was also wondering -- What's  
18 your pleasure here, Tom, Mr. Chairman?  
19  
20 **DR. FRAZER:** Thank you. I think we're probably at a good  
21 breaking point, to be honest with you, and we'll stick to our  
22 schedule, and it's 12:00, and we'll come back and pick this up  
23 at 1:00 with Ms. Muehlstein's presentation.  
24  
25 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay, and so we'll come back. I appreciate  
26 that, Dale. Maybe, by then, you can type it and send it, if  
27 that's how you want to do that. I guess we have one hand up  
28 that hasn't spoken. Tom, can I -- Can we go to that one before  
29 we quit, or do you want to just start there when we come back?  
30  
31 **DR. FRAZER:** No, go ahead. You can take that one question, and  
32 we'll start with a clean slate with Ms. Muehlstein when we come  
33 back. I would go ahead and take this question, Robin.  
34  
35 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. Martha, go ahead.  
36  
37 **MS. GUYAS:** I was just going to respond to the call for a  
38 motion, but, if Dale is working on one, then we'll take care of  
39 that after lunch.  
40  
41 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** All right. Thank you. That leaves us  
42 standing at recess until 1:00, and returning at 1:00, and is  
43 that correct, Mr. Chairman?  
44  
45 **DR. FRAZER:** That's correct. We will see everybody at 1:00.  
46  
47 (Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on September 28,  
48 2020.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

- - -  
September 28, 2020  
MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION  
- - -

The Mackerel Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council reconvened via webinar on Monday afternoon, September 28, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Robin Riechers.

**CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** For those who might have just tuned in after the lunch break, if you weren't here in the morning, we are still in -- We're coming out of recess in the Mackerel Management Committee, and we still have a couple of items to deal with there.

We're going to start, I believe, as we agreed to, as we took the break -- We're going to start with C-5(c), and, basically, that's Something's Fishy with cobia comments and the presentation there, and then that will maybe provide us some information as we also have this discussion about a possible motion moving forward that we talked a moment about, as we were leaving for recess. With that, I believe that Ms. Muehlstein is going to give us that presentation. Emily, take it away.

**SOMETHING'S FISHY WITH COBIA DOCUMENT**

**MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN:** Yes, sir. Thank you. Okay. I'm just going to go over, really quickly -- We do form a Something's Fishy effort for cobia, and this effort -- There is actually a presentation. There is a summary, if you look in the agenda materials, and that is the summary that we submitted to the assessment scientists, and you can read that full summary, if that's of interest to you, but I will go through the full presentation right now.

Something's Fishy, just as a reminder, is a tool that we use to gather information on fish stocks from active fishermen on trends or unusual things that scientists and managers may not have observed. The responses for this effort were gathered between January 8 of this year and February 7 of this year, and then the final report, which is included in your materials, was generated and presented to the analysts at the end of April of this year.

1 We did receive 586 unique responses for this tool. The  
2 respondents were not limited to a singular response when they  
3 were asked which sector they associated with, and so we did end  
4 up having 646 responses to sector, and so you will notice a vast  
5 majority of them were private anglers, and then there was a  
6 smaller number of federal for-hire fishermen, as well as  
7 commercial respondents.

8  
9 This map will just show you the frequency of responses based on  
10 the location. They could report observations for more than one  
11 grid locations, and so, although we only had 586 respondents,  
12 they identified responses for 878 locations overall, and I guess  
13 the important thing to note here is that a majority of the  
14 comments about cobia were concentrated sort of in the eastern-  
15 northern part of the Gulf of Mexico, and so, starting from the  
16 Panhandle of Florida and then moving all the way kind of through  
17 Louisiana.

18  
19  
20 We classified sentiment from each of the responses as either  
21 positive, neutral, and negative. We did it in two ways, both  
22 manually and automated, and the manual analysis is done by two  
23 separate analysts, who then work together to sort of reconcile  
24 any discrepancies that they have, and then automated analysis is  
25 done with our software, using a lexicon library that helps  
26 categorize sentiment.

27  
28 The both manual and automated analysis showed that a majority of  
29 respondents reported a negative sentiment regarding the cobia  
30 stock. The manual analysis showed a greater proportion of  
31 negative comments than the automated analysis did, and it is  
32 important to note that sometimes comments are dropped, and they  
33 are dropped in the manual analysis because they were not germane  
34 to what we were asking, and they probably had nothing to do with  
35 cobia, and then, in the automated analysis, they are dropped if  
36 they don't contain any words that are identified as positive,  
37 negative, or neutral, and there was a large number of comments  
38 dropped through automated analysis in this effort.

39  
40 Next, we do show sort of the sentiment by grid location, and we  
41 have also done this for both manual and an automated analysis.  
42 As you can notice sort of in those areas where we saw the  
43 highest concentration of commenters, there is also an  
44 overwhelmingly negative sentiment that showed up there through  
45 the manual analysis. We will show you the automated analysis,  
46 and that proportion of negative comments in that sort of  
47 concentration area is not as obvious. The trend is not as  
48 obvious.

1  
2 These are some of the results of the automated analysis that  
3 actually parses out some of the words that contribute to either  
4 the positive or negative sentiment, and so you can see that the  
5 most frequently used words -- The negative one are less,  
6 decline, limit, fewer, smaller, and the positive words that we  
7 saw the most often were large, like, good, and well. Those are  
8 just displayed either as a bar chart or as this word cloud.

9  
10 These most frequently used negative words could be interpreted  
11 to indicate that anglers with negative perceptions of the stock  
12 were seeing fewer fish and that the fish they do see are  
13 smaller.

14  
15 Finally, manual analysis, sort of the trends that we could pull  
16 out of that, showed that many of the commenters indicated that  
17 the average size of fish they encountered is smaller than it has  
18 been historically. Also, the comments that indicated a negative  
19 trend in abundance noticed that the spring migration had either  
20 diminished or moved farther offshore, and this was attributed to  
21 red tide or an influx of fresh water or removal of structure,  
22 and sort of those three factors contributing shifted based on  
23 where the respondent was located.

24  
25 Then, finally, comments indicated that the population decline  
26 had been occurring since about 2010. That sort of summarizes  
27 the responses that we got from the public from our Something's  
28 Fishy effort on cobia, and I am happy to entertain any  
29 questions, if you have some.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Any questions of Ms. Muehlstein of her  
32 summary? If we don't have any questions regarding the summary,  
33 it really takes us back to the discussion that we were having,  
34 and, at that point, Dale, I think you were at least crafting a  
35 motion that you may want to push forward, and I don't know if  
36 you're still in that position or not, but, at the time, you were  
37 thinking about doing that.

38  
39 **MR. DIAZ:** I am, Robin. I sent something to the staff, if they  
40 could put that on the board, and I'm going to ask them to make  
41 one small edit to it, based on a conversation I had with one of  
42 the council members at lunch.

43  
44 If you would, in the very last part of the motion, after "bag  
45 limits", if you could add "vessel limits". **My motion would read**  
46 **to direct staff to start a plan amendment to reduce the fishing**  
47 **mortality in the commercial and recreational cobia fishery in**  
48 **the Gulf of Mexico, which will include bag limits, vessel**

1 limits, size limits, seasons, and catch limit options.  
2  
3 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** We are, obviously, still in committee in  
4 here, and so I would just remind folks of that. Do I have a  
5 second for the motion?  
6  
7 **MS. BOGGS:** I second the motion.  
8  
9 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Thank you, Ms. Boggs. We've got a motion on  
10 the board. Any discussion surrounding the motion? It's fairly  
11 straightforward, I believe, in development of a plan amendment.  
12  
13 **MR. DIAZ:** We do need to get to get those two words added behind  
14 "bag limits" of "vessel limits", right behind bag limits.  
15  
16 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Can you say it how you want it again? Let's  
17 make sure that's like you want it. Sorry, Dale.  
18  
19 **MR. DIAZ:** Direct staff to start a plan amendment to reduce the  
20 fishing mortality in the commercial and recreational cobia  
21 fishery in the Gulf of Mexico, which will include bag limits,  
22 vessel limits, size limits, seasons, and catch limit options.  
23  
24 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. It's in the motion on the board now.  
25  
26 **MR. DIAZ:** I'm sorry. Thank you, Robin.  
27  
28 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** No problem. Any other discussion  
29 surrounding the motion? **Hearing none, is there any opposition**  
30 **from a committee member to the motion?** We will do it that way.  
31 It's probably simpler. **Hearing none, the motion passes.**  
32  
33 **MR. DIAZ:** Can I say one more thing? I just wanted to make one  
34 more comment, if I could.  
35  
36 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Go ahead, Dale.  
37  
38 **MR. DIAZ:** I was late on getting my hand up. Whenever I think  
39 about this, Robin, and I think about the fishing mortality that  
40 occurs with cobia, and I know we've had this discussion on the  
41 record before, and a lot of folks gaff cobia, and I've got to  
42 believe that's something that really hurts the fishing  
43 mortality.  
44  
45 I don't know if there's some type of way where we could look at  
46 some type of education campaign to encourage people to try to  
47 net the smaller, undersized cobia, when possible. I don't know  
48 if there's anything to be gained there, but, every time we talk

1 about cobia, that really sticks with me, that a fair amount of  
2 them are gaffed. Thank you.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. That's a good topic for discussion,  
5 maybe even as we have the plan amendment, and I may have gone  
6 too quickly here for discussion on this motion, in this virtual  
7 environment, as I'm trying to see hands up, and folks are trying  
8 to get it typed in, and it does appear as if Martha was trying  
9 to get her hand up as well, and, Martha, if we do need to go  
10 back and reconsider an amendment or something like that, we can  
11 certainly do that, and I apologize.

12  
13 **MS. GUYAS:** That's all right. I was just going to say, in  
14 Florida, you all remember when we went through the rule changes  
15 before, and the FWC made some changes, which I think I would  
16 like to have considered in this document as we go through it,  
17 and that's a one per person bag limit for commercial and  
18 recreational, and then we have a two per vessel limit as well,  
19 and so I'm just putting that out there as some options. Then,  
20 now that I think about it, I do have a question. Would this  
21 need to be a plan amendment, or could we do it as a framework?

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** That second question I assume is directed at  
24 Ryan or a member of staff somewhere.

25  
26 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** I think this will have to be a plan  
27 amendment, and we can get maybe some more guidance from Mara,  
28 but we also may have to consider updating the framework  
29 procedures, because this is a jointly-managed FMP, and there is  
30 some language that needs to be updated from when it was  
31 originally established in Framework Amendment 28.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** So they're looking into that, Martha, and  
34 they'll come back with whatever the most appropriate approach  
35 is, I assume. Leann, the apology goes to you as well, and I see  
36 your hand up.

37  
38 **MS. BOSARGE:** I am good. It wasn't on this particular motion,  
39 and so we're fine. I just wanted to -- I was in favor of the  
40 motion, but my question was about the South Atlantic, and  
41 Natasha just sort of alluded to it, but what will our  
42 interaction be with either the South Atlantic Council or the  
43 Atlantic States Commission, since I believe they manage cobia  
44 now over there? Do we have to have any interaction with them,  
45 or is this purely on the Gulf side stock?

46  
47 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries  
48 Commission manages Atlantic cobia, and, in this case, we would

1 be focusing on Gulf cobia, and we do have to do it jointly with  
2 the South Atlantic, because the Gulf cobia ACL is currently  
3 being shared with the South Atlantic for the Florida east zone.

4  
5 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Ms. Beckwith, I see you nodding your head  
6 yes, and did you want to add anything there, or are you good?

7  
8 **MS. BECKWITH:** No, she covered it, and so we'll be working with  
9 you guys on this one, for sure.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. Thank you. The motion, since no one  
12 on the committee came back to the motion and wanted to pull it  
13 down or have a re-vote, we're going to leave the motion as  
14 carried, and so I think that does take us now to our Other  
15 Business item, and, John, you had a data request that you wanted  
16 to ask about, or have a conversation about, there.

17  
18 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** I'm sorry.

21  
22 **STOCK ASSESSMENT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

23  
24 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Before we move over to Other Business, we  
25 still have to go really quickly over the executive summary and  
26 try to get some feedback from the council, and I think we still  
27 have Joe Powers on the line. Like I mentioned earlier, this is  
28 a document that summarizes the results of the stock assessment,  
29 and it includes the results from Something's Fishy, and it  
30 hopefully is something that can be read and interpreted by a  
31 wider variety of the audience.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Any comments on that? The way I saw that  
34 was it was a summary of the various both presentations and  
35 analysis and the SSC report and then Something's Fishy, and so  
36 it's kind of a quicker read of all the summaries that we have  
37 been presented, and it's probably useful for kind of that high-  
38 level, quick read of here's where we're at. Any different takes  
39 on that? I think all they're looking for is feedback as to  
40 whether that's a positive thing for them to produce or not.

41  
42 **DR. POWERS:** Just to reiterate that, I think the development of  
43 these executive summaries is for a broader audience, having  
44 really cogent information. If you look at this particular  
45 executive summary, it's very similar to that presentation that I  
46 just gave, but, if there's some key things there that the  
47 council would like to see, I think that both the Center and the  
48 council staff and the SSC would like to hear it, so that we

1 could modify the presentation, to make it more useful to  
2 anybody, and so I don't think there's any need to have input  
3 exactly now, but certainly input would be useful as we go ahead  
4 with this. Thank you.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Does anybody have anything on that front?  
7 Okay. If not, then I think we are back to you again, John.

8  
9 **OTHER BUSINESS**

10  
11 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. On to my data request, and  
12 I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to address this in  
13 Other Business. **I would like to request some analysis on the**  
14 **king mackerel sector landings and quotas for the last five, or**  
15 **maybe ten, years, if possible, with recreational landings and**  
16 **quotas in FES currency.** If you need me to repeat that, I would  
17 be glad to.

18  
19 **MS. ROY:** Could you please repeat that?

20  
21 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Yes. **Request an analysis of king mackerel sector**  
22 **landings and quotas for the past five or ten years, if possible,**  
23 **with the recreational landings and quotas in FES currency.**

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Everybody can see the motion? Is there a  
26 second to the motion?

27  
28 **MS. BOSARGE:** I will second that motion.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Any discussion surrounding that motion? It  
31 seems to me that it's what we get presented, but going back in  
32 time more, John, and is that correct, and, obviously, with the  
33 FES currency issue.

34  
35 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Yes, and I just want to make sure that, as we look  
36 at this going forward, it is in the FES currency, if that's what  
37 we're going to be using for decision-making down the road, and  
38 so I want to go ahead and make sure that that request is there,  
39 in case we need to look at overages and underages of king  
40 mackerel, and we're in the right currency.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Thanks, John. Mr. Swindell, did you have  
43 your hand up?

44  
45 **MR. SWINDELL:** I was trying to get it down, sir. Thank you.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. Any other discussion on this motion?  
48 I will give everyone a chance to get their hands up.

1  
2 **MR. DIAZ:** I do have a question for John. My question would be  
3 what type of timeline are you looking to get this analysis back,  
4 John? We've got another meeting coming up in very short order,  
5 and then possibly another meeting following that, and then we'll  
6 get back on our regular schedule in January, hopefully, and it's  
7 just about the timeline. Thank you.

8  
9 **MR. SANCHEZ:** If I may respond, Mr. Chair?

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Yes, sir.

12  
13 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you. I was, obviously, hoping to have it  
14 for the next meeting. If that's too big of an ask, given the  
15 Register notice and timeliness and all these things to agenda  
16 item these things, and I'm not sure where we fall into that,  
17 with the close time proximity of this meeting to the October  
18 one, but, if at all, and if the folks entrusted with gathering  
19 that data could do it, that would be ideal, with all the time  
20 we've lost. If not, I guess I am at your mercy, and we can do  
21 it at the following meeting. Thank you.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** I am assuming that some of this would need  
24 to be included in the amendment, and so I think it's going to be  
25 part of that as well, but I think what John is wanting is to  
26 look at a little before that, if we can, and maybe as you start  
27 thinking about options. Any other follow-up there, Dale?

28  
29 **MR. DIAZ:** No. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN RIECHERS:** Okay. I don't see any other hands up. If  
32 anyone has one up, please get it up. If not, we're going to  
33 vote this one up or down. I am not seeing any, and so we'll do  
34 it this way. **Is there any opposition to this motion? Hearing**  
35 **none, the motion carries.** Mr. Chair, I believe that now  
36 concludes the Mackerel Management Committee.

37  
38 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 28, 2020.)

39  
40 - - -  
41