

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

The Lodge at Gulf State Park

Gulf Shores, Alabama

April 4, 2022

VOTING MEMBERS

Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
 Susan Boggs.....Alabama
 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
 Billy Broussard.....Louisiana
 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
 Tom Frazer.....Florida
 Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
 Jessica McCawley.....Florida
 Bob Shipp.....Alabama
 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
 Troy Williamson.....Texas

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
 Phil Dyskow.....Florida
 Bob Gill.....Florida
 Lisa Motoi.....USCG
 Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
 Greg Stunz.....Texas
 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi

STAFF

Assane Diagne.....Economist
 Matt Freeman.....Economist
 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
 Mary Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
 Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
 Carly Somerset.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Peter Hood.....NMFS
 Kelli O'Donnell.....NMFS
 Laurilee Thompson.....SAFMC

1 John Walter.....SEFSC
2 Christina Wiegand.....SAFMC
3
4 - - -
5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	3
<u>Table of Motions.....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and</u> <u>Next Steps.....</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Review of Coastal Migratory Pelagics Landings.....</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Draft Framework Amendment 11: Modifications to the Gulf of</u> <u>Mexico Migratory Group King Mackerel Catch Limits.....</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>Final Action: Amendment 34: Atlantic Migratory Group King</u> <u>Mackerel Catch Levels and Atlantic King and Spanish Mackerel</u> <u>Management Measures.....</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>Other Business.....</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Discussion of Gulf King Mackerel Southern Zone Gillnet</u> <u>Fishing Restrictions on Weekends.....</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Adjournment.....</u>	<u>28</u>

- - -

TABLE OF MOTIONS

PAGE 22: Motion to recommend the council approve Amendment 34: Atlantic Migratory Group King Mackerel Catch Levels and Atlantic King and Spanish Mackerel Management Measures and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. The motion carried on page 22.

PAGE 26: Motion to direct staff to create a Framework Amendment to eliminate weekend and holiday closures in the gillnet component of the mackerel fishery. The motion carried on page 28.

- - -

1 The Mackerel Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
2 Management Council convened at The Lodge at Gulf State Park on
3 Monday morning, April 4, 2022, and was called to order by Vice
4 Chairman Kevin Anson.

5
6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
7 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
8 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
9

10 **VICE CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON:** I will call the Mackerel Management
11 Committee to order. The members are Mr. Geeslin, myself, Ms.
12 Boggs, Ms. Bosarge, Mr. Broussard, Mr. Dugas, Dr. Frazer, Ms.
13 McCawley, Dr. Shipp, Mr. Strelcheck, and Mr. Williamson.

14
15 The first item on the agenda, which is Tab C, Number 1, is
16 Adoption of the Agenda. Are there any changes needed for the
17 agenda? Is there any opposition to accepting the agenda as
18 written? Seeing none, the agenda is adopted.

19
20 That will take us to Item Number II, Approval of the January
21 2022 Minutes, Tab C, Number 2. Are there any edits or changes
22 that need to be made? I have two. Page 24, line number 9,
23 change "formal" to "four", and, page 26, on line 21, is to
24 change "size" to "bag". That portion of the conversation
25 related strictly to bag limits, and so those are the two that I
26 have. Is there a motion to accept the minutes, with the
27 changes?

28
29 **MR. BILLY BROUSSARD:** So moved.

30
31 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** So moved by Mr. Broussard.

32
33 **DR. BOB SHIPP:** I will second.

34
35 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Second by Dr. Shipp. Is there any
36 opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the minutes are
37 approved. That will take us to the Action Guide and Next Steps,
38 Tab C, Number 3, Item III in the agenda. Dr. Mendez-Ferrer.

39
40 **DR. NATASHA MENDEZ-FERRER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. For today's
41 Mackerel Committee, in Agenda Item Number IV, we'll see a review
42 of coastal migratory pelagics landings, and so we'll have Ms.
43 O'Donnell providing an update on the status of CMP landings
44 relative to ACLs. This is for information only, and no action
45 is required by the committee.

46
47 Agenda Item Number V is Draft Framework Amendment 11,
48 Modifications to the Gulf of Mexico Migratory Group King

1 Mackerel Catch Limits. Council staff will present Framework
2 Amendment 11, which would modify catch levels for Gulf king
3 mackerel. The SEDAR 38 update assessment and the SSC review
4 found Gulf king mackerel to be healthy and not overfished or
5 undergoing overfishing. This document includes an alternative
6 that would modify the catch levels to reflect the
7 recommendations of the council's SSC.

8
9 The revised catch levels use recreational catch and effort data
10 calibrated to the Marine Recreational Information Program's
11 Fishing Effort Survey. The committee should review the document
12 and provide feedback and consider selecting a preferred
13 alternative in Action 1. Staff will plan to bring a final draft
14 of the document to the June 2022 council meeting for
15 consideration.

16
17 Agenda Item Number VI will be a final action for CMP Amendment
18 34, Atlantic king mackerel catch levels and management actions,
19 and, for this item, we will have Ms. Christina Wiegand from the
20 South Atlantic Council presenting the management changes
21 included in CMP Amendment 34. This amendment considers changes
22 to catch levels for Atlantic migratory group king mackerel,
23 modifications to sector allocations, and management measures,
24 including recreational bag limit provisions requiring fish to be
25 landed with heads and fins intact. Ms. Wiegand will also
26 summarize the South Atlantic's rationale, and the committee
27 should review the information provided and consider approving
28 for final action.

29
30 Then, for Other Business, we have a discussion on Gulf king
31 mackerel Southern Zone gillnet fishing restrictions on weekends.
32 This was a request that came in between council meetings, which
33 is why it's not its own agenda item, but the committee will
34 discuss the current fishing regulations associated with the Gulf
35 king mackerel gillnet fleet in the Southern Zone, as it pertains
36 to the restrictions on weekend harvest. Mr. Chair.

37
38 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Any questions for Natasha?
39 Seeing none, we'll go ahead and move into Item IV, Review of
40 Coastal Migratory Pelagics Landings. Ms. O'Donnell, are you
41 present?

42 43 **REVIEW OF COASTAL MIGRATORY PELAGICS LANDINGS**

44
45 **MS. KELLI O'DONNELL:** A couple of things, and our 2021 landings
46 are still preliminary, and, of course, 2022 landings are
47 preliminary. We have commercial landings through February 28,
48 and, again, all of the commercial king mackerel landings were

1 combined for all of the four zones, and the slide will show a
2 July start date, even though the Northern Zone starts on October
3 1, and, as of now, still all of the ACLs that are listed are in
4 MRIP-CHTS units.

5
6 Cobia, we're still continuing to see a lower amount of landings
7 than we have in the previous years, which is why we've also
8 continued to just show a 2017 to 2019 fishing year average, as
9 that yellow dotted line, and it has been since 2020 that
10 landings have been lower than historically averaged, and we just
11 want to show what that difference has been since 2020, and, as
12 you can see, between 2020, 2021, and now 2022, the landings have
13 been getting lower and lower at the beginning of the year, and
14 we'll see what happens as the year progresses.

15
16 For the FLEC Zone, we're noticing the same thing, although 2022
17 had a little bit higher landings than we saw in 2020 and 2021,
18 in the beginning of the fishing year, and they have kind of
19 slowed down, as we've progressed in through February.

20
21 King mackerel is also showing the same, where we've had lower
22 and lower landings these past three years, especially this year.
23 By this time, historically, the Western Zone is already closed,
24 and potentially the Southern Zone hook-and-line component is
25 closed, and the gillnet component in the Southern Zone is
26 closed, and, as of now, only the Southern Zone gillnet component
27 is closed. The Western Zone, Northern Zone, and the Southern
28 Zone hook-and-line are all still open.

29
30 Spanish mackerel is the rest of the CMP species, and there has
31 been a lot lower landings, and the 2019-2020 fishing year is
32 only so high, because the majority of that fishing year, which
33 started in April of 2019, was completed right at the beginning
34 of the pandemic, because that fishing year ended in March of
35 2020, which was right at the beginning, and so that is when
36 we're still seeing such a high landings, even though that does
37 have 2020 in it, and that is my last slide.

38
39 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you. Any questions? We
40 have one question from Ms. Boggs.

41
42 **MS. SUSAN BOGGS:** Please remind me, and does king mackerel have
43 a payback, or what do we do when we exceed the ACL?

44
45 **MS. O'DONNELL:** Currently, only the gillnet component has a
46 payback, and so they did exceed their ACL this year, and so they
47 will have a payback next year.

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other questions? I don't see any
2 others. Continue on, please.

3
4 **MS. O'DONNELL:** That concludes my report, Mr. Chair.

5
6 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Okay. I saw the other item.

7
8 **MS. O'DONNELL:** We just provide that for reference. We don't go
9 over the tables anymore. Thank you.

10
11 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. That will take us to Item
12 Number V, and that will be Tab C, Number 5, Draft Framework
13 Amendment 11. Mr. Rindone.

14
15 **DRAFT FRAMEWORK AMENDMENT 11: MODIFICATIONS TO THE GULF OF**
16 **MEXICO MIGRATORY GROUP KING MACKEREL CATCH LIMITS**

17
18 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** Yes, sir. This is a single-action framework
19 amendment, and, in the CMP Fishery Management Plan, we call
20 these framework amendments, instead of framework actions, and we
21 number them, something that I kind of wish we had done with reef
22 fish a long, long time ago, but we do it here, and so that's why
23 this looks a little different, for those that are new to this.

24
25 As Dr. Mendez-Ferrer had stated, this framework amendment comes
26 about in response to the SEDAR 38 update assessment, which found
27 Gulf of Mexico king mackerel to be healthy and estimated that
28 the stock was not overfished and was not undergoing overfishing,
29 as of the 2017-2018 fishing year, but it did show that the
30 stock, spawning stock biomass, was between the minimum stock
31 size threshold and spawning stock biomass at maximum sustainable
32 yield.

33
34 When the stock is in that condition, again, it's not overfished,
35 but it's not quite as good as it could be, which is why the
36 annual projections increase over time, towards 9.99 million
37 pounds for the 2023 and 2024 and subsequent fishing years, just
38 so you guys have some frame of reference of why those are going
39 up.

40
41 The projections, of course, assume several things, and they
42 assume that things like recruitment and selectivity and
43 catchability will remain constant over time, and one
44 consideration for you guys, just to keep in mind, is that
45 recruitment for Gulf king mackerel has been pretty lackluster
46 and below average for the last decade, and so we're looking, on
47 the screen now, at our one action, which is to modify the Gulf
48 of Mexico migratory group king mackerel overfishing limit,

1 acceptable biological catch, and annual catch limits.

2
3 The OFL and the ABC came as recommendations from the SSC, and
4 you can see the equivalents there under Alternative 1, and so
5 Alternative 1 here is in our no action alternative, and, in this
6 particular case, because the current catch limits are based on
7 the Coastal Household Telephone Survey, this no longer
8 represents the best scientific information available, and so
9 this alternative is not viable for selection, but, in the table
10 there, you can see the equivalent of what our current catch
11 limits would be in MRIP-FES, had FES been available to be used
12 to set those catch limits back when we did SEDAR 38 originally.

13
14 In Alternative 2, which proposes revises the OFL and ABC for
15 Gulf mackerel, as recommended by our SSC, for the 2021-2022
16 through 2023-2024 and subsequent fishing years, it retains the
17 ACL being set equal to the ABC, as we do now, and it does not
18 use an ACT, which the council has not used, as long as the stock
19 has been not overfished and not undergoing overfishing.

20
21 You can see that, from where we would have been, had we used
22 MRIP-FES in SEDAR 38, to where we are now, things are not quite
23 as rosy as they were when we completed SEDAR 38, and a lot of
24 that can be attributed to this less-than-great recruitment that
25 we've had over the last ten years or so.

26
27 Given our timing and everything, if this were to follow as quick
28 of a pace as is regulatorily possible, the soonest that we would
29 expect anything from this framework amendment to be implemented
30 would be in such a way that it might take effect at the latter
31 half of the 2022-2023 fishing year, but definitely by the 2023-
32 2024 fishing year, and so, for the sake of the analyses that
33 follow in Chapter 2, we have used that 2023-2024 fishing year as
34 kind of the basis for that, since that would be the management
35 state of nature, if you will, moving forward, if this were to be
36 implemented. Are there any questions so far?

37
38 Just to note that, at the last meeting, we had this as part of
39 CMP Amendment 33, and you guys and the South Atlantic Council
40 agreed to split out the addressing of the catch limits here as
41 its own framework amendment, which means that we do not have to
42 take this back to the South Atlantic Council for any sort of
43 final approval. We can just run this thing through our normal
44 process.

45
46 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Ryan. Ms. Boggs.

47
48 **MS. BOGGS:** I think I asked this in August, when I was looking

1 back at my notes, and I don't remember the answer, and so we're
2 using data from basically, what, 2018, I think, and I can't
3 remember when the update was done, and then the SSC looked at it
4 in September of 2020 and based their recommendation on that.

5
6 We're seeing a decline in the fish now, and it's apparent, and I
7 did some numbers, and, I mean, from the 2018-2019 fishing year
8 to the 2020-2021 fishing year, we're catching 50 percent of what
9 we caught two years prior, and so I'm concerned that we're using
10 old data.

11
12 I understand what you're saying, Ryan, and we have this document
13 before us, and, I mean, we move at such a slow pace, and how do
14 we -- I know we have to address this, but I guess my general
15 question to the council, and this is probably not the
16 appropriate time, is how do we do better with this? I am just
17 concerned that we're seeing a trend in the fishery that doesn't
18 seem to follow what the recommendations were. Thank you.

19
20 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Mara.

21
22 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Not to directly answer that question about how
23 you move quicker on the information, but, I mean, if the council
24 feels, as a body, that there needs to be a more conservative
25 catch level, and you articulate the basis for that and what you
26 think, and I mean, I understand that you wouldn't have any
27 advice to say how much lower you should go, and so you would
28 have to make a reasonable determination about that. You're
29 always free to establish catch levels that are lower than the
30 ABC recommendations, right?

31
32 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other committee members have
33 discussion on this item? Dale.

34
35 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** I've just got a question for Ryan. Ryan, I am
36 just -- I pulled up the openings of the Bonnet Carre Spillway,
37 and I'm just looking at them from 2011 to 2016 and 2018 and 2018
38 and 2019 and 2020. In 2021, it did not open, but the northern
39 Gulf was very fresh last year, from personal observations, and I
40 track it pretty close, and it was one of the freshest years I
41 can remember without the Bonnet Carre being open.

42
43 I know landings are a little behind, based on what we've seen
44 with the last couple of years, but, on this recruitment thing,
45 whenever this has been presented, the amount of freshwater in
46 the northern Gulf, in some of these high-flow years, has that
47 been discussed as one of the reasons for maybe lower
48 recruitment, or do you think that's a factor?

1
2 **MR. RINDONE:** I don't remember us having much conversation about
3 salinity levels, specifically as it relates to recruitment, as
4 part of that assessment. I don't recall that, and, I mean,
5 Dale, that's an interesting point, and I know that, when we did
6 SEDAR 38, we did the South Atlantic migratory group and the Gulf
7 of Mexico migratory group, and there was a consultant, Peter
8 Barile, who had talked about salinity levels as it related to
9 king mackerel movement and abundance and bait availability and
10 things like that in the South Atlantic, but we didn't have a
11 similar discussion in the Gulf.

12
13 Granted, at the time, SEDAR 38 I think used data through the
14 2012-2013 fishing season, and most of the openings that you
15 mentioned I think occurred after that point, and that's not to
16 say that there weren't openings prior to that as well, and it
17 would be an interesting research question. It seems like
18 something that we might be able to drum up some information on,
19 since there is pretty regular sampling by academic institutions
20 in that area, and we would probably get something on the line of
21 a salinity profile at the time, and I'm not saying it's possible
22 or impossible, but we can certainly make a note of it to look at
23 for next time.

24
25 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Ryan, on that point, what data is used to
26 develop the recruitment index, or the recruitment number? Is it
27 SEAMAP data?

28
29 **MR. RINDONE:** It's SEAMAP data, yes.

30
31 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Simmons.

32
33 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just was
34 going to respond to what Ms. Boggs was asking about earlier,
35 regarding timing and trying to move things through a little
36 faster. One of the things that I have on my list that I want us
37 to look into is trying to automate some of the catch level
38 changes up or down and with what other councils are doing,
39 especially since we have this interim analysis tool with the
40 Science Center.

41
42 I think they gave a presentation, some time back, about how long
43 it takes us to get that through the process, and so I am
44 planning to work on that, and, maybe later this year, bring
45 something back to the council, but, as you all know, when we
46 start looking at allocations, things get complicated fast, and
47 so I will just remind everybody that we've now taken that out of
48 this particular action.

1
2 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Mr. Gill.

3
4 **MR. BOB GILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not on your
5 committee, and so I appreciate the recognition. What struck me
6 about this action is that we're functionally a one-alternative
7 action, and, now, unless you go back to the old recommendation,
8 Alternative 2 is all there is, and I would feel more comfortable
9 if we had some reasonable other alternative than just
10 Alternative 2, and I think there is one, and that's constant
11 catch.

12
13 I would also recognize that constant catch, in this particular
14 instance, doesn't yield a heck of a lot, and you're talking
15 600,000 pounds, give or take, total difference in ABC, and 1.3,
16 or something like that, for OFL, and so, if we just do an
17 average, you're not talking a whole lot.

18
19 On the other hand, I think you could argue that it might be
20 marginally better than Alternative 2, if stakeholders could see
21 a constant number, rather than one changing every year, and
22 staff wouldn't have to deal with the changes, et cetera, and so
23 I would hope that someone on the committee would consider
24 offering an Alternative 3, that would suggest a constant catch
25 strategy, as something to be considered before this action goes
26 final. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

27
28 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Dr. Frazer.

29
30 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** I'm happy, as a committee member, to go ahead
31 and move forward with a motion like that, but, when I was
32 talking with Bob about this a little bit before, one of the
33 sources of confusion that I had is that, when the SSC made a
34 recommendation with regard to the OFL and the ABC for each of
35 the three years that are represented in the framework action, I
36 thought that we would have exceeded, in a constant catch
37 scenario, the recommended ABC in the first year, and so I guess
38 I would really look at Ryan and ask whether or not it's a simple
39 process to go back to the SSC and ask them to bless a constant
40 catch scenario or if it becomes more complicated than that.

41
42 **MR. RINDONE:** I think that it would have to go back to the SSC,
43 because, again, we're between the minimum stock size threshold
44 and the spawning stock biomass at maximum sustainable yield, and
45 we're riding on some assumptions here that things like
46 recruitment are going to be -- That recruitment is going to be
47 achieved at that assumed constant level.

1 I think the assumptions about selectivity and catchability are
2 things that -- We can rest on those fine, but recruitment has
3 been low, and so one of the things that the SSC has discussed in
4 the past, and your SSC Chair, by the way, is in the back of the
5 room, and he might be able to speak to this from their
6 perspective, is that, when a stock is in a depressed or, in
7 worst case, a depleted condition, where we're below MSST, we
8 generally are -- We see the SSC be a little bit more
9 conservative and use these increasing yields, because we don't
10 want to overharvest in the early years, because, again, we're
11 riding on these assumptions that recruitment is going to be at a
12 level that maybe it's not going to get there, and so you don't
13 want to overharvest in the early years and then have a
14 detrimental effect on potential recruitment that you're
15 expecting to have to be able to achieve in the out years, and so
16 that's why the SSC goes with that increasing yield.

17
18 Something else that you guys can consider though, besides
19 constant catch, that would be in line with this line of thought
20 that the SSC has used regularly for a long time, is to apply the
21 ACL/ACT Control Rule to these catch limits, which I could do
22 pretty quickly, and that can allow you to -- Instead of setting
23 the ACL equal to the ABC, use the ACL/ACT Control Rule to create
24 a buffer between the ACL and the ABC, which can account for the
25 management uncertainty and any misgivings that you guys might
26 have about where recruitment might actually be, and then that
27 would give you another alternative to consider.

28
29 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Ms. Levy.

30
31 **MS. LEVY:** Just a couple of things to consider. You can do a
32 constant catch that is at the lowest recommendation, right, and
33 so you don't have to average it, and, if there's concern about
34 all of this being too high, doing the lowest one is an option,
35 or, like Ryan said, you could do an ACT, but the other point is
36 that the 2021-2022 fishing year -- Like that's never going to
37 get implemented, right, like that catch level, and so we're
38 already at the 2022-2023 fishing year, and so whatever you do
39 here is going to get implemented at the 11.05 OFL, the 9.72 ABC,
40 and so I'm not even sure if averaging it comes below the 9.72,
41 and I think you have an argument that you're not exceeding the
42 recommendation, because we're in the 2022-2023 fishing year at
43 this point.

44
45 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Froeschke.

46
47 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Mara made my first point. The other point,
48 just as a reminder, is, in vermilion snapper, we have recently -

1 - We did add an alternative to set the ACL at 75 percent of the
2 ABC, based on the F SPR 30, and so that would be another
3 approach, and we probably do have that from the stock
4 assessment, and I'm not sure, but I bet we do.

5
6 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Can you repeat that?

7
8 **DR. FROESCHKE:** We added an alternative that reduced the ACL,
9 and so, in the preferred alternative, the ACL was equal to the
10 ABC. We added an alternative, and it was the same kind of
11 document, where we had just the no action and the one
12 alternative, and we did add an Alternative 3 that set the ACL,
13 which resulted in a 9 percent buffer, and it was based on --
14 Ryan says what we did is we set the ACL using the control rule,
15 where we established a 9 percent buffer between the ABC and the
16 ACL, and so that was a way that we developed a third
17 alternative.

18
19 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Mr. Gill.

20
21 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to
22 emphasize that I think the point I was making is that we have
23 options that we could put on the table for Alternative 3 or 4 or
24 whatever, and the only one that I thought of that made sense was
25 constant strategy, constant catch strategy, but I would
26 encourage the committee to consider adding an alternative, to
27 give some options for consideration. Thank you.

28
29 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Mr. Strelcheck.

30
31 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** Thanks, Mr. Chair. Mara made my points
32 with regard to constant catch, and I think Mr. Gill's comments
33 are well taken here, in terms of the committee potentially
34 considering another alternative, whether it's constant catch or
35 some other way of estimating it. Ms. Boggs indicated, and we
36 all just saw the presentation, that we're not fully harvesting
37 the catch levels as they stand now, and what's not clear to me
38 though is, once you convert to FES, what may or not be estimated
39 to be caught going forward.

40
41 I am supportive of adding an Alternative 3. Right now, I'm just
42 not sure exactly what that Alternative 3 would be, in order to
43 at least have a third value that could be a little bit more
44 conservative, given what we're seeing with the fishery right
45 now. Thanks.

46
47 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Susan.

1 **MS. BOGGS:** Ryan, I want to clarify that what I'm looking at is
2 correct, and it's the same thing with vermilion snapper, and I
3 would ask Assane to do this, but the recreational landings are
4 in FES, and, if I take the recreational landings in FES, and I
5 add them to the commercial ACL, that will give me my total catch
6 for the year, correct, because these numbers are FES, the
7 Alternative 2?

8
9 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, the numbers in Alternative 2 are using FES.

10
11 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right, and so we've had some
12 discussion, and there may be some interest in adding another
13 alternative or two. Ryan.

14
15 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. It doesn't take very long
16 to run the control rule, and it would establish a 10 percent
17 buffer between the ACL and the ABC based on the facts of recent
18 landings of the commercial and recreational sectors combined,
19 which is what we would have to do here, because the way that we
20 have everything parsed out for kingfish is we take that total
21 ACL and then we divide that between the recreational and the
22 commercial sectors, and then the commercial sector is then sub-
23 divided amongst the zones, but the control rule would create a
24 10 percent buffer between the total Gulf kingfish stock ABC and
25 the total Gulf stock ACL.

26
27 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Tom.

28
29 **DR. FRAZER:** Thanks, Kevin. I just wanted to make sure that I
30 understand the process here a little bit, and so we can
31 entertain any number of alternatives, whether they're constant
32 catch or control-rule-related, but, as long as they're under the
33 ABC, then we don't necessarily have to run this back through the
34 SSC again, and that's important.

35
36 I guess the second part of that is, if we add a third
37 alternative, are there additional analyses, or does it all fit
38 within the scope of what has already been done, and can we --
39 There is some interest in pushing this document forward for a
40 final in June, and so can we still do that if we put a third
41 alternative in there?

42
43 **MR. RINDONE:** I mean, if you guys are talking about something
44 that's going to be more conservative, that shouldn't be an
45 issue, and, if it doesn't have to go back to the SSC, then it
46 definitely shouldn't be an issue, and so I don't see Peter
47 shooting a flare up either. If they propose a more conservative
48 alternative, that shouldn't slow anything down from where we are

1 right now.

2
3 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We will give Peter a few minutes to
4 confirm that. I guess, Tom, do you want to -- Go ahead, please.

5
6 **DR. FRAZER:** Just, in the interim, I think that we're okay, and
7 so, sometime between now and Full Council, we can think of what
8 might be the most appropriate alternative to add in the
9 document, but it's sounding like the two scenarios that we've
10 considered are going to be more conservative, with minimal work,
11 and we can go ahead and move this forward for a final action in
12 June.

13
14 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I guess, to that, the questions you asked,
15 Tom, I will ask Ryan. Inasmuch as trying to meet the June
16 timeline, an additional alternative that would be offered would
17 probably be best if it was situated within the context of a
18 control-rule-type situation, rather than somebody just coming up
19 with some number, and would that be easier for staff to try to
20 analyze and add that in, or it doesn't make a difference as long
21 as it's below the current ABC?

22
23 **MR. RINDONE:** As long as it's below the current ABC, it should
24 be fine. I think, in keeping with the SSC's recommendation, the
25 most straightforward thing would be the application of the
26 ACL/ACT Control Rule, because that is a nod in deference to the
27 scientific uncertainty that was identified by the SSC and
28 wanting to have these catch limits increase over time, as
29 opposed to any potential overharvest in earlier years that could
30 come at a cost in recruitment in later years in these kinds of
31 situations. I think that would be the most straightforward for
32 that, but as long as you guys are under the ABC for the
33 implementing year, like Mara said.

34
35 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Froeschke, did you have your hand up?

36
37 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, and he covered it.

38
39 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Susan.

40
41 **MS. BOGGS:** So I understand everything that's being said. Can
42 something come back, as long as it doesn't equal ABC, or go
43 above the ABC, pardon me, and, if you do something similar to
44 what's here, where you gradually increase it back to a constant
45 catch, just so we can kind of see -- I understand that, as long
46 as we are below, and, at any time, we can come back and increase
47 it, and so that might be the way to do it, as opposed to trying
48 to flesh out -- I'm just making sure we have all our options

1 available to us. Thank you.

2
3 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I have two hands. Dr. Froeschke first and
4 then Leann.

5
6 **DR. FROESCHKE:** In response to that question, the way that it
7 would work here is that you would implement the catch levels up
8 until you reach the end of the 2023-2024, and it would remain at
9 the 9.99 as a constant catch, or whatever you did, unless you
10 did an additional management action.

11
12 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Leann.

13
14 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of
15 observations. I agree with Tom and others, as far as the timing
16 of this document and trying to take final action in June, and I
17 think that's imperative if we want to have this on the books in
18 time for hopefully the next fishing season, and then the other
19 thing that I might point out is, in some ways, when I look at
20 that Alternative 2 that you have on the board right now, and you
21 look at that total ACL, the first year, whatever year we end up
22 doing that, would be 9.37 million, and then the last year is
23 9.99 million, and so essentially 600,000 pounds of difference
24 between the three years.

25
26 I just wonder if we're not making a mountain out of a molehill
27 when we're talking about some of these, and it's not a real big
28 difference there already.

29
30 Then the other thing that I will point out is, in the landings,
31 we maybe see some changes in the landings, some decrease in
32 landings, but I don't necessarily believe that that is a
33 reflection of the health of the stock as much as it is a
34 reflection of, on the commercial side, number one, COVID
35 impacts, right, and we didn't land quite as many of these fish
36 as we otherwise would have, because of the market situation and
37 the weather situation.

38
39 The hurricanes were so terrible, especially during -- Was it
40 2020 or 2021? My years run together, but the traveling fleet
41 from the South Atlantic that comes over here actually went home
42 and didn't harvest that portion of our stock that they usually
43 harvest and land here, and so I think that's what you're seeing
44 on the commercial side.

45
46 On the recreational side, as we know, this is not the most
47 prized fish, recreationally, to begin with, and I wonder if
48 we're not seeing, now that we do have longer red snapper season,

1 which is what they would prefer to target, that you're seeing a
2 drop-off in them targeting this fish, even as much as they were
3 before, and so I say that to make sure we understand that the
4 stock is healthy, and we got a good report from the last stock
5 assessment, and so I don't want to be too conservative here and
6 start decreasing things below what's already proffered, from an
7 OFL to ABC for any scientific uncertainty, when we have a
8 healthy stock that we never land the total ABC anyway, and so
9 there's really an unwritten buffer there, and so just to throw
10 that out. If we have to put one more alternative, maybe a
11 constant catch, but I'm not sure that we even need that much in
12 this document. Thank you.

13
14 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you for your comments. Any other
15 discussion on this topic? All right, and so perhaps, between
16 now and Full Council, again seeing that our timeline for final
17 action is in June, if any committee member or other wants to
18 make a comment. Mr. Williamson.

19
20 **MR. TROY WILLIAMSON:** I'm not sure that the characterization of
21 the stock as not being attractive to the recreational folks is
22 correct. I think, after folks go out and fish for red snapper,
23 after they catch their limit, then I think this stock is
24 something that's very attractive to it, even though it is a
25 catch-and-release fishery, mostly, for the recreational, and
26 that's my comment.

27
28 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Susan.

29
30 **MS. BOGGS:** To Troy's comment, for the charter fishermen, I
31 know, at least in Orange Beach, we do have it somewhat as a
32 targeted fishery, and it's a family fun fishing trip, and you do
33 your little four-hour trolling trip, and we have several boats,
34 and I know one in particular, that over the last -- I mean,
35 since I've known the boat, for twenty years, they've been very
36 successful with their king mackerel, and they do bring them in,
37 but they're not, and they haven't been, for two or three years,
38 and I understand what Leann said, and she made some very good
39 points.

40
41 I mean, we've had some -- 2020 was the year of the hurricanes, I
42 remember, but I'm sitting here thinking is this a good thing for
43 our fishery ecosystem issue, but I don't know what the answer
44 is, and I just know there's a decline. I don't want to do a
45 knee-jerk reaction, but, at the same time, I just want to make
46 sure that we take care of our resources. Thank you.

47
48 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Okay. That will take us to our next

1 agenda item, Amendment 34, the Atlantic migratory group king
2 mackerel catch levels and Atlantic king and Spanish mackerel
3 management measures, and that will be led by Ms. Wiegand. Are
4 you on the phone?

5
6 **MS. CHRISTINA WIEGAND:** Yes, sir. I'm here.

7
8 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** It's yours. Are you starting with the
9 presentation, Tab C, Number 6(a)?

10
11 **FINAL ACTION: AMENDMENT 34: ATLANTIC MIGRATORY GROUP KING**
12 **MACKEREL CATCH LEVELS AND ATLANTIC KING AND SPANISH MACKEREL**
13 **MANAGEMENT MEASURES**
14

15 **MS. WIEGAND:** I am starting with the presentation, and I will
16 give you guys just a second to get that pulled up. Thank you.
17 Just to quickly orient you, and I know I've presented this to
18 you guys close to three or four times now, but this amendment is
19 addressing Atlantic migratory group king mackerel only, and it's
20 based on the SEDAR 38 update assessment that you guys were just
21 talking about.

22
23 It updated the recreational catch data, and, consistent with the
24 original SEDAR 38 stock assessment, found that Atlantic
25 migratory group king mackerel was not overfished or undergoing
26 overfishing. In fact, due to a number of years of excellent
27 recruitment, the recommended ABC actually increased quite a bit.
28 Additionally, there are some actions in here that address
29 modifications to management measures, based on input that the
30 council received from the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel.

31
32 Here is the purpose and need for the amendment, and I've thrown
33 this up here, but it has not changed since the last time you
34 guys reviewed this amendment, and so I'm not going to focus on
35 it much today.

36
37 Action 1 revises the acceptable biological catch, total ACL, and
38 annual OY for Atlantic migratory group king mackerel, and the
39 current preferred alternative would set a 5 percent buffer in
40 between the ABC and ACL, where the ACL would be equal to 95
41 percent of the revised ABC.

42
43 This is the rationale that is currently on the record, between
44 discussions with you all as well as the South Atlantic Council.
45 There was a desire to be precautionary, due to uncertainty with
46 the new MRIP-FES numbers. Additionally, the council felt that 5
47 percent buffer was appropriate for this stock, because of the
48 substantial increase in the recommended ABC, and that the

1 analysis shows that it's unlikely for the proposed ACL to be
2 met, and so there aren't any closures to the commercial or the
3 recreational sectors anticipated.

4
5 Moving on to Action 2, the current alternative is Alternative 1,
6 the no action alternative, and this would retain the current
7 recreational and commercial sector allocations at 62.9 percent
8 and 37.1 percent, respectively. The current rationale on record
9 notes that management of Atlantic king mackerel is considered a
10 success story, and it's beneficial to preserve the historic
11 makeup of the fishery. If you will remember, these allocations
12 were set back in the 1980s, and they were set using catch levels
13 from I believe 1978 to 1983.

14
15 It was noted that, in recent years, the commercial sector has
16 come close to meeting their ACL, whereas the recreational sector
17 has remained well below their ACL, and so, while maintaining
18 those allocation percentages that were set in the 1980s would
19 shift poundage towards the commercial sector, that's considered
20 appropriate, and it was also noted that, even with maintaining
21 those current percentage allocations, neither sector is
22 anticipated to experience a closure, due to their respective
23 ACLs being met.

24
25 Action 3 sets the recreational annual catch target for Atlantic
26 migratory group king mackerel. The current preferred
27 alternative is the no action alternative, which would revise the
28 recreational ACT to reflect the updated annual catch limit
29 level, that ACL times one minus the PSE, or 0.5, and this is the
30 equation that has been used historically for Atlantic migratory
31 group king mackerel, and so the rationale on the record simply
32 states that desire to maintain that current method and simply
33 update it based on the new catch levels that were selected in
34 the previous two actions.

35
36 Again, you will notice that we're just considering a
37 recreational annual catch target here, and that's because a
38 commercial annual catch target has not been set for this
39 species, and thus isn't incorporated into the accountability
40 measures in any way.

41
42 Action 4 looks at increasing the recreational bag and possession
43 limit for Atlantic king mackerel off Florida, and the current
44 preferred alternative is Alternative 2, which would increase the
45 daily bag limit for king mackerel from two fish per person to
46 three fish per person.

47
48 The current rationale on the record for this is to create

1 consistency in the recreational bag limit in federal waters, in
2 order to provide the same opportunity for harvest. This would
3 make three fish per person the bag limit throughout the Mid-
4 Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Gulf. Additionally, it was noted
5 that the recreational sector hasn't been reaching their ACL, and
6 a higher bag limit is anticipated to help increase harvest, but
7 not increase harvest to the point where a closure would be
8 anticipated.

9
10 Last, but certainly not least, we have Action 5, and this looks
11 at modifying the recreational requirement to land king and
12 Spanish mackerel with heads and fins intact. The current
13 preferred alternative would allow cutoff or damaged fish that
14 are caught under the recreational bag limit that comply with
15 minimum size limits to be possessed and offloaded ashore, and
16 that's for Atlantic migratory group king mackerel and Spanish
17 mackerel.

18
19 One of the things that the South Atlantic Council did do, at
20 their meeting in March, which you will see reflected in the
21 codified text that's in your briefing book, is create a specific
22 definition for damaged fish, and so, for the purposes of Action
23 5, damaged fish refers to king or Spanish mackerel that are
24 damaged only through natural predation.

25
26 The current rationale on record for that is to create
27 consistency between the commercial and recreational management
28 measures related to possession and offloading of damaged fish
29 and to address the increase in shark and barracuda depredation
30 that has been reported by stakeholders.

31
32 Here is the amendment development timeline, and we are finally
33 at the very end of this amendment. The South Atlantic Council
34 approved the amendment for formal review at their March meeting,
35 and so now it's being thrown over to you guys, to see if you all
36 are comfortable with approving this amendment for formal review,
37 and, if so, then staff will get working to finalize everything,
38 to hopefully transmit that document sometime this spring. That
39 is all that I have for this amendment, and I'm happy to take any
40 questions or walk through the codified text, whichever you all
41 would like to do first.

42
43 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Wiegand?
44 Any other discussion on the topic? All right. I guess if you
45 want to bring up the codified text then.

46
47 **MS. WIEGAND:** Perfect. Thank you. If you scroll on down to the
48 first comment, you can see Section 622.381 that addresses

1 landing fish intact, and you will see the new language added
2 there related to the definition of damaged fish, referring only
3 to fish that are damaged through natural predation, and then you
4 will see, down under recreational, under there, which addresses
5 allowing recreational fishermen to keep cut and damaged fish
6 that are caught under the bag limit, so long as they meet the
7 minimum size limits, and, again, that definition of "damaged
8 fish" is included under there.

9
10 Then, if you look at 622.382, that's the bag and possession
11 limits, and you will see they've modified it so that now all
12 Atlantic migratory group king mackerel are at three fish per
13 person, due to the increase in bag limit off of Florida proposed
14 in the amendment.

15
16 Then you've got 622.384, and this addresses the quotas,
17 particularly for the Northern Zone and the Southern Zone. If
18 you will remember, for Atlantic king mackerel, the commercial
19 quota is split into the Northern and Southern Zone, and so you
20 will see those numbers updated there, based on the new ACL and
21 allocations.

22
23 Continuing on down, then you've got 622.388, the ACLs and AMs,
24 and you will simply see, updated here, those commercial ACLs and
25 recreational ACT and ACLs updated to reflect the new ACL and
26 allocations adopted through this amendment, and then, last, but
27 certainly not least, under 622.413, you will see that they have
28 removed the language that incorporates the Florida bag limit by
29 reference, since we're now increasing the bag limit simply to be
30 three fish per person, which does conflict with the current
31 regulation in Florida, and that is all I have right now, and you
32 can consider approval for formal review.

33
34 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Any questions about the
35 codified text? This is for final action, and so we'll need to
36 do a roll call vote, or, actually, we just need a committee
37 vote. That's right. Is there any opposition? Well, I need a
38 motion. Tom.

39
40 **DR. FRAZER:** I'm happy to make the motion to move this forward
41 for a final vote.

42
43 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** There's a motion, and it's seconded by Mr.
44 Broussard. Any discussion on the motion? **Any opposition to the**
45 **motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carried.**

46
47 That will take us to the next agenda item, and that will be
48 Other Business. We have the one item under Other Business, and

1 it's the Discussion on Gulf King Mackerel Southern Zone Gillnet
2 Fishing Restrictions on Weekends, Tab C, Number 7(a). The
3 regulation is currently in the briefing book, and that is Tab C,
4 Number 7(a). Mr. Rindone, do you have any other comments or
5 background information related to maybe how the regulation came
6 to be or any other things as to who the request came from for us
7 to look at fishing on weekends? Thank you.

8
9 **OTHER BUSINESS**

10 **DISCUSSION ON GULF KING MACKEREL SOUTHERN ZONE GILLNET FISHING**
11 **RESTRICTIONS ON WEEKENDS**
12

13 **MR. RINDONE:** Sure. This request is coming through public
14 comment from the Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen's
15 Association, and so the -- In the Southern Zone, the gillnet,
16 the runaround gillnet, component of the kingfish fishery is not
17 allowed to fish on weekends or federal holidays, and this was
18 implemented to better account for the harvest via gillnets,
19 which can come in quite rapidly, and landings on weekends and
20 federal holidays wouldn't be reported to NMFS and processed by
21 NMFS until the next business day, and so this had the potential
22 to result in quota overruns for that particular part of the
23 fleet.

24
25 Currently, the gillnet fleet communicates in real time with NMFS
26 staff, and one of the fishermen communicates regularly with NFMS
27 staff via text message, phone call, email, to let them know what
28 landings have come in, and then those landings that are reported
29 are then validated through the trip ticket system and seafood
30 dealer reports, once those reports come in.

31
32 The gillnet fleet voluntarily stops fishing when it's estimated
33 that, based on the landings that they've reported, that their
34 ACL has been projected to be met. This more recent reporting
35 method is -- Again, it's pretty much in real time, and it's the
36 opinion of the fishermen that it has negated the need for this
37 prohibition on weekend and federal holiday fishing, and so they
38 were asking you guys to consider lifting that prohibition.

39
40 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Susan.

41
42 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, I mean, if we did that, their fishing season,
43 it seems like, would be a week long, because, from what I'm
44 seeing, this year, Martin Luther King was, what, mid-February,
45 and they closed on March 2. They already have overruns, and am
46 I missing something?

47
48 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Ryan.

1
2 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. They have had a couple of
3 quota underages, if you will, in the last few years, and they
4 have had one, or maybe two, quota overages, where they then had
5 a payback the following year, and so, as far as their quota
6 management is concerned, for how quickly the fish can be landed,
7 it does seem to be working pretty well, the method of reporting.

8
9 Insofar as it relates to the duration of their fishing season,
10 the duration isn't as important to them as access, and so they
11 will not fish until the price for kingfish reaches a certain
12 price per pound, which they, as a collective, will discuss and
13 agree that, all right, once it reaches this point, then we'll
14 start going, and they draw names out of a hat, to see who gets
15 to go first.

16
17 They have a 45,000-pound trip limit, and they just -- They go
18 order of basically -- In the order in which the names are drawn,
19 and so not every set is 45,000 pounds. Some are less than that,
20 obviously, and so fishing continues in order until the ACL is
21 met, or projected to be met, and so, whether that takes them two
22 days or two months is not as much of a concern to them.

23
24 They have testified, in the past, that they would prefer to take
25 less time, if possible, because a lot of these fishermen are
26 also stone crabbers or lobster fishermen, and they're using the
27 same vessels for gillnetting, and it requires them to move some
28 equipment off of those boats and install these large drums that
29 hold the nets, and, while the runaround gillnet equipment is on
30 the vessel, it makes it very difficult to do anything else, and
31 so the vessel is kind of committed at that point.

32
33 If the weather is really bad, say during the week, like here
34 this week, and it's really windy out, they're not going out and
35 pulling stone crab traps or lobster traps, and they're just
36 waiting for the weather window and the opportunity to go out and
37 try and make a strike on those kingfish, and so the boats sits,
38 and, for commercial fishermen, they're not fond of that.

39
40 **MS. BOGGS:** Well, thank you for that, because I certainly didn't
41 know any of that. I mean, I don't care if they catch them in a
42 day or what, but I just -- I guess now I have a clearer
43 understanding, and so I appreciate that. Thank you.

44
45 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other questions or comments? I see a
46 couple on the board. I see Leann and then Andy.

47
48 **MS. BOSARGE:** I appreciate this being brought up during Other

1 Business, because I will always see the council process as one
2 that's bottom-up, right, and so our fishermen tell us what the
3 issues are, and then we try and take them up, and so I was glad
4 this finally rose to the top and we're seeing it in front of us.

5
6 Just to reiterate some of the things that Ryan said, in
7 commercial fishing, it's about efficiency, and so the fact that
8 their season will be shorter, they're good with it. It makes
9 them more efficient, in this particular case, because they have
10 other gears that they can put on the boat and go target other
11 things, and it does seem sort of strange that you don't allow
12 fishing on weekends and holidays, but I understand why, and Ryan
13 made that clear, but I think we're at a different point in this
14 fishery now, where they're almost self-regulating and managing
15 themselves.

16
17 As far as that overage, you're trying to wrap a net around fish
18 that are in the water, and you're trying to ballpark how many
19 pounds of fish are in the water before you ever pull them out,
20 right, because, once you wrap the net around them, you've got
21 them. That's why they asked us to have that payback put in
22 place, because, sometimes, at the tail-end of their season --
23 That doesn't usually matter too much, during the season, but, at
24 the tail-end, that last set might put them a little bit over
25 what their quota is, and they said, you know, we want to be
26 responsible about this, and, if we have an overage, towards the
27 end of that season, take it off the next season, and we do, and
28 so I don't see any issues there.

29
30 I hope the council will do -- I'm sure it would just be a
31 framework action, if we decide to take this up, to address that
32 one item, and I hope we can do that for those fishermen, make
33 this small change that will help them become more efficient in
34 the fishery. Thank you.

35
36 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Andy.

37
38 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Thanks, Mr. Chair. Ryan has done an excellent
39 job of summarizing the situation, and I appreciated Leann's
40 comments just now about the industry self-regulating. We are in
41 regular communication with the industry, throughout the season,
42 as they report landings. They are also, obviously, coordinating
43 effectively amongst themselves, and I think, really, this is a
44 situation where the regulation is really not needed any longer,
45 given how we're managing, or how the fishery is kind of self-
46 regulating, and so I would certainly support modifications to
47 this regulation.

1 This particular season, when talking with industry members, what
2 I was being told is that the weather was setting up to where it
3 would allow boats to go fishing late in the week, but the
4 problem that they were encountering is that, even if they could
5 do sets let's say on a Friday, by the time they got back to the
6 dock, and boats are backed up at the dealer, and it takes an
7 extensive amount of time to unload those fish, but they couldn't
8 unload them, or would not be able to unload them, by that
9 possession limit of on the weekend timeframe.

10
11 That's where the request came from, and they, obviously, want
12 more flexibility with regard to when they can land the fish,
13 when they can possess the fish, so that, when this bad weather
14 and other events, obviously, set up, that they are able to go
15 fishing when the weather cooperates.

16
17 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you for that. Leann, do you have a
18 question?

19
20 **DR. FRAZER:** I was just talking with Leann here, and one of us
21 is going to make a motion, and I will go ahead and do it. **I**
22 **guess the motion, and I will let Bernie get it up on the board,**
23 **would be to direct staff to develop a framework action to remove**
24 **the weekend closures in the mackerel gillnet fishery.**

25
26 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Ryan, while that's being put up?

27
28 **MR. RINDONE:** Just it's a framework amendment, because we're
29 special in CMP.

30
31 **DR. FRAZER:** Yes, we are.

32
33 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Billy.

34
35 **MR. BROUSSARD:** Does that motion need to include holidays,
36 because I think it was closed on holidays as well.

37
38 **DR. FRAZER:** Yes, I think so, and I hope the staff would have
39 enough latitude to incorporate the discussion in the framework.

40
41 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Tom, there's your motion. Is that what
42 you want?

43
44 **DR. FRAZER:** Yes, it is. I'm good with that.

45
46 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. We need a second for the
47 motion. Leann seconds. Any discussion on the motion? **Any**
48 **opposition to the motion?** Andy, have you got your hand up?

1
2 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I am not opposing the motion, but I just wanted
3 to suggest that if we could incorporate this into CMP Framework
4 11, rather than creating a new framework, that would certainly
5 be ideal, from a staff workload perspective. Thanks.
6

7 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Tom.
8

9 **DR. FRAZER:** I mean, I don't have any real problem, Andy, with
10 doing that, but my question would be for staff and whether or
11 not they have enough time to incorporate it into Framework 11 so
12 that we can still take it final in June.
13

14 **MR. RINDONE:** I think June might be a stretch, but, again, we
15 haven't considered putting it in that particular amendment,
16 because you guys, at the last meeting, had made it pretty clear
17 that you wanted Framework Amendment 11 to be moving at a wide-
18 open throttle, and adding something that's not related to the
19 catch limits into it like this -- I am not saying a flat no, but
20 we could definitely take final action in August, if it were
21 folded in.
22

23 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Tom.
24

25 **DR. FRAZER:** I guess the way -- I mean, we have a motion on the
26 board, and we can move it forward, and we can have some
27 discussion between now and Full Council and decide if we want to
28 modify the motion to incorporate it into the Amendment 11, on
29 Thursday or so, if that's okay with everybody.
30

31 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I guess I would just be curious, Andy, if
32 you had, I guess, a comment that, if it was August versus June,
33 if staff could in fact incorporate it into Amendment 11. If it
34 was August, do you think it could be implemented for the next
35 fishing year, or is that what you concern was, is trying to get
36 into 11, since it had a June final action time?
37

38 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I didn't weigh-in on specifically June versus
39 August. I think certainly, even if we took action in August, we
40 could have it in place by the start of the next fishing year. I
41 am just trying to look at, you know, where we can create some
42 efficiencies in the system, and, rather than create a new
43 framework action, if we could plug it into an existing one, I
44 always want to take the opportunity to do so.
45

46 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you. Natasha, your hand
47 is up?
48

1 **DR. MENDEZ-FERRER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Based on the
2 discussions that we're having, if there is any desire on having
3 this action take place within a particular timeframe, we do
4 have, in addition to Framework Amendment 11, we are still
5 working on CMP Amendment 33, plus there was a request to begin a
6 document on restricting the recreational sale of cobia, and so
7 that's another document that we will be having in the works this
8 year.

9
10 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Okay. I guess let's vote this up, and
11 then maybe we can talk a little bit more, and we have a little
12 bit more time, about giving some direction to staff as to
13 prioritizing things, maybe, if that's needed. Any other
14 discussion on the motion on the board? **Is there any opposition**
15 **to the motion on the board? I don't see anybody raising their**
16 **hands, and so the motion carries.**

17
18 Then, relative to that comment that Natasha just made, as far as
19 the workload of staff and maybe providing some suggestion, or
20 guidance, to them as to what we would prefer to have first, of
21 those items that she mentioned, because as it relates to maybe
22 the cobia sale, and does this supersede the cobia sale
23 amendment, and does that help staff, I guess, with trying to get
24 us to a point where we can have this by August? Dr. Simmons.

25
26 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I think
27 we understand that. I do think the sale, the recreational sale,
28 of cobia may be a little trickier issue, and I think it might
29 have to be a full amendment, and I'm not completely clear on
30 that, but we understand that you want this to be a priority, and
31 we'll see if we can fit it in the current Framework 11.

32
33 **VICE CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Thank you. There were no
34 other additional items added to Other Business. I am giving
35 opportunity to those to bring up any, since we have time for
36 other business items. Seeing none, that concludes the Mackerel
37 Management Committee.

38
39 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on April 4, 2022.)
40
41

- - -