

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

**Doubletree by Hilton Oceanfront Hotel
Atlantic Beach, North Carolina**

December 10, 2015

SUMMARY MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Mel Bell, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
Dr. Wilson Laney
Zack Bowen

Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Mark Brown
Jack Cox
Charlie Phillips

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Dr. Michelle Duval
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley

Chester Brewer
Ben Hartig
LTJG Tara Pray

COUNCIL STAFF:

Bob Mahood
Amber Von Harten
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Dr. Brian Chevront
Mike Collins

Gregg Waugh
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Mike Errigo
Chip Collier
John Carmichael
Julie O'Dell

PARTICIPANTS/OBSERVERS:

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Scott Sandorf
Erika Burgess
Kevin Anson

Dr. Jack McGovern
Tracy Dunn
Monica Smit-Brunello

Additional observers attached

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Doubletree by Hilton Oceanfront Hotel, Thursday morning, December 10, 2015, and was called to order at 10:45 o'clock a.m. by Chairmen Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: I call this meeting to order. The first item would be approval of the agenda. What I would like to do - John Carmichael is going to give us an update on Citizen Science at the end, is the way it is scheduled - I would like to flip Number 6 and Number 5 and basically do all of the updates and things before we get to the bulk of what we'll be talking about, which is to deal with the for-hire amendment.

I would make that one adjustment to the agenda. Any other adjustments to the agenda needed? Seeing none then; that adjusted agenda is approved. The next item would be approval of the minutes from the December meeting. Any changes to the minutes? Seeing none; then the minutes from the December meeting are approved.

Just to be clear, since we've had some personnel adjustments, the Data Committee consists of myself, Doug Haymans, Anna Beckwith, Chris Conklin, Wilson Laney, Bob Beal, who had to leave, Mark Brown, Jack Cox and Charlie Phillips. That is sort of a new group of folks in some cases. All right, so then the first item on our agenda would be a presentation from Dr. Ponwith concerning the status of the commercial electronic logbook pilot project. When you're ready.

DR. PONWITH: These slides will look familiar, it is cumulative and it's an opportunity to get you caught up on the genesis of this and where we are right now. Again, this is the status of the commercial electronic logbook project. If we go to the next slide you can see that we had multiple vendors participate in this.

The notion is we supplied data requirements to the vendors and allowed the vendors to develop the software to achieve those data requirements. We had several vessels participating. You can see we had six from the South Atlantic, two from the HMS and three from the Gulf of Mexico. The notion was to get geographic spread and also to get a blend of different gear types; to be able to see how this system could work across several different types of gear.

Here is the cumulative progress. Everything you see with a checkmark are things that we've accomplished, and we've actually reported on later. What I'm going to do is move our way down to the November/December timeframe, and you can see that the data collection is completed.

We're receiving feedback from the fishermen that participated in the program. That work is ongoing. The fishermen submitted e-reports in several capacities through the trial period of this, and those reports were submitted in many different ways via at-dock Wi-Fi, home Wi-Fi and through the vendors web portal. Most of the hardware is being reclaimed right now. We do have some fishermen that are going to retain that hardware for some additional testing that we would like to do.

Then we're also testing reporting via cellular networks. We've gotten a lot of feedback on the e-log use and this includes feedback on the hardware, on the software, and pretty much the overall experience of putting that together in a system and how easy it was to submit those data. We're conducting more extensive interviews with the fishermen to make sure that we get that feedback

and provide that feedback actually to the vendors that selected the hardware and wrote the software.

That is being incorporated into what can be the operational version of the software and hardware choices going forward. The perception of the e-log varies. The feedback suggests that the gear that is being used influences whether the feedback was positive or more challenging, certainly on the species that is being targeted as well, we saw some differences.

I think the main difference there is that the gear determines how many sets there are logged, so remember, this isn't just an electronic version of the current paper logbook form. This is a mechanism to be able to monitor landings on a set by set basis. It gives us a much higher level of granularity, and so certainly for that reason we would expect the feedback on the amount of time it took to submit these data would be commensurate with the number of sets that we have in these fisheries.

Also, the more species targeted tends to increase the amount of time that it takes to submit those data, but that is logical. We I guess will continue to use this information to inform the vendors and incorporate anything that we learn that can be corrected via modifications to the hardware or software to do so. That is my report. I'll take questions if you've got them.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Bonnie; I've got one real quick. What was the range of fisheries, boat sizes just roughly? I know you had numbers up there but I didn't get a sense of who that was or what kind of boats they were.

DR. PONWITH: Again, it was intended to represent a broad array of gear types and a broad geographic range. What the actual vessel sizes were, I know that that was a range as well. What those statistics are, I can't tell you off the top of my head. But I can certainly get that information if you're interested.

MR. BELL: Yes that would be great.

DR. PONWITH: It is vessel size you are interested in?

MR. BELL: Yes, just the size of vessels we're dealing with and the fisheries they were participating in.

DR. PONWITH: Sure.

MR. BELL: I think Anna had a question and then Jack.

MS. BECKWITH: Bonnie, thanks. The set level reporting is that sort of a part of the pilot program but not intended to become a mandatory part of that required reporting?

DR. PONWITH: What ultimately becomes mandatory will be dictated by the council, because of course to be mandatory you need the regulation. We are gathering data at the set level because one of the criticisms we've gotten on the logs for a very long time is, hey I go fishing on these long trips and fish a broad geographic area and a broad range of depths, and when you look at the log there is one place to put what depth you fished at; which one do you want?

That is a very, very legitimate issue. Now one of the questions that we have all the time is, what are our discards and what percentage of those discards die? The answer to that question is often driven by the very most important parameter and that is depth. If we had for commercial fishers the proportion of their trip that was accomplished at various depth strata that would enable us to do a more refined job of assigning a mortality rate.

If a boat went out and they fished in shallower depths for 30 percent of their trip, we could apply a differential and actually give them a lower mortality rate for that portion of the trip than the deeper. This is just one example of the things that we could learn from set by set collections, and it is one that works to our advantage from a stock assessment standpoint, and my guess is could really work to the industries advantage in terms of being credited for a higher level of granularity in their data.

MR. COX: I was just going to say, so I've got two boats participating in the program, my 28 foot center console has a tablet version that is waterproof, and then I have a laptop on my 35 foot boat that the captain does sea bass pot sets, and also bandit fishing as well; and that is a 35 foot boat, to answer some of those questions.

I was just going to say Brett Pierce has been a pleasure to work with out of your office. He has got the most patience in the world with some of these commercial guys that are not tech savvy, but he can go to Team Viewer and take over the computer and have them sitting right there and just show them how to do the stuff.

With a computer on the boat, they can link up with just a little disk and get GPS coordinates, and so when they're doing sets all they have to do is hit a button and grab a set. Then they can enter their discards on each set. This is a pilot program, but I think it is going to become voluntary pretty soon; I think in the spring of the year where we're going to be able to take a choice of doing away with the paper logbooks and then once we're really familiar with this, start using this and submitting the data electronically. I'm very excited and glad to be part of the program.

MR. BELL: You know what's encouraging is, of course, if there is an interest in incorporating appropriate electronic technologies in improving data and timing and flow and quality. But for it to work it has got to work, and that is why this field testing and working with the industry is so critical to make sure. We can come up with the greatest system in the world, but if it isn't practical then it doesn't work. It is encouraging that at least on the boat sizes that you're dealing with that it has some positive results, so that's great.

MR. BROWN: Do you have a sample of what they're using? I mean is there a sample that people can look at online or something?

DR. PONWITH: Not that I'm aware of. But if you're interested in a demo, you can send me a letter or a request as a reminder, and then I'll make sure that we set our colleagues up to come and do a demo for the council. They may be able to bring some examples of the hardware and then do a demo of what the software looks like on the screen, if you thought that would be useful.

If you think it would be useful for the broader fishing community to be able to see that we could establish some examples or maybe a short video and put it on a website for people to look at. If you explain to me what you think would be useful, we can talk about making that happen.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I'm already doing the electronic logbook for the headboat, and so I'm always making recommendations and talking to Ken Brennan you know about different things that could be adjusted to that. I've talked to Mel about it before too.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Bonnie right now? Okay thanks, Bonnie. We'll move to the next agenda item, which Gregg is going to give us an update on the commercial logbook electronic reporting he's been working on.

MR. WAUGH: I spoke with Mike Cahall last week and they're in the late stages of getting that data feed going into GARFO up in the northeast. That will be another potential option for commercial fishermen to provide voluntary electronic logbooks. Hopefully it will be operational by our March meeting. The background information for that is on Pages 3 through 5 of the overview, if you want a little more detail.

MR. BELL: Any questions for Gregg at this time? All right great, moving right along. John, are you ready to give us a Citizen Science update?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I'll give you a quick update on this. There has been a lot of progress, a lot of meetings, a lot of discussion, and a lot of brainstorming about how to get through this, because, you know, we have a lot of people coming and it is a new topic. I think we've got a pretty good plan laid out.

We're going to have a mixture of presentations and then facilitated type sessions very similar to like the visioning workshop that the council has done, and we'll break up group's different ways during the week to get different things out of them. The goal is still an end product which is essentially a blueprint of a citizen science program that will come to the council and decide how to proceed.

I wanted to go through some of the participant issues, because you appointed a large list of participants. In some cases we appointed participants and potential backups, and then we went and contacted all the folks to find out who was available and who was interested, and in that process we got a few places where we had say both the originally identified person as well as the potential backup who have expressed interest in attending.

Because it could increase the number of folks a little bit, we wanted to ask for just permission to allow, in most cases I think it will work out to allow both individuals to come, and I think that's good, because if we have folks that are interested, we want to bring them in. On the back page I had a few of the places where we have these issues and I want to give a bit of an update, because we've continued to work with our Sea Grant folks as well and we've got them between the four states supporting 18 people to come as a mixture of fishermen and Sea Grant agents, so that is just an amazing outpouring of support from those guys. Our hats off to them for coming together with us to do this and helping us get a lot of good people in the room.

As a result of that, for example, in North Carolina we had Bob Lorenz and Andy Piland with one as an alternative. Bob is going to be covered by Sea Grant. It turned out Tom Burgess couldn't come, they were still willing to support a total of four from North Carolina, so that could allow us to move Andy over to South Atlantic travel orders and not increase the number of folks coming.

Within Florida, we had Jimmy Hull and Jim Freeman together, and both of them are interested. I think that adds only one more person. That is certainly within the expected number of participants we could cover; also, we have Ira Laks, who at the time we put this together we hadn't heard from him, but we since have and he is interested in coming, so I'm thinking of adding him to the list, as well.

That covers the new folks and then another thing is we talked some within our Organizing Committee about having a nice proceeding done, and there is someone that has worked with the Citizen Science people and is known for doing a very good job of putting together a workshop proceeding.

Now that is something that really we hadn't discussed within the Organizing Committee, and didn't really see the staff involved with this with having time to do a nice proceedings document, so being able to bring someone in to do this I think will really be of real value added product in the output of this group.

Another reason that that is really important is this scene is kind of a groundbreaking effort that we're doing, and we know there is a lot of interest at the national levels of our federal government to promote citizen science within agencies. We're doing kind of a new thing here, so what we do here could really be an important reference to others who are going down a similar path, which then also speaks to the importance of having a really good proceedings document, which shows what we ultimately did and really how we got there.

We are plowing a lot of new ground and we've worked closely with citizen science experts like Rick Bonny and he's pointed that out to us that this is really kind of a landmark sort of thing we're doing and that really speaks to having a really good document. We talked some at our Organizing Committee about soliciting some additional funds from the council; another \$5,000.00 is what was identified to help us cover the proceedings and a few extra travelers.

I put that out to Bob and Gregg and Mike. It seems like the council can cover that. If there is consent, I think we're on track here with that to increase our budget another \$5,000.00. I think we were at \$35,000 before. Yes, so if you all agree with that and the suggestion to add those additional people, because they were appointed just as primary and alternates. Their names were already called out. I think that we're okay; we wouldn't need any motions or anything to handle that just your thumbs up at inviting all of them.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I am not on your committee. Just a quick plug for the proceedings document, you know when we discussed this amongst the Organizing Committee there was a lot of support for moving forward with allocating some funds to allow for those; just given the importance of this, and the importance with which this is being seen by folks in the citizen science community in general.

Having this is something that we can pass out to interested folks who are interested in partnering with us, who are interested in perhaps being able to support some of these efforts financially, would really be a good thing. I encourage everybody to think about this before we get to Executive Finance, and I would encourage the council's support of an extra \$5,000.00 for this effort to ensure its success.

MR. BELL: Yes, I consider it a good investment myself. I mean, it is really great when you can do something that the public is interested in and it makes sense, and we're talking about some pretty interesting new ways of improving data and addressing public concern.

MR. CONKLIN: Hey, I just noticed some names are crossed off the list. Is that because you couldn't get in touch with them or they weren't willing? A couple guys from South Carolina, I talked to them and they said they were more than willing to get onboard with this program.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think for the most part they are people that we reached out to and did not hear back in the affirmative that they could be there. There were some that weren't available, but I don't remember off the top of my head who was who. Like South Carolina Sea Grant in particular, they were interested in supporting an agent and three fishermen, so there is some move even within what they have to potentially bring someone else in.

I think if we found someone else in South Carolina that wouldn't be bad. Maybe if we can get with you and maybe get with some of those guys, I know time is running out and the sooner we do that the better, but if we could touch base with another one of those guys that we haven't been able to confirm with yet, that would be good.

We just wanted to point out one clarification, I've said appointments but these are actually invitations; because making appointments carries some connotation that is beyond what this is, this isn't an AP or anything like that where you're appointing people, just for the record clarify that. These are people the council has invited to come and take part in this workshop.

MR. MEL: Chris, if you could work with John, some of those are the ones you mentioned that would be great. We certainly do appreciate Sea Grant's support and involvement in this as well.

MR. BOWEN: I'm not on your committee. Just a clarifying question, where will this be located, at what hotel or establishment?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It is going to be held at the Town and Country in Charleston.

MR. CONKLIN: They have a really good buffet, for breakfast and lunch; yes you'll love it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just to reiterate, this is an open workshop, open to the public. I think it has even been advertised in the Federal Register, I can't recall, but I believe I saw that announcement go out. It is open to anyone.

MR. BOWEN: Are we going to record it?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes.

MR. BELL: Okay, any other questions for John on citizen science, any comments?

MR. HAYMANS: John, this Bryan Fluech guy; Sea Grant, is he still Florida Sea Grant?

MR. CARMICHAEL: He moved recently, is that correct?

MR. HAYMANS: I haven't had a chance to meet him yet. Okay, thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Doug, yes. We just hired him down at Marine Extension to take Lisa's place and I was sitting in on that committee.

MR. HAYMANS: He's the new Director for MAREX?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, he took Lisa Liguori's place, and yes he seems like he's going to be real good for us and it was real bad for Florida.

MR. BELL: Any other discussion of citizen science or questions for John? Yes, Jack.

MR. COX: When we visit the beautiful city of Charleston, is there any reason why we don't have more meetings downtown?

MR. BELL: My guess would be that it is expensive and the venues are not necessarily as easy to book. That is kind of a Mike thing. But it is not cheap downtown, necessarily or available, but I'm just guessing. Traffic can be challenging and even just parking can be a real hassle. No other questions for John. Oh, I'm sorry, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Again, not on your committee, but I do think it would be, given that this is the committee that sort of has oversight over the citizen science right now. I do think it would be good to get consensus from the committee, in terms of agreement, to allocate an additional \$5,000.00. Not necessarily that we need a motion, just a consent from the committee.

MR. BELL: Everybody knows who is on the committee now. Is everybody okay with that; \$5,000.00 additional dollars before we get to Executive Finance later? I mean I think it is a good investment.

MR. BOWEN: I mentioned this to our Chair a while ago and Anna did this, it might have been on this committee. But I'm making a formal request to be added to this committee. We have some amendments coming up that are near and dear to my heart, and if I could just ask that right now, I guess. I don't know if this is the proper time; but I've already asked it.

DR. DUVAL: Nothing like putting me on the spot, there will be payback for that. Yes, you can be added to the committee.

MR. BOWEN: Oh, oh.

MR. BELL: You have to pay the dues, though. All right, well, why don't we in the interest of time here – thanks John, I appreciate that – Gregg, let's go ahead and move to the main menu

item before lunch. There were two associated attachments for this, Attachment 2 and Attachment 3. I'm not sure how Gregg is going to drive this off of the Decision Document?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, we'll work with the Decision Document, Attachment 3; but you do have the complete Draft Amendment as Attachment 2. That contains all the detailed analyses, and if need be we can refer to that. I've gotten some edits from Jack and other members of the IPT that we will incorporate as well.

Again, the intent here is to approve this for public hearings, so we'll clean the document up with your actions and the additional input from the IPT. This amendment amends the Snapper Grouper Plan; it will be Snapper Grouper Amendment 39, Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 9, and Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 27.

The overall intent, what I've done is added a little bit of material to the document as we go through, and I'll point that out. The overall goal of this amendment is to get the charterboats reporting the way the headboats are now. We're going to make a slight adjustment in the reporting frequency in that the reports will be due the Tuesday following each week. Right now, it is a Sunday following each week.

That will align the for-hire reporting with the commercial. We want to make clear what is not in this amendment. We're not changing to what is currently defined as charter and headboat vessels, and we'll go through that in a minute. We're not changing; there are no new requirements for the states.

We're obviously going to work closely with the state of South Carolina to make sure that all their data elements are included with our data elements so there is no duplication there, and so fishermen in South Carolina can send in one report and meet both the state and federal reporting requirements.

There is no effort, no action in here, no intent in here to separate sectors. We know there is a lot of concern out in the public with what is in here and what is not, and we want to be very up front with what is in here and what is not. Purpose and need is the first item we're going to have to deal with, and that is on Page 3 of your decision document. The purpose is to increase the accuracy and timeliness of landings, discards, effort and socioeconomic data of federally permitted for-hire vessels participating in South Atlantic managed fisheries.

The need for this action is to improve charter vessel and headboat fishery data, use for management and to improve monitoring and compliance of federally permitted for-hire vessels in the South Atlantic managed fisheries. Since we are trying to get the charterboats reporting as the headboats are, there was a suggestion to add to the need to standardize for-hire reporting requirements by implementing the headboat requirements for all federally permitted charter vessels, to add that to the need. What you have before you is some wording in the motion to modify the need to read as follows: and of course, you can modify the purpose as well. The first action is to get some clarification on the purpose and need.

MS. BECKWITH: I sort of have to take a step back first as we talk about this, because it is all related within the document. We keep hearing that we're going to bring the charterboats up to the headboat standard. But the headboats currently require all fish, all trips. You'll see later on,

I've worked with Gregg to create some language that will add a subalternative within the Action 4 for the charterboats that will either be all fish all official trips, or reporting for our federally managed permits.

I am a little bit concerned about the language here and I want to sort of have a bigger discussion a moment, because when I read this purpose and need I read that the data for federally permitted for-hire vessels participating in South Atlantic managed fisheries; so that is our three permits. Within each of the alternatives that we'll sort of go through later on, it always talks about requiring permitted charter vessels participating in the subject fisheries to submit fishing records.

Again to me, the subject fisheries are our three permits. Currently, the headboats, the verbiage in the headboats are all fish all trips. That is not an issue for the headboats, because generally our headboats are participating in federal fisheries, federal waters, and even if they're catching state managed species they are catching them in cooperation or whatever with sort of our federally managed fisheries.

For our state folks that is not the case. We have a lot of the smaller charterboats that hold their federal permits that are not often fishing for any of the federal species that we manage. To me, it is not clear in this document that we could possibly be requiring those guys, when they are speckled trout fishing or red drum fishing in the Pamlico Sound, to be required to report on those trips. If that is the intention, then we need to be crystal clear, because that has been completely missed by all of our charter folks.

I don't think that is the route that we need to take, personally. Unfortunately, in North Carolina we had a large amount of misguided souls that felt that they should not be obligated to report their data in order to help manage our fisheries. But the reality is that is what we're dealing with in North Carolina. I think we'll possibly – taking a bigger look at this – will get more buy in from our federally permitted guys if we're asking them to report on the federally permitted species.

I only bring this up sort of as bigger picture, because if we add that additional sentence, the standardize for-hire reporting requirements by implementing the headboat requirement for all federally permitted charter vessels. That would technically require us to add the all fish, all trips caveat, and I am not currently comfortable with that caveat. I would like to add two subalternatives and let it go to public comment.

MR. BELL: Let's do this, Anna and I have talked about this. Let's kind of set that statement aside for right now. We can work through the other actions where this will come up. We'll work out the details of exactly what it is we want what we expect. Then we can come back and adjust the need statement appropriately.

MR. BOWEN: I understand that and it's fine, but just while it is fresh on my mind. You said they are fishing for trout and whatever else she said. My first initial thought is, well if they're not fishing for federally managed species why do they need the permit to begin with? We can come back to it, but if they're not targeting our species that we're managing why do they need a permit?

MR. BELL: What it has to do with is how the specific requirements for headboat is currently worded and all, where it is all trips, no matter what you're fishing for, right? We can kind of deal with this in more detail in the other actions and then come back to the purpose and need statement.

MR. WAUGH: If we look at the top of Page 4, this gets into what is currently defined as a charter vessel, and that shows you over the years 2010 through 2014 the total. It has decreased slightly from 2,141 in 2010 to 1,984 in 2014. You can see the breakout by South Atlantic states and other states.

Headboats, this shows how they are generally defined, and then this wording lays out how they are selected for reporting. Currently a vessel is selected by the Science and Research Director to participate in the headboat survey if it meets all or a combination of these criteria. That leads to some vessels being included in the sample that don't currently have federal headboat permit.

The number of headboats here again, South Atlantic from 2010 through 2015, pretty stable; a slight decrease from 80 vessels in 2010 to 76 from 2013 through 2015. I think if we look at the no action alternatives, this will help clarify in people's minds where we are right now. The yellow strike through are recommended changes from the IPT.

But right now, the owner or operator of a charter vessel, for which a charter vessel headboat or headboat permit for South Atlantic migratory pelagic species, that is the mackerels, or snapper grouper or dolphin wahoo have been issued, or who's vessel fishes for or lands such species and who lands those species in or from state waters adjoining the applicable South Atlantic EEZ and who is selected to report by the Science and Research Director, must maintain a fishing record for each trip.

You'll see in a minute there is different wording for the headboats. But none of the charterboats have been selected right now. They are currently being surveyed through the MRIP program. In addition we have a requirement in place that for South Atlantic Snapper Grouper charter vessels selected to report by the Science and Research Director must participate in a NMFS sponsored electronic logbook and/or video monitoring program as directed.

That is already in place. They just haven't been selected. What we're doing now with the alternatives under these Alternatives 2 and 3, we would be requiring 100 percent of the charterboat vessels to report. Let me just jump ahead to the no action for the headboats; so you can see the difference.

Then we'll come back to this action. For headboats the owner/operator of a headboat for which a charter vessel or a headboat permit for those three fisheries lands those species, in or from state waters adjoining the EEZ who is selected to report must submit an electronic fishing record for each trip of all fish harvested. For headboats they have to report all fish that are harvested. That is the difference between the two. If we come back now to Action 1 and look at our two alternatives, Alternative 2 would require that federally permitted charter vessels submit fishing records to the Science and Research Director weekly, or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the Science and Research Director via electronic reporting, via NMFS approved hardware/software.

The timeframe would be weekly, which would mean Tuesday following each fishing week. The Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel supported that. Alternative 3, the same requirement but requires daily, so by noon of the following day. To address this issue of what exactly they would be reporting, we've added to the version that is up on the screen subalternatives under Alternatives 2 and 3.

Subalternative 2A would read report all fish harvested and that would get you closer to what is being done with headboats, or Alternative 2B, report all federally managed species harvested. What we're talking about there are snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and the coastal migratory pelagics. Those are the ones, the FMPs that we are amending. That will make it clear to the public the two alternatives.

MR. BELL: That makes sense and that is what Anna was getting at. That is where the requirement existed already for headboats, and remember it wasn't that we were trying to make charterboats headboats, we just wanted to put everybody on a very similar reporting mechanism schedule and all. But being sensitive to the fact that charterboats may operate a little differently, in terms of where and that sort of thing.

MR. WAUGH: We're just clarifying here that the wording about catastrophic conditions and this is shown at the bottom of Page 5 and the top of Page 6. Catastrophic conditions, delinquent reporting, and no fishing reports that is currently in place for the headboats were adopting those same requirements for the charter vessels. We're not making any change to that requirement to participate in video monitoring program if selected.

MR. BELL: One other thing to keep in mind too remember, and Zack had brought this up I think at the last meeting that they were sort of depending on how headboats were defined. There were some folks that were kind of missed in the middle kind of, so the idea again with this would be once we have this in place all for-hire federally permitted for-hire vessels would be included, regardless of what you want to call them. I don't know who's definition of headboats you're applying, so that would be the benefit of this system is 100 percent coverage for all the federally permitted.

MS. BECKWITH: Gregg, can you put that additional subalternative wording back up? Just to be sort of extra crystal clear, I would probably if I had my druthers word it more like; report all fish all trips, exactly the wording that is under the headboats and then in parentheses actually include the explanation that this would include state managed fisheries.

I almost thing that there is a third alternative that we are not considering, which is, you know we've got the all fish, all trips. We've got just our three permits, and then we have I guess a potential to consider all federally managed species if we want to keep the state managed species out of it, but require reporting on all the federally managed species. Just as an option, I don't necessarily think we need to go that route either, but just for discussion sake. But for that 2A, I would be very specific to say report all fish harvested on all trips; and really, again just sort of specify in parentheses that that would include state managed species.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Like a regardless of where harvested?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes. I want to make very clear that that is what that would mean if we went in that direction, because I expect that we will get lots of public comment on that particular subalternative, and I want to make it real clear to our charter guys what it is that we're talking about.

MR. BELL: That is sort of the grand deluxe version; Bonnie, to that point.

DR. PONWITH: It is to that point but I know I'm in a long line. I just do have a comment. I can do it now or later.

MR. BELL: Well, if it is to that, go ahead.

DR. PONWITH: I am not troubled by having those alternatives and very crisp, explicit language that one is all fish regardless, and the other one is federally managed versus state managed. I will say that let's see, I'll play my Great Carnack and guess what the public comment will look like, and it is going to be obvious that it will be the path of least resistance.

I know this conversation is just to get the document ready for public comment, but I will say this, when there is a requirement for a judgment call, it enters into the system another chance for an erosion of the quality of the data. All is really crystal clear, and the difference between all versus federally managed versus state managed is clear to us.

But when you're in the chaotic system of bouncing around at sea catching fish that clarify may fog. It is just something for the council to keep in mind. I'm interested as well what the industry has to say about this. But I'm going to place my bet today on where it will land. It is just a consideration to keep in mind. It does, in my mind, severely weaken the clarity of the instruction to the captains.

MR. BELL: Understood.

MR. HAYMANS: That was certainly to those points. I can't imagine a scenario where we would ask a charter fisherman to separate two different reporting mechanisms based on a species. I also can't imagine a scenario where a guy went trout fishing and had a cobia swim by and he cast to it, and all of a sudden now he's got a federal species.

I've always envisioned this from the time we started it. That we're going to require, if you hold a federal permit, you're going to report through this system no matter what jurisdiction or what species you are managing. That is the direction I would like to make sure we go in.

MR. BELL: Okay to that point, Roy, or do you want to just get in line? Okay.

MR. BROWN: Well, it is like Doug said, you know and then you have some scenarios too like the inshore guides are fishing for the trout or bass or whatever and a cobia swims by in the Sound or Spanish or something. That happens all the time. I wanted to ask Gregg a question, though. This program here, or this project, we won't have the current system that we have right now with the headboat logbook? This will take its place and it will all be together?

MR. WAUGH: The intent would be, no, headboat reporting is still going to continue. This would apply to charter vessels. But we want to make sure that we have all the same data elements covered; such as, if you're a boat that participates as both, then you would submit one report.

MR. BELL: Makes sense.

MR. BROWN: When I was reading it, everything just sounded like you were going to incorporate both into the same type of system, I mean where they were both similar.

MR. WAUGH: Well, in terms of data elements, yes.

DR. LANEY: I just wanted to concur with what Bonnie said and what Doug said. I'm in their camp. Regardless of what sort of jurisdictional label we put on a species, it is a public trust resource. I have always been an advocate of those of us who are benefiting from public trust resources reporting how we benefit from those resources, and part of that is quantifying what we catch.

I did have one question, and Gregg is not at the microphone at the moment, but maybe somebody else can ask it just for my own clarification. Back in Table 1.3.1, maybe you know Mr. Chairman, in the other states' column are those vessels that are registered in other states but are based in the South Atlantic and fishing in the South Atlantic? Is that why they are included there? Is it that they are other states because they are registered in other states? Maybe Dr. Duval can answer that question.

MR. BELL: That would be my guess, but Michelle, is that your understanding?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I would think that those are vessels that are home ported in other states, but they hold our South Atlantic permits.

MR. BELL: Just like you'll see later on in a table, some of our folks are fishing in the Gulf. You'll have folks living in Georgia that have a permit for the Gulf reef fish.

MR. BOWEN: Let's keep in mind why we're even doing this to begin with. I'm in Doug's corner and I'm in Bonnie's corner on this and Wilson's. We not only want but need better data. When enacted, this will give us this. I'm under the impression and of the belief that if you hold a snapper grouper or one of those three federal permits, you should report every trip as a requirement of the permit, just like the commercial guys do; some consistency in our fishery and consistency in our regulations is what we're trying to do here.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't know how much of a concern this is, but I suspect we have dual permitted vessels that have charter permits as well as commercial permits. I assume if they're on a commercial fishing trip and they don't report what they're catching, even if it is in federal waters and federally managed species, but I don't think this is clear about that. The way I read that, they would have to report that whether they are on a charter trip or not on a charter trip. How are you going to sort out that?

MR. BELL: That's a good point, and I would assume right now there are headboats, well, some folks that are being classified as a headboat that have a commercial permit.

MR. BROWN: There are different requirements by the Coast Guard too for a commercial and for-hire boats, so you have to meet a specific requirement to be able to do one or the other.

DR. CRABTREE: I know in the Gulf we have boats that have both permits and they commercial fish in the wintertime and charter fish in the summer. I'm assuming we have the same thing in the South Atlantic. We need to sort out, because they're going to have to report on the commercial catches through the commercial logbooks and depending on how you write this you could have double reporting. I just think we need to be clear about how that works.

MR. BELL: That is a real good point. Make sure we capture dual permitting.

MR. WAUGH: I believe our intent is to only capture them when they are fishing as a charter vessel. Now we could make that clear in the wording of the alternative, or put it in the discussion. It may be better to make it more clear in the wording of the alternative. It would be require that federally permitted charter vessels while on a charter trip, something to that effect.

MR. COX: Yes, I feel like I'm missing something here. Somebody help me. When the commercial boats are in state waters and we're fishing and we're catching cobias, we report. If it is a federally managed fish we're doing the reporting on it no matter where we catch that fish. I am not quite getting what the problem is. Is that not something we should be doing?

MR. BELL: Yes, Michelle to that.

DR. DUVAL: We had a little bit of discussion about this previously, vessels holding a charter headboat permit are subject to federal regulations whether they're fishing in state or federal waters. You're reporting correctly, Jack. I think what Anna was trying to get at is that in North Carolina, and I'm assuming in other states, we have inshore guides who will take trips that are out in the EEZ.

But then they will also do trips that are only in state waters where they are only focusing on state water managed species, so they are only fishing for trout, they are only fishing for drum, they are only fishing for inshore flounder. They are not actually participating in a federally managed fishery at that point. That is, I think, what Anna is trying to distinguish with these alternatives.

MR. COX: Yes, I understand that. But if they come across a federally managed fish like a cobia, then they should report that catch, is that correct?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I would agree.

MR. BELL: Yes, the issue was if you find yourself doing an inshore trip, trout or drum or something, that wouldn't fly.

MR. BOWEN: To Roy's point and then back to that one if I can remember it. It seems to me that if you're on a commercial trip, you would report your commercial catch. Another thing that

we need to consider is the commercial guys keeping their recreationally caught species, their bag limits.

Again, I am going to reemphasize, if you have a permit you should report every trip, every fish. That way we alleviate the possible loop holes, if you will. Every fish, every trip if you have a permit, it is very simple, straightforward and it will alleviate the loopholes, I think. There are times that I fish in the EEZ that I'm targeting sheepshead that are not federally managed any more. But I still feel like that I should report that trip and those fish being caught.

MR. PHILLIPS: We just got through adding some socioeconomic people to the SSC. I think these charterboat guys, like everybody else, they portfolio fish. Having this extra information on what else they're catching is going to help us manage how to run the rabbit so we know how many of them depend on all of their income from federal, how many of them depend on half.

It is going to give us the socioeconomic data that we may not get otherwise. I'm sensitive to the fact of getting that data. I know it is going to be a hardship on some people, just more paperwork. But I'm looking at the socioeconomic data.

MS. BECKWITH: Sure. Just to be clear, one of my purposes in doing these subalternatives this way is because the guys don't see this coming. They don't understand that this is what we might be asking of them. To make it clear, we can make clear our intent, if that is the intent of the council; is to make this a preferred before we go out to public comment, so they very clearly see what direction we're taking this in.

But originally, Zack, to your point is, I mean you're fishing the EEZ. We have a lot of fishing guides in North Carolina that may fish in the EEZ for one season, just for the two months that cobia come in, and then they fish inshore the rest of the time. It is a very, very different burden on the charterboats, on the small boat charterboats than it is on the headboats. But if that is the intent of the council, we just need to let them know that that is where we're going with it.

MR. BOWEN: To your point, Anna. I'm with you, but if that is the case, they don't need but that one permit, they don't have snapper grouper; the cost of doing business.

MR. BELL: Keep in mind this is trying to formulate this document to go out to public review. We can have a preferred and it sounds like there may be a momentum towards a preferred. But we just want to make sure that in the document we've captured the other options and things, which is what we're discussing. Then it may be like Bonnie says that the public is obviously in favor of something and it may or may not be our preferred. But at this point we're just trying to construct this so we've got the different options covered.

MR. HAYMANS: To Charlie's point. Charlie, this is supposed to be alleviating burdens, making it easier for these guys. All the data is going to wind up in the same place anyway. ACCSP is where it goes now first and where it is going to wind up through this process. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to make a motion to pick a preferred if you would like.

MR. BELL: Well, let's make sure we've got all the options on the table that we want to look at here first. Is it to that specific point? Monica, you were next.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I guess it would be helpful in the document, and I agree the issues that Anna brought up in terms of make it very clear so the public knows what they have to report, what are the different alternatives. Also, I think it would be helpful to know in the document whether the state requires reporting of those individuals. Let's talk about all these inshore folks, like Michelle was talking about and Anna were talking about. Does North Carolina then require them to report? I think that would be helpful information for everybody to have.

MR. BOWEN: I would just like to remind everybody, we're not talking about two hours worth of paperwork. It is on an application on a phone that takes about ten minutes. The headboat at my dock on an average when 20 people come back with anywhere from 250 to 500 pounds of fish, by the time he gets coverage at about seven miles off the beach.

Before he has hit the dock, his information is already uploaded on his iPhone. It is not that big a deal; it is not that time consuming. Once you get the routine of it, it is like brushing your teeth in the morning. It's not two hours' worth of paperwork, guys, just a few minutes and you're done.

MR. BELL: Let's step back to the document a second. What we want to make sure is that what we've got up here covers and/or clearly covers about what it is we want to get out of this. If we've got kind of the full spectrum of options that we might envision, again to take to the public. Let's make sure that is there first, and then we can discuss a preferred. What we'll need to do is have a motion to approve the changes to the document, including the IPT stuff. But we just might want to make sure we've got it covered.

MS. BECKWITH: Under that 2B, report all federally managed fish harvested on all trips regardless of where harvested, but then you have in parentheses just our three permits. Again, to me, that is not clear as a charter guy if that means I also have to do like bluefish. I mean, I know that they have their separate permits; or just our three permits. I'm not sure how we clarify that and yes, I know we do BTRs for bluefish.

MR. BELL: Those are the three within our particular region. Those are the three South Atlantic under our particular jurisdiction.

DR. DUVAL: I think what Anna is trying to say is just, again, to make it crystal clear, report all South Atlantic federally managed fish harvested. That way we don't have the authority to require reporting of all federally managed species. A lot of those are already covered by HMS; they are covered in the Northeast Region, so South Atlantic federally managed fish.

DR. CRABTREE: I think you do have authority under this permit to require them to report every single thing they catch, whether it is federally managed, not federally managed and regardless of where they caught it. I think you have that authority as a condition of the permit.

MR. HAYMANS: To help clarify the difference between 2A and 2B, change the word "all" to "only", please. Report only South Atlantic federal, because that is the distinction between A and B. I think it makes it a whole lot clearer.

MS. BECKWITH: And to that point. If we want to have all federally managed species outside of what Roy is saying, HMS species or whatever. Then you've just got to take out the parentheses, yes the three example parentheses, if that is the intent. Again, it is just clarifying, so

when these guys read these options, they just need to understand what we're asking from them, so if I'm having trouble with it.

MR. BELL: If you did remove that like she said, now it is like Roy said, it was all federally managed.

DR. DUVAL: I think what Anna might be saying is adding a third subalternative 2C that would say; "report all federally managed fish". This gets to what Roy says we apparently have the authority to do under the requirements of this permit.

MR. BELL: Okay, then leave the three, and that is one version with those three and version 2C would be everything. Okay. That kind of covers it then, 2A report all fish harvested, all trips regardless of where, 2B only South Atlantic federally managed fish; and then that is where I guess we leave the three examples back in there again. Then C would be all federally managed fish all trips regardless. That includes everything federal. Those are the three variations. Does that make sense?

MS. BECKWITH: Just thank you to Michelle for pulling my thoughts out of my head.

MR. BELL: Once Gregg gets this kind of tweaked then we can look at accepting that wording. You would also have the same thing repeated for 3 as well.

MS. BECKWITH: Where did the discards come in, because that is a whole different conversation. Later on in the document we talk about either sub-sampling or different ways of getting some discard and economic information, but to me, I am reading that this is required; that they will be required to do discards, and I don't think we've had that conversation.

MR. WAUGH: That was added in there to get clarification, because right now, the headboats are reporting discards. If we're trying to match the reporting, then we need to specify discards for charterboats, also.

MS. BECKWITH: That was one of the biggest problems that we ran into for our state logbook, is everyone saying, you're telling me that I am going to have to tell you how many pinfish I caught, how many whatever. It just gave us a lot of pushback. When I originally had conversations with folks about discard components, I always suggested that a subsample of the charter crowd for discards, at times, would get to the information without having the pushback.

But when you are trout fishing, if we're going to ask you to report on trout and then you're also going to have to give the discards of the number of pinfish that you released, we're going to have a huge problem and you're not going to get any buy in and people are just not going to report.

MR. BOWEN: I want to go on record saying that discards are what is driving a lot of our closed fisheries, and I'm for reporting them. I think that a key component to this whole amendment is to figure out, not only what we're catching and killing, but what we're releasing. Again, alive and dead is on the headboat. It is not that much of a big deal for us offshore guys. Discards definitely need to be reported in my opinion.

MR. BELL: I will say our system is set up in South Carolina, we have covered discards. Mark does it. It hasn't been an issue, or nobody has freaked out over it. We've been doing this since '93.

DR. CRABTREE: We're assuming these guys are going to know what species are federally managed. I couldn't tell you right now a list of what is federally managed by all the East Coast Councils. Is it realistic to think they're going to know what is federally managed? Do they know mahogany snapper is in the FMP? I guess there are some that aren't in the FMP. I don't know if that is a big issue or not. But it seems like the more qualifiers we throw in here as to what they have to do, I can see the compliance problems really escalating.

MR. BELL: Yes, we're at three variations now, we could go to six really quickly.

MR. BOWEN: If the compliance is escalating, the number of permit holders should be declining. Don't renew the permit. If they can't get onboard and can't follow the rules, don't renew the permit.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, if I could respond. The problem is this is an open access permit, and so they can get it. This isn't like in the Gulf where it is a limited access, and if they lose their permit they are going to spend thousands of dollars and buy one from someone else. In this case anyone who wants a permit can get one for 30, 40 bucks, whatever it cost.

MR. BOWEN: I understand that.

DR. CRABTREE: That's a problem.

MR. BOWEN: I understand that and maybe that will change in the near future.

MR. BELL: Bonnie, did you want to weigh in here?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, and it is just on the issue of compliance. This is a fishery that is a fleet that is an order of magnitude larger than the headboat fleet, and in the headboat fleet this program has been up and running for a while; but we're having compliance issues in this smaller fleet, and I asked staff to do a rough order.

They don't keep statistics on how their day breaks down, but I asked for a rough order of magnitude estimate of what percentage of the total programmatic time are spent chasing late reports. The answer that I got from them is, in bad times it can be up to 30 percent of their effort. No QA/QC-ing data not reporting to the council, but chasing down reports that are late.

Again I think anything that we can do to make it as clear cut and simple as possible to try and keep that compliance level as high as possible, I think is going to be really important, because I'll tell you, losing 30 percent of your time to chasing reports is not in the best interest of the industry, of the council, and certainly not in the best interest of the Science Center with all the demands we've got.

MR. BELL: All right, and to Roy's question about how do they know. I mean, if we're dealing with this electronically, the software or the program you're using is what they fill in. You could differentiate federally managed, I suppose, in the software of the program.

MS. BECKWITH: Again, I'm just cautioning. If we want to start with the gold standard, we're going to fail. South Carolina has been reporting a long time, so yes, you guys have discards, great. The headboats have been reporting for a long time, you've guys have discards, great.

But we are bringing in a group of people who have not done it and are not crazy about the concept, and if we ask them to report all of their catch for all of their trips, then that alone is a pretty amazing step forward. If you also ask them to report discards it may be the thing that they do or it may be the thing that pushes them over the edge into not wanting to comply on those trips. Enforcement is going to be tough for those inshore trips.

I'm just cautioning you guys. Again, my original vision of this was to have subsamples done that would get some of that additional economic and discard information appropriate to the different sizes and requirements of the fleet. For the headboats and the bigger boats, it is not that hard. You guys have a mate downstairs and a captain upstairs that can keep track of stuff. When you are on a boat that is a 23 foot boat with five clients onboard, you are not keeping track of what you're tossing over the side, you're just not, so it's different and we need to be sensitive to that.

MR. BELL: I want to try to move along here. We'll note that in the data requirements for headboats now, I mean they do report number kept number released that sort of thing.

MR. BROWN: I was just looking at my headboat logbook, and there are already species in here that are not federally managed that we report on. There is a long list of favorites, and I mean it goes from everything from fish to eels. I mean, it goes through a long list of stuff, so we're already reporting things. If it is available in the South Atlantic, we have it on this list. To Bonnie's point, though, about the non-reporting, I've talked to the Beaufort Lab about that, too.

There are instances where sometimes people get stretched out if, during the season, they're having issues with their boat or something. If they don't have a way to report on the boat, and they have to wait until they get back to land, sometimes it can get stretched out. But there is already something in place to where they get a letter in the mail or I think they make an attempt to contact them up to five times, I believe, if I'm right. But anyway, that is already in place, and if they don't meet that mandate, then obviously, there is a problem.

MR. BELL: Okay. Charlie, and then we'll move on here.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Anna's point about the harvested/discard, you could also make subalternatives where it was harvested or subalternative harvested/discarded. If discarded just lets the wheels fall off of the wagon, and you can do a subset, maybe that is the simpler way to do it and maybe that is something you want to take out to public hearing. I don't have a dog in this fight. I'm just trying to help make things work.

MR. BELL: Right, the way to accommodate that, I think, you would have to have six subalternatives. I mean we can certainly take it out to the public and find out that they don't like

that; or we can put six of them in there now, which seems a little cumbersome to me. We need to kind of move along with this. I think we've talked it, in terms of understanding what the issue is and I understand Anna's point and all, but is there a desire to add more subalternatives, Committee or move on with three?

MS. BECKWITH: Just make an additional - take the discards out of those alternatives altogether and make it a different alternative where you either are going to mandate discards or you're not going to mandate discard information. But deal with Subalternative A, B, and C on just the harvest and then not a subalternative, another alternative altogether that would discard the discard component.

DR. CRABTREE: My understanding is at some point you wanted to stop doing MRIP on this fleet and use this, but if you don't require discard reporting and you don't require reporting of, it seems to me other species, you are not going to get out of MRIP then, because we would have to do MRIP to get the discard reporting and then we may have to do MRIP to get the reporting on the other species that aren't covered. You need to think about your long term goal here.

If you don't require sufficient level of reporting here to meet all the needs, then we have to continue with MRIP, and that is going to be burdensome and costly for the Agency, plus it is going to produce these dueling catch estimates, and we're going to be constantly in a battle over which catch estimates do you use, because people will choose the catch estimate that suits their purposes. I just think it will create a lot of problems down the road. We need to make sure that whatever we choose to require them is in line with something that would meet all the MRIP requirements.

MS. BECKWITH: I agree with you, Roy. Unfortunately, I think in North Carolina, we're not going to see another chance at a logbook for quite a few years. Gregg, to that additional alternative, maybe the subalternatives under the discards could be mandatory discard reporting and an additional subalternative that looks at a 10 percent survey or whatever.

DR. DUVAL: You need to use your microphone.

MS. BECKWITH: Sorry. Under the subalternatives for discards we can look at a mandatory discard reporting or a 10 percent, or whatever percent, subsample.

MR. BELL: Jack, did you want to say something?

MR. COX: I'm prepared to make a motion.

MR. BELL: All right, well, we'll see. What is your motion?

MR. COX: Okay. Under Action 1, get me back on the screen here, we're doing a lot of moving so I was going to go off the screen; go back to the alternatives if you would, please. **The motion I would like to make is Subalternative 2A, report all fish harvested, discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested.**

MR. BELL: Just for 2A, that's it?

MR. COX: That's it.

MR. BELL: Doug seconded that. All right, discussion of that.

DR. DUVAL: Right. so just procedurally, it would probably be helpful to get a motion from the committee to approve this action and alternatives as modified at some point, since there has been quite a lot of modification. Then I'll just remind folks that it is afternoon, and we do have a Dolphin Wahoo Committee meeting that is probably going to take a little bit of time. I don't know how much we'll catch up on Spiny Lobster, but just reminding folks of where we are.

MS. BECKWITH: Just for clarification, I thought when we had talked about stuff, we were going to pull the discard conversation out of Alternative 2 and turn it into its own alternative. Is that not where we got to, so we were just dealing with Alternative 2 reporting the harvest?

MR. BELL: Yes he was typing it in, but that wasn't Jack's motion.

DR. DUVAL: That is where my procedural motion comes into play, in terms of making sure that you've got the suite of alternatives that you want in this action before actually selecting a preferred.

MR. BELL: Right, it would be better to get all of the wording in there and deal with it all at once, rather than to try to pick through it. But we have a seconded motion right now that we're dealing with, so we need to dispense with that one way or the other.

MR. WAUGH: In clarifying Jack's motion, I inserted the wording approve the modifications to Alternative 2, because you can't really select a preferred there without the alternative. You need to make sure that Jack's intent is to approve the modified wording for Alternative 2 and the subalternatives, and then to select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2A as preferred.

MR. BELL: That would include the whole suite of things that you typed in.

MR. WAUGH: Just for Alternative 2.

MR. BELL: Did that have the discard language in there?

MR. WAUGH: As shown here, it has the discards. If the intent is to remove it, then we need to remove it.

MR. BELL: All right, so we have a motion. Is that wording that Gregg has there, is that consistent with what you are?

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. BELL: Do you want to read that then and make sure you guys are consistent?

MR. COX: Approve the modifications to Alternative 2 for Action 1. Select Alternative 2, Subalternative 2A as preferred.

MR. BELL: That would be all of that; all of 2A, 2B, 2C as worded right there.

MR. COX: Correct.

MR. BELL: Yes Anna and then we'll vote.

MS. BECKWITH: Sorry, this is one I am going to harp on from now until eternity. If Alternative 2 cannot only deal with the harvest then we can't deal with discards in a separate alternative. If this goes out this way, I lose support for this entire amendment the way this is written right now.

This is not okay for public comment. I am not okay with having harvest and discards in alternative. I think they needed to be separated out. The discussion for those who have read through the Discussion Document as this has been created; we have never had it in there that discards were going to be 100 percent mandatory in the reporting for all trips.

I have read every version of this and this is new. I am okay with dealing with discards in a separate alternative under this action. But if you guys mandate harvest and discards in this alternative you lose my willingness to play in the sandbox.

MR. COX: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: Yes, Jack.

MR. COX: My rationale for supporting this alternative is, you know this is what the headboats do and this is what the commercial guys do. Nobody said, hey what do you support. I mean it is the data that we hear Bonnie says we've got to have. If we're not going to do this thing right let's not even do it.

MR. BELL: All right, any other discussion right now on this motion? Okay and we've read the motion. All in favor of the motion raise your hand. Six, and again you need to be on the Committee; Zack got appointed.

MR. BOWEN: Aren't I on the committee?

MR. BELL: Yes you are, at least she said you were. Do it again. Hold your hands up. **Seven; anybody opposed? One; motion carries.** We would need another motion from the committee to accept the changes to Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Is anybody willing to make that? Accept the recommended changes to Alternative 1 and Alternative 3.

MR. PHILLIPS: **Mr. Chairman, I would make the motion that we accept the edits and changes to Alternatives 1 and 3.**

MR. BELL: **Second anybody? Chris seconds. Discussion.** Those are the things that were highlighted.

MR. WAUGH: Projected on the screen, because we added to them. This will all be shown in the committee report so everybody has it, as well, but it is Alternative 1 and that is basically the

same as in your decision document. Those are the IPT changes. Then Alternative 3 are the modifications that we made during the committee meeting.

MR. BELL: Okay, everybody clear on that? Further discussion of that? Any opposition to that; one. **Okay, and that motion carries with one opposed.**

MR. WAUGH: Okay, Action 2, we've got some suggested modifications from the IPT. Again, this is to make it consistent with just the South Atlantic. The wording of these alternatives are slightly different, because right now headboats, it is not tied to having a federal permit. Alternative 2 is to require that headboats, and perhaps we want to insert; while operating as a headboat here as well.

Submit fishing records to the Science and Research Director weekly, or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the Science and Research Director via electronic reporting, via NMFS approved hardware/software. Weekly means the Tuesday following each week and the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel supported that as their preferred. Then Alternative 3 is the same except daily reporting.

MR. BELL: Okay, so this just deals with frequency and mechanism. We would need a motion to approve the changes to Action 2, including the last little bit that Gregg typed there. Make sure we know what that is.

MR. WAUGH: Again, you have all the wording changes for Alternative 1. The catastrophic conditions, delinquent reporting and requirements to participate in a video monitoring program are not changed. The catastrophic requirements, no fishing reports, delinquent reports; all of that stays in place as well. Alternative 2, all we have added to what you have is to clarify; require that headboats while operating as a headboat, and the same for Alternative 3.

MR. BELL: Does anybody care to make a motion?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, Gregg, the reporting time, they are different in both. In this one, mine is Sunday and the other one is the Tuesday after the week.

MR. WAUGH: Well, the no action right now is they are reporting the Sunday following.

MR. HARTIG: I'm sorry.

MR. BELL: All right, somebody want to make a motion here?

MR. WAUGH: We've got one, right here.

MR. BELL: I'm sorry, Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Just a nuance challenge to the wording, when operating as a headboat is this; we have a subset of the headboats that are in the headboat program that for the most part operate as a headboat, but occasionally charter their vessels out. With that wording it creates a potential loophole. I just want to bring that to the attention.

MR. BELL: They're operating as a charter boat, so they would be captured, right?

DR. PONWITH: Correct. The distinction is, and again I haven't had time to kind of think through the matrix of this, but there are headboats who are in the headboat program that function like a headboat, but occasionally, they will charter that vessel out. We do not treat that as a distinction.

If they are in the headboat program we sample them, because they are part of the headboat program; otherwise they would have to dance back and forth between MRIP and the headboat program and you would miss them. I just want to make sure that we're not creating a loophole with that language.

MR. BOWEN: I kind of thought that same thing but then I thought about my headboat that is at the dock, and when that boat carries six people he still reports; and he does.

MR. HARTIG: Still paying by the head, though.

MR. BOWEN: No, the way I was understanding it works and the way we've been doing it at the dock is, even though he charges one price for six people, but he's mainly a headboat; we still report the data, even though it is not paid by head it is paid at one lump price.

MR. BELL: It gets into that definition of which definition you use.

MR. BOWEN: And it's confusing as hell sometimes.

MR. BELL: Our idea is that we capture the whole fleet, regardless of how they are operating, as long as they're captured.

MR. BROWN: That is what I was going to say. I was going to say the same thing, you know.
We're already designated as to what we are and so we're reporting either way.

MR. BELL: Okay now, I don't think we actually had a motion to approve changes.

MR. BROWN: Do you want me to make the motion?

MR. BELL: If you would like.

MR. BROWN: **Approve the modifications to Alternatives 1 through 3 for Action 2.**

MR. BELL: **Zack seconds that. Any further discussion of that? It's about mechanism and timing. Any opposition to the motion? Okay seeing none; the motion carries.** Do you all want to pick a preferred alternative? AP suggested Alternative 2.

MR. BOWEN: **I would make the motion that we make Alternative 2 our preferred.**

MR. BELL: **Okay Zack's motion, Mark seconds it. Any discussion of the motion? Alternative 2 as the preferred and that is the AP's recommendation. All right any opposition to the motion? Seeing none; that motion passes.** Action 3.

MR. WAUGH: Action 3 is on Page 13, and this deals with providing the catch location. We've got two alternatives, slight modification to the no action alternatives just to spell out Southeast Region Headboat Survey. Alternative 2 would require federally permitted charter vessels to report location electronically, striking manually by latitude/longitude and degrees in minutes or by clicking on a headboat grid instead of chart. The Snapper Grouper AP supports that. That would track how headboats currently report.

MR. BELL: That's how we set this up from the beginning.

MR. BOWEN: I'm prepared to make a motion for a preferred whenever you are, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: **Could we do one to accept the alternatives or the modifications to the alternatives first?**

MR. BOWEN: **I make that motion as well.**

MR. BELL: **Mark seconds it.** This is just to accept the wording changes first. Okay, so we've got motion, Mark seconds. Any discussion? Charlie

MR. PHILLIPS: Headboat chart.

MR. BOWEN: The grids.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, they drew a line through the grid.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, it is a chart and it comes up electronically and you click on that chart.

MR. BELL: Yes, it actually is a chart that pops up. **Any more discussion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none; that motion passes.** Now.

MR. BOWEN: **I'll make the motion that we accept Alternative 2 as the preferred for Action 3.**

MR. BELL: **Okay Mark seconds that. Any discussion?** Again, this is the APs recommendation. **Any opposition to the motion? Okay seeing none; that motion passes.**

MR. WAUGH: On the next page we've got some points that sort of start at the top outlining how we would like to see the program function. Remember originally this was included as a separate action, and then we got direction to insert it in this alternative. It really applies to the whole amendment. I've discussed this with Bonnie in the past. We've made recommendations to the states, so I asked Bonnie about making this a recommendation to NMFS on how the council would like to see the program operated.

It outlines the procedures that were developed by that Technical Subcommittee and Bonnie may want to comment on this, but she was comfortable with that being presented as

recommendations. Then the final item is timing. We're looking to approve this for public hearings; this is shown on Page 17. We've got the rough timing laid out there. The intent is to have a target implementation date of January 1, 2017.

DR. CRABTREE: I just have a question. We have language in there that says, a delinquent report automatically results in a prohibition on harvesting, et cetera. How would we know if there is a delinquent report? How would we know if a vessel went fishing or not, unless they filed a report?

MR. WAUGH: Well, this is patterned exactly after what is in place for the dealers and what's in place for the headboats. I don't know if the headboat program - but there should be an e-mail automatically sent to the vessel. If a law enforcement officer encounters that vessel fishing or returning to the dock, they should be able to look up in the system and see if they are current with reporting. If they aren't, they could be written a warning or a ticket.

DR. CRABTREE: But unless law enforcement documents that the vessel went on a trip and does that. I don't see how we have any way of knowing if a vessel is delinquent in a report. Do they have to report, I didn't fish today?

DR. ERRIGO: Yes, I'm sorry. I see what you're saying. If they don't fish for a particular week they have to file a no fishing report. They are allowed to file those ahead of time if they know they are not going to be fishing for a particular week.

DR. CRABTREE: That is somewhere in the document?

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

MR. BELL: That is the way the headboats are operating. Of course, we're on a different reporting system right now in South Carolina, but we require no fishing reports and you can turn them in ahead of time or you can tell us you didn't fish for the month; because we're doing monthly reporting at the moment.

MR. WAUGH: That's shown for Action 1 on the top of Page 6, where it talks about if no fishing activity took place. We point out in Action 2 that those requirements are continued on Page 9.

MR. BELL: We would need a motion to approve for public hearing at this time. Mark, is that what you -

MR. BROWN: **Yes, I was going to make a motion for Option 2 to approve for the for-hire amendment for public hearings.**

MR. BELL: **Seconded by Zack. Any discussion?** See the timeline laid out.

MR. COX: I'll just add something else. We don't get a lot of support for people to fill in their discards. It is just something that I don't think we get accurate information on, and I would love to see Bonnie and some of her folks put something together and it go as this amendment goes through, to folks to let them know how important it is; that it is not necessarily to hurt them, but how it can also help fishermen as well, just to kind of give support for what we're doing.

MR. WAUGH: One thing that will help with this is part of our ACCSP project that was approved, it is ranked highest, we'll know in the spring if it is funded. There is no feeling that it wouldn't be funded. But a part of that is going to be working with selected charter vessels to have a portion of them carry an electronic measuring board. We'll work with them to where they are actually measuring the discarded fish, so that will be another opportunity to build on how important that discard is; because then you can have that information go into the stock assessment so that you know the size of the discards. It will be recorded electronically and you'll know the depth of water for the discards as well. That can also go into the stock assessment in the future with adjustments to discard mortality.

MR. COX: I just think it is very important, because I know a lot of fishermen are scared to put their discards down, because they feel like it is to hurt them. We know that is different here, but the public doesn't see it that way and we need to do whatever we can to let them know how the information is used and get it out there.

MR. BELL: Right, again this is all done under the heading of making things better, not worse for people. Okay, so we have a motion to approve the timing for public hearing. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I had a question about the timing, and that is the effective date. It doesn't make sense to wait for Fran's study to be done before. I mean to have that extra tool that extra input device done before we actually make this effective.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and that is certainly something that we can talk about. That is why it is just presented as a target. There is a lot of work that is being done between the Center and MRIP and others that would lead to implementation. We may get to the end of it and have authority ready to go effective January 1, 2017, but all the systems may not be ready to go then. That is an excellent point, Doug, to incorporate the results from that survey work.

After we get back from public hearings you may want to talk about that. We should know about funding by then, and Bonnie will have more time to have worked with MRIP and we may have a better idea of when we want those regulations to become effective. What I think we don't want to do is hold off on finishing this amendment. We want it finished and out, and we can talk about then what we would like to see as an implementation date.

MR. BELL: We have the motion right now to basically deal with timing and approval to go to public hearing. But we do need to circle back to remember where we left off initially with purpose and need. **Any opposition to the motion related to timing and moving forward with the public hearing? Okay seeing none; then that motion passes.**

Then let's really quickly go back to where we started; purpose and need. In the discussion there was how to add wording or change wording to the need. The purpose I think was fine. We were talking about modifying the need statement. Yes, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: You know, we've got subalternatives that deal with this issue of whether we would sort of sync up with the headboat, and we won't know what we're going to do with that until after public hearings. Maybe you just want to go with the wording that is shown there now

for the purpose and need, not add that new wording, and we can certainly come back after public hearings and we have that input to see how we want to modify our purpose and need.

MR. BROWN: Can we state that in the motion, too, that we're going to evaluate it after the public hearings, or do we just go ahead?

MR. BELL: Yes, this will come back to us. I mean, we'll be messing with this again.

MR. BROWN: **Okay, then I would like to make a motion to accept Option 1, keep the existing wording for the purpose and need.**

MR. BELL: **All right, Zack seconds that. Any discussion? Again, we'll be seeing this again, but it will go out to public hearing as is. An opposition to that motion: Seeing no opposition then that motion passes.** Thank you for your help with that. That is it for that document. Is there any other business to come before the committee right now? Okay seeing none; then Madam Chair I will yield the floor to you.

DR. DUVAL: All right, so I know it is a little tricky to get lunch around here in a short period of time. It is 12:35. I think folks can just plan to have sort of a late day today. But come back at 2:00 o'clock and we'll start with Dolphin Wahoo.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 12:35 o'clock p.m., December 10, 2015.)

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
January 2016

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2015 – 2016 COMMITTEES

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Chester Brewer, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

Jack Cox, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Ben Hartig
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Chevront

DATA COLLECTION

- ✓ Mel Bell, Chair
- ✓ Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
- ✓ Anna Beckwith
- ✓ Mark Brown
- ✓ Chris Conklin
- ✓ Jack Cox
- ✓ Wilson Laney
- ✓ Charlie Phillips
- Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
- Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

✓ **ZACK BOWEN**

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Zack Bowen, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Tony DiLernia/Dewey
Hemilright
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT**

Doug Haymans, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Jack Cox
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
LTJG Tara Pray
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Chip Collier - CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

Michelle Duval, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Ben Hartig
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Jack Cox, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2015 - 2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

✓
Dr. Michelle Duval
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street
(PO Box 769)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/808-8011 (ph);
252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

VICE-CHAIR

Charlie Phillips
Phillips Seafood/Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

Robert E. Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
703/842-0740 (ph); 703/842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

Anna Beckwith
1907 Paulette Road
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/671-3474 (ph)
AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com

Mel Bell
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Zack Bowen
P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

✓
W. Chester Brewer
250 Australian Ave. South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
561/655-4777 (ph)
WCBLAW@aol.com

Mark Brown
3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)
capt.markbrown@comcast.net

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

Jack Cox
2010 Bridges Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/728-9548
Dayboat1965@gmail.com

✓
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Regional Administrator
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
727/824-5301 (ph); 727/824-5320 (f)
roy.crabtree@noaa.gov

✓
Ben Hartig
9277 Sharon Street
Hobe Sound, FL 33455
772/546-1541 (ph)
mackattackben@att.net

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2015 - 2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

Doug Haymans
Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
doughaymans@gmail.com

Dr. Wilson Laney
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617
(110 Brooks Ave
237 David Clark Laboratories,
NCSU Campus
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617)
919/515-5019 (ph)
919/515-4415 (f)
Wilson.Laney@fws.gov

Jessica McCawley
Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E.,
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847(f)
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

✓ LTJG Tara Pray
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
tara.c.pray@uscg.mil

Deirdre Warner-Kramer
Office of Marine Conservation
OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W.
Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
202/647-3228 (ph); 202/736-7350 (f)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

BONNIE POWWETH
JACK MCGOVERAN
SCOTT SANDORF
TRACY DUNN
ERIKA BURGESS
MONICA SMET-BRUNELLO
KEVIN ANSON

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

✓ **Executive Director**

Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

✓ **Deputy Executive Director**

Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Outreach Specialist**

Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

✓ **Senior Fishery Biologist**

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Biologist**

Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

✓ **Fisheries Social Scientist**

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@safmc.net

✓ **Staff Economist**

Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Julia Byrd - julia.byrd@safmc.net

✓ **Administrative Officer**

Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

✓ **Purchasing & Grants**

Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

COUNCIL MTG DAY 4

10 Dec 15

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Mumford	Doug Mumford	doug.mumford@ncdenr.gov
Alvarado	Nicolas	Nicolas.Alvarado@noaa.gov
Austin	Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com
Bademan	Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu
Ballenger	Joey	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Bissette	Jesse	jlbissette13@gmail.com
Black	Michael	mike@floribbeansea.com
Black	Michael	mblack54@bellsouth.net
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Brady	Bonnie	greenfluke@optonline.net
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Bresnen	Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Desfosse	Joseph	joseph.desfosse@noaa.gov
Dukes	Amy	DukesA@dnr.sc.gov
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Froeschke	John	john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Hadley	John	john.hadley@ncdenr.gov
Helies	Frank	fchelies@verizon.net
Hesselman	Don	don.hesselman@ncdenr.gov
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Hudson	Mary	mhudson@gmri.org
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Johnson	Denise	denise.johnson@noaa.gov
Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
L	I	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net
Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov
Levy	Mara	mara.levy@noaa.gov
Lindh	Ryan	nativetrade@bellsouth.net
MCCallum	James	jimmccall@mindspring.com
Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
Markwith	Anne	anne.markwith@ncdenr.gov
Martin	Gretchen	gbmartin71@gmail.com
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov

Merrifield	Mike	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com
Mitchell	W	warren.mitchell@noaa.gov
Muhammad	Ernest	Muhammade@dnr.sc.gov
Package-Ward	Christina	christina.package-ward@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Reichert	Marcel	Reichertm@dnr.sc.gov
Roberts	Claire	claire.roberts@gulfcouncil.org
Schalit	David	dschalit@gmail.com
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov
Smith	Scott	scott.smith@ncdenr.gov
Stafford	Pete	spstafford@gmail.com
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
rindone	ryan	ryan.rindone@gulfcouncil.org
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
smart	tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov
Brown	Angela	brownac@dnr.sc.gov
Buckson	Bruce	bruce@buckson.net
FARMER	NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov
Herndon	Andrew	Andrew.Herndon@noaa.gov
Mansfield	Bill	billman@ec.rr.com
Smith	Myron	myronsmith@nc.rr.com
Steamer	Donald	b001936@gmail.com
c	m	mec181@yahoo.com
custer	carl	carlswholesale@yahoo.com