

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

ECONOMICS COMMITTEE

**Jekyll Island Club Hotel
Jekyll Island, GA**

March 7, 2007

SUMMARY MINUTES

Economics Committee Members:

Robert H. Boyles, Jr. Chair
Dr. Roy Crabtree
George Geiger
Rita Merritt

Benjamin "Mac" Currin
Frank Gibson, III
Charles "Duane" Harris
John Wallace

Council Members:

Columbus Brown
Anthony Iarocci
Mark Robson

Brian Chevront
LTJG Laura Swift (liaison for Lt. Chad Brick)
Susan Shipman

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Rick DeVictor
Kerry O'Malley
Julie O'Dell

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Kim Iverson
Kate Quigley

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Carolyn Belcher
Dr. Joe Kimmel
Dr. Tom McIlwain
Dick Brame

Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Mike Jepson
Dr. Tom Jamir
Michael Sparks
Dan McGinnis

The Economics Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Club Ballroom of the Jekyll Island Club Hotel, Jekyll Island, Georgia, Wednesday morning, March 7, 2007, and was called to order at 11:05 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Robert Boyles.

Mr. Boyles: Good morning, everyone. I would like to call the meeting of the Economics Committee of the South Atlantic Council to order. You have been sent an agenda. I appreciate everyone's willingness to move up this committee meeting so we can make better use of our time here before lunch.

You've seen an agenda and are there any changes to the agenda or any additions? Seeing none, the agenda will stand approved. I would next like to ask for an Approval of the December 2006 Meeting Minutes. Do I hear any objections to approving the minutes from December 2006? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. Next, we're going to move straight into the review of the socioeconomic section of the Draft Fishery Ecosystem Plan and Kate is going to handle that for us.

Ms. Quigley: Originally, Myra Brouwer was going to be here and give you an overview of the socioeconomic section of the Draft Fishery Ecosystem Plan and she's not here, but I think I can probably walk through it. It was going to be very brief, in general. The purpose of this was I believe at the last meeting there was some talk about are we going to be doing what the fishery ecosystem plan is already doing and so to make sure that we're not, we thought we would go through the table of contents.

Really, this document is largely undeveloped, from what Myra has told me, and Gregg might want to add some information here. Basically, if you take a look at Attachment 1, this is Section 5 of that document. We can go through the table of contents, but basically, what I've been told is there are bits and pieces from other documents at this point in time basically copied and pasted into this document. However, the text has not been modified very much and so this is still just kind of in the planning stages, but we can just go through this briefly.

In Section 5, there is a discussion of the human environment in the South Atlantic, a description of economic aspects of stakeholder groups. We've got the commercial harvesting and secondary sectors, private recreational and for-hire recreational, and then you've got the secondary sectors for the recreational fishery and then a discussion of non-users and non-consumptive users.

Then there's a description of sociocultural aspects of stakeholder groups. Again, you've got the same categories and then there will be something included on coastal communities in the South Atlantic and this note here indicates that the information for this section was excerpted from the golden crab SAFE report.

However, there are several other reports out there that have been done that might be drawn upon. In particular, I'm referring to the communities document that was drafted by Mike Jepson and by Kathi Kitner and a number of other people somewhat recently, but I believe they use 2001 data. I'm trying to recall, but I believe it was 2001 data and that hasn't been updated at this point in time, largely because of the census data that's available.

Then what follows in this table of contents is a description of a number of different fisheries. There's the shrimp fishery and basically for each of these, there's a description of fishing practices, vessels, and gear, an economic description of the fishery. These are drawn from the various amendments, the social and cultural environment, bycatch, and this was repeated again for the shrimp fishery, the deepwater shrimp fishery, the snapper grouper fishery, golden crab fishery, coastal migratory pelagics, spiny lobster.

Then 5.9 is the live rock aquaculture and allowable octocorals fishery. I'm assuming that's corals. Myra could probably do a better job than I can talking about that one. There's sargassum, dolphin and wahoo, calico scallops, and it goes into other fisheries, such as Atlantic menhaden, striped bass, anadromous and anadromous species, red drum, and a number of other fisheries.

Like I said before, this is somewhat undeveloped, but this table of contents, Roger and Myra thought it would probably be the best thing for you to take a look at to get an idea of what's going to be included in the fishery ecosystem plan and for the most part, like I said before, the information will be drawn from the various amendments.

The idea is basically to keep this in mind when we're taking a look at what you might like the table of contents to be of this socioeconomic guidance document that the committee talked about back in December. I guess what we can do, unless there's any discussion, is we could move on to Attachment 2 and take a look at what we have drafted so far, and it's probably the table of contents, and quite a bit has been added on that is not in your briefing book. The idea would be basically to take a look at the table of contents and flesh out what you would like to see included in that document.

Mr. Boyles: Before we move into the second document, I know I've got a question on the ecosystem plan, but are there any other questions or comments about the draft table of contents, on what's going on in the fishery ecosystem plan with respect to socioeconomics, from any of the committee members?

Mr. Harris: I was just curious. We're drawing a lot of this from other documents. Some of that information is kind of old and so how are we going to update it? I guess that's what Gregg is going to talk about, but I'm curious as to how that information is going to be updated.

Mr. Waugh: We've got various writing teams that have been provided this material and this is what we will talk about in a little more detail this afternoon, but what we as staff have done is compiled the information from various FMPs and amendment documents, various work products, and provided that to these various writing teams.

Obviously a lot of the tabular information needs to be updated and Roger had discussions with Jeff White of ACCSP. They are in the process of helping us update all of the tables. What you will be looking at in June will be a rough cut of the FEP that will have a lot of this material filled in, but there are writing teams at work now updating this material.

Mr. Currin: I have a couple of comments. One is I'm assuming that under bycatch as a broad category that there's going to be discard discussion as well as a part of that. I don't know whether that's worth trying to change those headings to bycatch and discards or whether it's fine. If that bothers no one else, that's fine.

The other thing I would point out, I think, for consideration is that as we go through and pull information from the various plans, particularly on the sociocultural and economic sections, or

into these sections, that we look for maintaining consistency, because they may vary among the various documents, and we also look for conflicting information that may be carried forward as well.

I'm thinking in particular with reference to that of one particular community that was described in 13C that Kathi pulled together and lumped Wanchese, a port in North Carolina and a fairly major commercial port there, with Stumpy Point and there may be some good rationale for doing that, but those are physically located fairly far apart and I'm still struggling with justification for lumping Stumpy Point with Wanchese and why not Wanchese with Manteo, which is a much closer proximity to Wanchese, and describing that area? Just things like that can be troubling.

Ms. Quigley: I think Myra and Roger would appreciate your comments. One thing they wanted to get out of this, which I didn't mention, was they wanted your response, what you think should be included in this fishery ecosystem plan. Those are good comments and I'll relay those comments to them.

Dr. Chevront: Kate, are you only wanting stuff from FMPs or are you actually looking to put in some new information? I was just sort of scrolling through some of this stuff and I know that there is some stuff out there on Atlantic menhaden, which, interestingly, doesn't exist really in the South Atlantic Council anymore, with the closure of Beaufort Fisheries about two years ago.

For example, under the auspices of the ASMFC, I actually did a sociocultural interview project with participants in the Atlantic menhaden fishery in both North Carolina and Virginia a couple of years ago.

There are some other documents and I don't know if there's other people out there who have them and what's the best way to sort of bring them together so that they can be used, but only do it if it's going to be helpful and not overwhelming, because this is a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done and the last thing I want to do is heap more stuff onto you to have to do. If there's some way that I can help with maybe a -- I guess I'm offering some of my services to help identify documents, if I know of them, if they'll be helpful. If not, I'll just be quiet and sit back.

Mr. Boyles: We don't want you to be quiet and sit back there, Brian.

Ms. Quigley: The good thing for me is that actually this is not my project. I will be participating in it and contributing to it; however, Myra and Roger are the ones responsible for coordinating a lot of that information. I'm sure I will have a hand in writing and coordinating a great deal of the economic and sociocultural information.

I think they would certainly be interested in knowing that that information exists and so I would suggest you pass it on to me, as you have in the past, and I have passed that on to Myra and Roger and they just probably haven't updated some of this, but yes, if you have things that you think would probably be more useful than things listed here or things that you're not sure that we have, I would strongly suggest that you pass them on to myself, Myra, and Roger.

Mr. Boyles: I'll second that, Brian.

Mr. Currin: I have one more thing, Robert, that just occurred to me in looking at striped bass and it's listed under economic descriptions of the fisheries and certainly you can draw into our FEP from the ASMFC striped bass plan. I'm not sure how fully they incorporate or acknowledge the striped bass plan from the State of North Carolina.

I know it has to be approved by ASMFC, but I'm not sure whether it's incorporated by reference or whether -- There may be aspects of the North Carolina plan that we would want to consider, not only for striped bass, but for red drum and there may be other species. Just don't ignore that and at least take a peek at them. There may be some information that's useful to the council in this FEP.

Mr. Boyles: Thanks, Mac. Any other questions or comments? Kate, I've got one and I would be curious to see what the committee thinks about this. Maybe this is covered in kind of individual sections, but one of the things that strikes me is so much of the socioeconomic forces that are influencing the future of our fisheries take place far outside our own realm, global trade and efficient transportation networks.

I'm wondering -- Duane, maybe I'm looking to you specifically, but is that too big a chunk to describe as part of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan, in terms of imported seafood products and I'm sure we're dealing with loss of infrastructure in the individual sections, but I would be curious to get the committee's take on whether that's something that we think is appropriate to include in this document, in the Fishery Ecosystem Plan, and whether or not it might be too big.

Mr. Harris: I think to the extent that we can do so that we have to incorporate that information. If we're going to manage this ecosystem as a whole, that's an integral part of that and we -- It's not going to be easy, I don't believe, but that's why we've got experts.

Mr. Waugh: In addition, one of the new changes to Magnuson-Stevens Act that previously was not there was this issue of cumulative impacts. We have analyzed cumulative impacts under NEPA and that's now been added to Magnuson-Stevens Act and so not just in the FEP, but in any amendment, we are charged with looking at cumulative impacts on the industry and not just from our fishing regulations, but other regulations and other situations and other factors that influence the social and economics of our fishery. We are charged with analyzing those in all of our plans and amendments.

Ms. Quigley: That's one subject that I've added into -- We'll take a look at Attachment 2 and I've added into Attachment 2 a discussion of those external factors and what might be able to happen is I might be able to work on that and end up, instead of it being in this Attachment 2, the socioeconomic guidance document, and instead maybe it would go into the Fishery Ecosystem Plan document or into both, but it's certainly something that needs to be at least acknowledged, that there are external factors taking place and impacting communities and fishing businesses and recreational.

Mr. Boyles: Thanks, Kate. Are there any other comments on this item? I think staff has good marching orders. Let's move to the second item then, talking about the socioeconomic guidance documents. It was a nice segway into some of these other issues there, Kate. Take it away.

Ms. Quigley: What you have in your briefing book is just something very, very basic and I've expanded it so what you see on the screen is rather different from what you have in your briefing book. Just based on the comments that I had received at the last meeting -- Why don't I just scroll through this and we'll take a look at Section 1 and Section 2 until Gregg gets back or I can switch places.

Introduction, why develop a socioeconomic guidance document, and we talked about that in the first meeting and I can draw from that. How can this document be used? We vaguely referred to some of those things and maybe we can have some more discussion.

Then just a basic listing of South Atlantic fisheries FMP goals and objectives. We'll need to take a look at all of those goals and objectives and the approach for this document is we're not focusing on a single fishery, but we're taking a look at all the fisheries at this point in time. We may want to narrow the scope in the future, but I think that was the intention originally.

Basically, the introduction is a why and how and just a basic background on what guidance we already have and then Section 2 would be largely background, how South Atlantic fisheries changed socially and economically by regulations and other factors over time.

Under 1, I've got timeline and so how far back do we really want to go and then by fishery and I've listed several of the fisheries. I have not listed all the fisheries that are included in the Fishery Ecosystem Plan. The idea is that once I go through this, we can go back and we can add things into the table of contents that you would like to see there, things that I have missed. This was basically just a brainstorming session for me.

Under A3, we've got status of data, deficiencies and duplication, et cetera, basically what data is out there and what has it been able to tell us about how South Atlantic fisheries have changed over time and why are we not able to see more of what has occurred and why are we not able to analyze more. Maybe deficiencies that exist in the data can be pointed out.

Under Section 2B, I've got a section called the change in fishing infrastructure and so not only are we talking about changes in the fishery -- I've kind of split these up into changes in the fishery, so commercial and recreational, but then change in fishing infrastructure and so unloading facilities, trucking and distribution, ice and bait availability. I'm assuming this is basically going to be phone calls that I would be making and talking to Sea Grant personnel and talking to association directors and talking to fishermen.

There is a document included in your briefing book I believe that Kerry O'Malley did some years ago on fish houses and we've had conversations about updating that document and her assisting me in doing that. That was specifically done for the snapper grouper fishery, but could

possibly be expanded and I'm not sure how long some of these things are going to take, but these are just ideas we're throwing out there.

What I'm suggesting is that you shoot for the moon and say everything you would like to see in a document like this and then we'll decide later what can actually be done and so first talking about how the fisheries have changed, commercial and recreational, and then taking a look at fishing infrastructure and then under Section 2C, talking about fishing communities today.

There are quite a few documents out there on fishing communities. Each of the amendments has included something on fishing communities and so what I'm suggesting at this point in time is basically a literature review of what is out there, what individual documents are out there, and taking a look at the recent amendments, and I guess we're most heavily relying upon 13C and some of the recent mackerel amendments and other amendments, and take a look at what's out there for fishing communities and then assessing what's missing, possibly.

One possibility, something I've done in the past, is I have done dependence, resilience, and vulnerability analyses of communities, which can be pretty easily done with existing landings data and number of vessels, fishery employment, and census data. That might be a possibility, but first, we have to take a look at what actually exists.

Many of you know what already exists and I do know what exists for the snapper grouper fishery and for mackerel, but as far as the other fisheries, I'm not so sure. Brian has contributed quite a few documents on North Carolina communities, but Georgia has also -- Susan has sent me various documents for Georgia communities and perhaps some of the other states could send me or I can go searching for documents that state agencies have completed or Sea Grant has completed.

Anyway, we need to take a look at least at what's out there and what perhaps the next step might be. Under Section 2D, external factors affecting fishing businesses, this is what I was referring to just a little while ago, and what are some of the external things, tax structure, coastal development, weather impacts, and I guess we would add in there global impacts and so what's happened with imports, that's very important. We can add that in there.

Section 2E is community, industry, and other initiatives. There are initiatives that have taken place outside of federal and state governments. The Working Waterfronts Initiative, there's been value-added efforts and the Sustainable Seafood Initiative is one example and then, from what I've heard, there have been efforts to establish fishing cooperatives.

I don't have a whole lot of information on those. I heard that perhaps there was one being developed in Mt. Pleasant. We can look and see and talk to some of the fishing associations to see if there are other initiatives.

Section 3 is basically a looking forward section. We need to first state, for those who aren't aware, the items in the reauthorized MSA that the council will be responsible for and so we can predict a little bit how things are going to change within the South Atlantic fisheries just by

taking a look at the new requirements.

Section 3B is a review of current socioeconomic goals and objectives. Those are from the amendments. C is interpreting what actions these goals and objectives imply and so take a look at what has been done in the past and what's been said in the minutes of various meetings. Section 3D is a vision for the future of the South Atlantic fisheries and E is finding direction and strategy and then Section 4 would be how do we measure success.

Just taking a look at this table of contents, this is a large undertaking, to say the least, but let's put everything in there that you think is important and then perhaps we can prioritize and take a look at what would be realistic. Basically what I see people pointing out is what's missing in other documents and what are you not seeing? Perhaps some of these things can be incorporated into the fishery ecosystem plan and so that's good and perhaps then it can come out of this document and it can be more focused. Anyway, we can start a discussion just on those points.

Mr. Geiger: Would it be possible to have this emailed to us so that we can have it our possession so we can look at it in more detail?

Ms. Quigley: I'll do that right now.

Mr. Harris: With respect to fishing cooperatives, Kate, there's some history associated with fishing cooperatives in our area too and I don't think we want to go with just what we have today. We need to look at the history of those and what's happened to them over time.

Mr. Currin: With respect to your question on timelines and how far back we should go, I would recommend that we go back at least far enough that we capture the rapid increase in imports and it may be worth looking at imports and items like blue crabs, which although that's not a species managed by the South Atlantic, that has affected infrastructure and fish houses that deal not only in blue crabs, but other species. However, the impact of imports of blue crabs may have impacted some of those fish houses tremendously.

I'm assuming that perhaps Brian has made the council aware of a fish house inventory that's been done in North Carolina, a recent one, by Barbara Garrity-Blake, and it's still kind of in place. If you're not aware of that, that's something that may be useful.

There's also a -- I don't know exactly how to describe it, but a community fish house that's been resurrected in Ocracoke here recently by the community and by a group of fishermen up there. That certainly should be considered as well and you mentioned the waterfront access committee that's operating not only in North Carolina, but elsewhere, that may be a good source of information on some history and the like.

Dr. Chevront: Just to follow along with what Mac was saying, Kate, I've been -- While you were talking, I was making a running list of things that I know of that I don't think I've sent to you before, even things like the web address for the waterfront access committee. It has all the documents and everything on it and people that I need to make connections for you with, like

penaeid shrimp.

If you're not familiar with John Maiolo's book on the history of shrimping, it's a cultural approach in North Carolina. I've just got a whole list and I'll just email it to you and just say here it is.

Also, I don't know if you're familiar with Ben Blount. He used to be a member of our SSC. He did a research project recently looking at two fishing communities, one in Georgia and one in North Carolina, and he did some pretty extensive comparisons on the changes that have occurred in those communities over time, but one of the things that you asked for on the timeline, how far do you go back, as a general guideline, I might make as a suggestion to look at the biological landings data and see if you can go back to something at least that far.

Some of these things like imports and all that stuff, if that's influencing the landings that are being used for management, it ought to be picked up in those data as well and if you can have complimentary social and economic data that cover the same years, that might be really helpful.

I know that -- I don't know if other states have this or not, but North Carolina actually has a historical book of landings that we use only for just reference. We don't use it actually for any kind of scientific stuff, but I've used it when I've written FMP sections for North Carolina and they go back to the 1890s, so you can get a feel for how important different fisheries were going back.

At one point, river herring was the most important fishery in North Carolina economically and in terms of the number of pounds landed. When I was working on that FMP, I was able to show that a hundred years ago this was the most important fishery and look what's happened to it now. I can probably get you a copy of that if you would like to have it. It's been Xeroxed a jillion times, but you might just want to have it as something sitting on your shelf.

It has everything from whales and dolphin landings and sea turtle landings, back when people used to do that kind of stuff. It's all in there and so it just might be a handy thing for you to have sitting on your shelf.

Mr. Boyles: Thanks, Brian. It does sound like interesting reading, nevertheless. Are there any other comments?

Mr. Gibson: I have a question. I just realized I was a part of this illustrious committee and so I'm catching up, so to speak. In regards to the fish houses, I was just reading one of the documents and it said that there are 274 fish houses left in our purview. In South Carolina, there's only twenty-three left and I think Georgia has two or three and then I kept reading and found out that -- What's the one that I just asked you about? It was Phillips. Then I kept reading and it said sold for condominiums.

Like I said, I think there are twenty-three left in South Carolina and I just heard yesterday that one might be on the market in my neck of the woods in the near future. Flipping the page, my

county has been very successful dealing with open land trusts and getting matching grants, government federal grants, for preserving land.

Where, in the big picture, is the waterfront? Are there any fundings to save or to keep people in business or to assist new people in getting in business to keep the fish houses open from this valuable property being sold to developers? Is there any mechanism out there for people to go to? That's a naïve question, but I just have no clue.

Mr. Boyles: Frank, I think it's a central question to a lot of what we're dealing about here and it's a nice segway, if I will -- I don't know that I have an answer to your question, but I would like to get some feedback from the committee on this, because the way I see this document evolving -- I was serving as a hearing officer at a public hearing back in the fall and I got asked the question of what's the big picture and what are we doing.

My perhaps unstudied observations have been that we oftentimes get so wrapped up in dealing with the very, very difficult issues of rebuilding fisheries and dealing with problems that sometimes we -- I don't know that we lose sight of the big picture, but it's not altogether clear and I certainly see this document evolving into something where this council makes some qualitative statements about where we collectively see fisheries in the future.

You have to look back and see how these things have been important socially and economically so that I can answer that question when I'm asked at a public hearing of what is the big picture. We may be biting off more than this committee has as its purview and I'll look to the council chairman to rein us in, if necessary, but I do think it would be very, very helpful for us to have a touchstone document that talks about changes in the fishery and reminds us of what that big picture roadmap is to the future and in addition to sustaining biological stocks that we've got to deal with these other socioeconomic factors that do influence things. I don't know that I've answered your question, Frank, but I think it's certainly something that this committee seems to be very, very interested in.

Ms. O'Malley: Just as a point of clarification and it may not be the appropriate time, but I think it's important. When you look at those numbers in that document that I put together, it's not that there are four-hundred-and-sixty-something fish houses, because that's definitely not the case. That's how many dealer permits there are. In South Carolina, there's, I think you said twenty-three dealer permits, but there's actually about three or four fish houses.

What the change has been is the individuals are now starting to buy their own dealer permits and move their own fish, because there aren't enough. I just think it's an important note to change and I would point Frank to folks like Megan Westmeyer, who runs the South Carolina Sustainable Seafood Initiative, who is trying to help fishermen find places to unload and help fish houses stay afloat by doing value-added products and things like that.

Mr. Wallace: To what Frank was saying, I think it would be good information that we had available to our constituents. Everywhere I go, I keep hearing about this working waterfronts in the county business plans and state business plans and I even hear there's some congressional

funding available and it may be something that Roy may know something about, I'm not sure, but I think it is something that we may want to research, to see if we can make this information available to the people that might need it.

It is getting more and more -- If we don't start designating a specific piece of land to the commercial fishery, there's not going to be a commercial fishery. I haven't figured this one out yet, but you see the boat coming on the causeway that's anchored out in the creek and I'm not sure why he's there and I don't even know who he is, but it's still -- That's what it's coming to.

The condos are taking over and I can't blame the people for selling out, because the realistic part of it is the interest on the money that the property is worth is more than the fish house can make during the year. We've got to -- It may not be our duty, but I think it's an obligation that we should have to at least make the information more readily available to the communities or to the fisheries, because it's getting -- It's hard to find it. I've even tried to get some research and tried to find it and it's time consuming to try to find it, but it may be good PR for us also, to make this information available.

Mr. Boyles: Thanks, John, good points. I will say that I know we're going to have a conversation during the I&E Committee meeting about some work with Sea Grant, specifically looking at some projects that we could do, and I think that might be a really good time to discuss that in further detail, I think.

Mr. Brown: I just wanted to mention that the National Hunting and Fishing Survey Data will be released in June and it will be a good source of information that will give you some trends and forecast as to what's going on in terms of the population of fishers, recreational anglers, and I think when you look at that economic benefit, as well as where that's going, it should portray a pretty interesting story in terms of what we need to consider.

Mr. Currin: I think I mentioned this at one of our earlier meetings, but it would be particularly instructive to states like North Carolina if there were one place that we might be able to go and look at information on state docks.

I know that some of the states operate state docks that provide access for commercial fisheries and it may be worth looking at least at east coast, if not statewide or countrywide, how those operate and where they're located, so that that could provide information to people like the State of North Carolina and they may be considering things like that in the future in other states, as waterfront becomes less and less available and the state has to provide it.

Mr. Boyles: Thanks, Mac. I think certainly infrastructure is certainly something that we're all sensitive to and all kind scratch our heads as to what can be done and I think the more that we can do, just like John pointed out, the better. I would like to think that we'll bring this up and I'm looking at Kim just to remind me that we'll talk about it specifically with respect to the Sea Grant discussion at the I&E Committee.

Dr. McIlwain: Just a comment relative to availability of facilities and what have you. As you

know, we've been subjected to hurricane that pretty much wiped out all of our processing facilities and our fish houses in Mississippi and some of the thinking now is to put in a community dock, basically an unloading dock, ice house, fuel dock, and then moving all the processing facilities actually north of Interstate 10 and trucking product up there.

That's in the discussion stages and whether that will happen or not -- In the interim, we've probably only got about maybe two fish houses in operation in Mississippi and two or three processors. Our landscape has changed drastically in the last couple of years.

Mr. Boyles: Thanks, Tom, for that perspective.

Ms. Quigley: I think what I'm hearing is that there's very strong interest in creating something like taking stock of fishing communities, maybe even a stand-alone document or something that can be incorporated in the Fishery Ecosystem Plan, and this is largely a council staff undertaking, with guidance from you outlining what you would like in the document, but then it's largely almost a long-term endeavor and somewhat time consuming.

There's that and that's what I'm hearing, that you're very much interested in that. Then there's this maybe related, but different subject of what is our direction, given the goals and objectives that have already been stated in the FMP, and what do those goals and objectives really mean and what action do they imply and what kind of strategies do we want to figure out for the future and what future direction to we want the council to go in.

It almost seems like there may be some interest, and I don't know if we need to do this right now, but in just separating those thoughts, because one is very time consuming and involves research and perhaps some analysis and the other one is something that you guys can actually talk about and work on and have discussions about.

Mr. Boyles: I think that sounds reasonable and from my standpoint, it almost strikes me that -- It does require you to pull them apart and we can marry the two documents later, or two products later, if necessary, but I think you are talking about one almost being kind of a vision and a policy discussion and the other being a very methodical and data rich, presumably, analysis. I think that makes sense. I'm seeing some nods around the table.

Mr. Gibson: If you would like a real live case study, in the next six months twenty-three acres of land in Port Royal will be auctioned off. The governor has decided that the state needs the money and they're closing a ports authority, a wonderful bulkhead deepwater port that will be sitting there and twenty-three acres that some developer will develop.

This will be a perfect scenario to have an open area with a live fish house and dock already there and permitted and deepwater and the city manager of Port Royal would be glad to take any questions you may have, but that would be a perfect case study and to involve the lady from Charleston and all to see -- This is an opportunity. Somebody is going to take it and if we could be involved, it would be wonderful.

Mr. Boyles: Frank, thanks for that. That's something that's certainly happening in real time and, John, I think you know -- Some of the seafood processing facilities there are moving inland, just like Tom suggested, as a result of that change. I believe that's the intention there. Any other comments or questions from the committee on this?

Mr. Harris: I think one of the conundrums we are going to find ourselves in, and I made this comment at a previous meeting, is I think that because of the value of coastal properties, I don't see a whole lot of commercial fishing families continuing to own these properties in the future. I see that probably being a function of government, but it's between the time that government starts that process and these -- These folks don't want the competition right now.

They don't want government coming in and taking the boats away from them, but eventually, that's going to have to happen. I think there's going to have to be some kind of a plan laid out for that transition and I'm glad that I'm not going to be the one that develops that plan, but I think there's going to have to be something like that.

Mr. Boyles: I think that's what they call the classic sense of market failure, when government steps in and takes over what the private sector is not going to. That's a good point, Duane, and I certainly don't have any answers on that. Are there any other comments on this particular item, on the socioeconomic guidance document? That wraps that up. Is there any other business that the committee would like to talk about? Seeing none, the committee's business is over.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 11:50 o'clock a.m., March 7, 2007.)

Certified by: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed by:
Graham Transcription
April 18, 2007

Staff Meeting Attendance

Meeting Location: Jekyll Island, GA Date: March 7, 2007

Meeting: Economics Committee

Staff:

Mahood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Waugh	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Brouwer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Buscher	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carmichael	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Chaya	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collins	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DeVictor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Iverson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Lindsay	<input type="checkbox"/>
O'Dell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
O'Malley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Quigley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pugliese	<input type="checkbox"/>

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2006 - 2007 Council Membership

LTJG LAURA SWIFT

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

Curtis

George J. Geiger
566 Ponoka Street
Sebastian, FL 32958
772/388-3183 (ph)
chancesarecharters@juno.com

✓

David M. Cupka
P.O. Box 12753
Charleston, SC 29422
843/795-8591 (hm)
843/870-5495 (cell)
dkcupka@bellsouth.net

Lt. Chad R. Brick
U.S. Coast Guard
Brickell Plaza Federal Building
909 S.E. First Avenue
Room 876/ DRE
Miami, FL 33131-3050
305/415-6781 (ph)
305/415-6791 (f)
Chad.R.Brick@uscg.mil

COUNCIL VICE-CHAIRMAN

Curtis

Charles Duane Harris
105 Demere Retreat Lane
St. Simons Island, GA 31522
912/638-9430 (ph)
seageorg@bellsouth.net

✓

Curtis

Benjamin M. "Mac" Currin
801 Westwood Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607
919/881-0049 (ph)
mcurrin1@bellsouth.net

✓

Dr. Louis Daniel
Assistant to the Director
N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries
P.O. Box 769 (3441 Arendell St.)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 (ext. 105)
252/726-0254 (f)
louis.daniel@ncmail.net

BRIAN

✓

Mark Robson
Director, Division of Marine Fisheries
Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
620 S. Meridian Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847(f)
mark.robson@myfwc.com

✓

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

Curtis

Frank E. Gibson, III
P.O. Box 789
Beaufort, SC 29901
843/522-2020 (office)
843/521-7340 (cell)
fgibson@islc.net

✓

Susan Shipman
Director, 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)
sshipman@dnr.state.ga.us

✓

Chair

Robert H. Boyles, Jr.
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9304 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
boylesr@dnr.sc.gov

✓

Anthony L. Iarocci
236 Guava Avenue
Grassy Key, FL 33050
305/743-7162 (ph); 305/743-2697(f)

Curtis

John A. Wallace
5 Buddy Beckham Road
P.O. Box 88
Meridian, GA 31319
912/437-6797 (ph); 912/437-3635 (f)
gwallace@darientel.net

✓

Columbus H. Brown
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
1875 Century Boulevard, Suite 205
Atlanta, GA 30345
404/679-4143 (ph); 404/679-7194(f)
columbus_brown@fws.gov

Curtis

Rita G. Merritt
38 Pelican Drive
Wrightsville Beach, NC 28480
910/256-3197 (ph); 910/256-3689 (f)
miridon@ec.rr.com

✓

John V. O'Shea
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1444 Eye Street, N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/289-6400 (ph); 202/289-6051 (f)
voshea@asmfc.org

DICK BRAME
CAROLYN BELCHER
MIKE SEPSON
JACK MCGOVERN
MICHAEL SPARKS
DAN MCGINNIS

Curtis

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

✓

✓ TOM SAMIR
✓ JOE KIMMEL
MONICA SMIT BRUNELLO
✓ TOM McILWAIN
3

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we may have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

Economics Committee Meeting Jekyll Island, GA Wednesday, March 7, 2007

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE
& PHONE NO.

P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE, ZIP

Michael Jepson 813-286-8390 GSAPFI, Tampa, FL

J Dick BRAME (910) 338-0012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, South Carolina 29405
843/571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2006 - 2007 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

David Cupka, Chair
Robert Boyles
Louis Daniel
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Rita Merritt
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CONTROLLED ACCESS

Rita Merritt, Chair
Robert Boyles
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Mac Currin
Louis Daniel
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Susan Shipman
John Wallace
Staff contact: Kate Quigley

ECONOMICS

✓ Robert Boyles, Chair
✓ Mac Currin
✓ Roy Crabtree
✓ Frank Gibson
✓ George Geiger
✓ Duane Harris
✓ Rita Merritt
✓ John Wallace
Staff Contact: Kate Quigley

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT*

Duane Harris, Chair
Columbus Brown
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Mac Currin
Louis Daniel
George Geiger
Tony Iarocci
Rita Merritt
Mark Robson
Susan Shipman
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Gregg Waugh- FEP Comprehensive
Amendment

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT / NEPA

George Geiger, Chair
Robert Boyles
Chad Brick
Columbus Brown
Louis Daniel
Frank Gibson
Tony Iarocci
Rita Merritt
Mark Robson
Staff contact: Rick DeVictor

EXECUTIVE

George Geiger, Chair
Duane Harris, Vice-Chair
David Cupka
Louis Daniel
Susan Shipman
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

FINANCE

David Cupka, Chair
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Susan Shipman
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

Tony Iarocci, Chair
John Wallace, Vice Chair
George Geiger
Staff contact: Kerry O'Malley

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION

Duane Harris, Chair
Robert Boyles
Columbus Brown
George Geiger
Vince O'Shea
John Wallace
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Rita Merritt, Chair
Chad Brick
Louis Daniel
George Geiger
Frank Gibson
Staff contact: Kerry O'Malley

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Chad Brick
Columbus Brown
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Frank Gibson
Mark Robson
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Louis Daniel, Chair
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
David Cupka
George Geiger
Frank Gibson
Rita Merritt
Ron Smith, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Jack Travelstead, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Staff contact: Kate Quigley and
Gregg Waugh

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Frank Gibson, Chair
John Wallace, Vice-Chair
Chad Brick
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Rita Merritt
Staff contact: Kerry O'Malley

MARINE PROTECTED AREA

Tony Iarocci, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice Chair
Chad Brick
Columbus Brown
George Geiger
Frank Gibson
Duane Harris
Staff contact: Kerry O'Malley

PERSONNEL

Susan Shipman, Chair
David Cupka
Louis Daniel
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

(Continued on the next page)