

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

**Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, FL**

June 13, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee:

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chair
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel

David Cupka
Charlie Phillips

Council Members:

Lt. Robert Foos
Ben Hartig
Tom Burgess
Mac Currin
Doug Haymans

Dr. Wilson Laney
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Duane Harris
John Jolley

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Anna Martin

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Andrea Grabman
Dr. Mike Errigo
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Brian Chevront

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Otha Easley
Andy Strelcheck
Dr. Richard Cody
Joey Ballenger
Carolyn Sramek

Dr. Jack McGovern
Bob Gill
Phil Steele
Martha Bademan
Dr. Marcel Reichert
Dr. Luiz Barbieri
Kathy Barco

Additional Observers Attached

The Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, June 13, 2012, and was called to order at 1:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I call to order the Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee. We've got a lot of stuff on the agenda today so I want to make sure we get through in time for everyone to take a little break before we have the public listening session tonight. The first item is approval of the agenda. I have one other known item under other business. Are there any other modifications to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved.

Next is approval of our March 2012 meeting minutes. Are there any changes to those minutes? Seeing none, the minutes stand approved. We have a number of presentations today. We had a couple of presentations at our last meeting from some folks from the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program. Today we have Dr. Richard Cody with us from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute, and he is going to give an overview of the Florida Quota Monitoring/Dealer Reporting System. Dr. Cody.

DR. CODY: I wasn't sure initially whether I was to include any recreational information so I can leave that out at the end. It is on the slide; but if it is not necessary we can leave it out. Anyway, what I thought I'd do is give you a brief overview of what we do in Florida as far as dealer reporting is concerned and how it ties in maybe to the federal reporting requirements.

Basically, with Florida we have a number of different data collection vehicles. There is the license and permitting section and they cover commercial and recreational licenses. Dealer license is included. You've got also the saltwater fishermen and vessels and trap tags are included in there as well.

As far as commercial fisheries data collection is concerned, we have the marine fisheries trip ticket program, also known as the marine resource information system or the marine fisheries information system. That records information on landings, effort, participation and value at the dealer level, so it goes as far as the dealer. It doesn't go to retail as far as that is concerned.

As I said, recreational surveys, we're involved with the MRIP umbrella of surveys that includes a variety of things, including the for-hire telephone survey, a charterboat pilot study we've done, some angler public access site interviews, and then the headboat survey as well. That would collect catch, effort, participation and value.

As far as biological data is concerned, this ties into the trip ticket program as a validation tool, more or less. We have the trip interviews that are done by the National Marine Fisheries Service and our state samplers. Those are used to validate some of the information that is reported on trip tickets by the dealers. Things that would be included in that would be size, age, reproductive structures, things like that, and hard part collection and then also data used for generation of conversion factors.

We have also some special surveys or data collection programs that tend to be intermittent and not as long term as the others I just mentioned that include information on discards, at-sea

observations, tagging programs and information that we get more detail on the release condition of fish.

Just as kind of I guess not a warning but just an introduction to this as far as quota monitoring is concerned, our current role is really to assist in terms of providing data. We don't monitor quota as actively on an in-season type of basis, so we try to accommodate quota monitoring efforts that are done through the National Marine Fisheries Service through partnering with the commissions, Atlantic States and Gulf Marine Fisheries Commission, and through the FIN and ACCSP programs.

We try to do things like make necessary changes to the data base structures and codes that would facilitate more frequent reporting requirements that would help with quota monitoring adjustments. And then, of course, if there is any need for additional data collections, we assist wherever we can.

Just to talk a little bit about the marine fisheries trip ticket program, in Florida it has been mandatory since 1984 under Florida Statutes 379. Actually in the last complete fiscal year we had about 1,500 license wholesale dealers and on average in a given year about a thousand report. If you break down the numbers again, you've got about 12,000 or almost 13,000 saltwater products licenses issued. Not all of those will report annually.

You have about 220,000 trip tickets that are edited annually and about a similar number or maybe slightly higher that are submitted. The average annual harvest in Florida is about 90 million pounds and in the X-vessel value about 175 million. I know you can't see the information that's on here, but this is a survey questionnaire that we send out to dealers to get some background information that will help us with the verification of information that is reported on trip tickets to us whether electronically or on paper.

Really all it is, it is just a profile of the dealers, the types of species that they would expect to encounter in their business and the months that they would report generally and if they wanted to share some of their contact information for purposes of disaster relief and things like that. A summary of submission or the frequency of submission, data are submitted monthly right now.

There is a provision in the electronic reporting for weekly reporting of quota species. This is done through a program that is available, a modification to the electronic application that is a PC-based application done by Bluefin Data through Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. Basically, dealers that report electronically would have this application on their machine.

They're supported by the Bluefin and modifications have been made recently to allow weekly reporting and separate data dumps to the National Marine Fisheries Service on a weekly basis so that they get the information for those species that need to be reported weekly in a timely manner. As far as what we do with the data, paper tickets make up a fair percentage of the tickets that we look at.

We have some dealers that report on paper and electronically. The electronic portion of their tickets that they would report deal with the federal species. Data processing times for the paper

tickets, generally what will happen is that after the reporting month is up, it takes about two or three weeks to get the unedited data from most of the dealers and about another three weeks or so before it is edited.

Generally within six weeks of a given month the data will be in an edited format. It takes a little longer towards the end of the year because we get some tickets that are delinquent, that will show up late, and those get added in to the final landings estimates. Electronic data, on the other hand, we get unedited data from Bluefin basically within seven to ten days after a given month, and it takes a little less time to edit.

Generally for any given month, three weeks later the electronic data are available in edited form. As far as QA and quality checks, the trip ticket system itself, we do programmatic error checking using SAS and various other applications. We also use input from field samplers involved in the National Marine Fisheries Trip Interview Program, field audits. We currently just have the one auditor for Florida, so he can be busy at times.

Fisher and dealer summaries are produced. Those are back-checked against what is reported. Then we produce summaries for disaster relief claims related, say, to the BP incident in 2010. Then you've got qualification requirements where we will get requests for landings and that type of information for qualification purposes.

This is your typical trip ticket, the paper version, anyway. It has some basic information. If there is a vessel, there is room there for vessel information; also the crew size; the area fished; the state; that type of thing; the actual time fished. One thing you'll notice, there is information there for a species, species codes, the amount of catch, price, value and the ultimate disposition of the catch.

But one thing you will notice is that the catch is not split up – the actual trip is not split up. It is basically a summary for an individual trip so you don't get within-trip resolution for different portions of the catch. There is a provision now that is built into the electronic version that allows you to split catches by gears and areas fished.

The next modification probably of the paper ticket will include that and it probably would mean that we have to abandon this kind of credit card slip type of ticket and go for something that is a little bit different. We also allow dealers to produce their own tickets as long as they have the same information requirements that we need.

Some dealers, for instance, will preload the tickets with codes and species so that it is easier to fill out. This is particularly useful for things like marine life where you have a lot of different species codes. This is a marine life ticket and you've got over a hundred different species codes that are precoded. Basically the information up here at the top is the same as what would be reported on our trip ticket. As far as areas fished, we basically use the grid system that is used by NOAA Fisheries.

We do break up those areas into inshore or offshore and federal or state waters and also identify certain bay systems such as Escambia Bay, Apalachicola Bay, Tampa Bay, that type of thing.

There are also specific estuaries and bay systems that are included. Recently we have added some high resolution to the Florida Keys, which is sort of problematic in some ways because you can have fishers that fish in both Atlantic and Gulf waters, so we have provided maps that have a little bit more resolution there.

You can see down around the Keys, the red mark is basically U.S. 1 and then Tortugas as well, just to give you an example. Those are sent out to marine life dealers and to dealers that would operate in the keys. And then the codes – I know you can't see this, but this is a list of codes that we send to dealers. This is updated on a fairly regular basis.

The last update came to include HMS species, so we were requested by the National Marine Fisheries Service to include about 20 or so different codes for HMS or highly migratory species. Again, gear codes, those are updated on an as-needed basis basically. I can provide hard copies or PDFs of any of this information if people need it.

As far as the history of the program, it started basically in the late part of the 1980's, 1986 or so. The first what I would call a computer-based application was developed in the early nineties, so we had electronic reporting as far back as late nineties, mid to late nineties. The current version that we use through Bluefin Data – and they have a contract through the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission – that started in 2003 and has been updated on a fairly regular basis.

Right now we get about 70 percent of our tickets reported electronically. There is still a handful that are submitting on disk, but most of those are submitted by data dumps to Bluefin and then Bluefin sends us the data when it is compiled at the end of the month. You will notice that there is a little bit of a disparity there in the numbers of dealers that report electronically versus the numbers of electronic trip tickets.

A lot of the dealers that do report electronically are high-volume dealers. You have a lot of smaller dealers, almost two-thirds of them, that account for about 30 percent or less of the landings, and they are still reporting on paper. Again, as I mentioned, there is still about 5 percent of the dealers report on paper and electronic, and that is probably due to the fact that they would report separately to NOAA for federal species that require weekly reporting and then use paper tickets for the rest. I didn't know whether you needed to know anything about some of our recreational fisheries data collection; so if it's not necessary, I won't bother to include it.

DR. DUVAL: I think it would be very informative; and since you have it, go ahead.

DR. CODY: Okay, I can do that. We participate actively in the Marine Recreational Information Program that is being conducted by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Basically it will replace the MRFSS in the next few years. We have a few ongoing projects in there that will help as far as improving the quality of the data that comes out of Florida.

Right now we do the actual angler interviews in the field. It's not done by a contractor; it is done by the state of Florida. It has been that way since about 1997 or 1998. We provide recreational saltwater license information for the National Registry Program, and those data are to be used in a dual frame effort survey, so that will be used to augment the coastal household telephone

survey. We also have the for-hire telephone survey. That is something that we do to get effort information for the charter fleet. That has got weekly reporting, but the data are summarized by wave, which is customary for the MRFSS, but it could be done I guess on a higher resolution or higher frequency.

The for-hire pilot logbook program, we just finished that and the final report is in preparation. Then we have the Atlantic Coast Headboat At-Sea Observer Data on discarded catch. Those are species numbers and sizes for discarded catch from headboats on the Atlantic coast. It has been ongoing for about seven years.

Also we cooperate with the Southeast Center in doing the headboat logbook program. We have a couple of port samplers that work on that project. Biological sampling, we augment some of the FIN-funded and ACCSP-funded projects with U.S. Fish and Wildlife and with other National Marine Fisheries Service funding. And then discard information, that is some that we are starting to collect on inshore fish. Yes.

MR. JOLLEY: Do you put observers on any of the private boats yet?

DR. CODY: We had a pilot study with MRIP a while back and we had limited trips who were testing out a video system, so we had some validation of those trips by including at-sea observers, but it was a handful of trips, really.

MR. JOLLEY: Not routine?

DR. CODY: No, not routine. We do have pretty routine sampling, though, on the headboats and on some charterboats in the Gulf as well.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Dr. Cody, that was a great presentation. You actually answered a few questions I had about the percent of your dealers who were reporting electronically. I know that not all of our dealers in North Carolina report electronically as well. There is that similar disparity. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Dr. Cody, who pays for the at-sea observer program for headboats?

DR. CODY: The one that has been ongoing for about seven years in the Atlantic is paid for through ACCSP funding, so Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, through that program.

MR. HARRIS: Is that continuing today?

DR. CODY: Yes, it has been ongoing for about seven years and we just got funding for this year as well so it is continuing.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other questions for Dr. Cody regarding Florida's trip ticket program or some of their other sampling programs that they have? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I noticed you mentioned, when you had that Florida slide up there that showed the different quadrants, you mentioned that they were allied closely with the way NMFS does their blocks. Now, when I do a logbook, my blocks are different than that. They're not the same as yours. I don't know where the discrepancy is but it certainly seems to me that it would be nice if we get these two programs together to both have the same blocks where commercial reporting is concerned, anyway.

DR. CODY: I think the ACCSP, who we submit our data through, does some conversions of those blocks so that you can get a better picture of the two, and they're more compatible. I should have added that when we submit our – data are made available through ACCSP but also directly in unedited form to the National Marine Fisheries Service at the same time.

MR. HARRIS: How do you handle delinquent reporters?

DR. CODY: That's a good question. Well, the thing is those delinquent reports are hard to track because you don't know they're delinquent until they show up months later or years later. We're able to get an idea of what dealers should be reporting on a regular basis. Sometimes when we get requests for landings from the license holders, they will alert us to the fact that they should have trip tickets from this month from that dealer.

Those are the kinds of things that we would use to look at whether a dealer is a reporting correctly or not. There are some caveats to that as well because oftentimes crew shares will have to be considered and those won't be parsed out in the original trip ticket, things like that, so there may corrections that are made after the fact. During the months after the BP Oil Spill, we had quite a few landings show up from years previously because people were trying to qualify for money.

MR. CURRIN: Dr. Cody, I take it that since you don't know whether you're to expect a report from a dealer or not that you don't require that they report no landings each month so that you get some kind of report from them every month. If you had a system like that, would it not help you track your landings and perhaps prevent those year late kind of reports if you expected a report every month from them, yes or no?

DR. CODY: Well, the thing is that it is rarely a situation where a dealer doesn't report for a given month. What will happen is that some of the landings won't be reported so we will get information from a dealer. They forgot to enter some trip tickets or they omitted them, that type of thing.

In the dealer questionnaire that we send out we ask them for the months that they expect not to report, and for those months we're able to – we follow up usually if they don't have anything report and we haven't heard from them.

But, again, you've got that delay because we won't really pursue that until about four to six weeks after the end of a given month. That's a delay problem there; but you are right, we could require that they report no landings every month. There is an option in the electronic version to do that.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I'm not on your committee, but, Dr. Cody, do you have any process in place for tracking direct sales to restaurants that don't go through a dealer at all and do you have any sense of what percentage of the landings might be going into the market via that route?

DR. CODY: Well, that's a tough one. Technically, if they buy product – an SPL holder just can't sell to a restaurant unless they have a dealer license, so technically they're not supposed to be doing that. Does it happen? I'm pretty sure it does. Some of it is recreational sales. I think there are some provisions – and maybe Jessica can help me out here – that allow sales directly from the back of the boat types of sales.

DR. DUVAL: Jessica, to that point.

MS. McCRAWLEY: Yes, in fact, I think people do that a lot for shrimp, but they still have to have a wholesale dealer's license and a retail license in order to do that.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Chairman, I should make the caveat also that I'm not on your committee, but, Dr. Cody, you don't have a way of crosschecking logbooks with dealer reports, because you said some dealers report but they may not report all of their landings. Do you have anybody that crosschecks those with logbooks?

DR. CODY: That is something that is done in the science center as far as that is concerned because it's their logbook program. They will alert us if there is a discrepancy between the two. Also, the port samplers themselves, from the trip interview program they'll crosscheck what they have seen in the field from their trip interviews with what is reported.

DR. DUVAL: Other questions for Dr. Cody? Well, he will be around so if needed we can call him back up to the table, but thank you very much for your presentation. Next on the list we have our new SSC Chair, Dr. Luiz Barbieri, and he is going to give us a presentation on Florida's Tag Program for tracking harvested fish.

DR. BARBIERI: This is will actually be a fairly brief and hopefully simple to explain presentation about the types of programs that we have in Florida and expand it beyond the one that serves as sort of the poster child of the type program, which is the tarpon tag which requires every tarpon harvested or possessed in the state of Florida to be tagged with an individually numbered tag through the lower jaw.

I'm going to expand a little from that program to talk a little bit about the snook stamp program that we have in Florida as well. It's not a tagging program like the tarpon, but it is a variation that I thought would be interesting for you to hear about. Since we're talking about tarpon, I couldn't resist but to include a picture of Dr. Crabtree that in doing research for this presentation it came up. It is undated but rumors actually point out to the early seventies.

The tarpon tag program, like Jessica mentioned earlier, any type of licensing program in the state of Florida that involves a fee needs to be established by the Florida legislators, and the tarpon tag program is not any different. It costs fifty dollars and it was established by the Florida

Legislature in 1989 at the request basically of tarpon anglers in Florida that felt that tracking the harvest of these species was needed towards conservation.

There are 2,500 permits that are available for purchase every year. We only sell a fraction of those, as you're going to see in slides later in the presentation, but those 2,500 permits basically provide you with a ceiling or a maximum number of tarpon that would be directly harvested through the fishery.

Those 2,500 permits are broken down or subdivided and allocated to private recreational anglers – half of those go to private recreational anglers, and they are non-transferable. The other half goes to fishing guides who are allowed to purchase a larger number of tags if they want to have them on board during their charters for clients who may want to harvest one or participating in a tournament and possess a tarpon and they would have to have a tag.

The rule establishes any person who harvests or possesses a tarpon must have a tarpon tag affixed to the tarpon's lower jaw. The possession issue, which can be a little complicated for the law enforcement folks, actually entails you leave the fish in the water and you try to release it as soon as possible and you're not possessing the fish.

If you pull the fish out of the water, if you're handling the fish in a way that is considered to be more than just the natural act of pulling the fish by the side of the boat and cutting it loose or letting it go loose, you're possessing the tarpon and you should have a tarpon tag. The idea here is depending on how you handle that tarpon, it might actually die through that handling, through that possession process, and you want to account for those with a tarpon tag.

As established by this legislation, the funds generated by this stamp are to be used solely for tarpon research and management, and that is a help. Because we only sell a fraction of the permits available, it doesn't really generate a whole lot of monies. It is probably on the order of 15 to \$20,000 a year, but everything helps.

Here are examples of how the tag is used. This one is from a fishing tournament that is no longer a kill tournament. It is a catch-and-release-only tournament but it used to be until a few years back a kill tournament; and to bring your fish to the weigh scale and to get all the necessary weights, you kill the fish and you have to have your tarpon tag.

But tournaments that are catch and release and that use this system of weighing the fish as fast as possible still require the anglers to basically tow their fish to the weigh station to weigh them, and in that case, yes, you're still required to have that tag even if you let the fish go. Just for you to have a general idea of what the application form and the return card for the tarpon harvest program looks like, you're not going to be able to read all of this, but just to let you know that we're try to get as much information about that fishing event as possible about location, about the type of bait used, if your intention was to actually harvest that fish or just weigh that fish and let it go or take a picture and let it go, so did you release it alive or did you harvest that fish or did you kill it and some other general information just to give us an idea of what is being harvested or caught out there.

As I mentioned before, the number of tarpon permits that are sold each year, those 2,500 that are made available are distributed statewide through counties' tax collectors offices. Folks go those offices and fill out an application and buy their harvest tag. The numbers you can see from even the early nineties, no major change, fluctuate around 350 that we sell every year even including all the ones that are supposed to be used for tournaments that are catch and release.

So you buy the tag with no intention of actually harvesting the fish, you still have to buy one, so the two there are lumped because we have that possession requirement. Then we try to get an idea – the data is very uncertain and we have a very high non-reporting rate for this because we don't really have any way to produce accountability for the cards that are not returned.

The idea is that an angler buys a tarpon tag and whether you tag your fish or not, you're supposed to return the card saying, "Well, I purchased the tag but the tag was unused," just to give an idea of how many of those purchased actually translated into harvest. We have very poor return rates. As we can see here, we sell about 350 or thereabouts and we get about 50 back every year.

Now, of those there were a fairly small percentage of folks who actually put in their return cards that they actually intended to harvest a tarpon. That number now is very, very small. A big issue with tarpon back in the seventies and eighties was, of course, folks who wanted to get a mount of their fish. As soon as these fiberglass mounting techniques were developed, having to actually have the real fish is no longer necessary as strictly required and that usage for the tag has dwindled.

Here is to give you an idea of the non-reporting percentages there, which are on the order of about 80 percent. It is an issue that we recognize is there that really is very uninformative, basically is the best way to put it, the information that we collect through this program. Since we have that 2,500 fish ceiling for the number of sales that we feel would be okay for the stock to have and we're only selling a fraction, even if all of those fish are harvested it probably wouldn't have any real biological impact on the stock.

Right now we are using this more as a way to track angler attitudes and their preferences and to get some information of those fish that are being caught and released. Obviously, the largest proportion of the total take for tarpon has to be through dead discards, much more than the actual tag-directed harvest.

Now, changing gears here, the snook stamp I mentioned is another program that the Florida legislators established back in 1989 as well. The tag used to cost two dollars and now it costs ten dollars. I think it was last year or the year before, right, Jessica, that price went up, and this was really a request that a lot of Florida anglers had been making to the Florida Legislature and to us oftentimes.

We said to them this is not something we can address; you're going to have to go straight to your legislator and try to get that changed. Those dollars all are supposed to go towards tarpon research and management, but in this case any person who harvests snook must have a snook stamp affixed to their saltwater fishing license.

We no longer have the actual stamps, which are now collectors' items, because they involved actually competition with several artists and the stamps are beautiful pieces of art. Here from 1990, 1992 and 1996 are some examples. Right now it is basically just a note there on your fishing license.

Here is the type of information that we get. This program is not really directed at tracking harvest. My understanding, from what Gregg explained, is that you're really trying to see some examples and evaluate this harvest tag model for potential use with snapper grouper fisheries, I think. This is not in that category, but it gives us some information.

Here you have since 1989 through the last year of data available; we have the sales of snook stamps over time. On the top graph we have the number of licenses here, stamps, and here the fiscal years on the X-axis. Then the bottom graph is the number of Florida saltwater fishing licenses. You can see here in terms of us getting an idea of the number of folks who actually purchased a snook stamp relative to the number that actually purchased a saltwater fishing license.

It gives us an idea of the proportion of people who actually purchased the stamp with the intent to harvest a snook. Now, the fishery had been under stress. The snook population in South Florida was depressed through a cold kill event that happened in the winter of 2010. At that time the commission decided to take a proactive role in snook conservation and they closed the fishery on the west coast of Florida. The east coast of Florida, which we estimated had not suffered as much of an impact, was closed for the second half of 2010, right?

MS. McCRAWLEY: Yes, I was going to say at first we closed both coasts and then we opened it back up on the Atlantic late in 2011, I believe, and it has been open under its normal season structure, but the Gulf coast has remained closed and it has been that way for about two and a half years.

DR. BARBIERI: Right, and that gives us an idea that folks knowing no harvest would be allowed, then the sales of snook stamps dropped. It really generates a fair amount of funding; usually a regular year on the order of about \$1.5 million that we can dedicate to this program and help us track what would be the directed harvest, the intentions of targeting snook for harvest, but it is not a tag program like the tarpon tag is.

In summary, the tarpon tag really aims to track the harvest of tarpon statewide, but we have to deal with that unknown reporting problem. In general, however, this doesn't seem to be a problem. The directed harvest is such a small fractions of what is being taken of the total take for tarpon that it doesn't really seem to be a problem.

Right now it seems to be achieving its goals, which is to generate some funding and to give us an idea of angler preferences and their qualifications on their catch-and-release experience. For the snook stamp, it's not really a tracking harvest type of program. It is more focuses on gauging the interest on snook harvest and generating dollars for research, management and enforcement.

I think we have in the agency a formula that is applied to distribute those funds through the budgeting process to different programs within the agency, and that is a big help. By legislation, those funds need to be directly applied towards snook and it is something that we hear a lot back from snook anglers and they are really proud of this program.

A lot of people who even don't want to harvest a snook stamp send us e-mails or tell us that they actually purchased one simple because they feel it is a good thing to invest in snook research, monitoring, management and enforcement. With that, Madam Chair, that's it.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you very much, Dr. Barbieri. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Luiz, forgive me if I missed it because I was trying to explain to my boss and your friend what we did before lunch; but for non-reporting do you deny a request for a permit the following year if they reapply?

DR. BARBIERI: Not really. There on the application you're going to see a sentence that we put there that says for people who don't return their tag you may be denied – right there, failure to respond may jeopardize tag issuance next year, but in reality we right into I guess legal issues in actually putting this forward and it becomes very difficult for us to enforce that statement there. We attempt to encourage folk to respond and we try to come up with several ways to promote that response, to increase the response rate, but teeth for real; no.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I'm not on your committee. Luiz, how much do the tags cost, the tarpon tags cost?

DR. BARBIERI: Fifty dollars.

DR. LANEY: No, I mean to the state to purchase them.

DR. BARBIERI: Good question. I'm sorry, I should have checked on that, Wilson; that's a good question. I don't know what the administrative costs actually are for the program, and I should check on that because that is, of course, a big factor here. The tags themselves, of course, are minimal cost, but the total administrative costs, of course, might be significant and I'll check on that.

DR. CRABTREE: But you are a state agency and you tell me you run into legal issues, and then you have a fishery that has been closed for two and a half years. It sounds familiar. Is that accurate, though, two and a half years, snook west coast now?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes. I'm stepping into Jessica's area there, but right now I would say one of our main concerns is to be able to reopen because there is such a strong outcry to keep the snook fishery closed.

DR. CRABTREE: It's like the upside down Bizarro World; it's completely backwards.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: What is the outcry; what is the reason – I know what the outcry is; what the reason behind the outcry?

DR. BARBIERI: Well, conservation-oriented folks that actually focus more I would say on the fishing experience, and the snook, for example, is a fishery that is managed at a fairly target level. It is like a trophy fishery type of management scheme and folks want to find out there large numbers of snook and big-sized fish.

You have an abundance and you have a thriving catch-and-release fishery. Now, keep in mind that this is the most regulated fishery in the state of Florida, I would say, is snook, and 99 percent of the catch is actually released. Only about 1 to 2 percent of the total catch is actually directed harvest.

We have a fairly small slot and the fishery is closed by regulation pretty much half of the year and during all the peak times where you have an abundance of large fish coming into the inlets to spawn. It is a matter of focusing more on that fishing experience. The same thing; I mean, last year or the year before we were trying to increase the bag size for the number of red drum harvested, and that was an uphill fight because folks really wanted to keep at one fish per person per day.

DR. DUVAL: I just have a quick question; what is the target for reopening snook? It sounds a little bit – hearing you describe this reminds me of recreational striped bass. Up and down the east coast it is the same kind of disease I guess I might put it, but I was just curious what the target is for reopening?

DR. BARBIERI: You mean in terms of the biological reference point? We don't really have a hard target. We have a target right now of 40 percent SPR and that is where we are trying to manage the fishery; but since we are not constrained by Magnuson or any hard legislation on how we manage the fisheries, the commission has more discretion in managing the fisheries under that target if we are not there, but we are pretty much there across the board for the east and west coast.

DR. DUVAL: It is just fairly unanimous to keep the fishery closed, then?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, and another interesting thing is for red drum we used to have an SPR target of 30 percent, and we were approached by angling groups throughout the state and basically told we should raise that to 40 percent because we want to have a really phenomenal fishing experience when we get out there. Of course, for our industry, for the guides' industry and for the tourist industry coming to Florida and having a great fishing experience is a big plus. Basically that is what we hear.

MR. JOLLEY: I couldn't resist this; we like to think that they're following in the footsteps of the West Palm Beach Fishing Club pioneering the release ethic of sailfish from the 1930's on, and we release almost a hundred percent of our fish all over the world now.

MR. CURRIN: Madam Chairman, I'm not on your committee as well, but I do take some offense at the use of the term "disease" and I think it is more of an attitude. That may be a better term.

DR. LANEY: And I, too, Madam Chairman, was going to address that point and just tell you that the technical term for it is ichthyo-dementia and most of us sitting around this table are affected by with it.

DR. DUVAL: And I think if anyone has ever seen the "I want to catch a big 50-pound striped bass video", you know exactly what I'm talking about and it is very appropriate.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Do you have stamps for other fish?

DR. BARBIERI: Not for finfish. We have a lobster stamp in the Florida Keys that functions pretty much like the snook stamp but not for any other that I can think of, any other finfish.

DR. CRABTREE: Luiz, how much has closing the fishery for an extended period of time affected your ability to do a west coast stock assessment?

DR. BARBIERI: Well, that has been an impact especially for that extended period of time. As we can see, the effort on snook – I mean we have estimates because the assessment for snook just came out recently, and it falls pretty much – in terms of directed effort towards snook it follows pretty much the trend that we saw with the sale of snook stamps. The directed effort has decreased some. Of course, we're not collecting age information.

We try to keep track of the size composition. We have logbook self-reporting. We are working with the Snook Foundation, with their Angler Action Program that is a self-reporting online-based program where anglers go in and they report their snook and they put them within size slots for us so we have an idea of small, medium and large.

Even if they don't keep any, we want to know – primarily we use this to supplement our MRFSS or MRIP estimates. We estimate the total catch and effort through MRIP, but we use the AAP and the logbook program to give us the information on the composition and magnitude of discards because that is the – especially for a fishery for which you have 99 percent of the catch being released, discards is the big piece of that puzzle that we need to figure.

Of course, we're talking about an assessment using age-structured models and that conversion of length to age in snook is just as uncertain as a whole lot of species. So, yes, it has significantly increased the level of uncertainty in our assessment having the fishery closed for this long.

MR. HARRIS: Luiz, maybe I didn't hear this; did you say anything about folks in Florida wanting to do away with the tarpon tag program and just going to an all catch-and-release program for tarpon?

DR. BARBIERI: I will defer to Ms. McCawley since she is with the fisheries management part of the house.

MS. McCRAWLEY: Yes, we're aware of that request and we're tracking it. We're considering it just like we do any other management request, so it's on our radar screen.

DR. DUVAL: If there are no more questions for Luiz, I would like to thank Luiz. He will be around I think for the rest of the meeting if there are any other questions, but we do have two more presentations that I'd like to get through. Dr. Ponwith was going to review the commercial and recreational quota ACL monitoring. We did look at this yesterday in snapper grouper. We can go ahead and bring this up and just see if any of the discussion since then has raised additional questions. I guess, Bonnie, if you don't running through it again, that would be great.

DR. PONWITH: With your indulgence, what I'll do is the abbreviated version since we have been through this again. I guess this time, since we've discussed several issues that have implications that will be addressed by these improvements, if you've had additional questions you'd like to raise, go ahead.

Again, we are crafting a new commercial monitoring program, and it relies on several sets of inputs; permits, the ACCSP data, data from the Northeast Fisheries Science Center and then also data collected via the Bluefin effort, and that is Texas through Florida. We go through a validation process and then use that to monitor landings in the region.

The way this works is we download information nightly from these sources and the information then goes into the system on a nightly basis to help us evaluate those landings in the collective. There are different stages and levels of resolution that we can look at those data from, including summaries by stock or stock group.

We can look at them by dealer aggregated across time or by space and then look at forecast based on sort of customized queries of the system. This is an example of what the report would look like to us with the stock group listed, the opening and closing date, regulatory closing date, what the quota is, what the landings and what percentage of the quota those landings represent.

This is an example of an actual pull from the system to demonstrate what it looks like when the landings are not coming in on a timely basis. This is a Spanish mackerel pull and the request was for March landings; and in the month of March, March landings were 64,000. In the month of April, March landings were 115,000, and in the month of May, March landings were 117,000, so basically 40 percent of the March Spanish mackerel landings were reported in May, which is late.

What do we do about those late reports, and this is how the system helps us account for that. It keeps track of all the things we have talked about so far, the stock complex, the quota, the reported landings and what percent they are; but then what it does is expands for unreported landings and creates what percentage the reported plus the unreported represent of the total quota.

Right now the approach for how we deal with the unreported is by looking at a specific dealer and what their patterns for landings were the previous year – this is the on time and the late reports all pooled together – and use those patterns to expand the actual landed to be a total. In

the future we will do that very thing, but we'll scale that by changes in the success rates of one year over the next, so it will basically be an adjusted expansion, which will be a little bit more precise.

And then the forecasting, this kind of walks through what we will be able to do. We will be able to forecast under multiple assumptions and fishing conditions because the system allows that kind of an interaction. Again, this just reiterates that the current approach for dealing with the expansions are to use patterns from the year before and going into the future we will have some other alternatives, which are the scaled approach we have already talked about or by looking at what is the highest the landings have ever been in the fishery in previous years compared to the current year.

The bottom line is what we're seeing right now is for a lot of the stocks the need for expansions are pretty reasonable. In other words, the expansions are zero to 20 percent and that creates a pretty reliable landing upon which to make inferences about when you might have to close. The time we get into trouble is when we are required to do 50 to 80 percent expansions.

That's a lot of late data and, of course, those expansions are not quite as tight. What we believe is when we go to a mandatory requirement for all dealers to have a permit, that a lot of that problem will resolve itself because that creates the requirement to have those reports in and have them in on time.

One of the good things about this is it allows us the flexibility to build user-defined quotas, which means we can look at species or species groups, gear groups, fishing area or landing location groups and be able to evaluate the landings according to those groupings. Again, it allows quality control and investigative tools again to be able to kind of mine the data for patterns in the data to help us understand the way that fishery is unfolding.

Also, the way the system is being developed is that it is flexible enough to incorporate new code and new modules so if in using this we discover that we have an idea for some augmentation we want, it is possible to be able to make that. One of the questions that Gregg asked when we talked about this before was when the system as we envision it right now will be completed.

There are some things that we're still coding in. Our expectation is the objectives that we have right now of the system we will be able to complete the coding for that, have it tested and fully operational in about two months. But, that said, we're using the system now. These are some of the things that we're looking to include going into the future, and that is we need again the federal permits for all dealers for all federally managed species.

What that does is it gets us closer to having the hundred percent reporting that we would like to see and then also working closely with the dealers and the states to improve the timeliness of the reports. We have discussed that earlier this week about how critical timeliness is both in the dealer reporting and the vessel reporting.

That will help us with the expansions for some the stocks that we're more concerned about the reliability of those developed dealer compliance reports that kind of feedback in and of itself

improves compliance, and it helps us to define and actually code in some additional data treatments to be able to ask more of the system. Last slide.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any additional questions for Bonnie given this is our second run-through? I just had one quick one, Bonnie. When you spoke about assumptions of fishing conditions; can you give an example of what that might be?

DR. PONWITH: It is if you have an expansion from the year before for unreported for a particular dealer, and let's just say that based on that expansion you think that the unreported/reported ratio is about 30 percent unreported, right now what we're able to do is say, okay, bump this by 30 percent.

With the additional capability of building in other assumptions, you can say but this year the weather for the last four months has been horrible compared to last year and everybody is experiencing low or variable success rates, and you can incorporate finer-scale modifications to those assumptions rather than just a flat-out ratio comparison.

DR. DUVAL: And that's something along the lines of what I thought your answer was going to be, but thank you. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Bonnie, and there were two other questions; one dealing with the timing of updates to the website, the system is updated daily, and you were going to check to see what the timing was to get it available for the public on the website. The second one was since council staff have clearance for confidential data, how do we go about accessing the system.

DR. PONWITH: Right now the dealers are required to report semi-monthly, and those reports are required to be to us within five days after the end of that reporting period. Right now our plan is to continue receiving the data at those levels and then submit the results of that SERO from that point.

In terms of who has access to the confidential data, again I think I still need to be consulting with general counsel on that access. In terms of what goes on a website, our original intent was not to have sort of daily updates to this posted to the web. The original intent is to have I think this every two-week adjustment posted to the web.

I know we talked about periodicity of the report; should it continue to be semi-monthly, should it be weekly, should it be daily? That was another thing that you brought up, Gregg. Right now our thinking is that semi-monthly is good; weekly would be better; daily gets into a situation where it puts a huge burden on the reporters, the dealers in the field.

The times where daily reporting is at its greatest value is when you're in the very tail end of a fishery approaching that actual quota, and so it puts a large onus on the dealers for information that really is at its greatest value very close to the end. The other time it would be of value is if you had an opening that was extremely short and you didn't have time to watch once a week or every other week to be able to accumulate enough data to understand the patterns, you'd sort of be close to closure the day you opened it.

In a scenario like that we envision the projections and our ability to do projections in a way that have a higher resolution that account for some of the things that we talked about as almost an equal alternative to actually getting live data on a daily basis just because the onus that it causes and the risk of having people not reporting in a timely basis. I guess the short answer is at this point we believe that we would be better off having extremely timely and reliable data once a week and projecting from there than we would asking people to report daily and then get into compliance problems.

MR. WAUGH: So then is it correct that we can tell fishermen that in terms of their business planning, they should be able to check the status of quotas every two weeks from the regional website and that will be updated every two weeks? Great, thank you.

DR. DUVAL: It is very informative to see some of those numbers especially with regard to non-compliance for the species for which we don't have dealer permits. Looking at the king and Spanish mackerel numbers, that is more like a census than a survey at this point. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I was just going to suggest that Gregg and Bonnie and I get together and discuss the council staff's ability to see the confidential data. We can do that at this meeting off the record.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, if there are no more questions, we do have one more presentation and that has to do with commercial and recreational quota ACL projections. Andy ran through just before we broke for lunch an example of the recreational black sea bass quota projections. I don't think what you're seeing before you is any different than what Andy went through earlier. I don't know if there are additional questions. Bonnie has kind of covered a little bit some of the commercial quota projection issues that they are using, but does anyone have other questions for Andy regarding the black sea bass recreational projections? I guess one question I might have is have you decided on sort of which of the – I think there were three different scenarios in there for when the season might be closed. Is there any sense from the Fisheries Service about leaning one way or another?

MR. STRELCHECK: Right now the projections all extend past when we would receive the first wave of landings for the black sea bass season. Ideally we would like to take a look at those landings in season rather than project out a closure date prior to the fishing season.

Of course, the risk you run is landings could be higher than estimated and you would have needed to have closed sooner, but that at least give us an opportunity to crosscheck against the projections and see how they're comparing to actual landings estimates.

In the Gulf of Mexico we haven't had that luxury with red snapper in recent years because the season is so short that it closes before we even get landings data completed in season. While I have the microphone, a couple of things that the council should be aware of if you haven't been to the regional office website recently, we have posted tables now of all of the catch limits for the South Atlantic, both recreational and commercial. Those have been referenced.

As a matter of practice for updating those, we receive ACL data files from the science center shortly after the completion of each wave of MRFSS landings and we update the landings data then on our website based on those data files that are provided from the science center. Currently we don't have headboat landings coming in in-season for most species, but key species such as sea bass we do request for quota monitoring and catch limit monitoring, and those are added to the website. We will continue to update those and obviously with the science center advise if catch limits are being approached; and if need be project out when those catch limits will be met and do closure notices as necessary.

MR. HAYMANS: I'm not even going to begin to think that I understand the third method, but the reason that the dates are shorter, stepping from one to three, or coming up quicker is just because of accounting for increased biomass – well, not even accounting for the larger fish, there is more biomass out there so – I guess I'm confused if you can only keep five and you can only keep five and eleven, why would the biomass that is out there make the date shorter?

MR. STRELCHECK: Two reasons; one is the fish that you're catching will be larger.

MR. HAYMANS: But you don't account for them. Even in the no size limit change, it is still the same size as it would have been in ten and eleven.

MR. STRELCHECK: Right, but the other issue beyond the size increasing is that as the stock increases, catch rates can also increase even with a five-fish limit. Yes, you might have limited out, but not everyone limits out with five fish and so the catch rate can go up. You could also have increased effort which is not necessarily directly modeled in this instance.

MR. HAYMANS: If I remember right, though, 90-some percent of anglers caught three fish. We picked five because it was 99 percent of the anglers. Isn't that right; we picked five fish because it was 99 percent or somewhere near about? Like always, I'm confused.

DR. DUVAL: Any other questions for Andy? Okay, if not, then we're going to move on to our next agenda item, which is actually digging into the Joint Gulf and South Atlantic Council Generic Dealer Amendment. You have a decision document which we are going to be working from for this discussion. I think Gregg is going to take us through the decision document as well as review some of the Gulf Council changes and recommendations.

MR. WAUGH: The Gulf Council went through the decisions that we made at our meeting and basically agreed to those changes, and I'll point out where some of those are. The decision document, as Michelle pointed out, is Attachment 1B. That is what we will be using to walk through. We are trying to use these decision documents to make it easier for you to follow along and see where you have to make decisions.

As we go through, anyplace highlighted in yellow is where you need to make a decision. Right now there are three actions in this Joint Dealer Amendment. Action 1 deals with what dealer permits would be required and for which species. Action 2 deals with how frequently and by what method would dealers be required to report. Action 3 are the requirements for maintaining a dealer permit.

We've got a little bit of background that we've put in here. One of the issues that has surfaced is what is the need for this, why do we have to move forward and is it something that we need to do quickly. Gulf Council staff pulled together – John pulled together some examples from the Gulf looking at Gulf of Mexico Region king mackerel and Gulf of Mexico Region greater amberjack. We were having issues tracking and closing and preventing ACL overages.

I pulled some in showing issues with South Atlantic Region golden tilefish, black sea bass, gag and vermilion snapper. The intent here is show that we do have issues and we need to plug these dealer reporting issues. Then we move into what are the current dealer reporting requirements and that is laid out in the table.

I'm not going to go through that, but that points out where we have a dealer permit and where we don't, and that is one of the big issues that we're addressing. There is a history of management on the Gulf. The one for the South Atlantic is incomplete; I'm still working on that. That will be beefed up before we get to public hearings.

Then we have a section that deals with, okay, if this amendment is implemented what information will dealers be required to report and where will the information go. We've got a table there that highlights that information that will be collected, the data will go into GulfFIN and SAFIS to ACCSP.

Then we get into where we need some guidance. In each case what we present is what is in the document now. There is a box with what we did in March, and I'll just touch on that, but that will show you the exact wording that you approved in March. In some cases the Gulf Council gave their staff some direction to make some changes.

What we have done here is show in the box what the current purpose for the action is, and that is to change the current permit and reporting requirements for those individuals or organizations that purchase species managed by the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Councils. It's just removing some language that we had in there. It's more editorial but we do want to get your concurrence via a motion to either accept that revised wording for the purpose or to modify it if you want to modify it.

DR. DUVAL: At this time I would entertain a motion to either accept the proposed wording changes for the purpose or a motion to modify the revised purpose for action. Is anyone willing to make such a motion? Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I make a motion to accept the updated purpose and need as revised in this document. Also, on the needs statement it looks like we need to change that a little bit where it says "recorded accurately" and then add "in a timely manner".

DR. DUVAL: We were going to try to do this I think in two motions. Gregg hasn't reviewed the revised need, but I think everybody can read it up there. Is there any objection to taking care of this in one motion; the purpose and need?

I am not seeing anything so I think we can go ahead and do that. There is a motion by Jessica; second by Tom Swatzel. **The motion is to accept the revised purpose and need for action. Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: And just to clarify, the wording that was modified in the need for action is to ensure landings of managed fish stocks are recorded accurately and in a timely manner so annual catch limits are not exceeded. Next we move to Action 1, and this lays out what dealer permits would be required for which species.

We define the term “purchase” used throughout in dealer, what that means throughout. Alternative 1 is no action. These are the current six federal dealer permits. Alternative 2 would establish one universal federal dealer permit in the Gulf and the South Atlantic. Alternative 3 would establish separate dealer permits for the Gulf and South Atlantic.

The subalternatives under each of Alternatives 2 and 3 are the same. Option 2A would require a universal dealer permit to purchase all federally managed species except South Atlantic coral and South Atlantic sargassum. The universal dealer permit would be required to purchase species in the following fishery management plans. You directed us to do that at the last meeting.

2B would exclude South Atlantic coral, South Atlantic sargassum and shrimp; the concern there being that you add shrimp, you add lots of dealers and shrimp are not under ACLs. I have outlined the difference there. What you did in March is laid out. You directed us, as I said, to remove coral and sargassum.

Then we just need to have – as we go through this, clarify when the permits are to be renewed. We’ve got some information that is attached to the decision document that is the permits plan and I believe Carolyn was going to come up and just touch on this as well as when the permits are currently being renewed.

DR. DUVAL: Does everybody see that in that PDF with the decision document? There is basically three documents in there so this would be that third one-page attachment and titled “Plan to Implement Generic Dealer Permits as Proposed by the SERO Permits Office”.

MS. SRAMEK: Just to talk you through this diagram, basically what I really hope doesn’t happen is we get buried with a humongous pile of applications for a new permit that we couldn’t get done in a timely fashion. My thought is the first thing we do is say that anybody who has a fishery-specific dealer permit already for fisheries that would be covered under this generic dealer permit, to say that permit they can continue to use until its natural expiration.

That way those folks wouldn’t need to immediately come in and get this new generic dealer permit. With that in place, we’re still estimating somewhere 700 new dealers are going to come in looking for a new generic dealer permit. Our normal application volume is around 700 a month, so this would obviously be quite overwhelming.

My thought was to say that this new generic dealer permit wouldn’t actually be required for those new folks for another four months with the hope that those 700 people will send in their

applications evenly distributed over a four-month period so that we will get about 200 month, and we can handle that. I realize that probably won't be exactly what happens, but hopefully some of them will come in the early part of that four-month period and we will be able to get them all out on time.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that explanation, Carolyn. Are there questions for Carolyn about this scheme for renewing permits while making sure that the permits office is able to maintain a manageable schedule? Okay, I see none.

One of the things that we need to consider then is we had Carolyn come up here and talked about this to clarify the language in the alternatives as to when the permits would need to be renewed. As you see on Page 9 of your decision document, there are three options, one of which is to adopt the permits plan that the regional office has put forward. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Carolyn, I was trying to read through some of these options and suboptions, so I guess what you're saying is it is easier and better if we limit the universe to what we really need instead of just grabbing everything; is that what I heard?

MS. SRAMEK: Yes, I think so. I'm very fearful of having too many applications come in at once. In terms of when they'd need to be renewed after their initial implementation, then it would just be in accordance with the expiration date of the permit, which we generally issue to coincide with the birth month of the permit holder or if it's a business when it was filed. That part would stay the same; but, yes, the initial rollout of these new permits, if we can just hit the guys that don't have any permits at all first, that would be best.

MR. CUPKA: I would like to offer a motion that we adopt the permits plan to implement generic dealer permits as proposed by the Southeast Regional Office Permits Office.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by David; second by Tom Swatzel. Any discussion on the motion? Do we need to clarify at all that the existing process would then remain in place with the renewal on the birth month of the permit holder? Is there any need to add any language in there or, no, because that's just status quo of what you already do? Okay.

MS. SRAMEK: I think keeping the status quo is fine.

DR. DUVAL: I just wasn't sure if we needed to add anything in the document to reflect that; that's all. Okay, is there anymore discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, **that motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: Now we have got the alternatives there, and the question is do you want to alter those alternatives any, add any alternatives and then do you want to select a preferred. The big difference again is Alternative 2 establishes one universal federal dealer permit. Alternative 3 establishes separate. Looking ahead to Action 2, frequency and method of reporting, the Gulf Council is interesting in exploring a separate alternative just for the Gulf of Mexico. For that to be operative, then we would have to be looking at separate Gulf and Atlantic permits.

DR. DUVAL: Would anyone like to offer a motion with regard to a preferred? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: **I make a motion that we select Alternative 3, Option 3B, as the preferred.**

DR. DUVAL: I have a motion by Jessica; seconded by Charlie. That motion is to select Alternative 3, Option 3B, as preferred. Is there any discussion on that motion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that **motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: Okay, moving on to Action 2, this deals with frequency and method of reporting. We've got the no action described there. Then we've got Alternative 2 would require that forms be submitted via fax or electronically as determined by the center. The options under each of these alternatives, Option 2A through 2E, we have some suggested wording that just clarifies some of the wording.

It is more editorial and then we would request just some editorial license to work with the center on whether we need to keep the definition in here of some of these reporting periods. I'll get to that in a moment and show you that suggested revised wording for these subalternatives or suboptions.

Again, Alternative 2 would require forms to be submitted via fax or electronically. Option 3 is just electronically. Option 4 is the alternative I mentioned earlier that would apply to the Gulf of Mexico if the separate dealer permit is created. In the first year – and the Gulf Council is interested in phasing this in – in the first year following implementation of the regulations, forms must be submitted via fax or electronically as determined by the center. In Year Two and beyond, you can require forms to be submitted just electronically.

Then Alternative 5 deals with catastrophic conditions and you would be able to pick multiple preferreds here; one indicating what your normal reporting is going to be; and then if you wish to choose Alternative 5, it would deal with catastrophic conditions that provides for the use of paper-based components for basic required functions as a backup. It lays out what the Regional Administrator will do to implement that.

We just have a note here that under any selected preferred alternative, it includes dealers reporting purchases of king mackerel landed by the gillnet sector for the Gulf West Coast Florida Southern Subzone must submit forms daily. That's because that is a current requirement and that needs to be done so that we can keep track of that low quota. I have outlined the differences. You asked us to reword Alternatives 2 and 3 and we have done that for both 2C, 3C, 2E, 3E. Let's look for a second at this wording, and all it does is clarify so that in every instance we're saying submitted, we had some instances where it said submitted and reported. We've got forms – for daily, forms must be submitted by 11:59 p.m. each day.

Option 2B is weekly; forms from trips landing between Sunday and Saturday must be submitted to the center by 11:50 p.m. on the following Tuesday. Option 2C would require weekly or daily, forms must be submitted either weekly or daily as determined by the center. Reporting would be weekly but the center could require daily reporting.

If weekly reporting is required, then forms from trips landing between Sunday and Saturday must be submitted to the center by 11:59 p.m. on the following Tuesday. If it is daily, then any trip landing that quota species must be submitted by 11:59 p.m. on the day of landing. The idea here is that it would require weekly initially. If the center determined that they need more frequent reporting, they would have the authority to do that without coming back to the council and the council having to take additional action.

Option 2D is once every two weeks. Each week runs from Sunday to Saturday. Forms must be submitted by 11:59 p.m. on Thursday following the end of the two-week period. And then you've got the combination of once every two weeks or weekly. What we would be looking for is your approval of this revised wording to replace what is under Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 now and just some editorial license that if working with the center we don't need to define what these weeks are, then that would simply the wording a little bit. And then we'll talk about which alternative you might to pick.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that explanation, Gregg. I would entertain a motion from someone to accept the wording changes that were proposed by the IPT as well as give the staff some editorial license to make any further modifications that might be needed. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: So moved, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Second by Charlie. **The motion reads accept the proposed changes by the IPT and give editorial license to make any necessary changes to the wording.** Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I'm a little worried by the amount of flexibility that is in some of these whereby the center can decide to go from weekly to daily. One, what would be the basis of how they would decide to do that? Part of what we're trying to do here is to get it defined in the regulations your reports are due at this frequency, they're due at this time so we can go in and make a case.

I'm afraid the more we allow the center to just change it all and how would they do that; by sending them a letter? I think it all will make it much more difficult for enforcement to ever come in and make a case. I get the sense that we're talking, you know, the center can say, okay, well, this quota is going to be caught and you have to report daily for this species, but I don't think that not is my read at how this works.

You have a permit and you require a certain reporting. You may have to report on all species at that. I don't think this can be a boutique thing where you report on Species A daily and species, all the rest are weekly and we're going to keep changing it. If we do that, it's going to get really complicated and confusing; and I suspect as a result of that we will never be able to make a case on it.

It seems to me what we're talking about here is if we think weekly reporting is good enough, then reporting is going to be weekly. If we really think we need daily, then it needs to be daily. I'm worried that if we flip-flop all around this or if we think we can do it for some species and not others that we're really undermining what we're trying to do here, which is make it very cut

and dry and clear in the regulations so that we can prosecute a case for someone who is late reporting. I'd be curious to hear if Monica agrees with me.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, actually I was going to bring up the issue of how would the center notify the dealer that the center wanted a change in the reporting frequency? Gregg, at this point we're taking this out to public hearing, correct, and what is the hoped-for track of getting this council to take final approval?

MR. WAUGH: The hope is that we approve it here for public hearing. The Gulf approves it for public hearing at their meeting next week. We have public hearings scheduled for August and we finalize it at our September meeting. That's our goal so that we have the best chance of getting it implemented as early as we can in 2013.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So between now and at least September the version that everybody sees, I think I would want to work with center and figure out – and the enforcement attorneys – and figure out the best way to set up the process to notify people. One, it's not just to make an enforcement case; you want to give them plenty of notice so you can get the information because that is the goal, right?

So, the other idea, though, is if you delinquent reporting and if a case gets made you want to make sure that it can be prosecuted. I will work on that between now and September. There is some merit to what Roy is saying about having different species being reported on at different times.

Maybe that won't be an issue for some dealers because they don't deal in a lot of different species, I'm not sure, but it definitely could be something that could trip them up even inadvertently in terms of when they were reporting. It is something to think about how do you notify the dealers and then whether you want many different kinds of reporting schedules.

DR. PONWITH: From the science center perspective, I was originally a proponent of the additional flexibility of requiring weekly reporting as the standard but the flexibility to increase the periodicity for special cases. In hearing how that might play out and some of the complications in carrying that out, I'm reconsidering.

Just strictly from the science center perspective, I would be willing to concede that we may have more to gain by consistent, stable expectations of weekly reporting and not confound that by maintaining that flexibility. From that standpoint, given the two choices again strictly from a science standpoint, I would endorse a weekly reporting.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Bonnie. Monica again.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So given all those things I just said to make you think maybe this wasn't a good idea, you are taking it out for public hearing. It's just something for you to think about for the next meeting. I think that you could leave those alternatives in there and you're certain to hear I would assume from dealers about what they think about it. It's just something

for you to think about for your September meeting, and then you'll evaluate the public comments you receive from the public hearings and decide what you want to do in September.

DR. DUVAL: I know that Gregg wants to say something and I just saw Charlie's hand go up. I think that just speaking from North Carolina's perspective the science center sent out letters to all dealers back in I think it was December of either 2009 or 2010 stating that they were going to be required to report electronically.

I think the initial timeframe that was given was very short, and there were some upset people. I think we got that backed out to six months. That was the system for notification for something pretty big as electronic monitoring, so I just put that out there. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: And I think Monica hit part of it; this would lay out a range of alternatives because there was some concern that for some of these species with extremely low quotas you might need daily. I think given the discussion here, the way to handle it is to have these alternatives in there to get the public input, but then pick a preferred.

If you think weekly, then pick Option 2B as your preferred and that gives the public a clear indication of where you're headed. Right now all we're talking about doing is approving this revised wording to go under each of these Alternatives 2, 3 and 4. We'll then come back and pick which is your preferred.

DR. PONWITH: This is a nuance of each of these and it would be a request to consider modifying the wording so that instead of it saying that they must be submitted; reword that to say they must be received.

MR. WAUGH: At the IPT level we had some correspondence about that, and this is a requirement on the dealer, and so how can you require the dealer to ensure that you receive it? I think there is some concern on the center's part that they want to make sure they get this information from the contractor or whoever. That to me is a separate issue because all you can require the dealer, I would think, is that they submit it. That is the dealer's responsibility. How can you require a dealer to make sure you receive it?

MR. PHILLIPS: And to that point, I remember what happened to B-liners last fall. The dealers were sending it in, but it wasn't their fault that you weren't getting it. As somebody that packs fish and shrimp and just about everything else that is legal, I'd just as soon do all my reports on one day whether it has got a long season or a short season.

I'd have my secretary and say fill it all out, do it weekly. It's easy; everybody knows it needs to be done by Tuesday. Make sure she is not sick Monday and Tuesday. I think that would probably make it simpler for everybody and you would give you data so much faster than what you get now, it's ridiculous. I think that is probably the most workable. If you need a motion for an alternative, I would go with Alternative 2B, but we'll have to finish the discussion first.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I was just going to ask a question. Looking at Alternative 4, which was one of the ones that is specific to the Gulf only, that is this phase-in approach, I wasn't sure – talking

about the timeline that we finalize in September; does this mean that this would be effective, say, by the end of 2012 or early 2013.

And so if this phase-in approach took place, so dare I say if we add an alternative where we phase it in on the South Atlantic, would we be phasing it in for pretty much all of 2013 and then by 2014, which would be year two, then it would require that all forms be submitted electronically; is that kind of the timelines that we're talking about here?

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think for us, our goal is to have more frequent reporting in place for the South Atlantic by 2013. Obviously, we can't require that the Gulf do anything different. Certainly, I think if they wanted to do something different and just because we would carry different preferred alternatives for the South Atlantic does not preclude the Gulf from doing something different, but I would defer to Gregg on that.

MR. WAUGH: That is correct, and the feeling was we were perhaps farther along in the electronic reporting on the dealers in the Atlantic and our intent was to have this in place as early as possible in 2013, but the Gulf felt that they had I guess more dealers that were not currently reporting electronically and wanted to phase it in.

MS. McCAWLEY: So based on that discussion and those timelines, then I would support the potential motion that Charlie brought up for Alternative 2, Option 2B.

DR. DUVAL: We actually have a motion on the board that we have not actually voted on yet, as Gregg has reminded me, so if we can dispense with this motion, which is to accept the proposed changes by the IPT and give editorial license to make any necessary changes to the wording. Is there anymore discussion on that? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that **motion is approved**. Now, if there are any other potential motions that someone would like to offer with regard to a preferred alternative for the alternatives under Action 2, we can start there.

MR. PHILLIPS: **Madam Chairman, I would make the motion that under Alternative 2, Option 2B, be our preferred to go out to public hearing.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie to adopt Alternative 2, Option 2B, as our preferred for public hearing; second by Jessica. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just so you know I think in the regulations it plays out in a variety of different ways. For example, right now for dealers to report, it must be postmarked by a certain date. At least that's in the current regulations; but yet if you want to get, for example, a vessel permit, that permit application must be received by the Regional Administrator by a date certain. It's both ways in the regulations for different things.

MR. WAUGH: And so by picking this, we're saying that what we're going to do is to require or continue to allow forms to either be faxed or sent in electronically; and so what this will do is continue that delay of the center or a contractor having to re-key the information that is faxed in. That's the difference between Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 would require it to be submitted electronically.

DR. DUVAL: This is an excellent point. We are trying to move towards more timely receipt of information for the center to be able to make its projections and for us to be able to monitor our quotas. Any other discussion? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: That is a good point; and since this is going to go out to public hearing, I wonder if maybe we should pick Alternative 3, Option 3B, instead and just see if people have a negative reaction to the fact that we would go 100 percent electronic. That's just a thought.

MR. PHILLIPS: Because she doesn't have a second yet –

DR. DUVAL: You made the motion and Jessica seconded it. We just haven't voted on it yet.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, maybe we can put something in here. We can put an alternative for – we can phase it in for a year where they can fax or electronically report; and after a year it will be all electronic, and that might be another – I knew that's where you were going.

DR. DUVAL: That is exactly what Jessica just said, and I would remind folks the timeline that we were on was to get something in place by January 1st of 2013 so that we would have more timely monitoring of our quotas, and I don't think phasing something in gets us to that goal.

MS. McCAWLEY: So one more question is it is two times a month right now so just going to weekly is going to be an improvement. I see it as an improvement so then if everybody was electronic that would be a second improvement. So the phase in, I still think if we went to weekly and then did a phase in by fax or electronic and then the second year did all electronic, both of those things are still better than what we're doing right now. Once again I still argue even though I seconded the motion that is on the table, if we really want to stir things up we could tell the public that we're going to all electronic – weekly all electronic and see what the public has to say about that.

DR. DUVAL: Well, that's true. I guess I'll just refer to the comment that I made earlier. I don't know about folks in other states, but in North Carolina we received a letter, like I said, back in December of 2010 basically saying make it so that all of your South Atlantic federal dealers report electronically and we were given a very short timeframe within which to do that originally. There is a little bit of discrepancy or disconnect certainly with regards to electronic reporting. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Jessica, would you like to just add on the timeframe that you'd like to go to electronically?

MR. WAUGH: There is a separate alternative. If you want to phase it in, that's what the Gulf Alternative 4 does. If you don't think the South Atlantic dealers are ready to start reporting electronically in the first year, then you want to pick Alternative 4 and just have that apply to the Gulf and South Atlantic.

MS. McCRAWLEY: As the seconder, if you'd like to change the motion to Alternative 4 or 4B and we would have to reword that a little bit so it doesn't just apply to the Gulf of Mexico dealer permit, it would apply to the South Atlantic also, then I would support that also.

DR. DUVAL: I think we would actually have to withdraw that motion with the committee's consent and just formulate a new motion.

MR. PHILLIPS: Make it so, Madam Chairman.

DR. DUVAL: **The motion is withdrawn.** Bob.

MR. GILL: Madam Chair, I appreciate your recognizing me and I'm clearly not on your committee. One of the things that I think will confuse the public – and we had quite a discussion on this in the Gulf Council – is probably two iterations ago when we added the “as determined by the SRD phrase” to Alternatives now I guess it's 2, 3 and 4; that was tacked on the end.

When I read it, it was not clear to me what it was modifying. I thought it was the fax or electronically in Alternative 2 and it got really fuzzy in Alternative 3. I suspect I wouldn't be the only one perhaps; I have been known to do that before. My suggestion would be since it's really modifying the forms, that you move that phrase “as determined by the SRD” to read “require forms as determined by the SRD”, because that is what your intent of what you're trying to do is. Tacking it right next to the process, the mechanism, is potentially confusing. That's my suggestion. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you for that, Bob. Gregg, remind at our last meeting did we not decide that electronically meant by computer or some other –

MR. WAUGH: Yes, computer and not fax.

DR. DUVAL: Not fax. So, Bob, you're just suggesting removing that phrase on the end?

MR. GILL: No, I'd suggest move it to what it is really modifying, which are the forms.

DR. DUVAL: So just to clarify, you would move that phrase “as determined by the SRD” after the phrase “require forms”?

MR. GILL: Correct, and that is true in Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 in several places. That way it is clear what you're talking about here is the SRD might change forms on you and that's the whole purpose of why you have that in there, which is fine. My concern was that, for example, in Alternative 2, as the way it is written, the SRD could shift between fax and electronic for whatever reason, and that is a confusion factor that nobody needs. It just clarifies the intent of what the “as determined by the SRD” is really, and that is to determine and perhaps in the future change forms.

DR. PONWITH: And to that point, from the science center's standpoint we believe that the strongest way forward is requiring electronic reporting now as opposed to the phase in. The

phase in will cause some complications with the commercial landings program; so going straight to electronic is sort of the science center's advice on that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So I think electronically you ought to add I guess via computer or something like that because to me fax is also electronically. I'm not sure legally whether that is true or not. I don't know if you submit it via your iPhone, I'm not sure, but think about whether at least – and maybe it's even in the discussion if you want to put that, but you want to make it clear to the public that when you're talking electronically you mean via computer or the internet; how is that? Maybe the internet is more accurate.

MR. WAUGH: We can clarify that in the discussion.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so we can clarify that in the discussion, but I have Mac and then Jessica.

MR. CURRIN: Again, I'm not on your committee, but I don't support this motion. I think it's important that we move as quickly as we can to require electronic reporting from all dealers. If this the way the motion comes to the full council, I will oppose it.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you for that input, Mac. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Based on what I just heard from Bonnie, if I'm the seconder of that motion, I would support going to Alternative 3 and 3B instead of this.

DR. DUVAL: Charlie, I think you were the maker of the motion; are you okay with withdrawing this?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, Madam Chair, let's go back where we were.

DR. DUVAL: So we have two motions withdrawn here. Anybody willing to make another motion that we might be able to pass? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: **Okay, I make a motion to approve Alternative 3, Option 3B, as the preferred.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Jessica; seconded by Charlie. The motion reads adopt Alternative 3, Option 3B, as our preferred. I think the one thing – you know, Bob had made the suggestion to alter some of the language and take the phrase “as determined by the Science and Research Director” and move it to a different point in the sentence in the sentence. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes, I agree with modifying that and Monica's suggestion about modifying the word “electronically” to specify exactly what that means.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg is adding some language here to indicate that electronically means via computer or internet and has struck through the phrase “as determined by the Science and Research Director”. Are folks okay with that language change? Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, I think that's a good improvement and I also had one more point. If you move to Alternative 4, which is not the preferred, you'll see that the language talks about in some places reporting on Thursday instead of on Tuesday. I'm trying to see where that was.

MR. WAUGH: We modified the wording of those options.

DR. PONWITH: Okay, good.

MR. WAUGH: So that's what we've approved now.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, the point being is that the all Tuesday that comport with the reporting date that they have in the northeast, which minimizes confusion in the Atlantic, which we think is a good thing.

DR. DUVAL: And we would agree with you, I believe. I just want to make sure that the language change that we made with regard to modification of electronically to indicate that it is by computer or the internet and then removal of that phrase "as determined by the SRD" is reflected in Alternative 2.

We have a motion before us. **The motion reads adopt Alternative 3, Option 3B, as our preferred with the revised wording.** Is there anymore discussion on that motion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, **that motion stands approved.** Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And we're making similar revisions to the wording throughout all the alternatives because I think they all have similar issues.

DR. DUVAL: That's exactly what I just mentioned to Gregg just prior to that. David.

MR. CUPKA: **Madam Chairman, I would like to make a motion that we choose Alternative 5 in Action 2 as the preferred to take to public hearing.**

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Chairman Cupka; seconded by Jessica. Is there any discussion on this motion? Any opposition? Seeing none, **the motion stands approved.** Thank you all for a productive discussion on this particular action. Moving on to requirements to maintain a dealer permit, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: This is Action 3. It begins on Page 13. We have got quite a number of suggested changes. The wording shown under Action 3 is what came out of your actions in March and the Gulf action. The IPT and NMFS/NOAA GC have some suggested changes. If you look under the committee actions, we have an IPT suggestion – and I think it would be easier if we deal with these alternative by alternative.

Under Alternative 1, no action, the IPT suggests that we delete this line that says "no penalty exists for late or non-reporting", because there are penalties. The IPT group recommends the council consider the addition of the wording below as it describes the current process to

determine the penalties from reporting violations. It would be to strike that one sentence and then add this paragraph.

DR. DUVAL: So everyone on the committee has had a chance to look at that? If folks are in agreement with that, I would entertain a motion to accept the IPT's suggested modifications for Alternative 1. David.

MR. CUPKA: Madam Chairman, I would so move and indicate that is for Alternative 1 in Action 3 to accept the IPT wording suggested changes.

DR. DUVAL: The motion is for Action 3, Alternative 1, to accept the IPT's suggested modifications. Second by Charlie. Is there any discussion on this? Any objection? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.** Alternative 2.

MR. WAUGH: For Alternative 2 the IPT subgroup recommends the councils consider the deletion of Alternative 2 as the councils do not have prosecutorial authority.

DR. DUVAL: Recall this was the alternative that dealt with no purchase forms and what might happen in the event that a no purchase form is not submitted; and so based on the IPT input and NOAA GC, the IPT is recommending that we delete Alternative 2. I would entertain a motion to that effect. **Tom Swatzel; the motion is for Action 3, Alternative 2, to accept the IPT's suggestion to delete this alternative; seconded by Charlie.** Any discussion this? Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Just to clarify that any of these actions or alternatives that you remove will go into the considered but rejected appendix.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you for that. Any other discussion on this? Any objection? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.** I believe we have a similar suggestion for Alternative 3. Again, the only differences between Alternatives 2 and 3 were the penalty I guess that – or not the penalty but the requirement for maintaining that permit, so the IPT has suggested that we delete this alternative. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I would move that we delete Alternative 3.

DR. DUVAL: The motion is to delete Alternative 3 from Action 3; second by Tom Swatzel. Is there any discussion on this? Any opposition? Seeing none, **that motion is approved.**

MR. WAUGH: Next is the suggestion to add a new alternative. The IPT Subgroup recommends the council consider the addition of the alternative below that would clarify in the regulations that a permit will not be issued or renewed if the dealer is not compliant for the recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

DR. CRABTREE: What exactly does that mean? So they come in – after a year they've got to renew their dealer permit and that means if they have missed any forms or are we going to tell them we want you to submit your forms you didn't submit now and then we'll renew your permit?

MR. WAUGH: I'm not a hundred percent sure. This came out of the IPT Subgroup, which was NOAA GC and some of the IPT members in the regional office working on this. What I would suggest is let's look ahead to our wording for Alternative 5, which is I think where we were heading that may render that moot.

Alternative 5 would replace the current no purchase forms requirement as stated in the no action alternative with the following: No purchase forms must be submitted at the same frequency via the same process and for the same species as specified for purchase forms in Action 1 and 2. A dealer would only be authorized to receive commercially harvested species if the dealer's previous reports have been submitted by the dealer and received by NMFS in a timely manner. Any delinquent reports would need to be submitted by the dealer and received by NMFS before a dealer could receive commercially harvested species from a federally permitted U.S. vessel. We would retain that requirement that applies to wreckfish.

What this does is it gets to in-season requirements that if a dealer is not submitting the reports, either a no purchase form or the reports that they have purchased, then they can no longer purchase product. This tracks what is being done for HMS. I'm not sure if we adopted this, whether you would need that requirement for the renewal because if they haven't submitted the forms they wouldn't be able to purchase.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it is confusing to me because this seems effectively to me to suspend their permit, which we have another comment saying we don't we don't have the authority to do that. The only authority the permit grants to the holder of the permit is the authority to buy fish and we're saying here if they miss a form they can't buy fish, so it seems effectively the same thing.

MR. WAUGH: But this has been reviewed by NOAA GC. It's what is being implemented for HMS. The subgroup that looked at this included NOAA GC and the region did not object to this wording.

DR. CRABTREE: That is well and good but some point someone needs to explain to me how they're different and to the council because I don't understand how they're different. Regardless of what anyone else may be doing, we need an explanation I think of why this is any different than the one we can't do because I honestly don't see how it is.

MS. McCAWLEY: I think I'm saying the same thing that Roy is. That new alternative that is being suggested, I don't really understand how that is different than what we have for Alternative 5. I'm not really sure what is needed.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The other NOAA GC person, Karen Raine, who is up to speed on this will be here tomorrow. I know the committee doesn't meet tomorrow, but at least by full council I will discuss this with her and see if I can get you more description and discussion on it. It is I believe what HMS has gone out with in a proposed rule, but I will note that for whatever reason that rule is not final yet, and it has been almost a year. I think there were other things in that rule besides this, I will try to get more information on that as well.

DR. DUVAL: We had quite a bit of conversation about this during our last meeting. We need to have some mechanism – we need to have some requirements for maintaining our dealer permit. That is the whole point. That is the quandary that we have been in is that there is no requirement to maintain your dealer permit, so there is no incentive really to report in a timely fashion to allow for accurate tracking of quotas. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chairman, there are going to be some incentives to report timely if LE is going to follow up on late reports and the dealers are going to start getting fines. If you're going to have to report every week and you start getting missing reports, it is going to start getting expensive quick.

I think if you've got fines due – I'm guessing that if you've fines due when it is time to renew your dealer permit, they're not going to renew it until the fines are paid. That is a pretty good incentive right there. Now, if you want to try to do something where if they're three or four weeks late or something, then a letter goes out and their permit is suspended, that's something else, but I'm going to weekly reporting on everything, catch and no catch, and there are fines involved, I think we've got right much incentive built in.

DR. DUVAL: Well, correct me I'm wrong but I don't believe I heard any fines had ever been levied against any dealers for late reporting; am I wrong on that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I do not know.

MR. WAUGH: That's what I heard.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm sure that it has been very rare if it has happened. In all fairness to enforcement, this has not been elevated to one of our high-priority enforcement actions until very recently, but that doesn't mean that won't change.

MR. PHILLIPS: And to that point, no, they haven't, but it's now a priority. It is easy to track. They either got the report or they didn't. It shouldn't take a lot of time for them to know that somebody is in violation. It's not going to be a major investigation. You start as normal with some lower fines to get their attention; and if a low fine doesn't get their attention and they keep doing it and the fines keep getting higher, sooner or later it gets their attention or they decide they don't need to be a dealer anymore because they can't afford it. Just because there hasn't been any fines and stuff and violations written, I think there might be now especially more likely trying to get people to get used to weekly reporting if it goes that way.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, let me recap where we are within Action 3. We modified the no action alternative. We accepted the recommendation to delete Alternative. We accepted the recommendation to delete Alternative 3. I guess leaning towards not adding this new alternative. We need to deal with Alternative 4 and the IPT subgroup recommends the council consider deleting Alternative 4 as the NOAA Penalty Schedule should be described in Alternative 1.

We need to act on that; and if indeed we remove that, Alternative 4 – and I'm not hearing any support or at least we will have Alternative 5 in there, perhaps; but I guess then when we come

back and look at a preferred alternative, it will be no action is what I'm hearing. Maybe first we could deal with Alternative 4 and that recommendation.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a good idea. The recommendation is to remove Alternative 4; is there a motion to that effect? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chairman, I so move.

DR. DUVAL: **So the motion is to accept the IPT's suggestion to delete Alternative 4 from Action 3. Second by Jessica. Is there any discussion on that? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Charlie, I hear what you're saying about there are likely some incentives coming up. I think it is one thing to be aware of the fact that there is non-compliance in dealer reporting. I would argue that the center has been aware for a while that there is non-compliance in dealer reporting. They have just now been able to – I'm thinking about the logbook program.

Bonnie showed us the numbers and dealer non-compliance. It is whether anything is done about those non-compliant dealers and nothing has been done. I view part of the charge here as trying to provide a disincentive to report late. I think Gregg makes a good point. I think we can get clarification on Alternative 5; but I think if we don't include something like Alternative 5 in here, then we have no action. We have no requirement for maintaining your dealer permit. We've already been told that we can't do anything about setting fines. We can make recommendations but we can't actually do anything about that. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Michelle, I'm not on your committee, and it is very clear that we cannot set fines, we can make recommendations, but it's also not clear from the limited conversations I had with Karen Raine the other day whether they can or would be willing to set up a fine schedule that was outside some sort of issuance of ticket and a court proceeding and the due process that's allowed.

It's not clear to me whether the Office of Law Enforcement can do that. If they can't, then I would certainly suggest that they move in that direction to obtain that authority, because it is the only way that we're ever going to provide incentive for these people to toe the line. Mel showed you exactly what happened in South Carolina.

It is not going to be any different anywhere else until you get to the point where you can affect somebody's pocketbook, like Charlie said; and if they don't pay the fine at the end of the year, they don't get their permit until they pay the fine. That's quite different than saying at the end of the year you don't get your permit until you make up some numbers and hand them to us. Somebody has got to get serious about it and apparently we don't have the authority to do it, but I think we need to stay on top of the Office of Law Enforcement and general counsel until we get something in place that will set up a system that is going to provide the incentives that we need.

DR. DUVAL: I would agree and I would suggest that if a fine is the road that is taken, that it needs to be a stiff enough fine that is going to make you think twice about when you are getting your dealer reports in the following year if you're not having to pay that fine until you actually

go to renew your permit. What is the pleasure of the committee with regard to Alternative 5, which actually be new Alternative 2 should we adopt it for inclusion. This is with regard to no purchase forms and purchase forms and the frequency of submission. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: A question, Madam Chairman; what do they mean by timely manner? Would the dealer get a letter saying if everything is not paid, late fines paid or settled or something, you get a letter you can't buy after such date. I don't have a problem leaving 5 in there. I just want a clarification.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg, do you know if there was any discussion with regard to what a timely manner is; it seems to me just reading the language of the alternative "at the same frequency via the same process".

MR. WAUGH: There hasn't been any discussion about putting in a specific time. That is something that would be done generally in the regulations. You all could certainly put that in. We could ask the public to comment on that. We could ask the center and NMFS now what they would like to see that be. But, no, we haven't talked about a specific value for that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, doesn't the timely manner refer to some of the previous alternatives where you selected a time certain that they had to have their reports in? For example, if they have to have them in weekly or within seven days or whatever it is, to me that is the timely part of the timely manner. The discussion below can make it clear that depending whatever alternative the council chose for the frequency of reporting, that is what meant by the timely manner. You could even probably change that to be more specific once you choose a certain alternative.

DR. DUVAL: I think that is a great suggestion and perhaps clarifying some of that in the discussion. **I would entertain a motion from someone to accept the IPT's subgroup recommended wording for Alternative 5, which would actually be new Alternative 2 for Action 3.** Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: So moved, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Second by Charlie. Bob.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair, for recognizing me again and I'm not on your committee. I know this is going to come up next week and I don't know the answer on the yellowed portion relative to wreckfish. Is the intent there to do any fish during closed seasons, specifically wreckfish; is it applicable to Gulf species; for example, not wreckfish obviously, but it's not clear to me why that is added and what the intention is. I think in order to get these together, we're going to have to have that understanding.

DR. PONWITH: There is concern that there is room for misinterpretation of that. Certainly, it makes sense if a season is closed and that is what the dealer exclusively buys, that you may be able to avoid having to send those reports, but that is a big if. The concern at the center is that inclusion of that could be misinterpreted as my season is closed so I don't need to send in

reports. Certainly, if they're buying other species, regardless of the fact that wreckfish is closed, we'd still have an expectation that we would be seeing those reports.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, Bonnie, let's say we've got a dealer that is buying wreckfish; can he send in reports ahead of time I'm not buying wreckfish through X-date. It is kind of like if they're going to close the business and go to Europe on vacation for a month; can they fill in forms ahead of time saying we're closed for X amount of time, so you've had them and they're not trying to figure out somebody 500 miles away to get a report in or something.

DR. PONWITH: I would think that would be adequate. The main thing is that no report is critical. If the no report covers a blanket period, the doors are closed, we're buying nothing, I don't see how that could cause confusion. Another alternative is to be able to set up some sort of a system where an automated no report is submitted on a weekly basis. I can check with my people to find out which causes the least confusion from the science center end. The main thing is if they're open and that is only one of the species that they buy that creates a potential for confusion.

DR. DUVAL: Would there be a problem with just deleting this language? How difficult is it to submit a no purchase report for the wreckfish dealers? Would anyone have a problem with removing that language? I don't see any problems with removing that language. Okay, we have a motion on the board that we have not yet voted on. Is there anymore discussion on this motion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, **the motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: Okay, that completes the actions. The next item would be to approve this for public hearings. We are requesting just a little bit of clarification here. This is a joint plan with the Gulf. Our intent is to take this out to public hearings. If we approve it for public hearings, if the Gulf also approves it, then we can go out to public hearings.

We would ask for clarification ahead of time. If the Gulf decides that they need more time to work on it and don't approve it for public hearings in June, we would still take it out to public hearings at those August public hearings and then bring that input back to you in September. Do you want to discuss a potential for handling this if for some reason the Gulf does not go forward?

MS. McCRAWLEY: **I'd like to see this move forward to public hearing for the ones that we already have scheduled in August even if it's not approved by the Gulf. If you need a motion to that extent, then I can make one.**

DR. DUVAL: I think that would be preferable. I think the motion would be to approve the Joint Dealer Amendment for public hearings. Gregg, would you want to add language as scheduled. Okay, do we need any clarification other than the discussion that we've had on the record thus far that if the Gulf does decide they need more time to work on this, that –

MR. WAUGH: And I don't know that we need to get that in the form of a motion, but just should that happen for any reason – and this isn't to prejudice what the Gulf does. We have these discussions all the time on joint plans. The two councils can take different preferreds out to public hearings but they have to be resolved prior to finalization.

But if for some reason the Gulf decided not to go forward with this – and I can't imagine why they would do that, but the one option that would be available to us is to fold it into our CE-BA 3. We have other data collection items in that that we will be talking about in a little bit. But I don't know that we need that in the form of a motion.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, then we just need a second for this motion; John Jolley. John, I apologize, but you're not actually on the committee so I need a committee member. Thank you, Charlie. Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, **the motion stands approved**. Now we get to move into our next agenda item, which is a review of the decision document for the remaining data collection items that were in CE-BA 3. Do folks need a short break before we get into that? I think we can probably move through this quickly. Okay, be back here in ten minutes.

DR. DUVAL: All right, the next item on our agenda is to go through a decision document for the data collection actions that are in CE-BA 3. We actually have three different data collection items; one dealing with reporting for for-hire vessels; one dealing with reporting for commercial vessels; and one dealing with bycatch and discard reporting. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: This is Attachment 3 in your briefing material. Again, there are three actions. These will be renumbered now assuming that the recommendations from the Ecosystem Committee are approved by council that we will be working a little longer on those coral HAPCs. Those actions will be deferred into CE-BA 4, so we will have these actions on data. We put in a little background on the reporting requirements for for-hire, and we will fill that in with some of the other issues as well.

The first action deals with modifying the permits and data reporting for for-hire vessels. Again, the box shows what you did. You passed a motion to modify this action based on Attachment 4, so that's what we have done. We have laid out these alternatives. No action would retain existing permits and data reporting systems for the for-hire sector.

Alternative 2 would require that charter and headboat vessels submit fishing records to the science and research director weekly. Alternative 3 would require that charter and headboat vessels submit fishing records to the science and research director daily. Alternative 4 would require that charter and headboat vessels submit fishing records to the science and research director weekly or intervals shorter than a week if notified by the science and research director.

We've got a couple of points that we need to have a little clarification. For Alternatives 2 through 4, should we clarify – and this is a question for the center – should we clarify when these reports are needed and provide modified wording in the alternatives. For instance, if it's weekly do we need to say seven days after the end of each week; daily, do we say by noon of the following day; or do we specify any timeframe or just leave it to daily, weekly and let the regulations specify that; also to clarify how those reports are provided and modify the wording in the current alternatives.

The way the alternatives are worded now it just says that submit fishing records. The way some of the reporting is done now, the headboats, they make the forms available to statistical reporting

agents; are they mailed; are they submitted electronically, which means via computer or the internet; or are we allowing fax and mail? We need that clarification within those alternatives.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, do you have any input on whether or not we need to clarify that weekly means seven days after the end of each week; daily by noon of the following day?

DR. PONWITH: That is the intent and I guess the mechanism for achieving that, I don't know whether that's best via the regulation, but certainly that is the intent.

DR. DUVAL: So does that mean we don't need to add that kind of clarifying language that Gregg has up there on the screen, the seven days after the end of each week, whether by noon of the following day?

MR. WAUGH: I would suggest if that is the intent, that we add that to the wording of the alternatives. That will make it much clearer for the public to understand.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I agree with that, but I have a more basic question. What is the expectation of what we are to do with these reports? Why are we doing this?

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think it is clear we have had similar issues with for-hire reporting and timeliness. Certainly, I think of the headboat survey. I don't know if Bonnie wants to say a few words about that, but I think that has been demonstrated.

DR. PONWITH: One of the points with the headboat fishery is that we ran the pilot study for the headboat fishery on the feasibility of moving to electronic reporting. The outcome of that study was very positive. The feedback we got from the participating fishers was very positive. It is our desire to go to a hundred percent electronic reporting for the headboat fishery.

You will recall for the estimation process the private vessels and the for-hire charter vessels are run through the MRIP Program. The headboat fishery, the estimation process is done through the science center. We have received funding to move to a hundred percent implementation of electronic reporting in the headboat fishery.

What that does is gives us more data that are already electronic so we don't have to go through a keypunching phase, QA-QC keypunching phase. We jump right into QA-QC of the data as they arrive. Also, shifting to a weekly reporting gives us the same kind of advantages that we have already described for the commercial. It enables us to be able to do those projections based on real data at a higher level of periodicity rather than waiting for a long time and having to – because of that long time, having to project out farther based on data that are much, much older.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I'm not on your committee, but I would ask Dr. Ponwith if this doesn't also move us toward implementation of the ACCSP standards, I believe. If I'm correct in that, isn't the standard for electronic or maybe not, but I think it is moving us in the direction of more complete implementation of ACCSP, I think.

DR. CRABTREE: But I come back to my question; I understand with the headboats we use their logbook program to estimate the catches. To my knowledge we have never required logbooks for charterboats. We don't even have those, but that's what we're doing here. Again, what is it we're going to do with those logbooks? It is not clear to me.

We don't use logbooks to estimate charterboat catches. Based on some tests I've seen of electronic logbooks done in the Gulf, there are a lot of problems with it. I have reservations about requiring data reporting programs when it is not clear to me what exactly we're going to do with them.

I think there needs to be some discussion about that. Getting more timely with it might be somewhat useful with the ACLs, but the fact of the matter is the ACLs will continue to require a great deal of projections because they're all lumped in with the private sector catches, and that continues to come from MRIP, which has two-month waves and turnarounds and all. I think we really need to think through what we get out of this and what we would do with these reports from charterboats if have them.

DR. DUVAL: So would it perhaps be useful – and I don't know, Gregg, if you've had any conversations about this at the IPT level, but perhaps splitting out the charter from the headboat?

MR. WAUGH: And I would pose that to the center; should this just focus on headboats? We haven't had that level of discussion. Again, we should point out that these measures we're talking about now, this is not part of the joint amendment with the Gulf. This is separate and just applying to the South Atlantic. We've got two options here. We could put subalternatives to have it apply just to the headboat or just to charter; or if we feel it's not useful on the charter side, just delete that and just have it apply to headboat.

DR. DUVAL: I think if we're going to take this out to public hearing, it might be useful to have suboptions for charter and headboat vessels separately, and we could certainly get some feedback from the public on that. I don't know how the rest of the committee feels. Gregg is typing up some potential subalternatives that we could have within each of these to separate out the charter from the headboat. How do folks feel about this? Would anyone be willing to make a motion to provide subalternatives for charter and headboat versus headboat only?

All right, Gregg is suggesting that we work on the wording and then we can just adopt this in one motion. Those alternatives would read – Alternative 2 would read “require that charter and headboat vessels submit fishing records to the science and research director weekly; weekly equals seven days after the end of each week, Sunday.”

Subalternative 2A, charter and headboard; Subalternative 2B, headboat only; and similar changes to Alternative 3, “require that charter and headboat vessels submit fishing records to the science and research director daily; daily equals by noon of the following day,” with the same subalternatives for charter and headboat or headboat only.

And then again for Alternative 4 you have the same subalternatives and then just the added definition in the main alternative language that weekly equals seven days after the end of each week. Does anyone have any other thoughts on that wording? Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: And do we want to also insert how they're going to be reported; if it's electronic, then show electronically?

DR. DUVAL: It seems like that might be good idea – I'm seeing some nods around the table – I think particularly as it relates to Bonnie's comments about the center's intent to move towards full electronic reporting for headboats. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, I just looked in the ACCSP standards for the for-hire sector, and it does indicate that effort data shall be reported weekly electronically, where possible, so that is in the standards that were just adopted in May of this year.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Wilson, for that clarification. Gregg has included additional language within Alternatives 2 and 3 and 4 indicating that reporting would be via electronic means, and in parentheses via computer or internet to further define that. Does that look okay to everybody?

MR. SWATZEL: **I would move to adopt the modified language under Action 6.**

DR. DUVAL: We have a motion to adopt the modified language under Action 6; seconded by Charlie. Is there any other discussion on this motion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: So we have a snapper grouper charterboat permit and we have a mackerel coastal pelagics charter permit, but that would have to be joint with the Gulf, right? What other fisheries do we have a charter permit that this would apply to, Gregg? Is it just snapper grouper we're talking about? Dolphin and wahoo do we have –

MR. WAUGH: And dolphin and wahoo I think we do as well.

DR. CRABTREE: So that's what we're talking here is snapper grouper and dolphin and wahoo. I think with charterboats now there is already authority in the regulations if selected they have to do a report –

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: For snapper grouper.

DR. CRABTREE: – for snapper grouper weekly, but I don't think any charterboat has ever been selected to report, to the best of my knowledge. We at least ought to clarify that we're only talking those fisheries.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, that would be a good clarification under Alternative 1. Perhaps we could add some language that says "retain existing permits and data reporting systems for the for-hire sectors of the snapper grouper and dolphin and wahoo fisheries".

MR. WAUGH: The issue with how we handle the reporting for coastal migratory pelagics; do we want to just have that apply to vessels while they're fishing in the South Atlantic? We certainly hadn't contemplated doing that jointly with the Gulf, so we need some clarification there. Kari just pointed out there are separate South Atlantic and Gulf coastal migratory pelagic permits for the for-hire sector.

DR. DUVAL: Well, that makes things much cleaner; doesn't it? If folks would take a look at the words up on the screen there, we have made quite a few changes. We have added subalternatives for charter and headboat as well as headboat only for each of these different alternatives and then just clarified to which for-hire permits this would apply. Are folks okay with this language? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: So the main thing this would do for charterboats, if you decided to go down that path, is it takes the "if selected" language away and they all have to report, period, and then it would require electronic?

DR. DUVAL: Yes. Further comments? Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: We are well positioned to move to electronic reporting for effort for the headboat fishery. The charterboat fishery, as you know we have conducted a pilot study in the Gulf of Mexico to look at using electronic logbooks in the for-hire fishery, the charter for-hire fishery as a mechanism to gather up that effort information.

That was a pilot study that was funded by MRIP. The final report from that is on the brink of being released but it has not been released yet. I expect that in that report there will be some recommendations on the feasibility and what it would take to actually operationalize that; you know, go from a pilot to a fully operational scale.

By sending this out to public hearing prior to the release of that, you position yourself to be able to entertain this in the event that the outcome from that study is positive and has recommendations that this is the direction we should be going. The flip side of that is if the recommendations come back, no, we're not ready to do this yet, then the inclusion of the charter fleet in this may be not feasible and what it would cost you is the time to prepare the documents and gather up the public hearing and find out we're not ready to do that, anyway. So, that is kind of the state of play in the charter fleet. For the headboat, I believe this is a must, to get the public input on it.

DR. DUVAL: What do folks think in terms of the pros and cons as Bonnie has presented them with regard to getting some public input on electronic reporting in the charterboat fleet and staff workload versus getting some input that we could act on once this report comes out, which presumably we would actually be in our next briefing book in September.

Well, if nobody is making any comments, silence is assent to move forward with going ahead and including this. We do have a motion on the table to adopt the modified language under Action 6. I just want to give everyone a chance to look at that one more time. Any other comments? Any objection? Seeing none, **that motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: Okay, moving on to Action 7, which deals with modifying permits and data reporting for commercial vessels. Your direction at the March meeting was to modify similar to the alternatives that were in 18A. 18A dealt with snapper grouper, so some of this is tailored a little specifically to snapper grouper, but again we would need clarification as to which species we're talking about including here.

The potential would be snapper grouper, dolphin and wahoo, golden crab, and coastal migratory pelagics. Coastal migratory pelagics, we only have the one permit that is joint with the Gulf. Alternative 1 is to retain the existing permits and reporting systems, and we would add for the other species as well once you clarify which ones you are including.

Alternative 2 would modify the permits and data reporting for commercial vessels. Subalternative 2A would require all vessels with a federal commercial permit to have an electronic logbook tied to the vessel's GPS on board the vessel. Subalternative 2A would require a hundred percent of snapper grouper vessels to have an electronic logbooks; whereas current data reporting programs only require electronic logbooks if selected. To date none have been selected.

2B would develop a system for commercial permit holders to submit their logbook entries electronically via an electronic version of the logbook made available online. Alternative 2C would require the commercial landings and catch/effort data be submitted in accordance with ACCSP standards using the SAFIS system. It seems like we're pretty close to that now.

I have got some background information there on the ACCSP system. In terms of clarifying in addition to which species it would apply to, Subalternatives 2A through 2C; again clarify the timing on those reports; and also clarify how the reports need to be provided. We talked some about including an alternative that would provide similar to what is being proposed for the dealers, that if a dealer doesn't submit their reports on an ongoing basis, then their ability to purchase product is suspended until they provide that data.

This would do the similar thing at the fishermen level, so no fishing forms must be submitted at the same frequency via the same process for all species as it is currently specified for snapper grouper. A fisherman would only be authorized to sell commercially harvested species if the fisherman's previous reports had been submitted by the fisherman and received by NMFS in a timely manner. Any delinquent reports would need to be submitted by the fisherman and received by NMFS before a fisherman could sell commercially harvested species from a federally permitted U.S. vessel.

DR. DUVAL: Probably it would be a good idea to clarify when the reports need to be provided, so we would want to add some language that was similar to what did for the previous action with regard to defining weekly or daily. Right now there is nothing in any of the alternatives that actually defines a time period.

We had a little bit of discussion about this at the beginning of the Snapper Grouper Committee meeting when Bonnie went over the new quota monitoring system and reporting. Right now the

current regulations were that logbooks have to be submitted within one week, seven days after a trip.

Do we want to keep that frequency of reporting and add that to the existing alternatives? We could probably add suboptions. I guess the first thing is daily; is that a realistic reporting timeframe for a commercial vessel? I would think not so should we even bother taking something like that out? I am seeing heads shake around the table. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I'm not on your committee and I missed most of your discussion. Let me just give a little perspective. This is on electronic reporting right now, what you're talking about, on what time basis?

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. HARTIG: On a weekly basis or on a daily basis?

DR. DUVAL: Those were suggested alternatives that we could add in terms of a timeframe for frequency of reporting, so we have these subalternatives that are up here on the screen which describe the potential method for reporting, different means of electronic reporting, but they don't do anything with regard to a timeframe for reporting.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. Well, we had this discussion with Bonnie the other day when I said in reality how reporting actually occurs. I have fields on my logbook that I have to report on. The trip ticket is one of them. The other problem is the reporting burden is not equal across all fishermen.

There are a number of us that have to fill out the discard form and the economic form. Tom made that very clear the other day – and I'm glad he brought that up because it went right by me – that in order to fill out the economic part of it you have to have all your total week of receipts in front of you and your pay slip up to date before you can fill out the economics. In order to get that, the week starts on Monday and ends on Sunday, but then I don't get my receipt for that week until Friday of next week.

The seven days doesn't work right now. The way things have changed over time, it has been an evolution, fields added in the logbook that preclude us from actually meeting the seven-day requirement without having every logbook form that we fill out sent back to us at a later date and then resubmitting it with that field. What would really be good is if you extended the seven days to fourteen. That would allow us enough time to get our receipts for the week and to fill out the necessary fields that were required in the logbook. A week won't work; it is not working now.

DR. DUVAL: I appreciate that. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Ben, how would it work if the logbook was electronic and it was tied to your GPS on board the vessel; how would you do it then?

MR. HARTIG: No, the way I want to do it, Roy, I want to come in and report my stuff daily. That's how I want to do it. It's a burden for me to sit down at the end of the week and go through seven days, and I have a lot of weeks with seven days worth of trips. It's a real burden and time constraint, two or three hours, and a big part of a day to sit down and fill out one week's worth of trips.

I would much rather come home at the end of that trip, boom, I can get on the computer, everything is fresh in my mind, my discards are right there, I know everything that happened for that trip, much better reporting and do it on a daily basis. That is what would be great for me. For me now it is not working optimally for the data we need to collect or for the fishermen who are involved.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess what I'm looking at is to make it work that way we have to change more than just the reporting timelines. We have to change what is being reported and the whole structure of the system, it sounds like. Is that what you're saying?

MR. HARTIG: Well, that's what we face. Based on the fields we have to fill out now, we can't meet that burden.

DR. CRABTREE: So to make this action workable, it seems to me it needs a lot more – this needs a lot more vetting out with people who really thoroughly understand the system and all to figure out what is realistic and what will actually work and improve it.

MR. HARTIG: Well, that's a good point. I think we've got people from different states here that commercially fish. I think we could sit down and between now and full council come up with a workable situation and then we could move this on.

DR. PONWITH: And recognize I'm interested in what happens when there are three logbooks due and the interaction of that information; recognize that is the exception rather than the rule. We had that discussion a couple of council meetings ago that the requirement for the economic data is based on poundage landed, how frequently you're selected for that.

I would be interested in that analysis with respect to a person who has all three logbooks due and then also that same analysis if it's one or two of those due because I think the answer is different. All of that information would be valuable. As long as I'm on the microphone, with the indulgences of our chair, there is another thing that I wanted to talk a little bit about, and that is the Subalternative C.

The science center's recommendation would be to merge Subalternative B and Subalternative C and basically omitting the subalternatives that deals with SAFIS, and the reason is I'm concerned about calling out one system versus another because it ties our hands. For example, right now the commercial system is linked to ACCSP, the SAFIS system. It is linked to it; it uses information from ACCSP but actually in some cases has higher resolution. So specifically calling out SAFIS would actually cost us some resolution in the data.

MR. CURRIN: Michelle, I'm not on your committee, but I think – and, Ben, correct if I'm wrong, but what I heard you say I think is that it would be near impossible for you to submit the economic logbook on a weekly basis.

MR. HARTIG: That's true.

MR. CURRIN: The landings, however, and the discards would not be a problem?

MR. HARTIG: No, that's true.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, that's I think a salient point to clarify; what do we need more frequently? We need the landings, of course, and the discards would probably be valuable as well. It seems feasible to get those on a more timely basis, but you certainly can't require the economic logbook submissions on a weekly basis, but I don't there is any need to get those on a weekly basis.

DR. DUVAL: Good points, Mac, and I would like to take Ben up on his suggestion. We are running a bit short on time and I think this is a very important action and it definitely requires the input and the creativity of the industry.

If Ben and Tom and maybe Charlie don't mind working with Gregg on some wording for this action, keeping in mind things like timeframe for reporting, what would actually be feasible with these kinds of electronic alternatives as well as the point just made that I think really we're looking for landings information on a very timely basis and that some of the other very important information that we are collecting, such as the economics, would not necessarily have to be as frequently.

Perhaps that could even be obtained on a monthly basis. We can look at alternatives for that; so if that's okay I think just with regard to Alternative 2, with the indulgence of the committee, I would suggest proceeding in that fashion. I'm not seeing any objection around the table so we will go ahead and do that.

Gregg did bring up potential a new Alternative 3, which has to do with no fishing forms, and having those be submitted at the same frequency through the same process for all species as is currently specified for snapper grouper. This is a potential new alternative that we could adopt under this action. Personally I think that would be a good idea. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: It sounds good on paper but the no fishing forms by the way they're designed are submitted monthly. If you have two weeks with no or a week with no that you want to try and get all the other stuff in, it's not going to work for no fishing forms because they're already on a monthly basis and you fill it out after the month that you just had no fishing. You can't fill that out until the end of the month. But we can it in our monthly thing with the economics; we can handle it.

MR. BURGESS: I am not on your committee, but one way to maybe look at the no fishing form is the value it has and kind of weighted in that sense about how the information is going to be

used and maybe work it like that, if possible, and what it is going to be used for and how important the timeliness is. If it is determined that the timeliness is important and does have value, then, well, we will need to make some arrangements.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, it is a monthly report but you still could have the same kind of reporting requirements, and that went right by me, that you have for the other to submit that monthly report.

DR. DUVAL: So just to clarify, Ben, you could require that the no fishing report be submitted weekly as opposed to monthly. How do folks on the committee feel about including this suggested new alternative based on that discussion? I think we would need a motion to that effect. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I so move.

DR. DUVAL: **The motion is to add new Alternative 3; second by Tom Swatzel. Anymore discussion on this motion? Roy.**

DR. CRABTREE: I'm not on the committee, but it has the same language about authorized to sell, which my read of it effectively suspends their permit if they're delinquent on a logbook, but it's not all clear to me how that works. I understand it's in some HMS Proposed Rule; nonetheless, I don't really understand how that work or what that means.

DR. DUVAL: Point duly noted and I would hope that we would be able to get some GC review of this alternative. Has it already had some GC input in the IPT? Gregg is nodding his head yes. Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, **that motion stands approved.** We have one more action to get through and that has to do with modification of bycatch and discard reporting.

MR. WAUGH: And where we are right now is adopt the ACCSP as the preferred methodology. Until this module is fully funded, we require the use of a variety of sources. Alternative 2 would adopt the ACCSP, and this would require that there be some level of observer coverage on our fisheries. I have included wording from the ACCSP data collection standards for 2012.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Gregg, we have been around this block a couple of times I think before, and we have discussed the funding aspect of ACCSP and the fact that it's not fully funded and that you cannot require government agencies to spend funds or to enact programs for which there has been no funds allotted. There are a lot of different things there so I'm kind of wondering why this is back. If we could have some discussion, that would be great.

MR. WAUGH: My understanding is the councils are required to put in place – and this is not the last reauthorization of the Act, but the previous one that the councils are required to put into place a data collection system that estimates bycatch for the fisheries that they manage. I understand that there was a lawsuit on the west coast that pointed out that lack of funding is not an adequate reason to not have that system in place. We're looking at it again to meet the Magnuson requirement.

DR. DUVAL: We have this requirement to monitor our bycatch through the Magnuson Act. Right now for the commercial sector for snapper grouper at least – and Bonnie can correct me if I'm wrong, but approximately 20 percent of the fleet is selected to fill out the bycatch logbook; correct, for snapper grouper only?

In other words, none of our other commercially permitted fishermen have such a requirement for bycatch monitoring? In other words, there is no bycatch reporting forms whereby a commercial dolphin and wahoo permit holder is being selected to report on their bycatch or anything like that? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: The way I do it, all my trips, regardless of what I'm fishing for, I fill out the discard for each trip, so it doesn't matter what fishery I'm in. If I'm catching dolphin or king mackerel or Spanish mackerel or reef fish, I'm reporting my discards in each of those respective fisheries.

DR. CRABTREE: So we're talking about logbooks and electronic logbooks and all these other things, but then it seems to me if your intent here is changing your bycatch report methodology, you're now saying that is not part of your bycatch reporting methodology. It's an unfunded program that doesn't exist, and then that's kind of the problem with this.

Now, I don't know when the ACCSP Program will be fully funded. I don't really know where it is in the priorities of things that if they had money they would fund it. I don't really even know where it is in this council's priority of things if you had money which would you choose to fund first.

It is a funny thing to me that we're going to say we're not going to use the things that we're using now and actually have in place now and we're going to instead rely on something that I don't have any notion of when actually come online. With the budgetary situation we're facing, I don't think the prospects are good that these sorts of things are going to be fully funded. I guess if you're asking that we stop funding one thing and put the money into this program, you ought to be more clear about what is it you would like to defund.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, do you know through the fishery observer program through the science center; do we have an estimate of how many snapper grouper vessels carry observers or any of our South Atlantic permitted vessels? I know you guys have observations for like the shrimp trawl fishery, obviously.

DR. PONWITH: I would not know those offhand. I would have to actually go investigate what the coverage rates are. I know that the coverage rates are low because the observer program is chronically struggling for the resources to get those sampling rates up higher.

DR. DUVAL: So basically right now in the South Atlantic, the council doesn't have – we don't have a structured bycatch reporting methodology or module. We have pieces and parts here and there whereby we require folks to fill out a particular logbook form, but the way I see this action is the council start moving down the road towards something that is comprehensive across all of

the fisheries that we manage that includes self-reporting data like we already have but includes some efforts – and I hear you loud and clear, Bonnie, on the chronic underfunding of observer program but at least taking steps down that road to try to get some observer data for some of our managed fisheries. That’s how I see this particular action. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: This kind of a gee whiz thing, but still it is in my mind and it is important and I’d like to see it done. We have a reef fish observer study that has been done for four years. We also have a camera study that has been done.

How do you compare the results of those studies with the bycatch reported in the South Atlantic by fishermen? If we could compare that, then we’d have a much better idea possibly of what the bycatch actually is. We may get a better of that if we compared those two studies with what is actually being self-reported.

DR. PONWITH: I know that there is a keen interest within the NOAA Fisheries Service because the problem we have in the southeast, Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic combined, is that there are more demands than there are resources, and that is not unique. It is the theme nationwide.

One of the things that we’re looking at to deal with that is kind of a more holistic approach to the technical feasibility of augmenting our observer coverage electronically; so rather than a little study here and a little study there and coming up with the same answer of a little study taught us a little bit, we need a bigger study to teach us more, it would be a more holistic approach to that question.

We recognize the problem, we’re very interested in electronic tools to help augment – there is never a substitute for boots on the deck. Those eyeballs are the best, but it is not enough and budgets are shrinking and not growing, so we need to find a way to be more efficient with what we’ve got.

I think the agency recognizes the problem and recognizes that bycatch can become a choke point to targeted fisheries, whether that bycatch be finfish themselves or whether it be protected species. What I don’t want to do is again box us into something that may not be ready to be the prescriptive answer. I think that is the concern.

DR. DUVAL: Well, the way I see this we have a mandate under the Magnuson Act to monitor our bycatch and to have some comprehensive means of doing so, so we need to take a step down that road. The ACCSP is a program that has been around for 12 years now, something along those lines. I read this alternative and it looks very flexible to me. I could stand to be corrected, but I think that this is a step that we need to take. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Well, I would agree, Madam Chairman. I agree obviously with everything Roy said about budgets and the uncertainty of budgets, but I would also point out NMFS is a partner in ACCSP. Bonnie has staff just like me that sits on the Operations Committee and NMFS has representation on the Coordinating Council as well.

If we can find some way to move down that road, I certainly would concur. I am not a member of your committee, but still I think it's important to move in that direction however we can do it. We don't have all the money that we need to do fishery stock assessments either, but we still find ways to assess fisheries and move ahead and make decisions. I think it is important to try.

DR. DUVAL: When I read this alternative it says adopt the ACCSP Discard and Protected Species Module as the preferred methodology; it doesn't say we're going to implement this tomorrow. This is something that we're taking out for public hearing potentially. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: I have a suggestion that may be the way forward through this and that is rather than specifying the ACCSP module, specify that we record the data in a way that are consistent with those standards or higher, and that way we're not boxed in to one system.

I'm a fan of standardizing the way we collect the data so we don't have two systems collecting data in a way that are incompatible. Again, rather than calling out the module specifically and saying that, just state that we will collect the data at the level of resolution and according to the standards or higher.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's a reasonable alternative to include. Gregg is putting some language up on the screen right here for a potential Alternative 3 that data will be collected to meet – bycatch data will be collected to meet or exceed the ACCSP standards. I guess at this point in our discussion – it is eleven minutes after five – I would entertain a motion to include all of these alternatives under this action. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I move that we include Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 under Action 8.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Charlie Phillips; second by Jessica. **The motion reads approve Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 under Action 8.** We have not adopted a preferred alternative, but this is something that will go out for public comment. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And just for the record, just as we've heard this afternoon, there is bycatch discard information being collected. What you want to do is get additional or further collection or better collection, if you will, of that.

DR. DUVAL: That's correct and I think we want to standardize how we're collecting that information across all of the fisheries that we manage and really basically have a blueprint. We need to have a plan for continuing to move forward and improve the level of information that we're collecting in that regard.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, **the motion stands approved.** Is there anything else within CE-BA 3 that we need to deal with in this decision document? We're going to hold off on approving this for public hearing until full council given that we've asked some other folks sitting around the people to work on some alternatives for Action 7.

We do have one very quick item under other business and I would like to ask Carolyn Sramek if she might come forward quickly. There were some additional materials under the presentations' folder in your briefing book with regard to permits in limbo or as Carolyn calls them pimboes.

MS. SRAMEK: I know it is getting late so we can try and keep this brief. I know there has been some discussion about things being in the weeds, and I can see this is like the leaves on the weeds. Since this is going to both councils, I did want to kind of bring it to your attention. What we wanted to do is to put in the regulations something to clarify some of the ambiguities or areas that in real-life scenarios aren't exactly addressed by the regulations.

Specifically I wanted to talk about having regulations that would address the timeframes for permit transfers and also what happens when a vessel owner loses their boat; what are the implications on the permit? To do that, we wanted to create some terms that we could then use. As it shows there, we have "valid" and "terminated".

We are going to define some terms and describe options available when somebody loses their boat and also talk about timeframes for transfers. To do that, we propose creating a new word or defining an existing word, I guess, of "valid". That is the blurb right out of the regulations. What it really means is that the permit can be fished, so we want to say a permit is valid between its effective date and its expiration date, and so that's the timeframe in which it can be fished.

It remains valid until it expires or until it's transferred or if it's corrected or updated or if a duplicate permit is issued, in which case those new permits become the valid permit; also, if it's surrendered or revoked or annulled or any of those less common actions. And then another word we want to use "terminated", which we're kind of already using locally, anyway.

We say a permit is terminated if it is not renewed during its renewal window and therefore is non-renewable; it can never be renewed. We just want to introduce those terms into the regulations and into our nomenclature.

In keeping with similar housekeeping, one of the things we want to do is to clarify and state in the regulations that with permit transfers that the seller has to sign the permit before it is expired in the presence of a notary and that person buying the permit has to submit the application within that renewal window.

There is a lot of ambiguity about that right now. People think that there is an unlimited amount of time in which they could do those things. We want to create some regulations that put some time limits on those actions. The last sort of housekeeping item we have is to discuss what the options are and what the implications are if a permit holder loses their vessel either because they sell it or they lease the boat or the boat is lost.

What the implications are to the permits when that happens is presently not clear. What we wanted to do is introduce a new concept which we're calling "without vessel assignment". If a permit holder has a limited access permit and their boat sinks or they sell their boat or something like that, their permit will then be without vessel assignment; and we want to say that if a permit

is without vessel assignment, that they can still transfer it to somebody else as long as it's not yet expired and that they have one time only to renew it.

The purpose of that is to allow them that one year to find a new boat or to find somebody to sell it to. Otherwise, if somebody's boat sinks, once that permit is expired, they can't renew it because they don't have a boat and they can't sell it because it is expired, and they're stuck. We're thinking this will give a little more flexibility and opportunities to people in these real-life scenarios. A little housekeeping; we think it will make everything better for permit holders, clarify where it is not clear and hopefully make things better. Any questions on this?

DR. DUVAL: Questions for Carolyn? It seems pretty straightforward and I think a good thing. Thank you very much for coming here and clarifying that for us. If there is no other business to come before the committee, we will adjourn.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 5:19 o'clock p.m., June 13, 1012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
July 14, 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011 - 2012 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

MEL BELL

~~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

Tom Burgess

P.O. Box 33
Sneads Ferry, NC 28460
910/327-3528
tbburgess@embarqmail.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

Benjamin M. "Mac" Currin

801 Westwood Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607
919/881-0049 (ph)
maccurrin@gmail.com

Dr. Michelle Duval

NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell St.
PO Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

LT Robert Foos

U.S. Coast Guard
Brickell Plaza Federal Building
909 S.E. First Avenue
Room 876/ DRE
Miami, FL 33131-3050
305/415-6768 (ph)
305/415-6791 (f)
Robert.W.Foos@uscg.mil

Charles Duane Harris

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

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)
Doug.Haymans@dnr.state.ga.us

John W. Jolley

4925 Pine Tree Drive
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
561/346-8426 (ph)
jolleyjw@yahoo.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

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 R. McCawley

Director,
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

John V. O'Shea

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)
voshea@asmfc.org

Charles Phillips

Phillips Seafood / Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-3149 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

Tom Swatzel

P.O. Box 1311
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/222-7456 (ph)
tom@swatzel.com

SHRIMP

Robert Boyles, Chair
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Anna Martin

SNAPPER GROUPER

Mac Currin, Chairman
Ben Hartig, Vice-chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Red Munden, Mid-Atlantic Council
Staff contact:
Myra Brouwer / Brian Cheuvront

SOPPs

Duane Harris, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

SPINY LOBSTER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
Robert Foos
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION

✓ David Cupka
✓ Michelle Duval
✓ Jessica McCawley
✓ Charlie Phillips
✓ Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

South Atlantic Fishery Management 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

Assistant Public Information Officer

✓ Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@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
Kari Fenske - kari.fenske@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

BONNIE POWWETH
PHIL STEELE
MARCEL REICHERT
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
OTHA EASLEY
JACK MCGOY
RICHARD CODY
LUIZ BARBIERI
ANDY STRELCHECK
BOB GILL

CAROLYN SKAMEK
JOEY BALLENGER
KATHY BARCO

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will 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.

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE MEETING
 June 13, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

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

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Jimmy Hill	SEA ECF 689 547-1254	Hillj@seafishery.adl.com	32120-9351
Rusdyng D. Justice	ECFS 386 239 0948	DFE2009@adl.com	adlca711@attmail.com
Peter Barri	SEA-ECFS	TAMPA, FL	adlca711@attmail.com
FRANK HELMERS	GSAAF 386 689-8181	frank@seafishery.com	4320 HOBBSHOLE BEACH
Joe D. Justice	321 536 0802	Bottom DREAM@seafishery.com	4320 HOBBSHOLE BEACH
Brook Anderson	772-461-0499	GERSEC@aol.com	29131 mini Dr. at Ponce de Leon
Joe Klattermann	321-632-1774	321-632-1774	Pam. Gillespie @ house.gov
Pam Gillespie	843-327-1114	kgillespie@southemcath.com	CHS SC
Kate Quigley			

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

PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will 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.

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE MEETING
June 13, 2012
Orlando, FL 32812

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

EMAIL
ADDRESS

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

Marshall City NC

Ocala FL

Bradenton, FL

JACK COX

728-3548

CCA 352-246-3544

CCA

SEAN MILLER

407-854-7002

Miami Beach FL

PAUL KROSKO/CCA

910-599-5245

FLa Seaboard Airway

Pete Brown

(321) 453-4583

Barrett Coby

487-492-1901

David Hall

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

Generated

Jun 18, 2012 06:13 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 3 of 5 (Wednesday)	Webinar ID 970157482
Actual Start Date/Time Jun 13, 2012 07:26 AM EDT	Actual Duration (minutes) 767
Clicked Registration Link 114	Opened Invitation 27
Total Attended 58	

Session Details

Port-Minner,Samantha	sport-minner@oceanconservancy.org
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 08:36 AM EDT
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:36 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:20 PM EDT	431.02

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Dunn,Russell	russell.dunn@noaa.gov
Attended Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 13, 2012 09:09 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:10 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:55 PM EDT	465.8

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Krall,John southwindfishing@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 07:01 PM EDT

City New Smyrna Beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 07:02 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 07:28 PM EDT	25.82

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Michie,Kate kate.michie@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 11:04 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:41 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:11 PM EDT	449.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Miller,Janet janet.l.miller@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 10:10 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 10:11 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	359.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Adamson,Presley padamson88@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 04:55 PM EDT

City Key West

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 04:56 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 07:13 PM EDT	136.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 80

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Hesselman,Don **don.hesselman@ncdenr.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 01:36 PM EDT

City Fair Haven

State NY

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:37 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:20 PM EDT	223.02

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 41

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Lelis,Ludmilla **llelis@orlandosentinel.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 10:11 AM EDT

City Orlando

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 10:18 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 11:30 AM EDT	71.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 43

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

sandorf,scott **scott.sandorf@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 09:15 AM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:15 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:33 PM EDT	497.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

laks,ira **captainira@att.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 02:20 PM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 02:20 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	352.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 47

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Williams,Erik erik.williams@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 03:31 PM EDT

City MHC

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 07:54 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:34 PM EDT	419.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Sauls,Beverly beverly.sauls@myfwc.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 05:23 PM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 05:23 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:08 PM EDT	45.13

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 42

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

solomon,justin **justin.solomon@myfwc.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 11:48 AM EDT

City Jackosville

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:50 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 12:00 PM EDT	10.07

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 56

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Byrd,Julia **byrdj@dnr.sc.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 03:54 PM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:38 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:25 PM EDT	586.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 20

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

prugar,larry **lprugar@live.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 02:07 PM EDT

City south daytona

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 02:08 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:14 PM EDT	182.57

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

FARMER,NICK **nick.farmer@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 10:58 AM EDT

City ST PETERSBURG

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:58 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 01:02 PM EDT	243.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Brown,Mark **capt.markbrown@comcast.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 05:59 PM EDT

City Mount Pleasant

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 06:00 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	132.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 56

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

branstetter,steve **steve.branstetter@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 02:08 PM EDT

City St. Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 02:08 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:20 PM EDT	71.25

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 53

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Eich,Anne Marie annemarie.eich@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 09:28 AM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:34 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:03 PM EDT	508.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Waters,James jwaters8@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 12, 2012 01:58 PM EDT

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 10:22 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 10:45 AM EDT	23.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Schulz,Paul schulzpa@hotmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 09:24 AM EDT

City Tallahassee

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:24 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 09:35 AM EDT	10.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

fenske,kari kari.fenske@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 07:57 AM EDT

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 07:57 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:12 PM EDT	683.88

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Killer,Ed **ed.killer@scripps.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 01:08 PM EDT

City Stuart

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:09 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:38 PM EDT	148.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

potts,john **pottsy18@aol.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 01:19 PM EDT

City rockledge

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:19 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	413.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 80

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

stephen,jessica **jessica.stephen@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:28 PM EDT	456.53

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Chesler,Richard **richard.chesler@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:54 AM EDT

City Port Orange

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:54 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:06 PM EDT	353.13

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Coggins,Lew **lew.coggins@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:45 AM EDT

City beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:45 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:14 PM EDT	688.2

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Kellison,Todd **todd.kellison@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 11:53 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:53 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:12 PM EDT	198.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

holland,jack jack.holland@ncdenr.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:58 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:53 PM EDT	415

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Gore,Karla karla.gore@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:40 AM EDT

City Sarasota

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:41 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:17 PM EDT	396.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Whitaker,David whitakerd@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 02:09 PM EDT

City charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 02:09 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:42 PM EDT	58.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 42

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

gerhart,susan susan.gerhart@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 12, 2012 10:08 AM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:47 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 11:45 AM EDT	178.28

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

haddad,ken **kenhaddad50@gmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 09:58 AM EDT

City lloyd

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:59 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 10:17 AM EDT	18.45

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

OShaughnessy,Patrick **patrick.oshaughnessy@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 10:51 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 10:52 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:59 PM EDT	367.18

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Latanich,Katie cal7@duke.edu

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 09:45 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:45 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 11:53 AM EDT	128.13

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Knowlton,Kathy kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:22 AM EDT

City Brunswick

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:23 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:20 PM EDT	538.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 30

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Austin,Anthony **redress@ec.rr.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 12, 2012 11:45 AM EDT

City Hubert

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	703.68

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Baker,Scott **bakers@uncw.edu**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:45 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:46 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:59 PM EDT	432.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Smart, Tracey smartt@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:15 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:15 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 12:16 PM EDT	240.93

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 21

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Lupton, Dee dee.lupton@ncdenr.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 01:50 PM EDT

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:51 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:29 PM EDT	158

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

brennan,kenneth **kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 09:50 AM EDT

City beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:50 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:40 PM EDT	521.87

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Thomas,Janie **fecsapi@aol.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 01:22 PM EDT

City Fernandina Beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:23 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:00 PM EDT	156.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 39

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Beckwith,Anna **anna@pamlicoguide.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:29 AM EDT

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:19 PM EDT	530.22

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 70

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Daniel,Louis **louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 02:02 PM EDT

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:58 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 12:05 PM EDT	186.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Mehta,Nikhil nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 10:55 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:22 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:29 PM EDT	487.4

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 54

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Malinowski,Rich rich.malinowski@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:50 AM EDT

City St Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:12 PM EDT	366.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

C, Mike **mec181@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 07:28 AM EDT

City mtp

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 07:28 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	764.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Turner, Steve **steve.turner@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 03:06 PM EDT

City Miami

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:26 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 05:46 PM EDT	379.82

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Mumford,Doug **doug.mumford@ncdenr.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 11:46 AM EDT

City washington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:47 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 03:30 PM EDT	223.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 58

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Lemieux,Timothy **timcantfish@gmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 05:32 PM EDT

City cocoa

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 06:15 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	117.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 40

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Fitzpatrick, Eric eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:50 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:51 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:14 PM EDT	682.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 48

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

MacLauchlin, Bill billmac@charter.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:56 AM EDT

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 08:56 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:28 PM EDT	571.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 66

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Mann,Charles **charlesmann@paveselaw.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 01:48 PM EDT

City Fort Myers

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 01:50 PM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 02:07 PM EDT	17.27

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Exley,Gary **river92@bellsouth.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 12, 2012 05:23 PM EDT

City Tybee Island

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 09:53 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:14 PM EDT	620.22

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

DeVictor,Rick **rick.devictor@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 08:39 AM EDT

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Jun 13, 2012 08:39 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 07:13 PM EDT	488.58
---------------------------	---------------------------	--------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Clemens,Clemens **anik.clemens@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 12, 2012 12:35 PM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Jun 13, 2012 08:35 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 04:54 PM EDT	488.88
---------------------------	---------------------------	--------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Mahood,Robert **robert.mahood@safmc.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 11:27 AM EDT

City N. Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:27 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 06:23 PM EDT	44.98

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

thompson,mary jean **mjthompson860@gmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 11:42 AM EDT

City titusville

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 13, 2012 11:42 AM EDT	Jun 13, 2012 08:13 PM EDT	407.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 61

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Larkin,Michael michael.larkin@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:37 AM EDT

City St. petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Devictor,Rick rick.devictor@noaa.com

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 06:14 PM EDT

City St pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

NEAT,JASON

jloffshore25@yahoo.com

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 04:04 PM EDT

City ORMOND

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
-----------	------------	--------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

amick,steve

steveamicks2@aol.com

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 05:05 PM EDT

City savannah

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
-----------	------------	--------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.