

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 12, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee:

Michelle Duval, Chair
Steve Amick
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips

Martha Bademan, Vice-Chair
Tom Burgess
Dr. Wilson Laney
Tom Swatzel

Council Members:

David Cupka
Anna Beckwith
Doug Haymans
John Jolley

Mel Bell
Lt. Mario Gil
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Robert Beal

Council Staff:

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

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Amber Von Harten
Dr. Mike Errigo
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Brian Chevront

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Dr. Pam Dana
Otha Easley

Dr. Jack McGovern
Vince O'Shea
Joey Ballenger
Anne Marie Eich

Additional Observers Attached

The Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, Wednesday morning, September 12, 2012, and was called to order at 9:35 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Welcome to the Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee. The first item on our agenda today is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes or additions to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved. The second item is approval of our June 2012 minutes. Are there any changes or modifications to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes stand approved. We're going to start out with a couple of presentations from the Science Center and the first one is Dr. Ponwith, and she is going to be giving us a presentation on the results from their bycatch monitoring.

DR. PONWITH: This is just an update on the bycatch monitoring that we're doing in the southeast. Right now the National Bycatch Report that is put out nationwide by NOAA Fisheries Service reports that there are 43 fisheries in the Continental U.S. We have got observer programs for six of those fisheries.

In the South Atlantic that includes South Atlantic Shrimp, the Gulf and South Atlantic Pelagic Longline and Shark Bottom Longline, the Gulf and South Atlantic Southeast Shark and Coastal Gill Net Fishery, and some reef fish bycatch monitoring. The electronic effort logging program in the Gulf of Mexico has also been a very important component in bycatch monitoring in the Gulf of Mexico.

We're struggling to keep that program alive down there. This is the electronic logbook that gives a very, very refined measure of effort so that it is considerably more refined than just the start date and the end date of a trip. It gives us an ability to do a much stronger estimation for bycatch in that fishery.

I would really value the opportunity to expand that type of sampling using electronic equipment. Right now the thing that prevents us from expanding that both within the Gulf and also expanding it to the South Atlantic are having the resources to be able to do that. The bycatch in recent years and recent time periods, the coverage rates have been calculated.

These coverage rates are percent of vessels I believe as opposed to percent of trips, which is probably not the most refined way to do that because it is harder to calculate CVs on this. But, the observer programs for the South Atlantic Trawl has been right around 1 percent of coverage; the shark bottom longline somewhere between 3 and 8 percent of coverage; the shark and coastal gill net right around 11; pelagic longline right around 12.

We're doing some bandit gear observer work that has been around 1 percent, and then the headboat ranges between 2 and 9 percent. This is the headboat for some recreational observers. And then for logbook programs in the South Atlantic we have got right around a 41 percent coverage rate for that. Of course, for the headboat logbook program in the South Atlantic, a hundred percent coverage.

Some of the improvements that we have underway for bycatch monitoring in the South Atlantic is we're going through a review right now. We've brought in some external statistics experts who are looking at the observer programs that we're using for estimating bycatch. They're looking at how we make decisions about partitioning out the resources we have to make sure that we're applying the effort in a way that brings the greatest statistical strength to those programs.

They're looking at the estimation approaches that we're using and particularly we've asked for them to give us guidance on how we monitor bycatch for rarely encountered species where you have lots of zeros, which is a statistical challenge. We're also looking at the validation methods for headboat logbook validation. This is a program that was funded at a fairly high level by the MRIP Program.

The work that we're doing will not only serve our region but serve the entire Eastern Seaboard for evaluating and then improving those dockside validation methods. We're also looking at a electronic reporting system for the shark fishery where the observers themselves would have an electronic system on board with them and be able to enter their data and submit their data electronically.

That system holds a great deal of promise I think for use by other observers in other programs and ultimately could be used by the vessels themselves for reporting their logbook. We will be testing that and reporting on the outcome of that in the future. Are there any questions on observers or on bycatch monitoring?

MR. JOLLEY: Did you say up to 12 percent coverage with observers on pelagic longline? I think you said 12.

DR. PONWITH: Pelagic longline approximately 12 percent, yes.

MR. HARTIG: And the coverage in the South Atlantic discard logbook program is 41 percent; is that what you gave us?

DR. PONWITH: That is correct; it is about 41 percent.

MR. HARTIG: So that has been significantly increased over the recent time. It used to be like 20 percent, if I remember correctly.

DR. PONWITH: Right; the reason that it seems higher is that the logbook selection letters are put out by the amount of effort that the vessels are expending, and it appears as though the number of trips per vessel in the South Atlantic is somewhat higher than in the Gulf. While a greater number of vessels are carrying logbooks, it is because they represent a larger number of trips. What we will be doing in future reports on this is we'll talk more about rather than by vessels normalize that by trip.

MR. HARTIG: So does that mean that you're still using the same 20 percent but you're getting 41 percent of the landings because you're going to the effort?

DR. PONWITH: What I'll do is the next time we talk about this what I'll do is show both so you can see how the two of them compare.

DR. DUVAL: I was going to ask the same question as Ben, so it just seemed like the 20 percent sub-sampling of the fleet was capturing 41 percent of the trips. I just want to make sure that my interpretation is correct.

DR. PONWITH: And so what I'll do is for the next report I'll include both of those so you can see how the trips and how the vessels relate to one another.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, Gregg has up here on the screen; I think, Bonnie, this might have been your presentation.

MR. WAUGH: We found it.

MR. CUPKA: It was under the full council agenda, Attachment 4A. It is unfortunate that we didn't have it when she went through it.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, I'm just giving folks a couple of minutes to pull that up and look at this; Attachment 4A under Council Session. Are there any other questions for Bonnie about some of the bycatch monitoring and the coverage rates and some of the improvements that are being pursued? John.

MR. JOLLEY: Do you think you're going to continue to be able to monitor the longline fishery at that level?

DR. PONWITH: Well, that will depend a lot on what the 2013 budget looks like. Right now we're expecting a continuing resolution for six months, which means if the guidance comes back that we operate at 2012 levels, then our observer coverage could be expected to be status quo. If there is a change to that, then there could be a change in observer coverage.

What we will do is watch what the 2013 guidance coming out for the continuing resolution looks like and we watch what the final decision on appropriations in the spring looks like. I'll be back to the South Atlantic Council with any changes in observer coverage that are impacted by results of those budget decisions.

MR. JOLLEY: And if we're looking at 12 percent; would that be something like 30 or 40 trips or do you have a number for what 12 percent would be?

DR. PONWITH: I do not have the actual number of trips that equates to, but if you're interested in that I can get back to you.

DR. LANEY: Madam Chairman, it's obvious but I'll say it for the record anyway that the 1 percent coverage or approximately 1 percent coverage in the South Atlantic Shrimp Trawl, I certainly would like to see that go higher. We've had some discussions in the South Atlantic State/Federal Board and also on the technical committees for spot and Atlantic croaker and

weakfish as well about wanting to understand the potential impact of the South Atlantic Shrimp Trawl Bycatch on those species in particular.

It is kind of difficult when you don't have the data to really estimate discards in that fishery or also assess the benefits of fish excluder devices; so to the extent possible, it would be nice to see that percentage go up and provide those additional data to ASMFC to be able to better assess those species.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, do you want to respond to that?

DR. PONWITH: What is useful is when – you know, I certainly take this comment under advisement. What would be useful is if you as a council, when you're presenting your update to your science priorities report that goes in headquarters, to contemplate this remark weighed against some of the other priorities you have in your list science priorities. What that does is it provides that remark in context and helps us rank what the council's highest desire are and be attentive to that as we plan out our own science requirements.

MR. CUPKA: Bonnie, I was looking at the observer programs here and when you look at headboat down there it says it is about 9 percent for North Carolina but 2 percent for the rest of the South Atlantic, Florida through South Carolina. Is it higher in North Carolina because that is where the program is headquartered or do you know what the difference is of why that is 9 percent for North Carolina headboats but only 2 percent for the other states?

DR. PONWITH: I don't know the answer to that off the top of my head. I will find out and get back to you on that.

DR. DUVAL: And, David, I know that the DMF staff actually does the observations on the headboats in North Carolina. We don't contract any of the MRIP surveys out. We are the agent to do that ourselves and we've done a lot of supplementing so I can check in with our staff because that might be one of the things that we've supplemented.

Bonnie, I just had a question on the review. You said you are undergoing a review right now of the bycatch programs to help you make a better determination for parsing out the coverage. Is that review being coordinated with ACCSP at all to ensure that the bycatch monitoring is meeting those standards?

DR. PONWITH: The primary purpose of the review right now is the estimation procedures. We have multiple people responsible for – we have parsed out the responsibility for generating estimates to multiple scientists within the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and depending upon the estimate there are different people engaged in that both within the Science Center, the region, the states.

What we've decided was it was time we looked across the breadth of those estimation procedures again and bring in a statistician to look at how we're generating those estimates and make sure that the procedures are commensurate with the coverage levels. In other words, given

the coverage levels that we have; are we using the best mathematical approach for generating those estimates?

One of the outcomes of that we expect will be scientific advice relative given the amount of resources you have is there a better distribution of those resources in terms of resulting in the best estimates. The starting point of it are estimates themselves rather than the coverage levels. But we certainly in the aftermath of this will schedule a conference call and discuss this with our partners.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, are there anymore questions for Bonnie on the bycatch monitoring? If not, we will move on to the next presentation which is the quota monitoring system.

DR. PONWITH: The commercial landings monitoring system is something that we talked about in the last meeting and we want to talk a little bit more about it because there have been questions again about how that works and the availability of the results of that system for members of the council, for council staff, for fishermen for making decisions about how they are going to manage their fishery in light of where we are relative to the quotas.

Again, the commercial landings monitoring system; the starting point of it is that dealer landings are automatically loaded into the system. Then we have compliance monitoring and accounting for non-reporting is an important feature of this because it is automated. It will, when it is functioning properly, give us alerts when a dealer has not reported.

One of the best things about it is that it enables us to use present landings reports to generate forecasts of what we anticipate the future landings are going to be to be able to forecast when quotas or ACLs are going to be hit. Then it also gives us quality control capabilities and built-in QA-QC to able to look at those reports and tell when there are some problems.

The automatic loads of landing reports come from multiple sources. It comes from ACCSP, the Bluefin Data which are used by North Carolina and Florida through Texas and the Northeast Fisheries Science Center. The nice thing about this is that if a dealer discovers that a report they sent in was incorrect they can make a change to that report and send it, and that report is automatically updated in our system, and the system retains a copy of the original report.

Basically what it means is there is a versioning control, which is very critical considering what these reports are being used for. There is quality control on the coding tables for dealer identification and for building these integrated permit lists. Now, if you recall in our discussion about the yellowtail snapper, this is where we had the problem.

One of the very last steps that we had for working on this system is building that cross-walk table that enables us to identify a dealer as a unique entity. As you know because the states are engaged in dealer and vessel reports themselves, a dealer will have multiple identification codes. What we're trying to do is reconcile them so we know when a dealer has reported and when they haven't.

Because if we get a false negative we don't believe the dealer reported and it is because he is using some code in his report that we don't know about, we could end up doing an expansion for that dealer as an unreporting dealer and have that be an overestimate of what actually has been landed. Again, we will be working within the Fisheries Service, working with the Science Center and SERO, to take a look at those permits.

Once we have got our ducks in a row we will be consulting each of the states again to make sure that cross-walk table is complete so that we have a very firm knowledge of when a dealer reported versus didn't report. The monitoring of the dealer reporting helps us with our outreach basically to bring strong encouragement to those dealers on getting those reports in on time.

Again, the combination of landings report versus a dealer report where product is purchased versus a no fishing report where product hasn't been purchased gives us a feel for how much non-reporting is happening. We use information from an individual dealer's reports from the previous year relative to how they're reporting has been this year to calculate an expansion factor if we haven't heard from them.

Those expansion factors represent uncertainty because if they changed their behavior last year to this year and we expand based on what they landed last year, that creates uncertainty. The best way to deal with minimizing that uncertainty is to be as close to 100 percent dealer reporting as we possibly can. In that scenario no expansions are necessary and that is a very good thing.

There is extensive quality control that we do. A lot of this is automated. There are still evaluations because we're using the raw data coming from these dealers to support the timely monitoring for these ACLs. We like the dealer reporting because it basically reduces the reporting burden on the dealer with this dealer report system that they no longer have to submit the semimonthly aggregated landings, so it cuts down their burden.

It reduces data entry by most of the states and certainly by us, so those data are automatically loaded from the dealer reports. Currently we report on 51 quotas/ACLs for SERO to meet our requirements and that represents 71 stocks in species/region combinations. Previously the way we were doing it before, we were monitoring landings of 13 stocks so this is a giant step forward.

Again, the quota monitoring system was we believe a higher reporting burden on the dealers. We think the new commercial landings monitoring system will actually reduce the load on them and improve the quality and the timeliness of the reporting. Some of the things that have been improved is that the system generates automated reports on landings, expansion for non-reported landings.

It will generate forecasts going into the future and it will generate compliance reports so if we have folks that are not reporting we have got that information at our fingertips and can do something about it. It creates flexibility so that if there is a management change on our behalf we can make adjustments to the way the system is operating to accommodate for that.

We've got dealer trip ticket reports assigned to the region. We can use fishing area as one of the criterion for how these data collected. The automated system – some of these are redundant, but

I think it bears repeating – there is an increase in our capability to audit the data and the estimation systems. Again, this is important because by having the information come straight from the dealers into our system it skipping a lot of steps so you want really, really strong QA-QC procedures, and this system will help us to do that, both the automated and then the actual analysts going through it a second time and combing through it.

What we are really eager to get to is a point when the weekly reporting is implemented. Right now there is nothing preventing a dealer from reporting weekly. They can do that. We would encourage that as a way to sort of limber up for when that becomes the requirement. When the weekly reporting is implemented, we will begin compliance monitoring on a weekly basis as well; so that if people are failing to report, we get the word back out to them and get word back out to our enforcement people.

The other good thing is that when the weekly reporting is mandatory we will be submitting information to SERO weekly instead of every other week, and that information will be posted on their websites on a weekly basis so council members, NGOs, constituents and most importantly fishermen can be monitoring those weekly updates on the SERO Website to know what those projections look like and how they have changed on a weekly basis based on the data that the dealers are sending in. Any questions on this?

MR. CUPKA: Bonnie, the information, how available is that to fishermen and dealers? I'm assuming that once it is submitted to the regional office and then posted, that is when it is first available to them to really see it; is that correct?

DR. PONWITH: That is correct. Right now the intent is to continue having that be the dissemination point for that information, so pretty much everything is internal within fisheries until we get the data to SERO. They're posted to the website and that is the dissemination point. Right now that is approximately every two weeks. When the dealer reporting goes mandatory on a weekly basis, those reports will be updated weekly, and so they will weekly updates on the status of the quota.

MR. BELL: You had mentioned when dealers don't report so you have got this hole and you have got to put something in the hole, and I don't how long a period of time that tends to be for you, but I would assume that you know that in some cases we have the data directly from the dealer on paper.

To the degree that it is useful, I guess you could always come to us to see what we have to perhaps look at a place filler for that hole that might be a little bit better than your expansion factor. That does exist now but there is a little time lag for us. Our reporting requirements are by the tenth of the following month so there is a little bit of time delay; but if you're looking at a big hole, that might be useful.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, that is an interesting concept because when the rule goes through it will be mandatory reporting by dealers electronically on weekly basis; and so if everything is going swimmingly we would actually have our data before you have the paper copies. Using paper

data from this year that you may have received in a case where they reported to you but not to us is something we can look into as a way to fill those gaps.

Again, it is always the question of what is the most accurate way to estimate data that are missing. It is an important question because it is what you use to expand – you can't use zero because you know it is likely something bigger than zero. It is a challenging question.

MR. HAYMANS: Bonnie, just a real simple question with regards to the agenda. The agenda said we would have a live demonstration of it and was that not possible?

DR. PONWITH: That's a very good question. I talked with your executive director when this came out on the agenda. The question the system itself is an internal system that the analysts are using to gather up the data and assimilate those data into something that we then publicly disseminate via SERO's Website.

Because the system itself is not something that fishermen will be using or that the council will be using on a daily basis, because of the QA-QC demands that those data have to go through prior to being able to be disseminated, the question is, well, if it is not something that you're going to be able to use yourself, you know, go in and look at on a daily basis, because there is just too many steps that have to be taken before those data are ready, that it raised the question of the utility of going through sort of a live demonstration.

In other words, the system itself does not have a public user interface because the intent never was to have this system be the public point. If you're interested in how our analysts actually do those expansions, if you're interested in some aspect of it, I'd be willing to talk to them and have them address that more specifically.

That was the reason why we walked through the presentation like this. The second thing is that if there are questions about how the SERO Website is set up and the utility of how those data look on the SERO Website, that is another thing that we can talk about and address if you're interested.

MR. BURGESS: Not a question, Bonnie, but I wanted to appreciate you recognizing the importance of that monitoring for the commercial industry. It is extremely important and I hear about it quite often. Running a business, this information is very important and it will continue to be important and the importance could increase in the future, so thank you.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I just had a comment/question. Once weekly reporting is implemented, then we in the southeast region should be consistent with the rest of the Atlantic coast and the northeast region; correct?

DR. PONWITH: You mean consistent in terms of the timing of the release of the –

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

DR. PONWITH: Yes.

MR. WAUGH: Once general question and then a couple of specific ones; how will the data from this program be integrated into the ACCSP SAFIS Data Warehouse?

DR. PONWITH: The actual landings data, once the landings data come in – are finalized, you mean?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and the estimates because North Carolina north there is a quota monitoring system and the quota monitoring module in ACCSP; those data go right into the ACCSP Data Warehouse, are accessible by NMFS and by other people that have clearance for confidential data, so how are the data that are generated by your system going to be integrated into that system?

DR. PONWITH: I'm going to have to consult with our folks and get back to you on that one.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, and the specific question is – and it has been very difficult to understand on the continuum from what your system does automatically, to what is done manually, when it is available; it is hard to understand that. We have staff that are capable of looking at these types of systems and understanding how they work. We have access to confidential data. We have asked to have access to the system. Why can't we have access to this system at a technical staff level? We're not talking about disseminating information. We're talking about technical staff to technical staff.

DR. PONWITH: So is the question wanting to understand better how the estimations are done?

MR. WAUGH: I'm going to be very blunt here; and with all due respect, we would like to get in and see that the system is real and that it exists.

DR. PONWITH: I have absolutely no problem doing a demonstration for the technical staff on how that works; you know, what the data look like. I know, Gregg, you have been asking over and over and over again, well, the data are uploaded daily so we should be able to get these data and get them out to people on a daily basis to make business decisions.

The difference is if a dealer reports on a Tuesday instead of a Thursday or something like that, we won't wait to put the data in. Data are uploaded when they come in, and that is what I mean by the daily uploads. But with a weekly reporting requirement, the data aren't complete until that deadline hits.

When the deadline hits, that is when we make the determination on whether a dealer is on time with either a landings report or a no landings report and know whether we need to make the estimation. In other words, what we want to be careful about is having data out there that aren't done, you know, where the estimations haven't been done and it hasn't been through the QA-QC and isn't ready to be disseminated because that is confusing. But, absolutely, if you want a live demonstration on how this system works, we can set that up for council staff.

MR. HARTIG: Bonnie, thanks for the presentation; it was very good. My question is related to commercial landings and monitoring but not to your presentation. In this ACL system that we were mandated to do by congress, we have a number of species – most of our species are data poor. In the TIP sampling, which is going to be – to try and move these species out of that data poor into an assessed category, we're going to need the necessary samples, to move those age samples and to move those stocks to be assessed.

Okay, we haven't increased – at least in my area port samplers are the same level they have been for 20 years; no increase in sampling effort in the area for the commercial catch. Now we have in our area millions of pounds of animals that are caught and we have two port samplers basically to deal with it. We have one in Jupiter and one up in the Cape. God bless them, they do a tremendous job collecting samples.

But if we prioritize these things by assessments – and I don't know if you prioritize your species to collect the data through the TIP sampling in the same way. I don't know how that is done. If that is the case, then we'll never be able to move any of these species that haven't been assessed into the assessed category when we could collect the data fairly easily because the fish are available to be sampled for ages. If we had the people to do it, it could be accomplished.

The other way we could do this, and maybe I need to talk to you privately about it, is maybe we do a CRP for specific species and hit those stocks really hard. Like rudderfish is one where we could get thousands and thousands of samples a year. I don't know how many you would need. You could do the reproduction and the ages and the sizes and all that.

With just a couple of fishermen, we could sit down and hit some of these stocks. Almacos is another one we could hit, you know, those jacks. Those are species that probably aren't going to be subject to the camera surveys where you have jacks swimming in and out and you never know if it is the same jack swimming in. You're not going to have really good camera information. With what we're tasked to do with the ACLs, how do we move some of these species forward?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, the TIP sampling universally throughout the southeast we would benefit from a higher density of intercept sampling to be able to get the biological samples from those. I will say from a data-poor stock the age composition of the landings is, you're right, probably about the easiest piece of information, but easiest is not always the richest piece of information.

In my mind the number one type of data that brings the level of the quality of the data up for the purposes of a stock assessment is fishery-independent indices of abundance or absolute abundance. For a lot of these we've got the landings data. We do have some amount of age data or at least length frequencies or something like that, and the addition of fishery-independent data would be the thing that brings it up beyond that and makes it ready for a stock assessment.

You talked about cooperative research and every year I take a look at the priorities that listed in the Federal Register for what we want to focus on for cooperative research. One thing that we could possibly do is rather than having those priorities be general, we could take a look at a stock that we believe is bubbling just below the line in terms of being doable as a higher-tiered stock assessment and say we're going to focus on this stock this year for cooperative research and the

type of things we want are additional biological samples for landed catch or some level of fishery independent of some life history data collections and focus on taking that one stock and bringing it from the can't-do-it to the doable stage.

If you're interested in having a discussion like that, we could do that in December to take a look at what stocks are solidly assessable based on already existing data, what stocks are sort of beyond hope, but which ones are floating in that in-between space and see if you have an interest in giving some input to the cooperative research data call or a call for proposals that comes out every year in the Federal Register and putting some focus on one species over another. If you're interested in that I can prepare for that in December.

MR. HARTIG: I am interested in going in that direction. I know that the priorities are to get these overfished into stock assessments now and get some of these species that are rebuilding from our management plans, have those assessed and get them online, but we will get to a point where we will be able to start assessing some of these stocks we've put on hold. Hopefully, we will be ahead of that curve when we get to that point.

DR. DUVAL: All right, I had one final question, but it is actually for Bob. I was wondering if you could outline for the committee; you know, we have a lot of quota-monitored species in the Mid-Atlantic in the northeast, and I know that your staff have access to the ACCSP Warehouse and that they are very involved I believe in tracking those quotas, and I was wondering if you could just kind of outline that for committee. I know you're only here with us for a short time longer before you have to leave.

MR. BEAL: I think the bulk of the monitoring for the northeast quotas is done through the ACCSP system through the SAFIS reports that come directly into that system from the states. We have access to that data and it is downloaded on a daily basis so we can monitor that. There is also weekly dealer reports that occur in the northeast, but that data occurs on a weekly basis and then there is a lag in reporting and other things, so it is not as timely.

It is good data and it is complete data; it is just not as timely as the SAFIS data, and the bulk of the monitoring is done through the ACCSP SAFIS system. What I was going to say as I had my hand up before you called on me was to get back to Gregg's comment about access to the data, in the northeast the bulk of that access is handled through ACCSP.

In other words, the data is downloaded on a daily basis or on a weekly basis; and then once it is in the ACCSP system, that is when all the partners have access to that data. I think migrating the southeast data into the ACCSP system will allow the partners to access that data quicker. It doesn't get to your question about the inner workings of the system that is being developed in the Center, but that gets you access to the information that I think you're looking to get, but it has to migrate over to ACCSP before you can get a handle on it.

MR. WAUGH: And actually that is what we would like to get at and have been trying to get at. I think that system that you described has been operational in North Carolina north for the last six years. It isn't that we want to understand the inner workings of whatever is being done at the

Center, but we'd like to have access to the estimates of the catches. Certainly what has been in place for six years-plus North Carolina north, if we had that down here that is what we'd like.

DR. DUVAL: If there are no other comments, I think we're going to move into the next agenda item, which is actually the Joint Dealer Amendment that we have with the Gulf. The first thing is just a review of the public hearing comments, and I think Brian is going to take us through that. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, what we were going to do is walk through – and I'm sorry, I should have mentioned this to you before; we have got a decision document, Attachment 2E, and that is what is projected here. What we were going to do is walk through that and we come to a spot where Brian will cover the public hearing comments.

If everybody could look at that 2E, what we have got in there are the decisions to be made by the committee and ultimately the council that are highlighted in yellow. The Gulf Council's actions are folded in here as well; so if it is all right with you, Madam Chair, we just deal with those as they come up.

Also included in the briefing book is an updated amendment document that was presented to the Gulf and reviewed by the Gulf, and we have taken all the detailed biological, economic, social and administrative impacts and put them into the decision document here as well. I will show where those are.

There were no changes to the purpose need. We've got some examples in here of where we have quota overages and why we're looking at this amendment. That information has been updated. We've also got a table in here that shows what is currently being collected, and this starts on Page 7 of the document. There is a table there, Table 1.3.7, that outlines what is currently reported.

In terms of the data elements that are going to be required to be reported, those are shown in Table 1.3.3.1 on Page 10 of that document. The first area we come to a decision; we have a list of actions that we summarize in the document and that is carried forward in the summary. The IPT has recommended a change to that wording.

The IPT has some revised wording here and what is shown in this box up on the top right is what was in the document that you approved to go out to public hearing. The IPT recommendations are here, slight modifications to the wording, but we tried to make sure – and this is one of the differences in working with multiple councils.

The Gulf Council gives staff and the IPT editorial license to change the working of actions and alternatives; whereas, what we do is we bring that to you for you to review and give us guidance on those changes. The first decision is do you want to accept that wording change, and that is outlined in Option 2. That would change the summary version of those actions; Action 1, what dealer permits are required to purchase federally managed species; Action 2, frequency and method by which dealers will be required to report; Action 3, requirements for maintaining a dealer permit.

DR. DUVAL: I guess my only comment is that it seems like the wording changes for Action 2 and Action 3 aren't actually questions. It is more of a statement; so for what it is worth, I would just suggest getting rid of the question mark. **I would entertain a motion from the committee to accept the IPT recommendation for rewording the list of actions.**

DR. LANEY: So move, Madam Chairman.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Wilson; seconded by Martha. Is there any discussion on that motion? Any opposition to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

MR. WAUGH: The next item deals with the history of management. In general what we've done is shown when the council approves an amendment, when it is submitted, when it is implemented; and again this is different with two councils operating, but what has been done in the document now is all the dates of final council action submitting of the amendment has been removed. The only thing that is shown is when NOAA has approved the document.

Our concern and the reason we have had that in there before and the council has asked for it in the past to be in there is it shows the council's function in the process and in the timing. You remove all of that and you can't see what the council did when and where. We'd like your guidance on whether you want those dates retained or just leave it with no mention of when the council took action.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I was going to make a comment on that in that it seems like a point of history is to know actually when you did things, so I was a little bit confused by that particular recommendation. Are there any comments from the committee or a motion to either accept the IPT recommendation or to stay with what we had previously in the amendment? Gregg, you said that the actual language of the amendment right now has deleted all those dates?

MR. WAUGH: That is correct. It is in the public hearing version, but it is not in the revised version that the Gulf looked at. We have the information and we can put it back it if that is what you all want.

DR. DUVAL: What is your pleasure? Dr. Laney.

DR. LANEY: Personally, Madam Chairman, I need all the help I can get remembering what we did and when we did it so I would like to see the dates in there myself.

DR. DUVAL: So, Wilson, it sounds like you are making a motion to replace the dates of council actions, to put those back into the amendment?

DR. LANEY: Yes, that would be my motion.

DR. DUVAL: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded by Ben. Discussion? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I used to think that this was a great place to remove this information and shorten up the document for ease of reading and all that, but I have come to a different opinion, and I think it has been very helpful on many occasions to have that information in the document. I know it adds to the length of the document, but it is very helpful. I think it is good for the public to see, too.

DR. DUVAL: I would tend to agree as well. Are there any other comments from the committee regarding that? **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that is approved.**

MR. WAUGH: And then at the top of Page 12 is where we get into the public hearing comments and Brian is going to cover those.

DR. CHEUVRONT: As was said earlier, this document is a joint document for the Gulf and the South Atlantic Councils. Both councils took this document out for public hearing in August. We received a couple of written comments as well as folks coming to the public hearings. In all told the South Atlantic Council held six public hearings. Fifty-four people attended the total six hearings.

Of those fifty-four people, twenty-seven of them actually spoke during the public hearings. The Gulf Council did not receive any written comments related to this amendment. The South Atlantic Council received two written comments specifically related to this amendment. They were generally in support of dealers reporting weekly; possibly even going to daily when the quota is close to being caught, but they weren't necessarily in support of a universal permit for all dealers.

They thought that some of the issues that the councils are facing with timely reporting could be met by revising some of the procedures that are currently in place. One of the written commenters was concerned about the amount of data entry that is already required by the dealers. They all have to do the paper trip ticket on the dock and then they have an electronic trip ticket system and then financial accounting system.

There was concern about requiring additional data entry redundant with what they're already doing. The South Atlantic Council; those two people who wrote in also appeared and spoke during the public hearings.

Then there was one additional commenter on this amendment and basically wanted to speak about the unreported landings and their impacts on ACLs; spoke in support of weekly electronic reporting and the concern that these ACL overruns really must be stopped and somehow it needs to be done through some kind of a reporting system. That is basically all the public comments that we received on this amendment.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any questions or discussion on the public comments received? I don't know if anyone has any comments on the concern from the public that this would incur additional data entry burdens on folks. I don't think we're asking people to enter more data than what they're already entering. It is really reporting on a more frequent basis, and I just want to make sure that folks understand that.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, then we move into the alternatives. The first action is dealer permits required and we will update these boxes with the new wording. What begins on Page 13, the wording that you saw at the last meeting and approved to go out to hearings; the IPT has recommended some changes, which I'll show in a minute.

The IPT also updated all the biological, economic and social and administrative impact sections. We have pulled all of that discussion here into the decision document so you have it to look over. If we scroll down to Page 19 is where you get to the first action. The IPT has recommended some wording changes.

It doesn't change the intent of the previous wording, but the wording is changed and that is outlined in Option 2 here. We do show the revised wording. We will deal with the preferreds as the next action, but the first step would be to consider accepting the IPT's recommendation for changing the wording of the Action 1 alternatives.

DR. DUVAL: Folks have had a chance to review those wording changes. **I would entertain a motion from the committee to accept the IPT recommendations for the wording of Action 1 and the alternatives.**

MS. BADEMAN: **So moved.**

DR. DUVAL: **Seconded by Charlie. Is there anymore discussion on this? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: The top of Page 21 is then where we look at the preferred alternative. Currently our preferred alternative for Action 1 was Alternative 3, Option 3B, which would set up separate South Atlantic and Gulf permits. The Gulf Council; their preferred was to establish one federal dealer permit for the Gulf and South Atlantic Regions.

Our rationale was that if we wanted to make changes in the future it would be easier if it was separate permits. The Gulf's reasoning was that this would simplify the requirements on the dealer. They'd only have to get one permit and save \$12.50 for applying for a second permit, and it would reduce the administrative burden on the permits office. They stayed with their preferred alternative and we have to resolve this difference so that the document can go forward to the secretary.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I would ask either Gregg or Roy or I think, David, you might have attended that Gulf meeting, is to maybe give some rationale as to why the Gulf thought one was better than two; one permit was better than two permits.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, largely it was burdensome particularly, for example, in South Florida where people buy from both jurisdictions and this would require two permits. We at one time had a difference between the two councils on the reporting media. I think the Gulf was going to allow fax or something like that.

The Gulf changed that and so the reporting requirements were the same, and so I think the Gulf Council didn't feel like there was a need to have two permits and that one permit would suffice and was less burdensome on folks and that's where they wound up.

DR. DUVAL: So we have to resolve this. Our rationale for moving forward with separate permits for each of the regions was so that if we wanted to make any additional changes to the requirements for reporting that we would be free to go ahead and do so without having to go and consult with the Gulf. This amendment cannot move forward unless we resolve the difference between ourselves and the Gulf Council regarding whether we do a single permit or two permits.

MR. CUPKA: Madam Chairman, I'm not a member of your committee but I think it is important that we get this place and one versus two is not that critical. I think it would give us some flexibility and I tried to point out to the Gulf it would also give them that same flexibility if they wanted to change something in the future, that it would be easier to change.

It would be more convenient for the fishermen I think to go with the Gulf option. If we can make it more convenient for the fishermen as opposed to maybe more convenient for us down the road where we may or may not need to do something, I think we ought to change our preferred to be in line so that we can go ahead and get this submitted and get it in place as soon as we can. That is just my opinion and I'm not a committee member.

MR. BADEMAN: Just to echo what David said, at the Gulf Council we ended up being supportive of the Gulf's preferred just because for that reason; it makes it a lot simpler. It makes it lot a simpler for Florida. There are a lot of dealers in Florida that would have to – I mean, they're already juggling a large number of permits now. It would be reduced to two or one, but it just makes it easier for them. We are good with the Gulf's preferred.

MR. PHILLIPS: If we go with the Gulf's preferred and there was a discussion about the sale of tournament kings; is this going to affect that?

MR. WAUGH: No, that is being dealt with in the mackerel amendments so this won't affect that. Now, we will talk in a minute about clarifying the council's intent on permitted vessels selling and that has some implications for mackerel, but we'll talk about that in a minute.

DR. DUVAL: So what is your pleasure? Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: I would like to make a motion to adopt the preferred alternative – what are we on – Action 1 to match the Gulf preferred which would be Alternative 2 and Option 2B.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Wilson. Is there any additional discussion on that motion? **The motion is to adopt the Gulf Preferred Alternative 2, Option 2B for Action 1 as our preferred alternative. If there is no other discussion, is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: Okay, the Gulf Council clarified their intent that permitted vessels can only sell to permitted dealers. This will improve data collection and help prevent ACL overages. In

snapper grouper we do that now; require permitted dealers to only buy from permitted vessels and permitted vessels only sell to permitted dealers.

This was clarified in the discussion via motion. Option 2 shown below that would bring us into compliance and clarify that is our intent as well. We've also got the situation that in the South Atlantic North Carolina fishermen can harvest and sell Atlantic Migratory Group Spanish Mackerel harvested within state waters without having a federal Spanish mackerel permit.

We want to try and plug as many reporting loopholes as possible, and so the idea here was we should clarify whether we want those individuals to sell to federally permitted dealers to ensure landings are collected and to prevent ACL overages. Now, we can't do that. We can only regulate federal waters, but what we could do is to request – and we have made requests of the states in the past with various FMPs – to request the state of North Carolina that they implement regulations or whatever they need to do to require that vessels harvesting Spanish mackerel in state waters sell to federally permitted dealers.

Now, it may not even be an issue in North Carolina because their reporting is such that they would probably pick that up already, but we need to talk about that and clarify what we want to do about that. One final item here is that in – well, two other items; so in clarifying this, then if someone had – it says federal permitted vessels.

In the Gulf and in the South Atlantic we have a coastal migratory pelagics permit for for-hire vessels. Those vessels can sell consistent with state law coastal migratory pelagic species. This would also apply to them and that didn't come out in the discussions at the Gulf Council level, so we need to clarify – and this will come up when we look at the codified text.

We need to clarify and make sure everybody understands that would be the intent here as well. And then there is a little bit of confusion about whether this requirement that this is now going to apply to for-hire vessels, whether the whole amendment would have to go back to the Gulf Council for them to clarify their intent there as well. This has a little broader implication because the Gulf has already given final approval to go to the secretary.

As we've pointed out earlier, we don't want to slow this up; but if it is going back to the Gulf Council we may want to consider changing the preferred alternative under the timing for reporting. Right now it is weekly. There is an alternative in there that would require weekly, but in the future give the Center Director authority that if several years down the road they determine that reporting needs to be more frequent, daily, that then they could implement that. We wouldn't have to do another plan amendment. This is not talking about within the seasons switching from weekly to daily, but it is changing the requirements to daily down the line.

MR. CUPKA: Not a question but a comment; I did bring up that last issue that Gregg mentioned and gave Bonnie the option to point that we wanted to make sure she was happy with that and give her the opportunity if she wanted to recommend they change that, that they do so, but I think Bonnie agreed with their current preferred was fine with her.

I don't want to put words in Bonnie's mouth, but we did bring that issue up at the Gulf Council meeting to see if the Science Center was all right with their current preferred or if they wanted to change it to weekly but with the Science Center Director being able to request more frequently if she wanted to.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, do you want to respond to that and then we will move on to other folks?

DR. PONWITH: We've had conversations at both council meetings about what seemed like a really good idea at the beginning but it turns out in looking at it more closely would be adding confusion, and that was the ability to require weekly reporting and then to be able to shift toward daily reporting when the requirement for more frequent data would tighten up those projections.

I think the universal agreement was that was going to cause more damage than harm. What Gregg just said, the notion of requiring weekly reporting now but leaving a door open so that if we want to go to consistent 100 percent daily reporting some time in the future, I am not troubled by that. We're not ready for that right now, but leaving the door open for a light switch, a binary decision this week it is weekly, from this point forward we're going to daily reporting, I think that would be fine.

MR. WAUGH: Just to clarify, that is not what this alternative does. What the alternative does – and we will get to it in a second, but it says that we're implementing weekly. In no way does it say that we're doing weekly and then as you get close to the quota you switch to daily. This is in the future if the determination is that with weekly we're still blowing our quotas and then you all decide, well, maybe we do need daily, then we don't want to have to do a whole 'nother plan amendment.

DR. PONWITH: And that I guess is exactly what I was saying. I may not have said it that way. It is like to leave the door open to go to mandatory daily reporting exclusively in the future is a smart idea.

DR. CRABTREE: But there would have to be a rulemaking to do that, so I guess you're talking about setting an alternative in here that gives NMFS the authority to undertake that rulemaking without coming back to the council.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right.

DR. DUVAL: Although presumably you would be nice enough to at least let us know that you were going to go in that direction.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, sure. I agree with Roy, there would have to be rulemaking to switch I think to give everybody notice that this is what is happening. Of course, the council would know about that rulemaking.

MR. WAUGH: And just to be clear, that alternative – I'm projecting it now, it is on Page 23 of your decision document – that was in the document that went out to public hearing. That is in the final document that the Gulf Council looked at. It's an alternative that has been in here; it

has been out for comment; it has been analyzed. But, again, we don't want to switch to that unless the document is going back to the Gulf Council.

DR. CRABTREE: But my reading on that alternative and what it meant and the way it is written is the Science Center Director could just notify dealers you now need to report daily, and that is not what we're talking about here. This isn't a determination the Science Center Director is going to be able to make. It is going to be a determination made through a regulatory process. I don't really think that is what this alternative says.

MR. WAUGH: Well, this is the same box we're in now with adjusting all our ACLs. The intent here is – and we have been around and around with this. At one point it was worded such that it would switch in season or look at small quotas, and we got that all removed. The intent here is to prevent the councils from having to do a regulatory amendment or any other document.

DR. CRABTREE: I understand that but that is not what this alternative says. This alternative says the Science Center Director can change the reporting. That is not what we're talking about. If you go down that path we won't be able to enforce it then because it won't be a regulatory requirement and NOAA General Counsel won't ever make a case off of it. What we were just talking about is that the Fisheries Service through a rulemaking can change it, and that is different than what this alternative says to me. I have never read this alternative as meaning that and maybe I'm wrong.

MR. WAUGH: Roy's interpretation of that is different than mine and where I thought we were coming from. It says the Center Director could require, and to me what that meant was if the Center determines that we need daily, then the agency would publish a notice to change it to daily. We just want to be out of the process.

We don't want to have to do a regulatory amendment. That to me didn't mean that the Center Director just figures it is daily and it is daily. It is that the Center Director would be the one to make that determination and then the agency would publish a notice or rulemaking to make it daily instead of weekly.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, does it explain that anywhere in the document and say that is what it means? The reason I bring it up is because the regulations have other places where if selected by the Science Center Director and those kinds of things, and those aren't done through rulemaking. Those are done by just notifying a dealer you're selected or you're selected to fill out a bycatch report or things. I think when you look at the way we have used this kind of language before, that hasn't really been what it has meant in other places. Now, if Monica says she is okay with it, okay, but I really think the document would need to explain what is meant by that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This is kind of confusing. What would happen if the council wanted to go with what Gregg is suggesting, which is weekly or daily? I see a lot of benefit in having this set out in an amendment now so that you don't need to go through another amendment later if it is determined it should be switched to daily.

What if you selected Preferred Option 3B and Preferred Option 3C; and you would discuss it in the document itself that at this point in time it is determined that weekly is fine; however, the council wants to give the Science Center Director the option of requiring daily reporting in the future if necessary, but then changing from weekly to daily would have to be done through a rulemaking. Does that make some sense?

DR. CRABTREE: No.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Roy says it doesn't make sense.

MR. WAUGH: I think the chairman made this statement that it is important to get this implemented. To me that is critical and if there is this level of different interpretations about what this alternative meant, then I think my recommendation would be just to stay with our preferreds and deal with it. If that determination is made in the future, we will deal with it in the future. It's not worth holding this up.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I agree with Gregg on that. I'm also not convinced that the Gulf Council would be willing to turn over that and allow the Fisheries Service to just decide we're going to daily reporting. I think there would be pushback from a lot of dealers potentially about doing something like that. I understand the willingness to not be involved in some of these decisions, but I'm not sure this is one. My preference would be just to leave it where we are.

DR. DUVAL: And this is one of the reasons why we wanted separate permits in the first place.

MR. HARTIG: Gregg, one of the important things to add to this, it says North Carolina fishermen can harvest and sell Atlantic Migratory Group Spanish Mackerel harvested within state waters without having a federal Spanish mackerel permit; that is a very common practice in Florida.

We have lots and lots of fishermen who don't have the federal permit that just fish in state waters. In fact, a lot of the catch is caught by those fishermen. Yes, one way to deal with it is going to North Carolina and asking them to do that. The other way would be to require the federal permit as a requisite to harvest Spanish mackerel. I know North Carolina is shaking their head, but actually bring Spanish mackerel into the 20th Century in management. In a stock where we've caught the quota four times in the last eight years, require a permit in the Spanish mackerel fishery I don't think is too much to ask for in our second biggest fishery that we manage.

DR. DUVAL: And just to respond to that, 70 percent of our Spanish mackerel landings are within state waters. You go explain to all the Pamlico Sound fishermen why they need to get a federal permit when they're only ever fishing in state waters. Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: I was talking with and Ben is right; we don't require the federal permit for state waters for Spanish, so we're in the same boat as you are.

DR. DUVAL: I just see going to the dealers and asking them to get the permit is probably less administratively burdensome and captures the information that the agency is looking for than requiring all the fishermen to get a permit, but that is just me. Tom.

MR. BURGESS: This was in reference to the dealer part of the North Carolina issue. Probably a lot of these – or some of the dealers could possibly have a federal permit as we have changed our preferred, but the remaining dealers; you know, requiring them to have a federal permit seems reasonable under this day and age of monitoring ACLs and the importance of it to everybody, so it doesn't seem like it is a real problem.

MR. BEAL: In one of the other ASMFC plans, the Coastal Shark FMP, if you want to buy sharks you have to have a federal permit. That's just the way it is; all dealers that want to buy sharks have to have federal permits and it is required through the ASMFC plan. It is a bit of a precedent in an ASMFC plan.

If it helps the southern states, the commission could go through the amendment process and require that if it helps. But if the states are able to do it on their own or if only North Carolina has an issue, then may be a way out of it, as Tom was saying, just require – you want to buy Spanish mackerel you need a federal dealer permit in North Carolina.

MR. BELL: Madam Chair, I'm not on your committee but I guess the answer you give folks that are questioning why they need to do this for a state fishery is that the management lead on this resides within the council and within the federal side of the house and to get the best efficient, effective management out of it, that things kind of need to flow that way.

Now, that may not make people happy, but we have found out recently – we thought we were pretty lined up where all the federal fisheries stuff fed into the fisheries management for us, but we're finding we have some little holes in our state law which kind of made that happen, and it is related to snapper grouper stuff. I won't go into that right now, but if kind of tighten it up so you don't have leaks in the system it just makes it more efficient and you account for things better, and that is the logic behind it. People may not like that; it is kind of a state versus federal mentality, I guess.

MR. CUPKA: Just an observation and I think Gregg alluded to this earlier – well, what we really need to do is go back and see what we're trying to do here. We're trying to ensure that these landings are counted. The two states where it is occurring, North Carolina and Florida, have very good trip tickets systems already in place, so they probably are being accounted for already. Now, that is not say there couldn't be some loopholes developed, but it is probably being covered if you go back to the original intent with the systems that are already in place, I think.

DR. DUVAL: I would tend to agree. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, just to be clear, if you have a North Carolina, Florida or any state dealer that just harvests fish caught in state waters, I don't think we can require those people to have a federal dealer permit, just to make sure we're all on the same page on that.

DR. DUVAL: Right, and I think that's why the option that Gregg pointed out was request the state of North Carolina require the permit, so really it ends up being up to the state. That is something I would need to go back and talk to the folks about. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Just from a state commission perspective from North Carolina, we would not be supportive of forcing our commercial guys that harvest Spanish mackerel in state waters to get a federal permit. That would not fly, but we would be supportive of asking the dealers to be federally permitted to take in those harvest and for the ACLs. It would be a tough sell.

MR. WAUGH: So what we need to do first is if we want to track this – if this is indeed your intent under Option 2 that in the generic amendment permitted vessels can only sell to permitted dealers in those fisheries where a dealer's permit exists, we need to approve that as a motion. That will bring us in line with what the Gulf Council approved. Then the second item is we deal with the state fisheries.

DR. DUVAL: So at this time I would entertain a motion from the committee to clarify that it is the council's intent that in the generic amendment for dealer permits and electronic reporting permitted vessels can only sell to permitted dealers in those fisheries where a dealer permit exists. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I have a question; what does that mean in those fisheries where a dealer permit exists? A dealer permit does not exist right now for king mackerel of Spanish mackerel.

MR. WAUGH: But it will through this amendment. This amendment will require – if they want to purchase mackerels, spiny lobster, we're adding mackerels – coastal migratory pelagics, spiny lobster and Gulf red drum to the permit requirements, so those will have permit requirements.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, I was just thinking about the wording. Maybe we can add where a dealer permit is now required or something like that. I'm not sure.

MR. WAUGH: And this is the exact wording of the motion that the Gulf Council approved. It is not a requirement now, but you want to say whenever there is a dealer permit – and the codified text from this will add the dealer permits for coastal migratory pelagics, spiny and Gulf red drum. Then it would apply there also.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, I won't ask you to change wording, but as long as we discuss it in the document.

DR. DUVAL: So, Monica, you just want to make it clear that this motion clarifies that permitted vessels can only sell to permitted dealers where we are creating the universal dealer permit through this amendment?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think we can take care of it with discussion in the document.

DR. DUVAL: That was a motion that I would entertain. We need someone to actually make that motion and second that motion, if that is what we want to do.

MR. HARTIG: And that is what you just read, the motion that is on the board?

DR. DUVAL: The motion that is on the screen; clarify that it is the council's intent that in the generic amendment for dealer permits and electronic reporting permitted vessels can only sell to permitted dealers in those fisheries where dealer permits exist. The council made this motion; so if we want to do this and reflect that, we need someone to actually make that motion.

MR. HARTIG: Do we want to do it? I'm asking staff. Yes, I think from my point of view and reading it, absolutely we want to do it. **I'll make the motion; so moved, Madam Chairman.**

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Tom Burgess. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: A couple of questions that have come up since the Gulf Council meeting; one, this would apply to a charterboat; so specifically in mackerel if you have a federally permitted charterboat that is selling its bag limit fish, he is going to have to sell to a federally permitted dealer. That is one thing. The other issue that came up were lobster tailing permits. The strict wording of this, if you have a lobster tailing permit you'd have to sell to a federally permitted dealer as well. That one never came up at the Gulf Council specifically, the tailing permit.

MR. HARTIG: Well, the tailing issue; that only occurs in federal waters if I'm not mistaken, correct, because it is a matter of –

DR. CRABTREE: It is a federal permit that we issue.

MR. HARTIG: I don't have a problem with that.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, is there any other discussion on this motion? **Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** I think the next thing that we would need to deal is asking the states, which it sounds like it is really just North Carolina and Florida that do not require permits for harvest of Spanish mackerel in state waters, to possibly look at asking their dealers to get the federal dealer permits since Monica has pointed out we cannot require state dealers to actually get a federal permit if they are only buying fish caught in state waters from state-licensed fishermen. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Have you confirmed with South Carolina and Georgia that this doesn't occur in those states as well, so you might just want to make it generic to the South Atlantic states in case that is the case.

DR. DUVAL: That is a good comment. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, we don't land Spanish mackerel in state waters without getting sold, correct, Charlie. But, I did want to ask, since I have the floor for a moment – I'm not on your committee – but there is some really flowery language in the commission's Spanish mackerel spot, the Omnibus Bill, and it talks about providing flexible management systems that coordinates management activities between state and federal waters, blah, blah, blah, blah for Spanish mackerel. So can we not sort of hand this off to the commission and let the states work through the commission process just like we did for coastal sharks to require federal permitting?

DR. DUVAL: We certainly can if the committee would like to make that in the form of a motion that we direct – I guess it would be direct council staff to work with ASMFC staff to ask that state dealers get a federal permit for Spanish mackerel from the South Atlantic, and the intent would be in order to track the landings. Bob, do you have any comment on that?

MR. BEAL: I think it is a good idea. I think this is kind of where I was going earlier. If it helps the states that something changes within the ASMFC fishery management plan, we're willing to do that, so it is up to the group. We don't want to inject ourselves and say we will require permits; but if it helps this group deal with this catch monitoring issue you're trying to wrestle with, then the commission is happy to help out.

DR. DUVAL: And would that require a plan amendment from ASMFC or would that be through an addendum?

MR. BEAL: I think it can be done through an addendum given the flexibility that was included in the Omnibus Amendment that Doug was just referring to. I think we can do it pretty quickly.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: King mackerel doesn't have a similar issue in state waters? Heads are nodding no; just for the record.

DR. DUVAL: Heads are shaking no; for the record?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: So someone actually has to make that motion. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: So moved, Madam Chair.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Dr. Laney. Is there more discussion on this motion? This will probably come before the South Atlantic – Brian has a question.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Just to mix it up for you a little bit; in Amendment 19 for the CMP you're considering adding cobia to a permit, a permit or adding to an existing permit, and I do know that there is cobia landings that occur in state waters, so you could be in the same situation with cobia that you're with Spanish mackerel.

DR. DUVAL: Yes. Yes, cobia isn't included in that. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just so I'm clear, this is just asking the ASMFC to ask state dealers to get a South Atlantic federal dealer permit?

DR. DUVAL: It would actually be the generic dealer permit when it is all said and done.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: But a federal dealer permit?

DR. DUVAL: Correct. So are we running into the same problem, is that what you're saying, by trying to go through the Atlantic States.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, I'm just asking how the Atlantic States has the authority; so it is just through the South Atlantic Board or something that they then talk about this because there isn't a management plan. They don't have a mackerel – I'm just kind of wondering how the laws work together so that this would happen, but this is just a request that you ask staff to work with them, so it is not an action that you're putting in this FMP or anything, so I'm not that concerned about it. I can ask off record with Bob how that works.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, just really quickly there is an ASMFC Spanish Mackerel Plan, and generally that plan tries to reflect the actions that are taken here in terms of Spanish mackerel management but allows for flexibility for the states to manage their state waters fisheries. There is the option of making a federal dealer permit maybe a compliance requirement, I guess. I'll let Bob address that.

MR. BEAL: That how it was handled in the Coastal Shark FMP at the commission. It is a compliance requirement that – well, if you want to purchase sharks you have to have a federal dealer permit. I think that similar wording should be discussed by the South Atlantic Board at the commission and see if that is where the states want to go.

DR. DUVAL: I didn't have very much time to think about this motion before I tried to put this together, so I'm just looking at the wording to see if that needs to be tweaked at all. Bob, is the intent clear enough in that motion that we're really asking the staffs to work together and to bring this issue before the South Atlantic Board and that what we're talking about here is being able to monitor our ACLs.

MR. BEAL: I think I'm clear based on the discussion more than the wording of that motion, but I think, yes, we will bring this forward at the October meeting to our South Atlantic Board and the states can decide what they want to do there.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, is here anymore discussion on this motion? **The motion reads direct council staff to work with ASMFC staff to ask that state dealers get a federal permit for Spanish mackerel from the South Atlantic. Any other discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** There is no ASMFC Cobia Plan, but there is an issue with cobia.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, the next item we need to clarify here came about in terms of discussing when this amendment would likely be implemented and also the issue of when these permits

would renew. Our intent was to get this implemented as close to January 1, 2013, as was possible.

In discussing this on an IPT call, they're looking to have the regulations in place in March and then four months after that for the permits group to get I guess all the paperwork sorted out and the requirements there. Dealer permits currently renew on the birth date of the permit holder, and so this would push us into 2014 – before the start of 2014 and maybe even 2015 before you had a hundred percent of the dealers under this new requirement with the new permit.

The question is how does the council want to indicate your intent on how you want the permit renewal issue to be dealt with? It certainly carries some administrative requirements. If it was to be an annual permit, then perhaps some additional temporary staff would have to be hired in order to process those permits. We just need to clarify so that it goes into the regulations what the council's intent is on how we handle these permit renewals.

DR. CRABTREE: I would be reluctant to weigh into this too much because my fear would be we will do something that won't work that is going to create problems. There isn't going to be anymore temporary staff. We don't have any funds to hire anymore people in permits. If we create real rush of permitting, it is just going to result in a backlog, which then we'll all hear complaints about.

I haven't looked into this in great detail so I don't feel comfortable advising you one way or another on what the consequences of this are. I think you can indicate your desire and I think we all understand that is to get this done as quickly as we can, but I would be reluctant to get into the weeds of how the permit shop should handle this.

DR. DUVAL: Well, we did have a brief discussion about at this our last meeting, and I think Carolyn –

DR. CRABTREE: I think we did.

DR. DUVAL: – came before us and sort of laid out their thoughts on how the renewal process would come about, and that is pretty much what Gregg summarized. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think it is to everyone's benefit to have this implemented as quickly as possible, so maybe administratively NMFS could. We can discuss it. I know Carolyn wants this implemented in a certain way and she has got great reasons for it, I'm sure, as she does for everything she puts forward, but even before full council we could discuss this further and see if there is any way to get this implemented any more quickly.

I would agree with Roy and you leave this up to the Fisheries Service to implement as quickly as possible, but I would urge the council to say that means we want it done if there is any way possible to get this done more quickly than a year from now or whatever it is. I would urge that you make your intent clear.

DR. CRABTREE: But I think on all of these things, yes, we want them done as quickly as possible, but we still want them done right; and to get things done a couple of months quicker but create all kinds of problems that are going to persist with us, I don't think we want to do that. So, quickly, yes, but done right.

MR. HARTIG: Well, the quickly thing, if you're going to renewal on the birth date, that is going to take a full year of implementation. That is a long time. If you can somehow do it a one-time deal the first time where everybody had to get their dealer permits on a date – you know, had to qualify within a certain timeframe and they would be issued within a certain timeframe as well, then you went back to the birth dates after that; could that possibly work? That would help the whole situation move along at least a year quicker, at least.

DR. CRABTREE: The one thing I have learned about permits, that it is way more complicated than you think. We can ask Jack to check in or Monica to check with Carolyn and come back at full council, but I wouldn't feel comfortable about advising you on the weeds of permitting.

DR. DUVAL: I was actually trying to find the handout from the last meeting that Carolyn had given to us that sort of outlined her plan for staging, I guess, moving to the new universal permit, but I thought in there was something that the new requirements would apply in terms of the frequency of reporting, but it is just that the actual migration to the universal permit itself would be accomplished in a staged fashion. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: All we can do is call Carolyn and find out. We can even arrange for Carolyn to be on the phone when we come to full council probably, but I don't recall the specifics of it.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so perhaps the motion from the committee to clarify that our intent is that the new reporting requirements be implemented as soon as possible; and by that we mean for the 2013 fishing year. Gregg, do you think that is sufficient to clarify our intent that we'd like to see these weekly reporting requirements implemented sooner rather than later?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, I think that makes the intent clear.

DR. DUVAL: Like I said, I'd entertain that motion.

MR. HARTIG: So moved, Madam Chairman.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Charlie. Is there anymore discussion on this? I think maybe perhaps in the interim, before full council, Roy, you might be able to touch base with Carolyn, or Monica, and get her thoughts on this. Is there anymore discussion on this motion? **The motion is clarify the council's intent that the new reporting requirements be implemented as soon as possible (for the 2013 fishing year). Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: Okay, next is Action 2, which is the frequency of reporting. We've had discussion about this. The two councils are in agreement with the preferred. Over on Page 32

we have got – we already had the discussion. We were going to talk about potentially changing our preferred. We talked about that and you decided not to.

The Gulf Council in the wording of Preferred Alternative 5, they added this last sentence that the Regional Administrator has the authority to waive or modify reporting time requirements. That is the only change to it. It is also just to make absolutely clear that any of these preferred alternatives includes the requirement that dealers reporting purchases of king mackerel landed by the gill net sector for the Gulf West Coast Florida, Southern Subzone must submit forms daily by 6:00 a.m. That's a current requirement that they report daily. It is because the quota is relatively small, catches are very high and you need to have that daily reporting in order to make sure that we don't exceed it. That stays in place.

DR. DUVAL: So we would require a motion from the committee to accept the Gulf Council's additional wording in Preferred Alternative 5.

MR. BURGESS: So moved.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Tom Burgess; seconded by Ben Hartig. Is there any discussion of this? If there is no more discussion, is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

MR. WAUGH: The next item is Action 3, requirements to maintain a dealer permit; the HMS final rule was published. We were patterning Alternative 2 after this. We went out to public hearing with no preferred alternatives. Over on Page 37 we show that the Gulf Council picked Alternative 2 as preferred. They removed the wording "by the dealer" from the last sentence.

In addition to making it their preferred, they modified by removing "by the dealer" so the wording that the Gulf Council approved is shown in Option 2. That is that no purchase forms must be submitted at the same frequency via the same process 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 NOAA Fisheries in a timely manner. Any delinquent reports would need to be submitted and received by NOAA Fisheries before a dealer could receive commercially harvested species from a federally permitted U.S. vessel.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg, would you like two separate motions; one for the recommended wording change and then one for the preferred alternative or do you want that all combined in one motion?

MR. WAUGH: It could be one; however you want to do it.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, I would entertain a motion from the committee to accept the IPT's recommended change to the wording of Action 3, Alternative 2, and to accept Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative for Action 3.

MR. HARTIG: So moved.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Ben; seconded by Tom Burgess. Discussion? If there is no discussion, is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I understand that the Fisheries Service has the ability to accept no purchase reports from dealers for up to 90 days. What I mean by that is if a dealer knows that the dealer is going to be shut down or for some reason isn't going to be buying fish for a certain amount of time, the Fisheries Service has the ability to accept those no purchase reports for up to 90 days, so I would assume that would be fine with you.

Right in here the amendment actually says they would have to submit those no-purchase forms weekly, but to me they could submit them in advance for a certain period of time if they knew they weren't going to be in business for that period of time. If the council is fine with that, then we could just put that in the discussion of the document. Maybe I could hear some discussion on that.

DR. DUVAL: So perhaps just a little bit of dialogue from the committee regarding the existing allowances for a dealer to submit no-purchase forms, which extend for up to 90 days. Gregg, I don't know if you want to add something to that.

MR. WAUGH: Thanks, Monica, for catching that. This is going back to Action 2, which is the timing. Your preferred alternative is that the forms be submitted weekly. The question comes – and this will be shown in the regulations – right now allowing them to submit up to 90 days when they're not going to be operating is what is being done, but we don't want to necessarily put that 90-day requirement in the amendment in case it needs to be changed.

What I think we need to do is just make sure that it is clarified that your intent that they report weekly, that if someone is going to be closed for an extended period of time – and right now it is up to 90 days – that they could sit at the computer and just put in multiple reports for multiple weeks and do that at one time and not have to, while they're closed or on vacation or somewhere, have someone send in a report each week. To me I think by saying weekly, that encompasses that intent, but we just want to be clear it is discussed in the document and you all are okay with that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And I agree with Gregg's interpretation. It also, though, says in Action 3, Alternative 2, the sentence is no-purchase forms must be submitted at the same frequency via the same process, so I wasn't sure where to bring it up. I agree with Gregg that we shouldn't tie it to 90 days. That is probably a good idea, but just discuss in the document what Gregg said.

MR. BURGESS: I just had a question at the beginning of the decision document about proposed data elements; as I was looking at that Table 1.3.3.1, it says VTR number from vessel logbook

form; now is this in addition to what is already required that the dealer has to submit? It is a question about coordinating between fishermen and dealer in a timely manner.

MR. WAUGH: So, Tom, your question is, is that currently required now or is that a new data element; is that your question?

MR. BURGESS: Yes, it is because I've never been asked by my dealer to give that information. After I saw this, I went to my logbook and saw it on there and there was a specific number associated with each day of fishing. I was wondering about it is an addition I think and it could cause – I mean, I support it because we need to get this verification. It's just it is going to be a little bit of a job.

DR. DUVAL: I guess probably – and I'm thinking about North Carolina and Florida – I actually would need to go back and check with folks. If it is a change, then we would need to work with Bluefin to add that as a data element in the electronic reporting software. I don't think that would be too big of a deal. I think the more advanced notice that we get the better to do something like that, but I think that is the question that we would need to ask.

MR. HARTIG: What does the acronym stand for; VTR?

DR. DUVAL: Vessel trip report.

MR. WAUGH: And during the last IPT call we had, I think Dave Gloeckner mentioned some other changes that needed to be worked on with states in the Gulf similar to this; not this specific data element, but they were also – he was working with states to have their software modified in order to come into compliance with this. We will follow up and make sure that they're aware of that as well.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for bringing that up, Tom. I think maybe we're ready for the codified text now, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm not sure when to bring this up so I will bring it up now. Gregg, at least for coastal migratory pelagics the council for, right, Atlantic kings, anyway, the Mid-Atlantic and the New England Councils – I think it is New England, but definitely Mid-Atlantic, so it is Mid-Atlantic has some play in the FMP and they consult and they do other things. Have you taken this amendment up to them for their review or at least for the mackerel portion?

MR. WAUGH: Not specifically. We have consulted with them and they have sent representatives to our meeting. They have up to two seats on our Mackerel Committee. They have had the opportunity. At times Red Munden has represented them and offered some input, but they don't have voting authority for mackerel or snapper grouper. They also have a seat on the Snapper Grouper Committee. The South Atlantic Council has the lead for that as well as for dolphin and wahoo that goes all the way up.

The codified text; the revision was e-mailed. There is a version that was in your second briefing book, but also some changes have been made since the Gulf Council took action. There are

several questions that we just wanted to make sure and raise with you as we walk through that. Anne Marie is here. If she has any additional input or questions, feel free to jump in.

This is where Gulf reef fish harvested in or from the EEZ or adjoining state waters by a vessel that has a valid commercial vessel permit for Gulf reef fish; does the council want to require that all fish harvested on board a vessel with a federal vessel permit, even non-council-managed fish be sold to a federally permitted dealer or only council-managed fish for ACL monitoring.

I guess, too, there is some question with several of these issues that have been raised whether this amendment and the codified text need to go back to the Gulf Council or whether this will be handled similar to what we do. The Gulf Council approved the amendment and deemed the codified text. They also gave their chairman – as we normally do and will consider for this, giving our chairman the authority to approve any modifications, editorial changes and clarifications to the amendment and the codified text. I guess that is the first question to clarify here. This is tagged for Gulf reef fish. I imagine the same question probably comes up later for South Atlantic.

DR. CRABTREE: Have they identified any reason why we would want to do that; why we want to require non-council-managed species be sold only to them?

DR. DUVAL: I was a little confused by that, too.

MR. WAUGH: I guess these questions – are these questions coming from the IPT or from NOAA GC and regulation writers as they put this together?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Not necessarily from NOAA GC. To answer your question, they're coming from the regulation writers because as they write the regulations that is where the rubber meets the road, so to speak, so they're trying to come up with regulation text that carries forth what you want as a council.

Anique Clements I think is the one who brought this issue up, which some of these questions have spawned me to ask attorneys back at the office, which I'm doing as quickly as I can, during this meeting do we even have the authority to require this and what are those kinds of jurisdictional issues and answers to those questions.

I guess to the extent that, one, I'm not sure whether you have the jurisdiction to do it; but let's assume you did, would you want this kind of thing collected and what would be the rationale. That would be great to develop on the record if you can.

MR. WAUGH: And just to ask a question here that might address this; so a dealer, they have to send in weekly reports when this comes online, and they also have state reporting requirements. I would imagine what the dealer is going to do is say here are all my species that I've caught this week and send to satisfy this requirement and the state reporting requirement.

I'm just thinking isn't that how it is going to work in the real world? It was never my understanding that we were asking the dealers to do additional duplicative reporting above the

state. What we're trying to do is speed up the reporting and we are requiring those dealers – we're focusing in on the ACL species; but I'm just thinking from a dealer standpoint, he is going to hit one send button and satisfy the NMFS requirements under this, and then that also would go to the state to satisfy the state reporting requirements, I would think.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I think most of the states have the same frequency of required reporting at the state level where it is once a month and it is the tenth of the month following the month in which the landings were made. I know for our dealers that are reporting electronically for the state system, there is one button to report weekly to the northeast region, there is one button to report every two weeks to the southeast region and there is one button to report their landings to us, which they do once a month.

I guess when I read the question in here it seems like – you know, it makes me really leery to hear about requiring that non-council-managed fish be sold to a federally permitted dealer. That seems like overstepping one's bounds to me.

MS. EICH: The dealer is required to report all fish, and so it is only if they are a federally permitted vessel that they would have to sell their fish to a federally permitted dealer. Does that make sense?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, but only for those species that are managed federally.

MS. EICH: I think that is our question; do we want all the fish to have to be sold to a federally permitted dealer if they are a federally permitted vessel?

DR. DUVAL: I've gone too long without food to think very rationally about this. What if we were to break for lunch and then come back? I need to confer with the chairman about this before we consider that. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Just a question about I think Gregg said this version was e-mailed to us; is that right?

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

MR. HAYMANS: And as a non-committee member, I would say the answer is no.

DR. DUVAL: That is what I'm thinking as well. Anique.

MS. EICH: We're just asking for clarification.

DR. DUVAL: Just looking around the table, it doesn't sound like any of the states are interested in this at all. I personally think it is overstepping bounds. We still need to go through this codified text, we need to approve that and then we also need to approve the amendment for final review and give the chairman editorial license to make additional changes.

We can either break for lunch and have a little bit of time to discuss this and come back in an hour, but I'm going to defer to the chairman and see what he wants to do. We have a lot of issues to cover under mackerel, and I'm getting a little scared of some of the things we have deferred to discuss at full council.

MR. CUPKA: Well, not only do you have a lot of things to look at under mackerel; you've got another amendment under data collection that you haven't gone through yet either. I would prefer that we break for an hour because we do still have a lot to go through and we're behind schedule. We'll break now and come back at 1:00 o'clock.

MR. HARTIG: Is the intent of the chairman to take care of the dealer amendment first and then go on to mackerel?

MR. CUPKA: Well, we've got another amendment after the dealer amendment. You've still got CE-BA 3 we haven't even got to yet.

DR. DUVAL: That is why I'm thinking if we can break for lunch, come back at 1:00 o'clock, finish up the dealer amendment and I can converse with David and see what he would like to do in terms of going through CE-BA 3, when we might want to do that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And food for thought; quick question and maybe I would ask Ben, when you come in with your vessel and you go to a dealer; do you go to different dealers for different fish or do you pretty much offload and sell all your catch, for the most part, to the dealer you first go to?

The reason I'm asking is because maybe this information would be captured anyway even if the council doesn't – like I said, I don't know whether legally we can require it anyway, but maybe it is not much of an issue if the fisherman only goes to one dealer anyway, and the dealer is most likely to report all this information anyway.

MR. HARTIG: Quite often we go to different dealers, but those dealers would be federally permitted because we're selling snapper grouper species to those dealers. It is not like I go and sell my state fish to a state dealer and my federal fish to a federal dealer. Yes, they go to the same dealers, but those dealers would be federally – they would be permitted now under snapper grouper.

MS. BADEMAN: I don't know if that is always the case, though.

MR. HARTIG: It is not always the case and Martha makes a point.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, let's go ahead and recess for lunch and we will come back at 1:00 o'clock and finish up this amendment.

The Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina,

Wednesday afternoon, September 12, 2012, and was called to order at 1:00 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I would like to go ahead and possibly get started. Before we left for lunch, we were considering the codified text for the Generic Dealer Reporting Amendment. The question at hand from the folks writing the regulations was does the council want to require that all fish harvested on board a vessel with a federal vessel permit, even non-council-managed fish be sold to a federally permitted dealer or only council-managed fish for ACL monitoring.

I was not seeing much support for this for the states around the table. I know that North Carolina does not support that at this time. I know that things are a little bit different in the northeast whereby the northeast permitted dealers are basically required to report harvest of any fish up to the northeast region whether or not that fish is federally managed.

I guess just a couple of points I'll make and I think Monica has a few things to say to this. To me we didn't take this amendment out to the public with that intent in mind that there would be required reporting of even non-federally managed species. Personally I think at this point I would say, no, that is not our intent; dealers only report on the federally managed species.

I think another concern that I would have is that especially coming from a state where you have a lot of non-federally permitted dealers, that you would be really forcing commerce towards only the federally permitted dealers, and I have some concerns with that. Monica, I don't know if you want to add some of your intelligence.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm not sure I have intelligence to add at this point, but you raise a good point. I don't know that this was discussed in the amendment at all or brought out to the public for comment. On the one hand I understand that if you require this information it is very beneficial in terms of your future analysis for social and economic reasons and many things like that.

On the other hand this wasn't analyzed in the amendment in terms of the impacts on any of the fishermen and that sort of thing, so, yes, I think it is up to you to decide what to do. I would have a little bit of a heartburn over the fact that we haven't analyzed this. However, the Fisheries Service, if you were to say, no, we really think this is a good idea and here are the reasons why we want it, I'm sure that we would get a number of public comments on it during the rule-making process and on the amendment itself, so you would get some public comment on it at that point. You just wouldn't have it before you to make a decision.

DR. DUVAL: I guess my concern is just that we would have waited until the rule-making stage to bring that piece into it, and that point most members of the public are not anticipating that there are going to be what they might perceive to be significant changes and what the amendment is requiring. That is the concern that I would have, but I would ask for some input from the committee. Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: Yes, I share concerns about adding this in. It happens all the time I think in Florida where you might be harvesting a federally permitted species and you're going to a

federal dealer for that, but then you might have a state-regulated species that you need to take o another dealer like marine life and lobster on the same trip. I'm sure it happens all the time and I just don't see the necessity of doing this. I think it is going to cause more problems that it is worth.

DR. DUVAL: I would agree. Other comments? I guess my question to staff is do we need a motion from the committee to clarify that it is not our intent to do this?

MR. WAUGH: I think given that these are questions that have been raised, if we just provide an answer and I'll put them right in the discussion box, the comment box, I think that will be okay. If there is some disagreement, then we should make sure we've got a clear motion, but I think just answering the questions in here would be sufficient.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And I'm okay with that, but it seems to me that this particular comment box, if you look at the regulations that she is commenting on that are highlighted in pink, I would think, though, you would want a federally permitted fisherman to report his council-managed caught species in state waters to the dealer. For example, if you have a snapper grouper vessel permit holder who harvests snapper grouper in federal waters and who harvest snapper grouper in state waters you want him to report all that snapper grouper and sell it to the federal dealer. Is that accurate?

DR. DUVAL: I believe that is correct. Does anyone around the committee have any question about that? For snapper grouper we require that sale from federally permitted vessel to federally permitted dealer currently.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, that is correct. I was using that as just an example. What we were talking before is fish caught in federal waters that weren't managed by the council, and I clear on that.

I agree with what Gregg says on how to respond. But what I'm talking about now is fish that are managed under your FMPs but that also exist in state waters and that are caught in state waters by that federally permitted fisherman; you want those state water harvested fish – snapper grouper is clear; we already say on the books. But, for example, mackerel, you want those king mackerel caught in state waters, if there are any, to be sold to that federally permitted dealer by the federally permitted vessel holder; do you see what I'm saying.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and to me that would just be consistency between what we're doing for snapper grouper and for these other species, recognizing that you're going to have some vessels whereby – the example being Spanish mackerel that we used earlier where those vessels are not in state waters are required to have a federal permit but they're not – because they don't have a federal permit and they're not required to have that federal permit, they're required to sell their state waters catch to, at this point, a federally permitted dealer.

But, if you do have a fishermen – and I'll just use the example I know in North Carolina there are some shrimpers who have federal permits for Spanish mackerel; you would require those federally permitted vessels to sell their Spanish mackerel to federally permitted dealers.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, I'm clear, thank you.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I'm asking that is just what you're clarifying?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think so.

MR. BELL: I keep thinking about the – and I'm not on this committee – there is a federal shrimp trawl permit, right, so a very, very limited amount of our shrimp harvest comes from federal waters, but some of our trawlers, if they go in federal waters at all they're supposed to have that permit, but there is no such thing as a federal shrimp dealer permit, right?

DR. DUVAL: Right, there is not a federal shrimp dealer permit and that was one of the species that we specifically excluded from this amendment because it would just mushroom, and the shrimp are landed by such an incredible amount of dealers. Roy, I don't know if you want to add to that a little bit.

DR. CRABTREE: There are lots of dealers plus they're exempted from the ACL requirements, by and large, so we're not tracking that.

DR. DUVAL: And the whole intent behind this is to allow for improved tracking of ACLs.

DR. LANEY: I just wanted to be clear. The Gulf is asking for this because they felt like they weren't capturing all of the Gulf reef fish landings, right, so that is why they put this in?

DR. DUVAL: I'm going to leave that to Monica to address. It is my understanding that the Gulf isn't asking for anything.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's right; the Gulf isn't asking anything, Wilson. These comments were developed by a person back at the regional office who was trying to write the regulations and interpret what the council had in the amendment. I think from the additional comment box is, if Gregg looks at them real quick, we may have addressed all of those comments. They primarily deal with requiring for-hire vessels, federally permitted for-hire vessels to see their catch and then also the spiny lobster tailing permit issue, which Roy already brought up and the council already responded to Roy's question.

DR. LANEY: I understood that, Monica, I think that the question came from the regulation writers, but I was just asking about the provision itself. The Gulf was asking for that provision because they wanted to try and capture all their reef fish landings or they felt like they weren't capturing them unless those were received by a dealer who had a valid Gulf and South Atlantic dealer permit; is that the reason the provision is in there in the first place?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I think that requirement for Gulf reef fish already exists, so I don't think the Gulf is asking any questions.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, just for clarification; so we take this out and pass it so it has got to go back to the Gulf since it is a different document?

DR. DUVAL: Roy was just explaining we're just answering some questions that the folks who were writing the regulations to try to do what we want to do in this amendment had, so there are no changes would that need to be reviewed by the Gulf Council then.

MR. WAUGH: Right, so we're finished that one. The next one deals with the headboats and we answered that one already because if they have a coastal migratory pelagics permit, then, yes, they would be included. The third one, spiny lobster, we talked about this, but the federal permit is the federal tailing permit.

So those individuals that have a federal tailing permit we have included, but not all the others in Comment 4 gets into broader – include the regulation for other spiny lobsters; those were the federal commercial permit to federally permitted dealers, and it talks about only 10 percent of the fishermen having the federal permit.

The only federal spiny lobster permit is the tailing permit, and we have indicated that, yes, we want those included, and, yes, we want those selling to a federally permitted dealer. That gets into the tailing permit.

MS. BROUWER: I thought there was a federal permit as well for lobster, but you're not required to –

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I don't know that anyone has one. Everybody is operating under the state permits; but if someone did have one, they'd have to sell to a federally permitted dealer.

MR. WAUGH: That is all of them so we've answered the questions and you all have been through the codified text in the rule and that brings us back to the last – so the last item in the Joint Dealer Amendment Decision Document is to approve the Modified Joint Dealer Amendment based on the actions that you had before for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate' giving staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text; and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions and redeem the codified text. We just have a note in here that the same thing has been done by the Gulf so the council chairs will be reviewing and deeming.

DR. DUVAL: I would entertain a motion from the committee to accept Option 1 and approve the Modified the Modified Joint Dealer Amendment for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate; and also give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text; and give the council chair authority to approve the revisions and redeem the codified text. Charlie makes that motion; seconded by Tom Burgess. Is there anymore discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Doug, you look like you might have a question. I know you're not on the committee but questions are welcome.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I thought this was a full council motion and not for the committee, but I'm just trying to understand it.

DR. DUVAL: I think the committee has to do that first and then the council then –

MR. HAYMANS: We recommend to the full council and then they do this wording, right?

DR. DUVAL: David, would you like to clear this up for us?

MR. CUPKA: Actually what this committee does is recommend to the full council that it be approved for submittal and then we take a voice vote on the thing.

DR. DUVAL: And that the way it is with all of our committee motions.

MR. WAUGH: And, Doug, the problem comes in that if the committee was to word this motion – and it happened with the Gulf and it has happened with us before – if the committee makes a motion that we recommend to the council that they approve the modified amendment, then when it gets to the council and the council goes to approve that, the wording doesn't make sense because you've in the wording of the motion that we recommend the council approve.

All the committee motions are recommendations that the council has to act on. We're trying to get away from putting in that wording "recommend to the council" because then when it gets to the council you have to remove that wording.

DR. DUVAL: **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** The next item on our agenda is CE-BA 3, so I'm going to ask, Gregg, are we going to follow a similar process whereby we will go through the decision document and Brian will go over the public comments for each of those?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and here we have them split out a little more according to the individual actions. This is Attachment 4B, and again what we did here was various IPT members had suggestions for beefing up some of the analysis in CE-BA 3 and we've done that. All the biological, economic, social and administrative impacts are included in here as well.

We will walk right through and the first change is on the bottom of Page 2; the IPT is recommending revised language for the purpose and needs statement. What we have tried to do is include in our purpose and need and the summary to try to get away from a lot of acronyms so that the public can understand what we're saying.

Option 2 would be the IPT wording for the purpose and need. Option 3 would be the IPT's wording but just keeping in annual catch limit to make sure that it is clear that we're referring to ensuring that the annual catch limit is not exceeded.

DR. DUVAL: I know we always get a lot of complaints at least in North Carolina when we don't spell out all the alphabet soup of acronyms that we tend to use when we're talking about

these things. I would entertain a motion from the committee with regard to which option you would prefer regarding the wording of the purpose and need. Option 1 is no change.

Option 2 is the IPT wording. The only difference between Option 2 and Option 3, as Gregg pointed out, is that you're just spelling out those acronyms so that it is absolutely clear. Also in Option 3 you're actually including the phrase "annual catch limit" so that it reads "to help ensure annual catch limit overages" instead of just overages do not occur. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I think I would make the motion that we use Option 2.

DR. DUVAL: Was that Option 2 or Option 3?

MR. PHILLIPS: Two.

DR. DUVAL: There is a motion by Charlie to accept Option 2 as the preferred wording. This does not include reference to "annual catch limits".

MR. PHILLIPS: I think everybody understands ACLs as much as we've talked about them for the last couple of years. Some of the other acronyms maybe not so much, but ACLs, yes.

DR. DUVAL: So it just refers to overages, to help ensure overages do not occur in the South Atlantic fisheries.

MR. PHILLIPS: I stand corrected; it is not in there. Maybe we do need to go to Option 3. I would change my motion to Option 3, then.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so Charlie's motion is to accept Option 3 for the purpose and need. Second by John Jolley. Is there anymore discussion on this? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

MR. WAUGH: And we need to clarify how this deals with spiny lobster and shrimp. This is a question that has arisen; how does this amendment address these two fisheries? The annual catch limit for spiny lobster is being tracked using the Florida trip ticket system, and there is no annual catch limit for shrimp.

When we get to Action 3 is where we would want to talk about whether or not shrimp and spiny lobster are included in that action. When we get there we can discuss this more, but bycatch in the spiny lobster fishery has been studied and is not an issue. Bycatch in the shrimp fishery has been studied and given the large number of trips, the cost for observers would be high.

Thus far these two species have not been included in these actions and to include them now may trigger a need for additional public hearings. Including them would also increase the cost of the alternatives that include observers given the high number of trips in those two fisheries. We will come back to that when we get to Action 3 unless you want to consider including them in these other actions, but we're using the Florida trip ticket. Florida is tracking the landings; and if the

landings exceed the ACL, then it comes back to us and we will look at it. And shrimp, there is no ACL.

DR. DUVAL: Does everybody understand that? We can address whether or not we want to include other species in Action 3, but it sounds like there is not likely to necessarily be a need at least certainly for spiny lobster right now. The cost of the shrimp fishery observers being what it is, as Gregg noted any change to what we've already gone out to public hearing with might trigger having to go to another round of public hearings. Let's go ahead and move on to Action 1.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, Action 1 starts on Page 6. We've got the IPT has recommended that we change the language of the action to state "amend the snapper grouper, dolphin and wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics resources fishery management plans to modify data reporting for charter and headboat vessels."

Also, to remove "require that charter and headboat vessels" from Alternative 2 and 4 and replace with "require that vessels" and adding some subalternatives. We present there what is currently in place for charter and headboats. As I mentioned, we analyzed the impacts there and that analysis has been expanded. Brian will cover the public hearing input and then we'll get into the actual wording.

DR. CHEUVRONT: There were four comments total that we received at the South Atlantic public hearings. In general they were favorable for the council moving forward with electronic reporting for charter and for-hire vessels, citing the need for better data from these sectors and improvements on how the data were obtained.

A couple of comments received specifically supporting Alternative 2 that would require daily electronic reporting, but also there were comments that supported Alternative 3 that would require weekly electronic reporting. There was an additional comment received that recommended the council define a detailed methodology for the overarching data collection and analysis system and an independent review of the data system.

MR. WAUGH: So then moving into the IPT's wording, and here again it reflects Option 2 would be accept the wording. It is the revised wording of the action itself indicating which plans are being amended, and then splitting out the subalternatives. Part of the reason for doing this – and when we get to talking about a preferred, Bonnie may want to weigh in on this because some of the discussion at the Gulf Council meeting was that the Center is more ready to implement these changes on the headboat sector but not charter.

When we get to talking about picking preferreds, that is when you can indicate whether you want to try and do it for both or just the headboat. But right now we're considering accepting the IPT'S wording which would restructure it and basically putting these alternatives subalternatives so that it is charter and headboat as subalternatives.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm not on your committee but just for clarification sake, in the document under the public hearing input it is actually backwards. The Alternative 2 supports weekly and Alternative 3 supports daily.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you; that is my bad.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, the decision before the committee is whether or not you want to accept the IPT recommendations for Action 1 and the alternatives. **I would entertain a motion to accept Option 2, which would be to accept the IPT wording for Action 1.**

MR. HARTIG: So moved.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Ben; second by Charlie. Discussion? I think Gregg pretty much laid out the rationale for reworking those sub-options in order to completely separate out the charterboats from the headboats. Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, next in terms of picking a preferred alternative, we went out to public hearing without a preferred. We need to pick a preferred obviously to finalize this. We would be using the new wording that you just approved. If you pattern it similar to – well, we're looking at weekly reporting from the dealers. You need to talk about how you want to handle it here, and perhaps this would be a good time to hear from Bonnie about charter versus headboat.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, do you have some comments for us?

DR. PONWITH: I do, indeed. As you know, we conducted a headboat pilot last year looking at the feasibility of electronic reporting. The outcome from that was quite strong and quite good to the point where we sought funding to help us implement this fleet-wide both in the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico.

Not only are we pushing doing that, we have found the resources to make that conversion and we're ready to do that. We're eager for the councils' blessing to go ahead and go forward with making that mandatory requirement, the electronic reporting and then also the periodicity. We would be looking for weekly reporting. As you know, the distinction is that the headboat estimates are done by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center through the headboat program.

The charterboat estimates are done through the MRIP Program, and it is a combination of acquiring effort data via the telephone calls and requiring landings data via dockside intercepts and putting those together to have the catch-per-unit effort to generate an estimate of what the total landings were.

We have a strong interest in the Gulf of Mexico to move toward electronic reporting in lieu of a sampling program where you sample a subset of the enterprise and use what you see in that sample to estimate what is happening in the rest of the fleet. We did a pilot study looking at electronic reporting in a subset of the charter for-hire fleet in the Gulf of Mexico, and that study went on for a year. The report was written and it will be released this fall.

It is being briefed to the Gulf Council in the October meeting and I believe there was a request to brief it to the South Atlantic Council – I will have to double check that – at the December meeting. Without having seen the final report, the outcome based on the sort of the interim briefings we got was that the reporting rates were quite low.

They were well below what we would need to consider those reports a census. The notion is not only to change to electronic reporting but use that electronic reporting as a census of what is happening in the fleet rather than doing an estimate. If you have a census, the census is basically the whole enchilada.

You have your answer of what has been caught and you're not held captive to waiting for the data to arrive and running an estimate of what was caught and expanding it for the part of fleet you didn't sample. My expectation is we are not ready for that within MRIP. The catch is with the headboat, the council wants electronic reporting. If they want it, they can work with us; we want it. It is an easy thing to do.

If the council is interested in speeding up the charter for-hire reporting via electronic reporting, a third party has to be invited into the conversation and that is the MRIP Program because MRIP owns the protocols for how estimates for the charter fleet are made. My concern is that putting something in here without consulting MRIP may end up in the result where we have a regulation where we have a data source but nobody there with the catcher's mitt ready to catch those data.

You might say, well, then, why don't you have the Southeast Fisheries Science Center take over and do this? The catch is I don't have – MRIP, because they run the program has the money to run the program and so I don't have money to do either a census or an estimate for the charter fleet. Again, it would have to be negotiated.

Now, that said, if there is a way to word this so that it created an open door for us to move to electronic reporting in the charter fleet, once those conversations have been had, then I would be all for it. The thing that I don't want to do is create a regulation that requires them to report electronically because there is no receptacle for those data and currently no use for those data right now because of the way the protocols exist. You would have to change the protocols before those data would have utility. I guess I'll stop there and see if there are questions.

MR. HAYMANS: We did receive a preliminary report on this in the June meeting and it was dismal, but I don't remember how the lack of a regulatory requirement affected the non-reporting. I don't remember the discussion of that; because if we require it, it should change those results.

DR. PONWITH: There is in the regulations right now a statement saying that the Science Center Director has the ability to require the reporting. We sent selection letters to – randomly selected; it wasn't voluntary. Because a volunteer system doesn't reflect reality, we wanted it to be mandatory. We sent selection letters to a subset of charter vessels in two different regions.

It was in Texas, the Port Aransas Area and the Panhandle of Florida. It said, "You are required to report this frequently and report electronically. Here are the training sessions to train you up on this." Then we used that to evaluate how effective they were in reporting in a way that was timely and according to the correct protocols.

The bottom line is we subsidized that system by spending a great deal of time on the phone when they were late; saying, you know, you're late; you really have to get this report in; can we help you; is there some stumbling block? The reporting rates in the Panhandle were still extremely low. There were better in Texas.

The point there was not just does electronic reporting work; it was does it work well enough and is compliance high enough that we can shift to a census? My take is that based on those preliminary results as we envisioned it in that pilot study was, no, they're not ready to go to a census.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Bonnie, I did not remember that. But additionally, then, if we did require it; how is the charter reporting any different than mandatory dealer reporting or mandatory commercial permits? I mean, it is just another reporter. Why wouldn't the system be set up to accept those weekly reports.?

DR. PONWITH: Because commercial; they're keeping track of those landings. Those landings are basically a hundred percent of the catch; or at least when we have all dealers permitted and all permitted dealers reporting, you have a hundred percent of the catch. Right now the way MRIP is set up for the charter fleet is they do a call in for a subset of them to get effort and they do dockside intercepts to get the catch, and they use that to estimate. They don't have a hundred percent sample.

MR. WAUGH: In terms of evaluating choosing charter versus headboat or both, right now we get the charterboat estimates within MRFSS, so we have those. Those are available for quota monitoring. The problem is headboat because you remember from Bonnie's presentation we're in September and we have no numbers for headboats, so that is the one where we have to focus. We really need to plug that gap and the charterboat can be looked at down the road when NMFS is ready. At least we have that being covered now.

DR. DUVAL: Before I go to Steve, I think, Doug, maybe one of your points that I think I was going to mention was that even though in the pilot study it was required, people were selected. There was no consequence for not participating or reporting, correct, or no penalty?

DR. PONWITH: Well, my understanding is that because it is on the books that the regulations say they must report according to the direction from the Science and Research Director, that by not reporting they could have been subject to some sort of enforcement action.

MR. AMICK: Bonnie, I was just curious how many charterboats were involved in the pilot study in the Gulf?

DR. PONWITH: I'm stretching my memory so don't quote me because it is not precise, but I think it was somewhere around 240 in the Panhandle and I think it was somewhere right around – maybe a little fewer than a hundred in Texas.

MR. JOLLEY: I was just wondering why the underreporting in the Panhandle and do you have any evidence of why? For example, maybe some of those charter boatmen weren't set up to report electronically if you didn't know about it. Could that have been a contributing factor?

DR. PONWITH: It is actually an interesting question. We're a mystified; I'm mystified because I wasn't one of the PIs on the project. The PIs on the project may have actually done some forensics on this to understand a little bit better about why the disparity between Panhandle and Texas. It is particularly interesting because we have charter members in the Panhandle who have been begging for a decade for moving from a sampling program, a sampling and estimation process to a census process for a decade.

Had you asked me before the study, my prediction would have been the Panhandle would have run the show, that they would have really performed in a way that was stellar, and that was not the case. I don't know the answer to it but I expect that the final report is going to contain a lot of information on what they believe the main reasons for that are.

MR. BELL: I'm not on the committee but just an observation in the study. Perhaps there is a sense of there was really no perceived real consequences from not complying. I know when our system in effect, the law clearly states that they have to submit the logbooks by a certain date. We send reminder letters and all; but unless they really understand that there are real consequences and it is going to happen, they just don't seem to care.

I know in the past year we went through a year where we were very serious about it and we took a lot of people in front of the magistrate and we wrote a lot of tickets. Our compliance is much, much better now so the system actually works better, but it took that understanding that there really are real consequences. I have written letters to folks before and they just kind of blow it off, and maybe that is why you kind of got what you got.

DR. PONWITH: The concern with that – I hear you loud and clear and I do agree with you, but here is the catch. If the notion is that our new approach is a census, the bottom line is there is paper after paper that will explain that a well-crafted sampling program will always outperform a biased census in understanding what the true total number is for landings.

To be compelled to move to a census program, you would have to have very good compliance. If it constantly takes this giant push to get and maintain that nearly perfect census, then you have to ask your question is it financially, statistically better to stick with the estimation process or go with that census, and that is a tough question. Again, I think the final report will have recommendations to that end, but I definitely hear what you're saying.

DR. DUVAL: I've got Tom Swatzel and then Roy and then we're going to wrap this up because we need to make a motion and start moving on.

MR. SWATZEL: I would like to offer a motion for a preferred alternative under Action 1. That would be Alternative 4 with Subalternative 4B.

DR. DUVAL: **There is a motion on the table to accept Alternative 4, Subalternative 4B as our preferred, so this requires that vessels submit fishing records to the Science and Research Director weekly or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the Science and Research Director via electronic reporting, and that means via computer or internet and weekly equals seven days after the end of each week. That is for headboat, Subalternative 4B for the headboat. Is there a second to that; seconded by Charlie.** Discussion? Roy, you were next on the list.

DR. CRABTREE: It wasn't so much towards the motion. I'm comfortable with electronic reporting in headboats, but I think we're a ways away from the charterboat. I do think the document needs a lot of work and my recommendation to you is going to be that this is not ready for final action at this meeting.

I think in the analysis, when you go through this, we need to recognize with charterboats, if you're going to go to this, it is really not a validated form of reporting and so it is going to be subject to potential underreporting and biases that will be difficult to evaluate. I don't think that is adequately addressed in the amendment right now.

It is more timely I suppose, but it may be very biased. Then the other thing is in the overall gist of the amendment is that this is going to help us not go over ACLs and those kinds of things, but for the recreational fishery, probably for more species than not; and, for example, for the Dolphin and Wahoo FMP we don't do in-season monitoring and closures in those.

It is an after the fact shorten the season the next year if you go over, so the timeliness part of this really isn't so much of the issue and it is not clear to me that this data will be useful at all. Another part that is not clear here is presumably we're going to continue to use MRIP as the best available estimates of the catch, so they're really what are going to determine did we go over or not.

So for a lot of these plans I don't know that this really fits in with the purpose and needs that well because we're not doing in-season monitoring in them, so I think that all needs to be addressed and better explained in the analysis. There are a lot of issues there that I still think need to be addressed, but I think the preferred you chose is the appropriate one to go ahead with the headboat issues.

MR. BURGESS: I guess I just did have a little concern about the intervals shorter than a week for a headboat and the burden that it would put on them, it would be tough; and then as Roy had spoke about how the information is going to be used, too,

DR. DUVAL: I think we had a similar conversation about intervals shorter than a week when it came with regard to the dealer reporting and the frequency with which that would be required, and it was a pretty extensive conversation over the fact that this would just give the Science and Research Director the – it leaves the door open for the Science and Research Director to require

reporting at shorter intervals, which would presumably be done through rulemaking by the agency to require it sooner. Is that my correct understanding; Roy or Monica or someone can correct me.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think with this what would go into the regulations would be weekly. Then if we decided at some time we wanted to go to something less than that, yes, we would have to go through a rulemaking. Otherwise, we wouldn't be able to enforce it, I don't think.

DR. DUVAL: But similar to the comments that were made by staff earlier, the intent is that you don't have to come back to the council for a regulatory amendment. You would just let us know that you were proceeding with rulemaking.

DR. CRABTREE: I think so, but I think that is one of the things that needs to be explained in here because I'm not sure that is clear in the document at this point.

DR. DUVAL: Is there anymore discussion on this motion? **Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, this motion stands approved.**

MR. WAUGH: Okay, moving on to Action 2, which would modify permits and data reporting for commercial vessels. We've got quite a number of recommendations from the IPT, and we have put that together in rework of the alternatives to address those comments. On expanded analysis of the impacts, we have got the cost estimates for VMS.

These are updated cost estimates for VMS, for the units themselves, in Table 1; and for the communication costs in Table 2. The amendment itself has some expanded analysis in terms of installation costs and so forth. We've got the advisory panel – the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel has recommended to council on numerous occasions they consider a requirement to carry VMS for both recreational and commercial vessels in the South Atlantic.

April 2010 the Snapper Grouper AP approved a motion to recommend mandatory VMS for all vessels that interact with snapper grouper species in the EEZ and accountability measures that would prevent fishing in the absence of VMS. Again, in April of 2012 the Snapper Grouper AP approved a motion to recommend that the council require VMS for any snapper grouper vessel harvesting fish in South Atlantic waters. Brian will cover the public hearing input.

DR. CHEUVRONT: We had eight folks who spoke specifically regarding VMS and all of them spoke in opposition to putting VMS on commercial snapper grouper vessels. They cited economic hardship associated with maintenance, installation and communications costs for the units. Also, at least one of the commenters reiterated that if the council pursues requiring VMS for commercial vessels, that the same thing should apply to the recreational vessels.

And then there were four comments regarding electronic reporting for commercial vessels and all were in favor of requiring electronic reporting. One additional comment related to this suggested that the council consider modifying Alternative 2 to require electronic reporting of commercial logbooks within one week or less and discussed that 21 days is too long for reporting on logbooks.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg, why don't you take us – there are a number of decisions to make with regard to this action, so you if you take us through the logical order that would be great.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, the first one is to clarify – at the bottom of Page 17 clarify how we deal with mackerel. This portion of the amendment would need to be approved by the Gulf Council. We have already got it set up for them to look at this in October. The reason is because we're amending the Mackerel Plan to change commercial reporting for mackerel.

We need to clarify how expansive – what is your intent as far as what this covers? Under Option 1 you would be clarifying that it is your intent that the Action 2 alternatives apply to all vessels with a coastal migratory pelagics commercial permit fishing within the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Councils area of authority.

If you say area of authority, that includes Florida where we have got Gulf migratory group coming around. Option 2 would clarify it is the council's intent that the alternatives apply to all vessels with a coastal migratory pelagics commercial fishing permit within just the South Atlantic Council's area of authority. That would not include the Mid-Atlantic.

Alternative 3 is the council's intent to apply to all vessels with a coastal migratory pelagics commercial permit fishing for Atlantic migratory groups of king, Spanish mackerel and cobia. It seems to us that is the one that you were focusing your intent on because we're looking at improving ways to address commercial reporting for the fisheries that we manage. Once we get that resolved, then we'll go on to deal with the actual wording of the alternatives and how we split it out into multiple actions.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so we need to clarify our intent and Gregg has laid out the three options. I would entertain a motion from the committee regarding which of these three options you would like to select as the preferred with regard to coastal migratory pelagics commercially permitted fishermen.

MR. WAUGH: Kari has just reminded me we can't say coastal migratory pelagics so we're talking commercial here and there is no coastal migratory pelagics permit. There is a king mackerel permit and a Spanish mackerel permit.

DR. DUVAL: So we would need to change the wording to refer specifically to king mackerel and Spanish mackerel in this set of options.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, king mackerel and Spanish mackerel permits.

DR. DUVAL: I'll let everyone chew on that for a little bit. Roy, you have a comment?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I think Bonnie will make some comments on this, but my understanding right now there is one coastal logbook program that applies to all of these fisheries. I have seen some correspondence from the Center expressing concerns about if we

start changing all the requirements like this in terms of funding and things, and I wonder if Bonnie could comment on that.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, I think what would work best for us is carrying on kind of in the mode that we're in right now, to have one coastal fisheries logbook to cover Gulf reef fish, South Atlantic snapper grouper, dolphin and wahoo, king and Spanish mackerel and sharks. What we don't want to do is have multiple logbook programs that are managed separately.

It would be good to have one kind of master logbook program that covers the whole thing. The bottom line is that logbooks are not permit specific. They're just required if a fisher has a permit; so if you have a permit you use the logbook program. You don't have a logbook program for each permit.

DR. CRABTREE: And so the bottom line if we're going to go down this path for the king mackerel permits, we need to do it for the permit, which would mean the Gulf and South Atlantic as well; and the same with Spanish mackerel permits. One other comment I would have on this – and maybe this applies to the previous action as well – recall with the dealer permits we put in a process for catastrophic conditions.

If we're going to go to electronic reporting here – and this is real world, too, because we just implemented catastrophic paper reporting in Louisiana after the hurricane that just went through. I think we need to add an alternative in here similar to the way we worded the dealer reporting amendment; and probably we need to put that in the previous action although I don't know that charterboats are likely to be operating very much.

But the way this is structured now if they lost internet service for an extended period of time, they wouldn't be able to report and they wouldn't be able to fish without being in violation. Another thing I have difficulty tying some of this in with the VMS requirement to me doesn't really seem to fit in with the purpose and need for the amendment.

That is largely an enforcement tool. The purpose and need of the amendment seems focused on monitoring ACLs and certainly it doesn't seem to me that VMS fits in with this action. It is not clear to me to how that puts together, and I think the whole amendment could do with some restructuring and clarification as to what we're doing.

I think the notion of splitting these requirements out on these permits really isn't a practical way to go given our resources and funding, which means the Gulf Council is certainly going to want to weigh in on this and we're going to need to hear back from them and try to match these things up.

MR. WAUGH: The issue of the VMS not fitting with this, we've got wording that will deal with to separate that out into a separate action. Yes, the VMS is in part for enforcement but it is also for data collection because that will allow us to look at where they are fishing. Not necessarily to track ACLs but as part of the purpose is to improve data collection methods, it will allow us to track where they are fishing as we look to modify spatial management.

That is part of the rationale for it being in there. But coming back to this issue – and we may need to step back and deal with these logbooks comprehensively. The reason we put this in here is from Bonnie’s presentation either last meeting or the previous one, and you will remember this council has argued for tens of years that you should not allow individuals to complete their logbooks when they’re renewing their permit at the end of the year. This was an attempt to tighten that up. We’ve got a real problem in the timeliness of the logbooks.

DR. CRABTREE: Another thing that jumped out to me is so we’re allowing – I mean, they’re going to electronically submit these logbooks and we’re allowing them to do 21 days later; yet on that charterboat thing we’re talking about seven and potentially even less; so, one, how did we come to 21 days and why is that the only reasonable alternative and then why are we allowing them three times as long to submit what I assume is essentially the same information whereas we’re requiring the recreational fishery to submit weekly?

DR. DUVAL: We had quite a bit of discussion about this at our last meeting and I’m going to look to both Ben and Tom Burgess to provide some input and clarification on that. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Roy, in order to fill the necessary fields in the logbook you have to have your trip tickets from your sale of fish to do that. Okay, that is one required field and that takes 12 days to get that. From the time you catch your fish, it takes 12 days to get that information. Okay, if you add a week on that to allow them to report on the information after the 12 days, that is 19. To add a few more days on it to make it 21 didn’t seem to be that much of a – you know, an even number actually or an odd number or three weeks.

DR. CRABTREE: And it may make perfect sense; it’s just at least when I looked at it I don’t see that all laid out in the analysis and the explanation of the rationale and here is why it is 21 days here and why it is 7 days there and explain it all.

DR. PONWITH: To that end, I do know we had a really good discussion about that in June. What field is it that you need the trip ticket to be able to fill in? The reason I’m asking is the whole purpose behind this is to end or reduce the lag period between when the fishing trip is done and the time we have the data in our hands.

I’m wondering if there is some field that you absolutely have to have the trip ticket for, if there is a way to modify those requirements so that you could be filling that logbook out while you’re at sea recording that information so you’ve got really good effort information and then have that submitted within seven days of the end of the trip rather having some thing be the choke point for getting that and having it cost you those additional couple of weeks.

MR. WAUGH: When you read this you need to look at Alternative 3 as well. Right now the effective deadline for getting your logbooks in is a year plus. It is when you get your renewal. I was trying to pull up Bonnie’s old presentation to show the large number of logbook reports that are turned in with permit renewal.

The big difference here and the reason for 21 days you’re extending it – and I was looking for the wording; I thought we had put in some wording explaining what Ben just talked about. But

what you're doing is you're extending it on paper from 7 to 21 days, but then you're putting in this requirement that it will be 21 days or else then they will no longer be able make trips and sell their species, similar to what we did on the dealers, so it is really tightening it up. It looks on paper like you're going from 7 days to 21 days, but really what you're going is from over a year to 21 days.

MR. BURGESS: Bonnie, to directly address your question, the information that I receive first is the discards and I have that every day when I hit the dock. I have that all written down, species and number. The next information is my weight. If I get into the fish house late, I will unload my fish, but they won't weigh them until the next morning, and then I'll have them whenever come back in the next day. The financial information as Ben had discussed, we've had some lag times this year. A couple of weeks is not unheard of to have that financial information.

MR. HARTIG: The only field that prohibits me from doing it in a week is to put the trip limit verification number on it – I mean the trip ticket verification number on your logbook form so you can go back and look at it. That is a pretty important part of it if you want to verify these trips with the trip tickets and with the logbook reports, but that is the only thing that keeps me from doing it.

When I fill out my ticket on the dock, I don't fill out a trip ticket. I just fill out a pad with carbon copies and then that carbon copy each day goes to the fish house. They fill out the trip ticket. I guess if you had to call the fish house, but that is a tough thing to do on the hours that we fish and trying to call the fish house every day to get a trip ticket verification number. Certainly, that's the only thing holding me up.

DR. CRABTREE: And so this gets again to how this all fits together with the purpose and need because we're going to have logbooks that are turned in three weeks later and yet we're going to have weekly dealer reports. It doesn't seem to me that this is going to be particularly useful in terms of monitoring ACLs because we're going to continue to monitor them based on the dealer reports. Now, I do think getting more timely logbooks is a good thing.

The main thing we do with the commercial logbooks now is they use them in assessments to develop indices of abundance and things. My understanding of what is often done is that all those logbooks that are turned in at renewal and are way late, they aren't used because they're not considered reliable.

So if we require these logbooks to be submitted more timely successfully, I think we'll get more useful information that will be useful for stock assessments and things and the fishermen will be sending them in while they still remember what they caught, and I think that is all a positive thing.

It is not clear to me how it really ties in directly with the purpose and need of the amendment, which again is more focused on tracking ACLs because I don't really see that this is going to be all that useful to us in terms of tracking ACLs. I also think the bias part of it needs to be addressed in here because we know from a lot of experience with commercial logbooks they often underreport an awful lot of things.

That is another issue here in terms of trying to use this for tracking ACLs and things because they may be underreporting a lot of the catch. I think if you compare trip ticket catches with logbook catches, the logbook catches are typically lower in terms of the landings reported than the trip tickets are.

DR. DUVAL: In terms of the reliability of self-reported data, I think there is a sentence in there that – you know, the telephone survey that is done MRIP; I mean that is self-reported information. I guess all I'm saying is we're already using different forms of self-reported information in other collection modes. Gregg, did you have something?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, this is looking at the revised CE-BA document with the expanded analysis that is in your second briefing book. The bottom of Page 79 explains a little bit of detail about the change from seven to twenty-one days. This period of time would allow for fishermen to receive all the necessary information from the fish house to complete the trip and effort, economic and discard logbooks. There is some discussion in there and we could certainly expand on that. Then there is a figure in there showing what the late reports are.

MR. HARTIG: I misspoke. Paul Nelson reminded me of the economic information when we're selected. That takes time. You have got to have all your tickets from the end of the week, which is ten days to get all those tickets out because the week doesn't start – it is not a seven-day week. It's ten days out. We would have all those after ten days and then it would be an additional seven days; that's seventeen days.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would be real concerned trying to fill in half of a report and then going back and filling in another part of a report; and then when you've got multiple reports and you've got multiple pieces of reports, it is going to turn into a nightmare. You're highly likely to have stuff that is not accurate like that more than just doing it one time and being done with it. I see a nightmare if you try to piecemeal these trip tickets together.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, we still have not gotten beyond the first decision point for the committee, which is clarifying how we would want this to apply to coastal migratory pelagics. I think the conversation around the table has been really good. There have been a number of good points made. We have had some more clarification of why 21 days on the commercial logbook reporting, so what is the pleasure of the committee in terms of this action.

I think we can either go through this and make some decisions on this action with regard to how we want it to apply to king and Spanish mackerel, with regard to how the IPT has reworked the alternatives, and they have actually taken the VMS out and recommended that be a separate action entirely. What is the committee's pleasure in terms of moving forward with this? It is 2:14 and we still have mackerel to go, and I was really hoping we would wrap this up by 2:30.

MR. HARTIG: Basically under the coastal migratory pelagics option for consideration, Option 3 was what we had been going down the path to do, if I'm not mistaken. I would make that as a motion if that is what you need.

DR. DUVAL: The motion is it is the council's intent that Action 2 alternatives apply to all vessels with a king mackerel or Spanish mackerel commercial permit for the Atlantic migratory groups of king and Spanish mackerel. I think we need to remove cobia from there. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: The problem, Ben, is the Center is telling us they can't manage separate logbook programs for all these, and they want to stay with one logbook reporting requirement. I'm afraid you're going down a path that we're not going to be able to pull off and implement. I think what we ought to do is work with the Gulf and see if we can come up with this change to the whole logbook program for these. We've got to keep these things – we're heading into a period of budgetary difficulties and we're going to need to keep some efficiency. Making all of these changes independently like this, I just don't think is something we're going to be able to pull off.

MR. WAUGH: Monica may be able to help with this, but did we specify all this detail about how the logbooks are done in the Mackerel FMP and Snapper Grouper FMP, and then they're using it for HMS. Did HMS do that? I don't recall us laying out all of that detail. I think as I recall what we did was we said that we want to have a logbook and then the Center developed all of the details under their administrative authority. I guess what I'm getting at is if we indicate that this is the council's intent, what is to stop the Center from applying these changes to all the logbook programs? All of them have the same problem with the late reports and all of that. All of them would benefit from those changes.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't recall what the amendment said that set up the logbook programs, but I can look at those tonight before full council and let you know. To your latter point about what is to stop the Center from applying it to all those, I think then we would be – so your question is do we need to amend all those FMPs to have the Center institute that kind of change?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, or by us indicating that – yes; do we have to do that or just by pointing out a problem and a solution; can the Center then implement that solution without us having to spend two years working with the Gulf Council to get this amendment and then another two years for HMS to amend it before we can change all the requirements.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm not sure of the answer, but I'll try to get you an answer as soon as possible at this meeting.

DR. DUVAL: We have a motion on the floor by Ben; I don't know if we ever actually got a second to that. I don't think we did. Seconded by Tom Burgess. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I guess what I don't understand is why do we have to change the logbook requirements? You changed the permit requirements; does that change the logbook requirements as well? The logbook is administered by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. It covers all fish, Gulf and Atlantic. What is this going to do to change the logbook reporting?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that's exactly what you're doing is changing the logbook. You're not changing the permit. I think it is kind of a misnomer where it says modifying permits because you're not modifying the permit at all.

MR. HARTIG: You're modifying the logbook.

DR. CRABTREE: You're modifying the logbook program, and I think that is something we're going to need to deal with the Gulf Council on. Now, how exactly we do this I don't know. I think this amendment just needs a lot more work. We're coming in here planning to take final action, but there are just too many issues and too many questions; not the least of which is the fact that the Gulf Council has never even heard of this amendment or seen it. October will be the first time they have looked at it, but I think we're just – I understand the sense of urgency to improve some of these programs and all, but again we need to make sure we're doing these things right.

I don't think what we're doing in this amendment is really going to help us that much in terms of monitoring ACLs, anyway, because we're going to continue to use other programs principally for that. I think there are benefits from doing this, but I think we just need to take a little more time, address all these issues and make sure we're doing it right.

MR. WAUGH: As far as the Gulf looking at it, this is a product of being married. We've had numerous occasions where they have taken final action on an amendment that we hadn't seen and it came to us and we approved it and vice versa. That part of the concern, as long as we're not impacting fishermen in their area, we've done this for them and they've done for us on numerous occasions.

DR. DUVAL: I guess in terms of, Roy, your comment about the name of the action "modify permits and data reporting for commercial vessels", we wouldn't actually necessarily be modifying the logbook. It is just the timeframe in which we're asking fishermen to report.

DR. CRABTREE: The time and the format.

DR. DUVAL: Well, but, no, I think this says that the Service would make available an electronic form of the logbook that fishermen could use, but it does not require them to use it. That is the reading in the action that fishermen would still be able to use paper forms is my understanding. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, and that is exactly – and I'm reading right here; I see nothing changing the logbook in and of itself. I see changing the timeframe of submitting logbook reports. I see nothing about changing the logbook in any of these options of how it is done currently with one logbook for both Gulf and South Atlantic, the way it is currently done. A

Il we're asking for is the timeliness of the reports to change. We're not asking to change the logbooks. And how you are administering that program, I think as you have very eloquently put, that it is done in HMS, Gulf, South Atlantic; we cover a whole bunch of species with the one

logbook, which the efficiency is there already to do that. It is just we think that we can get increased efficiency in reporting on a more timely basis.

DR. DUVAL: I think the title is still appropriate because all we're doing is modifying the permits for these fisheries to require that the fishermen report their logbooks in a different timeframe. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, so let me ask you this; if we do this, which is that only the portion of the logbook that is dealing with reporting on Atlantic king mackerel is due within 21 days and the other is not; then the permit holder comes in to renew and hands us a whole bunch of logbooks, I don't know how we're going to make a case on that necessarily.

It just seems like it is going to be very confused in South Florida where you're going to have different timing requirements on when the logbooks are due based on where the fish you caught came from. It's not going to be I don't think apparent when permits come in to look and see if you're compliant with the logbooks. I think it is going to get real complicated when you split it out that way, and I just worry that it is going to be real messy particularly down in South Florida.

It seems to me it would be much cleaner if we applied this timeline to the whole permit, including all the Gulf guys. Now I know that involves the Gulf Council and they would have to look at it; but providing that is the only part of this we're changing and all that, they may be fine with that and it may not have to take two years to get to that, but we won't know until they have had a chance to look at it. That is just part of my concern with it.

DR. DUVAL: All right, we have a motion on the floor that it is the council's intent that Action 2 alternatives apply to all vessels with a king or Spanish mackerel commercial permit fishing for Atlantic migratory groups of king and Spanish mackerel. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, isn't this an attempt to make everything the same; snapper grouper, everything on the same kind of reporting requirements? Isn't that the intent of this motion right here is to try and get everything on the same timeline?

MR. WAUGH: Yes; and what we're talking about now is clarifying that portion that deals with coastal migratory pelagics because that's a joint plan.

MR. HARTIG: So they could be on the same timeline.

DR. DUVAL: Is there more discussion on this motion; do people feel like they're ready to vote on this motion? I would like to go ahead and get a vote on this motion that we've got before us. I think then we can – as Gregg has indicated, this is already queued up to go to the Gulf for them to look at and we can get some input from them on it.

It is clear there are a lot more questions and concerns than there are answers right. I'm not getting a sense that folks are ready to vote on the amendment. My suggestion would be that we postpone taking final action on this until the December meeting. Tom, did you want to make a comment?

MR. SWATZEL: I just want to call the question.

DR. DUVAL: **Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.** It is my suggestion that we go ahead and postpone final action on this until December; take this to the Gulf, get some of their input. My suggestion would be that some of the same explanation that we've had here and some of the same conversation with regard to I guess the consistency of the logbooks throughout all of the fisheries for Gulf and South Atlantic be discussed and that folks think about some of these things.

The staff can add a little more conversation and analysis to I think particularly this action as regards the 21-day reporting timeline. It sounds like there was some confusion from the public about that. Then we can come back and just plan to take final action on this in December. How do folks feel about that? Okay, I'm sensing that is a good idea so we'll postpone final action until December. I think, Gregg, that was the last thing on the agenda. We didn't have one item under other business. Tom Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: Do we need to do anything with the VMS thing in here or is that necessary to address that at this time about putting in its own action or would that slow us up in December?

DR. DUVAL: If the committee wants to, we can go ahead and accept the IPT – we would have to have a motion to accept the IPT's proposed wording for the revamping of Action 2, a new Action 3 which would be VMS in its own action. It's the pleasure of the committee.

MR. BURGESS: I just didn't know if it was important at this time. If it is not, I would say just leave it as it is.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: If you're going to look at this in December, I think if you can make some decisions along those lines on whether to accept the IPT's recommendation and all that, that would be good or else we'll be in the same spot in December that we are right now.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, so we can just go ahead and I would entertain a motion to accept the IPT's proposed wording changes to Action 2 and recommendation for new Action 3. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: The IPT recommended put in the VMS as an Action 3. Just as an administrative housekeeping thing, it would be better if you make it Action 4 because there already is an Action 3 and we would have to go through the whole document and change every reference to Action 3. This just might be cleaner if you make VMS Action 4.

DR. DUVAL: Is that okay with folks? As I said, I would entertain a motion to do that.

MR. BURGESS: So moved.

DR. DUVAL: Motion by Tom Burgess; seconded by Wilson Laney. **The motion reads accept the IPT wording for Action 2 and new Action 4. Is there any discussion of this? Is there**

any objection to this motion? Seeing none, this motion stands approved. We have some clarity on the verbiage for this action and we have got a new Action 4 dealing with VMS.

We will ask staff to add some further explanation to this action and we will get this over to the Gulf to see what their reaction is and come back and discuss this at our meeting in December. Is there any further business to come before the Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee? Seeing none, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 o'clock p.m., September 12, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2012-2013 Committees

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION

- ✓ Michelle Duval, Chair
 - ✓ Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair **MARTHA BADEMAN**
 - ✓ Steve Amick
 - ✓ Tom Burgess
 - ✓ Ben Hartig
 - ✓ Wilson Laney
 - ✓ Charlie Phillips
 - ✓ Tom Swatzel
- Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Tom Burgess
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Cheuvront

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Tom Swatzel, Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Doug Haymans, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Anna Martin- CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

David Cupka, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Tom Burgess, Chair
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

John Jolley, Chair
David Cupka, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

John Jolley, Chair
Tom Burgess, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Mel Bell
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
David Cupka
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair
Tom Burgess, Vice Chair
David Cupka
Mario Gil
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

PERSONNEL

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

PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Michelle Duval
John Jolley
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Roy Crabtree
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR Committee

David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice Chair
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP

Charlie Phillips, Chair
David Cupka, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Anna Martin

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2012 - 2013 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

Steve Amick
6902 Sandnettles Drive
Savannah, GA 31410
912/429-3537 (ph)
912/898-0361 (f)
SteveAmicks@aol.com

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

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

Tom Burgess
P.O. Box 33
Sneads Ferry, NC 28460
910/327-3528
tburgess@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

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. Mario Gil**
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)
Mario.g.gil@uscg.mil

✓ **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
561/732-4530 (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

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

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

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

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
✓ Julia Byrd - julia.byrd@safmc.net

SEDAR Admin/Outreach
Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@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

✓ **AMBER VON HARTEN**

JACK MCGOVERN
BONNIE PONWETH
VINCE O'SHEA
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
PAM DANA
JOEY BALLENGER
OTHA EASLEY
ANNE MARIE EICH

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

Charleston, SC

Wednesday, September 12, 2012

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

Hilly Bionis	PEG	850-322-7845	2107 Mulberry Blvd, Tallahassee, FL 32303
Terry Gibson	Marshfield Med's	772-285-7683	2060 NE 23rd Ter Jacksonville FL 32245
Lisa Dunham	PEG		
Mark E. Brown		843 881 9735	3642 Pasadena Dr. Mount Pleasant, SC 29466
Nate Dringley		843-327-1114	kguigly@caploggroup.com
Theresa Coppa		609-374-2783	PO Box 2153 Jupiter FL 33458
Bill Kevoy	FKCFA	305-619-0039	POB 504404 Markham FL 32050
Chad Engler		(561) 596-0821	165 Harris Dr. Sebastian FL 32958
David Stead		772-696-1386	6365 69th St Ocala FL 32967

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

Charleston, SC

Wednesday, September 12, 2012

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

Hewes GSAREP 813 286 8390

Paul Nelson Fish market 886-527-0732 736 Merrimack
Port Orange, FL 32127

Daniel Fleming owner Fish market (661) 455-6007 131 west HILLSBORO 33441
~~Port Orange, FL~~

Dick Greene 910 544-5245 WILMINGTON, NC

Josh Olinde 257-800-386-239-0948 32120-9351

Johnny Hull SFA EFES 386-542-1254 HULLSSEAFONT@HULL.COM

Jack Cox SAFA

Steven Shipman 912-222-9206 SusanShipman@att.net

Helissa Luke EDF 919-881-2909 mlucke@edf.org

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405

4044 Wusthorne Blvd
Raleigh NC 27607

843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-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
Charleston, SC
Wednesday, September 12, 2012

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

BARETT Colby (321) 453-4583 1950 N TROPICAL TR. MERITT ISLAND FLA
Pam Brown 772 589 4203 365 Orange Ave. Seb. FL

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

Attendee Report GoToWebinar

Generated

Sep 17, 2012 06:17 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar N: Webinar ID

SAFMC Co: 7.67E+08

Actual Star Actual Duration (minutes)

Sep 12, 2012 162

Clicked Reg Opened Invitation

139 57

Total Attended

24

Session Details

Attended	Interest Ra	First Name	Last Name	Registratio	Join Time	Leave Time
Yes	33	scott	sandorf	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	33	roger	pugliese	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	28	Rick	DeVictor	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	42	Jack	Holland	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	59	susan	gerhart	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	27	Richard	Malinowski	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	62	Nikhil	Mehta	Aug 22, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	20	steve	branstetter	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	46	Michael	Merrifield	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	20	Helen	Takade-Heumacher	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	28	Karla	Gore	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	31	Mike	C	Sep 05, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	68	chJanie	Thomas	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	20	Zack	Bowen	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	54	david	grubbs	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	31	Kathy	Knowlton	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	30	Anik	Clemens	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	26	Kate	Michie	Aug 28, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	22	deb	buscher	Aug 22, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	40	stephen	holiman	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	20	Anthony	Austin	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	20	mac	currin	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	76	trevor	MCMAHAN	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	75	ira	laks	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
No		michael	travis	Sep 12, 2012	11:44 AM EDT	
No		Donald	Steamer	Sep 12, 2012	12:07 PM EDT	
No		Luiz	Barbieri	Aug 24, 2012	01:44 PM EDT	
No		Janie	Thomas	Sep 12, 2012	10:00 AM EDT	
No		Laura	Crabtree	Sep 12, 2012	05:51 PM EDT	
No		rita	merritt	Sep 12, 2012	12:49 PM EDT	
No		Samantha	Port-Minner	Sep 12, 2012	04:25 PM EDT	
No		wayne	mershon	Sep 12, 2012	11:32 AM EDT	
No		Cindy	Chaya	Aug 22, 2012	11:54 AM EDT	

No	Scott	Baker	Sep 12, 2012 10:34 AM EDT
No	patty	hartig	Sep 12, 2012 04:30 PM EDT
No	Katie	Latanich	Sep 12, 2012 02:15 PM EDT
No	john	carmichael	Sep 12, 2012 05:43 PM EDT
No	mike	linville	Sep 12, 2012 04:00 PM EDT
No	Heather	Blough	Sep 10, 2012 12:37 PM EDT
No	kenneth	brennan	Sep 12, 2012 10:06 AM EDT
No	jeanna	merrifield	Sep 12, 2012 02:24 PM EDT
No	ron	kodetsky	Sep 12, 2012 07:09 PM EDT
No	clinton	smith	Sep 08, 2012 07:16 PM EDT
No	andrea	grabman	Sep 12, 2012 10:16 AM EDT
No	steve	b	Sep 12, 2012 06:20 PM EDT
No	robert	waltermire	Sep 12, 2012 03:48 PM EDT
No	Larry	DeLancey	Sep 12, 2012 02:02 PM EDT
No	todd	phillips	Sep 12, 2012 09:56 AM EDT
No	becky	stanley	Sep 12, 2012 09:13 AM EDT
No	phil	steele	Sep 12, 2012 10:27 AM EDT
No	richard	sergent	Sep 12, 2012 02:41 PM EDT
No	julie	califf	Sep 12, 2012 10:15 AM EDT
No	Bill	MacLauchlin	Sep 12, 2012 02:27 PM EDT
No	Chris	McCaffity	Sep 12, 2012 04:41 PM EDT
No	Michelle	Pate	Sep 12, 2012 01:15 PM EDT
No	joseph	klostermann	Sep 12, 2012 10:39 AM EDT
No	Anne	Eich	Aug 22, 2012 02:28 PM EDT
No	Peter	Barile	Sep 05, 2012 02:12 PM EDT
No	warren	mittchell	Sep 12, 2012 04:26 PM EDT
No	bob	english	Sep 11, 2012 12:56 PM EDT
No	shane	gibson	Sep 12, 2012 03:45 PM EDT
No	steve	branstetter	Sep 12, 2012 04:24 PM EDT
No	Ron	Rincones	Sep 12, 2012 04:14 PM EDT
No	mike	baker	Sep 12, 2012 12:26 PM EDT
No	Vincent	Bonura	Sep 12, 2012 11:03 AM EDT
No	Julia	Byrd	Sep 12, 2012 05:10 PM EDT
No	Nick	Farmer	Aug 22, 2012 12:57 PM EDT
No	nicholas	hill	Sep 12, 2012 12:00 PM EDT

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

Attendee Report GoToWebinar

Generated

Sep 17, 2012 06:19 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar N: Webinar ID

SAFMC Co: 7.67E+08

Actual Star Actual Duration (minutes)

Sep 12, 2012 590

Clicked Reg Opened Invitation

139 57

Total Attended

53

Session Details

Attended	Interest Ra	First Name	Last Name	Registration	Join Time	Leave Time
Yes	51	scott	sandorf	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	30	Helen	Takade-Heumacher	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	22	Chris	McCaffity	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	45	stephen	holiman	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	26	Scott	Baker	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	43	mac	currin	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	29	warren	mittchell	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	65	Nikhil	Mehta	Aug 22, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	63	Larry	DeLancey	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	36	wayne	mershon	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	61	jeanna	merrifield	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	55	Donald	Steamer	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	70	Ron	Rincones	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	24	robert	waltermire	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	38	Katie	Latanich	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	22	Julia	Byrd	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	64	nicholas	hill	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	22	shane	gibson	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	22	phil	steele	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	57	patty	hartig	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	71	mike	linville	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	69	ira	laks	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	39	Kate	Michie	Aug 28, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	68	Janie	Thomas	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	26	rita	merritt	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	40	Samantha	Port-Minner	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	46	steve	branstetter	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	22	Michelle	Pate	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	28	Karla	Gore	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	29	david	grubbs	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	22	Laura	Crabtree	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	75	trevor	MICMAHAN	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012
Yes	32	kenneth	brennan	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012	Sep 12, 2012

Yes	66	joseph	klostermann	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	77	Vincent	Bonura	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	62	Anthony	Austin	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	23	Peter	Barile	Sep 05, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	22	todd	phillips	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	33	Rick	DeVictor	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	29	ron	kodetsky	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	29	Kathy	Knowlton	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	29	Anik	Clemens	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	24	andrea	grabman	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	70	Michael	Merrifield	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	44	Bill	MacLauchlin	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	31	mike	baker	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	22	john	carmichael	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	30	Mike	C	Sep 05, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	27	roger	pugliese	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	41	Richard	Malinowski	Sep 10, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	26	michael	travis	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	35	Jack	Holland	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
Yes	57	susan	gerhart	Sep 10, 201	Sep 12, 201	Sep 12, 201
No		deb	buscher	Aug 22, 2012	11:56 AM EDT	
No		Nick	Farmer	Aug 22, 2012	12:57 PM EDT	
No		Cindy	Chaya	Aug 22, 2012	11:54 AM EDT	
No		chJanie	Thomas	Sep 12, 2012	08:54 AM EDT	
No		Heather	Blough	Sep 10, 2012	12:37 PM EDT	
No		clinton	smith	Sep 08, 2012	07:16 PM EDT	
No		steve	b	Sep 12, 2012	06:20 PM EDT	
No		becky	stanley	Sep 12, 2012	09:13 AM EDT	
No		richard	sergent	Sep 12, 2012	02:41 PM EDT	
No		julie	califf	Sep 12, 2012	10:15 AM EDT	
No		Zack	Bowen	Sep 12, 2012	09:19 AM EDT	
No		Anne	Eich	Aug 22, 2012	02:28 PM EDT	
No		bob	english	Sep 11, 2012	12:56 PM EDT	
No		steve	branstetter	Sep 12, 2012	04:24 PM EDT	
No		Luiz	Barbieri	Aug 24, 2012	01:44 PM EDT	

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