

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

ALLOCATION COMMITTEE MEETING

**Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, FL**

June 10-11, 2008

SUMMARY MINUTES

Allocation Committee Members:

Dr. Brian Chevront, Chair
George Geiger
Rita Merritt
Tom Swatzel

Duane Harris
John Wallace
Robert Boyles

Council Members:

Dr. Wilson Laney
David Cupka
Tony Iarocci
Mark Robson

Dr. Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
Lt. Brian Sullivan
Susan Shipman

Council Staff:

Robert Mahood
Mike Collins
Kate Quigley
Kim Iverson

Gregg Waugh
Rick DeVictor
Myra Brouwer

Observers/Participants:

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Bill Sharp
Dr. Tom Jamir
Kate Michie
Kay Williams
Otha Easley
Bruce Irwin
Scott Zimmerman
Tricia Choe
Jason Marlow
Dave Allison
Darden Rice
Robert Cardin
Jeff Oden

Julie Defilippi
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Jim Waters
Dr. Stephen Holiman
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Joe Kimmel
Tom Burgess
Joshua Giordano-Silliman
Brett Norton
Dick Brame
Margot Stiles
Eileen Dougherty
Jim Busse
Bill Kelly

Allocation Committee
Orlando, FL
June 10-11, 2008

Jim Reeves
Dr. Michael Jepson
Buffy Baumann

Beth Curry
Libby Fetherston

The Allocation Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, Tuesday afternoon, June 10, 2008, and was called to order at 4:20 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Brian Chevront.

Dr. Chevront: I would like to call the Allocation Committee to order. I think we've got everybody here at the table now. The first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. Do we have any changes to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. The second order of business is Approval of the Minutes from the committee meeting that was held on April 8 and 9 in Charleston. Do we have any changes to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes will stand approved.

Item Number 3 that we have, we had requested that someone come from the Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program to explain to us the program overview, because one of our alternatives that we had at this point was to look at making allocations based on landings data. What we needed to do was to figure out whether or not that was feasible and so we have with us today Julie Defilippi, who is the data coordinator of the ACCSP. Welcome, Julie, and it's all yours.

Ms. Defilippi: Thank you. Well, I don't have to do my name again. I did want to start out by saying that I know that originally you had Mike Cahall on the agenda and he is very sorry that he couldn't be here today. He did have a previous engagement prior to being asked to come here, but he wanted me to express that he is very interested in coming down here and doing sort of a southern tour and getting a change to talk to everyone and I don't take care of his calendar, but he is going to be in touch and scheduling meetings, so that he can get a chance to talk to everyone. Hopefully now that I've answered that question --

What I'm going to do today is start out with a sort of ACCSP status overview and give you a little bit of what ACCSP is doing, what we have done, and what we're hoping to do and then give you four examples of how certain partners have used the ACCSP systems and programs to further enhance either data compliance or to enhance data collection.

Just to start out, I'm sure -- Well, probably none of you have actually read the big long paragraph that is the ACCSP mission. It's kind of convoluted, with some big words in it, and I don't really entirely get it all, but I know that there are three main points to it and so I figured I would break it down that way. The three main components of that are to create common standards, improve data collection, and then disseminate the data that's been collected.

Starting with the common standards, as you can probably imagine, forming common standards for an entire coast is actually a pretty big undertaking and it was a fairly long process. The original standards were approved in 1998 and that was revised in 2004. For the recreational standards, it's pretty much an adoption of MRFSS, which is mostly because they're accepted methods and they're already coastwide and so we now have coastwide collection in place as well.

For the commercial standards, the catch and effort standards are in place and they are up and

running. The biological sampling, those common standards have also been established and a few of the recent pilot studies that we've run seem to work and that those are going to actually fly pretty well. The social and economic and bycatch standards, we do have standards for those, but we believe that they will probably be reviewed as those modules are put into place.

The second component of the mission is to improve data collection and there are two main parts to that. The first main part is to fund partner implementation of standards and we do have a process for funding. We have proposals that are sent in and then there's a collaborative funding decision as to how those will be funded and those usually are aligned with the priorities that the coordinating council has set up for ACCSP. The second component to data collection is direct staff support of partners, through helping with data management or direct hiring.

The two main ACCSP systems for data collection and storage and then, of course, for retrieval are -- The first one is SAFIS and that is the web-based data entry system for commercial landings on the Atlantic Coast. There are two components to SAFIS. The first is the electronic dealer reporting, which has been in place since 2000, and the second component is the eVTR, which is the electronic vessel trip reporting component. This is actually currently being rolled out. It went live in New Jersey on May 28 and they will have until June 10 to get in all of their May landings and so we're seeing how that is working as we speak.

The second component is the data warehouse and this is an online database that we've populated with some fisheries dependent data that's been supplied by our partners. This is a unique warehouse, because it harmonizes the data that's been collected from various partners into a single dataset and so it's able to be retrieved in one form.

Just a little bit more details about SAFIS, it's a single ACCSP-compliant dealer and fisher reporting system. It's been implemented primarily in the Northeast Region and it gives you here a breakdown by partner of whether each partner is either full or partially implemented.

This graphic here shows partner implementation over the last twelve years. As you can see, in 1995 it was primarily southern states. In 2000, it's still pretty primarily southern states and then in 2007, we now have pretty much the entire coast. For those of you with really good glasses, you'll see that Delaware is not filled in, but they do have a proposal to be implemented this year. The light blue, just in case you can't read the tiny printing, the light blue is ACCSP compliance via SAFIS implementation and the dark blue states are simply ACCSP compliance.

Recreationally, we've increased sampling levels, with significant increases in the Northeast states. The for-hire has been expanded to coastal and there's also been a new charter/headboat sampling method deployed, where there's now a new list, so that they know when they're going to be sampling who.

Commercially, we've improved data collection and fishermen and dealer reporting, biological sampling, and registration tracking. Specifically, in registration tracking, the ACCSP has what we believe to be the only full participant list for the Atlantic coast. That means we have an entire participant list and under that participant, we would know that Mr. Smith has a dealer permit in this state and he has fishing permits in these states and so we now have what we believe to be the

only complete list. If someone else knows of another one, let us know. We've improved data coordination by reducing duplicity and also the overall reporting burden. We've also improved partner data management.

Now I just want to quickly go through not every state on the coast, just the southern states, because those are more important today, and talk about a few of the things that we've been doing in each specific state.

In Florida, we've provided direct technical support. ACCSP and GulfFIN have provided staff onsite and we've installed MFIS onto local systems and I believe that was previously called MRIS. This has greatly improved flexibility and allowed for more local management and the ACCSP staff has also programmed licensing integration, for better fishermen and vessel validation.

In Georgia, we've supported a complete rebuild of the commercial trip ticket system, piloted social and economic studies, specifically for the blue crab fishery, rebuilt the vessel registration and vessel licensing programs and systems and provided staff support and specifically on the trip ticket system, this has allowed the state to go from monthly summary level reporting to specific trip level reporting, which has also happened in South Carolina in 2004, with the complete rebuild of their trip ticket system. That implemented ACCSP standards for the state. We've also provided staff support in South Carolina and funded a snapper grouper biosampling.

In North Carolina, we funded a long list, created regulatory and metadata database, surveyed recreational use of commercial gear, performed Wave 1 sampling, which is the MRFSS January/February, conducted snapper grouper and pelagic biosampling, implemented electronic data collection, performed socioeconomic analysis of core sound fisheries and assessed estuarine bycatch. For the NMFS Southeast, we've funded three things. We've funded the at-sea observers for sharks, biosampling of the snapper grouper complex, and trip TIP system upgrade.

The third component of the mission was data dissemination and ACCSP has done that through a flexible query interface, which was deployed in 1999 and rebuilt in 2006. We also cover commercial and recreational through the unique capabilities of our systems and their ability to query. We also have the recreational has directed trips and bag limit analysis and we have a unique query set up for various partners at their discretion and based upon their particular needs. We also field many custom requests through individuals and partners.

This is just sort of a summary of the first half of the presentation and the achievements that we believe we've reached so far: a good buy-in from our local users, new collaborative spirit among the partners, very good progress in our catch effort data collection, significant improvements in recreational data collection in for-hire, and the lobster stock assessment system improved concept.

The second part of the presentation, as I said earlier, is basically four examples of how specific ACCSP programs have helped partners to improve the ways that they manage their fisheries. The fluke quota in Maine, for those of you who may not know, is actually a very small quota. It's only 7,000 pounds.

What's important about this is that even though it's a small quota -- Sometimes it's hard to manage small quotas, because there's so many big things to manage out there that we forget about the 7,000 pounds of fluke. However, because it is such a small quota, it's very easy to exceed quota if people are catching fluke. Fluke, by the way, is also summer flounder. It's the same thing, just called a different name.

They were having a great deal of trouble managing this quota and they once actually exceeded the quota by approximately seven years worth of catch and so they weren't allowed to fish for a while. Since they've implemented SAFIS, they now get a daily email in Maine that has -- They're entered their quota information into our system and each night, our system goes in and says they've caught this much fluke and you have this much left in your quota and this is the rate at which your quota, et cetera, and each day they get an email to that effect.

It's allowed the state to manage their fishery much more efficiently and it also allows them to manage it in a much more timely fashion, so that they can close it before exceeding it by seven years worth of catch.

This is also beneficial to the fishermen, because for the one guy who went out and caught too much fluke and didn't bother to report until the end of the season, because he knew he was doing something wrong, he wasn't able to hurt other people, because the SAFIS reporting comes in real time.

The second example that we have comes from Massachusetts and this is about filling data gaps. Massachusetts is now currently 100 percent SAFIS compliant. However, prior to that, the state didn't actually have a complete dataset for their fisheries. NMFS was collecting some data and they were collecting some data and there were little bits and pieces everywhere. This meant that they couldn't provide a complete dataset to NMFS for the fisheries of the United States and they also weren't able to provide the legislators with fishery evaluations and we all know how important that is.

This example here shows that now that they're 100 percent compliant -- These three lines here, this one here, here, and here, are in bold and I wasn't sure if you would be able to tell that, but they show the difference between the shellfish landings in 2006 and 2007. An example for oyster counts, they had 143,468 in 2006 and approximately eight-and-a-half million in 2007.

This isn't a reflection in the change in the fishery. This is a reflection in the change of data collection. The eight million is the number that they thought that they were always collecting, but nobody was collecting the data on what they were catching. It's also similar for the Northern quahog. It's about 476,000 in 2006 and around twenty-one million in 2007 and so clearly they have filled some data gaps by switching to SAFIS.

eVTR, as I said again, is very new. It's just being rolled out in New Jersey. They expect that this is going to drastically reduce staff time, because this is an electronic reporting system for their fishermen. Prior to right now, New Jersey fishermen were sending in their paper reports to New Jersey and someone in New Jersey was having to sit down and enter them all into the

computer.

Now, the fishermen are going to be doing it on their own. They also expect that they're going to increase the amount of commercial landings data and they don't have to worry about any duplicate reporting, because most of this reporting was coming in through paper before and it's not coming in through paper now and this data is data that's not being collected anywhere else.

This is a benefit to the fishermen as well, because what the system does for them -- eVTR, the fishermen enter their own data and they receive a receipt of what they've entered and they can also go in and view previously entered reports. If you're a fisherman, you don't have to worry about I sent in this and they say I sent in that. Everybody is looking at exactly the same thing, so we can both get onto the computer and know exactly what we've sent.

The final example I have has to do with compliance in Virginia. Virginia doesn't have a staff member specifically dedicated to compliance. However, they do use the SAFIS system for their dealers and their fishermen turn in reports, where they actually report the dealer that they sold their fish to.

What this allows the folks in Virginia to do is to run a query on the SAFIS data and compare it to the list of fishermen reports that they've got sent in. They should match. If they don't match, they're able to very quickly identify which fishermen haven't sent in their reports and then they're able to contact them as non-compliant fishermen.

The alternative to the ten-minute SAFIS query that they're currently running is to actually go to the dealers and get this information. They estimate that going to the dealers would take approximately two days of staff time per dealer and they have approximately fourteen dealers and so they figure that this ten-minute SAFIS query is saving them approximately a month of staff time.

Pretty much, I think I already outlined the benefits. A month of staff time versus ten minutes of staff time to generate the amount of information is clearly timely and it also allows them to save their resources and to contact non-compliant fishermen in a timely fashion, so that you're not contacting fishermen five or six weeks after they've fished and asking them what they fished for. You can contact them a few days after they've fished and ask them what they fished for.

The conclusions that we came to from this is that each component of the ACCSP system provides unique and varied opportunities for the partners to improve overall data quality and reporting compliance. The broad systems of ACCSP can be implemented to whatever degree a partner wishes and in any manner that a partner wishes and the ACCSP strives to work with a partner, so that the program is implemented in such a way that it benefits the partner to the best available manner and that allows the partner to have good data and that way, they can make good decisions on fisheries management that will benefit both the partner and the fishermen in the system.

I just want to acknowledge the four people who sat down and gave me these stories when we were chatting: Heidi Bray from the Maine Department of Marine Resources; Peter Clark from

the New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife; Tom Hoops from the Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries; and Stephanie Iverson from the Virginia Marine Resources Commission.

While I take questions, I'm just going to pop this last slide up here. It's really far too complicated to actually sit and go through, but this is a current status of the data that's in the ACCSP warehouse and so it's the commercial, recreational, and biological data that we currently have available for query. Now I'll take questions.

Mr. Iarocci: Thank you for that. It was very informative. Could you go back to that slide with the comparison on the voids in the data, from hundreds of thousands to millions of pounds? Could you tell me how within one year -- I know it looks like something is wrong. I would like to hear how it went from -- Just, for example, soft went from 828,000 up to over five million and was it you guys were missing the dealers or the data or how did that happen?

Ms. Defilippi: In 2006, Massachusetts did not have SAFIS and so the SAFIS is the dealer reporting, the mandatory dealer reporting. What Massachusetts did was they didn't just implement a voluntary. Some states, some partners, have partial dealer reporting. Massachusetts went to 100 percent requirement for their dealers to report and so what this was is this was randomly what was being reported on a voluntary basis in 2006, compared to what was mandatorily being reported in 2007. That's when you ask someone versus tell them to tell you.

Mr. Currin: Somewhat to that point and then another question as well. Just a comment, but I would love to see the dogfish estimates and how they changed between 2006 and 2007. My other question is -- Maybe I misunderstood you, Julie, but what I understood you to say earlier was that the SAFIS system, I guess in toto, is primarily operational now in the Northeast Region and is that correct?

I know you're gathering data, types of data, from many of the South Atlantic states, but the entire SAFIS program, which seems to be more comprehensive, is currently operational only in the Northeast and is that correct?

Ms. Defilippi: Yes, the SAFIS is actually implemented right now in the states of Maryland/Virginia and north. It's north of Virginia, basically, and the four southern states remaining have different systems that they're currently using. If any partner here is from one of those states and is interested in using the SAFIS system, then we would be more than willing -- It's there and it's very easy to get you rolled in. It's just a matter of getting the folks in your state to use it, but I don't think it would be -- From our standpoint, it would be very easy to get you into the system.

Mr. Currin: I'm from North Carolina and perhaps you guys have talked about it and I don't know what the benefits or how it would change the amount of information and types of information that would be available, but --

Ms. Defilippi: We can definitely chat about it, if you want to.

Ms. Shipman: I was just going to remind Tony that in terms of those landings jumps, remember

what happened with rock shrimp for us back when we started the limited entry program and we went from six million pounds to twenty-one million?

Mr. Waugh: One of the reasons we asked to have this presentation here is to see that there is technology available that can be used as we move into having multiple quotas. In Amendment 17, we're going to put in quotas for all our overfishing species and then after that, we'll have quotas for all the remaining species. My question, Julie, is what is the cost for a dealer to have the software to be able to enter their own data or for a fisherman to be able to enter their own data?

Ms. Defilippi: There would be costs if you wanted a copy on a local PC, if a fisherman or a dealer would not have access to the internet, but if they have access to the internet, then that's all the cost that they're paying for. It's a web-based system and so they're actually just going to a website and logging in. They're logging in with their account, but we pass those out for free.

There's no cost unless you need a PC version and I'm not sure what the exact cost of the PC version is, but that's something that could possibly go through the funding proposal. They're developing one for eVTR as well. The eVTR one isn't actually currently developed. There's only a web version available, but a PC version will be available as well and the PC version is just for someone who has no internet access on a regular basis. If you have internet access, then you don't need a PC-based version and it's free.

Mr. Waugh: How do you ensure that a person's data remain confidential? How do you deal with confidentiality as these data are submitted and then reported out?

Ms. Defilippi: We have a confidentiality policy that anyone -- Whether there's a known dealer or a known fisherman, there has to be at least three records for the data to be released. All of the data -- Anything that's being queried by a user who doesn't have confidential access, the data is being rolled up into a summary, so that no three people who are identified or no group of three people, even if two people are unknown and one person is identified, it's still considered confidential, unless all of the people are unknown.

Then you can actually see it at a trip-level basis, but everything is rolled up for non-confidential users. If you're a confidential user, that's the only way to get access to that actual trip level data and you can't get a confidential account without -- We have a contact within each of our partners who can approve confidential access for someone else and they have to fill out a form and get that confidential access and then we'll give them that level of access, but other than that, you get summary data. You can't get trip level data.

Dr. Chevront: I do know that in North Carolina one of the issues that we faced was lack of computer literacy on the part of many of our dealers and that was a major stumbling block for us to join in on this. For whatever reason, we're not prepared to sort of force dealers to become computer literate, not yet, according to the chair of my commission.

Ms. Defilippi: We have tried to make the interface as user friendly and I don't want to say easy, but for the not computer literate -- You can set up favorites in the beginning, so that if you pull a

certain fisherman and he only has two types of gear, then you don't have to scroll through the whole list, only those two types of gear will show up.

We're also hiring a new programmer on our end and improving those interfaces is always on our plate. Making it more and more easy for users to use as far as entering data and also retrieving data is one of our goals. If you look at either an entry or a retrieval interface and have suggestions on how it could be easier, we're always open to hearing those.

Dr. Chevront: Bringing it back to this committee specifically, I think maybe on your very last slide that we might be able to find the answer to this question that I'm about to ask, but how far back can we go and have complete data for the states in the South Atlantic, and so we're talking from North Carolina, and can we separate out east coast of Florida from west coast of Florida?

Ms. Defilippi: The states from Virginia up through Maine have 1994 through 2006 and North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida all have 1980 through 2007. The 1980 through some of the earlier years are data that we have that ALS also has and so that's why it's split up like that and that's summary data and then the trip level data is the later years.

For separating Florida, you would need to look at that data at a trip level and probably choose county or port to determine which side of Florida you're in or splitting up your Florida. The recreational data is 1981 through 2007 and the lobster data is 1981 through 2006.

Dr. Chevront: I think that we would probably need to rely on trip level data and it looks like from South Carolina that it started from 2004 and so we really only have a couple of years of trip level data that are warehoused at this point.

Ms. Defilippi: Right. For South Carolina, it starts in 2004. North Carolina is 1994 and Georgia is 1989 and Florida is 1986. It's better for some of the other states outside of South Carolina, but we don't have trip level data submitted to us.

Dr. Chevront: Within the ACCSP, has there been any discussion of how these data could be used for management purposes, other than just looking at the accuracy of the data that you've collected?

Ms. Defilippi: We are branching out into the world of stock assessments and that's partly my job. I just started in November and part of my role is to start attending stock assessments and working with stock assessment folks in bringing our data. I've been to the king mackerel stock assessment and I was recently in Charleston for the vermilion snapper.

We are participating in weakfish, which is happening in July, and Jeff was at a few last year, where we brought a little bit of data, but not so much. That's part of what we want to do, is we want to start working more and more -- Probably the most involved with a stock assessment we've been has been with the lobster stock assessment, because we created an entire database for them and it's designed specifically for their needs. There's a lot of work that we've done with the lobster stock assessment, in trying to create usable data sources that are readily available for the new models that they're developing in the lobster stock assessments.

Dr. Chevront: Does anybody else have any questions for Julie? I'm not seeing any others. Julie, thank you very much for coming and doing this presentation for us. We really appreciate it.

Ms. Defilippi: Thank you and I just want to say thanks for having me and like I said, if you are interested in talking with Mike, I know he's interested in coming down here and so I'm sure that you'll be coordinating soon to get him into meetings, but I'm here all night and so if you're interested in chatting, then come find me. Thanks.

Dr. Chevront: The next item on our agenda is the committee report from our April 2008 meeting and I'm going to ask Gregg to give us an overview of that report.

Mr. Waugh: What we'll be using is the overview, because I just want to run through and hit the high points of that report. The major recommendations from the committee are shown and you all have this and I'll make this a little larger as well. You all have this in your overview document.

In terms of alternatives, the committee combined the old Alternative 3, which was using just the council's judgment, and Alternative 4, which was the detailed economic and social models, and moved immediate consideration of old Alternative 4, which was the detailed economic and social models, to Appendix A. We had a detailed presentation from Jim Waters, who is here, and we can go through some of this.

There are models available. Unfortunately, we don't have sufficient data in our area to do those types of analyses and so within the timeframe that we're looking at for our Comprehensive Allocation Amendment, detailed economic and social models will not be available for us to use. The committee has indicated that's something they want to look at in the future, as those models become available.

The alternatives that we would be looking at are Alternative 1, no action, and Alternative 2, landings data from NMFS or ACCSP databases, catch data from assessments that would include discard mortality. What the committee is recommending as its preferred right now is the council's judgment, based on fairness and equity. This approach would consider any number of factors, including, but not limited to, social and economic values, including demographic shifts. It will also include any models that do become available in the future. It would include looking at landings data and the council's view of what fisheries should look like into the future.

We're looking for some additional discussion, if any, at the committee level and then guidance from the council on this range of alternatives. These are the motions that implement that change in alternatives.

As far as these detailed economic models for the South Atlantic, we did -- The committee report does include a list of those data items and what we should discuss at some point here is whether we recommend -- Option 1 would be to recommend that data be collected for use in future analyses, for documents after the Comprehensive Allocation Amendment, whether we modify

that list and recommend approval or some other alternative at this stage.

The third item is to allocate by four sectors. The committee discussed how we do our allocations. Right now, the committee's recommendation is to allocate amongst four sectors: commercial, recreational, for-hire, and a conservation alternative.

Then something we'll address later is the committee made a number of data requests. The committee is also scheduled to have another committee meeting in July and we are working to prepare analyses for that. We've done some and some remain to be done. That's the main items from the committee report.

Dr. Chevront: Gregg, let's back up to the four alternatives as they now stand and I would like to have some discussion on that. Monica, did you have something?

Ms. Smit-Brunello: I guess I have a couple of general questions, if you wouldn't mind me asking them now. This is called a Comprehensive Allocation Amendment and when we've used the word "comprehensive" in the past, it's meant, I believe, that the council intends an amendment to amend many different fishery management plans and so I'm assuming that's what this is supposed to do, but is this supposed to then set up a process under each fishery management plan that you would use these procedures or this is the kind of data you would use to form your allocations in each fishery?

Mr. Geiger: Yes, it's a methodology, a comprehensive approach that we would use and the methodology that we would use as we allocated all fisheries, in every amendment, under every fishery management plan as we move forward. Along with ACLs, one of the things that has to be done is you've got to allocate and we don't have a firm methodology for doing that. What I envisioned us doing is determining a methodology, a standard methodology that the council would use in determining allocations as we addressed each allocation as ACLs came forward.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: You would address the actual allocation though separately in each fishery management plan?

Mr. Geiger: Yes.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: This would be the guiding principles, the guidelines, the position of the council, whatever, but it would amend each fishery management plan so that it would have to follow whatever actions you set up in this allocation amendment?

Mr. Geiger: In regard to determining the allocations, yes.

Mr. Waugh: Monica, if I could just clarify one thing. We have to remember the parallel track here. The Comprehensive Allocation Amendment is on the same track as Amendment 17 and we need that -- We need the allocations to apply to the annual catch limit that the council sets. The Comprehensive Allocation Amendment will have the methodology and it will apply that methodology and set the allocation formulas for each of our fisheries.

We need it for the species in Amendment 17, which is why it's tracking Amendment 17, and then we'll have it for the remainder of our managed species, for use with the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Mr. Robson: I guess if it's tracking Amendment 17, I don't know how approval of an allocation process will provide the guidance we need to help with Amendment 17, if it's on the same approval track. Then if we're looking at a preferred alternative that requires the council to assess a number of different parameters, that could be a pretty time consuming component just by itself, if we're going to go back and try to dig up all of the appropriate economic information and then have a debate and discussion about what we want the fishery to look like in the future. I guess I'm not sure how the timing is going to work for all of the ACL work we've got to do.

Mr. Waugh: I misspoke. The Comprehensive Allocation Amendment is on the same track as the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Dr. Chevront: Can you remind us of that timeline, Gregg?

Mr. Waugh: We've got approving the Comprehensive ACL Amendment for scoping in December of 2008, doing a scoping in early 2009, and then looking at options in March and June and then approving in September for public hearings. That's the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

The Comprehensive Allocation Amendment, we've got scheduled for approval -- Prior to this, we had it for approval in September and I've got to re-correct myself and I apologize. The Comprehensive Allocation Amendment and Snapper Grouper Amendment 17 are on the same track. They are on the same track. We had initially those scheduled for approval in September and we anticipate that sliding to December of this year.

Dr. Crabtree: Amendment 17 is not going to be dependent at all on the allocation amendment then?

Mr. Waugh: It is. It will be.

Dr. Crabtree: It is?

Mr. Waugh: It is, according to the schedule that you all have approved, yes.

Dr. Crabtree: I guess I heard different things. When George was asked about is the allocation amendment going to set the allocations, I thought you said it was going to set the methodology, but then Gregg just, I thought, said that it was going to set the allocations and so I guess I'm not understanding or at least we don't seem to be all on the same page.

Aside from the fact that it's not clear to me how we're going to take final action on this amendment in December, because I don't think we even have a -- Is there even a scoping document? I guess there is a scoping document on this, but there's not much beyond that at this point, is there?

Dr. Chevront: I think you're correct.

Dr. Crabtree: I think the first thing we need to get on the same page about is is this amendment just a methodology or is it going to actually set the allocations?

Dr. Chevront: My understanding, from what Gregg has said, is we've got to have those allocations, the actual hard numbers, if it's going to track along with Amendment 17, because of the ACL requirement. I don't know how we can get around it.

Dr. Crabtree: There are different ways to skin the cat. You could set the allocations required for Amendment 17 in Amendment 17, but we're getting to a point where we need to make decisions about where are we going to do what, so that people know what's going to be in what amendment.

I frankly -- It's difficult for me to see us ready to take final action on an allocation amendment in December. That gives us two meetings now to develop the whole document and do public hearings and that's going to be difficult, I think.

Mr. Waugh: The timing for both Snapper Grouper Amendment 17 and the Comprehensive Allocation Amendment, we're to approve it for public hearing in September. For both of those, approval for public hearing will slide to December, because we've made some suggestions for changes. That would slide approval to March and June of next year for both of those.

Dr. Crabtree: That's a big difference.

Mr. Robson: I just think we need to have more discussion about what we're looking to get out of the allocation amendment, if it is strictly a roadmap for us to use to look at and then determine an allocation, species or species, or however we're doing them, or if we use this as a way to actually -- I don't see how we can't -- That seems to be the way we would have to do it.

Even if you look at a suite of things for each species, that suite of parameters is going to be potentially different, depending on what kind of information is available. This is just, to me, a guideline or a methodology, but the actual allocations still have to be set species by species some other way or not some other way, but in a different amendment or as part of Amendment 17 or the Comprehensive ACL Amendment. I'm kind of rambling, but I'm just trying to understand what this particular amendment is actually going to do, other than set out the methodology that we look at when we determine allocations.

Mr. Geiger: That's the danger in asking me. When I originally proposed this amendment, that was my intent, was to develop a methodology and a process for this council moving forward without dithering and developing a process for every fishery we undertake in developing an allocation.

If we have a process, it would seem to me that it would be easier as we approached each fishery and if we had this plan approved by the council, we would all move forward together, utilizing

this plan to do our allocations. If it comes to pass, and I know it's been discussed that we can use this, potentially, in setting allocations. We even talked about it in the committee at one time, looking at allocations and if it was okay and -- We talked about that, but I don't know exactly where that's going. When you asked me and you looked at me, I told you what my intent was from the beginning.

Mr. Robson: That helps me a little bit, because my concept of this is assuming we settle -- Let's say we settle on the current preferred alternative and we'll be developing more or less a checklist that we go through and we follow that standardized checklist every time we look at an allocation issue, species by species, and it says that we've got to go out and gather all the economic data we can and look at it and then we have to go through, as a council, and make a determination about the subjective view of the fishery in the future. We have this series of things that we go through for every single allocation discussion and this would guide us in that.

Mr. Geiger: Just to that point, briefly, the reason this came up was because it appeared that the methodology that was kind of broadly out there as being the panacea for setting allocations was the catch history, which we had some discussion about as to the appropriateness of using just catch history to set allocations.

I think, based on that discussion, we came to the conclusion that it wasn't and we needed to have some other methodology. In the past, allocations have been established on some fisheries in this council just based on best judgment of the council and they've set allocations and they've readjusted allocations, just based on best judgment. Not everybody felt that was the best methodology and so what we're trying to do is determine what methods are out there and what methods are best used to determine how to allocate.

Of course, in the meantime, the Gulf did a cost/benefits analysis on red grouper and they actually got results and a model was developed by Dr. Waters, who presented that model, and we talked about the parameters that we would need to use that model in our process. As Gregg said, we don't have the data to fill in all the data needs for Dr. Waters' model for most of our fisheries, but we would like to do it in the future and so we've identified as a research requirement the collection of a suite of datasets to satisfy the cost/benefits analysis, but in the meantime, we're going to have to do something else.

Mr. Boyles: I'm afraid I may have bought a bridge in Brooklyn. I was going under the impression that it was a comprehensive, all inclusive allocation amendment and that at the end of the day we were going to have allocations for the fisheries for which we needed to set ACLs and the process of developing this was going to be the big forum that several of us have been talking about for several years, about how do we get our hands around the very, very difficult and thorny question of allocation.

I've been under the impression at the end of the day -- I was looking forward to getting there. I wasn't looking forward to the journey, quite frankly, but to the outcome that we were going to have a say, that the council was going to speak with an affirmative voice, that this is how we are going to allocate these various fisheries.

Mr. Geiger: Again, that's very well where the committee may go and if that's the way we go, that's the way we go. I was asked what my intentions were when I started this process and I just conveyed that and that's all. If we're going to set allocations on species going through this process, as we march through the Allocation Committee process, that's fine with me, too. My comments were just what were my intentions when I brought it up and I thought that was the question.

Dr. Chevront: One of the things though that -- If we go back to what George's original intent was and take into account what Roy had said, wouldn't it be possible that as opposed to developing a separate amendment for allocation that we can develop a guidance document that includes the things that George was originally suggesting and then put the allocations in each one of the amendments as we go? I just wanted to throw that out there.

Ms. Shipman: I agree with where you're coming from. To me, it's a policy statement that is going to guide every amendment and future plan that we do for the things that you take into consideration in how you're going to do allocations. If this is supposed to be the amendment where we decide the allocation for every fishery, we certainly will not get it done in time for the ACLs. It's not going to be a one-size-fits-all.

I don't see how we can take a golden crab fishery and use the same allocation formula, so to speak, that we would be using for a mackerel fishery that's got -- Our fisheries are just so diverse, but in terms of the guidance; I think we can do that. Now, how the council does a policy statement, what we have to go through for public input and all of that, I have no idea, but it seems like it would be more expeditious to do it as a policy statement than as an amendment or a plan or whatever.

Mr. Boyles: Again, maybe this -- I was tripped up by words. I guess I was thinking in terms of like we've done with the Fishery Ecosystem Plan and the Comprehensive Amendment. It's taken me a while to get my hands around all of this stuff as well, but the way I see it is the plan itself is the policy statement, like Susan references, and the amendment is where we really get down to rolling up sleeves and working on outcomes.

I've been using that nomenclature and expecting that we would have some kind of outcome and decision about this is how we're going to allocate red snapper and this is how we're going to allocate gag.

Dr. Crabtree: I just want to point out that I'm looking in the options paper for Amendment 17 and it says: Note, that allocation decisions for the overfishing species that do not have the allocations specified in an FMP, which is everything but black sea bass and snowy grouper, will be included in the Comprehensive Allocation Amendment.

It seems that where 17 is now is this allocation amendment is going to actually set the allocations, but I agree with Susan. I think you're going to run into some real timing problems and so I think this is something we need to get resolved at this meeting, so that if we're going to specify those allocations in Amendment 17, we need to go ahead and have staff start coming up with some alternatives to do that there.

As for the process for a policy statement, I think that's -- You have aquaculture policy statements and any number of policy statements and so if you want this to be a policy statement, I think you have processes and have done that in the past.

Mr. Waugh: The way we've approached this is for Amendment 17, we need the allocations to apply to your ACL and our understanding was that it was going to come from this amendment. If all we're doing here is describing a methodology, then the committee's work is done. You've got the methodology here. Alternative 4 describes how you're going to calculate it and what data are going to be used and then the other motion has your four sectors that you're going to allocate to.

If that's all we're doing, then there's no need for a July Allocation Committee meeting. That committee's work is done. What you then want is to come up with allocations for Amendment 17 and at the staff level, we thought that's what was going to be done in July. If you're asking staff to do the allocations for Amendment 17, that's what the Allocation Committee was going to do in July.

Mr. Geiger: I'm not asking staff to do the allocations. I think that's clearly a council responsibility and we're the people who have to do that. Now, if we want to do that in response to the requirement in Amendment 17 within the Snapper Grouper Committee, I guess we could do that, but if we have this smaller group that could do it and move forward and bring a recommendation back, it might be easier to do that, rather than taking up committee time within Snapper Grouper to do it. We can attack each of those fisheries in turn as an Allocation Committee. In truth, I thought we were going to start working on those allocations as well in July, that that's where the committee had gone to.

Mr. Currin: To that point, Brian, I'm not on the Allocation Committee, but I am on the Snapper Grouper Committee and somebody needs to do it and somebody needs to do it quickly and if it's not going to be done here, then we'll -- Assuming we have time, we're going to need to start talking about it at this meeting, with regards to the species in Amendment 17. That needs to be clear in the direction that we're heading and a plan to get there at the appropriate time. That needs to be very clear.

Mr. Geiger: I think that's why we had these meetings and we come to the council and give you a briefing on what's been done and seek guidance as to how we proceed and how we keep going down this path. I think there's a decision to be made as to whether we proceed and work on those allocations in July, at our July committee meeting, or as Gregg says, our business is done and we attack it at the Snapper Grouper Committee level at this meeting and subsequent meetings, because we won't get them all done here, I don't think.

Mr. Robson: I'm not on the Allocation Committee and so I apologize for jumping into this late. We have -- Maybe I just need to understand where we're at in the process. We have a proposed amendment that we're looking at with alternatives in it and if we move forward with this, that needs to go through the process and then be approved and that tells us, once that's done, what our allocation methodology will be.

We can't do anything -- If we go this route, we can't really do anything to set allocations specifically until all that is done and we can't do it in this amendment, because this amendment is where we actually decide what methodology we use. Have I got that wrong? In other words, this would hold us up, if we go an amendment route, to actually setting specific allocations quickly, unless I've got it wrong.

Dr. Chevront: I think you're right. We would have to work out the methodology issues really, really quickly to get on to then the allocations and if it was separated out, then we wouldn't have that potential bottleneck.

Ms. Merritt: I'm a little confused by Mark's input, too. I'll have to think that one over. When we had the Allocation Committee meeting, when we had started on this, I think we realized that we can't do any of this until we start setting the guidelines or the methodology and we couldn't begin until we at least identified the sectors.

Am I wrong that we aren't going to be doing that today? I think we need to be identifying the sectors, to begin with, and just follow Magnuson-Stevens as they lay it out. They have three sectors that they've identified and then from there, then we go into what it is that we're going to do as far as being fair and equitable and following the intent of Magnuson-Stevens to lay out these guidelines for us to go forward. Am I wrong? Are we not going to go forward with that today?

Dr. Chevront: Rita, we haven't even gotten to the sectors at this point yet, but I had fully intended that we were going to have that discussion, but we need to get through this one, I think, first, to the points that have been made before.

Mr. Geiger: I apologize, but we need to go back to square one here and remember that when we embarked on this path, we said that all existing allocations would remain and would be classified interim allocations until such time as we came up with a new process to determine what the allocations were going to be.

In effect, we have allocations for fisheries that already have allocations and they're interim allocations until we develop a process that tells us they need to be changed. In fact, we may come up, if this turns out to be our preferred and in our analysis it turns out that the allocations that were predetermined to be interim allocations, if they prove to be correct, then we leave them in place. If our new procedure that we develop via this committee indicates that a process identifies a better methodology for allocating, then we would employ that and change the allocation at some subsequent date.

Mr. Harris: Amen.

Mr. Boyles: I for one find this discussion helpful, for the following reason. I look at the discussions we've had to date and what we've brought to the table today is the -- A couple of things, on the basis of the last meeting, the Allocation's desire that we make allocations based on our judgment of what's fair and equitable. I think that's a fairly significant policy statement.

Secondly, and you'll note, those of you who weren't there, the discussion at the last meeting about allocating among four sectors. I think that's a fairly significant potential policy statement, should the council decide to go there. I'm not sure that all is lost here yet and maybe I've made the mistake of thinking at the end of the day that someone, the group of us collectively, are going to wave a magic wand and apply a formula or a series of formulas, to data and come up with the recommendations for allocations.

At the end of the day, however, I think it is significant that if this is -- To put in the FEP process, in that parallel process, if our policy statement at the end of the day from the Allocation Committee to the council, and the council adopts it, is we're going to base all further allocations on the basis of fairness and equity and not on historical landings, necessarily, or not solely on other, perhaps traditional data points, I think it's a significant policy statement.

I think the same thing, should the council let to allocate among the four sectors, as recommended by the committee, then that's a fairly significant policy statement as well. I think this is good discussion and it's very helpful to me at least.

Mr. Robson: Based on both George and Robert, what I think I heard them say, we could move forward either with an amendment that sets policy about how we want to allocate and what sectors we look at or we do it as a policy statement, whatever form we take it, but in the meantime, we continue down the path of setting allocations for Amendment 17, for all the other ACL species, and we already know that we've got interim allocations being proposed for gag and vermilion and then once this process of setting the methodology in place is done, then we can, at our leisure almost, go back and reevaluate those allocations that have already been set or will be set, because we have a time crunch with all the ACL stuff.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: Just so you remember, the Magnuson Act requires you to set these allocations in a fair and equitable manner. That's National Standard 4 and that carries through really when they talk about setting allocations. It's got to be fair and equitable and so I'm certain that you all would have been fair and equitable, regardless of whatever criteria you use.

Dr. Crabtree: If I could, so it's really not a policy statement. You have to be fair and equitable and I think if you went through the guidelines, you would find that you have to look at all those things. Now, I'll grant you that if you get to the number of sectors kind of thing that probably is a policy statement. I'm also hearing people use the word "methodology", but I haven't seen a methodology anywhere and I'm not sure what that's really referring to at this stage.

Dr. Chevront: We're not going to have a quantitative methodology like you can for a mathematical model, you plug in the numbers and it spits out who gets what. I think we pretty much agree that that is not going to be so easy to make it happen. I'm not quite sure where that leaves us.

Mr. Boyles: Monica, I appreciate you reminding us of the standards and you're right. I wasn't so focused on fair and equitable as I was the "judgment" word. We've talked about in there the preference is to discuss what we, in our judgment, would like the fisheries to look like in the

future. I wasn't focusing so much on fair and equitable as I was on what the council believes, in our judgment, is how we would like the fisheries to be.

If you recall, the discussion, I believe, started in Coconut Grove two years ago, about is Congress ever going to get around to the idea of allocating these fisheries among sectors and I think we all agreed at the time that we would not wait for Congress to do that.

Dr. Crabtree: You lost me there. Could you say that again?

Mr. Boyles: I seem to recall a discussion, Roy, asking the question during an early part of the meeting at Coconut Grove that led to the establishment of the Economics Committee, I believe, the question is Congress ever going to get around to making specific allocations of fisheries among sectors and I think the outcome of that decision was no, they've left that to the councils.

Dr. Crabtree: I would be astounded if Congress ever got into the weeds into an argument like that. That's why you're here.

Mr. Robson: I use the term "methodology", but I'm talking about basically guidance to the council as to how they will evaluate education. The way this preferred alternative is set up now is instead of -- Let's look at how we've been doing it. We basically looked at landings histories, in some form or fashion, and we picked some years and that's how we did it.

All this is doing is laying out a guideline or a policy or an amendment that tells us how we evaluate allocation, based on gathering and looking at whatever socioeconomic data is available and looking at the landings data and then the third item is using council judgment, in their view, as to what the fishery should look like in the future. That's what we're saying.

We're saying we're going to set up a process to evaluate every allocation, based on those three fundamental pieces of information. Now, the level of information for each species will vary, obviously, and we may wind up, in some cases, reverting back to just landings history, if we can't come to decisions on those other two factors, but I think that's where we're headed with setting something up.

Mr. Geiger: It's not germane to this conversation, but Congress has done allocation.

Mr. Waugh: If we back up a second and look at if we want to meet the congressional mandated timelines, what do we have to do? In Amendment 17, the proposal that we're going to discuss at the Snapper Grouper Committee is to move greater amberjack and mutton snapper out of 17, because they're not overfishing, and move red snapper back into Amendment 17, because it is overfishing.

The deadline for us having that in place is January 1, 2010. We need to approve that for public hearing. We had planned on September and that's not going to happen and it will be December and we had built into our timeline that you all approved a one council meeting window there to slide and so that can't slide anymore.

We have got to have, for the species that are overfishing, allocations. We have interim allocations for some of them, but not for all. There are several other species. Whether you set those allocations in 17 or some other amendment doesn't matter, but we have to have those for 17.

Then our Comprehensive ACL Amendment that will put in ACLs for all our other species, we're looking at scoping that early next year and approving for public hearing in September of next year. My understanding was we were taking the allocation issue -- Setting those ACLs, if anybody passed by the SSC for a while, that's complex. That's going to be tough.

My understanding was what we did was we said that allocations are going to be very controversial and so what we're going to do is take that and deal with it systemically across all our FMPs, in one document, and that would lay out the actual methods and it would give us the allocations that would then apply to Amendment 17 and the Comprehensive ACL Amendment.

Now, we can certainly change that, because we're not pushing that. That's our understanding of where we were, to take that very controversial item and fold it up into one document and deal with it there, because the species committees have got a lot to do with setting the ACLs and the management regulations and accountability measures. Our understanding was it was a division of labor and if you all want to smush that back together, that's fine, but we do need to get some clear guidance here, because we've got a committee meeting planned that if we don't need to have, we don't need to have.

Mr. Currin: Thinking back when we first put this committee together, my hope -- I can't say expectation, but my hope was that the committee would derive some sort of more or less quantitative approach, some way to quantitatively adjust or alter, the rationale behind it, what's always been used for allocations and that's landings history.

I struggled in thinking about this with what might be used and how that might be done and I didn't come up with much, one or two suggestions that I had made to the committee of things to look at.

Otherwise, I think if you don't come up with some quantitative either total approach or way to quantitatively adjust the numbers that we have, I think what you end up with is basically some guidelines, some guidance, or a policy approach or statement about how to set allocations. I think you all have done a great job with that, but it's still going to boil down to people hashing out around the table what's the best way to deal with it and here we've got one stock and here's mutton snapper and here's amberjack and how are we going to do this.

Then you can argue about what you want to draw in and if there's economic data, then yes, we can use it. As we know, there's very little for us to rely on. I don't know where we are exactly with that, but I am very sensitive to the pressing issue of the species in Amendment 17 and I don't think we need to delay with respect to those particular species.

I don't care whether the Snapper Grouper Committee does those allocations and we call them interim and this committee wants to continue to meet and develop, perhaps, different approaches

or some sort of step-by-step approach to setting allocations in the future that will assist the council and that's great. I wish the council well with that and I hope we can come up with some step-by-step approach to allocations.

With the species in 17, we need to get moving on that and again, I don't care. If you guys want to set the interim allocations on that and take the heat off of Snapper Grouper -- As Gregg said, we've got plenty to do and we're happy to let you guys meet in July and bring those to us in September, or at least by December, so that we can plug them in and see what's happening with our ACLs, but we can't dilly-dally. We've got to get it done.

Mr. Geiger: Mac, that's right and one of the things that we were -- As we went through this process, we talked about looking at allocations, but we wanted to have the ACLs to know what we were even going to look at, because part of this whole process is looking out to what the fishery is going to look like in the future and unless you know what the projections are, in terms of what the catch limits are going to be, it's difficult to try and forecast what the fishery should look like.

That was the schedule of events. We were going to get input from our SSC at this meeting and that was going to help us define the fishery and then we were going to take that information to the meeting and begin to thresh out what we could, recognizing that if we didn't get some place that we would have interim allocations there to back up to move out with and keep the process moving. Is that --

Dr. Chevront: That was sort of what my intention was, that we thought we were going to be doing at the July meeting.

Ms. Shipman: I'm not on your committee, but I would think you could still proceed along that course if you want to institutionalize this Preferred Alternative 4 as your guiding principles. It just seems to me there's a more streamlined, expeditious way to embrace that as the guiding principles that this committee is going to apply as you undertake your work to set the longer term allocations for the various fisheries.

The first one I'm hearing you all say you'll be tackling is the snapper grouper species that you need to get done most expeditiously, but I think as long as we can get some public input on this, however we need to do that that establishes the guiding principles -- I just don't know that you need an amendment. I think that's a more cumbersome process than what you might need.

Mr. Waugh: Susan, if I understand what you're saying, it's that the Allocation Committee could go through and come up with the specific allocations and then just funnel the snapper grouper ones into 17 and let that become a part of 17 and then funnel the other allocations into the Comprehensive ACL Amendment and let that implement it and that would certainly work.

Dr. Chevront: It sounds like to me what I'm hearing is that the Comprehensive Allocation Amendment isn't an amendment anymore and that maybe what we're really talking about is coming up with some guidelines and at this perhaps July meeting, what we're going to do is to come up with allocations, particularly for Amendment 17 -- Assuming that our ACLs and

everything work out, they may need to be adjusted later on, but I guess I'm looking for -- I would like for somebody on the committee to make a motion about the amendment and making it now guidelines or something and not a full-blown amendment. I would entertain such a motion, if somebody would like to make it.

Mr. Geiger: I apologize. At two o'clock this morning, I'm going to start calling everybody in here to tell you the reason that I originally wanted this to be an amendment. I'll be darned if I can grasp it right now, with the importance of why it was going to be an amendment, but I'm not going to speak against it, because I think we get to the end destination either way, unless my brain reacts and tells me there's something different. **I would make a motion to develop guiding principles for allocating FMP species in lieu of the existing FMP process.**

Dr. Chevront: Are you happy now with the way that's worded, George?

Mr. Geiger: **Develop guiding principles for allocating our FMP species, in lieu of the existing FMP process (Comprehensive Allocation Amendment).** It doesn't sound very smooth, but does it get to the point and does everybody understand it?

Mr. Waugh: Just one question. You're just going to develop the guiding principles or are you then going to apply them and provide the allocations?

Mr. Harris: I'll second it.

Dr. Chevront: Seconded by Mr. Harris. Any discussion?

Mr. Boyles: Let me just make sure. The idea then at this July meeting is that we are going to come up with recommended allocations to submit to the Snapper Grouper Committee for their consideration? Presumably at future meetings we would do that for other species, to be considered by other committees, appropriate committees, and is that -- What's the outcome of the July meeting? Are we looking at numbers, percents?

Dr. Chevront: I think for the July meeting that we've got to come up with numbers for Amendment 17. That's got to be the minimum amount that we come up with, because that's the thing that's on the front burner. If we can do more than that, great, but I think that's the bare minimum of what we've got to have.

Mr. Boyles: To that point, these will be recommendations then to the Snapper Grouper Committee for their work in September? Is that --

Dr. Chevront: Yes.

Ms. Merritt: Just so that I better understand it -- So by going to this description of what we're doing, versus the amendment process, it takes out the public input at this point, but then that comes into play after allocations have been recommended to the committees and then it goes into those amendments and then it goes to public hearing? Am I understanding that correctly? That's what helps get it on a faster track?

Mr. Waugh: The public input would come for those species in Amendment 17 when that amendment went out for public comment.

Mr. Geiger: That's why I wanted to go through the FMP process in the beginning, was to get the public input in developing some of the guiding principles and get public input when we started. Gregg is entirely right that as we move forward in this process that the public input, in terms of the allocations, will come during the public hearings on the specific FMPs, like 17.

Dr. Chevront: Mark, are your comments related to this motion that we've got now? At some point, we're going to need to vote on this. Susan, to this motion?

Ms. Shipman: Again, not a committee member, but my question of the maker of the motion or whatever is when you're saying the guiding principles, are you referring to the preferred alternative that's above it, which is Number 4? If you are, is it your intent to say that you're developing and adopting the guiding principle that is that, because that has the three parts and pieces that Mark was talking about earlier? If that's your overarching guiding principle, I think you can say you're going to be adopting it.

Mr. Boyles: I was anticipating a second motion to do that, Susan, to recommend to the council that.

Mr. Geiger: That's right, Robert, because we can't adopt any of this until it's approved by full council. We're bringing these alternatives to the council for approval.

Dr. Chevront: Are we ready to call the vote? George, would you mind reading it into the record, just to make sure that we've got it the way we have it?

Mr. Geiger: **The motion is to develop guiding principles for allocating our FMP species in lieu of the existing FMP process (Comprehensive Allocation Amendment).**

Dr. Chevront: Let's go ahead and take the vote. **All those in favor raise your hand, please; all those opposed; any abstentions. The motion carries four to one.** We now have to consider some other things that are related to this. One is do we need a motion to talk -- I guess its just direction that at our July meeting that we'll come up with the allocations for Amendment 17. I don't know that we have to vote on that.

Mr. Boyles: If you desire, if you want to go this way, but I was going to go through some of the preferred alternatives and suggest that the committee submit that to the council for their consideration.

Dr. Chevront: Which preferred alternatives are you referring to?

Mr. Boyles: Alternative 4 and the issue of allocation among sectors, among the four sectors.

Dr. Chevront: Yes, I was intending that we were going to go through those. I'm not skipping

over that at all. If we're okay with that at this point, I would like to go through the motions that we have in our summary document and have some discussion about those and then make our decisions, so that we can carry these motions forward to the full council, if we have any second thoughts about how we want to deal with things.

The first motion that we had was that we recommend to the council, in their deliberations, to allocate among four sectors: commercial, recreational, for-hire, and a conservation sector. Just so that people will know, when we had this discussion, the most controversial part was this discussion about what we're calling a conservation sector. I would like to tell how I remember that went and then ask for other people who were there to chime in to help clarify.

What we talked about, as I remembered it, is that what we were getting from the SSC was an ACL, which is based on statistics. This is the catch level that was going to keep us from going overfishing. However, what we had discussed though was at some point that while mathematically we might be able to come up with an allowable catch level, regardless of how we divided it up among the user groups, that level might be so small that it could potentially be unmanageable.

Sitting in with the SSC meeting the other day and talking about snowy grouper, for example, their recommendation was 523 fish could be caught by the recreational sector in a year. That's pretty unmanageable. It could be done, but it would take a lot of effort and so what we had thought we could do -- If we ended up in this kind of a situation, we could take all of the allowable catch and just say nobody is going to catch it, because the management of it was going to be difficult and therefore, what we could do is if we don't allow anybody to catch it, it might help that species to recover more quickly. That's the way I remember a discussion about the conservation sector.

Also, and it's not reflected here in the motion, but I do remember in our discussions is that just because we had these four sectors, it did not mean that we needed to allocate every sector a portion of the total allowable catch that we were going to have. We could choose not to allocate to some sector, whether its conservation, recreational, commercial or for-hire, it didn't matter.

We just wanted to somehow codify the fact that we would be willing to consider not letting anybody fish on a stock, based on whatever parameters we chose at that time and the one that we had discussed was the fact that the allowable catch level was so low that it probably would be worthwhile not to let anybody fish on it. At this point, I would be glad to entertain some more comment on that.

Mr. Boyles: I think that was an excellent recap of the conversation. Those of you that weren't there, you noticed the note and I think it was appropriate in the overview -- It was a very split vote. My particular interest in the discussion was introducing or affirming the concept that maybe we don't allocate to the very last fish, necessarily, which, again, I think is a very significant policy statement.

I'm going to look to Monica at some point whether there's anything in Magnuson that compels us to require among the use sectors, as it were, and I would like to reaffirm the discussion that

just because we specified or codified four different sectors, it did not necessarily mean that all four sectors would receive an allocation on any given species. I think it is a significant point of discussion and something that I think we should move forward on.

Mr. Swatzel: I thought our discussions in Charleston were very productive about the sectors. One of the rationales about breaking out the for-hire sector was that because the recreational data was so poor and there was a lot more certainty in the for-hire data and we were being penalized because of the uncertainty with the recreational catch that it might be useful to have the for-hire sector out on its own, because it's more known in terms of the catch, more certain.

I would say I am a little concerned about having an allocation to conservation, because my view is that -- You're factoring in a lot of conservative catches when you start dealing with these ACLs and you start factoring in the uncertainty. I'm not sure that if you start allocating to the four sectors -- I believe that might be too conservative an approach. That was the reason that I was one of those that dissented on that vote.

Dr. Chevront: I guess it doesn't really matter to me whether we're going to call that a separate sector or not. It's the concept. That was what was important to me and in our discussions, do we want to allocate, as Robert eloquently said, to the very last fish? I can see a scenario where perhaps we may not want to do that, for whatever the reasons might be.

Mr. Wallace: To that, that was my point there, was that we, by allocating zero to any of the other three sectors, it becomes a conservation, but why give it its own classification? Just allocate it to zero. If you've got commercial, recreational, or for-hire and they get zero allocation, then you're taking care of that.

Dr. Chevront: That certainly does achieve the same goal and I believe the Magnuson Act just says that we can't allocate above the ACL and so we can choose to allocate zero, if that's our choice.

Mr. Geiger: We all have different recollections of how conversations went, but the conservation element, from my perspective, was one of winners and losers in this whole allocation process. I can tell you that there's a sector out there, a group out there, that believes that if they win a portion of the allocation, they're going to get a bag limit increase or a season increase or a trip limit increase or whatever and pitting groups against each other is counterproductive, end all be all, for the resource.

We don't know what the fishery is going to look like until we get the ACLs, if we even have any fisheries to allocate to anybody, but if we did -- In our due deliberations, we're not just -- One of the things is not just allocating, but we need to figure out, and I've been a proponent of looking to try and determine what our fisheries should look like in the future for sustainability, so there's going to be something in twenty years for people to continue to fish for or be able to fish for.

The concept was that if you went through the reallocation process and in looking at our fisheries and we decided that one sector would get possibly, based on the size of the fish, of the biomass that remained, that it should be allocated to all one sector or another fishery should be allocated

or a portion came out and was transferred from one sector to another, that the portion that was transferred out of one sector would go into a conservation bank and not be able to be perceived as a reward to another sector.

If you change the allocation, whatever you took out of one sector would not be awarded to the other sector, but would be put into a conservation bank, in an effort to help recover the stock quicker, so that you might be able to in recovery reallocate then again and you wouldn't have this immediate knee-jerk reaction when you say we're going to take 20 percent from the commercial sector and give it to the recreational sector or vice versa, just to get away from that.

If you took 20 percent from one sector, it wouldn't be automatically awarded to the other sector. It would be put in conservation, in an effort to try and recover the stocks quicker. The allocation would be set based on the future of the fishery and what it looked like and we would move forward.

Dr. Chevront: Taking from what you said, George, I don't think that's all that terribly different from what John just said, because you don't have to allocate 100 percent. To take your example, if you had -- You decided that you were going to take 10 percent from let's just say the recreational sector and instead of giving it to the commercial sector, what you could do is you could then end up with 30 percent commercial or 30 percent recreational or 30 percent for-hire and you have 10 percent that is not allocated and you still achieve the same goal, whether you call it a conservation sector or not.

You don't have to make those numbers add up to 100 and getting back to that concept that Robert had talked about and do you have to allocate down to the last fish and I maintain that you don't.

Mr. Boyles: Just to that point and just briefly -- I do respect the alternative points of view here. I think it was a very good discussion and I think this will continue to be a very good discussion. I don't want us to lose the value of stating explicitly the idea of allocating a resource to a non-extractive group and I look at it as really kind of an investment, if you will, in the future. I don't mean that to be viewed as deleterious by the other three sectors that are in this particular idea, but I think it's very, very powerful to come out with this council saying that we explicitly acknowledge the value of -- Call it what you will, but we call it conservation.

Dr. Laney: I'll give you the perspective from the new guy on the block who represents the Fish and Wildlife Service. The first thing I thought about when I looked at that was they're moving even further into ecosystem-based management here, because they're going to do an allocation for conservation purposes.

From what Robert is saying and from what George said, it seems to me that was at least partially behind the concept and I have more of a question, in addition to that comment, and the question was -- Again, the other thing I thought about when I looked at that was are you talking about forage allocations here, because I know there are some management planning entities in other countries and other parts of this country that have begun making allocations specifically for forage purposes, when they know a given species is an important prey item for some other

fishery.

Now, from the standpoint of trying to relate that back to ACLs and how the SSC is going to help you all derive those though, I think -- See if you all agree with me here. To a certain extent, you are making a de facto conservation allocation, aren't you, when you look at a fisheries population dynamics or a fish's population dynamics? Whatever part of that production of that population that winds up in the M component is conservation, from my perspective.

That is sort of a de facto conservation allocation as well, in addition to whatever part of the OY or FMSY or whatever we're supposed to use that you want to set aside and not allocate to some extractive sector, like Robert pointed out. I guess the last thing I'll say is whatever you decide that is, it needs to be very clearly defined when you flesh your principles out here, so that everybody understands that. I think otherwise that people are going to read that and think very radically different things here, but I like what I'm hearing Robert and George say about it and I think it's a good thing to have it in there as a concept.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: It seems to me that much of your discussion and the concerns everybody has can be taken care of by where you set your optimum yield for the fishery and really, the way I read the Magnuson Act, it says that if it becomes necessary to allocate or assign fishing privileges among the United States fishermen that such allocations shall be fair and equitable to the fishermen, reasonably calculated to promote conservation, and carried out in such a manner that no particular individual, corporation, or entity requires an excessive share.

Then when you go over to the required contents of fishery management plans, Section 303.14 states to the extent that you need conservation and management measures which reduce the overall harvest in a fishery, to the extent those are necessary, you allocate, taking into consideration the economic impact of the harvest restrictions or recovery benefits on the fishery participants in each sector, any harvest restrictions or recovery benefits fairly and equitably among the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors in the fishery. I think that if you would add a conservation sector, that's really outside of what Congress told you that you should do.

Dr. Chevront: Monica, wouldn't we be achieving the same objective just by not allocating all of the fish? Don't we have that right, too?

Dr. Crabtree: Look, you've set up an optimum yield and then you catch it. That's your goal, is to achieve optimum yield. When you set up a total allowable catch, the goal is to catch it and so you allocate it. If you want to set fish aside, that's fine. Set the total allowable catch lower.

If you're going to reduce one sector and don't want to give it to the other sector, fine. Reduce the total allowable catch and you're reallocated the total allowable catch. There are ways to do what you want to do that are very straightforward, but I think what you're going down now is not consistent with the Act and it's certainly not consistent with our guidelines. You can get to it and I encourage you to be conservative, but I don't think this is really the way to get to it.

Mr. Geiger: I appreciate the input from both of you all. That's why we bring this to the full

council, to help us understand if we're going on the right path or not. I'm not opposed to what you say. I understand it completely. My intent was to try and alleviate this fair and equitable rip-saw of taking from one and the other perceiving they're going to get some benefit from it, which is not the intent of doing any of this stuff, but I appreciate both of your comments.

Ms. Shipman: We've actually done similar things to this years ago in mackerel, when we would set the catch limits well below the ABC. On the record, we said we are conserving fish into a bank, if you will, that will be a reproductive stock. I fully agree with what John and everybody else is saying. You just set whatever your ACT or ACL or whatever it's going to be below that ABC sufficiently and you set your OY. If you don't want to harvest, like in the case of jewfish, you set it at zero. Excuse me, goliath grouper.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Chairman, are you ready for a motion?

Dr. Chevront: You bet I am.

Mr. Harris: **I would move that we delete from the Motion 1 above the Item 4, Conservation, and simply allocate to the commercial, recreational, and for-hire sectors.**

Dr. Chevront: Do we have a second? John Wallace seconds. I have one question about this, as we're starting a little bit of discussion. As Monica read, the Act -- Instead of for-hire, it specifically said "charter" and now does the federal definition for charter include for-hire? It does? Okay. Monica is nodding her head yes. I just wanted to make sure that was clear. Do we have any other discussion on this motion?

Mr. Currin: **Again, I'm not on your committee, but it would seem to me the motion would be more clear if we modified the term "in their deliberations allocate among four sectors" to "consider allocating among three sectors" or whatever it is.** I think I heard the statement that the intention was not to require allocation to all three, but just to make that a consideration.

Mr. Harris: **I accept that as a perfection of the motion.**

Dr. Crabtree: I think that's a very good point and I want to go back to something Tom said a minute ago, which kind of alluded to uncertainty in the catch estimates and that by separating the recreational sector into two sectors, that would somehow improve that. In fact, if you split sectors, it will increase the uncertainty. If you go into the recreational catch estimates and you look at the overall recreational estimate and then look at the coefficient of variation and then you split it into the private boat sector and the charter sector and look at the CVs, they go up.

If you go down the paths of regional management, the CVs will go up dramatically and so the more you take a sector and split it geographically or in any form or fashion, the error around all the catch estimates will go up. Now, that would not apply, probably, to the headboats, where it's done more as a census type survey and it's separate, but I think you need to bear that in mind, because that's going to be a real difficulty we face.

Mr. Harris: To that point, Roy, then if this motion is approved and for-hire is left in there as a

sector that would receive an allocation, could we then do a sub-allocation to the headboat sector at some time in the future, if we chose to do so?

Dr. Crabtree: Yes, I think you certainly can.

Mr. Waugh: Let's remember too that our data collection programs don't have to be static. If you want to allocate to the for-hire, there's nothing wrong with putting in a requirement that the for-hire sector report electronically.

Dr. Chevront: Also, I think it depends on the characteristics of individual fisheries. I know that there was one discussion about, when we were looking at vermilion snapper, that one of the recreational bag limits was basically one fish per vessel. If you did that on a headboat, that would be devastating and so that's why we had wanted to consider, for example, allocating separately to headboats, compared to individual privately owned boats.

Dr. Crabtree: Just to go to Gregg's point, you could require that charterboats report electronically, but remember that your catch estimates for the charterboats come from the charterboat methodology and the charterboat survey and so they wouldn't be changed by requiring a logbook, just like we have logbooks in the commercial fishery, but we don't use those for the catch estimates. They come from the trip tickets. You have to look at all these kinds of things. If you wanted to say we're going to require logbooks, whether they're electronic or paper, in the charterboat sector, that's fine. That may be a very good idea.

If you say we're going to use those as the catch estimates, now you're getting into a whole other issue, because we're going to have to evaluate their reliability and whether those are the most defensible catch estimates or the charterboat survey is and that's something MRIP and the relooking at all this is.

All these things are much more complicated and I don't think just requiring a logbook in the charterboat, necessarily, means that those are going to give you catch estimates that are going to be even as good as what you already have. I was a fishing guide and I can tell you that in the Florida Keys for some years we filled out logbooks to Everglades National Park and I can tell you that I wouldn't have wanted to use those logbooks to estimate the catches. There's a lot of problems with logbooks and there always have been.

Mr. Waugh: Certainly what I was referring to was the council could set up a different way to track these quotas. That's what they're turning into be. We know the variation and the precision with the estimates that we have now. Yes, there are other mechanisms that are being looked at, but there's nothing to stop you from specifying how these allocations will be tracked. Certainly it carries, as Roy has pointed out, certain changes to existing programs.

Dr. Chevront: I believe we still need to vote on this motion. Does anybody else have any comments before I call the vote? Duane, could I get you to read your motion up here as it stands now?

Mr. Harris: **I move to delete Item 4, Conservation, from Motion Number 1 that was**

projected above and to consider allocating among three sectors: commercial, recreational, and for-hire.

Dr. Chevront: That motion was made by Duane Harris and I believe it was seconded by John Wallace. **All those in favor of the motion raise your hand; any opposed. The motion carried unanimously.**

Now that we've made some of these decisions, I've got to go back and regroup here for a minute, because I think some of the decisions we've now made have sort of voided some of the other motions that we made at our April meeting and I kind of need some help to figure out what we need to do here. Do we need to make a motion to void the motions that we passed in April? Can somebody help me out here?

I'm looking at, for example, Motion Number 4. That no longer seems relevant to what we had done. This becomes our preferred methodology and so that's our new motion that we just made at this meeting and so does that motion that we passed earlier invalidate Motion Number 4? What does that do? I need some procedural help here, I guess.

Mr. Waugh: To me, you would still approve it, because that now is reflected in this preferred alternative that you have.

Mr. Geiger: It still has to be approved by the council.

Dr. Chevront: We've already approved it and so does anybody in this Motion Number 4, which I'll read right now and then we'll have discussion and then maybe move on -- Motion Number 4 that we made at our committee meeting read: Amend Alternative 3 to read: Council's judgment based on fairness and equity. This approach would consider any number of factors, including, but not limited to: social and economic values, including demographic shifts and models, when available; landings data; and the council's view of what fisheries should look like into the future. Also, move Alternative 4 to Appendix A and the old Alternative 4, I believe, was the one to make allocation decisions based on social and economic data only. That motion was approved by the committee at our April meeting. Does anybody have any discussion or want to change the motion or whatever we need to do?

Mr. Wallace: Based on what Monica said, that all this has got to be based on fishermen's data or the participants in the fishery, we can't use demographic shifts, can we? The demographic shifts in the context that we did in the meeting was for the public moving into the coast and not so much of the fishermen getting out of the industry.

Mr. Boyles: Somewhat to John's point, but it strikes me that where we are with this motion was the committee's sense that we don't allocate solely on the basis of historical landings data. I think that's what the intent of the motion was. That was my interpretation and I would like to see where everybody else is. At the end of the day, I should have read Magnuson a lot more carefully than I did. I would have saved myself a lot of difficulty, I think, but my sense of things -- I would like to hear from other members of the committee, but maybe the outcome I would like to suggest is that one of the things for the council to consider is this statement -- What it

does say is that we don't look at historical landings data exclusively in determining allocations.

Dr. Chevront: Are you saying you would like to modify this motion?

Mr. Boyles: For the purposes of moving this forward, yes.

Dr. Chevront: Have at it.

Mr. Boyles: **I would like to make a motion that the committee recommend to council that future allocations not be made solely on the basis of historical landings data among the sectors.**

Dr. Chevront: Do you want to go any further and make some suggestions on some of the other things that they might want to include, like we had in our original motion, or do you like it the way it is? I'm just asking.

Mr. Boyles: No.

Dr. Chevront: We have a motion and do we have a second for that motion?

Mr. Harris: A question for the maker of that motion. That's not a substitute for the motion that's up there now, is it?

Mr. Boyles: No. The way I see that, that is a --

Mr. Harris: Separate guidance?

Mr. Boyles: Separate guidance, yes. Thank you, Duane.

Mr. Harris: Then I'll second it.

Dr. Chevront: Seconded by Mr. Harris. Any more discussion?

Dr. Crabtree: You seem to be telling them what they should not do here, rather than I think the guidance to the council would be more useful if you told them what they should use. If they're not going to just use landings, then what specific pieces of data is it that you're telling them to use and that are available and exist right now? Because you're going to have to make these decisions.

Mr. Harris: That's in the other motion.

Dr. Chevront: It is in the other motion.

Dr. Crabtree: No, I saw "judgment" and I saw "fairness and equitable", but those are rather vague concepts and they also are not data. Judgment is not data. I don't see any specific pieces of data in that preferred alternative, in fact. Specifically, if they're not going to just use landings,

what specific piece of data is it that you're telling them they need to consider? We all understand these broad things.

Mr. Harris: Social and economic values and demographic shifts and models, when available, and landings data, but not just landings data.

Dr. Crabtree: What if they don't have any of those other things?

Dr. Chevront: Then you have to use just landings data and judgment as to what you want the fisheries to look like in the future.

Dr. Crabtree: Then I'm not sure where this second motion goes beyond -- You've already told them they should use those and so I'm not sure where you're going with it.

Dr. Chevront: George or Robert or Duane, do you want to jump in on that?

Mr. Harris: I'm happy with the motion that Robert made and the motion that follows it. I have no problem with having both of those up there.

Mr. Boyles: I agree with Roy. I don't like making a motion that talks about what we shouldn't consider. It's probably due to my fatigue and my lack of --

Dr. Chevront: Are you saying you want to withdraw your motion?

Mr. Boyles: No, I wanted to move us along and I've done nothing but bog us down and so I'm casting about.

Ms. Shipman: Stepping back a few tens of minutes ago, maybe half-an-hour or so ago, I think what you all said is you all passed a motion that you were going to develop the principles and then, I asked the question of don't you need to adopt what's embodied in 4 as those principles and you all said we're going to pass a motion to do that, but you never did that and that's what I thought Robert was doing.

Dr. Chevront: That motion already exists and was passed. Isn't that what Number 4 did? We've already sort of done that.

Ms. Shipman: That's your principles and you've done it then?

Dr. Chevront: Those are our principles as it stands now and Roy is concerned because he thinks it's probably not quantitative enough or directive enough.

Dr. Crabtree: I'm just not sure where you're going with this. You couldn't just come in and say here's some years of landings and that's the allocation and we're not going to base it on anything else. The guidelines clearly require that you go through all sorts of things. You have to make the determination that it's fair and equitable and you have to make a determination that it's reasonably calculated to promote conservation and you have to make a determination that it

avoids excessive shares.

You have all kinds of things in the guidelines here that you already have to do and so I'm just not sure where we're going here. One thing I would suggest to you is that you read the guidelines to National Standard 4 on allocations, because they go through all sorts of things that you're required to do. It is late and I'm not sure we're getting anywhere right now, Brian, to be honest with you.

Mr. Boyles: **I withdraw my motion.**

Dr. Chevront: Is that okay with the seconder?

Mr. Harris: That's okay with me.

Dr. Chevront: The motion is withdrawn. We still have to deal then with Motion 4, based on what Roy has just said. How do we feel about that? He's basically saying what we have stated is what we already have to do and so to pass a motion on it is, in my mind then, is redundant, because Magnuson already tells us we need to do these things.

Mr. Boyles: **At the risk of really flummoxing parliamentarily, may I make a motion that we rescind Motion 4 or reconsider Motion 4 as approved by the committee at the April meeting?**

Mr. Harris: I'll second it.

Dr. Chevront: Seconded by Mr. Harris. Any more discussion on it?

Mr. Geiger: In lieu of this motion, we're going to revert back to National Standard 4 and use it as the guiding principle?

Dr. Chevront: That's the way I understand it.

Mr. Harris: If we can come up with anything to enhance it, we are welcome to do that, I'm sure, but we're not going to do that at this late hour.

Dr. Chevront: Any more comment? Let's call the vote. **The motion, as it was made by Robert, is to rescind Motion 4 that we approved by committee at our April meeting. All those in favor raise your hand --** We're going to hold off a second on the vote. Robert wants some parliamentary guidance.

Mr. Boyles: **The motion is to reconsider the motion.**

Dr. Chevront: Robert, would you please read your motion as you originally stated it, the way you want it to be done now?

Mr. Boyles: **Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that we reconsider Motion 4 as we approved**

at the committee meeting in April.

Dr. Chevront: Let's go ahead and call the vote. **All those in favor. It's a unanimous vote.**

Mr. Boyles: **Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion that we rescind the motion as it was passed.**

Mr. Harris: Second.

Dr. Chevront: Robert has made a motion and seconded again by Mr. Harris. Any discussion to rescind Motion 4 from April? **All those in favor raise your hand; anybody opposed. The motion passes unanimously.** I've got to look at my agenda again. We sure spent a whole lot of time undoing a lot of stuff that we just did.

Mr. Boyles: Mr. Chairman, may I make a motion that we adjourn for the evening?

Dr. Chevront: Are we going to adjourn or go into recess?

Mr. Boyles: Recess for the evening.

Dr. Chevront: Chairman Geiger, how do you feel about that?

Mr. Geiger: We can go ahead and recess. We've got a closed session in the morning that starts with SSC Selection and so if we could -- It's scheduled from eight to ten, understanding that it may not take a full two hours to do SSC selection. I would presume it would take at least an hour and then what we'll do is we can pick this up, if the committee so desires, tomorrow morning, first thing, the first order of business after SSC Selection, which will be a closed session when we begin. There's no point in opening and then closing and then opening again. We'll continue this committee's dithering and then we'll pick up with SEDAR.

Dr. Chevront: There's one thing I do need to check with. We were going to have Dr. Jim Waters talking with us some about the appropriateness of the economic models and I need to make sure he's still going to be here tomorrow. Jim, are you going to be here tomorrow? He's still going to be here. He indicated yes.

Mr. Geiger: Before we recess for this afternoon, I'm going to request staff get with Monica to ensure that she's going to be available for our July meeting. If she's not available for the scheduled dates, we need to adjust the dates of the meeting to correspond with her. She was supposed to be at the last meeting and she had things that interfered with that meeting.

Ms. Smit-Brunello: I have it written down already.

Mr. Geiger: It's obvious that we need legal guidance, which we understood at the time.

Dr. Chevront: Okay. We now stand in recess until tomorrow. Thank you, everybody.

The Allocation Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, Wednesday morning, June 11, 2008, and was called to order at 9:02 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Brian Chevront.

Dr. Chevront: I would like to call the Allocation Committee back to order. Yesterday, we ended with a lot of things on the table, but right now, I have been requested that a committee member would like to make a motion.

Mr. Harris: **At this time, based on the discussion we had yesterday and the fact that I think we will be a lot more productive in this arena when we've had some time to sit back and think about it and reconvene in July, I move to adjourn.**

Mr. Boyles: Second.

Dr. Chevront: Seconded by Robert Boyles. I would like to have a little bit of discussion before we take the vote on this. The first thing is that we did go through a whole bunch of motions, both in April and yesterday. I've gotten the report from Gregg and I will be going through those motions at full council and then we'll just begin to take up things again when we get to our meeting in July.

Mr. Geiger: Could I ask a member of staff to go out and find Monica and ask her to please come to the room? I'm very sensitive to even having any discussions about anything anymore without legal people here and I reiterate the fact that before we schedule this meeting firmly in July, I want to make certain that her schedule is clear and she's going to be at this meeting.

Dr. Chevront: I got the impression yesterday that she said that she would be there, but let's get that confirmed.

Mr. Harris: I talked to Monica as well and she did say that she intended to attend our meeting in July and I said our plan is to not have the meeting unless you are there and so she knows very clearly that we don't intend to have an Allocation Committee meeting unless she's sitting at the table.

Dr. Chevront: The one other thing that I wanted to bring up before we actually go to a vote is we have Dr. Jim Waters here with us and since our meeting in April, he did a presentation on the economic model of red grouper in the Gulf of Mexico and as a result of that, we had a discussion in which we decided that we really weren't capable of reproducing that kind of a model yet for the South Atlantic.

We moved into a discussion of what would it take for us to be able to do some kind of extensive economic modeling in the South Atlantic Council and we spent a fair amount of time going over the kinds of data and things that we thought that we would need to be able to do this modeling. Since then, Dr. Waters has taken what we've said and he's regrouped it a little bit, but I was going to ask the committee's permission that between now and the July meeting that I would be allowed to work with Dr. Waters to go over some of this and then I would present it at the July

meeting to the rest of the committee, just to show this is what we're thinking about with the data.

That doesn't mean that we couldn't modify it further at that point. What I am just suggesting is that Dr. Waters and I would do some of the legwork ahead of time, before we get to that meeting, much of which he has already done. I don't think it's going to be an extensive amount of additional work between now and then. I just wanted to make sure that the committee gave me the blessing to go ahead and do that.

Mr. Geiger: That's fine with me, as long as we understand that this is going to be a relatively brief discussion and presentation. We spent over half-a-day developing all the parameters for Dr. Waters to move off with. I'm just concerned that we have an awful lot of work that we've got to do at that committee and only two days to get it done in. If we dither and dally with another half-a-day, worrying about what's right and what's wrong or how this economic data goes, it's going to impact how much we're going to be able to get done. I just --

Dr. Chevront: I have no problem with that. We can limit it. We can decide right upfront how long we're going to allow to discuss that. I can't really see it even going more than an hour, at most, at that point, because we've already gone over these things. It's really more of a regrouping and trying to make logical sense out of that laundry list that we came up with.

We are planning on having our next meeting July 8 and 9 in Charleston. The actual meeting's occurrence is going to be contingent on ensuring that Monica is going to be able to be there. If she cannot be there, we probably will not have that meeting. I want to make sure everybody understands that.

We do have a motion on the table now to adjourn the Allocation Committee. It's been seconded. Is there any further discussion? **Is there any opposition to the motion? The motion carries.** The Allocation Committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 9:08 o'clock a.m., June 11, 2008.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
July 28, 2008

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2007- 2008 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

George J. Geiger ✓
566 Ponoka Street
Sebastian, FL 32958
772/388-3183 (ph)
georgejgeiger@bellsouth.net

COUNCIL VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

Dr. Brian Chevront ✓
N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries
P.O. Box 769 (3441 Arendell St.)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 Ext. 8015 (ph)
252/726-6187
brian.chevront@ncmail.net

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BONNIE PONWITH ✓

JULIE DEFILIPPI (ACCSP) ✓

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

Susan Shipman ✓
Director, Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
sshipman@dnr.state.ga.us

Tom Swatzel ✓
P.O. Box 1311
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
(C/O Capt. Dick's Marina
4123 Hwy 17 Business,
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576)
843/357-1673 (ph)
tom@capticks.com

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

BILL SHARP-FWC

MONICA SMIT BRUNCKOW ✓

TOM JAMIR ✓

JIM WATERS ✓

KATE MICHIG ✓

STEPHEN HOLMAN

KAY WILLIAMS-GMPME

JACK MCGOVERN ✓

OTHA EASLEY

JOE KIMMEL

Staff Attendee List

Bob Mahood

Gregg Waugh

Mike Collins

John Carmichael

Rick DeVictor

Dale Theiling

Julie Neer

Andi Stephens

Roger Pugliese

Kate Quigley

Myra Brouwer

Kim Iverson

Julie O'Dell

Rachael Lindsay

Cindy Chaya

Deb Buscher

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2007 - 2008 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

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

ALLOCATION Committee

Brian Chevront, Chair ✓
Duane Harris ✓
George Geiger ✓
John Wallace ✓
Rita Merritt ✓
Robert Boyles ✓
Tom Swatzel ✓

ECONOMICS

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

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT*

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT / NEPA

George Geiger, Chair
Robert Boyles
Columbus Brown
Brian Chevront
Tony Iarocci
Rita Merritt
Mark Robson
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Rick DeVitor

EXECUTIVE

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

FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

Tony Iarocci, Chair
John Wallace, Vice Chair
George Geiger
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION

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

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Rita Merritt, Chair
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Columbus Brown
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Mark Robson
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

David Cupka, Chair
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
Brian Chevront
George Geiger
Rita Merritt
Tom Swatzel
Ron Smith, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Jack Travelstead, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

LAW ENFORCEMENT

George Geiger
Duane Harris
Rita Merritt
Brian Sullivan
Tom Swatzel
John Wallace
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

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

MARINE PROTECTED AREA

Tony Iarocci, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice Chair
Columbus Brown
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

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.

Allocation Committee Meeting Orlando, FL Tuesday, June 10, 2008

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

Bruce Irwin 305-743-7938 1546 Eastward Ho Lane Marathon, FL

Tom Burgess 910-327-3528 P.O. Box 33 Sneads Ferry N.C. 28460

Scott Zimmerman 305 619-0039 P.O. Box 501404 Marathon, FL 33050

Joshua Girolamo-Sullivan 843-819-6778 1170 N Skedow Dr Mt Pleasant, S.C. 29464

Tricia Chipe DOCLGC 202 482-4265 Washington, DC

BRET NORTON FWC 850 488 5600 620 S. Meridian St, TALLA FL.

JASON MARLOW / FWCC 850-410-0656 620 S. MERIDIAN ST. TALLAHASSEE, FL 32399

Dick Brane 910-338-0012 NC

DAVE Allison 202-833-3900 1350 Connecticut Ave NW 5TH FL WA DC 20036

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.

Allocation Committee Meeting Orlando, FL Tuesday, June 10, 2008

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

Margot Stiles, Oceana	202 833 3900	Washington DC 20036
Darden Rice, Oceana		St. Petersburg FL
Eileen Daugherty, FDF	843-737-4466	Charleston, SC
Robert Carlin		Ft Pierce
Jim BUSSE Seafood Atlantic	301 4033035	Camden
Jeff Oteew commercial	252 986-2575	Hatteras
Bill Kelly - ICBA	305-394-5337	129 Tequesta Sr Tallahassee FL 323070
Jim Reeves / Fisherman	772-332-2828	14890 Orange Ave Ft. Pierce FL 34945
Beah Curry		

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.

Allocation Committee Meeting
Orlando, FL
Tuesday, June 10, 2008

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

GSAFFZ
Michael Japson

813-286-8390

Tampa, FL

Libby Fetherston

OC-FL

BUFFY BAUMANN, OCEANA

202.833.3900

WASHINGTON, DC 20036

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

Table 3.4-6. Distribution of South Atlantic Rock Shrimp Endorsements (RSE).

Year Obtained	# of Vessels	Currently Active or Renewable ¹	Currently Terminated	Currently Active or Renewable Meets 15K	Currently Active or Renewable Does Not Yet Meet 15K	Currently Active or Renewable Meets 7500	Currently Active or Renewable Does Not Yet Meet 7500	Currently Terminated Meets 15K	Currently Terminated Does Not Yet Meet 15K	Currently Terminated Meets 7500	Currently Terminated Does Not Yet Meet 7500
2003	107	83 (66,17)	24	40	43	43	40	3	21	4	20
2004	14	9 (8,1)	5	5	4	5	4	2	3	2	3
2005	13	12 (12,0)	1	5	7	5	7	0	1	0	1
2006	9	9 (7,2)	0	5	4	5	4	0	0	0	0
2007	11	11 (11,0)	0	0	11	0	11	0	0	0	0
2008	1	1 (1,0)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total	155	125 (105, 20)	30	55	70	58	67	5	25	6	24

¹ The number of active endorsements and the number of renewable endorsements are the first and second numbers in the parenthetical respectively.