SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, Florida

June 11, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Committee Minutes:

Duane Harris, Chairman
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
Dr. Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Dr. Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
Ben Hartig
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel

Council Members:

Lt. Robert Foos
Duane Harris

Council Staff Members:

Robert Mahood
Kim Iverson
Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Mike Collins
Gregg Waugh
Andrea Grabman
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Mike Errigo
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Julie O'Dell

Observers/Participants:

Bob Gill
Otha Easley
Monica Smit-Brunello
Ginny Fay
Andy Strelcheck
Steve Blair
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Dr. Jack McGovern
Jennifer Lee
Phil Steele
Mike Merrifield

Other observers listed in the back of the document

The Ecosystem-Based Management Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Vienna Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, June 11, 2012, and was called to order at 1:55 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Duane Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, I'm going to call to order the Ecosystem-Based Management Committee. The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions to the agenda? Seeing none, is there any objection to approving the agenda as published? Seeing none, the agenda is approved.

The next item is approval of the March 6, 2012, Committee Minutes. Are there additions or corrections to those minutes? Seeing none, is there any objection to approving the minutes as published? Seeing none, those minutes are approved. The next item we have is a report of the status of catches versus quota for octocorals. Jack, are you going to do that to begin with, and then Jessica is going to follow up with respect to Florida. Jack McGovern.

DR. McGOVERN: Historically the Southeast Regional Office has gotten octocoral landings from the state of Florida for monitoring purposes since harvest of octocorals has been prohibited from other states. Effective January 30 of this year, CE-BA 2 changed the fishery management unit and octocorals from Florida are no longer considered to be in the fishery management unit and subject to federal management.

The state of Florida is now responsible for managing octocorals off of Florida. The allowable catch of octocorals off of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia remains at zero. We've contacted Dr. Gloekner at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and he indicates there are no landings of octocoral from North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Jack. Are there questions for Jack? Jessica, you're up.

MS. McCAWLEY: Okay, I've got the landings. I believe that I sent them to staff if you could project them. I also wanted to mention that our rule went into place October 31 of 2011 that extended our regulations into federal waters.

MR. HARRIS: Just a reminder, we were scheduled for two hours. We're down to an hour and a half now. I just wanted everybody to know that as the chairman said, we're behind times, so indulge me and let's try to move this committee meeting along to the extent that we can without messing anything up. I'll try to keep us from messing anything up, but it is not always possible.

MS. McCAWLEY: Okay, I sent these to Mike so he could send them around so you can see them on your own computer since they are quite tiny up there. Basically we are not done with 2012, but in 2011 the landings went up a slight bit as did the trips in federal waters on the Atlantic, but the units in state waters are actually down. The landings are pretty variable. They are kind of all over the place. Overall in 2011 the units and the trips were up a little bit from 2010, but they were down from what they were in 2009 and 2008 and 2007. It is up to you what you want to make of that.

MR. HARRIS: Other questions for Jessica? Seeing none, we will move along. Thank you, Jessica, I appreciate that information. Next we're going to hear from three of our advisory panels; the first will be the Shrimp Advisory Panel and Mike Merrifield is going to give us that report, and then Steve Blair will give us a report of the Coral Advisory Panel, and then Roger is going to give the Habitat AP report.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Council, for the opportunity. Basically the way I organized this was I just kind of went down our meeting and the different motions that came up in our meeting and kind of explained how we got to those and what discussions took place. The first one was Motion 3 that we were talking about the AP recommended involvement of the other APs prior to public scoping.

Basically what happens – and there was considerable discussion about this in the AP. What happened was the APs were informed that the council was moving to an annual cycle for completing these amendments and this just didn't follow with what we were used to, I guess, in terms of the CE-BA 1. This is basically about half the time.

Also in CE-BA 1 it was more of a cooperative, collaborative environment where the Coral AP, the Shrimp APs and the Golden Crab AP got together and kind of hashed a lot of this stuff out. The Shrimp APs thought we were going to have the opportunity and thought it would be more productive to meet with the Coral AP and share data, give justifications for their positions and find common ground and then present differences to the council.

Most of the major issues I think could be hashed out at that level. Then it would just be some of the minor issues or issues where we couldn't come to agreement on that we would bring into council. Today we have a decision document that is prepared and I guess we are unclear as to whether there is an opportunity for compromise or discussion or dialogue.

Unless somebody tapped into the Shrimp AP meeting, some of the data that you'll see here you will see it for the first time. Likewise, some of the information that the Coral AP came up with we would be seeing for the first time as well. I think the webinar – by the way, this webinar process works very well. I got to listen in to the Coral AP meeting.

There were a lot of questions that came up, a lot of issues that had I been there I could have resolved those, and it would have been easier to get past those points. Originally I was going to be there for that but I was unable to attend. There seems to be a lot of misconceptions about the rock shrimp fishery that we probably could have resolved.

I guess the question is, is public scoping meetings the best first step in developing an amendment? Our thought was maybe it would be better to have a vetted amendment where the APs had a chance to look at it and put something combined together and then put that out for public comment to get more feedback from the public. In that regard, in this section the Shrimp APs were basically recommending that we have a joint Coral and AP meeting to discuss our proposal which was the best case scenario for us and then the Coral proposal which was probably the best case scenario for them, and come to some agreement between the two areas.

I don't know if we are beyond that point here or not, but we'll just continue and I'll present some of the stuff that we came up with. I'm still learning the council process. Leading this effort for the Shrimp AP has been a tremendous learning experience for me, and it has also given me some appreciation for how this process was designed and that stakeholders are all involved.

To me the APs are critical. I think the APs have the potential to make the job for the council members a lot easier. If we are able to focus on the issues and come up with some determinations and then bring that to the council, it will make the process for the council a lot easier. At this point I guess what I'll do is I'll go through the action.

The first Motion 6 said no action. We had a good deal of discussion about this. We chose not to make it the preferred. There are several reasons for that. In general we would like to change the misconception or the misunderstanding about how shrimping takes place and that shrimping does not occur in coral areas. Somehow we've got to get this across that this is not – I mean this misconception has to be changed.

I cannot stress enough how important it is for the captains to know the bottom that they're shrimping on. Shrimpers are looking for the shrimp habitat with silt and muddy sand and sand bottoms. Shrimpers are marking bottom when they're not trawling to avoid coral and snags at all cost. As you'll see, I'll put the charts up that show the different marks that the captains put on their charts.

These marks will indicate obstructions and bottom that will not support shrimp, which is areas that they want to avoid. VMS and tracking data you will see matches very closely. The highest concentrations indicate shrimp habitat. There are fewer boats in the fishery now, less than probably half in the last ten years. The same tracks are trawled year after year, sometimes even from one month to the next.

The shrimp habitat recovers quickly. The shrimp repopulate the same area and that is why they are able to come back month after month, year after year for over 90 years. Safety and gear costs prohibit just aimless wandering out there and snagging into bottom that can potentially cause safety issues, gear cost, downtime. The gear cost basically is about $15,000 per side, so there is about $30,000 worth of gear being pulled.

It can make a break a captain or a vessel depending on how badly they damage their gear. And the downtime, the lost downtime, the economics; they just can't afford that. There are basically three major determiners out there, nature, regulations and economics. Obviously, if nature doesn't cooperate, there is no catch out there.

You can have zero regulations out there, you can have all the bottom in the world, but if the economics aren't there they can't afford to be out there. The Shrimp APs support protection of the corals. Some believe the coral habitat acts as a rock shrimp fishery – or nursery. Others have other concepts about it; coral and hard bottom ledge are why the shrimp are out there in the first place. The Gulf eddies create the natural silting and nutrient concentration that the shrimp love.

Another reason we decided not to go with the no action is because we thought in a cooperative effort we could come up with a win-win solution that could be achieved by both Coral and the Shrimp APs. Coral can be protected and historical shrimp areas maintained. Motion 7 – and this is where I probably need to go ahead and pull a chart up. Can I get the chart up on the screen?

MS. MARTIN: The chart from the decision document?

MR. MERRIFIELD: No, this would be the one that shows the tracks.

MS. MARTIN: Switching over to your program; okay.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Basically what I am going to do here is show you what is being used out on the water, the tools that are being used out there. I've got data from a few captains that basically shows –

MS. MARTIN: There is a delay with the transfer so it will just take a second.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay, it basically shows where it is that they are shrimping. Let me zoom in on this a little bit. What I'm showing you here; at the bottom of the screen you'll see here in just a second is the – I'll use a pointer for the moment. At the bottom of the screen you will see this is the top of the existing Oculina Closure. This red line goes across right here.

That is the Oculina Box. This is the satellite; this is the northern satellite right here. What we're looking at here is going northward is the entire expansion or extension proposal. The outside lines are blue, and those are the 60 to 100 Coral AP recommendation. The red lines are the 70/ 90 that Roger had put together.

What the Coral AP did was they basically took Roger's 70/90 and made a few modifications to include areas that have been fished. What you will see here is the green lines are now actually trawl tracks from the shrimp fishery, from the rock shrimp fishery. Those are the areas that have been fished.

The red dots are areas that have been marked that say those are not rock shrimp; it is not an area where you are going to find rock shrimp. Typically what they are doing is they are trawling north with the tide. As they come back, they will clock area and mark as they're going along, looking for areas that look like they could be rock shrimp areas.

Anytime you see green tracks inside the blue lines, that is area that would be excluded by the 60/ 100. Likewise as we go north, you will see areas that are inside the red as well. I'm going to go ahead and move north at a pretty quick pace here so you can kind of get an idea. This is an area here that is between. This was an adjustment that was made by the rock shrimp fishermen to include this trawling area there and this area here as well. This is a long stretch here. There is a long stretch right down the center here that was inside that would be closed given the 70/ 90 and that is why they chose to choose points that would allow them to fish these areas. You can see the bathymetric data. You can see where the pinnacles are.

MR. HAYMANS: Mike, how many trawls does that represent over what period of time?

MR. MERRIFIELD: This is probably – it is hard to say, because what these guys will do a lot of times is rerun the same track so they don't lay down another track, but this is probably data that has accumulated over quite a few years. I don't even know how long the software has been out, but this data has been accumulated over a number of years. It is not necessarily – it is hard to say if that is how many tracks there actually are, because they will rerun a track.

MR. HAYMANS: And the red doesn't necessarily – it is not a symbol for coral. That is a haul-back and there is no rock shrimp there.

MR. MERRIFIELD: It could be rocks, it could be coral, it could be hard bottom that would not support. As they're marking bottom, they can see the texture of the bottom. Obviously, you guys are familiar with that.

DR. CRABTREE: Those green trawl paths; are they from you guys' records; they are not from the VMS data. That's from your logs.

MR. MERRIFIELD: That's correct; this is shrimper data; but if you look at the VMS, they are exactly the same. You will see this center area in the VMS data as well. Basically that is the reasoning behind the Shrimp AP recommendation was to try to include – it was a best case scenario for the shrimp fishery. That is what they wanted to present.

The 60/100 they felt was a lot of needless elimination of productive rock shrimp bottom. 70 meter west boundary and 90 meter eastern boundary; Roger developed this option as least impact to the fishery based on VMS hits. We had considerable discussion about VMS hits, and I know this was a big question in the Coral AP, and I've had questions about it since.

Roger did a great job of taking those VMS points that were within the trolling speed and indicating which ones were within the zones and what percentage. We felt like that was a good indicator of which area would be most impacted or least impacted, but it was not a good indicator of productivity or how productive a particular bottom was or how much it was trawled.

MR. HAYMANS: This doesn't necessarily tell us how productive it is. It's just that is your traditional trawl grounds.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Correct.

MR. HAYMANS: I mean the ones that are toward the center may not be as productive as what is on the outside.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Right, and it is really hard to determine that because the data that is collected on catch history; when they come to the dock – just until the last year, when you put it into the trip ticket system you had the option to put one area that you fish. If you were down in Key West doing pinks and came up and did some rock shrimp and then came into the dock, it is

the data – now in the last year they've changed that so you can have multiple locations at least in the state of Florida, so that is easier to tell what area which shrimp came from.

But still offshore Cape Canaveral is a huge area to be able to determine how productive that center ground was or how productive this ledge was versus that area. A couple of things about the VMS data is that Roger picked the last five years trawling speed. The proposed closure hits in the different areas versus the total hits.

By law, owning a rock shrimp permit requires VMS and it must always be on a pinging. Law enforcement notifies vessel owners of all anomalies, either not pinging; or if it is pinging on I-95 going north, which happened. Somebody was taking their VMS to be repaired or from being repaired back to their boat and they got a call from law enforcement saying why is your VMS pinging on I-95?

I've been called directly whenever my boat stops pinging and told that the boat has to come in immediately to make sure that it is repaired. I think the VMS has been very good. I think the data is very good coming out of the VMS. Total hits include all trawling speed hits, so that means if they're white shrimp fishing, red shrimp fishing, brown shrimp, which is not typically targeted, or rock shrimping, any of those are included in the total hits.

That is why I'm saying it doesn't necessarily tell you productivity, because total hits are not directed at that specific area. It is anywhere in the South Atlantic; or whether they are anchoring, steaming, drifting, it is all hits. It does do a good job of indicating which areas are more impacted than others.

There are a lot of environmental conditions that change. For instance, I can tell you that in the last five years there has been more productivity to the south of the Oculina Box than there has been to the east or west. That changes. Whatever environmental conditions there are, whether it is water temperature or whatever changes, it makes a difference in where those rock shrimp show up.

There are environmental changes that will impact that; weather conditions, tide speeds, boat size. The smaller boats are the ones that are going to be working the western side of this area here. The larger boats can work to the southern. The tides and the churn that is going on down there from the eddies coming off this hard bottom is too great for the medium and small-sized boats to work, so those boats don't even attempt to go down there. It just spins their gear and tangles up.

That is all going to be your larger boats to the southern end, and I'll show that to you here in a little bit. Economic conditions also impact this. The minute white shrimp show up there is nobody out here on the rock shrimp. It is much more economical to be on the beach shrimping for white shrimp than it is to be out here on rock shrimp. There might be a good season going; they will leave the rock shrimp and come in and do the white shrimp. There are a lot of factors, so it is really hard to figure out what the productivity is. Then the data reporting and I already talked about that.

DR. CRABTREE: It is more profitable to fish white shrimp just because it is closer in and you don't have to spend the same amount of fuel?

MR. MERRIFIELD: Correct.

DR. CRABTREE: What is the price per pound difference between rock shrimp and white shrimp?

MR. MERRIFIELD: White shrimp is a higher price per pound. In this time of year, which usually is an August timeframe, white shrimp prices are probably in the three to four dollar range for the larger white shrimp that come down this far. The rock shrimp are typically a dollar to a dollar and a half; last year a dollar and a half to two dollars.

DR. CRABTREE: You've got to have high catches of rock shrimp to make any money?

MR. MERRIFIELD: Right. What the shrimpers did was we used Roger's model from the 70/90. He modified the points to include historical productive rock shrimp areas. We attempted to keep the boundaries as straight as possible for law enforcement. This I have a question about, because in my mind is this really necessary?

In other words, can we not move a boundary and just jut it straight out, jut it out and go around a coral head or something that allows some area that has been – as you'll see if I can find an example of it, there are areas where there might be a coral head. Like, for instance, on our yellow line here, there might be a coral head like in this area right in here that could actually be moved out and still allow for – or actually this is a better example right up in here – but still allow for this bottom up here to be drug if you moved it out to go around this like this.

The reason I bring this up is because really the law enforcement activity that we've had – and there have been a couple that I know of, and one is where a captain drifted anchor. It is not that somebody has been out there monitoring this area. It has all been done electronically, so the minute that their ping shows up inside of a closed area, a flag goes off. Law enforcement is notified and law enforcement is on it.

They are on it out to the captain at sea, told to come right back to the dock, when they get to the dock their hatches are sealed and so on and so forth what happens after that. The point is though does shape really matter, because it is all done electronically, anyway? The stakes basically are is that you are either not in or you're in and hopefully if we get a transit option here, you are in at a transit speed or you're in and you are below transit speed, at which case you are in violation.

That is a question to I guess the law enforcement as to whether these have to be straight lines or do we have some flexibility in how we build these borders? An additional point, as an example of something that is not straight lines is the Stetson-Miami Terrace, which is 219 points. I couldn't even put it into the software without – I have to talk to the designer, but it is 219 points to create that Coral HAPC. There is some flexibility there in drawing those lines and I'd like to see if we can't look at that down the road here. Let me go on up to the top of this.

MR. HARRIS: Mike, if you can just go as fast as you can, we've still got a lot of work to do. You'll have a chance to come back up here and answer questions at the end of that, too.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. I went up to the very top. Just above this is the top. As you can see there is really very little trawling that goes on up here. I cut this yellow box off. It could go on up. I don't think anybody has any concerns about that. This area is not particularly good for rock shrimping; there is no trawling that is occurring in this area.

The next thing that we talked about then was the Western Extension, and let me get there. For the most part connecting the two satellites, there is really one area that I've ever seen any trawl tracks in, and that is in this very corner right up in here. That is where the original – right in the corner where that satellite is and where the original design of the Oculina Box left some of that offshore slope available.

There was some trawling up in this very corner, right up in here. Other than that, there is absolutely no – there is very little trawling in that northern part. In the southern part it is a little bit different. We have a little more activity in there, but for the most part I think that most of the rock shrimp fishermen were fine with this. Then when they said they would like maybe the possibility of an access areas that was one of the – that would be in this area right here.

The purpose of this extension is to correct how the Oculina was originally defined. Basically the straight lines that were chosen for ease of enforcement for the original design of the Oculina HAPC were straight north and south, and obviously this ledge does not run straight north and south. On the western edge we kind of missed, so that is why the adjustment is being made here.

The northern section, as I said very little trawling; in the southern section there is a little bit. Given that information, if you look at the red box that defines the current Oculina Box, there is the extension, the top extension. Here is the Oculina Box. Then this bathymetric data shows you where the pinnacles are, where the coral is, where the structured bottom is.

There is all this bottom out here that is slope that has been closed off when this original was made. The Shrimp AP had put in a request to make some corrections because of the way that the Oculina Coral HAPC was originally defined. The goal was to identify obvious slope bottom with no structures from the 90/100 meter on line, basically on the western side to the 140 meter depth on the eastern side, which at one time was prime rock shrimp bottom.

As you can see in this area here that to the north of the box is where these trawl lines and track lines stop. If I go down to the bottom, you can see this is where they pick up again right outside the box; basically the 90 to 100 meters and out to the 140, 130/140 in that range.

We basically took this yellow line, and I think I sent coordinates to Roger to identify this and the request is to have a shrimp access area for that bottom. This is mud bottom. Like I said, at one point in time it was active rock shrimp trawl area. Are there any questions about that? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, Mike, that area is bounded by 90 to 100 meters on the inside?

MR. MERRIFIELD: Yes.

MR. HARTIG: And then 140 meters on the eastern?

MR. MERRIFIELD: Yes.

MR. JOLLEY: I'd be interested in what other information is available on the bottom type in some of these areas that are being suggested; how much video is there or other evidence of the bottom type in that area.

MR. HARRIS: I think Steve might, when he does the Coral AP report, address some of that.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay, continuing on; Motion 8 in the document; I think it basically states that the AP preferred a modification to Roger's 70/90 extension and that is what we came up with. The Motion 9 was that the APs recommended that I be here for this. Then the Motion 10, this is a critical issue as well. This is to transit provision.

The proposed Oculina extensions create a closure from Fort Pierce to just south of St. Augustine for approximately 170 miles. Somebody may have an actual figure for that, but I'm just estimating. Currently if you have rock shrimp on board, you are not allowed to be for any reason inside of the Oculina Coral HAPC.

From a vessel safety standpoint, we were looking to have some type of sensible transit provision here. From a vessel's fuel economy standpoint, it would make sense that it is harder to travel either direction to try to get around the end of this. From an operational standpoint, because when these guys are working on the eastern side of this proposed closed area, what they will do is they'll work it and when they are done for the day or the night they'll go over into the shallower water to anchor.

They are not anchoring on the deep side. Operationally they need a place to go anchor, and it doesn't make sense for them to have to go around the entire closure to anchor. It's also a safety issue not just from a personal standpoint, but it does create basically a rock shrimp blockade to Port Canaveral for anything that is caught on the eastern side of the closed area.

With VMS capabilities we can determine speed, direction. There are probably other parameters available as well that I'm not even aware of. Currently the transits currently transmit once per hour. That is what our current transmit rate is and it's about six cents a ping for approximately about $40.00 a month in cost.

The pings rate could be increased to some rate adequate to determine speed when transiting. I don't know what that would be. If it is to double it or every 40 minutes, 45 minutes, I don't know, but we could figure out what was a good ping rate in order to best determine speed and then require the boats to travel at that speed to indicate that they're not trawling. That would either be above 4 knots or above some level of speed that indicates they're not trawling.

These guys, when they have gear in the water, are not going to be traveling more than two, maximum three – probably not even reaching three knots. Then the other issue – and I can't stress enough that these guys almost – they are not interested in dragging coral. It's not like they're going to pull their nets up, drop their load and then put the nets back in the water and cruise straight across the Oculina Bank and mow down coral. That's just not what is happening.

Gear stowed is an issue as well. There was reference to a legal description on that and to what level they would have to have gear stowed to be considered legal. Unshackling or boarding or stowing all equipment does not make sense. It is a lot of work to bring that gear up on deck. It is a lot of work to unshackle.

In South Carolina apparently, and I guess Georgia as well, when the state waters are closed they have a requirement that gear must be out of the water. Boards can be up on the outriggers out of the water. Nets can be hung over the decks and not in the water, and that is adequate for gear stowed in those waters when the season is closed.

That is what the captains would like to define as the gear out of water; doors at a minimum must be out of the water. It's a safety issue for storing doors. Typically if they have pulled up their nets and dropped the bag, the nets are sitting over the boat. If they're going back for another trawl, they'll go back overboard, but they'll be in an area that is allowable for trawling.

If they're getting ready to go in and anchor, what they'll typically do is get those nets up, get that catch on the deck, and then head straight in to shallow water for either anchoring or heading to the dock. It's a safety issue from the standpoint that those doors typically sitting out there are probably about 2,500 pounds; and if you're trying to wrestle those doors in, put them in the racks and the seas are rough at 10 foot seas, it is an issue.

A lot of these boats, probably about half these boats have to actually crawl out on their outriggers to tie and loop those doors in order to get them in. That's a problem. Nets at a minimum tied up and out of the water. Speed is the real determiner of whether the vessel is towing gear or not. I think we can come up with the criteria to determine that speed as not being a trawlable speed.

There also needs to be some type of a disabled vessel provision. I think there is now. There is a call-in contact that if you become disabled or the tide has got you and you're going to drift into a closed area, there is a number you can call that warns them that this is going to occur and what the reasoning is behind what's happening. We need some type of disabled vessel provision. That is everything I have on the Oculina expansions, the north and the west, and a request for the shrimp access area and the transit provision. Are there any questions on those issues?

MR. HARRIS: Let's move on and then we'll bring Mike back up when Steve finishes his report.

MR. MERRIFIELD: I have one more area. The other area is the Miami-Stetson. I can bring that up; I need to do that. Basically the original one that Roger – the original one that was presented by the Coral AP, Roger made some modifications based upon some input from scoping. We were basically in agreement with that modification. I think the Coral AP came up with another modification to their original.

I didn't get that until late so I think I have as close as I could get to the borders for that particular HAPC extension. The area farthest out there, as you can see, is the red shrimp bottom. The dark finger coming down here, that is Roger's modification that he made. The current HAPC is along this red line here.

This was based upon some coordinates that Roger sent me that basically raised this up here and then diagonally went across at this angle here. This is the current red shrimp trawl tracks for this area. This is a highly productive red shrimp ground. I don't know if it is because of some of the upwelling's that are occurring there or what, but it is a very productive area.

Most of the captains have not had an opportunity to look at this, this new line that was created. One of the concerns that they have here is the possibility that they have of drifting into any area here is pretty high. There is about a five knot current here. Anytime they are pulling up their rigs, they are drifting north at five knots. That is a concern about putting a line without some type of a buffer zone.

Basically what they've told me is that this area, there are no coral – there is no coral in this area. When they get to this spot here, that is when they get into the structure bottom. They've told me that north of where they stop right here is absolutely not trawlable. We haven't really had a chance to look at this new line here as to would they be acceptable with that or not or if we would like a compromise that would at least bring it up a little bit further north. I just haven't had any input on that. That's all I have on the proposed extensions.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, that completes your report then, Mike?

MR. MERRIFIELD: Yes, the only other thing that came up was the red shrimp. There was a question about VMS being on all the boats that are in the rock shrimp fishery. We did determine that any boat that comes around from the Gulf to fish in the Atlantic typically comes around for rock shrimp. That is their purpose. There is only one captain I know of that came around and did rock shrimp and then did red shrimping. Other than that, there is nobody that I know of or that I have ever heard of that comes around just to red shrimp that would not have a VMS; just to set that record straight.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Mike. We will forego any further questions of Mike at this point and ask Steve Blair, the chairman of the Coral AP, to come up and give the report of the Coral AP, and then we'll bring Mike back up and you can ask any questions you want within the time limits that I establish. I'm just kidding; I'm not that mean. Well, maybe I am.

MR. BLAIR: Good afternoon; my name is Steve Blair; I'm presently the Chair of the Coral Habitat AP. I thank Chair Harris, the Committee Chair, and the Council Chair for allowing me to come and speak today. I just wanted to try to go through and will try to go through quickly the summary of the approved recommendations and motions of our May meeting.

It was held in Charleston on May 9 and 10. We had a number of topics that we discussed, but specifically we received an update on the final version of the Spiny Lobster Amendment 11. We

discussed protocols for assessment of procedures for usage of bottom-tending equipment and activities within coral habitat areas of particular concern.

We discussed the inclusion or exclusion of exotic coral species within the fisheries management plan, as well as reviewed measures proposed for inclusion in CE-BA 3 pertaining to the expansion of the boundary and modifications of the CHAPCs. Obviously, there were a number of other informational aspects of it.

I would kind of like to reflect Mike's comments about the perspectives of the AP as we go through it. Just as the shrimpers were looking at their best options for them, the Coral Habitat AP was doing the same. We were looking at things that were most protective of the areas that we know are very productive and fragile coral habitats throughout the area.

As a result of the meetings we had five recommendations and four motions approved. I'd like to go through those. The Spiny Lobster Amendment; there were measures in Amendment 11 that were developed to protect the federally listed acropora species. These were to establish areas of known significant acropora coral densities in the Southeast Florida EEZ that would be closed to lobster fishing with a decision of whether it was closed to all fishing or simply lobster trap fishing.

The amendment proposed 60 closed areas within that region and closed to trap fishing, but still open to recreational lobster fishing. It also considered requiring the marking of the lobster trap lines to provide identification of fishery-based equipment, of which no action was selected for that in that the Coral AP just wanted to reiterate its support for those measures as they were sent forward.

We did, however, have two recommendations, one based on the knowledge of the time and spatial distribution of acropora, and that it can come and go to a certain degree as one of the most rapidly growing corals that exist. The Coral AP recommended that the Spiny Lobster AP consider a periodic review and update of the closed areas to allow release of those areas that no longer support significant cover of acropora; as well as inclusion of any locations that have been identified since initiation of the amendment.

Secondly, the Coral AP recommended to draft a letter for the council approval to send to the state of Florida requesting that they identify and evaluate conservation measures similar to those identified in Spiny Lobster Amendment 11 for implementation in the state waters. The next topic that we discussed or reviewed was protocols for surveying methodology within coral habitat areas of particular concern.

This was a Department of Energy Report that was specific to some proposed pilot projects for hydrokinetic energy projects in the Stetson-Miami Terrace CHAPC and focused on three specific lease blocks of the BOEM lease blocks. The purpose of the report was to try to detail specific methodologies that would be good for assessment of the habitats within the area and potential environmental impacts.

In general a two-tiered approach was done to these assessments in which geophysical surveys with subsequent post processing and data interpretation by geophysicists and marine biologists who were experienced and knowledgeable in deep sea coral ecosystem habitats were done. Additionally, video and photographic validation of benthic habitat types from the geophysical data was done.

This was significant in that it attempted to tie more of a correlation of the ability to use the interpretation of the geophysical work and tie it into the actual verified habitats that were found. Two recommendations came from this discussion. One was that the Coral AP draft a policy for council review and approval regarding appropriate assessment protocols to be used in CHAPCs.

That policy would be based on the recommended protocols listed in the DOE February 2012 report. However, it should also include a tier approach which provides for increased informational needs associated with the increased magnitude and complexity of the activities and habitats found in the area. This came about specifically because some of the activities were going to be requiring anchors; those anchors requiring specific sediment depths in order for them to function appropriately. The Coral AP's concern, as you might imagine, is with the relief areas and presence of hard bottom communities and coral communities; if there are survey methods such as overburden surveys that could show that there were significant sediment deposits there and no coral communities excessive or more intent multibeam mapping and other things would not necessarily be required.

We wanted to make sure that capability and tiered aspect were in there. Again, if it is found that there would be an increasing level of complexity and of information that would be required for that. Our second recommendation was for the council to send a letter to BOEM relative to an EA that was presently available for the hydrokinetic energy projects in the Stetson-Miami Terrace HAPC that stated that for those areas that were identified for probable project activity, that those activities pose a significant risk to the deepwater coral and benthic habitat communities.

We received another update of information relative to mapping efforts in deep sea coral ecosystem habitats. This is in the area of the expansion region that is being proposed for the western expansion of the Stetson-Miami Terrace HAPC. This is just showing some of the sidescan sonar and multibeam mapping that has been conducted on that western edge that verified the existence of the habitats within those areas.

We will see this again as this is one of the actions that we selected in Alternative 4 with one of our motions and that Mike had also just discussed in his last item. The Coral AP, relative to this and the importance of the multibeam and sidescan information that has come out of recent cruises, recommended that the Coral AP draft a letter to NOAA for the council's consideration that would support continued efforts to coordinate mapping activities and information exchange among the agencies.

It is known that there are a number of NOAA ships that regularly transit this area that do have bottom profiling and sidescan mapping capabilities. We are looking to coordinate with them to ensure that that mapping continues to be able to fill in the data gaps that we see here in order to

continue to refine our knowledge and understanding of the location of these habitats and avoid the types of conflicts that we are already seeing occur between some of the proposals that are to be brought forth.

Another topic that we discussed was for inclusion of exotic invasive coral species – inclusion or exclusion from the fisheries management plan. We discussed that presently there are minimally two species of exotic Scleratinian hard corals, tubastrea coccinea and tubastrea micranthus that have been identified within the South Atlantic and/or the Gulf Council regions.

At least one of those, tubastrea coccinea has shown fast and extensive expansion of coral cover and regional distribution throughout the Caribbean and the Gulf and Southeast U.S.; specifically off Florida. These species prey on substrates from native coral recruitment and decreases the diversity of the invaded areas as well as reduces habitat complexity.

It has become very abundant on artificial substrates in the Southeast United States. Again, it is specifically in Florida, and is presently considered by Sammarco to be the single most abundant hard coral on artificial substrata in the Gulf of Mexico. It is a point to make that right now this species is only found on artificial substrates in the Southeast Florida.

It's on artificial reefs and so forth but is not found at this time to be extensively invading natural habitats. Yes, this is the orange cup coral. T micranthus presently shows a very limited distribution but due to its similar characteristics is expected to expand as did the orange cup coral.

An exclusion from the FMP would be required if control or eradication measures are to be considered. Relative to that, the council's policy for protection of the South Atlantic Ecosystems from invading species identifies Tubastrea as a threat to the coral ecosystems in the South Atlantic Council and states in instances where the invasive species belongs to a group of organisms included in a fisheries management unit, i.e. the stony corals, the species would need to be excluded from the FMU via plan amendment or existing framework for it to have actions of control or eradication to move on.

Based on the information and discussion, the AP approved a motion that the Coral AP deems the presence of Tubastrea in the South Atlantic region a threat to coral reef systems and recommends that the species of the genus Tubastrea be removed from the Coral FMP and that states within the council, specifically South Atlantic Region, modify existing rules as necessary to allow for the take of this genus in the waters of the state and EEZ.

That take may be through a regulatory or non-regulatory process as deemed appropriate by the state. This was passed by a 9 to 3 vote by the AP. The other items that we reviewed relative to our meeting were associated with the CE-BA 3 Amendment and alternatives for there. Three actions were listed for us to consider; the first action noting two subunits for it.

The first action was expansion of Oculina Coral HAPC, and this was Action 1 and it had a northern expansion of Oculina as well as a western expansion of the existing HAPC in the Oculina HAPC; yes, the western extension of the Oculina HAPC. Action 2 was the western

extension of the Stetson-Miami Terrace HAPC off Jacksonville, and three is an expansion of the Cape Lookout HAPC off the Carolinas.

In doing this we did try to include in consideration public scoping comments and alternatives provided by the Deepwater Shrimp AP where applicable. The first is the northern extension of the Oculina – and I'm going to go through this relatively quickly. Mike covered this quite a bit as far as some of the things.

The presentation that you do see here, though, instead of the tracking we have the VMS points so that the small black dots are the VMS points and the densities there reflect the activities of the – and this is for the Deepwater Shrimp VMS through the period of time through 2007 to 2011. The green area there does show the proposed 60 to 100 meter extension of the north Oculina Bank.

As mentioned by Mike, there were three other alternatives that were proposed that were drafted by council to modify those boundaries so that an alternative was developed to have it start on the west at the 70 meter contour and on the east at the 100; another at 60 meters to the west and 90 meters to the east, and a third from 70 meters to the west and 90 meters to the east.

MR. HARRIS: I kind of got those backwards.

MR. BLAIR: Did I? I was thinking I was.

MR. HARRIS: You said it right.

MR. BLAIR: Okay, good. We did take a look at these. Obviously we are trying to be as considerate as we can for the other activities that are going on there, but again our perspective, I must say, is to protect the habitat and the deep sea coral ecosystem habitats that are found. Review of the bathymetry and multibeam sonar that we have available to us would indicate that those areas between 60 and 70, and 90 and 100 in general do include significant areas of coral reef habitat.

Now that being said, there have also been some indications already on the western side of the northern portion of this region where there are impacts that have been seen to these coral communities that would be similar to those that would be seen by trawling activities. Part of the consideration in doing these areas as well is understanding to make sure that we provide enough area to allow appropriate activities to occur without being so close that they can incidentally create impact and damage as well.

The Coral AP reviewed the various alternatives and determined that the originally proposed eastern and western boundaries provided the most appropriate protection for the documented resources while minimizing impacts to the fisheries. Any reduction in the east/west boundaries would place a significant amount of Oculina deep sea coral ecosystem habitats at risk.

The recommendation was for Subalternative 2, which is in Figure 1 of your decision document, and the associated polygons and draft listed coordinates that are presented there as the preferred

alternative. This was passed unanimously. The next item that was reviewed was Alternative 3 in Action 1, which is the western boundary of the Oculina HAPC, which essentially extended the western boundary to be inclusive of the areas of Oculina outcroppings that exist in that area.

The recommended alternative was to accept Alternative 3 as depicted in the figure, and again this is in Figure 5 of your decision document with a list of drafted coordinates as the preferred action for modification of the western boundary for the Oculina CHAPC. Again, this was approved unanimously.

Again the decisions for where these lines are are based on the interpretation of the bathymetry information that is now being backed up both here and other areas repeatedly through interpretation of these and the actual groundtruthing information that shows in areas where they have found relief and have verified the bottom, it has been live bottom and live coral reef bottom.

The next action and concern, the western boundary of the Stetson-Miami Terrace CHAPC, as you see on the right the kind of intermediate blue area is labeled Coral AP proposed extension area is the original proposal. That was based on information that was received to the abundance of coral habitat. Some of the mapped areas are down here or some of the reasons that ended up promoting how far down it went.

Also depicted in this area are the stippled areas that was information provided by the Deepwater Shrimp AP relative to their existing fishing areas. The left panel shows the original proposed extension. The middle panel shows the one that was proposed after the Shrimp AP meeting that would exclude the entire region of the existing deepwater shrimp areas.

Based on the information from the deepwater shrimp areas and the recent mapping information that has come about for this region, the Coral AP proposed a modification that reduced the southern limit, removing this area here; reduce the northern limit as sidescan showed that habitat was not existent there.

Although it did transverse this line from the base of the known existing reef areas to the base of the known existing reef areas to the east, that is what defines that southern line. Then in this area is a protected area, as we know we have extensive habitat here that extends to some point into that northern area.

We did modify those boundaries to try to exclude as much of the habitat or area that has been identified to not contain habitat while maintaining as much area as possible where habitat was going to be known to exist. Finally, for the Cape Lookout HAPC, I think this is probably the figure in your decision document is probably a little bit easier to see than on here, maybe not.

The proposal that we looked at is again additional multibeam mapping had identified numerous; and if we were to expand this up, you would see a fair amount of rigosity in this central region of that box that is surrounded by the yellow box at the north; additional deepwater coral habitat and lophelia areas, so that the proposal was made to extend the Cape Lookout HAPC in order to be able to incorporate those newly defined areas of deepwater coral. The recommendation was to

accept that extension, which is Figure 10 in your decision document, as the preferred action. We hopefully went through it pretty quick. That was the actions that we did have. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Steve. Are there a couple of questions for Steve before we get into the decision – well, we've got Roger's report of the Habitat AP first. David.

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, not a question but I would like to call to the council's attention a letter I received last week from Nick Wiley, who is the Executive Director of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. The commission staff along with staff in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary are expressing concerns about allowing the harvest of orange cup coral.

The commission has requested that the council continue to include this exotic species in the Coral FMP and continue to prohibit their harvest. This action he said would also avoid inconsistencies with management of this species in Florida. Now, this has come up before and earlier they expressed concerns about it.

They are continuing to reiterate those concerns and also saying that the Key Sanctuary people have concerns about allowing it, too, and requesting that we not allow it, contrary to the recommendation from the Coral AP. I just want everyone to be aware of that when we get around to discussing that particular issue.

MR. CURRIN: Duane, I don't think I'm on your committee, but I have a question for Mike.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, you are, everybody is on the committee including Wilson.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, thank you, I am on your committee, I was just making sure you knew. Mike, on the west side of the Oculina HAPC, the suggested boundary that you guys came up with; everywhere I looked as you moved up, there weren't any tracks in that as well. It was inside the, I guess, 70 meter or maybe it was the 60, I forget.

But you guys drew your suggested line, the yellow line – I presume that was the AP's line – was to the east of the ones that were currently there. Can you explain why? But am I clear, there were no trawl tracks there at all, at least for as far as I could see along that boundary. Can you explain why you chose to move that to the east some?

MR. MERRIFIELD: I had a captain that was calling me and basically saying – what you'll see there is that the frequency of the structured bottom there is a lot further apart on the western side than it is on the eastern side. What they'll do – and I didn't have this and I may have, I don't know, 75, 80 percent, but there are captains out there with other data that I don't have.

When you see that there are distances between some of those pinnacles, what some of them will do is curve in or miss that, curve in, come back out, miss the next one and kind of curve in to catch some of that soft substrate bottom. When I was drawing this up, I had lines out there right

with Roger's but the ones that the captains had tracks inside there asked if it could be moved over a little bit to include those.

MR. HARRIS: Other questions for Steve? We're going to get back to Mike once we get in the decision document. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, Steve, Mike made it pretty clear that he thought the Shrimp AP should meet with the Coral AP. Do you see the same benefits, meeting jointly together and getting some of this hammered out early in the process instead of coming back and forth?

MR. BLAIR: Yes, I have no problem with that whatsoever.

MR. LANEY: Steve, we've had that discussion I think on the record several times about orange cup coral and the pros and cons of removal versus leaving it alone. Would you share with us just a little bit of the AP's thinking on that?

MR. BLAIR: The management issues did come up. It was not a unanimous decision which says that definitely there were other thoughts on the panel. Management issues associated with it, enforcement issues and potential complications came up with consideration of it, but I think the overall opinion is that it simply did not make sense for the council to protect an invasive exotic species. To that end, we thought it was appropriate to at least provide the input that we feel that needs to be acted on in some level of measure to have that ability to do so.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Steve. Okay, if we can, I'm going to get into Roger's report on the Habitat AP recommendations and then we'll go into the decision document and that is where we can get into the heart, teeth, something of this. Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: On behalf of Pace Wilbur, who is our Chair of the Habitat Advisory Panel, I wanted to provide the information from the Habitat Advisory Panel Webinar that was held. Pace wasn't able to attend, but I've worked with him to get some of the specifics in terms of what happened. Also, I was going to do at the end of this somewhat of a preliminary update on some of the VMS discussion.

We had the first Habitat Advisory Panel Webinar to run over and review specifically the management actions being proposed for modifications of the CHAPCs. In the review of the alternatives, the webinar happened after the Coral Advisory Panel so they had the ability to see what the recommendations were from the Coral Advisory Panel and also from the Shrimp Advisory Panel and provided the following recommendations.

Under Action 1 they essentially adopted Subalternative 2A in concurrence with the Coral Advisory Panel recommendation on the 60 to 100 meter depth contour; to a great degree reinforcing some of the Coral Advisory Panel recommendations on ensuring that the broadest habitat context was protected in this activity.

This is essentially the same action. The decision document reflects both Coral and Habitat Advisory Panel's recommendations. With regard to the western extension, they also adopted

Alternative 3 which was really the only proposal that is on the table, the extension that covers the area between the two satellite HAPCs and the southern portion; covering that high bathymetric area that in the most recent mapping of the area it was acknowledge significant pinnacles; and from the obvious view of it, significant habitat and very limited access or activity relative to VMS.

They adopted Alternative 3, which again concurred with the recommendation of the Coral AP on May 10. The next area that they looked at was the consideration on the Stetson-Miami Terrace Coral HAPC. They were able to look at the proposal that came out of the Coral Advisory Panel, which as Steve had indicated had truncated the northern to exclude the area that did not have habitat and then also moved the southern portion to the north that came closer to the existing mapped habitat, but acknowledged the occurrence of habitat in that southern portion and captured the habitat from the navy mapping efforts.

Carter Watterson now is on our Habitat Advisory Panel as the Navy representative and provided the specific details of both the bathymetry and some of the characterization of these habitats that will be able to fold into the subsequent documents. I'll show that map later. The other action of the Habitat Advisory Panel was looking at the Cape Lookout CHAPC, and they did look at the high resolution bathymetry, acknowledged the presence of those habitats and approved under Action 3, Alternative 2, which right now is the only alternative under consideration.

It acknowledges the high amount of habitat, especially on the western portion of that extension. That was approved with no dissenting votes at the advisory panel. Now this is getting to the area that I talked about. Subsequent to the webinar, Carter provided the Navy bathymetry and the habitat characterization.

They've done some of the most high-end work in this area, which covers both our North Florida MPA as well as a good portion of this proposal extension. If you can see, the area does show the habitat distribution that the Coral Advisory Panel had been trying to capture in the southern portion of this recommendation and even gets into some of the more refined resolution of coral rubble versus rubble versus pavement; all the complex of habitats.

This information was provided subsequent to our webinar, but had been acknowledged as the justifying movement of the Coral Advisory Panel and reaffirmed by the Habitat Advisory Panel. That is the report of the Habitat Advisory Panel on activities pertaining to CE-BA 3 and any of the management actions that had been proposed under CE-BA 3.

What I did want to also do was provide – there has been a lot of discussion in a number of the different advisory panels about the VMS information. What had been acknowledged was the consideration of fishing versus non-fishing, the pool of all VMS points versus the VMS points for deepwater shrimping.

Preliminary what I did was go back in and look at the data set; look at areas, and basically used a depth contour; cut out what should be most of the penaeid shrimp fishing inshore and provided what we see here. Now, the first pie chart shows you the Coral and Habitat recommendations. This is all VMS fishing points.

There had been two requests; one that we look at all the fishing points versus just the fishing points relative to the whole universe. Well, this gets to that. This gets to of the vessels involved in this fishery, how much of the fishing in this area constitutes all the fishing, but that combines all the different shrimp fishing activities involved, from penaeid to deepwater shrimp.

So that was showing about 2.64 percent of the area occurred within the 60 to 100 meter proposal. Well, when you look at then excluding the penaeid efforts, like I said it's a preliminary look at it, but what it did is it cut out pretty much all of the inshore areas that they would be trawling. It does move it up. This has been acknowledged in all the APs that we knew that there were probably some adjustments we need to look.

But given the low numbers, it was probably going to be something that moved it up some but not – there have been some comments that it may be 50 percent of the fishing activities. What this is showing is that it is about – under this at least, looking at of the offshore deepwater shrimp fishing, this constitutes about 6.6 percent of those points that occur within this 60 to 100.

Now, what I did do is I took the opportunity to look at the Shrimp APs, and it does confirm pretty much exactly what Mike had said is it really did pin down that the proposal as laid out really reduced any of the historic trawl activity in the area, because it is 0.25 percent. Then when you look at the fishing relative to offshore deepwater shrimp fishing, it is about 0.63 percent.

This pretty much concurred both what the Shrimp APs had identified, but also what the Coral and Habitat APs have been discussing about occurrence. Now, the next one coming up shows all of the different areas in context. It's showing that the Shrimp APs – you have the range from the Shrimp APs recommendations showing about 0.63 percent of the VMS points for fishing occurring within that bound to the original 70 to 90 meter, because the Shrimp AP area really did cut into some areas that are probably more like 75 and maybe 85.

It kind of just looped around capturing the tracked areas. It was about double, about 1.2 percent of the area. The 70 to 100 meter was 2.5 percent of the VMS points, fishing points. The 60 to 90 was about 5.78. And then when you get up to the Coral recommendations and Habitat AP recommendations, it moved it up to about 6.6 percent.

I think what this really does show you is that the biggest impact on any of the shifts between those areas is on the inshore area between that 60 and 70 meter. But it does bring it – even in looking to here, it brings it up to still about 6 percent, 6.6 percent of the VMS points. That at least updated and this really was just looking at the whole universe, and that was between 0.2 percent and again 2.6 percent of all the fishing points for a vessel involved in the fishery, but this includes both VMS.

You've kind of got a range of the impact on the fishery in total from 2.6 percent of the VMS points to then the impact on the deepwater shrimp being up to 6 percent, 6-plus percent. At least it updates a little bit more. What I have done is I'm looking at getting the entire data set for the entire time series and we'll again look at a similar type of a review of the information beyond

this. That at least updates it some to at least begin to open the door to look at kind of the overall impact on the deepwater shrimp fishery. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Roger. Questions for Roger? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Roger, these points; I'm guessing the VMS are doing points even when the boats are anchored. I could possibly see somebody fishing in one place and then going and anchoring where they might be trawling. I'm seeing a possible distortion of dragging area. There is no way of just getting the points at nighttime when they're working and getting the percentage of points there.

MR. PUGLIESE: But when we're looking at this, we're looking at it wouldn't include any of those anchored points, because we're looking at where vessels were moving above two knots; so eliminate that plus steaming. Above two knots, and then below five, four and a half moves it down so it is a fishing operation, so it excludes anchoring, it excludes steaming.

It is at least the attempt to try to get in and zero in and not include those kinds of things. Because it kind of looked at that; it kind of got masked a little bit when you looked at the whole universe. This is tracking very similar to what we did under CE-BA 1 when we looked at the overall fishing operations.

MR. HAYMANS: Just jumping to the Law Enforcement AP, which I know none of you guys are, but they continue to argue for straight line points or at least following the latitude/longitude as closely as possible. For rock shrimp cases, they're going to be made on VMS points. I mean, it is not like we are going to go out and chase a white shrimp trawler and have to mark his location. It is a VMS violation.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, I think one of the things that is really important here is that the regional office has acknowledged that there has been some shift in terms of having operations more in-house there. They have the ability to track this. That is one of the reasons that they said that they are now able to really use this to do the transit capability; to have something that flags it when it does go over things. I think there has been a significant acknowledgement that they can use it beyond just a line and it can actually address some of these issues on transit. There is more functional capability from the region to actually use VMS for what it is intended to do.

MR. HAYMANS: My point there was that we could draw the lines more towards the Shrimp AP, if need be, in and out of the coral heads or whatnot; because if they are inside of whatever box we draw, no matter what the shape is, the case is going to be made based off the VMS location.

MR. HARRIS: Apparently. Mike, do you want to address that?

MR. MERRIFIELD: No, that is the point I was trying to make earlier is that I don't think the shape matters. I think there was a presentation here last year from Alaska where they had these little dots all over the place and there was no problem. I think VMS is a great solution for that. I had a question for Roger. Is this still the five-year data?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, this is still the five-year data. I've been looking at getting – as we proceed and develop a hearing document, looking at trying to look at the entire universe of the points and redo this type of a review of the overall. Then we can compare it to the more recent fishing activities relative to historic and then get a bounds of what the implications may be.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, let's take a ten- minute break and when we come back we're going to get right into the CE-BA 3 Decision Document.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. HARRIS: Okay, if we're all back to the table, before we get into the decision document there are a couple of issues that Anna asked to discuss first, so, Anna, it is in your lap.

MS. MARTIN: This kind of tags along to some of the recommendations that Steve was mentioning that came out of the Coral AP meeting. A couple of attachments that are in your briefing book, you'll see within Attachment 3 – that is the Coral AP report – there is a bundled attachment.

This is in regards to their letter to submit a letter of recommendation to the state of Florida to recommend similar conservation measures to protect those two coral species, elkhorn and staghorn. Essentially we're talking about closed areas to lobster trapping similar to what was pursued in Spiny Lobster Amendment 11. Again, this is a draft letter of recommendation. The Coral Advisory Panel is recommending this would be a letter submitted on behalf of the council to FWC.

MS. McCAWLEY: I think this letter looks good. I would support this letter; in fact, staff has already been working toward this end. I just would make a suggestion that this letter probably needs to be addressed to the chairman, which at this time is Kathy Barco, because the list of commissioners at the top of this draft letter, they are not even the current commissioners.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, do you need a motion?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir.

MR. HAYMANS: I want to make a motion we draft a letter from the council to the FWC based on staff recommendations and the AP.

MR. HARRIS: There is a motion; is there a second? Second by Mac. Discussion on the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, **that motion carries.** Anna, you have another?

MS. MARTIN: Okay, and the other point I wanted to bring up before we get into the decision document is Attachment 7 in your briefing book. This is the comment letter that was submitted on behalf of the council. This is in regards to the hydrokinetic feasibility project that Florida Atlantic has proposed. It was submitted on the 24th of May in time for the BOEM comment

period before the expiration. If you have time for review, that was submitted and essentially is an essential fish habitat comment on the proposed activities.

MR. HARRIS: Do we need a motion on that?

MS. MARTIN: No.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, is that it, Anna? Okay, thank you. Let me see if I can frame this correctly. The decision document for CE-BA 3 at this point in time has three actions and they all include expanding the Coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern. You heard from Mike and you heard from Steve that both the Shrimp AP and the Coral AP kind of took the maximum that would benefit each of those two groups.

There was a recommendation from the Shrimp AP that they have a joint meeting with the Coral AP to see if they can work through some of these issues and perhaps come to some kind of compromise on these expansion areas. It is up to the committee. I've talked with the Chairman and I've talked with the Executive Director.

There is money in the budget to have a joint AP meeting of perhaps just the Deepwater Shrimp AP, the Coral AP and perhaps the Chair and the Vice Chair of the Habitat AP in hopes that they can come back to this committee with a recommendation for modification of these proposed expansion areas. I think it's a good idea.

I like to see agreement between APs in situations like this. That would be what I would recommend, but it is up to the committee. If that is something that we can find agreement about, then I would entertain a motion to do something like that. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: So moved, Mr. Chairman, and I have a question if I can get a second.

DR. CRABTREE: Second.

MR. HARRIS: It's been moved and seconded by Roy. Okay, Jessica, you're up.

MS. McCAWLEY: Would that occur prior to the public hearings in August so that any kind of changes or proposed changes could be shown to the public at the public hearing?

MR. CUPKA: I don't think we'd be able to do this before the next round of public hearings, but what we would do would be to break these actions out of this amendment and put it in another amendment and leave the data collection and the Warsaw and speckled hind in the current CE-BA 3; just move these to CE-BA 4 and then we would hit that on the next go round of public hearings, which would be in the spring. That would be the way I would see this proceeding.

MR. PHILLIPS: Otha whispered in our ear so I'd like to make a friendly amendment that you add the chairman of the Law Enforcement AP.

MS. McCAWLEY: I accept the friendly amendment.

MR. HARRIS: Is that accepted by the seconder of the motion as well? Yes, good. You've heard the motion and the friendly amendment. Is there further discussion on the motion? **Okay, the motion is to convene – I think I said the Deepwater Shrimp, because I don't think this really involves the other Shrimp AP because all of the trawling for penaeid is inside of the 60 meter line – the Deepwater Shrimp and the Coral APs and representatives from the Habitat AP and the Law Enforcement AP to discuss the HAPC measures in CE-BA 3. Yes, Michelle.**

DR. DUVAL: Just to clarify what Chairman Cupka said, these options would then be wrapped into the next round of public hearings that we have in the spring, so would these actions be included as part of CE-BA 4 then?

MR. HARRIS: Yes; CE-BA 3, then, if we go down this road, would include the data collection and MPA discussion based on the Snapper Grouper recommendations, committee recommendations. Then the expansion of the Coral HAPCs would be a new CE-BA 4 document.

There is no time crunch on what would become CE-BA 4. We're not pushing ourselves into a corner by doing this. Is there further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that **motion is approved.** That concludes any discussion we will have about the CE-BA 3 Decision Document. Yes, Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Do you need to remove the HAPCs from CE-BA 3? Do you need a motion to do that?

MR. HARRIS: I don't think so, I think direction to staff. Do we need a motion on that, David, to remove the HAPCs from CE-BA 3?

MR. CUPKA: I think direction of staff and we all understand what we're doing and everything.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, so the next item on the agenda would be Item 6, ecosystem activities and an update by Roger. Before you do that, let me just thank Steve and Mike for your work and Pace and the Habitat AP for their work; both of your APs. I think you did an excellent job of providing the council with some needed direction. Thanks for being here.

MR. PUGLIESE: I'm going to be fairly quick with it. What I did provide you in Attachment 7A of your briefing material was a presentation that I coordinated with the Southeast Regional Office Habitat Conservation at a national workshop on sound and fish that BOEM was holding. There was a real desire to – traditionally in the context of any energy activities and other activities, there has been a focus on marine mammal interactions relative to sound.

There was a real desire to fill in the gaps and understanding of what should be the considerations relative to fish and sound implications. We provided our information on priority species and habitats in that presentation – I am not going to go through the presentation – gets to our

managed activities, managed species, some of the identifying species that were overfished, areas of particular concern, et cetera, to really kind of highlight what should be focused on.

The meeting itself was – in addition to myself we had Tom Hauf from the Mid-Atlantic Council and an Alaska representative, also. It was very eye-opening to all involved, because some of the implications are a lot more significant I think than people had realized; damaged associated with sound, fishing impacts relative to sound in terms of some of the documented research on an area where they were doing all the sonic cannon testing for enhanced oil and gas aspiration off of regions.

Some of the presentations made showed changes upwards of 50 to 70 percent reduction in fishing catch rates; some having to do with displacement, but also some having to do with probably damage and then just changes. It was a very comprehensive program. It even got into things such as understanding sound masking of species ability to settle on habitats; sound implications of things I hadn't even heard of about the impact of sound as in translating through benthic – say they are doing pile driving.

Some of the offshore wind systems have support systems that are upwards of 18 or 20 feet wide in the deep ocean areas. The sounds associated with those actually would travel through the seabed. The implications of seabed transfer were even on the table. They did a fairly comprehensive effort to open the door of what really needs to be understood in terms of understanding the existing sound, the species that are sound producing, and the implications, and ten the whole suite of what species may be impacted, what prey may be impacted, feeding impacts, spawning impacts, et cetera.

This was a real good opportunity to get in the door early and acknowledge what they should be focusing future research and characterization relative to energy activities and work that BOEM could provide in terms of long-term research efforts. Some of the other things ongoing in terms of ocean energy; the states of South Carolina and North Carolina's task forces with BOEM are still moving forward.

There was a joint conference call webinar that was held acknowledging kind of the connections between the two; what the implications of the North Carolina activities may be for South Carolina. North Carolina is further along in terms of identifying focus areas for wind production and the move towards wind energy.

To date we've had input on providing information on essential fish habitat, et cetera, on those areas; but as we're not formal members of the task force, we're kind of doing peripherally through NOAA, but are still with some of the newer tools are trying to do it on a regional basis. Because I think there is so much focus on an individual state orientation, we want to be able to capture that.

I think the systems that are being developed will be able to bring in information, put them in context relative to the overall species distribution as well as habitats, et cetera. Those are ongoing collaborations and cooperation we are having with the individual states on energy.

As you have seen, some of the continued deliberation on other alternative energy distribution such as the kinetic work, et cetera, especially off of Florida, in the most recent comment letter that was provided. Other activities that are ongoing is the Governors Alliance is continually moving some of the efforts forward.

Our most significant connection is again through the Habitat and Ecosystem team that is guiding kind of the next step of compiling information systems, data, et cetera, that will be, as Michelle had indicated, trying to figure out what is going to be the best umbrella of understanding how all these different data can provide useful tools for the state partners and other partners in the region.

There is continued work with developing the South Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative. The group that I sit on the steering group for has created a science plan and a needs assessment, which what they are trying to do is to include all the different – it is the highest scale review of information assessment to look at long-term strategies for ecological conservation.

We're keeping in the fray and keeping marine and estuarine right at the forefront of that. There are opportunities with a more recent RFP to expand that. There is some collaboration again between a number of different partners, including the Alliance and SARP and others to try to enhance the marine context of those different systems; all of which I think are going to benefit.

And with the fact that we've got some of the developing capabilities with online and elsewhere, I think that cross between all these different programs is going to be really a very productive long-term value to the council as well as the different partners that we're working with in the region.

Those are some of the highlights of the areas. What I want to do is I will follow up after this meeting with some of the links to some of these other documentations and where things are moving with the different activities; but a lot going on in our region, but a lot to benefit from the council and our partners.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Roger. Questions for Roger? I think the last thing for us to discuss is other business. Is there any other business to come before this committee? Timing and Task Motion, we know what we're going to do; convene the Deepwater Shrimp, part of the Habitat APs and the Coral AP and the Chair of the Law Enforcement AP, and try to reach a compromised position on these expansions of these Coral HAPCs. If there is no other business to come before this committee, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 o'clock p.m., June 11, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: 9/10/12

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc
July, 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2011 - 2012 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

John V. O'Shea
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
703/842-0740 (ph); 703/842-0741 (f)
voshea@asmfc.org

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

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2011-2012 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION
Doug Haymans, Chair
Robert Boyles
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES
Ben Hartig, Chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Cheuvront

DOLPHIN WAHOO
Tom Swatzel, Chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Red Munden Mid-Atlantic Council
New England Council Rep
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT
✓ Duane Harris, Chair
✓ ~~Robert Boyles~~ - MEL BELL
✓ Tom Burgess
✓ Roy Crabtree
✓ David Cupka
✓ Mac Currin
✓ Michelle Duval
✓ Ben Hartig
✓ Doug Haymans
✓ John Jolley
✓ Wilson Laney
✓ Jessica McCawley
✓ Charlie Phillips
✓ Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Anna Martin- Comp. Ecosystem-based Amendment

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE
David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Robert Boyles
Mac Currin
Duane Harris
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB
David Cupka, Chair
Mac Currin
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION
Robert Boyles, Chair
Tom Burgess
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES
David Cupka, Chair
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
Michelle Duval
Robert Foos
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION
Robert Boyles, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Robert Foos
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL
Ben Hartig, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Tom Burgess
Mac Currin
Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Red Munden, Mid-Atlantic Representative
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

LAW ENFORCEMENT
Duane Harris, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Robert Boyles
Robert Foos
Ben Hartig
John Jolley
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

PERSONNEL
Robert Boyles, Chair
David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES
David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION
Roy Crabtree, Chair
Robert Boyles
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR Committee
David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Michelle Duval
Duane Harris
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Vince O'Shea
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: John Carmichael

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Staff

Executive Director
Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director
Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer
Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Assistant Public Information Officer
Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist
Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist
Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist
Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist
Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Staff Economist
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager
John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators
Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Kari Fenske – kari.fenske@safmc.net

Administrative Officer
Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary
Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator
Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants
Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

BOB GILL PHIL STEELE
BONNIE PONWITH ANDY STRELCHECK
OTHA EASLEY MIKE MERRIFIELD
JACK MCGOVERN STEVE BLAIR
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
JENNIFER LEE
GINNY FAY

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.

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
June 11, 2012
Orlando, FL 32812

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
John GALVEZ (USFWS)	772-469-4314	John_GALVEZ@FWS.gov	USFWS 1339 20th Street Vero Beach, FL 32960
[illegible]			[illegible] CO
Jeanna Mennefield (Wild Ocean Seafood)	321.269-1116	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com	Titusville, FL
Ginny Fay (NMFS)	727-551 5739	VIRGINIA.FAY@NOAA.gov	263 13TH AVES. ST. PETERSBURG, FL 33701
Samantha Port-Minner	727-369-6613	sport-minner@oceanconservancy.org	33701
Holly Binns	850-322-7845	hbinns@peopletrusts.org	32303
Leda Dunmire	305 393 0934	FKCFA	
Bill Kelly			

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.

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
June 11, 2012
Orlando, FL 32812

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
RICHARD REID	(321) 960 3257	SEAMAP 82000@ YAHOO	
Christopher Merrifield	321 604 1489	chrism@wildoceanmarket.com	
Sherri McCoy	321-960-1663	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	
Laurilee Thompson	321-794-6866	lauriletthompson@aol.com	32120-9357
Rusty Hudson	386-239-0948	DSF2009@aol.com	PO Box 366 Ormond Beach 32174
Rosa Zirlott	251-379-4892	brentrosa@aol.com	36549
Brent Zirlott	251-709-0001	" " "	" "
FRANK HELIES	813 286 8390	fchelies@verizon.net	GSAFF
Paula Blair	305-383-8001	S_PBlair@Bellsouth.net	Miami Fl. 33183

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

Attendee Report

GoToWebinar

Generated

Jun 12, 2012 04:33 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name
SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 1 of 5 (Monday)

Webinar ID
222234954

Actual Start Date/Time
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT

Actual Duration (minutes)
399

Clicked Registration Link
78

Opened Invitation
42

Total Attended
30

Session Details

Gore,Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 10:09 AM EDT
City	Sarasota
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:28 PM EDT	391.67

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 46

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Austin,Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 02:47 PM EDT
City	hubert
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 02:50 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 05:23 PM EDT	153.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 69

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Waymer,Jim	jwaymer@floridatoday.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 02:42 PM EDT
City	Melbourne
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 02:42 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 03:10 PM EDT	27.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

DeVictor,Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:49 PM EDT
City	St. Pete
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:50 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 05:01 PM EDT	190.93

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Whitaker,David	whitakerd@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 02:52 PM EDT
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 02:52 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 05:35 PM EDT	163

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 24

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

klostermann,joe	grkjfk@aol.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:00 AM EDT
City	ft.pirece
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 04:03 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:35 PM EDT	151.8

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 52

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Whitaker,David	whitaked@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:58 PM EDT
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:58 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 02:00 PM EDT	1.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 69

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Merrifield,Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:29 AM EDT
City	Titusville
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:36 PM EDT	399.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 63

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

klostermann,joe	grfjfk@aol.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 08:38 AM EDT
City	ft. pierce
State	FL
Unsubscribed	Bounce

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 03:22 PM EDT	205.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 43

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Mims,Chuck	imims@comcast.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 02:24 PM EDT
City	Edisto
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 02:25 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 03:18 PM EDT	52.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 58

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Beckwith,Anna	anna@pamlicoguide.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:06 AM EDT
City	Morehead City
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:35 PM EDT	447.63

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 64

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Byrd,Julia	byrdj@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:51 PM EDT
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 03:52 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 05:16 PM EDT	84.77

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

fenske,kari	kari.fenske@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 08:28 AM EDT
City	charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:14 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 03:43 PM EDT	148.88

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Lamberte,Antonio	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:39 PM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:40 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 02:56 PM EDT	75.97

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 54

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Eich,Anne Marie	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 08:52 AM EDT
City	Saint Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 04:07 PM EDT	237.67

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 34

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

sandorf,scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:56 PM EDT
City	st petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:57 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 04:54 PM EDT	175.7

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

MacLauchlin,Bill	billmac@charter.net
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 12:02 PM EDT
City	Stockbridge
State	GA
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 12:02 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:06 PM EDT	363.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 64

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Mehta,Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes
Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:54 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 04:38 PM EDT	282.65

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 50

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

thompson,mary jean	mjthompson860@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 11:01 AM EDT
City	titusville
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:34 PM EDT	398.62

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 76

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Mueller,Mark	mark.mueller@gulfcouncil.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:58 PM EDT
City	Tampa
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:59 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:36 PM EDT	277.27

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Williams,Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 03:29 PM EDT
City	MHC
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 03:29 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 04:25 PM EDT	55.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Travis,Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:32 PM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:36 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:06 PM EDT	270.75

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 38

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Meyers,Steve	steve.meyers@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 10:39 AM EDT
City	Silver Spring
State	MD
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 03:59 PM EDT	241.02

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

c,mike	mec181@yahoo.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 12:02 PM EDT
City	mtp
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 12:02 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:36 PM EDT	393.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 41

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

pugliese,roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 02:15 PM EDT
City	charlston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 02:15 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 06:35 PM EDT	259.62

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Thomas,Janie	fecspi@aol.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 08:25 AM EDT
City	Fernandina Beach
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 11:56 AM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 05:11 PM EDT	315.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 54

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

DeLancey,Larry	delanceyl@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:29 PM EDT
City	Charleston
State	SC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:30 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 05:08 PM EDT	218.25

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 60

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Merrifield,Mike	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:26 PM EDT
City	Titusvillle
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:26 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 03:57 PM EDT	150.78

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 62

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Michie,kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date	May 25, 2012 11:03 AM EDT
City	St. Petersburg
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 11, 2012 01:29 PM EDT	Jun 11, 2012 03:30 PM EDT	120.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Kelly,Bill	fkcfa1@hotmail.co

Attended No

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:34 AM EDT
City	Marathon
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Daniel,Louis	louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov

Attended No

Registration Date	May 25, 2012 02:01 PM EDT
City	Morehead City
State	NC
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

Hudson,Russell	dsf2009@aol.com

Attended No

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 09:42 AM EDT
City	Daytona Beach
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

Sedberry,George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 01:06 PM EDT
City	Savannah
State	GA
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

FARMER,NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date	May 25, 2012 10:58 AM EDT
City	ST PETERSBURG
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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

youngman,jeff	jyoungman1@gmail.com
Attended No	
Registration Date	Jun 11, 2012 11:36 AM EDT
City	rockledge
State	FL
Unsubscribed	No

In Session

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

Registration Q & A

Questions Asked by Attendee

Poll Questions

Post Session Survey Questions

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