

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

CITIZEN SCIENCE COMMITTEE

**DoubleTree by Hilton Atlantic Beach Oceanfront
Atlantic Beach, NC**

December 8, 2016

SUMMARY MINUTES

Committee Members:

Chris Conklin, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer

Mark Brown
Tim Griner
Dr. Michelle Duval
Charlie Phillips

Council Members:

Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans

Dr. Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Lt. Tara Pray
Robert Beal

Council Staff:

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Chip Collier
Mike Collins
Dr. Mike Errigo

John Hadley
Kim Iverson
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Roger Pugliese
Amber Von Harten
Kimberly Cole

Observers/Participants:

Erica Burgess
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Jack McGovern
Rick DeVactor
Mike Cahall

Dr. Jessica Stephen
Erik Williams
Tracy Dunn
Patricia Bennett
Aydan Rios

Additional Observers/Participants attached.

The Citizen Science Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the DoubleTree by Hilton Atlantic Beach Oceanfront, Atlantic Beach, North Carolina, Thursday afternoon, December 8, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Chris Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: As a reminder, the members of the committee are myself, Ben Hartig, Zack Bowen, Chester Brewer, Mark Brown, Dr. Duval, Tim Griner, Charlie Phillips, and Robert Beal. The next item is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any modifications to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved. The first agenda item is Attachment 1 in your briefing book, which is a presentation that's going to provide a Citizen Science Program update, and Amber is going to walk us through this.

MS. VON HARTEN: Good afternoon, everyone. I am going to walk you through just an update of what we've accomplished in 2016 and then kind of hopefully have a discussion about some next steps in moving forward with development of the council's Citizen Science Program. Just to refresh your memory, here is the vision and mission statement that came out of the Citizen Science Program design workshop that we had back in January that brought together all those fishermen, scientists, and managers from the Region to talk about what a program might look like.

Starting in January, we had the workshop. Starting the day after the workshop concluded, the council's Organizing Committee sat down and began to draft the Citizen Science Program blueprint. Then, in March, we presented that to you all, and you adopted that blueprint and supported moving forward with development of a program.

Then, in May, council staff was asked to present during the NMFS QUEST Webinar Series, and that's organized by Laura Oremland, and we were asked to present kind of an overview of why the council was interested in a program, to address certain data needs and gaps, and how we developed the blueprint to help guide and serve as the framework for developing the program. That was a very well-attended webinar and very well received. We made a lot of different connections, after that webinar, with folks interested in learning more about what the council is trying to do.

Then, in July, we had a really unique opportunity to participate in the International Marine Conservation Congress up in Newfoundland, and, with the help of some of the other Organizing Committee members, it was myself, Julia Byrd, Leda Dunmire, and Ben Hartig. We traveled up to Newfoundland, and we presented during a special symposium on actionable science with another group of panel members that talked about that topic.

Then we were also able to host and facilitate a focus group at the congress, and what was unique about that was we felt that we got lots of really great input at our workshop from folks that had a lot of fisheries experience. At this congress, there were a lot of folks -- I think it was something like 30 percent of the presentations at this congress all were focused on citizen science, and so we had a great opportunity to kind of pick the brains of a lot of folks that had citizen science expertise, and we had over twenty-seven participants participate in that focus group, and Julia and I were able to walk them through some of the four components of the blueprint that we felt the council could use a little bit more information about. We used the recommendations that came out of that focus group to help inform the blueprint further.

Then we also have continued to work with Dr. Rick Bonney and Jennifer Shirk at the Cornell Lab of Ornithology. If you recall those folks from the January workshop, they were instrumental in helping us connect with all those citizen science folks at that congress, and we continue to use them as a resource as we move forward.

Then, in September, you all decided to elevate the council's efforts to an actual committee, and that's why we are here today, having our first Citizen Science Committee. Then, as you've heard about earlier this week, we had some opportunities to develop some project ideas that are based on some of the ideas for projects that came out of the January workshop to develop a kickstarter project. When I say kickstarter, I know that may have a connotation of like getting money to do online, as a kickstarter, but what we're talking about is like a pilot project, like a first proof-of-concept project, and we had an opportunity to submit a proposal to some internal funding opportunities. We continue to look for funding for that initial project.

To date, the council has put a lot of effort and time and investment into these efforts, and it kind of totals to about \$110,000. Obviously it's staff time for coordinating all the activities in 2015 and 2016, which included three primary staff, myself, John Carmichael, and Julia Byrd, and then other staff support to help pull off the workshop. It's also some of the initial sampling and research that was done with different scientists and fishermen and the January 2016 workshop, which was also made successful by some of the Sea Grant support that we received to bring fishermen and Sea Grant agents to that workshop, and then the participation in that international conference that we attended, two staff and one council member.

What do we need moving forward? It's been pretty clear that having a dedicated staff person to operate the program is kind of the biggest need right now, moving forward, and that was one of the key recommendations that came out of the workshop in January. For the long term, we obviously need a person to help implement and organize the program. Then, for the short term, we really need someone that can focus on developing projects, finding funding to support those projects, and develop different program partnerships to make those projects actually be able to be carried out.

Just a reminder, and this is part of the blueprint. This is kind of the tiered program structure that the Organizing Committee came up with. We definitely see a role for the Organizing Committee moving forward, to serve in those key roles in the permanent infrastructure, but, just to give you an idea, this is a pretty high-level type of program structure that is going to need to be in place to make the program a success.

Some of our challenges are, as we have moved throughout the year, is funding. As you know, the council is limited to receiving funds only from NMFS. We can't receive grant monies and things of that nature, and so we're going to have to be creative on that front and really work on developing our partnerships with other organizations and agencies to make that happen. Also, the limitation of we don't have a dedicated staff person to pursue that program or project level support, and the initial project. We really need to be considerate of what type of project we want to start out with. It needs to be a successful project that can actually be applied directly to the science and management that is used by the council, and there is definitely a level of risk involved if the first project fails. Then the program can be at risk of failing.

What did we do in terms of pursuit of funding? We did submit an initial budget request to NMFS, but we've always been exploring other program partnerships and other funding opportunities. The thing that is starting to happen now is that the word is out on the street about what the council is trying to do, and we've generated a lot of interest, and so we have some partners, other organizations and agencies, that have begun to approach the council and council staff about engaging us on citizen science projects. As I already mentioned, we had the grant opportunity, and so the kickstarter project idea that we kind of have been shopping around is dealing with the scamp grouper discards, and I think Gregg gave a little overview about that earlier this week.

We kind of wanted to outline some of the options for moving forward, considering that maybe we want to pursue this kickstarter project, and so I've kind of outlined, in this table here, three different options, what would happen under each of those options, and then some of the benefits and risks.

The first option would be to pursue this kickstarter project with no program or staff support, and so we would essentially have the app built, which the scamp discard project is centered around building a mobile app to have fishermen report discards, take a photo of the fish, report the depth that they're fishing and the length of fish, and so it's a very simple app to report that type of data.

The app would be built, under this first option, but the project would be just open to anyone, and there really wouldn't be any oversight by a program or a staff person, and so this would be a pretty low-cost option, and the app would be built, but we're concerned about this option, because there wouldn't be a staff person to support the project, and there is going to be definitely some project support that's going to be needed. There is also less chance that the data could actually be used.

In Option 2, we would employ maybe a temporary staff person that could help make sure that the app was built and also provide maybe some part-time support on oversight of the project, and so this would be a moderate cost, with temporary staff, and the success, we feel, would be pretty moderate as well, because staff time and availability would be limited. We would also have some concerns about stakeholder buy-in without enough staff there to support the project, and the data may not be available in time, under this option.

Then the third option would be under the scenario of having an actual full-time staff person that could not only carry out the project, but also begin to develop the program. The program would have support to get off the ground, and the success rate would likely be really high. We would have a lot of stakeholder support for the project, through having a project staff onboard, and this is also the highest-cost option. I wanted to kind of lay this out, so that you could kind of weigh out the benefits and risks of developing things under these different scenarios.

Some items to consider for next steps are we definitely wanted to make sure that you all were aware that the existing staff time and resources that were put into the program, or developing the program this year, is really not sustainable. We're all doing this in addition to our normal duties, and so that needs to be taken into consideration. Also, looking at budgeting for a full-time, dedicated staff with the existing resources we have, if that's possible, and finding project funding for that kickstarter project.

Also, there is a risk of -- Here we are it's December, and it's almost a year after the initial workshop, and we're worried about we have a risk of losing some of the momentum that we have moving forward and stakeholder support. Also, we are concerned that we might be missing

opportunities for partnership development and funding opportunities, and so these are just some items for you all to consider, and we would love to have some discussion about what you all think of this and steps moving forward.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Do we want to talk some about the scamp potential kickstarter project? We introduced it some, but it was rather brief, and are folks interested in hearing maybe a little more about that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Before you go on, John, can I ask a question? When you're talking about a kickstarter project, you're not talking about the kickstarter thing that's on the net that people -- You're talking about a project to kick start citizen science?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We're talking kickstarter in the old usage and not in the modern, tech-world usage, where it has a meaning that people go in and fund in money to kick start you. No, this is in the earlier usage of the word. It's the idea of something that gets this program off the ground and moving. In all of our discussions over the past year with different folks at NMFS, one of the things that has certainly emerged to us is that there is a need to show a success in something like this, to help build the commitment for folks to help commit to you to go down the road in funding and things of that nature, and I can certainly appreciate that.

One of the places we need to show success is can we get information that's useful in the management program, particularly within the stock assessment realm. When we started thinking about that, and it was folks who are working at it, they said, you know, if we had some kind of ideas, some short perspectives of things that you would look at, and one of the things that we happened upon was the idea of discard information.

That's because, during the workshop, there was a lot of interest in fishermen providing greater details about discard information, as well as with the APs. We talked about the descender devices, and there is interest in fishermen of letting us know how often those kinds of things are used and what types of things are being used. Fishermen increasingly understand how important discards and discard losses are to our stock assessments. Under our regulatory framework, a lot of our fish, the primary removals that we're seeing, certainly -- If not primary, significant removals, are tied back to the discard losses.

It's also a place where we have very little information, and that's particularly key. There is a lot of interest from folks in developing applications where fishermen can go in and report their catch and do things of that nature, but the problem with that, in having it actually used, is you are competing with other existing, established monitoring programs, such as MRIP. As difficult as MRIP is and the challenges it faces, it has far greater coverage than any sort of voluntary programs that have been created, where people just go type it in and occasionally enter their fish.

We also know that any such programs like that are likely to be very biased, because people often don't enter their effort when they didn't catch any fish, and so one of the challenges in those types of things is overcoming that, but, when you look at getting information just on the fish that are discarded, it's key within the assessment to know why they're discarded. It has a big impact on the selectivity, and we always talk about selectivity. Knowing whether they're discarded because of size limits or bag limits or what have you affects what you may assume about the size of those fish.

It would be even better to have observations of their actual size, but that's hard to get, because how do you put observers on private recreational vessels, where many of our issues exist, and even the observer coverage we have is not all that good on things like the headboat or the commercial vessels, and so there's a huge lack of information there.

We have seen information from fishermen used in the past in stock assessments, and what most recently comes to mind is the work of Steve Amick, over many years, with red snapper, where he just simply recorded the number of fish that were undersized and the number of fish that were oversized that he caught and he discarded, and so you knew a proportion of what is he discarding that's due to size limits, and it ended up that that lined up pretty well with signals of good year classes, and so we know that simple information like that can be used and has been used, and so we felt that going after the discards met a lot of the criteria for a good kickstarter, the interest and all of that, and the usefulness of the data.

We settled on scamp because there's an assessment coming up, and because it's a relatively rare species, and that's important to us, because we were thinking, when we get into the data collection, if we're in the Option 1 and we're trying to do this with existing resources, maybe there's a possibility, if we got someone to build an app for us or got some very limited funding to build a focused, simple application to record discard information, the amount of data coming into that would not be overwhelming, if it focuses on scamp, because there aren't that many scamp encountered.

It would be very different than if you tried to go after something like vermilion snapper or black sea bass or even red snapper, where there are so many observations that you would have to deal with that we would quickly be overwhelmed with data management. We thought, okay, this is something that -- Amber and Julia Byrd and I, in thinking about this, were like scamp may be one that we could handle the observations that come in. The worst-case scenario is people could email them to us or something.

For all of those reasons, we gravitated toward the idea of a scamp project, and we really want to get an app that is focused on the discard information, and the thinking there, and we ran into this when we came up with the more detailed proposal, and we're looking to get that funded and work with the folks at Harbor Light Software, is the interest, often, with app developers is to try and put as many features and bells and whistles and everything in there as they can, because they're trying to get broad adoption.

They want it to appeal to as many people as they can, and one of the conversations that I had with them, I said, well, that's not what we're looking for. We want something that is simple and focused, so that people will actually stick with it and use it and that is very user-friendly and easy, because I tend to think, if there's too many bells and whistles, there is a high novelty factor, but then application and usage really drops off in hurry, because people say it's too hard for me to go into this thing and cycle through all of these different screens when all you want to know is maybe five things about this fish that you discarded. How big was it, where did you catch it, did you use a descending device, what kind of condition was it in, and maybe take a picture.

Our other idea was we really need a focused app. If a guy is out on the boat, it's real simple. It doesn't take a lot of time, and he can actually do this information really quickly, in the hopes that

that actually means, okay, it's something that people will use, because I think we all know that we use tools that are simple to use and effective. If a tool gets very complicated, it's not worth the time and aggravation of using it, and so its usage really quickly drops off, and I think you see that with a lot of tech stuff. It may be really appealing upfront, but, five years later, who is actually doing it?

For all of those reasons, it led us to try to get this focused app just for discards on scamp. Now, long-term, we would like to see if this information could be useful in the scamp assessment and we shed some light onto why scamp are discarded and what the size and the selectivity of scamp that are discarded is. Then maybe this works to something that gets scaled up to other upcoming assessments and maybe snapper grouper and other fisheries as a whole.

Then sort of the last fact that we went into with this was we wanted it to appeal to all sectors, and we wanted it to be useful to commercial, for-hire, private recreational, and everybody. A lot of times, these sort of reporting things tend to gravitate toward one sector or another, and we wanted to be careful not to do that and get the same information, the same type of information, from all the different sectors.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks, John. I think you did a good job of lining up and explaining why -- If we get the kickstarter off the ground, the needs for the staff person are there, and we have options there. Tim.

MR. GRINER: I think it's a great idea. Given where we are now, I'm having a little bit of a hard time understanding exactly why you picked scamp say over the red snapper. I mean, given the problem we've got with red snapper, it seems like that would be the first place to go.

MR. CARMICHAEL: One of the biggest things is being the scamp research track assessment starting in 2018, and, as I said, sort of rolling this thing out and seeing how it works and what the data management challenges are going to be. We felt that was a much more manageable species to deal with, because of so many fewer people are going to encounter them and so many fewer scamp are encountered over a year than say red snapper, and so our hope is that, if we get the bugs worked out of this and it works pretty good, we would like to quickly escalate it up to doing other focused species. Maybe it starts our targeting in on species that are coming up for an assessment, so you can get that information, but, ultimately, it becomes something that people do regularly, so you have that information available.

MR. GRINER: Will you be able to use it in the assessment?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's the question that we would have to see. We have to get the data and submit it and have it evaluated, but hopefully yes. Another thing about scamp is so maybe the data are useful, but there might be some ways it could be improved. Then that would give us an opportunity to do that as well. We can learn and we can adapt, and then we maybe apply it to something with much higher stakes, such as red snapper, when the next assessment comes up.

MR. HARTIG: It seems, to me, that the time you want to figure out if your data is going to be good enough for the assessment is to include the Southeast Fisheries Science Center early and often, to make sure that how you're moving forward will be able to be used in an assessment.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's definitely our intention as well, and that was part of our proposal, was to reach out with them and make sure we're getting the right information.

MR. BREWER: Amber or John, any kind of idea what a full-time staff person would cost per year?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we'll turn that over to Gregg, because I know he came to the table, and he wanted to follow up with some thoughts on this afterward, and so very good transition.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you. We had tried to -- We've been trying to get funding to get this program going. We've got tremendous support from Dr. Merrick at the Headquarters level, Roy and Jack and the staff at the Region, and Bonnie and her staff. We have worked with them, and there is a lot of support for it, but it's just, right now, the funding being what it is, we can't get funding from them to start the program, and so we've been kicking around what can we do, on a short-term, interim basis, so we don't lose the momentum that we have now, all the good will with our constituents.

What we were going to suggest is we move Amber over into this full-time position to start the program and to work on the program structure and to shop this kickstarter project around and to then manage that when it gets going. Then, on a contractual basis, we backfill her position and make it clear to that individual that this is a temporary position. That way, should funding become available, then we can look at how we want to handle this permanently. If we do this for a period of time and nothing pans out and our demands are such that we need to scale back, then we haven't hired someone that we can't afford long-term.

We would like to offer that for your consideration, as to how we move forward. It would, in essence, mean adopting Option 3, but we would move Amber over into that position and hire someone, and this would all be under John's shop, the Science and Statistics Branch, which was our plan from the start.

This individual would be supervised by Amber, so that Amber can train that individual in what she has been doing on the outreach side and the visioning side, and to keep those activities going. We've got other staff on the management side that have helped with the visioning that would continue to do that, and we feel that's something we could do on a short-term basis, assuming that our budget stays somewhere where it is, and we will know that hopefully after the February Coordinating Council meeting.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks, Gregg. Michelle had a question.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Not really a question, but more of a comment. I like this approach, and I think Gregg was also maybe going to talk about it in Executive Finance, when we discuss our budget as well, and I also have a lot of concerns about losing the momentum that we've gained. I gave a presentation at the Council Coordination Committee meeting in February of last year, right after we had the workshop in January, and there was -- That was very well received. There was lots of, hey, we're rooting for you kind of comments from council leadership from other regions, and it would be really great to, at this upcoming CCC meeting, be able to say that, although progress has been slow, we are still moving forward and be able to report on the pilot project ideas that we have at least and the steps that we're taking to try to find funding.

If I could pay for app development myself, I would go ahead and do it, because I think it's such a great idea, and especially to have something that's simple, that could be used by both commercial and recreational fishermen. It definitely meets a need that we have in our assessments, and it might take a few tweaks to ensure that those data are useful, but, gosh, it's going to be a lot more useful than what we have now, and so I am fully supportive of this approach. I trust that Gregg and John and Mike feel like they can handle it.

MR. CONKLIN: Gregg, to that point, and then I have Charlie.

MR. WAUGH: Just to clarify, because I am not sure I made this point, but that would cover the staffing side. We would work with some outside partner to get the funding to do the kickstarter project. We, the council, would not be paying for that part of it.

DR. PONWITH: From the agency perspective, I remain extremely interested and excited about the notion of citizen science. I think, the way I've heard it described, and I agree, is this council is pioneering new ground. I think this concept has a lot of promise in this council and in other councils, and so I'm glad to hear the CCC excited. Within the agency, I have pitched this to the other Science Center Directors, and their answer has been, glad it's you and not me, number one, but their second comment has been that you keep really good notes, because, if this works, we want you to show us how it's done, and so there remains a great deal of interest.

I think the council staff have done a phenomenal job of making the pitch to the agency, and I think the response is a chicken-and-egg scenario, where, from a business perspective, it's you finance the core staff, so that, once you get it started, you can keep it rolling. That's logical. From the agency perspective, they're approaching it with scientific skepticism of show me what you can do first and then let's talk about whether this is something that we can build the long-term infrastructure for.

I am emphatic to both, and so I think the notion of doing a project, and I don't want to call it a demonstration project. I want to call it a project that demonstrates what this council is capable of and what that contribution is to the council's mission, and I think that that will go a long way to helping improve the odds that this idea gets traction and we can stand it up for the long haul.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks. I skipped Charlie, and then Zack and Dale.

MR. PHILLIPS: Gregg, are we going to talk about costs? Do we have an idea of what the kickstarter program would cost or to build the mobile app would cost? If we're talking to NGOs that may not be here, that may want to network with some of the other NGOs to come together to help do this, do we have an idea?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We actually do have a pretty good idea, from our efforts in working with Harbor Lights, for what it would cost. The costs are not excessive. It comes down to \$25,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000 or something, and then also have you have to have some way to get the data in, and they were willing to do that for a nominal fee as well, but I think, if this gets legs for this, then the next step would be to go to Erik and them and talk about more specifics of variables and whatnot, and we just haven't done that, because we didn't feel like we wanted to -- We have so many other things that we ask of those guys, and we didn't want to go with this when it was still

sort of just an idea that was percolating and hadn't really gelled to where we thought it could become a reality.

I think, once we do that, we would talk with them, to really nail down what needs to be collected and then look back at ways to get that done, and one of the things we've learned over the year is that there are a lot of funding opportunities that can be directed toward things like that, like building applications and doing the projects and those things.

The challenge has always been the care and feeding of those within our staff people, is why we felt this position is so important. You can get money to say, yes, I'm going to build this app. You can get funding for that. There is so many different opportunities out there, but all of those projects require an awful lot of effort to make them actually happen and happen successfully, and so I think we're less concerned about the cost of the actual kickstarter project itself, because we do have opportunities, and they are pretty light, particularly if we get a good data partner. Another place would be to go to talk to ACCSP about what they can do to help bring in data of this nature as well, and so those would be conversations this staff person would start having, once it looks like we do have the resources to start putting into all those types of conversations with folks.

MR. BOWEN: In terms of where our funding for this potential project would come from, are we bound -- I guess maybe Gregg or Monica might be the ones that I could direct this question to, but are we bound to where we get our funding from? I guess what I'm asking is could it be corporations or individuals or someone that wants to, quote, unquote, sponsor this to get the kickstarter off the ground, because we could all put our thinking caps on and maybe come up with different, if this is legal, people or corporations or individuals that could maybe donate our funding to get it started.

MR. WAUGH: This is the tricky part of it, because we can only accept funds that come through NMFS and NOAA. Our intent all along was to partner with some other organization, be it Sea Grant or somebody else, who can accept outside funding, and so that part of it actually -- We've been trying to hold that down. The level of interest is so high there, but what we need is, and what we're looking for, is the funding to have someone on staff support the program and develop the program.

The funding for that person has to either come from NMFS/NOAA or through our budget, which is the same thing, and so that is why now, as a short-term solution, we're talking about making an adjustment in our structure and budget and doing that over the short-term, so that we have a project and demonstrate how it works. As Bonnie said, then that gives us a much better opportunity to shop it within the agency, to get more stable funding for our staff person, but it's always been the intent that the money to do the projects would come from lots of outside groups.

MR. DIAZ: People come to our council all the time, and they're interested in sharing data. I do agree with Dr. Ponwith. I think this is pioneering, and I also want to have access to those notes in the future too, depending on how this works out, but I think it's a great idea, if there's a way to get some public participation, and we will surely be following it closely.

I did want to volunteer that the Mississippi Department of Marine Resources started a program called Tails and Scales. It started up a couple of years ago, and it has an app with it, and I do remember talking to the gentleman that oversaw that program, and he told me that they learned a

lot developing that app, and, if they had to do it again, they would do it differently. If you all would like his contact information, just so you could maybe think about what lessons they learned on maybe better ways to develop apps more efficiently and cheaper and different things like that, we would surely put you in touch with him.

I don't think Tails and Scales lines up with this exactly, but there is enough similarities, I think, that it would be worth talking with them about the problems that they encountered and how they would do things differently, and so just get with me later and I will give you that contact information, if you all are interested. Thank you.

MR. CONKLIN: Okay. Next, I had Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not on your committee, but Gregg already answered my question, I think. I was going to ask if Sea Grant was a potential partner.

MR. WAUGH: We just happen to have someone on staff that used to work for Sea Grant, and so we have that connection there.

MR. CONKLIN: That's great. We have a Bahamas representative and a Sea Grant representative, and so that's excellent.

MR. BROWN: I was curious about whether we could put in a proposal to the ACCSP, and I was just talking to Bob, and he said that we could do that and that would fall right in line with that. It just so happens that we've got Mike Cahall in the audience, too.

MR. CONKLIN: Can somebody answer that?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, to answer that question, sure. We could apply to them for funding to do a project, but I don't think we would be successful there in terms of getting funding to run our staff person to run the program. I think that's a little bit different. The suggestion I was going to make, and Michelle hit this before, is we will be talking about this at Executive Finance, but it would be helpful to have some indication of what the Citizen Science Committee would like to see happen.

The whole idea of scheduling the Executive Finance Committee last is the various committees make demands of time and money and then it comes to the Executive Finance to sort it out. If the Citizen Science Committee would like to see this move, it would be helpful to have a motion indicating that, and I would encourage you to consider it a short-term solution, because we don't want to bind ourselves unnecessarily for the long term.

MR. PHILLIPS: This is kind of the chicken-and-the-egg. Until we get to Executive Finance, we don't know how much wiggle room we have. We would like to do something, but we don't know how much wiggle room to ask for, and so my gut feeling is to shoot for Option 2, and, if we've got wiggle room to go to Option 3, fine. If we don't, we back up to Option 1, but we know we've at least got something we want to shoot for, but I really don't know how to run the rabbit, because I haven't heard the other side of the story.

MR. CONKLIN: Okay. Go ahead, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was actually prepared to make a motion.

MR. CONKLIN: We would love to have you make a motion.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. **I move that the Citizen Science Committee recommend Option 3, as presented by staff, for moving forward with the council's Citizen Science Program. In the event that sufficient funds are not available, then recommend Option 2.**

MR. CONKLIN: Motion by Michelle and seconded by Chester. Any discussion on this motion? Bob Beal.

MR. BEAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Going back to the notion of an ACCSP proposal, I think, in the past, or I know in the past, that ACCSP has funded app development and those sorts of things, some of the mobile apps and applications. There is a lot of that going on at ACCSP, and so that's definitely consistent. As far as funding staff, I think, again, the program has funded staff on a sort of pilot program basis. It's not a long-term solution, but that may be an avenue that we could seek some funding. I can't guarantee it will be approved and where it will fall with all the other proposals, but I think it's worth exploring, that's for sure.

MR. GRINER: Gregg, are unpaid internships a viable alternative for getting started?

MR. WAUGH: We talked about that, but you get someone at that level and then you have to spend a lot of time working with them and explaining stuff to them. Then, at times, it can be almost too short of a period of time, but that certainly is an option we thought of, but, all in all, if you look at expenditure of time and money, we thought it would be more efficient if we got someone in that Amber could train in her other duties. Then she would be there to supervise and provide some feedback, rather than just going with a student. We kicked around a master's student from the College of Charleston or something like that, but it would then eat up a lot of staff time.

MR. CONKLIN: Madam Chair, do I need to read this motion into the record, or is what you did good enough?

DR. DUVAL: I think it's always good to reread the motion into the record, just to make sure it's correct as written on the screen.

MR. CONKLIN: Okay. I am going to read the motion into the record. **The motion is to recommend Option 3, as presented by staff, for a Citizen Science Program. In the event that sufficient funds are not available, then recommend Option 2.** It was seconded by Chester. Is there any other discussion on the motion? **Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion stands approved.**

It looks like that's going to be coming up at Executive Finance, and I appreciate us getting that done. Is there any other business to come before the committee? Seeing none, the committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on December 8, 2016.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
January 10, 2017

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 - 2017 COMMITTEES

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Chester Brewer, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CITIZEN SCIENCE

✓ Chris Conklin, Chair
✓ Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
✓ Zack Bowen
✓ Chester Brewer
✓ Mark Brown
✓ Michelle Duval
✓ Tim Griner
✓ Charlie Phillips
✓ Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
✓ Amber Von Harten/John Carmichael

DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Tim Griner
Wilson Laney
Ben Hartig
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Tony DiLernia/Dewey
Hemilright
New England Liaison, Rick Bellavance
Staff contact: John Hadley

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

Michelle Duval, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Chris Conklin
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT**

Doug Haymans, Co-Chair
Wilson Laney, Co-Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner
LT Tara Pray
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Chip Collier – Coral/CEBA

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: John Hadley

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 - 2017 COMMITTEES (continued)

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Mark Brown, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Michelle Duval
LT Tara Pray
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair
Anna Beckwith, Vice-Chair
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
LT Tara Pray
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

MACKEREL COBIA

Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Rob O'Reilly
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Dewey Hemilright/
Tony DiLernia
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

PERSONNEL

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

PROTECTED RESOURCES

Wilson Laney, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice-Chair
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Michelle Duval
LT Tara Pray
Staff contact: Chip Collier

SSC SELECTION

Charlie Phillips, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR

Michelle Duval, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP

Charlie Phillips, Chair
Mel Bell, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Chip Collier

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 - 2017 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

Dr. Michelle Duval
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street
(PO Box 769)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/808-8011 (ph);
252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

VICE-CHAIR

Charlie Phillips
Phillips Seafood/Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

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

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

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

Zack Bowen
P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

W. Chester Brewer
250 Australian Ave. South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
561/655-4777 (ph)
WCBLAW@aol.com

Mark Brown
3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)
capt.markbrown@comcast.net

Chris Conklin
P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/543-3833
conklinsafmc@gmail.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

Tim Griner
4446 Woodlark Lane
Charlotte, NC 28211
980/722-0918 (ph)
timgrinersafmc@gmail.com

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

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 - 2017 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

✓ 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)
doughaymans@gmail.com

✓ LT Tara Pray
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
305/415-6765 (ph)
tara.c.pray@uscg.mil

✓ 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

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

✓ Jessica McCawley
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

Aym Rios

Erica Burgess
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Mmica Smit-Brenello
Dr. Jack McGovern
Rick DeVictor
Jessica Stephens
Erik Williams
Tracy Dunn
Patricia Bennett

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

✓ Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

✓ **Deputy Director – Science & Statistics**

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

Dr. Brian Cheuvront
brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ **Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

✓ **Fisheries Social Scientist**

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

Julie O'Dell
Julie.Odell@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

✓ **Senior Fishery Biologist**

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

✓ **Administrative Officer**

Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Outreach Specialist**

Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Biologist**

Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Julia Byrd - julia.byrd@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Economist**

John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

Kimbulyle

Dec 8, 2016

Full Name	Email
Dean Foster	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Rusty Hudson	DSF2009@aol.com
david bush	davidbush@ncfish.org
Steve Poland	steve.poland@ncdenr.gov
Bill Gorham	getbowedup40@gmail.com
rich malinowski	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov

Dec 8, 2016 p1

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu
Bell	Mel	bellm@dnr.sc.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Blow	Wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
Bowen	Zack	fishzack@comcast.net
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
Brown	Mark	capt.markbrown@comcast.net
Bush	David	davidbush@bcfish.org
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Cheshire	Rob	rob.cheshire@noaa.gov
Cimino	Joe	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Conklin	Chris	conklinsafmc@gmail.com
Crosson	Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Diaz	Dale	Saltwaterlife@live.com
Dunmire	Leda	ldunmire@pewtrusts.org
Dutka-Gianelli	Jynessa	jdgianelli@ufl.edu
Errigo	Mike	mike.errigo@safmc.net
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Estes	Jim	jim.estes@myfwc.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov
Geer	Patrick	pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Guyas	Martha	martha.guyas@myfwc.com
Hanson	Chad	chanson@pewtrusts.org
Hartig	Ben	mackattackben@att.net
Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov
Hemilright	Dewey	fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Henninger	Heidi	heidi@olrac.com
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Jiorle	Ryan	ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov
Kalinowsky	Chris	Chris.Kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov
Klibansky	Nikolai	nikolai.klibansky@noaa.gov

Dec 8, 2016 PV

Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
Laks	Ira	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net
Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov
Lupton	Dee	dee.lupton@ncdenr.gov
MacLauchlin	Bill	billmac@adttrends.com
Mahood	Bob	rmahood@mindspring.com
Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
McCoy	Sherri	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com
McPherson	Matthew	matthew.mcpherson@noaa.gov
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Package-Ward	Christina	christina.package-ward@noaa.gov
Player	David	playerd@dnr.sc.gov
Pulver	Jeff	Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Ralston	Kellie	kralston@asafishing.org
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Schwaab	Alexandra	alexandra.schwaab@accsp.org
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov
Shipley	Krista	krista.shipley@myfwc.com
Stephen	Jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Surrency	Ron	captronacc@gmail.com
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Walia	Matt	matthew.walia@noaa.gov
Waters	James	jwaters8@gmail.com
Waugh	Gregg	gregg.waugh@safmc.net
White	Holly	holly.white@ncdenr.gov
Wyatt	Elizabeth	elizabeth.wyatt@accsp.org
brewer	chester	wcblaw@aol.com
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
shertzer	kyle	kyle.shertzer@noaa.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov