

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

CITIZEN SCIENCE COMMITTEE

**Westin Jekyll Island
Jekyll Island, GA**

March 9, 2017

SUMMARY MINUTES

Committee Members:

Chris Conklin, Chair
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Tim Griner

Ben Hartig
Chester Brewer
Dr. Michelle Duval
Charlie Phillips

Council Members:

Anna Beckwith
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley

Mel Bell
Doug Haymans
Lt. Tara Pray

Council Staff:

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Brian Chevront
Mike Collins
John Hadley
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Roger Pugliese
Cameron Rhodes

John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
Dr. Mike Errigo
Kim Iverson
Kimberly Cole
Amber Von Harten

Observers/Participants:

Dewey Hemilright
Kristin Foss
Dr. Marcel Reichert
Rick DeVictor
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Leann Bosarge

Dr. Jessica Stephen
Dr. George Sedberry
Dr. Jack McGovern
Monica Smit-Brunello
Erica Burgess

Other Observers/Participants attached.

The Citizen Science Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, Thursday morning, March 9, 2017, and was called to order by Chairman Chris Conklin.

MR. CONKLIN: We'll call to order the Citizen Science Committee. As a reminder, the members of the committee are myself, Ben Hartig, Zack Bowen, Chester Brewer, Captain Mark Brown, Dr. Michelle Duval, Tim Griner, Clammer Charlie Phillips, and Robert Beal.

Next, is the Approval of the Agenda. Are there any modifications to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved. Next, we will approve the minutes from the December 2016 meeting. Were there any modifications to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes stand approved. Next, I would like to call Gregg up to bring us up to speed on what shook out at the December meeting.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to give you all a little heads-up, and we'll go into this a little more in Executive Finance, but you all gave us direction at the last meeting to go ahead and move Amber over to head up the Citizen Science Program, and I introduced Cameron earlier, and she is our new Outreach Specialist, and so that's how we're moving forward.

I think you all are to be commended for making that step. I think the fiscal environment that we're going to be operating under in the next several years, to any extent that we are successful in being able to identify and bring outside sources of funding, that's where we're going to get work done. I think it's going to be a challenge to hang on to what we have going on now within the agency, and so this is very timely, and we're excited to be moving forward with this. If you all have any specific questions, I will be glad to answer them. You can get with me one-on-one, and, again, we'll touch on this a little more in Executive Finance, but I just wanted to explain where we are before you get into Citizen Science. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks, and I would like to thank the Region for allowing us to create this position, and it's a good deal. The next item of business is a program update and overview of the draft one-year plan of work for the council's Citizen Science Program, and I believe Amber is going to walk us through it.

MS. VON HARTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I have for you is Attachment 1, and it's a draft plan of work. Last year, when we were kind of developing some draft proposals for what a budget might look like to support the program, we actually pulled together an initial draft plan of work with some specific goals and objectives to carry out in year one, if a program was put in place, and so we had this great draft already pulled together.

I was just going to walk you through it really quickly. There is just some introduction with some background on how we got to where we are today and then the specific goal of the program that was established during the January 2016 workshop. Then it gets into the specific objectives, which some of them we have already accomplished, which is great, the first being to establish program resources. As Gregg just explained, we now have a position in place to move the program forward.

The second objective is to address some of the organizational governance for the program and establish a Citizen Science Committee, which is what we're doing right now, is meeting with that committee. You all did that late last year, and then the next step forward is to work with the

Organizing Committee to build what we're going to call a transition team, and that is what I am going to be going through with you next, after we go through the draft plan of work.

The third objective is going over developing some communication strategies to promote the program. Just to fill you in on a few activities that are already happening in that realm, the Citizen Science Association is meeting this May, in St. Paul, Minnesota, and we will be attending that. There was a symposium that was accepted to talk specifically about citizen science and natural resource management and how to address data quality concerns when using those types of data, and I will be doing a poster with the lovely Dr. Jennifer Shirk, if you all remember her from the Cornell Lab of Ornithology.

We're going to be collaborating together on a poster, to talk about our collaboration with them and how it's very unique, because, if you all remember, she and Rick were very intrigued by the approach that we were taking, because it was not just a project. It was a program, and she feels like we have a lot of information to impart on the citizen science practitioners that will be at this conference, and it's going to be an amazing conference. I am so excited that I will get to attend and talk about what we're doing here with the council.

Also, in August, the American Fisheries Society is meeting in Tampa this year, and I will be co-organizing a symposium on cooperative fisheries research and citizen science that some folks with NOAA as well as Florida Sea Grant have put together, and they asked me to participate in that. We will talk about collaborations and future applications of not just cooperative research, but also citizen science, and so that will be another great opportunity to talk about what the council is doing and hopefully forge some partnerships there.

Objective 4 talks about this kickstarter project, or the pilot project, that we have talked to you all about at the last couple of meetings, when we've talked about different pilot projects, and so you all saw what we think might be the pilot project, the scamp discard proposal that was in the last briefing book, and so that's something that we definitely would like to flesh out more and something that the transition team would help move forward and what approach we want to take for getting that supported.

Objective 5 is talking about developing outreach and training approaches, and that's more for when we actually have a project in place and how we will carry forward the different training opportunities for those stakeholders that would participate in that project.

Then Objective 6 is developing partnerships and identifying different partners, with the help of the transition team, that would help fill the role of those five action teams that came out of the Citizen Science Program Blueprint and also establishing some formal memorandums of understanding with different project partners. We have kind of been working on a draft of what an MOU might look like with some potential partners, mainly our Sea Grant partners, to bring them into the fold of what we're doing.

Then Objective 7 is talking about funding opportunities and how we can get creative with getting some program and project support to carry forth the mission of the program. We kind of just wanted to present this to you, to give you an update of what we think we are going to plan on doing this first year. Now that Cameron is onboard, I'm super excited, because I will be able to focus more on this and get the ball rolling, and so I would love to hear any feedback you guys have, if

you think there's anything missing or something that is more of a priority. I would like to hear from you guys.

DR. DUVAL: Along the lines of the conversations that we've had earlier today, both in the SEDAR Committee and just in the Habitat and Ecosystem Committee, I don't necessarily -- This isn't what I would call a kickstarter project, but I am wondering if this would fall under potentially Objective 3, in terms of communication strategies, or outreach and training approaches, under Objective 5, but just talking about this more formal approach, or at least a method, for gathering information from our stakeholders who are on the water on some kind of annual basis and finding a way to do that through suggestions like what Tim has made, in terms of an online portal, or development of a fishery performance evaluations, similar to what the Mid-Atlantic has done, perhaps utilizing our advisory panels, but, if there is capacity to start thinking about how we could do that, I think that would be really good. Thank you.

MR. CONKLIN: I am just eager to learn about how they count fish in the Land of 10,000 Lakes, and so I will be looking for a report on that.

MS. VON HARTEN: Do you feel like that's something that maybe the transition team could tackle, figuring out an appropriate approach for collecting that kind of input? I am just looking back at some of the action teams that were in the blueprint of volunteers, data management, project topics management, communication, outreach and education, and finance. The idea was that the transition team would possibly take some of these topics and start to flesh them out in more detail and definitely coming up with approaches of how to address each of those action team activities.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I definitely think that would be something that the transition team could tackle, certainly at least fleshing out how it could be done and moving those along to you for consideration and for this to come back to this committee to respond to.

MR. CONKLIN: Anything else from anyone else? Then we're going to move on to the second agenda item, and that's going to be an explanation of the transition team, and Amber will also lead that discussion.

MS. VON HARTEN: As I mentioned, this is just a discussion document, Attachment 2, describing the purpose and role of the transition team. As you all know, we had our Organizing Committee that helped us develop the workshop and kind of develop the final blueprint to help guide the program, and now we kind of need to take this a step further to move forward with the development of the program, and so we were talking about, at a staff level, about forming a transition team that would be -- The membership would be guided by help from the Organizing Committee to help expand potential partnerships in the council's program to other agencies as well as formally inviting Sea Grant participation within the region and also including some folks from ACCSP.

We also had another suggestion recently about possibly including some folks from the National Marine Sanctuaries to be a part of that, based on some of the work that they're doing, and so kind of just expanding the role and the membership of the organizing team to include more partners, so we can start working on developing partnerships and having the key players that we need to have on this team to start making the guidance, like Michelle was suggesting earlier.

The role would be to begin this development of the blueprint, and the approach that we were thinking about was to have monthly webinars with the team, and we would tackle a component of the blueprint during these monthly webinars. Then, at every council meeting, outside of the normal council agenda, we would get together, like we have been doing with the Organizing Committee, to meet face-to-face with those members of the transition team that could attend.

Then this team would help prioritize the discussion items for each quarterly meeting. Then, at the end of the year, hopefully we would have more of these specific program components fleshed out and actually able to start moving forward. That is our approach, and we are kind of just looking for some feedback, if you all support that approach, so we can start working on that.

MR. BREWER: Amber, in looking at the makeup of the team, you've got essentially four Sea Grant participants. I don't know what's going to be happening with Sea Grant. I mean, they're defunded, or going to be defunded, apparently, or maybe not. We don't know yet, but it's sure as hell a threat.

One of the things that is going to be, I think, critically important to citizen science is going to be buy-in of the different NGOs, like ASA or the West Palm Beach Fishing Club or the Southeast Fishermen's Association, groups like that, and you've only got one here, and I would think, if it's possible, that you would put some more on there, maybe three or something like that, to get their input, but, more importantly, to get their buy-in, because you're going to want some cheerleaders. That's the way that I think, at least in my mind, to develop your cheerleaders, and that's all.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think one of the things we were thinking is, as we get down and we have perhaps an AP or something, that's a chance to bring in many more of them, at that level, as opposed to this, which is really just kind of ephemeral as we get all these different pieces in place, and so I think that would be one of the key thoughts, is like what is the role to get many more NGOs and groups like you mentioned involved. This was intended to really represent people who are kind of more familiar with where we've come so far, so they can hand the reins off to all of this other infrastructure as it evolves over hopefully the next year.

MR. BREWER: If you will excuse me for this comment, but you've got a lot of administrative-type people that are on here, and I am worried that we may see what has happened so many times before, that the thing gets researched and talked about to death before it actually gets moving, and I would love to see some folks on there that would be saying, okay, let's go ahead and get this done, and I think, for NGOs -- I know there is a lot of enthusiasm out there for this right now, and I would hate for us to lose that enthusiasm. For that reason, I really would recommend, or suggest, that there be maybe three NGOs that are on there. That's all.

MR. CONKLIN: Also, I was wondering about Kate Latanich's group out of Beaufort, the Fisheries Forum, and if we could make it a priority to reach out to them and ask them to be a part of this as well.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: To keep this information that you would get out of the transition team usable for the council, I think you have to think about the Magnuson Act and how FACA applies, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and I would advise you to make this transition team an advisory panel, and so you would have maybe a Citizen Science Advisory Panel, and you would have people apply to it, or how you would want to structure that, but I think that's the way this is

going to -- My advice is that's how you should establish this team. It should be more of an advisory panel to the Citizen Science Committee and then to the council.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I guess we were thinking of this functioning more as kind of an IPT team does and that they would do preparatory work that will come before this committee. As I said, the vision was we have that Organizing Committee now, and that would sort of transition into this team, because those folks have been working with this stuff for a year-and-a-half, and so they're all well-versed in where we're going. They would create an advisory panel, or maybe more than one advisory panel, for citizen science, depending on which way that objective goes. Advisory panels would be part of it, but this group would be more of a working-type situation, if that's allowed under the rules, but that's certainly our intention.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I would be happy to look into that. An IPT's function -- Really, right now, they're like the Fisheries Service staff and then staff from the council who get together and put together draft management plans or alternatives, whatever, that the council has directed them to consider, and this, to me, is not functioning in that same process, and so I think I would be happy to look at -- You could call it a working group, if you want, or anything like that, but my guess is that it probably has to meet FACA concerns, and, to give you usable information that the council can then use, we're going to have to consider this a little more broadly under the terms of the Magnuson Act and FACA.

I would be happy to look into that, and, by Full Council, give you my final advice, but, right now, I'm thinking that's probably the direction this has to go, and I am not sure that it would be that much more difficult for you to make it an advisory-like-panel or a working group, whatever you want to call it.

MR. HAYMANS: I'm not on the committee, but, sort of along the lines of Chester's comments, and I have sort of stayed hands-off with this particular issue, but I don't quite understand why Sea Grant would be the representative here and not some state agency representative. At least in this state, I think I have state agency folks who are much more familiar with the constituents and the constituents involved than maybe Sea Grant would. I don't know if that's the case everywhere else, but, to me, a state agency representative is a glaring omission from this particular body.

MR. CONKLIN: I think John is going to follow up.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The thinking on the Sea Grant is because we have identified Sea Grant as a potential important financial partner, because we have the issues where all of the council's money has to come in through NOAA, but there is other organizations that have expressed some interest in perhaps helping fund this project, and we felt that Sea Grant opens up more of an opportunity that they could help in that regard, and so that's specifically why they are highlighted in here and why we've talked about the Sea Grant folks a number of times and that they would do in that role.

Again, this is just in setting up the infrastructure, and so if we wanted Sea Grant people to take that role in the infrastructure, they need to have participation here, as opposed to ultimately I see having representatives, perhaps, from each state agency both on the various teams that we've mentioned that will be doing the work, you know those action teams that will be addressing each of the different program areas over the next year, as well as the long-term standing regular advisory panels that we have. We may have a constituency advisory panel and a technical advisory panel,

perhaps, related to citizen science. Those are the kind of details that we intend to work on over the coming year.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, certainly if it's a pay-to-play concept, then we're out, as far as the state, but I do think that a state agency representative, in helping develop some of the program, would be beneficial.

MR. CARMICHAEL: But our view is that you're the group that -- This group here is making the final call, and so we have state agency representation around this table, and that was our thought of it, at least.

DR. DUVAL: Doug, I think if you look under Attachment 1, that draft plan of work, under Objective 2, the last bullet notes that the transition team may work on items such as establishing membership function and charge of the Program Oversight Committee, advisory committees, and the action teams, and I would certainly see a role for a state agency representative from each of the four states on like the advisory panel for this program as we stand it up, and certainly with regards to a volunteer action team.

As you have noted, there are state agency staff who may have more extensive relationships with stakeholders than Sea Grant staff, and that may vary amongst the states as well. I know the Sea Grant staff in North Carolina do a tremendous amount of extension work, and they are probably more familiar with a greater number of constituents in certain regions of the coast than I am, and so I think it probably varies from state-to-state, but I would certainly see state agency representation on any of these action teams, projects, communication, outreach and education.

DR. PONWITH: I think, really, it is the difference between the team that is constructed to develop the infrastructure, to make sure that we're not just -- You know, if you're going to do something and you're going to do it once, you create something that is used once. Then, when it's done, you're done. You make less of an emphasis on the infrastructure in that circumstance, because you don't want that to swamp actually getting the job done, but we're putting a heavy emphasis on infrastructure, in this case, and the reason is we don't want to do one project. We want this to be perennial and productive for years.

In that circumstance, standing up a project is really important, but standing up the infrastructure to make sure that not only that project is successful, but all the projects going in the future are successful is important. If I understand the concept of the transition team, it is to take over from kind of the organizing committee and keep that progress on developing that infrastructure correct and rolling and concrete.

The projects, when we start getting into that, that's going to be really important, because we absolutely need heavy involvement from the fishing industry, and we absolutely need heavy involvement from the states, because of their familiarity with the fishing industry, but we also need heavy involvement with the people with the catcher's mitt, the people who are going to take the products, the results, the advice, from the citizen science and actually put it to good use, because, if you miss that ball, then you stand a risk of the whole thing imploding. That's one of the most important steps, is to take those results and actually be able to put them to solve a problem that the council is extremely eager to solve, or the agency is extremely eager to solve, and so this transition team structure makes sense to me, from that logic.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks for that explanation, Bonnie. Is there anybody else? Then we're going to move on to the third agenda item. We are looking for Mr. Carmichael. He is going to go over the research and monitoring priorities.

MR. CARMICHAEL: As we mentioned earlier, we do the research and monitoring prioritization plan, and so it's required under the revisions to the Magnuson Act, and they're required to be submitted in five-year blocks. For a few years, we were doing it annually. Then, last year, or the year-before-last, we decided that we would start doing it every other year, just because research doesn't move that fast, actually, and we spend a lot of time on this.

The other thing we did was we greatly simplified the plan and made it more specific. It was general. It had a lot of topics before, and that was reserved as this research and monitoring plan source document, and then we went into this more concise presentation of very specific, measureable objectives that we needed, time-dependent, with deadlines and such, particularly in the assessment needs, and so that's where we are now.

As we mentioned earlier in the SEDAR committee, we are updating this. The SSC will get a draft at their meeting in April, and then we will bring it back, I guess at the Data Committee in June, to go through it in detail and approve it, and hopefully, certainly if not in June, by the September meeting, we will have a version ready to go to the agency and the Science Center. What we wanted to do here was consider what things are on this plan and what changes we may want to make that fit in well with the citizen science concept and where we want to go with the Citizen Science Program. I will just go through some of these quickly.

The first item is the things that are coming up with assessment needs, and there are things within here where citizen science programs I think would fit well, perhaps collecting information for stock identification evaluations or participating in discard mortality estimates or samples for fecundity. Any of those could fit in with Science Center goals, citizen science goals.

Looking at abundance indices is more of the type of thing that would be done through the fishery-independent research needs, but then I thought, in this Item 2, the short-term needs for spawning special management zones, trying to understand what's going on there and getting people out and researching in these different closed areas that we have and trying to get samples of what's there is something that's certainly been discussed as citizen science projects.

We have our short-term MPA needs, and a number of these could fit in very well with citizen science concepts, and then we have our section of long-term needs, which I think there's a couple of things in there that would come out as saying, you know, getting information through citizen science projects would be helpful, but then I guess the question, really, in our minds, is, when we try to fit citizen science into this, would it be better to have a section devoted to citizen science or would it be helpful maybe, in some ways, to use an asterisk or something to indicate areas that are already prioritized where citizen science may want to be looked at in more detail.

That may be less duplicative and less taking citizen science and somehow trying to make it as a separate and unique thing, as opposed to something that fits in well with all of our existing needs and is just yet another tool, just like CRP and MARFIN and all the other tools that we have available to fill these needs. I think Bonnie may want to follow up on that a bit.

DR. PONWITH: I have a pretty strong opinion on that one, and I think that putting an asterisk on items in the council's top-priority science or research plan is a very powerful statement, as opposed to having a standalone, and I can see sub-setting that and doing a standalone, to say here are ways that we could tackle this using citizen science, versus other ways, and have it be more detailed and refined. There is something to be said about having those core top research priorities identified by the council as making their jobs easier with this research actually flagged as this is possible to be done by citizen science, and it makes a really good, strong statement, and I like that a lot.

DR. DUVAL: I am kind of with Bonnie on this. I feel like if we can flag certain things that might be appropriate for the different types of programs, so items that would be appropriate for a citizen science approach, versus CRP or MARFIN, then I think that helps to -- It helps to focus our efforts down the road, and I know that there are some other possibilities, I think, for citizen science or for pieces of our research plan that could be included that would be flagged as citizen science, and this is just based on informal conversations that I have had with scientists at the Beaufort Lab that could be part of a broader piece, but citizen science is definitely the way to go about collecting that information.

MR. CONKLIN: John, do you have anything else for us?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am glad there is support for that, and I think that's something that we will do with this version. Are there any things that comes to folks' minds that they would like to see added to this for our update this year, when you think of highlighting citizen science or something that's not on here?

MR. BREWER: Maybe I missed it, but I know that we're going to be having some discussions later on this meeting with regard to red snapper and the adaptive management plan. It seems to me that one thing that fishermen out on the water could really help -- I am not talking about them being the exclusive source of information, but working into an evaluation and trying to figure out what the release mortality ratio is really for red snapper, both commercial and recreational.

I brought one of these with me, and this is a nineteen-dollar descending device, and it just seems like, to me, that that might be low-hanging fruit and something that would get people really enthusiastic, and I know we haven't made any kind of decisions with regard to this adaptive management plan, but it is coming. It is going to be discussed, and I really think that that might be, to use someone else's phrase, low-hanging fruit that would get tremendous buy-in early on, and so maybe that could be something that, if the council decides to go forward or do something with this red snapper plan, that it could be considered here as one of the projects that citizen science could contribute to.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes, and I think that was brought up at the end of the last meeting, in December, under Other Business, and so thanks for bringing that back to our attention. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Chester, how do you see this working? Do you see recreational fishermen, which would be interesting, but recreational fishermen fishing how they fish and tagging these animals, so you could get an idea of how many survived?

MR. BREWER: No, I don't think that it would have to be that sophisticated. I think that your data would be how many -- Your datasets, and I am just talking off the top of my head right now, which is probably dangerous, but I just see a lot of synergy with getting both recreational and commercial fishermen interested in trying to help resolve, as best we can, the red snapper problem, and the problem with the red snapper that we all see is that, right now, supposedly our dead discards are higher than what we're allowed to catch.

In any kind of a program where you're trying to get data of what the release mortality really is, it seems like you could have both your recreational and commercial folks using devices that would be required, as a matter of a fact, to use devices like this or the Seaqualizer or an equivalent and report back, through some sort of program like -- I am not saying that we have to use iSnapper, but something like iSnapper, to indicate the number of red snapper that they caught, perhaps the size, estimated, where they were caught, how many of them were caught on a particular fishing trip, and how many of them were taken down where they were successfully, in their opinion, released using a descending device.

I just throw that out, and, like I say, it's kind of off the top of my head, and the scientists could probably tell us that there would be better data, or better datasets, that they would desire, but I just really see this as -- I realize it's not as simple, perhaps, as doing the scamp, but I really see it as being something that you're going to get a lot of bang for your buck in a lot of different ways, particularly the folks seeing that this council has recognized a problem and is trying to do something about it.

MR. CONKLIN: Being those comments probably -- We have a scientist at the table. Dr. Collier.

DR. COLLIER: There is a literature review that is included in the red snapper section that you guys had requested additional information red snapper discard mortality, and so this is included. In addition to that, I've been working with FWC and some of their scientists. They have done a tagging project. There's a lot of tagging that's been done off of northeast Florida, but actually along the coast of Florida, and it included data from North Carolina as well, to look at discard mortality based on tagging, in order to get a better estimate of it.

That's one approach to do it, and so what we would like to do is present that to the SSC for their review before we have any estimates that are available, and so we're still developing that, and we're going to be developing a paper. We don't have a number for discard mortality yet.

The other part that you're talking about is trying to figure out how many people are using some of these discard mortality devices and different ways to report that, and there is the electronic application that the council has put in for, and that could be a consideration in that electronic logbook, of did you use a descending device on this trip, and so that could be added as a question on that electronic permit, as we begin to develop it, but, in any situation, we're not going to have those numbers available for this current amendment, and so we're going to need to figure out a value for the current amendment, but those are definitely some things that we could improve on for the future and be able to incorporate into a future amendment or a future stock assessment for red snapper.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks, Chip. Anything else, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Nothing more from me.

MR. CONKLIN: Is there any other business to come before the Citizen Science Committee? Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Not other business, but I guess that I just want to make sure that Amber and John have what they need, and I didn't know if you all needed any motions from the committee, with regard to the plan of action and the transition team and anything else on the research plan.

MS. VON HARTEN: No, I think we were just looking for guidance and for you all to review it and kind of give us some direction on whether or not we were headed in the right direction, and it sounds like you all are supportive of that. If Monica can give us some guidance on the FACA stuff, that would be great.

MR. CONKLIN: That's what I was going to ask for, the transition team versus the AP. If we have to go the AP route, then we have to get with our budget and see if we could afford it. Otherwise, it would put the brakes on the project for a while.

MR. CARMICHAEL: They probably wouldn't meet like an AP would meet. We would work with them over emails and webinars, to keep from spending any money. Regardless of what they're called, that's the plan.

MR. CONKLIN: Okay. I'm not familiar with that process, but okay. Is there any other business to come before the committee? Seeing none, the Citizen Science Committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 9, 2017.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
April 5, 2017

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
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

Dewey Hemilright
Dr. Jessica Stephen

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
Jessica McCawley
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

Kristen Foss.
Dr. George Sedberry
Dr. Marcel Reichart
Dr. Jack McGovern
(Continued) Rick DeVictor
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
8 Erica Burgess
Leann Bosarge

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
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
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

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 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

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

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

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 Chevront
brian.chevront@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

✓ Kimberly Cole
kimberly.cole@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 Citizen Science Program Manager

✓ 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

Cameron Rhodes

SAFMC MARCH MTA DAY 1 MONDAY

| Last Name | First Name | Email Address |
|-------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| . | fisherynation.com | bhfisherynation@gmail.com |
| Abeels | Holly | habeels@ufl.edu |
| Ballenger | Joey | ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov |
| Becker | Emily | beckere@dnr.sc.gov |
| Bell | Mel | bellm@dnr.sc.gov |
| Bianchi | Alan | Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov |
| Binns | Holly | hbinns@pewtrusts.org |
| Bonura | Vincent | SailRaiser25C@aol.com |
| Brennan | Ken | kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov |
| Brouwer | Myra | myra.brouwer@safmc.net |
| Brown | Mark | capt.markbrown@comcast.net |
| Buckson | Bruce | bruce@buckson.net |
| Byrd | Julia | julia.byrd@safmc.net |
| Clarke | Lora | lclarke@pewtrusts.org |
| Conklin | Chris | conklinsafmc@gmail.com |
| Dale | David | david.dale@noaa.gov |
| DeVictor | Rick | rick.devictor@noaa.gov |
| Dunmire | Leda | ldunmire@pewtrusts.org |
| Erwin | Gwen | gwen.erwin@myfwc.com |
| Estes | Jim | jim.estes@myfwc.com |
| Foss | Kristin | kristin.foss@myfwc.com |
| Foster | Dean | dfoster@pewtrusts.org |
| Geer | Patrick | pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us |
| Gibson | Shane | shanegibson24@yahoo.com |
| Godwin | Joelle | joelle.godwin@noaa.gov |
| Gray | Alisha | alisha.gray@noaa.gov |
| Guyas | Martha | martha.guyas@myfwc.com |
| Hadley | John | john.hadley@safmc.net |
| Hartig | Ben | mackattackben@att.net |
| Helies | Frank | frank.helies@noaa.gov |
| Hudson | Rusty | dsf2009@aol.com |
| Iverson | Kim | kim.iverson@safmc.net |
| Kratowicz | Tony | tkratowicz@comcast.net |
| Laks | Ira | captainira@att.net |
| Lee | Jennifer | Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov |
| MacLauchlin | Bill | billmac@charter.net |
| Mahood | Bob | rmahood@mindspring.com |
| Mehta | Nikhil | nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov |
| Neer | Julie | julie.neer@safmc.net |
| Potts | Jennifer | jennifer.potts@noaa.gov |
| Pulver | Jeff | Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov |

| | | |
|------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
| Raine | Karen | karen.raine@noaa.gov |
| Records | David | david.records@noaa.gov |
| Roberts | Claire | claire.roberts@gulfcouncil.org |
| Rock | Jason | jason.rock@ncdenr.gov |
| Sedberry | George | george.sedberry@noaa.gov |
| Stephen | Jessica | jessica.stephen@noaa.gov |
| Stillman | Karolyn | karolyn.stillman@noaa.gov |
| Takade-Heumacher | Helen | htakade@edf.org |
| Waters | james | jwaters8@gmail.com |
| Williams | Erik | erik.williams@noaa.gov |
| brewer | chester | wcblaw@aol.com |
| pugliese | roger | dolphinwahoo@gmail.com |
| sandorf | scott | scott.sandorf@noaa.gov |

| Last | Email | Mailing Address (If your address is already on file, please type "on file") | Private Recreational Angler | Non-Govt | Other |
|---------|---------|--|--|----------|------------------------|
| Brett | Boston | brettboston@grouopsolutions.us | on file | | presenter, habitat ap |
| david | bush | davidbush@ncfish.org | on file | | NCFA |
| Lora | Clarke | lclarke@pewtrusts.org | on file | NGO | |
| Robert | Crimian | rcrimian@tnc.org | on file | NOG | |
| Leda | Dunnire | ldunnire@pewtrusts.org | on file | NOG | |
| Kristin | Foss | kristin.foss@myfwc.com | on file | | FWC |
| Dean | Foster | dfoster@pewtrusts.org | on file | NGO | |
| Bill | Ke;;y | FKCFA1@hotmail.com | On File | | Commercial fishing rep |
| Gary | Morgan | gmorgan@clsamerica.com | 450 Rosedale Dr. Satellite Beach, FL | NGO | CLS America, Inc. |
| Susan | Shipman | susanshipman@att.net | on file | | Alumnus |
| Jessica | stephen | jessica.stephen@noaa.gov | on file | | NMFS |
| Wes | Wolfe | wwolfe@goldenisles.news | 3011 Altama Ave., Brunswick, Ga. 31520 | | Local newspaper |