

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DOLPHIN WAHOO COMMITTEE

**Doubletree by Hilton Oceanfront Hotel
Atlantic Beach, North Carolina**

December 10, 2015

SUMMARY MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Chester Brewer
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley

Zack Bowen, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Doug Haymans

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Dr. Michelle Duval
Mel Bell
Jack Cox
Dr. Wilson Laney

Charlie Phillips
Mark Brown
Ben Hartig

COUNCIL STAFF:

Bob Mahood
Kim Iverson
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Mike Errigo
Chip Collier
John Carmichael
Julie O'Dell

Gregg Waugh
Amber Von Harten
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Dr. Brian Chevront
Mike Collins

PARTICIPANTS/OBSERVERS:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Jack McGovern
Erika Burgess

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Scott Sandorf
Tracy Dunn

Additional observers attached

The Dolphin Wahoo Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Doubletree by Hilton Oceanfront Hotel, Thursday afternoon, December 10, 2015, and was called to order at 2:00 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Anna Beckwith.

MS. BECKWITH: I'm going to go ahead and call the Dolphin Wahoo Committee to order. I'll give folks a chance to finish up their conversations and come on back to the table. Where is my gavel? Let's go ahead and approve the agenda. Are there any alterations to the agenda, any additions?

MS. McCAWLEY: Who is on the Committee?

MS. BECKWITH: The Committee is myself, Zack, Chester, Chris Conklin, Roy, Doug and Jessica; of those who are present here today. Of course, I invite all those to participate who have an opinion on anything. That's pretty much everybody. The minutes have been approved; sorry, the agenda has been approved. Were there any additions or notations to the minutes from the last meeting? Seeing none; those minutes are approved. Now, if Dr. McGovern would like to run us through our necessary pieces of information.

DR. McGOVERN: I'll talk about landings of dolphin and wahoo. For commercial dolphin, it was closed on June 30th, because it was projected that the ACL would have been met by that date. We met 95 percent of the commercial ACL. For wahoo, thus far, this year we have met 80 percent of the wahoo ACL. I should mention last year 88 percent of the dolphin ACL was met, and last year 85 percent of wahoo.

Actually landings for wahoo for this year and last year are very similar. For the recreational sector of dolphin through Wave 4, 39 percent of the recreational ACL has been met, and last year 37 percent was met for the whole fishing year. For recreational wahoo, 46 percent of that has been met through Wave 4 and 38 percent of the recreational ACL was met last year.

MS. BECKWITH: Were there any questions on those? Next on the agenda is discussion of Regulatory Amendment 1.

DR. CHEUVRONT: You need an update on the two amendments.

MS. BECKWITH: Oh yes. Well, he gave us an update on the Fillet Amendment during the Snapper Grouper, but if you would like to add anything to that.

DR. McGOVERN: The only thing I have to add to that is both the Generic AM and Dolphin Allocation Amendment which are in Headquarters under review, and Fillet Amendment is also in Headquarters under review. They both are up there now.

MS. BECKWITH: Next on our agenda is a discussion on Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 1. When Brian finds a good place, I had also asked John Carmichael to sort of be ready to chat with us a little bit about some of the public comment that we heard yesterday about having 14 million pounds for the recreational ACL, much of which has not been caught.

At some point, I wanted to have John sort of come up and probably before we go through the potential Amendment 10, sort of walk us through how those ACLs have come to be, potentially

what kind of actual estimate of biomass they give us. The fact is that dolphin really hasn't been through a stock assessment. He was just going to frame a discussion for us to make sure everyone is on the same page.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Madam Chair, my suggestion would be that that would be an appropriate conversation after we get through Regulatory Amendment 1, because that does fit in quite well with the things that the council discussed in September about a potential Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 10. If you would like me to proceed, I'll go ahead with Regulatory Amendment 1.

If you'll recall, in September, there was the first discussion that the council had after the dolphin season closed in June 30th of this year; and the concern was what can we keep that from happening again? That was the first in-season closure that had happened on the commercial sector ACL.

As Dr. McGovern just mentioned, Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 8 was looking at shifting the allocation between sectors in dolphin, and the commercial sector was going to pick up roughly 30 percent more allocation than what they had before, about 400,000 pounds were going to be added to the dolphin allocation.

What we didn't know at the time, because that sector allocation had not been increased, is we didn't know if there was going to be any effect of the allocation increase to the commercial sector, in terms of whether or not the ACL would have been met. The council gave direction to staff to develop an amendment that would look at a regulatory amendment that had one action that would look at a potential way to extend the season beyond, certainly beyond the major longline part of the season.

I'll go into some of that; the landings characteristics, here in a few minutes. What you all came up with was the notion of considering having a trip limit when a certain percentage of the commercial sector ACL had been caught at that point. What you gave us at that time was 65, 70 or 75 percent of the ACL had to have been caught, and then it would trigger a commercial trip limit.

The levels of the trip limits that you gave us to consider were 1,000, 2,000, 3,000 and 4,000 pounds. What we did was when we left here in September, we didn't have any potential action drawn up yet. We had no purpose and need. But you wanted to have an amendment ready that you could look at that could be considered at this meeting, and you could decide what you wanted to do; potentially vote it up or down or send it for Secretarial Review. An IPT was formed and we did go through things, and I'm going to lead you through what we need to get your approval on. If you have any questions, need any more information clarifying decisions and things that were made, please let me know. I'll be glad to talk to you about it. But we have a purpose and need. I just wanted to let you know that this amendment has already been reviewed.

It has had Science Center review, DEIS review, and it has been reviewed by Monica and Jack and internally and all sorts of things. But one of the first things that I need to do, and I forgot to bring that up; no, I'm sorry I think I made a mistake. Didn't I make a mistake by saying DEIS review? I did. Thanks, Monica, there is no DEIS review here, sorry.

But we have given it a bunch of reviews already at this point. Actually, the main body of the document is in pretty good shape, if you've taken a chance to read it. It is the appendices that needs work. Please don't comment and say, oh the appendices are wrong. We know that. Some of the things can't be done until you choose a preferred alternative.

Until we can get some preferred alternatives, there can't be an RIR, an RFA, an FIS, all that acronym fruit salad that we have to deal with in these things. Yes, we know that the appendices need work. We were trying to get you a document that would have the things put together. What we have here for you now is the purpose and need.

The purpose that we are suggesting for you, and I just want to let you know that this is NEPA approved – so it has already been under that review – the purpose of Dolphin and Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 1 is to institute a commercial trip limit for the Dolphin fishery; I left off a word there, sorry.

The need for this amendment is to maintain optimum yield for dolphin in the commercial sector of the dolphin wahoo fishery, and to prevent potential socioeconomic impacts caused by an early closure of dolphin. Now, what you really need to do at this point, Madam Chair, is probably discuss the purpose and need and either give it your blessing or tell us what needs to be changed.

MS. BECKWITH: Great, thank you, Brian. Are there any suggestions or comments on this purpose and need? Assuming that there is not, I would be looking for a motion to accept the purpose and need as stated.

MR. CONKLIN: I make a motion to accept the purpose and need as needed.

MS. BECKWITH: Is there a second to that; Jack. Okay, is there any further discussion on that motion? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: In the need statement it says towards the end, prevent potential socioeconomic impacts. Are we really preventing those impacts or just minimizing? I don't know if prevent is the right word.

MS. BECKWITH: Brian did mention that because we are sort of in a time crunch on this, the verbiage has already been approved. If you feel very strongly about it we can discuss it. If it is sort of an, eh, then it might be worth allowing that to slide. But in terms of preventing socioeconomic impacts, I think it sounds like Monica has got a suggestion.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm sorry. You all have never seen this document before, because this is very quick track. I think that even though it has had some review in the region; feel free to change that if you want. I think that Jessica raises a great point. I believe you want to prevent adverse socioeconomic impacts that resulted from the closure. But I think that you are free to edit this. I don't know how Brian feels about that. But you've never seen this before, so it is within your prerogative to change things.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, Jessica, so what verbiage would you prefer?

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm good with either prevent adverse impacts or minimize adverse impacts.

MS. BECKWITH: Does anybody else have a preference?

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I'm not on your committee, but maybe I'm a little bit confused as to the phrase "maintain optimum yield." We're still catching the same amount of fish, possibly less if we do a step down. How are we maintaining optimum yield when potentially we're going to catch less fish. If anything, you're just going to shift from the longline sector to the hook and line sector. I would just like a little clarification of how you possibly end up catching less fish and you are just reallocating potentially between sectors.

MS. BECKWITH: Brian, did the IPT add anything to that particular set of language, before I go to Chester?

DR. CHEUVRONT: No, not specifically.

MR. BREWER: To Charlie's question. I think later on, not at this meeting but at some point we're going to have a discussion of what optimum yield really is and what that definition is. But I think this language is appropriate in that it may be that there will be a few less fish caught, potentially.

But optimum yield takes into account socioeconomic benefits and detriments. There has been, because of what happened in 2015, a very definite socioeconomic detrimental effect for closing that fishery down for six months out of the year. Remember, we manage all the way up the coast.

The folks in the Mid-Atlantic didn't even get to fish for dolphin in 2015. In the Keys and the South Atlantic Fishery, we have a very thriving industry, where fresh dolphin are being provided to restaurants through the hook and line fishery. They got shut out for six months last year. I think that the language about maintaining optimum yield is appropriate.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay and we're going to have ample opportunity for some sort of philosophical conversations when we look at Amendment 10. I want to be sensitive to the amount of time we have to get through everything. Jessica, how about minimize adverse socioeconomic impacts, would that work? Okay, so Chris, do you accept the amendment to that since you made the motion?

MR. CONKLIN: Yes, Madam Chair.

MS. BECKWITH: And the second do they? Who is the second? Oh go ahead, Jack.

MR. COX: I just realized that I am no longer on the Dolphin Wahoo Committee, so somebody else will need to second.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, Charlie, would you be willing to second; Zack, fantastic.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Also, I wanted to say that we probably need to **modify the motion so it says; accept the purpose and need as amended.**

MS. BECKWITH: All right, folks, is that okay? Everyone take a quick look at the board. Accept the purpose and need as amended. Is there any further discussion on that motion? Seeing none; that motion carries.

MR. HAYMANS: Brian, flip potential and adverse.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Either way that works. I think it reads better the way you say it. What we have here now is, this is the first time you've seen the actual language for the action. Alternative 1 is there is no commercial trip limit for dolphin in the Atlantic EEZ. The commercial fishery for dolphin will remain open until the entire commercial portion of the ACL is met or projected to be met.

Now Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are variations on the theme that I had discussed before. Alternative 2 is a commercial trip limit for dolphin will be established once 65 percent of the commercial ACL is met. Then the subalternatives 2A, 2B, 2C and 2D are 1, 2, 3 and 4,000 pounds trip limit respectively. Now Alternative 3 is the same as Alternative 2 except for the 70 percent of the ACL trigger, and Alternative 4 is 75 percent of the ACL trigger. Madam Chair, we need to accept that language, modify that language whatever you all need to do.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, so if the language is okay with folks I would like a motion to approve that language. Chester, is there a second? Zack. Is there any discussion on the language that you guys see? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: May I talk about no action for a second?

MS. BECKWITH: Certainly.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: There actually is a trip limit in place but it is a little bit different. Right now, the regulations say the trip limit for a vessel that does not have a federal commercial vessel permit for Atlantic dolphin and wahoo, but has a federal commercial vessel permit in any other fishery is 200 pounds of dolphin and wahoo combined, provided that all fishing on and landings from that trip are north of 39 degree north latitude. If you'll give us some editorial license to put that in the no action, that will be helpful.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, we can do that as direction to staff if that works. The motion on the table is, accept the language of the action as stated with editorial license to fix the no action alternative. Okay, is everyone okay with that motion, Chester, yes, you agree, Zack fantastic. Is there any discussion on that motion? Is there any opposition? Seeing none; that motion carries. Did you want to go through some of the public comment next?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Actually, what I would like to do is go through some of the analysis so you can sort of see what we now know that we didn't know in September regarding this. One of the things that we really didn't know, what was going to be the effect once Amendment 8, which increased the commercial ACL. What effect would that have had, had that been in effect for this season?

As it turns out, we did some analysis with some forecasting and things, and you can see first off that when you look at the average of years from 2010 through 2014, you can see this black

dashed line that I am showing you here is the average of landings across those years. The blue line, the green line and the purple line, those are the trigger points.

You can see that in an average year historically, the trigger never would have been met. That is okay. Then what we did was look at the – I don't want to call it the worst case scenario – but the highest landings year scenario, which was 2015, and we wanted to be able to see if we could predict based on the landings in 2015, had the fishery stayed open, when would the trigger have been met?

If you can see here in Table 1, and just so you know, we're on Page 7 of the Decision Document here. This is that 65 percent trigger would have been reached on June 20th, the 70 percent trigger would have been reached on July 2nd, and the 75 percent trigger would have been reached on August 25th.

You can see this is actually the big one that I want to show you right here. What is happening with the landings here? As you can see, you look at the months of January through April, and then you look again from July through December. There is not a huge amount of variability from year to year in the landings.

The variability seems to come primarily in the months of May and June. Those are when the large longline landings are occurring. At the September meeting, you heard from some longline folks who have HMS permits and other fisheries, who said, "Please don't institute a trip limit from the very beginning of the season", because that was really going to adversely affect them, and there really wasn't a real reason to be able to do that.

What the council came up with was the idea of this trigger that would allow some of these longline trips to occur. But the idea was that if they were having a really, really, really good year with longline landings like they did in 2015, we could cut them off, and so that we could keep that hook and line fishery going throughout the year.

That was sort of the goal of what the council was looking at. Now, if you go to a 75 percent of the ACL being caught before the trigger is met, you see that there wouldn't be any trip limits until August. If you look here on this graphic, you can see right here in August, from there on out, there is not a huge amount of variability throughout the rest of the year.

Now the interesting thing is, had the new ACL been in place in 2015, the fishery would not have needed to have been closed. There was no reason to close the fishery. I think I've got the number in here somewhere. It is 1.2 something million pounds, is what would have been projected to have been caught. I am not sure exactly where that is in the document right off here at this point. But the idea is that you simply would not have needed to close the fishery, had that higher ACL been in place.

One of your options could be now, it's like we don't need this now. The other thing that you could consider though is since the likelihood of – and I can just tell you that over that 2010 through 2014 year period, for example if you chose a 4,000 pound trip limit with a 75 percent trigger – one trip would have been affected by that.

Basically, what we're saying is that there is a very small probability that if you go with the most liberal form of alternative and subalternative here, which would be Alternative 4, Subalternative 4D, not very many trips would be affected; historically speaking. We don't know what the future is going to be, and that is the part that I think you need to have some discussion about - deciding if you want to be precautionary?

How much is this fishery going to grow? Are there going to be other years like this where there is going to be even higher longline landings than you saw in 2015? We don't know. But if you don't put something in place, and you continue to have this huge growth in the fishery, you could find yourself in a couple of years from now in the same place where you are right now thinking, gosh maybe we should have done this back in 2015.

Right now, if there isn't any growth in the fishery it is not going to hurt anything. You guys have to kind of wrestle with that. If you decide that no, we think that the new ACL is going to take care of this: then you can select Alternative 1, no action as your preferred alternative and I guess the amendment goes away, because there is no reason to submit an amendment with only one action that says we're not going to do anything.

However, I think you should have some discussion about whether you want to be precautionary for the future and figure out, what do you want to do if you want to be precautionary? Now let me show you. I wanted to show you one table in here, Table 2 in the economic analysis. You can see - that starts on Page 9 - and what was done, I want to make sure you all understand is that in Alternative 1 if the landings in 2015 occurred in the future, the assumption then would be, what would happen if you had all these other alternatives and subalternatives?

How would that potentially affect the value of landings and the pounds landed in the future? You can see really when you have that 65 percent trigger, you're talking potentially over \$300,00.00 lost value as well as you could just subtract 1.178 million pounds from 1.285 million pounds and that gives you the difference in pounds that you would expect to land in the future.

You can see they all are slightly less than what is in Alternative 1. But if the fishery grows then that is your insurance policy, to make sure that you're going to have a hook and line fishery that ought to carry you throughout the rest of the year. The hook and line fishery is not the one that is causing the variability in these spikes, it's the longline fishery that is causing that.

Have that discussion how you want to do that and use that to help you decide what to do. Frankly, this would be kind of a worst case scenario. I think in most years you're probably not going to hit that trigger and you're going to be just fine, and you're not going to have any affected trips. But the potential is there for that to happen. Let's remember, 2015 was an abnormal year, and truly an outlier year. We've never seen that kind of landings from the longline fishery in the past.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay so I have Zack, Charlie and then Jack and Doug.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Brian for the presentation. It is very educational. As you were speaking my mind was all over the place, really. We had discussion about limited entry for this fishery. I think we do need to act in one form or another. I think we need to act on the limited

entry part, or we need to try to do something in this amendment that ensures that fishery doesn't close any more.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That is one thing you can consider. The limited entry is one of the potential topics you had for Amendment 10.

MR. BOWEN: Again, I'm just openly discussing this for the record. I'll let somebody else speak now; probably reserve the right to come back if that is okay, Madam Chair.

MS. BECKWITH: Sure, sure. We had a little bit of that discussion last time if you remember, and the idea was that this would be the sort of insurance policy stop gap while we worked the rest of those things through the system, because we have to start from scoping and anything that we do in Amendment 10 is going to be probably a two year process.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'll remind you again, I'm not on your committee, but thank you. Okay given '15 is an outlier year, much higher than any other years. Will you remind me again against what the projected landings would have been in '15, had we had the increase and what the projected landings would have been and what the ACL would have been. I'm thinking there is still room in there on top of an already high year.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes and Charlie, and I just want to make a point before he goes into that. It is an outlier year for past behavior, but we don't know that it's an outlier year for future behavior; just to keep that in mind.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay Charlie, to answer your question. On Table 2, the top of Table 2 here it is 1.285 million pounds is what we would have expected would have been caught had the landings from July through December in 2015 followed the historical pattern. You can see that is probably a fairly good estimate, because as we looked at this graphic here you can see from July through December, which is the month 7 through 12, there is not the huge amount of variability.

We feel a little more confident in that. The new ACL, once Amendment 8 is approved is 1,534,485 pounds. In essence you've got about a quarter of a million pounds buffer from what you would have expected would have been landed in 2015, had the season stayed open all year. But I want to show you one other thing, and this gets back to something Anna was just saying.

We notice that 2015, which is the black line here was much different than the previous years, but before that 2014, which is this yellow line was higher than any previous year and 2012 and then 2010; but 2013 was the lowest. We really, you know we've had two really big growth years, but we don't know what is going to happen in the future.

MR. COX: I am not on the Committee, but I would like to speak for just a few minutes about some of the things that are my concern. One of them is, it is an open access permit. As more and more of the snapper grouper fisheries close early in the season, this is a great fishery for folks to enter into to kind of fill the void until they can go back to vermilion fishing. You don't have to have an HMS permit to logline in the dolphin wahoo fishery, all you've got to do is have a South Atlantic, I think it's a \$25.00 permit to go longlining.

With that said, I like the insurance policy you're talking about, so I would hope that members would certainly consider looking at Alternative 5, Subalternative 2D, which gives you a 4,000 pound trip limit after 75 percent of the ACL is caught, if we've got a lot of support from industry. The real fix is going to be when we get to allocation, and hopefully we can get the commercial allocation back to about 2 million pounds, I think is going to be the way to address this as well. But thank you.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, I was willing to offer a motion to accept these alternatives as worded if you want that now, because they are not in.

MS. BECKWITH: We're good on that.

DR. CHEUVRONT: We have accepted.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair I would like to make a motion to select a preferred if you want.

MS. BECKWITH: Shoot, why not?

MR. HAYMANS: Where was I? Actually I was going to look at Jack for just a moment. I was thinking the 70 percent line, Jack, because that gets you into mid July at current ACLs in 2015 effort. That seems to provide a little extra buffer for 4,000; and I'm good with 4,000 pounds through the rest of the year versus 75 percent. But you're the fisherman, I defer.

MR. COX: Well I'm just making it known that there is a lot of support for the 75 percent, but I understand what you're saying. Hopefully we won't close again.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay to the 75 percent I've got Michelle, and then if there was any specifically with the 75, okay so Michelle first.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I might need a little bit of Brian's assistance on this. When I look at this Table 2, where it has the different estimated pounds that would be landed under all the different alternatives, I mean Doug, I am not seeing a big difference; and thank you, Madam Chair. I am not on your committee, so thank you for allowing me to speak.

I am not seeing a whole lot of difference between the estimated pounds that would be landed between a 70 percent trigger and a 75 percent trigger, and according to what I'm seeing right here, Doug, at a 75 percent trigger and under Subalternative 4D a 4,000 pound trip limit, you still would have almost 300,000 pounds left over there. There is very little difference between 70 percent and 75 percent; in fact none on some of these alternatives with the projected landings.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Can I speak to that?

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

DR. CHEUVRONT: What that really means is that there were no trips over 4,000 pounds during that time period. There were no additional trips that were affected between the 70 and 75 percent. When you're looking at the 4,000 pound trip, whether it is the 70 percent trigger or the 75 percent trigger, there was no difference.

MS. BECKWITH: I think one of the original reasons to consider 70 percent was in case we had, once we hit the trigger, if we had a number of longline vessels still coming in that had not been able to land. We could potentially have a number of 20 to 25,000 pound trips that would come in after that 70 percent had been hit.

It was sort of trying to work in a buffer that would make sure that those trips could come in and still have enough to carry the hook and line guys through. But it seems like the 75 percent may be able to achieve that as well and might be more palatable. All right so back to Doug and then for his alternative choice, and then we'll discuss it based on that.

MR. HAYMANS: To Michelle then. What I was looking at was roughly a seven week difference, between July 2nd and August 25th, and I was going to jump back to my record from September and I didn't. The longlines are mainly prosecuted, we see there in that May/June timeframe. But that is as it is right now, and I guess that is because of when the fish are there.

There is the potential that they catch another month or a few extra days, and so if they were to do that and you wind up with 20,000 pounds later on, even a few weeks later on. I thought that by going 70 percent, you sort of curtailed that possibility.

DR. CHEUVRONT: You would curtail that possibility for that difference between July 2nd and August 20th.

MR. HAYMANS: Correct. I'm not stuck on it. I'll be fine going 75 percent. That is the reason why I was offering 70, so anyway **I'll make a motion Madam Chair that we select Alternative 4D as our preferred.**

MS. BECKWITH: **Okay, Zack seconds that. That would be the 75 percent trigger, the 4,000 pound whole weight trip limit.** Chester, you can speak to that while Brian gets it up.

MR. BREWER: **I would like to make a substitute motion.**

MS. BECKWITH: Whoa, let's talk about it first.

MR. BREWER: Not desperate at all. **I'll make the motion and then give the rationale. I move that we accept Alternative 4, Subalternative 4B as the preferred. I will now give my rationale for doing that.**

MS. BECKWITH: **Okay, Jessica seconds, go ahead.**

MR. BREWER: What we're doing here, is essentially insurance. If things go as we hope they go, this thing will never trip there will never be a trigger and the quota won't be reached; and we won't have the situation that we had last year, which hopefully was an anomaly. But it had very real adverse affect, and that was this fishery got closed down for six months.

We had some other historical data at the last meeting that I would like to refer back to. It showed what the average longline landings were for dolphin from 2010 to 2015. In 2010 the

average longline landings was 607 pounds. In 2011 it was 529 pounds. In 2012 it was 512 pounds, 2013 it was 408 pounds, 2014 it doubled to 820 pounds.

In 2015 it went up from 2014 by two and a-half times to 2,000 pounds. There is a potential here that there is a trend, and it is one that I don't think is going to be good for the fishery. I would move that we put in 2,000 pounds once the trigger has been hit. You're still going to be above, slightly, slightly above the average longline landings for the past 10 years.

If you take a look at the difference between the estimated differences from 2015 between these two alternatives, there is exactly zero. Both of them are \$169,539.00. Now I am willing to bet you that what happened in the last six months of 2015 had an adverse impact of one hell of a lot more money than that. That is the reason I would like to see us go with something that's got a little bit smaller trip limit, to make sure that this thing goes out all the way. We're still over the average trip limit for the past five years, and that is the reason I make the substitute motion.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, there was lots of people in mind, but to this, I think Roy wanted to speak and then Mark specifically to Chester's point, and then Ben, sorry.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, here is the trouble I'm having. We have a purpose and need that I think is going to say we're trying to reduce adverse economic impacts. But if I look at the analysis and put the trip limit in place, it creates adverse economic impacts. If we vote up either one of these motions, we're losing \$169,539.00. It seems to me that is not consistent with the purpose and need. Where am I wrong, Brian?

DR. CHEUVRONT: It is socioeconomic impacts. Your huge loss is coming from the fact that the fishery did not exist for six months in 2015. There is more than just dollars in determining socioeconomic impact here. If you're looking strictly at dollars, in any fishery commercially speaking, you don't want any trip limits, you don't want any limitations, you want the ACL to be caught up as quickly as you can and as few trips as possible. That gives you the highest –

DR. CRABTREE: Not if it floods the market and reduces prices.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Well, and what I had to do in the analysis is take what would be the average price based on history. We don't really know how the price per pound would change by this analysis; I just had to do it by what had happened historically. This is a best estimate. My guess is that if you really want to look at it from an economic perspective, the market seems to be able to handle as much domestic dolphin caught commercially as it possibly can take. Whether it is all caught up in the first six months or in 12 months, my guess is it probably really doesn't affect the price much.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, so it seems like this is just about who catches them and it seems to me that in the absence of any evidence of adverse effects on price, it is economically a loser, the trip limit is. At least, that is what I'm seeing. I agree you are probably right; there are probably social impacts and all kinds of arguments like that you could make. But I'm just looking economically.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, so I've got Mark, Ben, Jessica and Mel.

MR. BROWN: Well, you know, I've heard from some of the commercial fishing industry in different areas up from North Carolina north, and I read this letter of the Long Island Commercial Fishing Association, and how they are against this trip limit altogether, simply because the fish haven't even gotten to them yet.

They are really concerned about the fact that we're going to implement something like this, and before the fish have reached them it is going to be closed, and they are going to have a high number of discards. This letter was sent out from the Long Island Commercial Fishing Association.

They have a fishery in New York State that, you know, they probably have to travel a long ways in probably bigger boats, and so it takes them a long time to get offshore to catch any amount of fish, so they're going to have a lot higher of an overhead to be able to go and catch these fish.

But what I'm saying is that if they do have a strong fishery for these dolphins in the northeast and we close this fishery early, or we implement some sort of a small catch limit or trip limit, then you're going to have a lot of discards and you're going to be hurting the fishermen in the northeast.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, and I think that is one of the things we are trying to avoid by taking these steps, so we can assure that it doesn't close and that there is a trip limit that will sustain the hook and line fishery in a fairly economically viable fashion.

MR. HARTIG: I am not on your committee, but there is an absolute trend of increasing landings in this, and if you don't increase that trend in your analysis, you're making a big mistake. The economics goes out the window with the increasing trend. It is dramatic, it is only one year in this recent time series where it actually goes down.

But every other year it is on an increasing level and it is increasing more and more. As Chester pointed out, each of the two years in particular. Somehow in the analysis, I would have looked at this increasing trend and done that in future years, but I understand what we're limited by. The other thing is, Brian, the forensic evidence of what has happened, so far, do we know that? Do we know that we have dolphin wahoo permits that aren't HMS permitted that are catching these dolphin?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, we do know that.

MR. HARTIG: We do know that. Okay, is that information in the document somewhere?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Kari, do you have, in the social effects section on Dolphin Wahoo Regulatory Amendment 1 information about permits, as to whom of the longliners; who has HMS permits and who doesn't?

MR. HARTIG: I don't need to see it now. I'm just asking if I can reference it somewhere eventually. That is not the problem. I just really needed to know what has changed. That is the critical thing, and what can we expect in the future based on the changes we've seen recently?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I think that you can really look at that volatility of all that change is really occurring is mostly in May and June. When you're looking at the terms of adverse socioeconomic affects, the closure of the fishery early disproportionately affects the hook and line sector of the commercial fishery. Even if it closes early, it is largely because the longline sector has taken the majority of the landings. That seems to be the part that is the most volatile here.

Closing early, in terms of percentage lost over the total year of the longline sector would be much smaller than the percentage lost to the hook and line sector. Disproportionately, if the fishery closes sooner, it does affect the hook and line sector more. But overall, the total profit of the fishery, by having a trip limit in place, could affect the overall potential value of the fishery.

MS. McCAWLEY: One of the reasons that I supported this is I thought that part of our discussion at the last meeting was about preserving the hook and line sector. Even though it is at a much lower level, it was continuing throughout the rest of the year. That is one of the reasons why I support the 2,000 is because I just want to make sure we're going to get all the way through the year.

I also think that the longer term measures we're going to look at are going to help, but to me this is insurance in case it takes us two years to get that in place. I would like to have this in place first. The reason that I think 2,000 is the way to go is because the hook and line fishery, at least in Florida, appears to be landing less than 2,000 pounds per trip. In order to preserve that – I think last time we called it the traditional fishery – I think that 2,000 is plenty.

MS. BECKWITH: Do we have an average trip limit analysis, like the poundage for hook and line for that August/September/October timeframe?

DR. CHEUVRONT: That was what Chester - you've got that handy, don't you?

MR. BREWER: That analysis was done from 2010 to 2015. It is not done by month. It is a yearly mean. For the hook and line folks 2010 your average is 80.69 pounds; 2011 it is 91.15 pounds; 2012 it is 76.11 pounds; 2013 it is 83.55 pounds; 2014 it is 84.58 pounds and for 2015 it is 76.10 pounds.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, thanks for that.

MR. BELL: I think Jessica kind of covered what I was thinking here. Our concern, as I recall when this came up, was sort of long term throughout the year sustainability of the fishery. While we can use this table and see the same figure on some of these alternatives, it doesn't really get into the full socioeconomic impacts of what might happen with a closure, because there is a lot of downstream sort of economic, and I guess that is socioeconomic impacts from it closing. An approach that would perhaps be a little more conservative to try to ensure the fishery goes for the whole year seems to make sense and in keeping with what we were originally thinking, I thought.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, I've got Zack and then Michelle, and then I may take this to a vote.

MR. BOWEN: You know with those analyses, it is hard for me to sit here and see how if they are a – I hate to use the word true – but if they are full time, I guess would be a better term, commercial fisherman how they can make it on bringing back 70 or 80 pounds of dolphin. That kind of tells me that they're not full time commercial fishermen, so this council or this committee really needs to decide how we want to go.

Do we want to really try to protect the full time commercial fishermen, such as the longliners, the ones that have the big trip limits, or do we want to restrict them to look out for what appears to me just by what I heard from Chester, appears to be guys that are probably out there on Saturday or Sunday when the ocean is nice trying to pay for diesel fuel or gas.

MS. BECKWITH: That is probably a discussion for Amendment 10, reconsideration of the purpose and need and management goals; because right now.

MR. BOWEN: I don't know that to be whom that is, it is just my guess.

DR. DUVAL: I am not on your committee, I would support the original motion, and part of that is because we do manage this fishery along the entire coast and so by the time you get to the end of sort of the peak of the longline landings that generally tend to happen in May and June, there are still landings from both gear types that are happening north of our area of jurisdiction.

My thinking was that a 4,000 pound trip limit would still allow for some of those landings to come in. From the analysis that we have it doesn't look like we would be meeting the ACL under a 4,000 pound trip limit at a 75 percent trigger. It would still allow for both the hook and line landings that occur throughout the year sporadically.

I've looked at ours as well, and we have hook and line and longline landings throughout the year, but the longline definitely tend to spike, the hook and line are steadier. But in my mind that 4,000 pound trip limit would prevent discards of dolphin by longline vessels that are occurring north of the South Atlantic area of jurisdiction.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I guess I worry that we're getting in a rush to do something here. We've closed one time in a lot of years. We have shifted some allocation in order to address this. The analysis we have indicates it should get us through next year. It seems to me we have time to deal with Amendment 10 and do a little more thoughtful way of addressing this.

It just doesn't seem to me that we need to react this quickly, given the analysis that we've had. I guess like Michelle, I would feel better about 4D if everyone wants to do something with it. But I'm just not convinced we need to try and move this quickly.

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, Roy, you know I am still concerned with the rate of growth that we're seeing in the pelagic longline, and I would hate to be sitting here next year with an early closure just because we decided that we thought we might be able to get through and all of a sudden didn't. I think the intent of this is the insurance policy to make sure.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, but do you want to be sitting here next year and see those catches fall back down and we leave 300, 400,000 pounds of fish in the water?

MS. BECKWITH: I think with Brian's analysis, it looks like that wouldn't be the case, because the larger, depending on the trip limit that we choose.

DR. CRABTREE: But the analysis indicates they probably won't close next year, so if we're going to go by the analysis, it would seem to indicate we don't need to do anything. Now, I don't know what is going to happen next year. Maybe it will close earlier; maybe effort will continue to go up. It could go the other way though. I just don't know.

MS. BECKWITH: Right. I think I am ready to vote on this substitute motion. Is there anything else that folks feel the burning need to say? **Okay, so we're going to take a vote on the substitute motion. If this passes, then it becomes the main motion. All those in favor of the substitute motion; please raise your hand.**

Four in favor, how many opposed? Oh that is right, Ben can't vote so it is really three. **All right, let's try that again; people on my committee.** Do I need to reread? Folks on my committee are Zack, Chester, Chris, Roy, Doug and Jessica. Those are the folks that can vote on this. **Those folks, if you are in favor of the substitute motion; please raise your hand.**

I see two in favor, those opposed; four opposed the motion fails. We are back to the original motion, which is select Alternative 4, Subalternative 4D as the preferred. All those in favor of this motion; please raise your hand. Okay five, anybody opposed? Roy. Motion carries. Okay, I am going to let Brian catch up.

MR. HAYMANS: Anna, can I ask you a question while he's catching up?

MS. BECKWITH: Certainly.

MR. HAYMANS: Do we have an idea of how many pelagic longline boats there are up in the New England area, versus how many are actually catching dolphin as well? What is the potential increase out there?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Right off hand, Doug, I can't answer that question. There was one thing in September when we got into discussing the potential for Amendment 10; the council asked that if this goes forward that certain additional analyses be done. You've got to realize folks; you gave us three months, less than three months to get to this point and all the reviews that it has already gone through.

It is hard for the IPT to come up with the level of analysis like you've got in Regulatory Amendment 16. That is the problem, so we want to address some of those data concerns and a more detailed analysis if you decide to go ahead with Amendment 10. You had given us some direction in September of what kind of additional analyses, and well, like the stuff you're talking about, Doug. That is the kind of stuff that we would put into Amendment 10, where we have a full year to be developing this amendment and tweaking analyses and things as we go along. I mean you, guys didn't see a purpose and need, didn't even see the wording of the action and alternatives until today, or until the briefing book came out.

I apologize that there is not more, because there are more questions, but we did get as much in there as we could with the limited amount of time that we had. There is one thing; Madam Chair

that I do want to add is that we did take this out for public hearings. I just want to make sure that we got this on the record. There is a document in your briefing book that summarizes the public hearing comments.

Basically, if somebody commented on this, they either were in favor of no trip limits at all ever, or they were in favor of Alternative 4, Subalternative 4D. That is what it basically boiled down to. Those were the only kinds of comments that we were hearing, and there was not a huge amount of comments. I solicited the Dolphin Wahoo AP for comments and I only got one comment back, and that was basically in favor of Alternative 4, 4D.

MR. CONKLIN: That is what I've been raising my hand over here about is a lot of the comments I read that we received were the 4D and the 75 percent option. That is why I voted for it.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Gregg just reminded me of something that I want to make sure we all understand. The South Atlantic Council manages dolphin and wahoo for the entire Atlantic, so we cover the Mid-Atlantic Council as well as the New England Council for dolphin and wahoo. When we did this public hearing, this was done by webinar. People from the Mid-Atlantic as well as New England had the opportunity to be able to provide comment as well. We solicited comments throughout the entire management area.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes just to add something else. Down in Hilton Head the gentleman that showed up and made reference to the Game of Thrown longliner guy, I forget his name. But that is a solution that he offered up, an idea like that. I think it says a lot about us when we can take an idea from industry and put it into action here and make it work.

MR. HARTIG: One question, Brian. Do we know for those longline trips that occur after the peak, do we know how many fish would cover those trips?

DR. CHEUVRONT: The total amount of longline landings after the closure period, the trigger?

MR. HARTIG: What I'm looking at is a trip-by-trip basis. How many pounds of dolphin do they need to cover their bycatch in their HMS fisheries?

MS. BECKWITH: If you remember some of the public comment we've received, Terry Bodman and all those folks; about 2 to 3,000 pounds, 3,000 pounds they felt comfortable covering it so this would well cover what they might encounter. They did sort of go through and explain that the types of hooks and lines and stuff that they use in the times during the fish can be altered to reduce the amount of catch that they can bring into the boat.

MR. BREWER: Terry was 75 percent, 4,000 pounds. She said that would be fine.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Just to follow up with you, Ben. One of the things I had said in my comments is that historically speaking from 2010 through 2014, on average about one trip a year would have been affected by a 4,000 pound limit. I can't get into any of the details of what that amount is that would have gone over that. But just letting you know that on average one trip would have been affected; is about what it is.

MS. BECKWITH: As we move this forward, I mean the hope is that we can take the amount of time needed to develop the pieces of Amendment 10 and allow ample discussion for those and really take a look at what this fishery is and could like in the future, and take the time to make decisions without having to worry about an early closure. To me, that is what this amendment accomplishes is just giving us time to deal with everything that we might consider in Amendment 10.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Could we go back, Brian and look at the purpose and need and just take a look at that one more time? Is that as it was revised by folks here?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, Ma'am, that is as it was revised. What it says now is as it was revised by the committee.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it seems to me there are some problems with it when I read the need is to maintain optimum yield. It seems to me what we just did makes it less likely that we'll achieve optimum yield, because we're not going to catch optimum yield, which we have defined as equal to the ACL. As I said earlier, it seems to me that this has negative economic impacts. It may have social benefits, it may maintain the hook and line fishery and those other things, but I don't see that in the purpose and need. It does seem to me like this needs some work.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes and if it needs some work that is what we should do. But we talked about optimum yield. One of the things we need to remember about the original purpose and need for this for the management plan for this fishery is that the commercial fishery was going to be a bycatch fishery.

That is something that we need to address in Alternative 10, because clearly what is happening is when you're getting things like 20,000 pounds plus of dolphin on a single longline trip, it is hard to believe that they're somehow trying to avoid dolphin. This optimal yield thing, does that same definition apply to what we currently have designated as a bycatch fishery?

DR. CRABTREE: Didn't we when we put the ACLs in place to find optimum yield as equal to the ACL in this fishery? I mean, we did that in most of them, so didn't we do that?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I think we probably did.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm assuming we did and so the analysis we have here indicates we're less likely to catch that than we were without it. That seems a problem, and I don't know about the bycatch fishery and all that. That I guess is going back to the original dolphin wahoo plan. I think this needs to focus more on if it is social benefits we're worried out, if it is the small players and the directed hook and line fishery not surviving in it; or something like that. But it just doesn't really seem to capture why we're doing this.

MS. BECKWITH: Roy, do you have any suggested language, because clearly the intent is to assure that the season does not close, so that the hook and line fishery can be maintained for the entire fishing year.

DR. CRABTREE: Well if I think if that is what you're trying to do and that is your need then it should in some way say that. But that is not what it says right now. It doesn't say anything about that I don't think.

MS. BECKWITH: Okay, suggestions for rewording the need for action, folks.

DR. CRABTREE: I would suggest we ask staff to kind of work on it based on the discussion, and we come back to it in full council.

MS. BECKWITH: Sounds like a great idea. Chester, go ahead.

MR. BREWER: I might as well; you all can hear me cursing under my breath. Change it to read; the need for this amendment is to prevent potential socioeconomic impacts caused by an early closure of dolphin. Roy, maybe sometime we can have a discussion. Excuse me?

MS. BECKWITH: Yes, but it does take out the, maintain optimum yield thing.

MR. BREWER: Roy and I can have a conversation sometime as to what the definition of OY is under law and pursuant to Magnuson.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, right. Let's get some suggestions. I'll work with Brian and we'll have something to consider at full council.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Oh, you don't want suggestions now, or you do?

MS. BECKWITH: Oh no, okay. All right, go ahead.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I had some well placed editorial language given to me, which is instead of preventing potential we just replace that; to reduce the severity of adverse socioeconomic impacts caused by an early closure. I can work with Brian and we'll come back at Full Council with something.

MS. BECKWITH: Sounds good. Chris, did you have something?

MR. CONKLIN: The need is, we need to keep the commercial dolphin fishery open year round. That's the need. We don't need all these fancy words and stuff, do we?

MS. BECKWITH: All right, we are historically bad at word smithing so let's work off this and take a look at this at Full Council. Once we reapprove the purpose and need, then I will wait until Full Council to approve this for Secretarial Review. In theory, we're supposed to go into a discussion about Amendment 10, but I guess my suggestion, given how tight we are for time, Madam Chair is, I'm not sure that the discussion for Amendment 10 can't be its own topic for a Dolphin Wahoo Committee meeting at our next council, and just give us a little bit of time for maybe a two hour session for philosophical thoughts and conversations at our next council meeting.

DR. DUVAL: I mean, I'm fine with that if the committee is fine with that. Delaying that discussion by one meeting is certainly not going to delay moving forward with an amendment by a significant amount of time.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, because what we would be looking at in the white paper is what of those topics to take out for scoping as the first step. But I think each of these topics is going to require a bit of discussion sort of back and forth about what we envision this fishery to be like in the future. I can see it taking a long time, so I would suggest.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Typically, we have a twice a year public hearing cycle, but this is scoping and what we've been doing with scoping now has been doing it by webinar. That is going to make it easier if you decide that you want to move ahead in March and go to scoping. You will be okay for scoping, but that could push you back yet an extra meeting for public hearings.

Because I doubt that if you send this out for scoping after the March meeting that you'll be ready after the June meeting to send it out for public hearings. I'm just trying to think long term planning here as to what you all might want to consider.

DR. DUVAL: Madam Chair, I would just check in with the rest of your committee and see. I mean, that is certainly fine with me. I just want to make sure it is fine with the rest of your committee. I tend to agree with you that it is going to be a pretty lengthy conversation once we get into these topics.

MS. BECKWITH: Who has got thoughts? Can everyone hold off for one meeting? Okay.

DR. DUVAL: I guess the other thing I just might throw in there is that if you delay until March to have that conversation, and then have scoping sometime between March and June it will be a little bit fresher for your advisory panel, which generally meets in April.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and then also, if you want to wait until March, we can look at some of these data things that might help stimulate your conversation, and we might be able to pull some more data together if we're not trying to deal with other aspects of the fishery as well. You might be able to have a little more informed discussion in March than you could perhaps have today.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, and now that we have this amendment going through as our insurance policy that the fishery won't close next year, I think it just gives us time to do this thoughtfully and right. Unless there is any opposition to that; then that is what we'll do. We will hold all discussion for Amendment 10.

But what I would special request is a solid two and a half hours in the next meeting to sort of have ample time to go through these issues. Right, I'll take some of Doug's time. Okay, so if we're going to hold off on discussion for Amendment 10, then we are at other business for the committee and we'll pick up the last couple of things at Full Council. Is there any other business to come before Dolphin Wahoo?

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Madam Chair, I just wanted to let folks know, we received a letter from Bob Jones with the Southeastern Fisheries Association regarding, and I asked Mike Collins

to forward that to all council members. It was regarding for-hire sales. It was focused primarily on dolphin and king mackerel was my understanding. I'm not sure if wahoo was in there, as well.

I read the resolution and it specifically referenced king mackerel and dolphin. I would just note that there have never been for-hire sales of wahoo allowed since the inception of the fishery management plan, but this is sort of a, I guess I will call it a bipartisan group of fishermen who have been having conversations.

Chester and folks with the West Palm Beach Fishing Club have been involved in this, Ben has been involved in this conversation, Jimmy Hull and other folks have been involved in this conversation. If you read the e-mail, the gist of it was that this is a group of folks primarily from Florida that would like to see fishermen who hold both their for-hire permits for these species, as well as their commercial permits for these species be allowed to sell fish caught on for-hire trips.

I indicated to Bob that we would bring this up here. I did let him know that we were really pretty pressed for time on this week's meeting agenda. We thought that Dolphin Wahoo would be the most appropriate committee to bring this up in. I just wanted to make sure that I did mention it. I know there are probably lots of different thoughts around the table regarding reinstating for-hire sales. But I just wanted to note it, and I think that could be a topic for your lengthy conversation for which we will allow you a significant portion of time. I think you had Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes, I just had a couple points. One, Michelle, did you reach out to Bob to make sure that he meant those three species and he didn't mean snapper grouper species as well?

DR. DUVAL: I have not had the chance to connect with Bob. I meant to, and I was pulled in multiple different directions. In reading the resolution, it wasn't entirely clear to me, because there were only dolphin and king mackerel that were specifically called out, and reading some of the correspondence that came with it, some of the e-mails from different captains who indicated that they were not interested in snapper grouper species, but specifically king mackerel and dolphin. Perhaps Chester, who has been participating in some of those conversations, can clarify.

MS. McCAWLEY: Chester is saying just king mackerel and dolphin. As you mentioned, I was hoping that we could have further discussion about this at the next meeting where we're going to talk about the white paper more.

DR. DUVAL: That was one thing I did indicate to Bob was that I really felt this would be a conversation that would need to continue at our next meeting in March, that I really doubted we would have enough time to appropriately and thoroughly discuss it today.

MS. BECKWITH: Alright, so we're up to three hours.

MR. BOWEN: Maybe between now and March we can figure out how to count them.

MS. BECKWITH: Is there any other business? All right seeing none; I adjourn.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 o'clock p.m., December 10, 2015.)

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcription, Inc.
January 2016

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2015 – 2016 COMMITTEES

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Chester Brewer, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

Jack Cox, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Ben Hartig
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Chevront

DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Mark Brown
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

DOLPHIN WAHOO

✓Anna Beckwith, Chair
✓Zack Bowen, Vice-Chair
✓Chester Brewer
✓Chris Conklin
✓Roy Crabtree
✓Doug Haymans
✓Jessica McCawley
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Tony DiLernia/Dewey
Hemilright
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT**

Doug Haymans, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Jack Cox
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
LTJG Tara Pray
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Chip Collier - CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Jack Cox, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2015 - 2016 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

✓ Jack Cox
2010 Bridges Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/728-9548
Dayboat1965@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

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

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2015 - 2016 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

LTJG Tara Pray
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
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

MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
BONNIE PONWETH
JACK MCGOVERN
SCOTT SANDORF
ERIKA BURGESS
TRACY DUNN

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

✓ Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

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

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@safmc.net

Staff Economist

✓ Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net



**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council –
December 2015 Council Meeting
Atlantic Beach, NC**

Date: Thursday December 10, 2015

Committee: Dolphin Wahoo

PLEASE SIGN IN -

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown above.

Name:	Mailing Address/E-mail: <i>(If your information is currently on file, please check the box.)</i>	How do you participate in South Atlantic fisheries? <i>(Check all that apply)</i>	
David Bush	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Bob Loney	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Gretchen Martin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Gary Zurn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Bill Kelly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Kellie Ralston	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>

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



**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council –
December 2015 Council Meeting
Atlantic Beach, NC**

Date: Thursday December 10, 2015

Committee: Dolphin Wahoo

PLEASE SIGN IN -

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown above.

Name:	Mailing Address/E-mail: <i>(If your information is currently on file, please check the box.)</i>	How do you participate in South Atlantic fisheries? <i>(Check all that apply)</i>	
		Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
Dick BRAME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
		Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
Andrew Rubin	<input type="checkbox"/> On File <i>Andrew.Rubin@noaa.gov NMES - SF-HMS</i>	Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
		Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
Dean Foster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
		Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
Bob Laery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Recreational <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
		Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/> On File	Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
		Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/> On File	Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
		Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>

COUNCIL MTG DAY 4

10 Dec 15

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Mumford	Doug Mumford	doug.mumford@ncdenr.gov
Alvarado	Nicolas	Nicolas.Alvarado@noaa.gov
Austin	Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com
Bademan	Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu
Ballenger	Joey	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Bissette	Jesse	jlbissette13@gmail.com
Black	Michael	mike@floribbeansea.com
Black	Michael	mblack54@bellsouth.net
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Brady	Bonnie	greenfluke@optonline.net
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Bresnen	Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Desfosse	Joseph	joseph.desfosse@noaa.gov
Dukes	Amy	DukesA@dnr.sc.gov
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Froeschke	John	john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Hadley	John	john.hadley@ncdenr.gov
Helies	Frank	fchelies@verizon.net
Hesselman	Don	don.hesselman@ncdenr.gov
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Hudson	Mary	mhudson@gmri.org
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Johnson	Denise	denise.johnson@noaa.gov
Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
L	I	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net
Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov
Levy	Mara	mara.levy@noaa.gov
Lindh	Ryan	nativetrade@bellsouth.net
MCCallum	James	jimmccall@mindspring.com
Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
Markwith	Anne	anne.markwith@ncdenr.gov
Martin	Gretchen	gbmartin71@gmail.com
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov

Merrifield	Mike	mikem@wildoceanmarket.com
Mitchell	W	warren.mitchell@noaa.gov
Muhammad	Ernest	Muhammade@dnr.sc.gov
Package-Ward	Christina	christina.package-ward@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Reichert	Marcel	Reichertm@dnr.sc.gov
Roberts	Claire	claire.roberts@gulfcouncil.org
Schalit	David	dschalit@gmail.com
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov
Smith	Scott	scott.smith@ncdenr.gov
Stafford	Pete	spstafford@gmail.com
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
rindone	ryan	ryan.rindone@gulfcouncil.org
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
smart	tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov
Brown	Angela	brownac@dnr.sc.gov
Buckson	Bruce	bruce@buckson.net
FARMER	NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov
Herndon	Andrew	Andrew.Herndon@noaa.gov
Mansfield	Bill	billman@ec.rr.com
Smith	Myron	myronsmith@nc.rr.com
Steamer	Donald	b001936@gmail.com
c	m	mec181@yahoo.com
custar	carl	carlswolesale@yahoo.com