

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Key West Marriott Beachside Hotel
Key West, Florida

June 13, 2011

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mackerel Committee

Duane Harris, Chair
Tom Burgess
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
Ben Hartig
Dr. Wilson Laney
Mark Robson

Robert Boyles
Dr. Brian Chevront
David Cupka
George Geiger
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel

Council Members:

LTJG Matthew Lam

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Andrea Grabman

John Carmichael
Dr. Mike Errigo
Myra Brouwer
Anna Martin
Roger Pugliese

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Dr. Nick Farmer
Phil Steele
Dr. Mike Travis
Nik Mehta

Dr. Jack McGovern
Rick DeVictor
Bob Gill
Otha Easley
Jessica McCawley
Capt. Chisolm Frampton

Other Participants Attached

The Ecosystem-Based Management Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Flagler Ballroom of the Key West Beachside Hotel, Key West, Florida, June 13, 2011, and was called to order at 10:05 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Duane Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Okay. the Ecosystem-Based Management Committee will come to order; and just to remind everybody who is on the committee, everybody, including Wilson, so there are 14 members of the committee. The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. You have seen the agenda under Tab 7. Is there any objection to approving the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved.

The next item is the approval of the March 7th Ecosystem-Based Management Committee minutes. Any additions or corrections to those minutes? Is there any objection to approving those minutes as published? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. The next item, Item 3 is status of catches versus quota for octocorals. Jack McGovern will give us that report. That was e-mailed to everybody I think earlier today.

DR. McGOVERN: Correct, that was just e-mailed probably half an hour ago, and that has all the quota-monitoring species in there including octocorals. We get those landings from the state of Florida. They are not finalized. Thus far 4 percent of the 50,000 colony quota has been met. We get that report twice a year from Florida. I think we are going to be able to get the final landings for 2010 maybe today and definitely by full council.

MR. HARRIS: Do we have any idea what it is going to look like?

DR. McGOVERN: Well, the landings from previous years are in Section 4 of the CE-BA 2 and 7,000 colonies were caught last year. The total thus far for this year is about 2,000 colonies and about 9,800 colonies the year before, so it will probably be in that range.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, any questions for Jack on quota monitoring for octocorals? Seeing none, the next item on the agenda is the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Management Amendment 2. Remember today is the time when we are expected to approve the amendment to send to the council for approval and sending to the secretary. That is what is on the agenda today. If you will give Anna and Roger your complete attention, I will ask them to take us through it. Anna.

MS. MARTIN: I would just like to reference that this is Attachment 1A in the second briefing book that was distributed. This is an environmental assessment, and as Duane mentioned it is on track for final approval during this meeting. We do have preferred alternatives for all of the actions in the document and refined analysis for the new alternatives developed during the March meeting.

We have received feedback from the Science Center as well as comments from NOAA GC. Aside from the recommended changes to the wording in a few of the alternatives and actions that I will review with you, no major issues to bring forward at this time. What I would like to do is walk through the actions as they are in Chapter 4 of the document after which the council will review the proposed rule for CE-BA 2, modify as needed and deem accordingly. Mark.

MR.ROBSON: Anna, could you just help us by getting us to the right pages on the document where we are at? Well, we just need some help with where the pages are.

MS. MARTIN: Sure thing, Mark, I was getting there. Okay, Action 1, PDF page 109, and again, this is Chapter 4 of the document. This action would remove octocorals from the fishery management unit under the Coral FMP. Preferred Alternative 3 was developed by the council during the March meeting.

This would shorten the management unit for octocorals to include them in the FMP off of North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, removing protections in Florida waters. Now the council has said this alternative is contingent upon FWC's plans for assuming and extending management in Florida waters.

Attachment 2 in the briefing book is a letter of intent from FWC to the council and Attachment 3 is the draft state rule FWC presented to their commission last week. To summarize, their proposed rule states the measures that they plan to take upon removal of octocorals from the councils coral FMP. This would extend state management for octocorals into federal waters off of Florida.

That is for vessels landing octocorals in Florida and for Florida-registered vessels. This also includes a six-colony recreational bag limit, prohibition of harvest in the EEZ north of Cape Canaveral and in the coral HAPCs adjacent to Florida. These measures are consistent with the current measures the council has in place under the Coral FMP.

Additionally, FWC is proposing to establish an annual quota for allowable harvest of octocorals for 70,000 colonies combined in Florida state and federal waters. Their proposed rule would go out for a final public hearing in September before their commission would finally approve changes to their draft rule.

MR. HARRIS: Any questions for Anna regarding Action 1? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have a question for Mark. Mark, I guess the commission met on June 9th and maybe you could discuss, or Jessica, what happened at that meeting regarding octocorals.

MS. McCAWLEY: There was no public comment on the item regarding octocorals and the commission approved our draft rule and approved it for a final public hearing at our September commission meeting.

MD. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Do you know when your September commission meeting is?

MS. McCAWLEY: The commission meeting is September 7th, 8th and 9th.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I've talked to Shepherd Grimes, who advises the Gulf Council – and Bob Gill can add to this, too, but I believe it is still the intent of the Gulf Council; it is their

preferred measure to remove octocorals from their Coral FMP as well. That would allow Florida to manage the EEZ off their state.

MR. HARRIS: Further comments, questions of Jessica, Monica or Anna? Seeing none, let's move on to Action Item 2.

MS. MARTIN: Let's back up real quickly; sorry about that, Duane. We do have an IPT recommendation to revise the language of Action 1 to reflect a modified management of octocorals in the South Atlantic. This would be a little more appropriate, according to the IPT, considering the preferred alternative would not fully remove octocorals from the Coral FMP.

MR. HARRIS: Is there any objection to modifying that language? Seeing none, that language stands modified. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: I was just going to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if you needed a motion to accept the IPT's recommendation; but if we don't, that is fine, I support that change.

MR. HARRIS: Do we need a motion, Anna?

MS. MARTIN: I suppose for clarification that would be nice, thank you.

DR. LANEY: I would move that we accept the IPT's recommended change there which is to modify the language to say, Action 1. Modify management of octocorals in the South Atlantic.

MR. HARRIS: Second by Mac Currin. Is there a discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Mark and Jessica, I have a question. I was going through the regulations this morning looking at where we discuss octocorals and there is one regulation at 50CFR622.31F that discusses or actually prohibits the taking of octocoral in the South Atlantic EEZ with a power-assisted tool. I don't know if that is anything that would be in your regulations at this point, but it might be good for you to consider that. I can shoot you an e-mail if you need or some sort of communication.

MR. HARRIS: I'm having a hard time hearing if you turn away from the microphone, Monica. I think I got it but –

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So the end result is that I am going to send the state of Florida, or someone will – I guess I will – the regulation that states you cannot harvest octocoral in the South Atlantic EEZ with a power-assisted tool. They will look into that so that they can bring it up before their commission, I guess.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to commend the council at our last meeting for coming up with a way that we could maintain the protections in place off North Carolina, South

Carolina and Georgia and still accommodate Florida's desire to manage off Florida. I appreciate that very much.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Wilson, I do, too. Okay, are we ready to move on to Action 2 or do we need to back up some more? Action 2.

MS. MARTIN: All right, Action 2, PDF Page 116. This action would extend the management unit for octocorals into the Gulf Council's area of jurisdiction. Now the alternatives in Action 2 are presumably linked with how the council chooses to proceed with the previous action. In March Alternative 1 was selected as the council's preferred, which would not extend the FMU for octocorals into the Gulf Council's area of jurisdiction.

This alternative allows FWC to monitor the quota for octocorals in state and federal waters in Florida. As Monica mentioned, the Gulf Council's preferred alternative for octocorals is within their generic ACL amendment. Currently they have a preferred to remove octocorals from the Gulf Coral FMP. They are scheduled to approve this document in August.

MR. HARRIS: Any desire to revisit Action 2?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I just have questions about how it would work. So corals then could be harvested in the EEZ anywhere in the Gulf of Mexico and would be counted against the Florida quota? If so, how is that going to work in terms of Florida monitoring the quota?

MS. MARTIN: Well, I believe if the Gulf removes octocorals from the Gulf FMP, then they would be unmanaged in the EEZ outside of Florida waters.

DR. CRABTREE: But we're extending --

MS. MARTIN: We have a preferred alternative of the no action to not extend.

DR. CRABTREE: So we are not going to do that; all right.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The only thing I was going to say is that we will coordinate rulemaking on this closely with Florida so the EEZ isn't left uncovered by the octocoral regulations on how you can harvest them. We'll talk with Mark's office and make sure that in terms of the shortening of the management unit, to not include the management of octocorals in your Coral FMP will closely coincide with Florida extending their jurisdiction over octocorals into federal waters.

MR. HARRIS: Now just a question regarding that; I've not heard of any harvest of octocorals anywhere other than Florida waters and the EEZ off the coast of Florida. I don't know that that is a problem. It's not really germane to this particular action item, anyway. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: We did have an EFP I think recently that asked for harvest of some octocorals off of North Carolina. I think it was like 11 pounds or something was all that they were going -- it was a very, very small amount. The fact is, just to clarify and let you know,

Duane, that at least that there was some interest – and I believe it was for medical research – and so potentially based on the results of what they get from their EFP, there may be greater interest in the future. We just don't know at this point.

MR. HARRIS: Brian, that has been going on for a long time, the consideration of harvest of octocorals off other states for medical research. I think when I was on the council before there was some harvest for medical research, so, anyway, I still don't think it is a problem right now. We can deal with it if it comes up. Okay, I don't see any desire to revisit Action 2. Action 3.

MS. MARTIN: All right, Action 3, PDF Page 119. This action modifies the annual catch limit for octocorals in the South Atlantic. Alternative 3 is currently the council's preferred. This alternative was also developed during the March meeting. The range of alternatives here is also linked with how the council chooses to proceed with Action 1.

Alternative 3 would establish an ACL of zero for the modified management area for octocorals, and so this would be where they are included in the FMP off of North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. Currently harvest is prohibited in these areas. Now, the SSC also convened in April and reviewed several amendments including CE-BA 2. They did not have any concerns with Preferred Alternative 3 for this action. Carolyn will be providing the full report from the SSC meeting during the Snapper Grouper Committee.

MR. CUPKA: I believe we need to modify that language and I would like to make a motion that our language of Preferred Alternative 3 would be ACL equal to zero for octocorals in the EEZ off North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

MR. HARRIS: Seconded by Mr. Haymans. Is there a discussion of the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Anna, that kind of moves us right along.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, we will move into Action 4. This is PDF Page 123. This action modifies management of special management zones off of South Carolina. The council has selected Alternatives 2 and 3 as their preferred. These would limit harvest and possession for snapper grouper and coastal migratory pelagic species to the recreational bag limit in these areas.

We have NOAA General Counsel recommendation to reword the language in this action to reflect that we're modifying management of special management zones off of South Carolina as opposed to South Carolina SMZs.

MR. HARRIS: The Chair would entertain a motion to that effect. Mr. Boyles.

MR. BOYLES: Mr. Chairman, so moved for Preferred Alternative 2 and Preferred Alternative 3, to adopt the NOAA GC recommended language.

MR. HARRIS: Is there a second to the motion; seconded by Mr. Haymans. Discussion of the motion: Is there an objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, now we do have an overlooked issue regarding Preferred Alternative 3 and this limits, as mentioned, harvest and possession of coastal migratory pelagics to the recreational bag limit. This alternative would amend the joint Coastal Migratory Pelagic FMP in place with the Gulf and the Gulf Council would need to approve this measure before this action in CE-BA 2 presumably becomes final.

They currently have not looked at this action or preferred alternative. We have spoken with staff at the regional office and developed a potential solution for this issue. If the council proceeds with approving CE-BA 2 during this meeting, it could be done contingent upon the Gulf Council approving this measure and the document during their August meeting.

This scenario would enable the council to keep this as a preferred alternative in the document at this time while not holding up approval of CE-BA 2 in entirety. This scenario would also not prevent approval of CE-BA 2 by the Secretary by the end of the year.

DR. CRABTREE: Robert, wasn't this whole issue, though, about snapper grouper, really?

MR. BOYLES: It was, I guess yes. It started out – it got on the public's radar associated with snapper grouper.

DR. CRABTREE: So couldn't we just take the simpler approach here and not select Alternative 3 as a preferred and leave the mackerel out of it? Then we could finish this up and we wouldn't have to deal with the Gulf.

MR. BOYLES: We could but we have talked about that, Roy. I think that again it is consistent with the spirit and intent with which these special management zones have been constructed. Our preference would be to include the coastal migratory pelagics as well.

MR. HARRIS: Further discussion of that issue: If we get to the point where we recommend approval of CE-BA 2 for submission to the Secretary, it will be contingent upon the Gulf Council approving this action. This is the only action they have to approve at their August meeting. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Bob, you all talked to Bortone about getting this on the agenda?

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, they are aware of it. We are going to get it on their agenda for August.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, is there any other discussion of this action item? Seeing none, moving right along.

MS. MARTIN: All right, Action 5, PDF Page 134. This action modifies sea turtle release gear requirements for the snapper grouper fishery. Alternative 4 was revised during the March meeting and selected as the council's preferred. Now, again, this alternative modifies sea turtle and smalltooth sawfish release gear based on freeboard height of a vessel.

Vessels 4 foot or less are required a suite of gear which basically includes no long-handled dehooking gear. Vessels greater than 4 feet are required a suite of gear where the long-handled dehooking gear is still required. This alternative is recommended by the Protected Resources Division as the minimum requirements necessary to remain in compliance with the current biological opinion for the snapper grouper fishery.

MR. HARRIS: You will recall we have had lots and lots and lots of discussion about this issue.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, it is a minor point, but it just struck me the way these two preferred subalternatives are worded. what would happen if you had a vessel with a freeboard height of four feet? The way it is worded you would have to do both.

MS. MARTIN: Well, we do have an IPT recommendation to revise that language to fix the issue there, so that Subalternative 4B would indicate this refers to vessels with freeboard height greater than four feet. Like you say, otherwise, there is an overlap for that specification.

MR. HARRIS: The Chair would entertain a motion to accept the IPT's recommendations regarding that alternative. **Motion by Mr. Cupka, second by Mac Currin. Discussion of that motion? Everybody understands what we are doing, fixing that. You need the motion read? The IPT's recommendation is to change the language of Subalternative 4B to reflect vessels with freeboard height greater than four feet (and/or using longline gear) would be required to carry and use, etcetera, etcetera.** Matt?

LTJG LAM: I just had a question as whether that is documented freeboard or freeboard of the vessel with catch and fuel on board.

MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry; I could not hear the last of that, Matt.

LTJG LAM: I just wanted to know if that was the documented freeboard or if it was the freeboard with the catch and fuel on board if the Coast Guard or another law enforcement agency pulls up.

MR. HARRIS: Good question; I don't know the answer to that. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I can't give you an answer but I will say that there was a discussion about needing to define what freeboard meant so that it would be clear for everyone. I don't see it in the codified text, but we will try to get it to you before the council meeting.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, and that will fix that issue then.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I should say full council, sorry.

MR. CURRIN: Just a note; we are getting in the weeds here with measuring these things. I realize that it is very important from a law enforcement standpoint because they have to have standards and something quantifiable. I hope that law enforcement will use some discretion in application to this regardless of how we define it.

I think it is important to realize that documented freeboard I presume is done with the boat afloat with no one aboard and whatever. I don't know how it is, but it certainly does not include whoever is handling the gear to release a captured or encountered sea turtle standing in the corner of the boat, which with an average – if I'm in the corner of the boat, it is going down a pretty good ways.

I hope we are not going to get real sticky with all of this if somebody has got a documented freeboard of 4 feet and 3 inches. I don't know, maybe it is just a problem we've got to deal with. But in impracticality you could have a freeboard of less than four feet with somebody actually performing the necessary operation in the corner of the boat.

MR. SWATZEL: I thought the Gulf Reef Plan actually used the freeboard plan as far as the turtle gear, so there has got to be some regulations already existing concerning that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I believe that is true, Tom and I don't think though freeboard is defined and maybe you don't want to define freeboard. I mean that is something for you all to consider giving some of the discussion Mac just had.

MR. HARRIS: Let me ask Matt a question or anybody else that might have the answer to this. Is freeboard height defined only on documented vessels, because I have not seen any vessels that had freeboard height defined?

LTJG LAM: I believe only on documented is where it is officially written down. I'd have to check on state-registered vessels.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, it is not something that I'm just very familiar with. It is a good question though, Monica, whether we want to define it or whether we want to leave it to the discretion of the law enforcement officer. I'm happy to leave it to the discretion of the law enforcement officer but I know sometimes law enforcement officers want it defined. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: From what I remember on my documentation, I don't see freeboard and I've got 40-foot boats. I think we are going to have to leave this with some common judgment instead of trying to define it because if we define it we are going to get into some horribly thick weeds.

MR. HARRIS: I suspect you are correct.

MS. MARTIN: I did want to point out in the proposed rule for CE-BA 2 that we will get to a little further along there is a definition for freeboard and the regulation writers have defined this as freeboard means the working distance between the top of the gunwale to the water surface and will vary based on the vessel design.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, we did vote on this motion, didn't we? Did we vote on this motion? Is there further discussion on this motion? **Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Mac.**

MR. CURRIN: Matt, what options do you guys have as far as measuring freeboard? I see a lot of potential problems with this and trying to enforce it and whether the boat is full or at the dock or how would you go about doing it? Help us out with trying to define this.

LTJG LAM: Well, a boarding officer would normally do an at-sea boarding as opposed to the NOAA guys that mainly do it dockside. We would do it at sea with a tape measure and not at the dock. Does that answer your question?

MR. CURRIN: Well, yes, but in practicality I am still having difficulty with it. You know, you are at sea, the boat is rolling, is it a best guess sort of thing?

LTJG LAM: It could be, I mean if you look at it and you can tell this is over four feet of freeboard. I think that is where that officer discretion that you are talking about comes into play. Absolutely, boarding officers are going to use officer discretion and if there is a gray area I am sure it would be a minor thing. It would come down to measuring and it would be based on the rest of the boarding as well; as in if there were other violations or what not and compliance of the master and the crew with the boarding.

MR. CURRIN: Well, in response I guess these guys are going to have to decide at some point which category they fit, so the charterboat owner is going to have to determine, probably at the dockside, what his freeboard is and whether that is loaded with fuel or with people on the boat or whatever and he is going to have to have an idea of what his classification is before he decides which set of equipment he is going to have to have.

LTJG LAM: Correct, and one classification is going to come at a much less expense than another classification, I am sure. You can see the issues there that could arise.

MR. CURRIN: If I might, I would just hate for somebody who has made a good faith effort at the dock to measure their freeboard and determine where they fit in this thing, and, of course, they've got some latitude to jerry rig it. If they are 4, 2 or 3, then they might add a little more fuel or a little more weight and say, yes, now I'm down to 4 and then if it gets out at sea and maybe they burn some fuel or whatever, and it is a close call. Again, I hope you guys will use some very lenient discretion on how they enforce this thing.

MR. PHILLIPS: I really don't want to delve in the weeds much, but I know some of these boats, like one of my boats has a tuna door in the back so it has got a six-inch freeboard back there; so if you've got a tuna board, I'm guessing that covers you, puts you below that; and the same thing for some of the charterboats.

MR. HARRIS: I would assume that the law enforcement officer doing the boarding is going to look at the vessel and look at whether they think an individual can safely release the turtle or smalltooth sawfish given the equipment that they have on board. If they feel like they can, I would assume they will be okay. That is an assumption, but that is what I would do if I was in a law enforcement officer boots. Okay, moving along to the next action item.

MS. MARTIN: We are going to move on to the EFH and EFH-HAPC actions in the document, and I will hand that over to Roger for an overview.

MR. HARRIS: Wait just a second. I have got an IPT recommendation here. Did we deal with that? Okay, never mind, moving right along.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay, if you move to PDF Page 142, Action 6 is amend the Snapper Grouper FMP and designation the new EFH-HAPCs. The council presently has Preferred Alternative 2 to designate one or more of the following EFH-HAPCs, and those would be the Subalternatives 2A. That would include Subalternative 2A, which designates EFH-HAPC for golden tilefish; Sub alternative 2B, designation of EFH-HAPC for blueline tilefish.

In addition the council has also selected a preferred alternative to designate EFH-HAPCs for snapper grouper complex to include the deepwater marine protected areas. Now we do have a clarification and action recommendation from NOAA GC that they recommend we reword the language under Alternative 3 to read:

“To designate EFH-HAPCs for the snapper grouper complex to include the following deepwater marine protected areas as designated in Snapper Grouper Amendment 14 which would include the snowy grouper, northern South Carolina, Edisto, Charleston Deep Artificial Reef, Georgia, North Florida, St. Lucie and East Hump MPAs.” So that is a recommendation that has been provided by NOAA GC.

MR. BOYLES: I would move that we adopt the NOAA GC recommended language for Preferred Alternative 3 as presented.

MR. HARRIS: There was a motion and seconded by Wilson. Discussion of the motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

MR. PUGLIESE: As I mentioned, those are the present preferred alternatives of the council unless there is other discussion or desired action we'll move forward to Action 7, which is on PDF Page 149, and Action 7 it is to amend the Coral FMP to designate new EFH-HAPCs. That would be to amend the Coral FMP to designate the deepwater coral HAPCs as EFH-HAPCs.

MR. HARRIS: We have a preferred alternative and there is no IPT recommendation?

MR. PUGLIESE: No additional.

MR. HARRIS: Any desire to revisit the preferred alternative? Seeing none, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Similar to the other suggestion I had, maybe on this preferred alternative, the deepwater coral HAPCs as specified under CE-BA 1 basically.

MR. PUGLIESE: So we could track that the same way, CE-BA 1 and list the names of the CHAPCs.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think that is good because there are a lot of different areas that are called either marine protected areas and there is HAPCs, there is all kind of things so I think the more specific you can get the better it will be.

MR. HARRIS: So without objection we will give staff the authority to provide the correct wording in there similar to the wording provided in the last alternative. Is that good enough?

MR. PUGLIESE: That moves us to Action 8 on PDF Page 155 and it is to amend the fishery management plan for pelagic sargassum to designate new EFH. **We did have an IPT recommendation to remove “new” from the language in the action because the Sargassum FMP was approved in 2003; however, the provisions proposing the designation of the EFH and HAPC were disapproved. The recommendation would just be to remove “new” from the action.**

MR. CUPKA: So moved.

MR. HARRIS: A motion, is there a second; second by Mac Currin. Discussion of the motion? Is there an objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

MR. PUGLIESE: The present preferred alternative is to amend the Sargassum FMP to designate the top ten meters of the water column of the South Atlantic EEZ bounded by the Gulf Stream as EFH for pelagic sargassum. Unless there are additional recommendations or comments, we move forward to Action 9.

MR. HARRIS: Any desire to revisit that preferred alternative? Seeing none, moving along.

MR. PUGLIESE: Moving to Page 159 of the PDF document, it is to amend the FMP for pelagic sargassum to designate EFH-HAPCs. The council at the last meeting, the committee and council had discussions and recommendations about taking no action as a preferred alternative, and there is an IPT recommendation to essentially just remove the action item to the considered rejected.

The rationale mainly was the fact that we have the same designations for snapper grouper for dolphin and wahoo that would take care of most of the commenting and really just gets to some of the consultations, et cetera. It would be duplication.

MR. HARRIS: **There is a motion by Mr. Haymans to accept the IPT recommendation under Action 9 to remove Action 9 to the considered but rejected appendix; second by Brian.** Discussion of the motion? Is there objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

MR. PUGLIESE: Those conclude the actions.

MR. HARRIS: That concludes the actions under CE-BA 2. Are we ready for a motion to recommend approval of CE-BA 2? Chairman Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: I would recommend or make a motion that we recommend to the council that they approve CE-BA 2 for secretarial action contingent upon the Gulf Council approving the pelagic restrictions in the South Carolina SMZ areas. That is kind of noisy and extended, but I think we need to somehow put that contingent on the Gulf Council taking appropriate action at their August meeting.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, is there a second to the motion; seconded by Brian. Discussion of the motion? The motion is to recommend to the full council approval of CE-BA 2 for submission to the Secretary with one contingency, and that is approval by the Gulf Council of the mackerel items under the SMZs of South Carolina. Further discussion of the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. What's next?

MS. MARTIN: I did want to pose a question; if the committee could consider editorial license to staff for cleaning up the document, correcting a few grammatical edits, I've already found again and we can go from there.

MR. HARRIS: **Is there a motion to give staff editorial license to fix minor issues within the document? Mac; seconded by Charlie.** Discussion of the motion? Objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's just I wanted to apologize. I'm sorry I missed that mackerel issue. I should have caught that before. I know we have a solution and all that but they could have approved it last week, so my apologies.

MR. HARRIS: There were lots of people that missed that.

MR. MAHOOD: There was lots of blame to go around there. We keep thinking that divorce was final because we don't talk about it anymore, but we are not divorced.

MR. HARRIS: Now do we need to review and approve the proposed rule? That is the next item on the agenda and you have the proposed rule before you. Is that the next item? Okay.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have a question for Anna. I printed out the codified text but I must have an older version. Is the proposed rule that is on the council's website; that has the freeboard definition in it?

MS. MARTIN: Yes, it should. The document and the briefing book has the definition kind of as a – at the front of the codified text.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, that is on Page 2 at least in the attachment. It says freeboard means the working distance between the top of the gunnels to the water surface and will vary based on the vessel design. I'm not sure though that still addresses the concerns that were raised earlier unless there is some definition of working distance here, because that would imply that the vessel is actively offshore I guess fishing and could be loaded or unloaded.

It still doesn't resolve that whole issue about how much weight you are going to put on there to determine where you fall, whether you are above four or below four. I don't know whether the Gulf has addressed that in their definitions or not. It seems like once you define freeboard, then you have to define working distance in this definition.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: On the other hand, working distance allows some flexibility in interpretation, so you might – if you wanted to keep this definition, and I'll talk with law enforcement after this committee adjourns to see whether this is adequate for their purposes. It does give plenty of flexibility from my point of view.

MR. HARRIS: **The Chair would entertain a motion to approve the proposed rule with guidance to staff to modify it as necessary or appropriate. Motion by Robert; seconded by Wilson.** Is there a discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Is there confusion as to what the motion is, Anna?

MS. MARTIN: I don't believe so.

MR. HARRIS: The motion was to approve the proposed rule as written but give guidance to staff to modify that proposed rule as necessary and/or appropriate.

MR. CUPKA: That the way we would deem it at the full council?

MR. HARRIS: Well, we will do that at full council. At full council we will deem it. Okay, is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Thank you all very much for that. Item 5 is an update on ecosystem activities; NOAA Deep Sea Coral Expedition, 'Extreme Corals 2011' Update. Anna.

MS. MARTIN: All right, thank you, Duane, I'll be brief. The "Extreme Corals 2011" trip is a 12-day research cruise currently underway sponsored by NOAA's Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program. They are currently in year three of three of research plan for activities in the South Atlantic.

This is all an overarching goal to better understand the location, distribution and health of coral and sponge ecosystems in the South Atlantic. This year they are aboard the NOAA Vessel Pisces. They are deploying an ROV to conduct video surveys and photo document some of these areas and also collect coral samples to assess use and biomedical application.

The focus area for the trip includes an area off of Jacksonville. That was discovered during one of the 2010 research cruises; also two of the HAPCs, the Miami Terrace and the Portales Terrace. They were also going to focus some of their dive sites in and around the fishery access areas.

MR. HARRIS: Questions for Anna? I like the idea of doing it off Jacksonville. Okay, seeing no questions, the next item is Item B under ecosystem activity updates. You have Attachments 5 through 16 in your briefing book. Roger, you are not going to go through all of those are you?

MR. PUGLIESE: No, and actually I apologize for putting so much out there, but there are so many critical documents and actions that happened that are converging at one time and that will be complementary and provide input, and I think it is important that council members have some of these very specific things in their hands to know how the details – a very short summary would not do justification for some of the materials that have been presented.

I'll just briefly touch on essentially what is being presented and then some of the convergences. One of the first areas that I had highlighted was the South Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative. I have been briefing the council on its continued development and refinement, development of a steering committee and then its connection into the climate centers.

That continues to move forward. What is happening now is that there is a very significant effort to build an optimization strategy for landscape, which in their interpretation it is basically from all the way interior to off into the deep ocean systems. This connects directly with the climate science centers.

Some of the capabilities of us inserting our needs for fisheries, fish habitat, into that whole effort are coming together at one time. The one good thing is that there are resources. While NOAA has dropped pretty much most of their climate science analysis, the centers are still funded through DOI and USGS, so we do have an opportunity to tap in on some of the expertise to connect some of these longer-term analysis and to highlight how the fisheries and fish information is important and connected to the system.

One of the documents provided is also the SERAP, the Southeast Regional Assessment Project, and that is part of this whole broader scope of looking at the whole assessment and then beginning to build that connection into the system. The Landscape Conservation Cooperative, as I mentioned, one of the biggest things now is to continue to tap in on other aspects of information to integrate into the system and to move forward with that optimization strategy.

Working with our additional partners, the Southeast Aquatic Resource Partnership, that is one of the partnerships that has developed under the National Fish Habitat Plan. I have provided both the details on the 2010 review of activities by the SARP partnership and it is a pretty important effort. It was one of the first ones organized. It is achieving the needs of the National Fish Habitat Assessment.

It is very much linked into activities that are meeting what maybe the council cannot meet in our area with resources and providing resources to directly look at conservation and preservation of aquatic habitat through monies that come down through the national program as well as one of the real collaborations as an effort in in-stream flow activities through the Southeast In-Stream Flow Network, which is under SARP now.

What we were able to do was to leverage the previously mentioned South Atlantic Landscape Conservation Resources to enhance and expand the efforts through the southeast region. We have this partnership, the ability to begin to build those and water flow, in-stream flow and its affect on habitat distribution, species population, migration, all that has been highly identified as an important topic under a habitat plan, an ecosystem plan, our partners in the southeast.

It is a real opportunity to have this convergence of different programs addressing which was one of the most significant activities and issues that the states and our region has to deal with. One of the other really important programs that is under SARP is the NOAA Community-Based Restoration Program.

That, to a great degree, is actually on the ground providing resources to fund and implement restoration projects. Most of these have done – they have been done in six states and are addressing marine areas, estuarine habitats, a lot of significant oyster habitats. We are building the case about the importance of those to council-managed species like gag and other species in our region.

That is a real opportunity to implement again what we may be able to do at the council level through our collaborations and partnerships with the existing regions. As I mentioned, that is connected to our national habitat, the National Habitat Plan that right now there is a board that oversees that. Bob Mahood represents the councils, all the councils on that overall board.

Their action plan is under review for revision. I have been tasked to work on the writing group that is going to readdress that, and I think one of the big things is to make sure that the marine environment and the areas that we cover, habitats and species are more fully represented in that effort.

I think that is a real opportunity again to connect directly into that system. What also is included was the first National Habitat Assessment that was provided. That document itself actually analyzes the entire country and mainly focuses on river and estuarine analysis. The intent is that it is supposed to expand and cover essentially all fish habitats looking toward into the marine system and making bigger connections has been identified as a critical need.

Moving on beyond that, our continued work with the development of a South Atlantic Governors' Alliance; the refinement of that with the next step as I think mentioned earlier efforts was the development of an implementation plan that highlighted the specific areas of concern and priority issues areas.

That draft is actually – the executive summary is approved, the draft is moving forward and that is actually in review. There are opportunities again to link directly with efforts that the council works on with our partners at the states and other partners under the organization. One thing that I included was a structure of the overall alliance action structure.

There is some revision to include not only – the way it exists right now is you have the executive group, which are essentially the governors; you have the steering group, which is the designees; and then you have this executive planning team that has been coordinating in the background the continued evolution of this process.

There was also a revision to create a legislative arm that had the state members and then had partner and federal groups participating directly in that kind of core group. It is actually operationalizing this group. As it stands, we've have got a chair and a co-chair designated for

the federal group, and then the partner group we had Nature Conservancy step forward as a chair of that. I have also been connected in as an alternate.

We have a direct line into the continued evolution of this implementation plan and then into the future of where the governors' alliance is moving forward. That brings us into our collaborations with SECOORA. I included some documents that have just been created for SECOORA, The Southeast Coastal Ocean Observing Regional Association.

There are state-specific flyers on identifying how the ocean-observing information is being used at your individual state. In addition, the 2011 planning document which highlights how we are already going to have some opportunity to begin to look at fisheries and remote sensing activities and begin to set the stage for that move toward integration of ocean-observing information and the stock assessment, so it very specifically has that as a line item task and a funded project that is identified.

The last couple of quick points were the SEAMAP program; I still chair the SEAMAP Committee in the South Atlantic, and one of the good things to report on is that the South Atlantic DNR is now going to be the oversight group for the entire SEAMAP Data Management System.

An individual has been hired to manage the entire system, and the vision that we had was that this was also going to connect all of the fishery-independent activities under MARMAP, under potentially all the – where the states could be brought in, the Albemarle/Pamlico Sound Surveys and other surveys as they began to be developed.

This is moving forward as an operational document to implement and an individual is coming on board literally within weeks. The last thing I was going to touch on was the EFH activities and ecosystem tools. We did get word the other day that I think I highlighted before that and I think Miles Croom distributed to the council, that for the first time the Southeast Region actually received some essential fish habitat monies to enhance what is called an ecospecies section that begins to operationalize some very detailed information on species-specific information that can be continually updated.

The vision there is to connect it in with our GIS information but also ultimately provide input and capability to connect with our SEDAR process in the long term. That is actually in process at getting refined and working with our partners, the FWRI, and their subcontract is to get this implemented and actually refine this. This meets some very specific requests from the five-year review for EFH, so there is a real opportunity to go beyond. They were looking at species-specific habitat assessments. This could be an actual operationalized and more useful tool than 50 individual documents.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, just a quick question, will that also help get us closer to looking at something that truly is ecosystem management?

MR. PUGLIESE: Well, having the opportunity to begin to connect it, I think in its larger vision – when we had done this, I think it would have probably gone further to get there to then I think

the springboard from this then is to really truly look at how you connect into ecosystem models and prey and predator interactions and that whole – we need to get additional resources.

To note, this is the first time that door has been open; so with the right additional justification, I think we can expand to meet those; to everybody is moving toward ecosystem management prey opportunity. With this line item for the southeast, we can keep that beyond one-year funding to get there.

I think we need to get to – especially we are kind of converging. With all the mandates under Magnuson and allocations and specific targets and more assessments, there are a lot better inputs into those types of efforts and to at least give the scope of where things are going to go in the future.

Our ecosystem tool, the only comment I was going to make about that is that we do have continued developing of our GIS capabilities. The next vision I think is potentially a data dashboard which would ultimately have linkages. Our jump page right now would then change and have linkages to EFH, to regulations. One of the newest developing ones will be on ocean energy.

We have the opportunity to work closely with our partners at the states that are moving forward in the task force, with Bomer, and with all the information systems that were already built for fisheries that we are connecting and provide that in a more uniform way. It also would potentially provide linkages to a lot of these different assessments that are moving forward, information that is moving forward and research efforts.

We built a research component that is supposed to connect all these different activities and provide information on them as well as who is doing them and where they are going on. So with that, that is the update on our ecosystem coordination assessment.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Roger. Are there questions for Roger? No questions for Roger, okay, moving along to other business; is there other business to come before this committee? .

MR. CUPKA: I just wanted to briefly mention this. This Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning, this has received a lot of discussion at our CCC meetings the last couple of meetings. This process is on a fast track. Originally it looked like the councils weren't even going to get an opportunity to be involved, which kind of amazed everybody since obviously when they start talking about special planning offshore it is going to have impacts on our council activities.

The CCC wrote a letter to the head of this group kind of complaining that we weren't being included; and as a result each council now I think has been invited to send one member to a big workshop they are having this month up in D.C. and Duane has agreed to represent the South Atlantic Council at that workshop.

What a lot of the councils are trying to do is to get involved through these regional planning bodies and it looks like for the South Atlantic that probably the South Atlantic Governors' Alliance hopefully will shape up to be the regional planning body in our area. I think, Robert,

you are on that or involved with it, and so the council will have some representation on that. I think we will find out more after this workshop and look forward to a report back by Duane. We appreciate your willingness to go attend that and represent us at that workshop, Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, and Robert will be there as well, won't you, Robert?

MR. BOYLES: Actually, no, I have actually got a conflict with the DNR Board Meeting but we will have staff there. Along those lines, Mr. Chairman, we have had a number of briefings. State agency folks had an opportunity to sit down with NOAA's Director of Officer Policy and my sense of things is it is a very awkward arrangement.

My sense of things is that a lot of this coastal marine special planning effort is being designed to I think favorably get a lot of the other marine and maritime interests up to where the fisheries interests have been. I think the regional fishery management process is I guess probably in its adolescence, we should say. This other CMSP effort maybe is more in its infancy.

I think there is a lot of concern and a lot of misunderstanding. We've been involved with the Southeast Governors Alliance. I know Doug and Spud have been heavily involved with that as well. There is a lot of storming going on right now as we try to figure a path forward. I think a lot will be revealed at the workshop next week, I believe it is in D.C. We are waiting with bated breath.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to mention that I have been asked by our Southeast Region's Climate Science Team or whatever the right name is to give them a presentation on June the 24th that deals with how the councils and the interstate commissions as well as other fishery management institutions are dealing with climate change.

I have discussed with Roger and collaborating on him and also will touch base with Bonnie, too, to make sure that I have included any information about NOAA's programs relative to fisheries. The one thing I've told them already is that the council is well aware that some of the species they are now managing that are largely restricted to their area of jurisdiction are moving north and that the council is already dealing with that issue at least from a jurisdictional perspective.

If anybody has any information they want me to include in that presentation, feel free to send me an e-mail or grab me during the council meeting. Also I'll mention one other thing, too, since everybody is here, and that is the Science and Technical Advisory Committee of the Albemarle/Pamlico National Estuary Program, which I co-chair, has written an issue paper and made a recommendation to the policy board for that NEP that they expand the boundaries of that NEP to include all the area that is above Roanoke Rapids Dam up into Virginia and also includes coastal ocean waters out to three miles to at least encompass state jurisdiction.

It makes sense to the STAC that if you are trying to develop an ecosystem-based management plan for an estuary you should include the boundaries of that system at an appropriate scale. In the past they weren't included; they were sort of truncated at the first dam on the Roanoke due largely to political reasons.

There was a water war going on between Virginia and North Carolina at the time, so that is why it was truncated in the past and we recommended that they revise the boundaries accordingly. I'll keep you posted on how that discussion goes.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you. Has everybody seen this document? It is in your briefing book as well and then it is out there on the table. This has to do with Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning and the decades of knowledge that the regional fishery management councils have with respect to that. Each council has a page in there. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: I wanted to follow up a little bit on what David said. We are kind of caught in the situation we get caught on in a number of cases is what are the councils? The councils have been making a very strong push with the NOC, the National Ocean Commission, to be included and have a seat on the regional planning boards.

They are hitting us with this, well, we can't do that because there is a FACA issue with you guys being involved. I guess it is just an executive order; there is no legislation that spells out federal, state and tribal representation, of which we don't fall into any of those. We are making a strong point that we are the people with spatial planning experience obviously as well as NOAA Fisheries and other components of NOAA.

And whether or not we'll prevail or not, it is like one of these things that I don't know if we've come on so strongly we've scared them. It took us about, I don't know, Kim, not too long to put this document together to show them the experience the councils have had. We are hoping at this workshop that we'll make some headway.

To me it is basically a policy decision of whether we participate or not. The CCC had a subcommittee that dealt with NEPA. We were able to sit down with federal fisheries folks and talk about NEPA and the NEPA rule and work on a plan. The policy there was that, yes, the CCC's standing under the Act gave them the ability to be exempt from NEPA when dealing with FACA when dealing with NOAA on the NEPA issues. We are making a strong push. We are running into a lot of resistance from the current staff of the NOC.

We are sending some good people up to the workshop, so hopefully they will be able to make some headway with what we are trying to accomplish, but we won't know. Again, we are in that category of nonentity really when it comes to state, federal or Indian.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, just to connect you into that, I did provide the flyer as well as some of the correspondence for this briefing book, but also made sure that a lot of these materials were provided directly to the entire group organizing and working on the Governors' Alliance so that all the different levels understand the commitment of the council and what is going on.

I think that there was enough representation there that didn't even have a clue about what is going on, that it was really important. I think Carolyn Boltin-Kelly, the chairman of the EPT, had forwarded even further up through different chains into the governors and et cetera. I think at least the message is there about the commitment of the councils and the responsibility and what the councils have involved.

MR. BOYLES: Mr. Chairman, just another note. I guess this is a line from Cool Hand Luke. I think what we have got here is a failure to communicate. I mean, that is what I think kind of characterizes kind of how we are all bumping up into one another. I know in the Southeast Governors' Alliance, when we were talking about forming this as an explicit decision to not deal with fisheries issues; not because fisheries issues weren't important but because the councils and the commissions had already had fisheries issues well in hand. I think from my perspective from the Governors Alliance it is not a – I guess it was intended to be an omission, not a sin of commission to not even deal with fisheries issues because we are doing such a great job with it.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, and just for your information in the briefing book is a letter from the Nature Conservancy supporting the council's position with respect to the regional planning bodies.

We do have some outside support getting the councils appointed to these regional planning bodies. Okay, other business to come before the committee? Anna, anything else? Timing and task motion; we know what is to be done before we submit to the Secretary CE-BA 2. Any need to specify that?

MS. MARTIN: I don't believe so unless you all feel necessary.

MR. HARRIS: I don't think so either. Well, if there is no other business to come before the committee, we stand adjourned. Thank you all very much.

DR. CRABTREE: Can I give you a heads-up on something while we have a minute. I've gotten notice that the final rule for Regulatory Amendment 9 will file June 14, which is tomorrow and publish on June 15. You recall Regulatory Amendment 9 had black sea bass bag limit reduction, a number of trip limits and some other things.

Most of the trip limits will become effective 30 days after publication but the bag limit reduction will become affective 7 days after publication. We need to do what we can; and if any of you state folks can help us get the word out on that. Well, it is going to publish on the 15th, so 7 days after that; exactly what date that is, Jack, do you know right off the top of your head? We'll have to figure it out.

There was one measure in the rule which was not approved. That is the measure for a split commercial season. Recall it had a quota for the June to November commercial season and then a larger quota for the December/May commercial season. We got a number of comments on that that raised concerns about right whales.

The net result of that split season likely would have been more trapping activity in the right whale calving season. That portion of it was disapproved until we give a more careful look at the interactions with right whales and how the pros and cons and whether we want to deal with that.

Procedurally that posed a real difficulty for me as well because in order to have moved forward with the rulemaking, we would have to have done a formal biological opinion, which the way

things are now would have likely taken four months. There was some urgency to get particularly the bag limit reduction in place.

So it may be that if you want to proceed with the split season, you can do that but we need to deal with the right whale issues and factor in the time that it is going to take for the biological opinion. As we move forward over the course of the fall, there are a lot of things happening. We've got Amendment 18, which has provisions in it to limit entry in the sea bass fishery and limit the number of traps fishermen can use and some other things.

We also have a sea bass assessment that is under way now and I think will be presented to us at our December meeting. I know everyone is hoping that we are going to get some good news from the assessment and we will be able to raise the black sea bass quotas at that time. I think if that is the case, there is going to be some urgency to do that very quickly.

We need to probably in snapper grouper, when we talk about all of this, think about how all of this fits together because the net effect of raising the quotas will also be to extend fishing into potentially the right whale calving season. If we are going to get in a position where we want to move quickly in December, we need to try and have the biological opinion essentially done by then.

Amendment 18 plays into all of this because while extending fishing more into the right whale season potentially increases potential for interaction with the right whale, reducing the number of fishermen through limited entry, reducing the number of traps, requiring that traps be brought in at night potentially will reduce the potentials for right whale interactions.

All these things are interconnected. I think we need to give some careful thought to how we put all these pieces together so that we don't get to the December meeting and want to raise the quota and then we are told it is going to take four months to do a Right Whale Consultation. That is what I wanted to make everyone aware of, David.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Roy. Questions for Roy? Mark.

MR. ROBSON: Roy, could you just repeat those dates on the publishing and the actions.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, it will file tomorrow, June 14, and it will publish on June 15. The bag limit reduction will go into effect seven days after that, which we think is the 22nd. Then the remaining measures will go in place, I'm guessing it is around July 14 or so for the trip limits. We will have a copy of the published rule Wednesday, I guess, that we can distribute to all of them which will have the official dates.

MR. SWATZEL: Just to follow up what Roy was saying, I know that we will probably talk about this in snapper grouper, but there is also the looming issue of recreational black sea bass in the fact that the bag limit reduction probably won't get us past March maybe in terms of another closure and the things that we might be able to do to prevent that based on 18 or based on the assessment, so just keeping that in mind, too.

MR. BURGESS: Yes, getting back to the whale issue and the split season, I attended a Large Whale Take Reduction Team Meeting in April in Baltimore of the Mid-Atlantic and Southeast Subgroup as they describe it. This was brought up at the meeting and there were concerns raised by members of the group.

There was a paper written on the final outcomes of that meeting and I would like to read you a sentence on how this was addressed at the meeting, or a paragraph on how this was addressed at the meeting. It will just take a minute.

“The subgroup broadly endorsed a trigger’s consequence approach as a possible management strategy in the southeast for addressing both new and emerging fisheries and current fisheries that had a large whale entanglement that resulted in a serious injury or mortality. However, as noted earlier there were divergent views regarding both the triggers and consequences.

“Some subgroup members expressed interest in offshore vertical line caps as a way to reduce vertical line risk. But, again, there was no consensus on this point. Additional discussions are needed on this topic.” Now, the trigger that is associated with a serious injury or mortality is all subgroup members strongly endorse expedited analysis by the National Marine Fisheries Service at three levels; 1, serious injury determination; 2, gear identification; and 3, fishery identification.

So this is a concern of the Large Whale Take Reduction Team. It is on the table and they are going to address this further and discuss it. Vertical lines are what is being discussed by the team. There will be another full team meeting possibly in October is what I am thinking and this will be discussed further. Again, I am still an industry representative on the team, not a council representative, and I just wanted to let you know what was being discussed.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Tom; other questions or comments? Seeing none, then why don’t we go ahead and break for lunch and come back at 1:00 o’clock rather than 1:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 o’clock a.m., June 13, 2011.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
June 2011

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2010 - 2011 Council Membership


COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

COUNCIL VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Handwritten list of names:
Rick DeVictor
Nik Mehta
Nick Farmer
Otha Easley
Capt. Cheslum Frampton
Jack McGovern
Bonnie Bonwith
Jessica McCawley
Monica Smit Brunello
Bob Gill
Mike Travis 3

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2010-2011 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Mark Robson, Vice-chair
Robert Boyles
Brian Chevront
Roy Crabtree
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Tom Swatzel, Chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
Brian Chevront
Roy Crabtree
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Red Munden Mid-Atlantic Council
New England Council Rep
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

- ✓ Duane Harris, Chair
 - ✓ Robert Boyles
 - ✓ Tom Burgess
 - ✓ Brian Chevront
 - ✓ Roy Crabtree
 - ✓ David Cupka
 - ✓ Mac Currin
 - ✓ George Geiger
 - ✓ Ben Hartig
 - ✓ Doug Haymans
 - ✓ Wilson Laney
 - ✓ Charlie Phillips
 - ✓ Mark Robson
 - ✓ Tom Swatzel
- Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Anna Martin- Comp. Ecosystem-based
Amendment

EXECUTIVE

David Cupka, Chair
Brian Chevront, Vice-Chair
Robert Boyles
Mac Currin
Duane Harris
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

FINANCE

David Cupka, Chair
Mark Robson, Vice-Chair
Brian Chevront
Duane Harris
Mac Currin
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

David Cupka, Chair
Mac Currin
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Mark Robson
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact:
Gregg Waugh / Kate Quigley

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION

Mark Robson, Chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
Wilson Laney
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

David Cupka, Chair
Tom Burgess
Brian Chevront
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Matthew Lam
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Duane Harris
Mark Robson
Matthew Lam
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

George Geiger, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Tom Burgess
Mac Currin
Brian Chevront
Duane Harris
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Mark Robson
Tom Swatzel
Red Munden, Mid-Atlantic
Representative
Staff contact:
Gregg Waugh / Kari MacLauchlin

LAW ENFORCEMENT

George Geiger, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Robert Boyles
Duane Harris
Ben Hartig
Matthew Lam
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

CATCH SHARES

Brian Chevront, Chair
Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
George Geiger
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact:
Kate Quigley / Kari MacLauchlin

PERSONNEL

Robert Boyles, Chair
David Cupka
Brian Chevront
Duane Harris
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair
Doug Haymans
Mark Robson
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Roy Crabtree, Chair
Robert Boyles
Brian Chevront
Doug Haymans
Mark Robson
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR Committee

David Cupka, Chair
George Geiger, Vice-Chair
Brian Chevront
Duane Harris
Ben Hartig
Vince O'Shea
Mark Robson
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: John Carmichael

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

✓ **Executive Director**

Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

✓ **Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

✓ **Assistant Public Information Officer**

Andrea Grabman
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

✓ **Senior Fishery Biologist**

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Staff Economist

Kathryn (Kate) Quigley
kate.quigley@safmc.net

✓ **Science and Statistics Program Manager**

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

✓ **Coral Reef Scientist**

Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Biologist**

Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

✓ **Fisheries Social Scientist**

Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Kari Fenske - kari.fenske@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@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/Adm. Assistant**

Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

SEDAR/ Staff Administrative Assistant

Rachael Silvas
rachael.silvas@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

Please sign in so that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting, and so that your name may be included in the minutes.

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

June 13, 2011
Key West, FL 33040

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

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

32120-9351

32303

28472

28409

28516

POB-501404

33070

129 REQUESTA

Charleston, SC

386-239-0948

850-322-7845

910-685-5705

910-599-5245

919-451-6591

305-619-0039

905-304-4179

919-601-8818

Rushy Pugh
ASIF

Holly Binos, Pres

Sandra Krenovak Pres

Dick Brave

KATE LATANICA

Bill Kelly

BARBARA KELLY

Eileen Dougherty

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