

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE

**Doubletree by Hilton New Bern/Riverfront
New Bern, North Carolina**

December 4, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

Executive Finance Committee:

Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips
Mel Bell

Dr. Michelle Duval, Vice-Chair
Jessica McCawley

Council Members:

Jack Cox
Mark Brown
Doug Haymans
Anna Beckwith

Zack Bowen
Dr. Wilson Laney
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Myra Brouwer

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Amber Von Harten
Dr. Mike Errigo
Chip Collier
Dr. Brian Chevront

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Pres Pate
Tracy Dunn

Kevin Anson
Phil Steele
Dr. Jack McGovern

Additional Observers Attached

The Executive Finance Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Grand Ballroom of the Doubletree by Hilton New Bern/Riverfront, New Bern, North Carolina, December 4, 2014, and was called to order at 1:57 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: I would like to convene the Executive Finance Committee. The first order of business is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Bob, do you have anything that you thought we might need to do additionally to what is on our current agenda?

MR. MAHOOD: I do not for this; full council, maybe.

MR. HARTIG: Is there any objection to approving the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved. The next one is approval of the June 2014 Executive Finance Committee minutes. Are there any changes, deletions, corrections to the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. That brings us to status of the current year 2014 budget expenditures, Bob. That is behind Attachment 1.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Chairman, everybody I assume has had time to look at that. It basically is the format we follow to determine where we are throughout the year. One issue that came up; this is the last of our five-year grant. The council has requested NMFS that we be allowed to carry some money forward into the new five-year grant.

We do that with what is called a grant extension for you that work in the states and deal with grants. We have extended our 2014 grant into I think the first six months of 2015. Right now we are looking at somewhere around \$251,000; give or take \$100,000 or whatever. Well, we just don't know the last couple meetings what the costs are going to be.

It is going to probably be around the \$300,000 range or something like that we'll be able to carry forward. We'll utilize that to finish projects or amendments that were started during 2014. We are allowed to do that. It is pretty self-explanatory. If anybody has any specific questions, Mike or I will be glad to address them.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions of Bob concerning the budget? Is there anything that jumped out at you, Bob, as far as expenditures go? I breezed through it; I didn't see anything that was glaring.

MR. MAHOOD: No, not really.

MR. HARTIG: I didn't see anything. All right, we don't need any action with that one. Gregg is here to address follow-up and priorities, Attachment 2.

MR. WAUGH: Attachment 2 has our regional operations, schedules and deliverables. I am not going to go through that in any detail. I will call your attention to PDF Page 106. That is where we list your 2014 priorities and timing. You can look along there and see which we have accomplished. We accomplished the vast majority of them; some have carried over. You will see those on the sheet that we have that was e-mailed; and Julie is going to distribute a hard copy to each council member now and we'll go through that in a second.

MR. MAHOOD: One thing I meant to say when I started talking about the next five-year budget; we have gotten word that we need to go ahead and get that in. We have been given a map for the first year, level funded with 2014 funding. Then we've been instructed to add 10 percent per year for the next four years after the first year.

Now it would be nice to have a 40 percent increase in our budget in the next five years; we don't really think it is going to happen. Really, we do the budgeting based on activities more than the dollars, because we get what we get from Congress and through the National Marine Fisheries Service.

What we put in our budget doesn't really mean much as far as the dollars go. We will be doing that; and Mike and I have already started working on that. We should have it finished early this next week. Then we'll send it on through the magic of grants.gov for approval. Nobody knows when we're going to get an actual budget this year. Hopefully, we'll get one this year, we'll see.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that; it is always good to be updated on how we're moving forward.

MR. WAUGH: In terms of that priority sheet; I will walk through and just brief you on what is in each of these amendments. What we want you to do is indicate on the columns on the right – there is a high, medium and a low – either put a check or an X in each of those. We want you to rank all of the amendments, even those that are below this line for 2016.

Remember, we just talked about Mackerel Amendment 24, moving that below the line in 2016. That will be something coming up in 2016. We want you to rank those as well. That first column shows the 2014 priorities. You can see the ones that didn't get completed during 2014; they show up on here again.

The new ones are Amendment 37; so let's start at the top, 36 is spawning SMZs. We talked about that in snapper grouper. The system management plan for our Snapper Grouper Amendment 14, MPAs; and then Snapper Grouper Amendment 37, which would be the short-term items from visioning.

This is where we had intended to address the hogfish assessment results and deal with those changes that we wanted to look at in the jacks' complex. Then Snapper Grouper Amendment 38 would deal with allocations from visioning. Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16, removing the black sea bass pot closure; then the Joint South Atlantic Gulf of Mexico Charterboat Reporting Amendment. We'll talk about that some in the Data Committee later on today.

But we have the final report from the Charterboat Tech Committee, and that is a joint amendment we'll work on in 2015. In the Fishery Ecosystem Plan, we are in the process of updating that. That is the first update; that is mandated to be updated every five years, and we're running a little bit behind on that one.

Snapper Grouper Amendment 22 is a recreational tag program to track harvest; you talked about that in Snapper Grouper. Then the three mackerel amendments, we just talked about. The ones that were added in 2014, after we did our ranking, was Snapper Grouper Amendment 35, which is removing species and the golden tile endorsement, which we talked about.

Then the Joint South Atlantic/Gulf Amendment for South Florida Issues, which we will go through in a moment. Then items below the line, we are moving the Mackerel Amendment 24 down there. The golden crab amendment to modify allowable fishing areas; we're having an AP meeting in January, and we may get a recommendation to look at that.

Roy wanted us to add on the list a snapper grouper amendment to update the wreckfish ITQ program. We have a joint South Atlantic/Gulf of Mexico Generic Commercial Logbook Amendment. That was on hold pending the pilot project. Any shrimp closure work. that really shouldn't be a lot now because we've got that pretty much automated.

Then hanging out there is still a Calico Scallop FMP. We've made several runs at that but harvest comes and goes. Again, just put a check by high, medium or low for each of these and rank all of them. Then what I will do, if you give them to me, I will collate that and then we'll have the rankings attached to the Executive Finance report; and you'll look at this at full council. Are there any questions about what is on the list?

MR. PHILLIPS: I see we have calicos on here. At some point in time we might want to start taking a look at what is going on with the jellyball industry; the fact that seems to be growing and how it is going to affect fisheries, habitat, turtles, and things like that. Again, it is not on here, but I think we just need to keep that in our mind on a back burner, something we may want to look at.

MR. BREWER: In looking at the 2014 priorities; am I correct in assuming that the higher the number, the higher the priority?

MR. WAUGH: No, the opposite; the lower the number is the higher priority. Don't pay a lot of attention to those priorities from 2014. What you need to do is just check for each one, whether you think it is a high, a medium, or a low; put a checkmark in one of those columns. Then what I will do is we tally these; and ones that are ranked high get a score of three, ones that are ranked medium get a score of two, ones that are ranked low get a score of one. Then, indeed, the highest number there is the highest priority; but then what we do is put them in numerical order with one being the highest priority and go down the list.

MR. HAYMANS: Why do you have the ranking on our right side?

MR. WAUGH: Because I am going to fill that in. That is going to be the ranking that you see when it is attached to the report; so just ignore that column.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, you are going to do that?

MR. WAUGH: Yes. It is based on everybody's ranking. All you have to do is put a check for each one of these in the high, the medium, or the low column and you are done. We did a practice run on this with the staff. We'll see how you do versus what we thought. Again, we'll tally this up and then it will be attached to the Executive Finance Committee Report.

MR. HARTIG: Do you want to go to update on the Joint South Florida Committee, Attachment 3?

MR. WAUGH: This committee met in July and we're scheduled to meet again in January. We've been working on a document. This was e-mailed out to you on Friday. What I wanted to do is just walk through this, similar to what we do in the SEDAR Committee where we provide Ben and Bob some direction, so that when they go to the Steering Committee they have some direction.

It is the same way our Mackerel Committee works in terms of joint meetings with the Gulf in spiny lobster. We're not looking for any decisions here today. We just want to go through and let you know what is in the document and what we're going to be talking about. If there is any guidance you want to have, you can stop as we're going along and provide guidance to the Executive Committee. They are the ones that will be meeting jointly with the Gulf.

The rough timing is that we are aiming to have the two councils approve this document for public hearings during the June meeting when we're both meeting across the street from each other in Key West in June. I put this together with input from Jack, Kari, Doug, and Ryan. Then there was some disagreement over what was in here.

We didn't have verbatim minutes to use. We had a report that was written afterwards. We at the staff level had some disagreements over what was in there. I got with Jessica and Martha and we resolved, at least to their satisfaction, the wording of these actions. There is one that we added here.

On the version that you got it is shown at the bottom of Page 1; but the first action is modifications to the fishery management plans of the two councils. We're trying to structure this in a way that the first thing we deal with is, okay, what species are we going to remove; how are we going to handle the species?

No action, of course, is keeping all the species in. Alternative 2 would delegate management of any species listed below to the state of Florida. Now, this committee has worked several meetings on this document. We started out with a lot more species in here and have removed some; and so now what we're considering for potential delegation to the state of Florida would be black grouper, mutton snapper, and yellowtail snapper.

The idea here is this would be a total delegation of management to the state of Florida. Alternative 3, which is the one we had difficulty figuring out how to word and there may be some more modifications to this; but it would read "manage each stock as a single unit with the overall combined multi-jurisdictional ABC".

The two councils would agree on an ABC for black, mutton, and yellowtail, and then how we specify the ACLs would be handled in a separate action. Then we renumbered the remaining alternatives. Alternative 4 would remove any of these three species from the reef fish and snapper grouper fishery management plans.

By removing them from the plan, then Florida could manage those same three species. Alternative 5 would remove any of those species from the reef fish fishery management plan of the Gulf Council and request the secretary designate the South Atlantic Council as the responsible council. Again, that would apply to those same three species.

MR. HAYMANS: Excuse me, Gregg; it was going to be e-mailed, and I am looking for that e-mail. I haven't had a chance to look at this. When was it e-mailed?

MR. WAUGH: It was in that Friday e-mail that Mike sent out. You don't have this yellow Alternative 3. That was shown on the bottom of Page 1 as a possible new alternative, but the wording is a little different. Alternative 3 in yellow is a new one to the version that you have, but it is based on the wording that was shown at the bottom of Page 1 of the document that you have as possible new alternative.

Again, this is a range of alternatives for handling these three species. Depending on what alternative is chosen here; then you go on to a species-by-species look at these three different species. Alternative 2 would deal with delegating just the commercial and recreational management of yellowtail snapper to the state of Florida.

We've got that split so that Alternative 2 would allow the state of Florida to determine the recreational management actions, and we're limiting it to these – 2A would be size limit; 2B, seasons; 2C, bag limits; 2D, minor modifications to existing allowable gear; and 2E, fishing year changes.

Alternative 3 would determine specific commercial management items; let Florida do those. There was some concern expressed by some of the public input. They were more comfortable with having Florida set recreational regulations but perhaps not commercial. That gives the council some flexibility to do that.

Then Alternative 3 would deal with how we handle the allocation; again, yellowtail snapper annual catch limits and creating a bycatch allowance for the other states. For these species there is some harvest off of other states; so our guidance was to come up with an alternative that would cover a bycatch allowance in those other states.

But the ACL, since the vast majority of the harvest is off the state of Florida, then we would specify an ACL that would apply to catches in Florida waters and the EEZ off of Florida. Alternative 2 will use both councils agreed upon ABC for yellowtail snapper and allocate commercial and recreational ACLs for the Gulf and South Atlantic – and this is in addition after talking with Jessica and Martha – off Florida.

This just clarifies, because the subalternatives deal with off of Florida. So 2A would use the South Atlantic Council's current sector allocation formula; 2B would base the allocations for waters off Florida on the average of landings from 2008 through 2012. The IPT may suggest some additional alternatives to be examined also.

We got some interest in looking at additional alternatives. Alternative 2 uses our allocation methodology. Alternative 3 would use the council's agreed-upon ABC and use the current ABC jurisdictional split, 75 percent of the ABC for the South Atlantic Council waters/25 percent for the Gulf. Then the Gulf sector allocations would be derived from one of the options below. The subsequent Gulf and South Atlantic sector allocations would be combined to create sector allocations off Florida.

Florida doesn't have sector allocations for yellowtail; so this alternative would establish those for the Gulf and then we would combine them. Again, 3A is using the South Atlantic's current sector allocation formula. It should be 3B; the sector allocations for waters off of Florida using the average of 2008 through 2012 and then possible other years.

MR. BREWER: Excuse me for asking this question, but why would not one of the alternatives with regard to allocation be to set it up according to OY?

MR. WAUGH: Well, we have OY in here. For the most part, we've set ACL equal to ABC equal to OY. I think that is done for all of these species, so that is encompassed in the specification of ABC and ACL. That is in there.

MR. BREWER: My question was specific to allocations.

MR. WAUGH: Jessica has something.

MS. McCAWLEY: Let me see if I can explain, and maybe this is going to answer your question; the South Atlantic Council has a lot of allocations between commercial and recreational but the Gulf doesn't have them. You have to figure out if the council is going to tell Florida what the allocation is.

You have to figure out how to take the portion that is given to the South Atlantic and the portion that is given to the Gulf and figure out commercial and recreational between them. That is where these formulas are coming from. Part of it is taking into account the fact that the Gulf doesn't have commercial and recreational splits for most of their species.

MR. WAUGH: Are you getting at instead of using landings use something else?

MR. BREWER: I'm getting at the overall thought that allocations should be based upon OY as opposed to historic landings, in my opinion.

MR. WAUGH: Right. I don't know that we talked about that in a lot of detail with this group. It has been discussed a lot when our council was developing sector allocations. We looked at that; the economic data are not sufficient or were not sufficient at the time we developed our allocations to look at something like that. What we've tried to do here for the most part is use allocation formulas or splits that are in use now either by one of the councils or the other council to try to minimize the amount of delay in preparing this amendment.

MR. BREWER: If it was from the standpoint of a delay, then I understand exactly why you did what you did.

MR. HARTIG: One other thing, Chester, we're going to take up that whole allocation scenario. Well, we'll actually set up a timeline to do that after we come back from visioning. We're going to have that discussion.

MR. WAUGH: Then in terms of a bycatch allowance that would apply to the other states, Alternative 4 would create a bycatch allowance for the other Gulf and other South Atlantic

states; and 4A would adjust the ABC by 1 percent to address bycatch off the other states. Option 4B would adjust it by 2 percent.

Where those numbers come from is looking at the actual harvest data; it has ranged between 1 and 2 percent over the years. The 2 percent would cover the maximum that has been caught or landed off of the other states combined. This is a way to focus our quota monitoring on the state of Florida where the bulk of these species are caught.

Then similar to what we did with blueline tile for the Mid-Atlantic area, just set aside a portion of the ABC and the ACL to account for that expected harvest. That would need to be monitored over the years just to make sure that landings are staying below that. If it is not, then we'll have to make some adjustment.

Again, this is for yellowtail snapper and you will see the same thing applied for mutton. Then Action 4 is to delegate commercial and recreational management of mutton snapper to the state of Florida. We just had a couple of typos in here from cutting and paste that have been corrected here. These should all apply to mutton snapper.

Again, it would allow the councils and the state of Florida to agree to delegating recreational or commercial, or both. Then Action 5 would allocate mutton snapper using the same approach that we just described for yellowtail snapper; and the same bycatch allowance. Again, the 1 to 2 percent was sufficient to cover the harvest in other states.

Then Action 5 deals with a mutton snapper recreational bag limit. Alternative 1, the mutton snapper is a part of the aggregate 10 snapper bag limit in the Gulf and the South Atlantic. The problem here is that the Gulf and the South Atlantic have different species included in those aggregate bag limits.

Alternative 2 would remove mutton snapper from the recreational aggregate bag limit and change the recreational bag limit for mutton snapper during the regular season, July through April, and during the spawning season, May through June. Option 2A would have a 10 fish per person per day in the regular season, which is the status quo now.

Then during the spawning season the bag limit would be lowered to two fish per person per day. Option 2B would lower the bag limit during the regular season from 10 to 5 and then have it two fish per person per day during the spawning season. Alternative 3 would retain mutton snapper within the aggregate 10 snapper bag limit.

MS. McCAWLEY: I found another typo; I think there are two Action 5's now. There is an Action 5 that says allocate mutton snapper sector ACLs and then another Action 5 that says mutton snapper recreational bag limit.

MR. WAUGH: We will renumber those. What is shown here as Action 6 is the mutton snapper commercial trip limit. During May and June the commercial sector in the South Atlantic is restricted to 10 mutton snapper per day or 10 mutton snapper per trip, whichever is more restrictive. There is no bag or trip limit for the commercial sector in the Gulf or South Atlantic during the regular season.

Alternative 2 would establish a commercial trip limit for mutton snapper during the regular season of 2A, 10 fish per person per day; 2B, some higher bag or trip limit. Alternative 3; specify a commercial trip limit for mutton snapper during the spawning season; and ranging from Alternative 3A to 5, 10, and no bag or trip limit.

That is a range of a bag and trip limit – well, here trip limit alternatives that we’re looking at. Then dealing with black grouper; delegating recreational management of black grouper to the state of Florida. No action would retain recreational management of black grouper – and we are just focusing on recreational here, because black grouper are part of the ITQ program in the Gulf.

We’re just looking at potential delegation of recreational measures. Alternative 2 would determine specific recreational management items for delegation to the state of Florida. We would select from that suite size limits, bag limits, seasons, minor modifications to existing allowable gear and the fishing year. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: We’ve talked repeatedly about some of the ID challenges we have. Do we have concerns about delegation of something that folks can’t readily tell apart?

MS. McCAWLEY: That wasn’t really discussed very much at the South Florida meeting, but it is something that we could discuss at the next meeting in January.

MR. HARTIG: To your point, Bonnie; one of the things that works in our favor a little bit is once you get into South Florida, there aren’t that many gags. Blacks do dominate the catch to a high degree. There are some gags; I am not going to tell you there are not, but there are some gags but predominantly it is black grouper.

MR. WAUGH: Okay, we’ll add that and make sure we get some discussion about that. Then allocating black grouper recreational annual catch limits to the state of Florida and creating a recreational bag limit allowance for other Gulf and South Atlantic states; so again using the same approach – sorry, no, it is different here.

Alternative 2 would use both councils agreed-upon ABC and allocate the recreational ACLs for the Gulf and South Atlantic. Then 2A would combine the current recreational allocations. This is one where there are sector allocations in the Gulf. It is 63.12 percent of the South Atlantic ACL/27 percent of the Gulf ACL.

That would be put into a single recreational allocation for delegation to the state of Florida. Then 2B would use the South Atlantic Council’s current sector allocation formula; 2C would base sector allocations for waters off Florida on average landings from 2008 through 2012 and then some other set of years.

Alternative 3 would use both councils agreed-upon ABC for black grouper and create Gulf and commercial/recreational sector ACLs from the current ABC jurisdictional split; 47 percent for the South Atlantic and 53 percent for the Gulf. This may need to be reworked some, because again on the Gulf commercial side this is a part of the ITQ.

Then Alternative 4 would create a recreational bycatch allowance for the other states. Here we’ve got in looking at the data; it ranges up to 3 percent, so we’ve got an alternative going up to

3 percent. The next one deals with accountability measures. The joint committee asked us to simplify this action.

This is one where we would like to have a little bit of guidance from you to take down to the meeting. We haven't simplified this yet; but what we've got in here are from the South Atlantic Council's perspective Alternative 3 is how we deal with the commercial. Alternative 4 is how we deal with the recreational. You remember we went through this this morning.

Alternatives we evaluated are 3A, only if the species is overfished; 3B, if the total ACL is exceeded; and then 3C, if the species is overfished and the total ACL is exceeded. We've consistently picked 3C for our species. One way we could simplify this is not analyze 3A and 3B and 4A and 4B and remove those.

We would still have the alternative using our accountability measure that we're trying to standardize for most of our species; that if the species is overfished and the total ACL; that is when you do your paybacks. We would be looking if you think that is a good idea to simplify this by removing those two alternatives. Monica, I know Shep is the one that usually handles this; but any guidance you might be able to provide us at this stage, it still leaves us with four alternatives; just fewer subalternatives.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Gregg, I really haven't talked with Shep about this. Do you feel that you've got a reasonable range if you take those two out, the two subalternatives under each alternative?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, I think we do, because what we would be left with is Alternative 2 is looking at the sum of the commercial and recreational landings exceed the ACL. That sort of looks at the stock ACL, which is in sum a part of this 3B. I think we do; but again I am not trying to put you on the spot here.

DR. DUVAL: **I would be happy to make a motion to remove Options 3A and 3B, and 4A and 4B from Action 9 – I guess this would be Action 10 if you renumber it.** I think there are plenty of alternatives in there, and there is no reason to include more than is absolutely necessary, especially if on our end we've already decided that those are not preferreds from our perspective.

MR. HARTIG: All right, the motion from Michelle; remove Subalternatives 3A, 3B, 4A and 4B from the accountability measures action. Second by Charlie. **Is there any discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

MR. WAUGH: This is one that has been referenced some is to modify the shallow water grouper species compositions and seasonal closures in the Gulf and South Atlantic. Right now no action is retain the existing respective shallow water grouper species composition and seasonal closures.

We've got separate species that are included by each council and separate times by each council, so you can imagine this creates quite a nightmare down in South Florida. Alternative 2 would remove the shallow water grouper closure for all affected grouper species in the Gulf of Mexico

and South Atlantic. We've got Option 2A, south of the 28 degree north latitude line, which is just a little south of Canaveral; and then 2B throughout each council's jurisdiction.

Alternative 3 would be to establish identical regulations for shallow water grouper species compositions for the Gulf and South Atlantic south of 28 degrees north latitude. 3A would adopt the Gulf species composition; 3B, adopt the South Atlantic species composition; 3C would be to specify a new shallow water species complex for the Gulf and South Atlantic. Then Alternative 4 would establish identical regulations for the shallow water grouper seasonal closures.

Alternative 3 dealt with the species that you are talking about; 4 deals with the time period for the closure. Again, this applies south of 28 degrees north latitude. The same set of alternatives; 4A would adopt the Gulf; 4B, the South Atlantic; 4C would establish identical regulations for shallow water grouper seasonal closures for the species included.

Alternative 5 would be to establish identical regulations for the shallow water grouper seasonal closures throughout the Gulf and South Atlantic; 4A, adopt the Gulf's shallow water grouper seasonal closures; 4B, adopt the South Atlantic; 4C, establish identical regulations in the Gulf and South Atlantic.

Alternative 6 would remove black grouper from the shallow water grouper closures of the recreational seasons in the Gulf and of the recreational and commercial seasons in the South Atlantic. Then 7 would establish a seasonal closure for black grouper with a potential separation between recreational and commercial to have separate and several different time periods.

Alternative 8 would establish a one-fish recreational bag limit for black grouper in Florida with an optional seasonal closure. There is some talk about considering removing black grouper from the aggregate bag limit. Any input on these potential modifications to the shallow water grouper closure?

MR. PHILLIPS: While I'm thinking about the sub-option of having the South Florida regulations making the Gulf, South Florida and South Atlantic all the same' if you did that, that is fine, well and good; but if the Gulf or the South Atlantic, it would almost tie their hands on changing it, because I am not sure how practical of an option that is.

MR. WAUGH: Yes; and because we standardize them now doesn't mean they have to stay standardized throughout time; but certainly you would want to weigh changing that carefully; and there may be a good reason to do it.

MR. BOWEN: Just for clarification, we were having some discussion around the table offline; but we are discussing south of the 28 degree line?

MR. WAUGH: For Alternative 3 it is south of the 28; 4 is south of the 28; 5 is throughout both the Gulf and South Atlantic EEZs. Six would apply through the South Atlantic, and I think Alternative 2 has a subalternative that is south of 28 degrees; Alternative 2B was throughout each council's jurisdiction; so it is a mix.

MR. HAYMANS: In that case, we're really swapping A1A for latitude 28 or whatever it is. It is still going to be a dividing line where there are different sets of regulations on both sides in that case.

MR. WAUGH: That is correct.

MR. HAYMANS: Versus something like – I don't have it pulled up anymore – I think the fifth one works throughout its range, which would make it a whole lot smoother.

MR. WAUGH: That is correct. Then the next item is one that deals with the circle hook requirements, and this applies to Gulf and South Atlantic jurisdictional waters. No action is to retain the current non-stainless steel circle hook requirements in the EEZ of the Gulf. Alternative 2 would remove the requirements to use circle hooks when fishing with natural bait for yellowtail snapper in the EEZ of the Gulf; separated recreational and commercial.

Alternative 3 removes a requirement to use circle hooks when fishing with natural bait for all reef fish south of 28 degrees north latitude in the EEZ of the Gulf. These thus far just apply to the Gulf EEZ. Alternative 4 would remove the requirement to use circle hooks when fishing with natural bait for all species in the snapper grouper complex north of 28 degrees north latitude in the EEZ of the South Atlantic; and again separated for recreational and commercial.

Five, remove the requirement to use circle hooks when fishing for yellowtail snapper south of 26 degrees north latitude in the EEZ of the Gulf. That is the range of actions and alternatives. Again, we would anticipate when we come back to our March meeting to have a good bit more detail.

We would hope to have some indication of preferreds for some of these hopefully from the joint committee. Certainly, if you have any questions after this, feel free to contact me. I would be glad to help sort this out. Our intent is to get the briefing book out for this group; I think it is January 6th; and I think you meet the third week in January.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, if there aren't any other questions for Gregg; thank you very much, it is a great presentation on how we're proceeding with those with the South Florida Workgroup.

MR. WAUGH: The Joint South Florida Committee will meet the third week in January.

MR. HARTIG: All right Bob, is there any other business?

MR. MAHOOD: I don't believe so.

MR. HARTIG: Any other business before the Executive Finance Committee? Seeing none; I am going to give you a break.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 o'clock p.m., December 4, 2014.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
December 30, 2014

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2014 Committees

AD HOC SOUTH FLORIDA COMMITTEE (NEW)

Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Chester Brewer
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood and Gregg Waugh

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

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

DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Doug Haymans
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Doug Haymans, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Chip Collier - CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wilson Laney, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Chip Collier - Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Acting Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Ben Hartig, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
LT Morgan Fowler
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

PERSONNEL

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

PROTECTED RESOURCES

Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Michelle Duval
LT Morgan Fowler
Ben Hartig
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: John Carmichael

(Continued)

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2014 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

Ben Hartig

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

W. Chester Brewer

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

Deirdre Warner-Kramer

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Dr. Michelle Duval

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

Mark Brown

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

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

Chris Conklin

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

Jack Cox

2010 Bridges Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/728-9548
Dayboat1965@gmail.com

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

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

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

LT Morgan Fowler

U.S. Coast Guard
510 SW 11th Court
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

Charles 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

Anna Beckwith

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

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

Zack Bowen

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

PAUL STEELE
BONNIE POWERS
JACK MCGOVERN
KEVIN ANSON
PRES PATE
TRACY DOWN
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO

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

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

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 below.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Executive Finance Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 4, 2014

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:	EMAIL ADDRESS:	MAILING ADDRESS:
John Boreman			
David Knight			
EMANUELE	GSAPP		
Will Heyman	301 335 3230	WHEYMAN@LGL.COM	
DICK ORANGE			
Trip Alkeman		CCA	
Lara Clarke	631-379-6218	clarke@petrus.org	
Emilie Helmke		ehelmke@petrus.org	