

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

JOINT EXECUTIVE/FINANCE COMMITTEES

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 14, 2010

SUMMARY MINUTES

Executive Committee:

Duane Harris, Chair
Mac Currin
Robert Boyles

David Cupka, Vice-Chair
George Geiger

Finance Committee:

David Cupka, Chair
Dr. Brian Chevront
Mac Currin

Mark Robson, Vice-Chair
Duane Harris

Council Members:

Dr. Wilson Laney
Ben Hartig
Vince O'Shea
Doug Haymans

Dr. Roy Crabtree
Tom Burgess
Tom Swatzel
Charlie Phillips

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Kim Iverson
Kari Fenske
Kate Quigley
Rick DeVactor
Anna Martin

Gregg Waugh
Dr. Julie Neer
Roger Pugliese
Mike Collins
John Carmichael
Julie O'Dell

Observers/Participants:

Nik Mehta
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Marcel Reichert

Dr. Bob Shipp
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith

Additional Observers and Participants Attached

The Joint Executive/Finance Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, September 14, 2010, and was called to order at 1:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Duane Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, let's come back into session and call to order the Joint Executive/Finance Committee Meeting. This is the one that David Cupka would normally chair, but he said he is real comfortable in that chair that he is sitting in right there, and he didn't want to move up to these uncomfortable chairs up here, so I'll chair this meeting.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any recommended changes to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. The next item is the approval of the June 2010 Executive/Finance Committee Meeting Minutes. Any changes, corrections, additions or deletions? Seeing none, those minutes are approved as provided. The next item is the status report on the Calendar Year 2010 Council Budget. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: Okay, that is the first attachment in your tab for the Executive/Finance Committee. Instead of going all over it, we're looking pretty good. If you look over on the far right, you will see the monies we received this year. The only thing that is not in that column is the additional \$300,000 for SEDAR that we will be receiving, and then that will push up a little over \$4.1 million.

Remember, we're in the first year of our five-year grant program, we have the ability to carry money forward at the end of the year; so if we have money to carry forward, that's good because I'm not sure how long good times are going to last. I think we're going to be in good shape. Tom had asked the question that I may want to point out is on the other travel.

A lot of that is related to SEDAR, bringing people in for the SEDAR workshops, paying if they get paid for the webinar. Obviously, they don't travel too far to a webinar if they do it correctly, anyway. A lot of that is related to SEDAR funding. We may be looking at readjusting some of that, Bonnie, if we continue with the webinars because there have been some savings relative to travel, quite obviously. Other than that, if anybody has any specific questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

MR. CUPKA: Bob, on the insurance, have we paid those ahead; is that why we're at a high percentage midway in the year?

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, Mike said we paid ahead on that, and I believe it didn't go up as much as we had anticipated this past year, about 9.5 percent. I think we had put in something like 13 or something like that.

MR. HARRIS: Other questions of Bob on the Calendar Year 2010 Budget? Seeing none, we will move on. Bob, the report on additional SEDAR funding.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, I touched on that earlier. We got a call – I guess it has been two weeks ago, Mike, maybe three weeks ago – on a Friday indicating that there was funding available for SEDAR, an additional \$300,000 for the southeast to be used for Gulf activities. I think the

reason that they were able to get it – and they got a pretty good of money. That was just a small part of it to do work.

I know Bonnie is going to be able to utilize quite of it relative to the oil spill and the followup. Primarily what we looked at in SEDAR was the potential need for more assessments on some of these species if we find out there are some problems and the fish are being affected by the oil. What I did is we wrote our grant for a two-year appointment for a third SEDAR coordinator and some additional funding for a workshop and then some additional SEDAR activities.

It was difficult because we couldn't plan it. We don't know exactly what is going to occur. It worked out pretty well because we had approached Bonnie at this upcoming SEDAR Steering Committee about having a third coordinator. One of the things we're finding is that webinars do save travel funding, but it is much more staff labor-intensive than meetings, believe it or not, and that is because these webinars go on and on and on, and you've to coordinate.

There is a short turnaround on some of this stuff. It is just taking a lot of time. It is even difficult to find dates that you can get all your folks together to do the things. Plus, the Red Snapper Update went to a benchmark, which made a big difference, and several other things were kicked up. That staff has been very, very busy the first part of this year. That is the report on SEDAR, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: I would just add it is not just busy for staff, Bob. There are other people who want to be involved in the webinar process. I think we're probably going to have to sit down and take a look. If you want to have fishermen involvement, it is much easier for a fisherman to plan on a week-long meeting than it is to have every two days saying we're going to have a webinar update or next week. It's problematic. We're going to have to have that conversation sometime.

MR. MAHOOD: I believe, John, at the SEDAR Steering Committee today or tomorrow we are going to talk about fishermen involvement or are we going to wait until after we've had the – okay, we will be talking about that at this meeting.

MR. HARRIS: Other questions of Bob? Okay, the next item is the discussion of Mark Robson's letter to Bob Shipp relative to Florida management of spiny lobster, octocorals and several reef fish species, Attachment 2. Bob, do you want to start that?

MR. MAHOOD: There are a number of issues. The first one is the spiny lobster, and I believe we dealt with that at the Spiny Lobster Committee Meeting. Then next is stone crab and we don't have a fishery, so that's pretty much just a Gulf issue. Octocorals we just dealt with at the Ecosystem-Based Management Committee Meeting. This leaves us with the reef fish.

Bob and David were at the Gulf meeting and they did discuss this. According to David – and, David, chime in, please – David indicated they were really waiting for our input on the reef fish issue. If you look at the letter, this is a letter from Mark Robson to Bob Shipp. They are talking about the management of yellowtail and mutton snapper and Nassau grouper. Mark, what was your intent here in your letter?

MR. ROBSON: Well, our intent was just to try to give some sense of where the commission as a state agency would fall out if the situation arose where either council or both councils were considering giving up management of those fisheries or some other form of delegation. We've already had some discussion about the concern we have with partial delegation and the fact that the state of Florida doesn't at this time want to be responsible for implementing those provisions in the Magnuson Act particularly as they deal with catch limits or accountability measures or some of the other issues that have been difficult to deal with.

In terms of giving up fisheries or at least taking certain species out of a fishery management plan, the intent of the letter is to say that we're ready to manage those fisheries to the extent that the councils are willing to let us manage them. It is not much more specific than that.

MR. CUPKA: Well, Bob can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the Gulf Council has kind of taken a wait-and-see attitude to see what we want to do in the regard, and, of course, we're kind of waiting to see what they want to do, and in the meantime we aren't moving ahead on things like the ACL Amendment.

I will mention that at the last Gulf Council meeting they did add an alternative to their generic ACL Amendment to manage these species jointly. There would be a joint plan for these three species. Since they co-occur on both sides and down in the Keys, I think anything we could do that would make it easier on the fishermen down there, it is kind of a bad situation from the fishermen's standpoint because you end up with different regulations depending on which way you're going to fish that morning. Anyway, I know they haven't made any decisions and they're kind of waiting to see what our druthers would be on this.

DR. SHIPP: I think Dave is exactly right; we were pretty avoiding it and hoping that you would take the lead on it. Our council members don't have much interest in those species, anyway. They just occur in Monroe County, so we were hoping you would bear the burden or the state of Florida would.

MR. CUPKA: Well, again, we have to keep in mind if we let the state do it, we're going to have problems with some of these things being fished by out-of-state boats that Florida wouldn't have any control over. It is probably less critical for some of these things like spiny and octocorals than it is for some of these reef fish, which are capable of moving and do move around. From the fish standpoint, it would probably be better if one or the other council did manage the whole thing rather than delegating it to the state, I would think. That's up to this council to decide how we want to move ahead.

MR. ROBSON: And that's a very good point, David, and in our letter we did state that, that among the things that have to be figured out is for the state to take over management of, let's say, mutton or yellowtail, if there is a problem of being able to enforce regulations on vessels that come to Florida federal waters and then fish outside of any regulations that we have, that is a problem and we wouldn't want to move forward as a state unless that could be dealt with. That is a real issue.

MR. HARRIS: What is the desire of the committee? Is there a recommendation? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: I'm not prepared at this point to make a recommendation, but I do have a couple of questions about how far up both the east and the west coast these species occur to any degree. I know it states in the letter that they're almost exclusive found in the southern tip of Florida, and that's my impression but are there regular catches of mutton snapper up as far as Canaveral, for example, or up to St. Pete or further up the west coast of Florida.

MR. GEIGER: Well, up the east coast of Florida they occur regularly off of Sebastian. I've not heard of them off of Canaveral. I'm sure they have been caught there, but I know up off of Sebastian they're not an uncommon catch.

MR. HARRIS: And I think we've seen yellowtail snapper all the way up in Jacksonville and even into the southern coast of Georgia on occasion. It is not a very common occurrence, and Charlie is shaking his head saying, yes, they've seen them in the commercial fishery, too. Mark.

MR. ROBSON: Getting back to the other part of that would be the state of Florida's interest would certainly be one of seeing – it is a problem in Florida for these federally managed species when you are under two different council plans and two different sets of regulations. We've all talked about this. We know what the problem is and particularly in Monroe County what kind of a problem it presents. To the extent that this council could responsibility for management of those species in Atlantic and Gulf waters, I would certainly encourage at least taking a look at that.

MR. CUPKA: Mr. Chairman, I'd make a motion that we indicate both to the Gulf Council and the Florida Wildlife Commission our willingness to manage these three species – that's mutton, yellowtail and Nassau – throughout their range.

MR. HARRIS: Seconded by George Geiger. Discussion on the motion? David.

MR. CUPKA: Well, I think for all the reasons that we mentioned earlier, not only does it make sense in terms of managing the fishery, but it also makes it easier on the fishermen and whatnot. I think it is the way to go.

DR. SHIPP: My sense of the Gulf Council is we would support that wholeheartedly. In addition to the comments that were about the occurrence of those three species up the east coast, that's not the case in the Gulf. Occasionally you can pick them up maybe as far up as Fort Myers, but in the north central Gulf none of those species ever occur, so it does make more sense for your council to take it over. I agree with what David said about the fishermen and making it a little bit easier on them.

MR. HARRIS: David, would you just go ahead and restate your motion?

MR. CUPKA: I was afraid you were going to say that. **My motion was to indicate to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission this council's willingness to assume management responsibility for yellowtail snapper, mutton snapper and Nassau grouper throughout their range.**

MR. HARRIS: Further discussion on the motion? **Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Okay, the next item on the agenda of discussion of future timeliness of recreational data for management purposes. Bob, do you want to carry us through that.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, let me clarify that a little bit. Back in July the chairman was requested by Brian to put this on the agenda to talk – it should say timeliness of recreational and commercial quota monitoring, data for quota monitoring. I think Brian had some concerns. I think Brian initially was talking about commercial mackerel. Duane and I had some discussion also about recreational, and I somehow inadvertently lost control and left the commercial part of it out. That is the issue and I guess, Brian, maybe you want to do the lead-in on this.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Just to sort of tell you what was going on, if you remember at the June meeting we had discussions about mackerel, and we were referring to the quota monitoring. I think Sue Gerhart from NMFS was here presenting some of the information. What I did was look at some of the information that had been provided to me by Sue as to some of the landings.

I went back and compared it to the reports that were issued at different times in the past and found out that there was sometimes great disparity in actual numbers of fish that had been landed and reported on the mid-season quota monitoring reports compared to what it really was when we finally got to the end.

The concern was that there are fishermen I know in North Carolina especially following mackerel who are trying to follow the quota who are thinking that this is going to be the accurate amount of fish that have actually been taken. In talking to Sue about it, she indicated, well, it is to some degree but it might actually be more than that because they would wait until they thought that the quota was getting closer to being taken up and then they would enforce the reporting requirements.

That is why we were sometimes seeing a lot of fish being caught at the very end. That was some concern about how can we monitor fishing behavior when we weren't sure that the quota reports that we were seeing were really accurate to everything that was being done. I had done a spreadsheet that showed the disparities in the reports over time just for king mackerel in the Atlantic group.

I had shared that with a few people on the council and Duane had requested, well, maybe we need to have a discussion about that the council meeting. I wasn't quite where that was going to appear, but it sounded like they thought maybe this was going to be a generic issue than just king mackerel. That was the background on it.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Brian brought that to my attention and I felt like it was something that the council need to at least have a discussion about and decide if there is an action item that we need to move forward and get some resolution on it. I don't fully appreciate what Brian has identified as the problem for North Carolina, but I suspect it is not just a problem for North Carolina.

It is a problem where there is any quota monitoring taking place. If the data that we receive are not up to date and accurate, then it can cause fishermen to be changing behaviors and it can cause other potential problems. I'll just put that out there for discussion.

MR. CURRIN: Am I correct in assuming that the data originate with the states from the landings or are they reported directly from federal dealers to NMFS or is it a combination of the two? Where are the data coming from that go into this quota summation?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, for the quota monitoring there are dealer reports that go to the science center and then we get the estimates from the science center.

MR. CURRIN: Are there landings that occur outside of federal dealers that are of concern or a problem that add to this delay or lack of incorporation? Brian, you may know that in North Carolina. I don't know, but I guess if they're federally managed species and the requirements are they're sold to only federally licensed dealers – I'm just trying to get at the root of the problems and how we can streamline in or make them more timely. I'm trying to find out where the bottlenecks are.

DR. PONWITH: As best I understand what is contributing to the problem is that we will identify in advance based on historic landings who the key dealers are for the species and focus on obtaining their information as quickly and routinely as possible to use toward the projections. Two things can happen. You can have dealers who are outside of that core group actually having landings or there have been cases where people have held back information until as late as possible to turn it in, which creates the impression that the burn rate through the quota is much slower than it actually is.

What it does is it creates a projection that underestimates what the actual burn rate through that quota is. Then when the actuals come out, when the fishery has been closed, you see that the burn rate is actually considerably higher. I think those are two things that are contributing to the issue.

MR. HARRIS: Well, I guess that begs the question then, Bonnie, is there a fix to this or is this something we just have to live with or where do we go?

DR. PONWITH: I would hope that there is a fix to this. I think that maybe as a first step to be able to get the state and the federal data people together and brainstorm on what steps could be taken for each of those two contributing components. It is a common problem. It is a common problem when you're running projections.

I mean, the same thing would be true if you were doing projections based on recreational landings if you're using last year's behavior to predict this year. Things change. The other thing that happens is that even if you're using this year to predict this year, if people anticipate a management measure being put in place, they will actually change their behavior which renders the earlier part of the season as a poor predictor for the behavior in the later part of the season.

But I think the right thing to do would be to get the state and the federal people together to brainstorm the two factors that are contributing to this and see what their ideas are and what would be technically feasible to implement in terms of solutions to those.

MR. HARRIS: Well, it sounds like a letter is in order from the council to you, Bonnie, to implement this meeting between the states and the science center and ask that you report back to us and potential resolution of this problem. I understand the problem with people holding back data and projecting landings and all that. It seems to me, though, these dealers are required to report in a timely basis; and if they're holding back data, is that unlawful?

DR. PONWITH: If you miss the deadline, it is unlawful. If you don't miss the deadline, it is not.

MR. HARRIS: So it doesn't matter what you report; as long as you report by the deadline, you're not violating the law? You can hold back landings. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: What is the required frequency for reporting or what is the reporting interval, Bonnie; is it monthly or two weeks?

DR. PONWITH: I believe it is monthly, but I'll check on that.

MR. CURRIN: Because that is one potential solution is to decrease that reporting time requirement. Another question, I guess; you mentioned that the way you're currently doing it you get reports from key dealers, and I assume that is based on the history of who had the most landings and you try to capture most but not all of the landings; and you indicated that can be a problem. Are there complications or problems with requiring all dealers to report and enter into that data base so that it is accurate to that reporting period? Is it just a manpower problem with trying to get those data entered?

DR. PONWITH: There again I would follow up by getting clarification on it. My understanding is that they were getting higher-frequency information from the core dealers as a way to expedite the projections, and that core turned out – which was the core in one year turned out to not exactly match the core the next and that resulted in missing significant landings. Let me get clarification on that. Again, what I will do is raise these questions to the team in their troubleshooting.

MR. MAHOOD: Two items, and the first one, Ben, maybe you can help, but it seems like on king mackerel we've had some fishermen doing some self-timely reporting and indicating when they think the fishery will close based on how much they're voluntarily I guess restraining themselves from landing. I don't know if that is still going on some, Ben, or not, but that was one issue. Then I had a question for Roy.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, to that point, in the winter season, yes, they have gone on weeks where they didn't fish, and I think you'll see more of that in the future. They have foregone harvest for a week at a time to try and stretch the season and get a better price.

DR. CHEUVRONT: And that is something that happens in North Carolina. When the season occurs later, some of these guys are very concerned and they're following this quota to find out how much fishing are they going to be able to do and do I need to figure out to do something else and try to plan on doing something else instead of the mackerel fishing.

That is what brought this up was North Carolina king mackerel fishermen contacted me. They were very concerned about the rate at which it appeared the quota was being taken up, which we had talked about at the meeting in June. Post June council meeting in conversations and e-mails I had with Sue she gave me more data and all that, and that is when I went back and compared it to the reports. As a matter of fact, what I think I'm going to do is I'm going to send a copy of the spreadsheet that shows the comparison between the reports and what Sue reported as the actual landings during those time periods. I'll send it to Mike and maybe he can send it out to other folks who want to look at it.

MR. MAHOOD: Roy, I'm not sure this still occurs, but at least on Spanish mackerel I know when Mark Godcharles was down here in your office he used to actually call on a daily basis I think as they approached the quota on Spanish mackerel because they had the capability of landing so many fish in a given day. Do we still have somebody that does that or is kind of gone by the wayside?

DR. CRABTREE: I think the only one we do that on now is the king mackerel runaround gill net fishery where they can catch half the quota in one day. That is one where we talk to fishermen and we'll tell them how much is left and they'll only send one boat or something sometimes. No, I don't think we're doing that with Spanish or king anymore. As far as I know all that is provided by the science center.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I would just recommend if we look into a solution for this and describing it is not to overlook ACCSP. I think their SAFIS Program is pretty well intended to deal with this problem, so it would be important to bring them in and include them in this. There may already be a solution that exists.

MR. HARRIS: Well, the chair would entertain a motion to draft a letter to Dr. Ponwith at the science center and request she evaluate this program in concert with the state agencies and come up with a recommended solution to the problems, and I would assume that letter would include an evaluation of the SAFIS Program. Is there anybody who wants to make such a motion on the Executive/Finance Committee? Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, Duane, I'll be happy to make that motion that the council write Dr. Ponwith a letter asking her to consult with the states and/or ACCSP to try to derive a solution to timely reporting of quota-monitored species.

MR. HARRIS: Second by David Cupka. Discussion on the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Hopefully, that will get us closer to resolving it. Bob, just asked me if we wanted to talk about the recreational data and where we're going to be going with respect to that in the future.

I'll open the floor for discussion of the recreational data at this time and where that is likely to take us because under these accountability measures and things like that that we're developing, we're going to have to be tracking the recreational landings' data on a more timely basis than they've had to be tracked in the past, it appears. Bonnie, have you got any suggestions on that?

DR. PONWITH: I've got a conference call with the MRIP people. It won't do any good for this meeting, but a conference call with the MRIP people early next week to talk about where they view their priorities to be in the foreseeable future on that. My take on this is there are a few changes they could make to the program now that significant progress on the registration has been implemented to reduce that sampling frame.

I think the next big change that would have the most influential impact on that program would be reducing the waves from a two-month wave to a one-month wave. Now, a one-month wave still doesn't get you to a point where you're doing real-time quota management because the way it works is they would allow a month to pass, and then they would begin a recall period where they're actually phoning the individuals who are now in the new directory based on the registration. They would phone them over a two-week period to obtain the information on effort.

I talked to them about can you reduce that to one week, and the problem with reducing the phone call period from two weeks to one week is you end up having a lot of misses where you have to phone more and more and more people to actually catch people at home; whereas, if you can spread that over two weeks, it enables you to actually encounter more people and get more answers on the telephone.

So, with that two-week period, then you would begin the actual analysis, so you can see that there still would be lags in obtaining those estimates, so it is not going to be real-time data but it's certainly going to be better-quality data. To be able to go to a one-month wave would require much higher sampling rates for both the telephone calls and the dockside intercepts to maintain the same level of precision that we have for the two-month waves, because once again it is stratifying.

And anytime you stratify you have to increase your sampling rates to maintain the same level of precisions. In my opinion that is the thing that they could be doing next that would have the most sweeping change. They have been evaluating several areas. They have been looking at the algorithms that they're using for the catch estimation process.

I believe they're evaluating day versus night. They're making significant contributions to a headboat sampling procedure that is being piloted both here in the South Atlantic but also in the Gulf of Mexico for electronic reporting for headboats. I think those are the ones that stand out in my mind.

MR. HARRIS: I can't speak for the council but I did tell the Marine Recreational Fisheries Summit folks when I spoke at that that I was more interested in the quality of the data rather than the timeliness of the data. If we don't get good accurate data, it doesn't matter how timely it is. I don't know how anybody else feels about that, but I just request that you report back to us at our December council meeting of the results of this and where the MRIP people see this going in

the future and whether there is any hope for in-season monitoring of recreational data in the future.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask if there are additional questions or concerns that you would like me to carry to the MRIP people at this call, I'm happy to do that.

DR. McGOVERN: I just want to point out that on our website we do have a place where recreational landings are being tracked for the Gulf of Mexico. They have recreational sales now. There is also a placeholder there for South Atlantic recreational sales.

MR. HARTIG: To that point, Bonnie, one of the questions I had; the recreational anglers who have registered in the registry, how representative are they of the recreational fishery in their respective areas? That's something I think it would be – I don't know if there is a way to look at recreational fishing and how many days a week do you go, do you go one day a week, do you go only on the weekends, do you fish three days a week; do we have all those bases covered? Do we have all those different kinds of people who fish different ways recreationally covered in the registry or do we have – is the registry made up of a certain kind of person who would register for that kind of thing.

DR. PONWITH: The registry is a saltwater angler registry, so people in the coastal states would have to register to get their license to be able to fish, and so it is either a state license – in the cases where the state licenses meet the requirements of MRIP for the data collections that they're doing to get a waiver for the requirements for the national registry. Otherwise, the national registry would be put in place.

For the people who are inland, the people from Kansas who come down once a year and go fishing – yes, linear sampling we call it – they would not be in the saltwater anglers registration. The way we pick them up and their data would be through the dockside intercepts. The calls would be made to the people within that registry, but the dockside intercepts pick up the people who are coming in from inland so that we can do a correction for the non-coastal people and their effort.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think, Duane, you really hit the nail on the head about this timeliness and it is about quality. I have long felt that within our region the impediment to management is not so much the timeliness of the recreational data. It is the CVs that approach a hundred percent. If you think about the waves and how they function, and you get wave data now 45 days after the end of the wave, so January/February Wave 1 means you get January/February data in mid-April.

If you trim the processing a little bit and maybe you can get that down to 30 days so you can get it back to getting it April 1st. Well, if you cut that in half to monthly waves, you're still getting your February data April 1 as the best case scenario. You're getting 50 percent of your data a month sooner for doubling your resources.

Like Bonnie said, if you're going to maintain the level of quality of your data and reduce your sampling period by half, you're going to have to double your effort. I think when thinking about

timeliness you really need to consider if we could double the money that goes into MRFSS, where we should we put it; to improving our CVs or to getting 50 percent of our data a month sooner?

MR. HARRIS: Much better stated than what I stated; thank you, John. Okay, further discussion on this issue? We'll ask Bonnie to report back to us at our December meeting as the results of her discussion with the MRIP folks and hopefully she will have a resolution to all this. I would ask you to take back to the MRIP folks, in case they forgot what I told them at that summit, that we like to have good quality data, and that is more important to us than more timely data. John, you hit the nail on the head; spending 50 percent more resources to get it 15 days sooner just doesn't seem like a good investiture of funding to me. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, maybe so but we start having annual catch limits with paybacks and in-season provisions for recreational fisheries, you're going to find that having two-month waves is a huge problem and results in large overruns and all sorts of problems. I'm not so sure I would agree that is not the larger issue right now. It has created all kinds of problems for us in the Gulf with greater amberjack and red snapper. The timeliness issue to me is a big issue.

MR. HARRIS: Mac, last word on this issue.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and I can see that, Roy, but I've heard you say a number of times that there is no requirement in the Act that we do in-season monitoring on the recreational industry, I believe, but correct me if I'm wrong. To me it doesn't make sense – under this sampling frame, under the new even more timely frame, it doesn't make sense to me to try to do in-season quota monitoring and adjustments in the recreational fishery.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I understand that, but the problem then is you can have a situation where you know the recreational fishery is going to go over by a hundred percent or more but you're not going to do anything in season, and you just sit and watch it happen, and then the next year you've got to deal with this huge overrun, which may result in the fishery being completely closed down, because you've got to have some sort of accountability mechanism.

I've been in those situations where I get Wave 3 and they've already gone over. In fact, I've seen them already have caught twice what they're supposed to catch; and then you go through some emergency rulemaking and that can take months. I understand that there is not a requirement, but there is a requirement to have accountability; and if you allow those overruns to occur you can sure dig yourself into a deep hole.

MR. HARRIS: Okay, moving right along, is there any other business to come before the joint Executive/Finance Committee Meeting today? Seeing none, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 o'clock p.m., September 14, 2010.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
September 14, 2010

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2009 - 2010 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

COUNCIL VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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
ttburgess@embarqmail.com

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

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)
mcurrin1@bellsouth.net

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

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

Lt. Richard Mach
U.S. Coast Guard
Brickell Plaza Federal Building
909 S.E. First Avenue
Room 876/ DRE
Miami, FL 33131-3050
305/415-6781 (ph)
305/415-6791 (f)
Richard.A.Mach@uscg.mil

John V. O'Shea
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1444 Eye Street, N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/289-6400 (ph); 202/289-6051 (f)
voshea@asmfc.org

Charles Phillips
Phillips Seafood / 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

CAROLYN BELCAGN

NIK MAWETA

BONNIE PONWITH

MONICA SMIT BRUNELLO

BOB SWIPP

JACK MCGOVEN

MARCEL REICHERT

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2009 – 2010 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

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

DOLPHIN WAHOO

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

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Brian Chevront, Chair
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Mark Robson
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Myra Brouwer- Comp. Ecosystem-
based Amendment

EXECUTIVE

Duane Harris, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Robert Boyles
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
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

HABITAT & ENVIRON. PROTECTION

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

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

David Cupka, Chair
Rita Merritt, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
Mac Currin
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Brian Sullivan
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Robert Boyles, Chair
Mac Currin, Vice-Chair
Duane Harris
Mark Robson
Brian Sullivan
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

LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

CATCH SHARES

Robert Boyles
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
George Geiger
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Vince O'Shea
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Kate Quigley

PERSONNEL

Robert Boyles, Chair
David Cupka
George Geiger
Duane Harris
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair
Doug Haymans
Mark Robson
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

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

SEDAR Committee

Duane Harris, Chair
George Geiger, Vice-Chair
Brian Chevront
David Cupka
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

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Staff Economist

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

Cultural Anthropologist

Open Position

Environmental Impact Scientist

Rick DeVictor
richard.devictor@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Outreach Assistant

Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Coral Reef Biologist

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 Lindsay
rachael.lindsay@safmc.net

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, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

Joint Executive/Finance Committee
Charleston, SC
Tuesday, September 14, 2010

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

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

Sera Devenak (Pew) 910-685-5705 Bolivia, NC 28422

Brock ANDERSON 321-536-0802 4320 HORSESHOE RA. M/F FL. 32953

Jimmy HULL (386) 547-1254 1258 Tolmarderson DR. O.B. FL 32176

Nickole Owen EDF 919-923-0774 Swansboro FL 34234

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201

North Charleston, SC 29405

843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10