

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

COUNCIL SESSION

**Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel
Orlando, FL**

June 15, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Members:

David Cupka, Chair
Mel Bell
Jessica McCawley
John Jolley
Tom Burgess
Dr. Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Duane Harris
Mac Currin
Tom Swatzel
LT. Robert Foos
Dr. Wilson Laney

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Anna Martin

Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Andrea Grabman
Dr. Mike Errigo
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Brian Chevront

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Otha Easley
Andy Strelcheck
RADM Baumgartner
Brad McHale

Dr. Jack McGovern
Bob Gill
Phil Steele
Martha Bademan
Brad McHale

Additional Observers Attached

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, Friday morning, June 15, 2012, and was called to order at 9:27 o'clock a.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: I would like to call the council meeting to order. I want to take this opportunity to formally welcome Mel Bell to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. Mel, we look forward to having you serve on the council. Let's get on with our voice identification.

MR. PHILLIPS: Charlie Phillips, Georgia.

MR. HAYMANS: Doug Haymans, Georgia.

MR. BELL: Mel Bell, South Carolina.

MR. SWATZEL: Tom Swatzel, South Carolina.

MR. JOLLEY: John Jolley, Florida.

DR. DUVAL: Michelle Duval, North Carolina.

MR. HARTIG: Ben Hartig, Florida.

MR. CUPKA: David Cupka, South Carolina.

MR. MAHOOD: Bob Mahood, council staff.

MR. CURRIN: Mac Currin, North Carolina.

MR. HARRIS: Duane Harris, Georgia.

MS. McCAWLEY: Jessica McCawley, Florida.

DR. CRABTREE: Roy Crabtree, NOAA Fisheries.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Monica Smit-Brunello, NOAA General Counsel.

MR. STEELE: Phil Steele, NOAA, Fisheries.

DR. PONWITH: Bonnie Ponwith, NOAA Fisheries.

MR. GILL: Bob Gill, Gulf Council Liaison.

MR. EASLEY: Otha Easley, NOAA Enforcement.

MR. BURGESS: Tom Burgess, North Carolina.

REAR ADMIRAL BAUMGARTNER: Bill Baumgartner, Coast Guard.

LT. FOOS: Rob Foos, U.S. Coast Guard.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you. We do have a special guest with us today, Admiral Bill Baumgartner. He is the commander of the 7th Coast Guard District out of Miami. I am going to ask Lt. Foos if he would introduce the admiral.

LT. FOOS: The admiral's bio has already gone out to everybody so I'll be very brief. Admiral Bill Baumgartner is responsible for all coast guard activities in the Coast Guard 7th District, which spans from the North Carolina/South Carolina Border up the west coast of Florida and throughout the Caribbean.

REAR ADMIRAL BAUMGARTNER: I'm very glad to be here today and to participate and observe the council's meeting. I think I did my first fisheries enforcement boarding about 34 years ago. I really appreciate the association with this particular mission and the coast guard's role in protecting this vital resource.

I do keep pretty well appraised of what is happening in this fisheries management council. Lt. Rob Foos has done a good job. We pick our representatives carefully. He has been a commanding officer of one of our patrol boats in Georgia and has operated extensively in this area. We pick sharp people; so sharp that in fact I'm taking him to be my executive assistant and my aide-de-camp.

The coast guard representative coming in is Lt. Mario Gill. He is finishing up a tour as an operations officer of one of our larger cutters, a 210-foot cutter that operates in the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean and the Florida Straits. He should be well versed and well up to speed when he comes in. Again, the representative that comes here speaks for me and keeps me well advised of the critical issues that are going on.

Many of our vital coast guard missions do interact with fisheries. We like to say we protect people on the sea, we protect America from threats from the sea, and we protect the sea itself. Clearly protecting lives on the sea is huge for us. Safety regulations for commercial fishing vessels is huge. I'm proud of the progress we've made over the last couple of decades.

When I first came in and started with this over 30 years ago, we had very few regulations to protect our fishermen. We have gotten much better than that, and I think we've done a lot better job at helping protect their lives. Just in the 7th District we generally have between 4,500 and 5,000 search-and-rescue cases every year; somewhere between 900 and 1,100 lives saved.

A significant number of those are fishermen. We do have a lot of threats to America that come in the 7th Coast Guard District. The 7th District is South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and the whole Caribbean area, so migrant interdiction is huge. Narcotics, we have over 33 tons of cocaine so far this fiscal year we have seized and whole host of other things. The fisheries mission is very important for us and we have done I think a pretty good job

of segregating resource hours to make sure that we are targeting our patrol boats and our smaller vessels to support or to enforce the regulations that you enact to protect this vital fishery.

We are trying very hard to make sure that we target our enforcement efforts where it makes the most difference, where the fishing vessels are, where the most sensitive regulations are so that we can do the best job there. Continuing to provide us information as where the vessels are and where we need to be is huge and that helps us make sure that we target those precious resources as best we can. In this region we've had 540 fisheries boardings so far this year; eight significant violations to date. I think that is pretty successful. I look forward to continuing to work with the council and supporting your decisions and your regulations as best we can. Thank you.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Admiral, and we welcome you to our meeting. We appreciate you taking the time out of your busy schedule to be here with us today. We want to thank you for all you have done and are continuing to do not only for this council but for our country. Thank you very much. All right, adoption of the agenda; are there any changes to our agenda? Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Just to note that some people might have to leave before we finish, and we do have a vote in the Law Enforcement Committee so we need to get to that before people start leaving.

MR. CUPKA: All right, our agenda is approved. Approval of the March 2012 minutes; are there any corrections, additions or deletions to our minutes? Seeing none, then those minutes are approved. That brings us to our next item which is presentations. We have three council members here today that for them this is going to be their last council meeting.

One of them is moving on to other duties. The other two, as we say, termed out. They've served three consecutive three-year terms and are unable to continue serving, but we certainly want to recognize these individuals this morning. The first one is Lt. Robert Foos, our resident lacrosse player and all-around good guy. We've been real fortunate on this council.

We have had excellent representation from the coast guard over the years. I am proud to say that Robert has continued that tradition and we very much appreciate all he has done. We have a little memento here for you, Robert, to present to you in appreciate for what you have done. We have got a little set here to give to you, and it says, "Proudly presented by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council to Lt. Robert Foos for his distinguished service to the council and the outstanding contributions in the conservation and management of our nation's marine fisheries resources. August 2011 to August 2012." (Applause)

The second individual I'd like to recognize this morning and have the council recognize is the guy I like to call "Mr. Snapper Grouper", Mac Currin. It is hard to believe, Mac, that you have been here nine years already. In fact, I had Bob to double-check that just to make sure you were not bailing out on us early, and he assures me that indeed you have been here nine years.

I even contacted some members of congress to see if they couldn't change the Magnuson Act and allow you to serve a fourth term. When I got back in touch with them, they all said the same thing, that they were willing to do it, but when they talked to you that you begged them not to do

it. But, Mac has done a yeoman's job during his time on the council while serving as chairman of snapper grouper where we spend a lot of our time dealing with issues in the snapper grouper fishery.

Mac has done an outstanding job in serving as chairman of that and leading us through a lot of thorny issues over the years related to snapper grouper. Mac, we very much appreciate your leadership in that and all that you have done to move that along, and we're going to miss you. We're going to miss you a lot.

Again, we have a little something for you to remember us by. This is proudly presented by the council to Mac Currin for his distinguished service to the council and the outstanding contributions in the conservation and management of our nation's marine fisheries resources. August 2003 to August 2012. (Standing Ovation)

The third person we want to recognize is Duane Harris. Some of you may not realize it but this is Duane's second time around on the council. Us old-timers will remember back when Duane was on here before. Duane, again as Mac, has done an outstanding job. He has served as chairman of this council during this last time around and has represented this council very well in several testimonies before congress on council activities.

One of the things I had the privilege of doing the last time I served as chairman was to establish the Ecosystem-Based Management Committee, but Duane is the one who really brought that committee to life and done an outstanding job. Based on his leadership, as a result this council was recognized nationally as one of the leaders in the protection of habitat and ecosystem-based management.

That is due in no small part to the leadership role that Duane has play in that. Duane, we're going to miss you, too, and we wish you all the best. We have a little something here for you, also. (Applause) Thank you, Duane, and we wish all three of you the best as you continue on your journey through life and nothing but good things. All right, that is going to get us down to our committee reports, and the first one is snapper grouper.

MR. CURRIN: The Snapper Grouper Committee met Tuesday and Wednesday of this week and as usual received our updates and reports on commercial and recreational landings from the Regional Office and the Science Center. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center was requested to present recreational landings and trends alongside the respective ACLs. In fact, that occurred for an additional species, mackerel, I believe, later in the meeting.

Bonnie also gave presentations on enhancements to the data monitoring system as well as actions that the agency has taken to address the late reporting of logbooks and dealer reports. We also received updates from the SERO staff on the status of amendments under review. Also got a summary report from Carolyn Belcher and Luiz Barbieri came in and gave us their reports from the Science and Statistical Committee.

We then dove into Amendment 18A with that issue that was not approved and discussed regarding the transferability of black sea bass pot endorsements. I have several motions

regarding 18A from the committee. **On behalf of the committee I move to recommend to the full council to approve transferability action for formal review. Is there any discussion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.**

Another motion from the committee to recommend to the full council to approve the codified text for the transferability action as being necessary and appropriate, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? I see none and that motion is approved.

Another motion to give the staff editorial license to make changes and clarifications in the transferability action and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? I see none and that motion is approved.

Another motion to give the council chairman authority to approve editorial changes in the amendment and deem the codified text as appropriate and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? I see none and that motion is approved. Bob, we need a roll call vote to approve that action.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. McCawley.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Swatzel.

MR. SWATZEL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Currin.

MR. CURRIN: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: **The motion passes unanimously.**

MR. CURRIN: The committee then moved into discussion of Amendment 18B and golden tilefish and received an overview of the changes that were made to the document since the March meeting. The committee provided some guidance and made some recommendations and a number of motions were put forth from the committee.

The committee recommended to clarify language regarding the requirement to stow longline gear and refer to language used for the Gulf longline endorsements. Under Action 2 there was a motion to include a number of additional subalternatives in the document; Subalternative 2G through 2I, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Is there any objection? I see none; that motion is approved.

The staff needs some clarification on a number of issues within that Action 2. As you recall, that action is to establish initial eligibility requirements for golden tilefish longline endorsements. There were some suggestions from staff; two. In fact after I give these to you, I hope I can receive a motion from the council to include these wording changes under that action.

The one recommendation is to modify the wording of Subalternative 2A through 2E to read “from year” to “through year”. The second is to modify the wording of Subalternatives 2G through 2I to read “within the period year through year”.

MR. HARRIS: So move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CURRIN: **Motion by Duane; second by Charlie. Any discussion? Pretty minor; just clarification, wording changes to make things a little more clear in the document. Any further discussion? Any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** Under Action 4, to allocate commercial golden tilefish annual catch limit among gear groups, some guidance was provided to the staff.

MS. McCAWLEY: Mac, you skipped a motion.

MR. CURRIN: I did; thank you. This is not the longest snapper grouper report I've ever made, but it's one of the more involved and confusing, but we'll get through it with your assistance. **Another motion from the committee to change the preferred from 2F to Alternative 2G, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Jessica.**

MS. McCAWLEY: **I would like to offer a substitute motion based on what we've heard from public comment to make our preferred – change that to Subalternative 2H.**

MR. CURRIN: **Motion by Jessica; second by Tom Swatzel.** Discussion on the motion? Everybody understand the implications? I think what that does, if I remember correctly, is change the number of entrants from 18 to 23; is that correct? Discussion? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: And one of those 23 is the young gentleman who spoke last night?

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes, to that point, the gentleman that actually spoke the past two nights was the one saying that he needed that more recent year in 2011. What this is doing is keeping the poundage the same, at the 5,000, but it is adding one more additional year, a newer year at the end.

MR. HAYMANS: That was his first year of fishing was 2011?

MS. McCAWLEY: I think it was my understanding that he bought the endorsement in 2010 and began fishing in 2010 but did not have the qualifying poundage in 2010.

MR. MAHOOD: I think when we started this we didn't have the data through 2011 to make that determination, so that is kind of why the council ended at 2010 at that point.

MR. HARTIG: He has been involved in the fishery longer than that. He actually fished on another longline boat for I know at least one year, and I know he tried to fish in his boat one year and had problems with his gear. He has been trying to be into this fishery for quite some time. Although I may be concerned with the number of people we're adding, if I could add anybody else to this fishery I would add Chad.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think like all of us I don't want to see this gentleman eliminated from the fishery, so I guess my inclination is to go along with the motion, but I think everybody in this fishery and all of us need to recognize we really haven't fixed the problem we've got. We're

going to end up with 23 boats and they're going to catch the quota up very quickly, and we're going to have to deal with it.

Mostly what I've heard from these guys of late, anyway, is reluctance to eliminate vessels. That's fine and we can do that but then we're going to have a heck of a derby fishery on our hands. Those guys who are in it are the ones who will probably suffer for it and I expect we will be back dealing with the golden longline fishery again before too long.

MR. CURRIN: Well, you're right, Roy, either we're going to have to deal with it or they can deal with it on their own if they can put it all together and make some decisions that everybody can accept and kind of help manage within the framework that we have provided. **Any further discussion? Is there any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.**

That is a substitute motion so that becomes the main motion. Is there any discussion on the main motion? Any objection to the main motion? I see none and that motion is approved. Under Action 4 there was some guidance as I mentioned to the staff. Under Action 5, to allow for transferability, a motion from the committee to approve wording changes for the transferability action and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Is there any objection? I see none and that motion is approved.

Under Action 7 the staff needed some clarification and there was some suggested rewording from the IPT for the no action alternative to retain the current step-down regulations that implement a trip limit of 300 pounds gutted weight once 75 percent of the quota is taken. The staff suggests different language to retain the current wording because it mentions the 4,000 pound trip limit currently in place and it also includes that step-down from 75 percent; so just some guidance to the staff on what you think is most appropriate, whether you want to accept the IPT's suggestions or the staff's suggestions. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I briefly talked about this with Gregg, and I have two sentences that I think could just be substituted for the no action or to clarify the no action. I think it could read, "The commercial trip limit is 4,000 pounds gutted weight. If 75 percent of the quota is harvested by September 1st, the trip limit is reduced to 300 pounds gutted weight." That is what is currently in the regulations right now.

MR. CURRIN: And you discussed that with Gregg and he thought that was acceptable language?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, would somebody like to include a motion if we need one? If not, can that be provided as guidance to the staff? Gregg, would that be acceptable to you guys or would you rather have a motion?

MR. WAUGH: No, I think it's clear what the intent is and you will give us editorial license at the end; so if Monica comes up with some additional fine tuning, then we can make it.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, under Action 8 a motion from the committee to clarify language of alternatives under Action 8 as follows in your report and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Any objection? I see none and that motion is approved.

There was some additional guidance to the staff to determine whether future clarification of the definition of longline gear is necessary; some ITP wording to changes; and another place where the staff has suggested some different wording. They like the wording as indicated in your report to retain the current wording which is currently – I’m sorry, we did that, didn’t we? Yes, this is a different action. I guess this is the same as the previous suggestion that Monica made, Gregg, is that correct?

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

MR. CURRIN: And with direction to staff you guys can handle that and you’re comfortable doing so. **All right, another clarification that the staff wanted was to make sure that the committee and the council was comfortable that longline gear cannot be used while the 500 pound trip limit is in effect. Is that the intent of the committee; and if so perhaps a motion to that effect would be appropriate.**

MR. HARRIS: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CURRIN: A motion by Duane; second by Charlie.

DR. CRABTREE: Mac, what we mean there is it can’t used after the longline ACL has been reached and the longline fishery is closed; right?

MR. CURRIN: That is correct. There are a couple of other longline fisheries operating out there. As we discussed, there is shark longline and it goes on the bottom. In talking to one of the golden tile longline fishermen, he also uses longline gear to target some of the deepwater groupers when they’re available and blueline tilefish. Further discussion on the motion?

The motion is that longline gear cannot be used while the 500 pound trip limit is in effect. I think with Roy’s clarification I would add after the longline ACL has been met. Does that clarify it or confuse it more? Would you rather –

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it’s a confused motion because longline gear can be used. It can be used in other fisheries. What we’re really saying is you can’t retain golden tilefish if you’re –

MR. CURRIN: That is caught with longline gear, yes.

DR. CRABTREE: And the 500 pound trip limit is in effect all year.

MR. CURRIN: That’s true.

DR. CRABTREE: So it’s a squirrelly motion.

MR. CURRIN: Well, it is but we need to clarify it so that everybody understands. I think everybody understands what the intent is, but we need –

DR. CRABTREE: On vessels using longline gear after the golden tile longline quota is reached; isn't that what we mean?

MR. CURRIN: I think that's clear to me. Is everyone okay with that?

MR. HARRIS: No, you can't use longline gear; that's part of the problem in the first part of that motion.

DR. CRABTREE: But you can use longline gear.

MR. CURRIN: You can use longline gear. You just can't use it to land golden tilefish. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, we've already said that the golden tilefish longliners can't catch the hook-and-line share so I think really all you want to do is say you can't use longlines to catch the hook-and-line trip limit. Would that make it simple?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, what we're saying is if you're fishing with longline gear you can't keep golden fish after the ACL has been met, which would preclude you from fishing in the handline fishery afterwards, but you could go out and fish for snowy grouper or sharks if you have the appropriate permits and keep those; but if you catch a golden tile while you're doing that, you would have to discard it.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: To ask another question, if I'm a golden tilefish longline fisherman who receives this endorsement and then the golden tilefish longline quota or ACL is met, may I go use different gear and catch golden tilefish, like hook and line?

MR. CURRIN: Participate in the hook-and-line fishery? I vaguely remember some discussion of that, and I believe the recommendation from the committee was that if you had a golden tilefish longline endorsement you were not eligible to participate in the hook-and-line fishery. We had some discussion about if they wanted to do that, they could transfer their golden tile longline permit somewhere else and then participate in that hook-and-line fishery. There were ways around it. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think what we mean is golden tilefish can't be retained on vessels that have golden tilefish longline endorsements after the golden tile longline ACL has been met.

MR. CURRIN: Is that what we mean? Is everyone okay with that language? You're not okay with it, Charlie?

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, it is not the longline endorsements that I think we're worried about. I think we're worried about a shark fisherman or somebody like that that had a longline working on that 500 pound trip limit.

MR. CURRIN: And I think you're right that we're actually worried about both of those cases; are we not? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, this is the snapper grouper fishery management plan and so you're managing the snapper grouper fishery. I don't think you're managing the shark fishery and you're not managing the blueline tile – well, never mind. You're sticking with snapper grouper species; right? Okay, and so you haven't discussed a shark is managed under a different regime, under a different management plan and not covered by this management plan.

MR. CURRIN: But there are longlines that are used to pursue or to seek other deepwater snapper grouper species, apparently. I know there are some regulations that prohibit those inside/outside of 50 fathoms on part of the coast, so there are areas where they can't be used, but I believe there are areas where they still can be used to seek other species besides golden tilefish. Those fisheries may interact with golden tilefish.

One questions is do we want those people fishing longline gear for other snapper grouper species to be able to retain a 500 pound trip limit set aside for the hook-and-line fishery or do we not? That's one. Then the other is we want to make sure that the longline fishermen who are endorsed do not use their longlines to seek golden tile after the ACL has been met. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think what we mean – and if this isn't what we mean, I'm not sure what we're doing but I think the purpose of this whole thing is to retain a golden tilefish that is caught with longline gear you have to have a golden tilefish longline endorsement. Otherwise, I don't know what that endorsement does.

If you're shark fishing and you don't have a golden tilefish longline endorsement you can't keep golden tilefish, period; and if you do have that golden tilefish longline endorsement, once the longline ACL is caught you can't keep golden tilefish. Now, I'm assuming somewhere in the establishment of the endorsement it says that in order to retain golden tilefish you have to have a golden tilefish longline endorsement. If it doesn't say that in there, then we certainly do need to clarify that because that is fundamental to the whole reason we're requiring the endorsement, it seems to me.

MR. CURRIN: I'm not sure I can answer that question. Gregg, have you got any insight into – okay, thank you.

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Chairman, Action 1 limits participation in the golden tilefish component of the snapper grouper fishery. Your preferred alternative is to limit golden tilefish effort through a golden tilefish longline endorsement program, distribute golden tilefish longline endorsements for snapper grouper permit holders that qualify under the eligibility requirements specified in Action 2. Only snapper grouper permit holders with a golden tilefish longline endorsement associated with their snapper grouper permit will be allowed to possess golden tilefish.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, so that's clear in Action 1. The second verbiage there that is highlighted in – all right, has someone made this motion?

MR. HARRIS: Well, I made the original motion.

MR. CURRIN: **All right, the motion by Duane is golden tilefish cannot be retained on vessels that have golden tilefish longline endorsements after the golden tilefish longline ACL has been met. Second by Charlie. Discussion on that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** There was a motion from the committee to approve Amendment 18B for formal review and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is this a roll call vote as well, Bob?

MR. MAHOOD: Yes. Mac, could you make your motion to also include the codified text so we don't have to do two roll call votes for the same thing.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm looking at the codified text and it says for a person aboard a vessel for which a commercial vessel permit for South Atlantic snapper grouper unlimited has been issued to fish for golden tilefish in the South Atlantic EEZ using longline gear, a golden tilefish longline endorsement must have been issued to the vessel. I guess my question to Monica would be should we be slightly more explicit and say "to fish for golden tilefish or possess golden tilefish caught with longline gear" or should we tweak that language a little?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think it is preferable instead of saying "to fish for" because people could say, "Well, I wasn't fishing for." I think it is better to just say "to harvest or possess" golden tilefish; substitute "harvest or possess" for "to fish for", and I think you would be fine.

DR. CRABTREE: Then I suppose I should make a motion to adjust the codified text?

MR. CURRIN: You can do that or I believe we have given our chairman the editorial or will give him the editorial authority.

DR. CRABTREE: We will work with David and clarify to make sure there is no question about that in the codified text.

MR. CURRIN: **I make the motion on behalf of the committee to approve Amendment 18B for formal review and deem the codified text for Amendment 18B as necessary and appropriate.**

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. McCawley.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Swatzel.

MR. SWATZEL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Currin.

MR. CURRIN: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: **The motion passes unanimously.**

MR. CURRIN: **Another motion from the committee to give staff editorial license to make changes to the amendment document as appropriate and give the chairman the authority to approve changes to the document and redeem the codified text as necessary and**

appropriate, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Is there any objection? I see none and that motion is approved.

The committee then discussed measures within the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 3 regarding speckled hind and Warsaw grouper protection actions. We received some summary reports from the council staff on input from two MPA Public Workshops and the Expert MPA Workgroup. We also received recommendations from the SSC and the Snapper Grouper AP.

The council staff also reviewed some of the pertinent information on the status of speckled hind and Warsaw grouper contained in NMFS 90-day ruling on the two petitions to list those species under the Endangered Species Act. There were several motions from the committee on this issue.

The first is the committee recommends moving forward with consideration of MPAs for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? I see none and that motion is approved.

Dr. Nick Farmer then gave us a presentation on a possible approach to designate candidate sites for MPA designation, including an overview of some of the data used and recommendations of criteria to consider while siting possible MPAs. **Another motion from the committee to direct the staff to develop alternatives to look at reconfiguring the existing MPAs as a first tier, new MPAs as a second tier and a combination of the two as a third tier. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Is there objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

There was some guidance to the IPT to clean up some of shapes of the options that we viewed to make them a little more regular or uniform and also guidance to schedule the two additional workshops, one in Florida and one in North Carolina, I believe, to obtain input from the fishermen and scientists in those areas. We then move on to discussions of – yes, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Before we leave this, I think that one of the things we need to do as we develop this amendment; there have been a lot of questions about are we overfishing and are we not overfishing speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. It seems to me that is going to be central to what we do with this.

I would suggest that we go back to the SSC with this. We had a presentation this morning of the ORCHS methodology, and that seems to be where we're going. Right now we do not have an overfishing level for speckled hind and Warsaw; but from what I saw with the ORCHS methodology, that is designed to allow you to derive an overfishing level for data-poor stocks.

I think it would be valuable to go back to the SSC and engage in some discussion with them about risk to see if we couldn't use that ORCHS methodology to come up with an overfishing level for speckled hind, which we could then address in this amendment. I think that would be helpful in getting where we need to be and deciding what we need to do.

MR. CURRIN: Do you want to make that in the form of a motion?

DR. CRABTREE: **Yes, I would move that staff go the SSC and ask them to review the current fishing levels for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper and to look at applying the ORCHS methodology to derive an overfishing level for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.**

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Roy; second by Charlie. Discussion on that motion? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: If we're going to consider this as one stock, are you going to have to get both SSCs together?

DR. CRABTREE: I think if you looked at most of the stocks that we manage in the South Atlantic, there is enough larvae coming through the Keys and the Straits of Florida that you're not likely to find very strong genetic differences in any of them. I think based on that you could argue that red snapper and gag and all sort of things – we've had gag migrate around the Keys and be tagged gag and be caught in the Gulf.

I think that issue is inherent in all of this; but from a practical standpoint for us to be able to manage these fisheries as councils, we have typically done separate stock assessments on it. I would say at least for now, no, we ought to see what our SSC says and we ought to continue to manage this as we have these other stocks. Now, if the SSC comes in that this is somehow different from everything else and we need to look at that, that's a different question. To me I don't think it's really any different than the situation for most of the stocks we manage.

MR. CURRIN: **Other discussion? Is there any objection to that motion? I see none, that motion is approved.** Anything else on speckled hind and Warsaw before we move on to red snapper?

MR. MAHOOD: Roy was your intent – John, refresh me, when is the next SSC meeting; in October?

MR. CARMICHAEL: October.

MR. MAHOOD: Was your intent that the SSC look at this before we move forward in any way relative to our workshops?

DR. CRABTREE: No, not at all, but I think in the course of putting this amendment together and before we finalize it all, we ought to have this resolved.

MR. CURRIN: That was my understanding as well. All right, if there is nothing we will move on to issues regarding red snapper management. Marcel Reichert came in and gave us a presentation and a summary of fishery-independent surveys, Chevron traps, CPU data for black sea bass and red snapper. There were some trends indicated, upward trends in abundance as per the MARMAP sampling efforts for both of those species.

We received an overview from the council staff on changes to red snapper management in recent years, reviewed all of that. The committee reiterated their choice of an ABC for red snapper since such a specification was not clearly made during the discussions pertaining to Regulatory Amendment 10.

To make that official, the committee moved that the council's intent was to adopt the ABC protections reviewed by the SSC with the headboat index weight of 0.3; and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of the motion? Any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.

Andy Strelcheck gave a presentation illustrating some different methods of calculating a range of possible levels of harvest for consideration for 2012 based on estimated levels of discards for 2010 and 2011 and estimated discards for 2012 from the SEDAR 24 projections. In addition the presentation discussed options on how to carry out a possible reopening of the red snapper fishery, including some benefits and drawbacks associated with it.

Bonnie explained that the estimated discards for 2010 and 2011 were calculated using the MRFSS data rather than the MRIP so that they were consistent with what has been done in the past and also because of guidance from the MRIP Calibration Workshop. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center will continue to use MRFSS recreational estimates until specific guidance results from the MRIP Calibration Workshop become available.

The committee considered several aspects of reopening the red snapper fishery and a whole suite of them there. I won't read them to you, but ranging from the South Atlantic states' ongoing programs to NMFS collaborating with the states to obtain data on red snapper if such a reopening occurred; consideration of placing observers on charterboats and headboats and to obtain better information on discards. Of course, that's all up in the air and subject to availability of people and funds and the like.

There was a motion from the committee to consider reopening of the red snapper fishery with an ACL of 13,067 fish. Note that this ACL would be for 2012 only. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? I see none; that motion is approved.

There was a motion and then a substitute motion. **I will give you the substitute motion which became the main motion and was approved by the committee. That motion was to develop a plan amendment to control harvest of red snapper through a tag system to be administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service. The tags would be subject to the commercial and recreational allocations and they would be distributed through a lottery system. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of that motion?** Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I would just ask that there be a note added that this is for the 2013 season and beyond. That is correct; right?

MR. CURRIN: It would certainly be after 2012, yes, whenever it is put in place. That is assuming that it is put in place in 2013, yes. I think that is clearly the understanding everyone has. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: And a couple of things that I think would be included in this amendment; one, the tag system would then become the AM for the fishery just like IFQ programs in the Gulf are the AM on it because that would prevent the quota from being exceeded. That's one. I think in this amendment as well we ought to address how we define overfishing in red snapper.

Because we have to go through extended periods between stock assessments, we find ourselves in a position as we are right now where based on the discards and the evidence we have, they all indicate we have ended overfishing of red snapper in the South Atlantic and yet it remains listed as undergoing overfishing in the status of stocks because of the way are overfishing.

I think in this amendment we ought to indicate our intent that during the periods in between stock assessments we will define overfishing as remaining below the overfishing levels defined in the projections. I think we have done that in the ACL Amendment and for a number of other stocks, but we haven't done it for red snapper at this point.

And then also this amendment would need to lay the annual catch limits because right now the annual catch limit is zero and we may change that with this emergency rule that we're going to discuss next; but in this amendment we would need to lay out what the annual catch limits would be and that would then define the number of tags that would go out.

MR. CURRIN: Any further discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? I see none; that motion is approved. Another motion on behalf of the committee to initiate an emergency rule to provide for the recreational allocation of red snapper to be landed on three-day weekends; the number of which would be determined by NMFS. The commercial portion of the ACL would be landed under a 100-pound gutted weight trip limit. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I guess I was just wondering if we could have a little bit more discussion on these three-day weekends for recreational and then when the commercial would be allowed to start fishing. I know we talked about this would start maybe some time in late August at the soonest, and I was wondering if there was a possibility for maybe two; have the recreational open one weekend and then the commercial open the following Monday; and then maybe at the end of that week maybe assess where we are or maybe NMFS is going to try to go ahead and specify two recreational weekends with the commercial in between. I just would like to have a little bit more discussion on that.

MR. CURRIN: Thoughts or suggestions? We're giving the regional director a lot of authority and latitude on how to put this together; and if the council has specific guidance they would like to offer, as Jessica indicated this would be a good time to do it. Personally I have some concerns about the number of weekends it might be open, and I hope we won't push that too far.

One I can see perhaps fairly easily. I might be dragged to two; but if it goes to three, I'd start jumping up and down screaming, so that is at least some guidance that I might offer. I'm still, as I expressed certainly in previous phone calls and I believe during the committee as well, concerned about the potential for overages in this fishery and we run the risk I think – if in fact we're able to measure those numbers and determine what the catch is accurately and it is over, then I would consider it to be a fairly large dark circle on the council's eye. I think we need to be careful is my only advice. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to suggest if it is possible to get it opened by the end of August that we hit that last weekend in that wave. Forty-five days hopefully we have the information from that wave and then you can determine a second opening in the next wave, if that's possible.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, yes, July and August are Wave 4. If we open for one weekend in August and then – Andy and Jack, help me out – we would expect to get the data for Wave 4 in October, generally. That would require that the next opening take place in late October/November, and then you're getting into questionable weather; but if that is what you wanted to do, we could look at that.

My thought process had been more along the lines of we would open the recreational fishery on a Friday, which would be done as quickly as – the emergency rule would publish on some date and then it would be effective 30 days later; so a fisherman would get 30 days' notice that we're going to open it up. We would open this on the Friday that is 30 days after the emergency rule publishes.

The recreational fishery would fish – and I'll tell you right now my preliminary look at this is that we're talking about two three-day weekends. I share Mac's concern and think we need to be conservative with this. The fishery would open on a Friday; the recreational guys would fish Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The commercial guys would then start fishing on that Monday and their season would run through Friday. The recreational second weekend would be that Friday and they would have Saturday and Sunday.

And then depending on if the commercial guys caught it all up or not, that could be the end of the whole thing. By putting it in a period of time like that, that would enable us to really put the biologists out in force in a defined period of time. All the fishing is taking place in that time. It seems to me that might maximize our ability to catch the fish.

Now, we could do that differently. Assuming we could get the emergency rule published in time to do it, I guess we could fish a weekend in August and then wait until we got the data, look at it, and then look at reopening after that, but that is going to put the next weekend pretty late in the year.

The other problem I think we have to be realistic about is we're going to get MRIP or MRFSS estimates of what is caught in that wave, but it is not likely to effectively capture those three days, and it may not give us anything useful in terms of really knowing whether it was caught or not and whether we ought to have another weekend. If we get the number and it has a 90 percent

CV on it, that is telling you that it is not very useful. I don't know what it will show in terms of the CV. That may sound good but in practice given the data collection it may not be very effective. But if you wanted to try it that way we could do that.

MR. HAYMANS: First of all, Roy, at least the motion now is a seven day and not a five-day commercial season, so that may need to be adjusted. Secondly, I did have an e-mail from one of our headboats that was asking for a start of October 1 because of weather. I know the table that Andy presented showed some tremendous wave heights later in the year, but his feeling is that by October the weather had smoothed out for them and he would prefer a later period.

MR. MAHOOD: Bonnie, we talked at some point that the MRIP people had a mode for tournament sampling that I think you were going to check into and see if somehow it could be applied to a weekend opening type thing even though the tournament would be the whole southeast coast, that we felt like we could maybe zero in on some of that.

DR. PONWITH: Correct, and in anticipation of this very discussion I have initiated conversations with MRIP about how other than the normal MRIP approach, which Roy is right, you run the risk that if you use just the normal sampling regime it might not be sampling at a rate that we need to actually reflect what happened and it creates large CVs because of that.

I am really heartened by the states' willingness to put additional folks out there and help with the dockside intercepts; but as you all know the dockside intercept is half the equation. The other half which is equally as critical is accounting for effort. The effort estimate of how many people are out there you need the CPUE data which the intercepts will do.

When you put the two of them together, you get the expansions for what the total catch is. The issue we're working on right now is how would you account for that effort. One approach is to use the normal MRIP and see if that is going to be adequate. The other one is to use a tournament-like approach.

I'm in discussion with them on that. They're open to talking about it, but it's an iterative thing. We need to know what is the council's thinking on what this would look like. I can carry this discussion back to them and say, okay, this is what the council is thinking; how would we do that? The answer is I can't give you a definitive answer but your discussions will help me refine the discussions with MRIP to figure out what could be done.

MS. McCRAWLEY: Can someone refresh my memory of the whole carcass drop-off discussion? I'm not saying that is going to solve the effort estimation, but is that only associated with the tag program or are the states supposed to be initiating a carcass drop-off associated with this weekend opening? I guess I'm a little confused about that.

MS. CURRIN: I would hope everybody would do everything they possibly could to gather as many carcasses as they could. Of course, it is not going to be quantitative, but it is going to provide opportunistic hard parts and lengths that will help fill out the data set. That would be my thought. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I agree with that. I think that ought to be a component of this. I think we and the states ought to let fishermen know what docks we're going to have biologists at so someone who brought fish in somewhere else and wants to be a good patriot could bring those fish by to be looked at. I think we ought to make every effort we can to do that.

I guess there are a couple of things to decide before we vote on this motion. One is what Doug brought up on the timing of this, and that is up to you. I don't think you need to change the motion, but if you want to give us direction that you would like us to structure the weekends such that we can collect some data, then we need that direction.

Then the second thing I want to bring up relative to this motion is the hundred pound trip limit. The Center has given me some very quick estimates of what might be caught, and it is possible that the entire commercial allocation could be caught up in five days or so under this trip limit. We have a seven-day mini-season kind of increment, and I guess we have two ways to go.

One, in the next motion we could shorten that up or in this motion rather than going with a hundred pound trip limit we could go with a fifty pound trip limit to slow them down some. I think we need to have some discussion about how you want to handle that.

MR. CURRIN: Thoughts regarding the trip limit in particular; because if we want to change that, this is the place within this motion to do that. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I think I would rather have a 50-pound trip limit than shorten it to five days. I think it might be a little more helpful with discards. I would make the motion that we go from 100 pounds down to 50 pounds for the trip limit for the seven-day mini-season.

MR. CURRIN: We might be able to amend it, but we'll make sure if he can amend it in just that specific language. **Charlie's motion is to amend the motion to change the 100 pound value to 50 pounds. Is there a second? Second by Ben. Discussion of the amended motion? Ben.**

MR. HARTIG: Really what you have done here is you've taken a directed fishery which would have occurred at a hundred pounds in the southern portion of the range and you have put it more to what we should have done in the first place as 50 pounds and it would be a bycatch.

MR. CURRIN: So I take that you are in support of this motion. I think it is a good idea, too, and it may allow a second opening as opposed to running a high risk of running it over. We will have good numbers on this so then we get into paybacks and all of that. **Any further discussion on this motion. Is there any objection to the amendment? I see none; that motion is approved. Now the amended motion is before you. Is there further discussion on the amended motion?**

DR. CRABTREE: I think we can come back to the issue of when do you want the three days after we see if this passes, but I would like to just talk a minute about where we are. The guidelines that the Fisheries Service has for emergency actions say that an emergency exists if you have a situation where you have results from recent unforeseen events or recently discovered circumstances.

I would say in this occasion we have recently discovered circumstances as a result of the discard estimates we have and the work done by the scientists, and we have only recently discovered that we have some fish available that could be harvested this year, so we meet that. They also state that it can happen in a situation that presents serious conservation or management problems in the fishery.

We certainly have serious management problems in this fishery right now, and I think that is clear from the public comment. We also have had a recent and unforeseen delay in the timing of the stock assessment. Recall in December we were under the impression we would be able to do a red snapper assessment in 2013.

At the March meeting we learned that the assessment really needed to be held off until 2014. That is a recent and unforeseen event. The management issue we have really right now is partly due to the lack of ability to produce a more timely stock assessment on it, and that is in part due to data availability difficulties.

One of the reasons and one of the benefits we'll have from what we're talking about doing is it should produce quite a bit of data, which then addresses some of our management problems that we have. Then, finally, emergencies can be justified based on a number of things, but one of them is economical harm and cost and also social issues such as impacts on communities.

I think we heard last night from quite a few people, including tourism boards, hotel owners, chambers of commerce, two members of congress as well as a whole group of fishermen that these closures are having significant economic impacts, and I don't think there is any question that they're having significant impacts on communities. I think that is evidenced by chambers of commerce and representatives of local communities coming and talking to it. I think on the basis of those, that is really how this fits with the Fisheries Service criteria for emergency rules.

MR. CURRIN: Thank you; I think you did a wonderful job justifying that and providing it for the record.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And perhaps Lt. Foos wants to talk about this, but he did mention at the committee that the coast guard does have concerns about putting this opening too late in the season because of weather events; and weather events as we all know really kick up in the fall in the Atlantic. I heard over here about some fishermen who wanted at least in the opposite direction to open it in October, but perhaps the lieutenant could talk a little bit about the timing of this from his perspective and safety-at-sea issues.

LT. FOOS: Mr. Chairman, I was going to wait until the next motion to bring my concerns, but the council has made it pretty clear that we're willing to go forward on what will be a derby fishery. The coast guard has several concerns when it comes to derby fisheries. The two main concerns are safety related.

One, that fishermen are going to go out when their vessels are in material condition that they maybe would not have gone out otherwise. There is not very much that the council can do about that, but in this instance the concern is weather related in that fishermen would go out in weather

that they would normally not otherwise fish in if they think that there is going to be a very short window of opportunity for that fishing to occur.

I think it is in the fishermen's best interest as well as this council's best interest to try to get this opened up as soon in the season as possible to try to take advantage of the normal seasonal weather that we see offshore in the South Atlantic vice what you particular see as we get later into the fall period where the wave heights start to creep up.

MR. JOLLEY: To that, is there a way to run this thing kind of like you run a tournament? If we have a hurricane going by, we certainly wouldn't want to encourage people going out in that ocean. I just thought – I don't know if there is a way to do something like this – if the weather is too bad, you call the damned thing off, but I know that would be cumbersome.

MR. CURRIN: Well, I think in the next motion we're giving the director some latitude to adjust openings due to weather conditions. I believe we talked about that, anyway. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I think that's right. During the oil spill in the Gulf, we set up a process whereby we could make changes just by posting notice to fishermen on the web, so we were able to make changes daily on that. I don't know if we can do it or not, but I would like to set this up so that the RA would have the authority, without going through the whole rule-making thing, to simply put out on the web and through a Fishery Bulletin notice to fishermen that there is severe weather coming and the season is going to be delayed.

That would only happen I think if we were talking about a tropical weather system coming up, but I would like to build into that the flexibility to do it. It's the only way it would work; because if you've got to go back through the whole federal register rulemaking, it's too cumbersome. We can try to do that and I think that is implicit in your second motion.

MS. McCAWLEY: Did we need to specify in this motion that this emergency rule is specific to 2012?

MR. CURRIN: I don't think so; it is pretty clear. I think it was somewhere that it was for 2012 only.

DR. CRABTREE: I think that is clear and remember it is an emergency rule to be in place for six months and then it is gone.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, if you'll note in your committee report, I think it was the first motion under this action, Jessica, there was a note at the bottom of the first motion that said this ACL would be for 2012. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mine is not to the motion so I'll defer.

MR. CURRIN: **Now, I think we approved that amended motion; did we not? We did not vote on the amended motion? All right, that is what all this discussion is about. Any further discussion on the motion? Any objection to that motion?**

DR. CRABTREE: Do we have to do a roll call vote?

MR. MAHOOD: What we're going to do is we're going to finish all the related motions and then ask for a motion to send it to the secretary.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, just to be clear on the record, so we are not – I don't know if it's okay with me because my read on this is we're requesting an emergency rule.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, but isn't that next motion part of that? We handled it separately but it's –

DR. CRABTREE: And also the words "initiate an emergency rule" are in this motion.

MR. CURRIN: All right, maybe we can handle this by tabling this motion and then taking care of the next motion and then come back to this one and do a roll call vote on it; how is that? **Okay, let's just postpone voting on this motion until we take care of all the other motions within this action. The next motion on the next page is that the ACL for red snapper would be set at 13,067 fish. Weekends would consist of Friday, Saturday and Sunday. NMFS would strive to open the season as soon as possible. NMFS would be able to modify the opening date subject to weather conditions. The recreational bag limit would be one per person per day with no size limit. The commercial fishery would be open in seven-day mini-season increments subject to the remaining quota. There would be no size limit for the commercial sector. On behalf of the committee I so move.**

I know there is at least one modification the committee or the council would like to consider here. The staff asked for some clarification on the red snapper ACL, the accountability measures and wanted to pose the position of whether there was a consideration of paybacks. I think it is clear from one of the previous motions we set the ACL at 13,067 fish. Gregg, is that okay?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, we just wanted to make clear that these are your percent allocations between recreational and commercial and you apply those to that number of fish, so you end up with a recreational ACL for 2012 of 9,399 fish and the commercial ACL for 2012 is 3,668 fish or 20,818 pounds gutted weight.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, so this is just to inform the committee and the council, I guess, that this is what all of these actions result in as far as allocations among those two fisheries. Also, I think Gregg has highlighted what the current commercial accountability measures are and what the current recreational accountability measures are. Paybacks, I don't know how we're going to track –

MR. WAUGH: Mr. Chairman, you need to specify those. Those are what are in place in terms of accountability measures for other species. Right now you're ACL is zero. There is no harvest so we don't have accountability measures or have not addressed any payback provisions so you need to specify those.

DR. CRABTREE: I think clearly the accountability measures that the emergency rule will establish will be the in-season closure based on the projection or actual tracking of the landings

to close the fishery down. In terms of the payback, remember this is a six-month rule so it will start and expire; and so by the time a payback actually happened, this rule would no longer be in force.

Now, my view on partly what we're doing here is we're going to try this and see how it goes. Now, if we have an overrun or we have other significant problems with this, then I think that is where we're going to come back to, okay, the only practical way to handle is the fish tag program. My view at that point would be we're not going to do this again next year.

We're going to get the fish tag program in place; and the next time we open it, it will be under that program. Now, if this works out beautifully and everybody is happy and all the catches are in line with where they should be, I think then you might could argue we don't need a fish tag program, this sort of approach is working fine.

Unless Monica has some ideas, our guidelines on annual catch limits have a whole section in there about in-season closures as an accountability measure. We have many, many fisheries where the accountability measures and in-season closure – and I think because of the nature of this being a temporary rule that is not going to be extended I think we have to deal with the payback differently because that has to be something more long term. I don't see how else to do it.

MR. CURRIN: Gregg's suggestion is that we explicitly I think include some accountability measures in this motion.

DR. CRABTREE: They will be included in the emergency rule because they're required; so the emergency rule will have to point out that those are the accountability measures.

MR. CURRIN: Okay, and since they don't change, would it help you out if the committee would make a motion to specify these as they exist now in 17A?

MR. WAUGH: Well, I think as long as that is your intent that during the emergency those are the accountability measures, I guess that's fine. I don't know that we need a motion because it is clear here. But then the paybacks, I guess the payback provision would be addressed in the amendment that we're initiating and not in the emergency rule.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I think it would have to be if we want to make a change to that. Now, in the amendment, if we go with the tag system it seems to me that then becomes the accountability measure; and if you have an overrule under a tag system, it seems to me you must have an inadequately designed tag system or you've got compliance problems. But I think, yes, we'll have to figure that out when we get there. Likewise, if we have an overrun here, we'll have to deal with what does that mean in terms of the ACLs next year; do we need to rerun the projections or how do we adjust next year's take levels to reflect the overrun, but I think we would have to do that.

MR. CURRIN: So are you okay, Gregg, just with the guidance in this?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think the record is clear.

MR. CURRIN: Also, the staff asked for a clarification and I think it's clearly the council's intent that the motion that is before you now would be part of the emergency rule. Is that sufficient for you guys, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CURRIN: **Without any objection from the council. All right, you have the motion before you and we've had some discussion of this. The extent of the commercial season within this motion is set a seven days. There was some talk about whether that would be perhaps too long.** With a 50-pound trip limit, I don't know, are there thoughts on this, any desire to change that time period? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think it's probably okay. Now, I think with the 50-pound limit, based on what I've got, they probably wouldn't catch that in seven days; but should we do the projection and it shows that they would catch it in less than seven days, then we would say the season opens on this date and closes on this date. That is what would happen.

MR. CURRIN: All right, so everyone okay with that? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to ask the benefit of requiring daily reporting for the commercial sector during the season. Is it possible and is there benefit there?

DR. CRABTREE: We'll take that suggestion into advice. I'd have to talk to the folks at the Science Center about that; but if that is an option it would be voluntary; but if we could get people to do that, we could try that.

MR. HAYMANS: I can sort of see some sandbagging through the first seven days in order to get a second seven-day mini-season and if there is a way to avoid that.

DR. CRABTREE: And I will say right now if we get a situation where the Center tells me we have poor dealer compliance, there will not be a second seven-day season.

MR. CURRIN: Nobody would do that, Doug, would they? Yes, that's a good way to handle it, Roy, and I'm glad to hear you say that. We have got to measure some compliance here and adjust for that or otherwise we're going to get taken to the cleaners, I think. **Any further discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to the motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

So now, David, our postponed motion is before us and it's on the screen to initiate an emergency rule, for the recreational allocation of red snapper to be landed on the three-day weekend, et cetera, et cetera. This has to be a roll call vote to send it to the secretary.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: No.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Currin.

MR. CURRIN: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Jolley.

MR. JOLLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Ms. McCawley.

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Mr. Swatzel.

MR. SWATZEL: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: Chairman Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: Yes.

MR. MAHOOD: **Mr. Chairman, the motion passes with one negative vote.**

MR. CURRIN: All right, thank you all very much. Yes, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I've explained my negative votes before, but that is a procedural thing that I'm instructed to do. We're still back to the question Doug raised I think about separating – now, one point I would make is if both three-day weekends occur during one wave, I would think the probability that MRFSS could capture that and the estimate it would give you would be better than if the two three-day systems were in separate waves. It's something to think about.

MR. HAYMANS: But you're basically talking about mid-August at that point in order to get two in Wave 4, right?

DR. CRABTREE: And if I can get this done it could be that both three-day weekends occur in September. I can tell you right now – and I won't speculate on the cause of it – regulations and rules are not moving quickly. They are moving very slowly and there is nothing I can do to change that.

I think you just need to give me your desire – if your desire is to split them and try to review some data before they happen, I can do the best I can to do that, but it may not work out that way; or if you'd rather just have the weekends in the same wave and go that route, I'll try to make that happen as best I can, but I may not be able to do it exactly the way you want and I think you have to understand that the Fisheries Service may have to make some tweaks and changes to this in order to make it work out.

LT. FOOS: Mr. Chairman, as far as analyzing this as a derby fishery and also from an enforcement's perspective we would prefer to see it one weekend right after the other in the same wave. That way that would give the recreational fishermen an opportunity to pick one weekend or the other knowing that they would be able to pick the conditions that would be best of them rather than looking at it as this might be the only weekend I get and I better go out regardless. It also helps ease our enforcement planning efforts for that time period.

MR. HAYMANS: And my suggestion for August was only if we could account for it in that wave; but if it seems like we can't, then I'm fine with back-to-back weekends in September or October.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, I think we had some discussion of encouraging Roy to try to get it done within a single wave as you mentioned, and I think it's a very valid point, the chances of gathering more accurate information is going to be enhanced by doing that. Is everybody okay with that? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I wanted to bring it up earlier, but can't we use the experience of the Gulf to inform us on what is going to happen? You guys had the openings last year under weekends in the Gulf and you will see what happens within the waves of the recreational fishery. Can't we look at that?

DR. CRABTREE: We can look at that and see if it is useful to us. It was different in the Gulf because you had the spill and all that crazy stuff going on, but we can look back at how MRFSS captured that and how well it did and take that into account.

MR. CURRIN: Any further discussion on red snapper issues and management? Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I want to hearken back on what I said yesterday. I'm real concerned about the collection of biological information from this opening, and I would like to see a presentation at – I would like you all to see a presentation at the September meeting by the Science Center and the Regional Office as to how they have worked with the states to collect as much biological information from this opening as possible; and then if it's possible, depending on which wave is selected, a presentation in December on the results of the recreational catch through those openings.

MR. CURRIN: Anything else? All right, the committee then discussed some issues regarding black sea bass management and received an overview of the information from the Science Center that the council requested. The Science Center fulfilled the council's request, but the projections were initially run at a 50 percent probability of rebuilding success.

That was a lower probability than the council had selected through actions in Amendment 18A and so we asked the Science Center to provide some projections late in the game, really, at a 66 percent probability of success. Thankfully, they were able to do that and met that request. Under this scenario it did not seem that there was an allowable increase to the current ACL of 847,000 pounds whole weight; so a lot of discussion on this issue. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: Bonnie, we really appreciate your staff bringing all this together. It worked out well working with Tom Jamir. He was on the ball and worked with us to get all this information. I think all of it made the briefing book, which was great, so we appreciate that.

MR. CURRIN: The committee also briefly discussed the future consideration of limiting black sea bass trips and possibly changing the black sea bass fishing year. **Just a single motion regarding this from the committee and request that the SSC apply the control rule to the black sea bass fishery and advise the council on the probability of rebuilding success, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there any objection to that motion? I see none; that motion is approved.**

Under other business, a couple of issues brought to the committee and a couple of motions as a result. **The first motion was to direct the staff to develop MPA alternatives that are Type II MPAs, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of this motion? Any objection to this motion? I see none and that motion is approved.**

Another motion to direct staff to include requiring VMS on commercial vessels in alternatives to designate MPAs, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? I see none; that motion is approved. Mr. Chairman, unless there are further questions, that will end my last snapper grouper committee report. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: We had Amendment 22, I believe it was, Gregg, that we scoped for a fish tag program for red snapper, so will this fish tag program then pick up as Amendment 22, and in that case we would be bringing an options paper in September?

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, and the other issue – and I don't know, David, where we want to talk about it, but I think a little bit of discussion of the MRIP numbers versus MRFSS numbers and modifying our ACLs might be worth having before we finish today. It is not entirely a snapper grouper issue, but it is something I think we ought to have a little bit of discussion about timing and how we're going to do that before we leave.

MR. CUPKA: Do you want to bring that up under other business or do you want to go ahead and do it now?

DR. CRABTREE: Whatever your preference is.

MR. CUPKA: Well, we can go ahead and do now while we're thinking about it.

DR. CRABTREE: We've got MRIP and MRFSS running simultaneously this year, but next year there will be no MRFSS anymore. We had the workshop conducted to look at calibrating these numbers and they made recommendations about using a ratio multiplier to scale back earlier years. I think the plan is still to potentially produce some additional estimates going back earlier in time, and I think John Carmichael would know the details of that.

We may have some of those come out late this summer or early next fall. The issue we have is that for some stocks, and most notably yellowtail snapper, the MRIP numbers are much higher than the MRFSS numbers; and so when we start monitoring ACLs next year they're not really apple-to-apple comparisons.

And in all likelihood if we use MRIP numbers to monitor a MRFSS-based ACL for yellowtail snapper, we're going to go way over it and trigger the accountability mechanisms, and there are probably some other stocks where this is going to be an issue. We need to come in and recalculate our annual catch limits to pull in these new estimates.

I guess the issue is how many iterations of that do we want to go through because I think there will be additional changes and improvements to these estimates that may require us to come in again. But we probably could come in and take the formulas we set up in our ACL amendments and not change any of the decisions we've made but simply go in, replace the 2004 forward numbers with the new 2004 numbers, scale the earlier year numbers based on a ratio estimator which would have to be determined, and simply change those numbers.

I think when we do that we could probably do a categorical exemption under NEPA, which means that we wouldn't look at alternatives or anything else. We would just replace the numbers, come in as the council and say, yes, vote it up, and put the new numbers in the Federal Register. I guess the decision is when would we want to do that? I think what staff could do is essentially set up a spreadsheet that has all the numbers in it and then just stick the new estimates in and recalculate the numbers.

I don't think it is a complicated thing to do to correct those. If we went ahead and did that now and tried to come in September and vote that up and put them in place, then we could end up coming back in December or another meeting and doing it again because we may have yet some more years to do it in.

I am concerned that we get in a situation next year where – yellowtail snapper is an obvious example but a situation where we've got ACLs that really aren't comparable to the catch estimates we have now. I guess my inclination on this is to come in as quickly as we can and plug these new numbers in – it's not just the ACL numbers; it would be the allocation formulas as well – and re-estimate these things and correct them. Then if we have to do it yet again with new estimates, we would do that, but I think we ought to make some sort of decision as to how we want to proceed with this.

MR. CURRIN: Other thoughts or discussion on this? One point to make, Roy, is we've had a number of discussions throughout the past 12 to 18 months about some desire – and I think Ben has brought it up a number of times and I agree with him – to look at Boyles' Law and the timeframe on the last section or the last few years to – see, it is currently set at three years and there is some feeling that may not be an adequate range of years because it allows for too much variation in the highly variable recreational estimates and it has skewed some of the historic allocations. The point is I think there it was talking about changing allocations within that suggested way of operating; is that going to cause problems with converting the MRIP numbers.

DR. CRABTREE: I understand that, but my suggestion to you would be let's separate those two issues. We've got one issue that is purely a technical issue. We have new catch estimates; we need to plug them into the formulas we've already selected. Now we have another issue of do you want to change those formulas.

That's going to require a NEPA analysis, alternatives, that whole process. I would say let's keep the technical change separate; just get that done; and then if you want to change the allocations and all those other things, that's great; go forth and do it, but let's do that as a separate amendment.

MR. CUPKA: I really do think that would be the best approach. I think is it the upcoming SSC meeting, John, that they're going to be taking a look at Boyles' Law? Isn't the SSC going to be taking a look at Boyles' Law at their upcoming meeting?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes.

MR. CUPKA: They deferred that I think from their last meeting and wanted the SEP to look at it before they dealt with it. We should be having that later on this year, but I think it would be best to keep them separate.

MR. CURRIN: Other discussion on Roy's suggestion? What is your reaction to that; how do you want to proceed?

DR. CRABTREE: John, do we have a ratio correction factor to actually use to correct the years prior to 2004? I know that is what they suggested we do, but do we have one yet?

MR. CARMICHAEL: As I recall, I believe they were going to have ratios for all of those stocks that are managed around the country July 1st. They were wanting it to be done through the MRIP folks and the science centers together to come up with a consistent approach that is used for everything, and they wanted them to give the numbers. They said July 1st was the target.

DR. CRABTREE: So it would be feasible to pull together a spreadsheet, plug in the new numbers, apply the ratio correction and then spit out all of our ACLs and allocations with the landings data corrected by the September meeting?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I would believe that would be feasible to show what the adjusted ACLs would be.

DR. CRABTREE: **All right, I'd like to make a motion, Mac, to request that if the necessary determinations are available that staff bring in corrected ACLs and allocations incorporating MRIP estimates to the September meeting and schedule the council for final action to correct those.**

MR. CURRIN: Motion by Roy; second by David. David.

MR. CUPKA: You wanted updated ACLs and allocations?

DR. CRABTREE: It would be ACLs, ACTs and allocations. If we don't get those ratio estimators and we can't do it, so be it; but if we do get them and we can pull this off and if Monica and everyone is in agreement with us doing this through an expedited kind of process, I think we would be well served to get that taken care of.

MR. CURRIN: **All right, the motion is to request that if the necessary determinations are available that staff bring updated and corrected ACLs, ACTs and allocations with updated MRIP numbers in a framework for final action at the September meeting. Further discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? I see none and that motion is approved.** All right, anything else to come before the Snapper Grouper Committee. All right, Mr. Chairman, that ends my report.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Mac, excellent job as always and we're going to miss those reports. The next report is from the Golden Crab Committee which met yesterday. The committee discussed the results of the indication of interest and participation in a catch share program by

permit holders who had landed at least one pound of golden crab in two of three following years, 2008 through 2010.

The council gave direction to staff to convene a meeting of the golden crab permit holders to discuss the catch share program prior to the September 2012 meeting. The committee reviewed confidential data relative to the golden crab fishery and then discussed Amendment 6 of the Golden Crab Fishery Management Plan. The committee made the following motions and gave the following direction to staff.

The first motion was to continue with the development of Amendment 6. The motion was approved by committee, and on behalf of the committee I would so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Mel.

MR. BELL: Mr. Chairman, I was not on that committee and I'm new to this, but I would be inclined to support that, but I have some issues I think particularly from some of the testimony we had last night and discussion. I've just got some concerns about how this might work out. Given the apparent condition of the resource and some of what we heard again last night, there might be some significant impact on folks. We can move forward with it because that is what I look at that first thing about it is moving forward. I just want to make sure we deal with some of those concerns we heard.

MR. CUPKA: I think some of those concerns will be addressed and hopefully all of them as we move forward with it and start looking at what comes out of the meeting and how we might adjust the FMP. Further discussion on the motion? Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I was just going to say again that I'm going to vote against this motion. I don't support the continuation of this catch shares program. Based on what we heard in public testimony last night, I don't think it is just a philosophical objection that the folks have. I think they understand. We even heard people talk about their current landings. I am going to vote against this motion.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I guess I'll vote in favor of it, but my view of development right now means reconvene these guys and have them go through this. Whether I'll support this amendment in the end is going to depend in part on what comes out of those folks and also what substantive changes we end up making to the amendment.

MR. CUPKA: Understood. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: The most surprising thing that I heard last night is some of these guys don't even know what their allocations would be, and I think that would go a long way towards us continuing to pursue this.

DR. CRABTREE: So when we have this panel meeting, these guys can see what they would get. That only reveals their own landings to them, so I think that's fine. Now, I've heard people discuss that some of them at least are willing to sign waivers; and if they all did that, then they could all sit down and look at what everybody is going to get.

That's totally up to them as to whether they want to do that. I don't see any problem with having staff show each one of them under a whole list of alternatives what their particular allocation would be. My hope would be we'd have staff at this meeting who would be able to churn out those analyses and numbers for them to look at while they're there.

MR. HARTIG: My support was just like Roy's. I want to see what comes out of that meeting and then make a decision whether we go ahead.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, some of us had some discussion, too, about the fact that if there is any way to do it, it would be good for council members to see the rest of the numbers prior to the next meeting or at least early in the meeting. I realize by the nature of those confidential data that you have to provide it in those individual folders and we have to give it back again, but it's kind of hard to get that information and be able to digest it all while you're sitting at the table trying to make a decision. If there is some way to provide that to council members in advance, that would be good.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we can ask staff to give that some thought and see if there might be some way to accommodate that. **Other discussion? All right, all those in favor of the motion signify by raising your hand; opposed. The motion passes.**

We had a second motion which was to accept the proposed language change dealing with the purpose and need section, and on behalf of the committee I would so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection? Without objection, that motion is approved.

The council gave direction to staff to provide additional rationale for the purpose and need section. **Action 2, there was a motion to create an alternative that distributed 35 percent of the share allocation equally among all permit holders and distribute the remaining 65 percent using historic landings for the years 1997 through 2010. On behalf of the committee I would so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection? Seeing one objection, that motion is approved.**

Okay, there was a motion to remove subalternatives under – this says Alternative 4, but it's probably Action 4 to the considered but rejected appendix, and on behalf of the committee I would so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? I guess that is subalternatives under Alternative 4 of Action 2 to the considered but rejected. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.

The council gave direction to staff to work up annual pound allocations based on the Action 2 alternatives. **Another motion to accept the IPT recommendation to remove the phrase "or renewable" from the alternatives in Action 4, and on behalf of the committee I would so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

Action 5, this deals with the share cap, there was a motion to change the preferred alternative to Alternative 4, which would be a 35 percent share cap, and on behalf of the

committee I would so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection? Jessica. Okay, the motion is approved.

Action 6, there was a motion to accept the IPT's recommended wording change for Alternatives 3 and 4; "Shares that remain inactive for three consecutive years will be revoked and proportionally redistributed among the remaining shareholders subject to share cap restrictions based upon the amount of shares that each holds immediately prior to the redistribution." On behalf of the committee I would so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? The motion is approved.

The council clarified their decision that participants who have shares revoked in any given year cannot participate in any redistribution of shares revoked by other catch share participants during that same year. That concludes the report of the Golden Crab Committee. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Mr. Chairman, based on the direction that council was given yesterday by the committee and now today by the council, the golden crab permit shareholders meeting, we have talked to some of the participants in the fishery. The council is already going to be doing public hearings in Florida in early August, and it is looking like right now that they probably are going to have the meeting with the permit holders on August 10th, which is a Friday, and it will probably be in Key Largo.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, thank you, Brian. I'm glad to see it is moving ahead and I hope that it will be a fruitful meeting and something good will come out of it. All right, the next committee report is Ecosystem-Based Management. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: The Ecosystem-Based Management Committee met on Monday, June 11th, in Orlando, Florida. An update on the status of catches versus quota for octocorals was provided by NOAA Fisheries staff. Jessica McCawley provided an update on octocoral landings in Florida state and adjacent federal waters since the transfer of management of octocorals in Florida federal waters to the state in 2011.

The committee then received several reports from advisory panel meetings held in April and May 2012. Mike Merrifield, representing the Deepwater Shrimp AP, presented the report from the April 20, 2012, joint Shrimp and Deepwater Shrimp AP meeting in Charleston, South Carolina.

He reviewed the AP's recommendations for the proposed expansions of coral habitat areas of particular concern that are considered in the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 3 and presented a spatial representation of rock shrimp trawl track data in relation to the Oculina Bank HAPC.

Steve Blair, chairman of the Coral AP, presented recommendations resulting from the May 9-10, 2012, Coral AP meeting in Charleston, South Carolina. Roger provided the Habitat AP recommendations that resulted from their May 15, 2012, webinar. The committee briefly discussed the CE-BA 3 Decision Document and deferred further consideration and development

of the Coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern measures until after a joint meeting of a number of the council's APs.

The committee also received an update on the South Atlantic ecosystem activities. The Ecosystem-Based Management Committee made the following motions. The first motion has to do with a letter to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission regarding protection and conservation measures for elkhorn and staghorn corals in relationship to spiny lobster fishing.

The first motion then would be to submit a letter to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of the motion? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.

The second motion was to convene the Deepwater Shrimp and Coral APs and representatives from the Habitat AP and Law Enforcement AP to discuss the habitat area of particular concern measures in CE-BA 3, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of that motion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Mr. Chairman, that completes my report.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Duane. All right, moving right along we're trying to get ahead on some of these because we still have the Mackerel Committee, which is going to take some time. Our next committee report is dolphin and wahoo; Tom Swatzel.

MR. SWATZEL: The Dolphin and Wahoo Committee met on June 11th. The committee received presentations on the status of the commercial and recreational sectors towards meeting the ACL of the season. The committee discussed the report of the Dolphin and Wahoo AP meeting of April 24, 2012.

They discussed the AP's motions regarding a recreational tag program for dolphin; sector allocations for dolphin; and allowing for-hire sales for both dolphin and wahoo. The committee made the following motions:

Motion 1: Recommend that the tag program for dolphin and wahoo and the sector allocation issues recommended by the AP be addressed in CE-BA 4. That motion failed. Motion 2: Take the dolphin allocation issue brought by the AP out to scoping as part of CE-BA 4. That motion was approved by the committee and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion of the motion? Yes, Mac.

MR. CURRIN: As per my discussion during the committee meeting, I will vote against this motion. I think it is the same motion that has been before the committee numerous times over the last several years, and I still do not support moving forward with this.

MR. SWATZEL: Any other discussion of the motion? **All in favor raise your hand for the motion; all opposed. I believe it passed; is that correct? It looks like the count did. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.**

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Tom. Bob is passing out the forms now. I guess you want us to vote on these and give them back to you before lunch maybe, Bob, so you can tally them.

MR. HARRIS: That is up to you, Mr. Chairman. I guess it kind of depends on when we do the Law Enforcement Committee report. That is what it was scheduled to be done at, but he just wants them to be available to you for you to read them. If you want to go ahead and vote, vote and he'll collect them and he will announce it at the Law Enforcement Committee report.

MR. CUPKA: My only concern, Duane, is that we have a closed session scheduled after lunch and still quite a bit to do on the Mackerel Committee before we get to law enforcement.

MR. HARRIS: Well, we can do the Law Enforcement Committee anytime you like.

MR. CUPKA: Well, we can ask people that have to leave before then to do an absentee ballot as long as they have got identification on them.

MR. MAHOOD: Remember to put at least one and two or you can put one, two and three if you want.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, the Shrimp Committee; Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: The Shrimp Committee met on Monday, June 11th, in Orlando. The committee received two presentations from Jennifer Lee with NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Regional Office, Protected Resources Division, on the listing of Atlantic sturgeon under the Endangered Species Act and also the 2012 South Atlantic Shrimp Biological Opinion.

The staff reviewed the recommendations from the Shrimp Review Panel Webinar held May 2, 2012. The council staff presented the Shrimp Amendment 9 Decision Document, which included measures that consider specifying criteria that trigger states' abilities to request a concurrent closure of the overwintering white shrimp fishery in the adjacent EEZ during severe winter weather; modifying the process of a concurrent closure during severe winter weather; and revisiting the overfished status, determination and criteria for the South Atlantic pink shrimp stock.

The Shrimp Committee made the following the motions in a discussion of Shrimp Amendment 9 Decision Document. **Accept IPT recommendation for a purpose and need; approved by the committee; and on the part of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing no objection, the motion passes.**

Motion 2; approve the IPT recommendation to split action into two; approved by the committee. I move on behalf of the committee. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing no objection, the motion passes.

Motion 3; endorse the Deepwater Shrimp and Shrimp AP recommendation for Alternative 3, Action 1, as preferred; approved by the committee and I move for the committee. Any discussion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing no objection, the motion passes.

Motion 4; water temperature criteria is to used in lieu of population abundance criteria under Action 1, and on the part of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing no objection, the motion passes.

Motion 5; accept Shrimp and Deepwater Shrimp AP endorsements of Alternative 2, Action 2, as preferred. On the part of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing no objection, the motion passes. There is a note that this motion refers to Action 2, Alternative 2; any state requesting a concurrent closure would send a letter directly to NOAA Fisheries with the request and necessary data to demonstrate that criteria has been met.

Motion 6; remove Alternatives 2 and 3, Action 3, to the considered but rejected. On the part of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Any objection? Seeing no objection, the motion passes.

Motion 7; accept Shrimp Review Panel endorsement of Alternative 4, Action 3, as the preferred measure. Motion withdrawn.

Revised language, Action 3; revise the overfished status determination criteria for the pink shrimp stock. We've got Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 that were moved to the considered but rejected. I think Alternative 4 and Alternative 5 – we need a motion to move those to the considered but rejected, and then we have some new alternatives that we need a motion to add, so do I see a motion for this? I think part of the rationale that they wanted of moving 4 and 5 were they were still based on making the information available to the Shrimp Review panel, but I will let Anna explain that.

MS. MARTIN: If I understand the discussion from Monday correctly, Alternative 4 is a little too vague for the purpose of this measure. It does give considerable deference to the Shrimp Review Panel for determining which data sources to use in developing an overfished status determination criteria here.

Alternative 5 is also vague in that it would require the council to select a time series and also combines the two data sources that the Shrimp Review Panel has recommended. What the IPT has been able to do is more specifically outline in these new alternatives, which are 6 through 10, I guess some more specific details.

Alternative 6 and 7 would reference the SEAMAP fishery-independent data; Alternative 6 being the most recent five-year time series and an average of the catch-per-unit effort value from SEAMAP. Alternative 7 is a three-year time series and again also using an average and the catch-per-unit effort from the SEAMAP survey to develop the proxy for Bmsy.

Alternative 8 is a little different in that it would establish a proxy using the lowest catch-per-unit effort value from SEAMAP for the entire time series that we have in the table. They are listed in the report so that would be 1990 to 2011. Alternative 9 and 10 are similar to 6 and 7 in that they would establish a proxy based on an average CPUE value for a five-year time series and a three-

year time series; however, using the Pamlico Sound Survey, and that is the data source that the Shrimp Review Panel has recommended the council consider here.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, any discussion? Does anybody want to make a motion?

DR. DUVAL: So you need a motion to move Alternatives 4 and 5 to the considered but rejected appendix? I move that we move Alternatives 4 and 5 to the considered but rejected appendix.

MR. PHILLIPS: A motion from Michelle to move Alternatives 4 and 5 to the considered but rejected appendix; second by John Jolley. Discussion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes. We're also going to need a motion to add the Alternatives 6 through 10.

DR. DUVAL: I move that we add new Alternatives 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 to Draft Shrimp Amendment 9.

MR. PHILLIPS: I have a motion from Michelle to add new Alternatives 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 to Draft Shrimp Amendment 9; second by John Jolley. Discussion? Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I still think there needs to be some further discussion by the Shrimp Review Panel I guess relative to using the Pamlico Sound Index versus the SEAMAP Index. If you look at the values that the staff has provided there, there is a great deal of difference between the Pamlico Sound values and the SEAMAP values. I think part of the reason for that is the Pamlico Sound values are derived from an inshore estuary where generally speaking the shrimp concentrations are going to be higher than they will from the SEAMAP Survey offshore. I don't know what the implications would be of using one versus the other, but I think there needs to be some further discussion and explanation of that for our consideration later on.

MR. PHILLIPS: Any other discussion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the Shrimp Committee report.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, thank you, Charlie. The Ad Hoc Data Collection; Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: The Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee met June 13th. The agenda was adopted with the addition of a presentation by Carolyn Sramek from the SERO Permits Office. The minutes of the March 2012 meeting were approved. We received several presentations; one on the Florida Quota Monitoring and Dealer Reporting by Dr. Richard Cody with FWRI; as well as the Florida Tag Program for tracking harvested fish by Dr. Luiz Barbieri, also with FWRI; as well as the NMFS Commercial and Recreational Quota and ACL Monitoring by Dr. Ponwith; and then Commercial and Recreational Quota and ACL Projections by Andy Strelcheck.

The next thing the committee did was review the Decision Document for the public hearing draft of a generic amendment to modify federally permitted seafood dealer reporting requirements. This document proposes modifications to the seafood dealer reporting requirements for fishery

management plans of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic in two joint fishery management plans.

The committee reviewed current dealer reporting requirements and considered the purpose and need and three proposed actions, which you see on the screen in front of you. I'm not going to read those. **The committee discussed the purpose and need statements and modified the wording of the need statement, and on behalf of the committee I so move to recommend adopting the revised wording for the purpose and need statements. Is there any discussion of that motion? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

With regard to Action 1, the committee discussed whether to create a universal dealer permit or a separate Gulf and South Atlantic permits and how to clarify when and how those permits were to be issued or renewed. There was interest in separate permits given that the two councils may want to specify different requirements such as phasing in of electronic reporting or requiring electronic reporting upon implementation.

The committee discussed the proposed permits plan to implement the generic dealer permits as presented by Carolyn Sramek from the SERO Permits Office, and on behalf of the committee I so move to adopt the permits plan to implement generic dealer amendments as proposed by the SERO Permits Office. Is there any discussion of this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Next the committee discussed the alternatives under Action 1, and on behalf of the committee I so move to adopt Alternative 3, Option 3B, as the preferred alternative. Discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't like creating separate permits and think at the end of the day we need to create one universal permit and one set of data requirements. I think particularly in the Florida Keys if we have separate permits and very different requirements, it is going to create a mess. I think it is going to be burdensome on people and it is going to be burdensome on the government to try and execute it.

I understand we're concerned that we may come to different decisions on things, but I think this is a case where it would be in everyone's best interest if the Gulf Council and the South Atlantic Council could come to an agreement on these issues. I think my inclination is more to select Alternative 2B, which is one permit, and thus indicate our desire to have both councils come to an agreement on reporting frequencies and these other issues and try to work all of those out. I would like to hear some discussion, though, before I make a substitute motion just to see if I'm missing anything.

MS. McCAWLEY: I agree with Roy that this would significantly help Florida if we went to the single permit. However, part of the discussion we had during the meeting was on Action 2. The Gulf of Mexico wants to phase in the permits, and so I'm not quite sure how that would work if we just had a single permit and there was a phase-in in the Gulf versus not a phase-in on the Atlantic. I guess that was my take, and I was the one that actually made the motion for separate

dealer permits because of those other actions in the document that seemed to be affected by the separate dealer permits versus one. But for Florida it would be better if there is one.

DR. DUVAL: I appreciate those comments and we definitely had a lot of discussion about that. I think part of the difference between the Gulf and the South Atlantic is the Gulf has so many ITQ-managed species right now that the understanding was that maybe this wasn't quite as urgent of a thing as it was for the South Atlantic. I think Gregg had something he wanted to say.

MR. WAUGH: And again just to remind everybody, this is to go out to public hearing, so the councils can have separate alternatives for a public hearing and then resolve them after public hearings.

MR. CURRIN: Roy, are there any particular concerns or problems with dealers – and it would be a South Florida problem potentially but maybe throughout Florida – having a physical address somewhere where the dealer permits are mailed and the like and yet their actual location or periodic location is in another management area.

I think back to when we were looking at black sea bass endorsements. We identified a couple of people that had physical Florida addresses that were their home addresses but they were actually black sea bass potting out of South Carolina during some part of the year. It concerns me I guess that if we mail a dealer permit to some guy whose address is Fort Myers but he very often or at least periodically buys seafood on the east coast from South Atlantic fishermen and the like; if he sends in his report from Fort Myers to the Regional Office or the Science Center; does that cause potential problems?

DR. CRABTREE: I don't know that I can answer that right now. I know the dealers in the Keys have to somehow indicate in their dealer reports the fish was caught South Atlantic or Gulf. How good that is, I don't know. I don't know; that's something we will have to figure out. I'll let it go for now but I really would hope that both councils could come to a common set of rules on frequency and how we're going to do this so we could go down – and, Mac, I think your questions are something we'd have to get people with a lot more expertise than me to address.

MS. McCAWLEY: First to Mac's point, I know in the state we have wholesale dealers that have multiple locations, including we allow something called a temporary location and a lot of people, if they're going to go pick up the product at the dock, a long way from where their actual location is and all that, so that is an issue.

If you want we could have somebody from our Office of Licensing and Permitting come and give a presentation or have a discussion about that, if that is something that the council or the committee wants to do. In addition, I'm still fine if Roy wants to make a motion to change it so that there is one permit. I'm really fine either way since we're sending this over to the Gulf Council and we're kind of sending a message. I'm fine either way, if we want to go to one or we want to leave it two.

DR. CRABTREE: I would like to hear Mr. Gill's comment on this issue.

MR. GILL: From the aspect of a dealer, I don't see any significant difference. On the permit apps you have a mailing and a business address; so wherever you conduct your business is where the document has to reside and be available for inspection. From the aspect of the council, I don't know how they'll stand.

My initial inclination when you first discussed this is that given the changes that each council may wish to deal with going forward, it would probably be easier if it's split. I don't particularly see any significant confusion other than folks in the Keys will have two permits more than anyone else. I guess it depends where you're coming from.

MR. CUPKA: I was just going to say since it's going out to public hearing, there might be some advantage in having two different preferreds in there to get as much comment as we could on how people thought about them.

DR. DUVAL: I agree and I think it is fine to have two different preferreds, one from the South Atlantic and one from the Gulf. Certainly, we will be informed by the public comment. Duane.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Chair, I'd just like to request that Mr. Gill ensure that Corky Perret reads the motions before you vote.

MR. GILL: That is an impossibility as you well know, Mr. Harris.

DR. DUVAL: **Is there anymore discussion on this motion? Any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.** I think we understand that this is going out to public hearing and there is going to be more input from the Gulf next week and we will be able to refine this as we move forward.

Moving on to Action 2, Action 2 considers potential changes to the frequency and method of reporting for federally permitted seafood dealers, and the committee discussed the wording for options under Alternatives 2 through 4 and the suggestions from the IPT, and on behalf of the committee I so move to accept the proposed changes by the IPT and give editorial license to make any necessary changes to the wording.

Before we have some discussion on this, Gregg has noted and Bonnie noted this during the committee meeting that under Alternative 2 in Options 2D and 2E, the word "Thursday" actually needs to be corrected to "Tuesday"; so possibly if I could get somebody to amend the motion that is on the screen to include those changes, then we could tie this all up in one motion. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I move that Thursday become Tuesday.

DR. DUVAL: **We have a motion by Roy to change the word "Thursday" to "Tuesday" in Alternative 2; seconded by Mr. Harris. Roy, would you be willing to make this an amendment to the motion so that it can be all tied up.**

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I would.

DR. DUVAL: Is that okay with the seconder?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: So now we need to vote on the amendment to the motion to change “Thursday” to “Tuesday” in Alternatives 2D and 2E. Is there any discussion on this? Any opposition? Seeing none, the amendment to the motion is approved. Now we need to vote on the amendment motion. Is there any discussion on this? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Next the committee considered Alternative 2, Option 2B, and Alternative 4, Option 4B, as preferred, but instead chose Alternative 3, Option 3B, and on behalf of the committee I so move to adopt Alternative 3, Option 3B, as our preferred. Any discussion on that motion? Any opposition to that motion? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee then directed staff to modify the wording of Alternatives 2 and 4 and to track the revised wording for Alternative 3 approved above and also to keep the following wording, which is a note that any selected preferred alternative will include the phrase “dealers reporting purchases of king mackerel landed by the gill net sector for the Gulf West Coast, Florida Southern Subzone, must submit forms daily by 6:00 a.m.

The committee also discussed how monitoring would be done during catastrophic conditions, and on behalf of the committee I so move to adopt Alternative 5 as preferred for public hearings. Is there any discussion of that motion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

With regard to Action 3, the committee discussed concerns about whether the council has authority to levy penalties for non-reporting and reviewed the wording suggested by the IPT subgroup. On behalf of the committee for Alternative 1 I so move to adopt the IPT’s suggested modifications for Action 3, Alternative 1. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

For Alternative 2, on behalf of the committee I so move to accept the IPT’s suggestion to delete Action 3, Alternative 2. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. The same thing for Alternative 3, on behalf of the committee I so move to delete Action 3, Alternative 3. Discussion? Opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee also discussed adding a new alternative to clarify in the regulations that renewal or issuance of a dealer permit is contingent on compliance with the recordkeeping and reporting dealer requirements, but decided that it was not necessary given the wording tracking the HMS dealer requirements.

For Alternative 4, on behalf of the committee I so move to accept the IPT’s suggestion to delete Action 3, Alternative 4. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. For Alternative 5, on behalf of the committee I so move to adopt the

IPT's suggestion for the following new Alternative 2. Any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The committee approved the document for public hearings in August and on behalf of the committee I so move to approve the document as modified for public hearings as scheduled in August. Discussion? Opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

The next item we discussed was data items for Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 3. We reviewed this decision document for data collection actions in CE-BA 3. Action 6 addresses permits and data reporting for for-hire vessels and the committee clarified that their intent is that this apply to the snapper grouper, dolphin/wahoo, and Atlantic coastal migratory pelagic for-hire fisheries and discussed applying this to charter and/or headboats. **On behalf of the committee I so move to adopt the modified language under Action 6. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.**

Action 7 addresses permits and data reporting for commercial vessels and the committee directed staff to work with a subgroup of council members, Ben Hartig, Charlie Phillips, and Tom Burgess, to develop an alternative that addresses the data needs and fishery operations. It was our intent to address this here and so that is what we're going to do.

First, we're going to actually deal with a new alternative that we discussed similar to the one proposed for dealer reporting, and on behalf of the committee I so move to add new Alternative 3. You can see that there up at the top of the screen and this refers to no fishing forms. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved.

Now we're going to go to the results of the workgroup with regard to Action 7. The council member workgroup recommends deleting Subalternative 2A from Action 7 because fishermen are not ready for this requirement at this time given the large number of small vessels. As you can see, that requirement deals with having an electronic logbook tied to the vessel's GPS on board the vessel. At this point I would entertain a motion to delete Alternative 2, Subalternative 2A from Action 7. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chairman, I make a motion that we remove Action 7, Alternative 2, Subalternative 2A and move it to the considered but rejected.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Ben. Any discussion? Opposition? Seeing none, that motion stands approved. The next thing that the workgroup recommended was modifying Subalternative 2B to clarify that fishermen would still be able to use their paper reports and to modify the deadline because fishermen don't get all their trip ticket information for up to 12 days after a trip.

We had quite a bit of discussion at the committee level so I think everyone is clear with regard to what those lags are. At this point I would entertain a motion to modify Alternative 2, Subalternative 2B to the following wording; "Develop a system for commercial permit holders to submit their logbook entries electronically via an electronic version of the logbook made

available online” – sorry, that is not the revised wording; that’s the original wording, my apologies –

“Require NMFS develop a system for commercial permit holders to submit their logbook entries electronically via an electronic version of the logbook made available online. Fishermen are encouraged to submit their logbook reports electronically but would be allowed to submit paper logbooks. Commercial landings and catch/effort data are to be submitted in accordance with ACCSP standards. Require that the three logbooks, landings, economic and bycatch, be submitted 21 days after the end of each trip.” I would entertain a motion to adopt that revised wording for Action 7, Alternative 2, Subalternative 2B. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chairman, I so move.

DR. DUVAL: Second by Tom Burgess. Is there any discussion on that? I see some quizzical looks on Bonnie’s face.

DR. PONWITH: I remember our discussion and I remember the fact that the economic was the one that was the most difficult to meet those time constraints, but my understanding is that the other two were technically feasible to turn in sooner.

MR. BURGESS: One of the things that came up in our discussion was with the landings information logbook is that state trip tickets are requested on there and that some people do not receive their trip tickets until they receive their pay, which at times could be 12 days after the end of the trip.

MR. CURRIN: Well, it sounds like the best solution involves reporting at two different times, and I hate considering that, but I think it is critical that we get the landings information in as quickly as we possibly can. On a weekly basis would be preferable and that kind of meshes with all of our discussions before. I hope we can figure out some way to do that.

I understand the dilemma you’re in, Tom, but if we can modify that requirement that the trip tickets be submitted along with those landings information and not require that, then – again, you’re probably going to have to ultimately submit that trip ticket information, I guess, but it sure would be nice to get those landings in on a weekly basis.

MR. WAUGH: This needs to be read in conjunction with the new Alternative 3 as well, and remember this is the logbook landings. They aren’t currently used to track our quotas. The quotas are going to be tracked using the dealer. We would hope that there would be some comparison because you want to have two different sources. The feeling was that if you allowed the 21 days, that would allow the fishermen to get their trip ticket from the fish house, get all that information and turn it in 21 days after each trip.

Then you would have this tightening up such that the fishermen would not be able to sell fish if they hadn’t turned in their report. Right now there is an indeterminate period of time. They’re supposed to turn in their report seven days; but as you remember from Bonnie’s report, there is a significant portion that it in up to a year later. The idea here was to give the fishermen the

necessary time so that they have their information together and then enforce the 21 days with this new Alternative 3.

DR. DUVAL: Mac, does that address some of your concern?

MR. CURRIN: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, is there anymore discussion on this motion? Any opposition to this revised wording? Okay, seeing none, that motion passes. So then this takes to Action 8, which addresses bycatch and discards reporting, and the committee discussed the requirement for bycatch reporting and the funding limitations and developed a new Alternative 3.

On behalf of the committee I so move to approve Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 under Action 8. Is there discussion? Opposition? Roy, okay, opposition noted. Everyone in favor of the motion please raise your hand; opposed to the motion. The motion passes with one opposition. Yes, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I do want to comment that I think this entire portion of CE-BA 3; one, I don't think this is ready to go to public hearing. I think it contains a whole host of issues of questionable legality. It does seem to me that we are effectively going to revoke people's permits if they miss a single report, but I don't understand how the language works.

We're putting a lot of new requirements on charterboats to report, but it is not at all clear to me why we're doing that or what we would do with those reports if we had them. And then we seem to be abandoning our methodology for assessing bycatch for a program that doesn't exist at this time.

I have a lot of issues with this and I don't think this is ready to go out to public comment. I think it needs considerably more work from staff to think all these things out and the legal implications of them and whether we can do it not. I think we've got an awful long way to go on this, and I think it is going to require much more thought than what has gone into it at this stage.

DR. DUVAL: So is your question about the legality and whether or not the Service has the ability to require fishermen to report on discards?

DR. CRABTREE: No, it seems to me that we're putting a penalty in there and revoking or suspending their permit. It is not clear to me how you can tell someone their authorization to sell is removed when they have a permit that authorizes them to sell. I know there is language in an HMS Proposed Rule somewhere, but nonetheless that doesn't answer my questions. I think the attorneys really need to run this up and do more work on this.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think at the next council meeting we could have the enforcement attorneys come, Karen, and discuss this so that you all are more comfortable with it. Roy is right, we'll have more analysis in my shop and we will report back to you on that in September. For right now I have been told that this is not revoking someone's permit. They're basically setting themselves up for a future enforcement action if they continue to purchase fish, sell fish

or whatever if they haven't reported in time. I know that sounds like nuance language so I think that we could have a more robust and full discussion at the next meeting.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, and just to clarify it, I don't think it is our comfort level that needs to be addressed because the attorneys at the regional office have worked on this. It was a subgroup of the IPT involving the attorneys that have worked on this. I guess we just need clarification whether that wording that was in the proposed HMS rule is deemed legal or is being implemented and whether we can do it down here.

I haven't heard any objections and there haven't been any in the subgroup of the IPT that worked on this and brought this wording forward. But I agree, it needs to be resolved but I don't know that it needs to be resolved with a presentation to us. It seems to be it needs to go down the pipe or up the pipe in the other direction.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, to that you're probably correct, but also I would think that you're going to get public comment on this, which should be interesting for us to hear. Also, I think to put the public on notice we should have more description and maybe some examples of just what does this mean, what does this language mean so that you know as a dealer, as a fisherman or whatever what kind of ramifications it could have if you don't report on time.

DR. CRABTREE: My issue is if I don't know what it means, I don't know how a fisherman is going to know what the heck it means. If I'm confused by it, then I would think most fishermen are going to be confused by how that works.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: But to that point, before you go to public hearing, we could work up some discussion and examples and we could send it to you for inclusion in the document. Public hearings are going to be in August; is that correct, Gregg?

DR. DUVAL: That's the intent right now, but we did defer approval of this particular document, these data items in CE-BA 3 until here, so we still have to take a vote on sending this to public comment. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: That's correct.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So if the vote is positive and it goes to public comment, I think it would be good for our shop to provide some examples that you could put in so people could understand what would happen.

DR. DUVAL: I think that's a great idea if you guys have the time to do that. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: You could have someone even join us at the public hearing if you wish.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That sounds like a grand idea.

MR. BURGESS: When you get your permit; is the idea or the understanding is to actually have this permit to harvest this resource – one of the requirements is to maintain a logbook and send in

information in a timely manner. I think there is some language that states that; if you agree to take this permit and apply for it, that it is that understanding that there are requirements involved with it.

I think there is some general language that describes that and it is a requirement. I guess the penalties would be a second part of that, but as it states right now you're required. Bonnie, are you still considering sending out a letter that we're going to tighten up on this in the future and things like that at this stage of the game; just give a little heads up maybe?

DR. PONWITH: Recall again the letter would have been to the dealers – no, wait a second, we have two things going on. We have the timeliness of the dealer reports and the timeliness of the vessel reports. Yes, that is correct, we working on drafting a letter that would go out to the vessels.

MR. BURGESS: And to that point, if you did actually consider, as we had discussed earlier, maybe a little purpose-and-need type of a thing in the beginning of it, if appropriate, and maybe if you could slip in that general language that is on the books at this time – I spoke with Karen Raine about it – about if you do agree to take this permit, that you are required to send in logbooks in a timely manner and it is already on the books and everything, and maybe just something like that to just give them a little nudge about what is coming down and we need this stuff.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, we would certainly take full advantage of this being an outreach opportunity, but that is excellent advice.

DR. DUVAL: Is there anymore discussion? At this point I would entertain a motion to take the data items in CE-BA 3 out to public comment, understanding that there would be some additional language that could be worked up by Monica and her shop some examples for folks to see with regard to some of these items. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chairman, I make a motion that we take the data items in CE-BA 3 to public hearings.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Mac. Is there anymore discussion on this? Any opposition? The motion passes with one opposed. The only other thing that we discussed was under other business. Carolyn Sramek from the permits office briefed the committee on proposed changes to regulations to clarify limited access permit transfer and renewal provisions and described options available to permit holders upon the sale or loss of the vessel to which these permits are issued. These simply going to be made through the regulations and required no action of the committee. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Michelle. We're almost back on schedule. We're going to break here in a minute for lunch. We still have a lot to do, though. We have got a bit to do yet on mackerel as well as the other committee reports. Monica, do we still need to have a closed session when we come back from lunch for a legal briefing?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't think so. I think I can discuss it briefly in open session.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, let's take about an hour break for lunch. Charlie, on the Shrimp Report, we didn't take action to send the amendment out to public hearing.

MR. PHILLIPS: **We did not entertain the motion of take Shrimp Amendment 9 to public hearing, and I would entertain a motion to that point. Doug.**

MR. HAYMANS: **Mr. Chairman, I so move.**

MR. PHILLIPS: **Motion by Doug; second by Jessica. Any discussion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.**

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Charlie. We will go ahead and recess for lunch.

The Full Council Session of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council reconvened in the Ballroom of the Renaissance Orlando Airport Hotel, Orlando, Florida, Friday afternoon, June 15, 2012, and was called to order at 1:25 o'clock p.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: If everyone will get back to the table, we'll go ahead and reconvene. The next item is our legal briefing, but I've talked with Monica and we're going to skip that and go right into the Mackerel Committee Meeting with Ben.

MR. HARTIG: The Mackerel Committee met on Thursday, the 14th. The committee received an update on current king and Spanish mackerel landings, commercial and recreational, for the 2012/2013 fishing year. The council staff reviewed Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 19, which incorporated the Gulf actions; Mackerel AP recommendations and comments from the Gulf Council scoping meetings under each action.

The committee did not review Amendment 20 or the framework items during the committee meeting and the intent is to do that as the Committee of the Whole after I finish this report. Concerning Amendment 19, the committee made the following motions: **Under Action 1, sale of king mackerel and Spanish mackerel, the motion was to adopt the language for Alternative 2 as indicated. Alternative 2, prohibit sale of king mackerel caught under the bag limit with the exception of for-hire trips in which the vessel also holds a federal king mackerel commercial permit. Prohibit sale of Spanish mackerel caught under the bag limit with the exception of for-hire trips in which the vessel also holds a federal Spanish mackerel commercial permit. All sales of king and Spanish mackerel during the commercial closure are prohibited. Then we had two options, South Atlantic Council jurisdiction and Gulf Council jurisdiction. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion on that motion?** Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I guess inherent in this is we're changing the permit. It is going to be a permit – you know, in the past it has been a permit to exceed the bag limit, but now it is going to be you've got to have this permit to sell fish, depending on which one of these we ultimately choose.

MS. McCAWLEY: I brought this up before when we were in committee. Since we're about to go out to public hearing and Amendment 19 and 20 are both fairly complicated, I would love it if we could pick some preferred alternatives for the public to react to, but that is just my opinion.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, duly noted. Anymore discussion? Mel.

MR. BELL: Just to make sure I'm clear, so selling the bag limit under this permit, if it is a charterboat, he is functioning as a commercial fisherman at that point and he would need to be – well, that may be an issue for us. To make it legal we would have to license him as a commercial fisherman, but this permit from the federal standpoint doesn't really care about that, I guess.

MR. HARTIG: Well, if a recreational vessel holds both permits – and let me make sure; you're confusing me here – yes, under for-hire trips you can't sell but if you were on a commercial trip you could, and if you were duly permitted. Anymore discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

All right, the next motion was to accept the recommended change in language under Alternative 3, and that is prohibit sales of king and Spanish mackerel caught under the bag limit, and that's for-hire and private recreational fishermen. On behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Kari.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Sue mentioned something that we had added in parentheses for-hire and private recreational. She said there are commercial vessels – or vessels operating as commercial, but they only have the state commercial permits and not the federal. She feels like with this language these would still be able to harvest under the bag limit in federal waters and still be able to come back and sell.

She recommended removing – unless your intent is to only prohibit sales from a private recreational boat or a boat operating as a charter or headboat under our definition, then you would want to – then we can keep that in, that parentheses that says for-hire and private recreational. But if you want to just allow sale only by people who have a federal king mackerel or Spanish mackerel permit, then you would want to take out what is in the parentheses. Does that make sense?

DR. DUVAL: So I'm understanding this right, by removal of that parenthetical so that it just reads “prohibit sale of king and Spanish mackerel caught under the bag limit”, this applies to anybody, so folks who are catching their three kings and bringing them in who are state-licensed commercial fishermen would no longer be allowed to sell that catch.

DR. CRABTREE: And that gets back to my comment about the permit. What we're saying now is in order to sell king mackerel or Spanish mackerel caught in the EEZ, you have to have a king mackerel permit or a Spanish mackerel permit, period, so it becomes not just a permit to exceed the bag limit, but it is a required permit to sell. Somewhere we need to make that point. And

then here we're prohibiting fish caught under the bag limit from being sold even if you do have that permit.

MR. HARTIG: The intent is that anybody who doesn't have the permit, they will not be able to sell the bag limit of king and Spanish mackerel. Do we remove the parentheses? We do, okay.

DR. CRABTREE: This is another one of those cases where we've got those suboptions there, but if one council decides to allow the sale and the other doesn't, it is going to create a mess down in the Keys.

MR. HARTIG: Well, to that point I talked to Bob and he thought it may have been better that we didn't have those in there when it goes to the Gulf next week. They can still come to different conclusions. It's just –

DR. CRABTREE: Joint committee.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I guess the intent – and Jessica had broached this earlier – was to bring the two committees in after public hearing and have a joint committee meeting. Mac.

MR. CURRIN: Yes, and that's fine if that is the way you want to proceed. I just don't want to get in a situation where we come to an impasse and then we have to go back and develop some new alternatives to add to the document, which delays it another meeting. I fully intend or expect that all of this will come out well and we'll walk out hand-in-hand and be on the same page.

It may not happen like that with every issue and it may be one that people feel strongly enough about that we need to quit holding hands and move in a different direction. I just hate to see everything delayed by another meeting because we had to go back in and add alternatives that provide that pathway.

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm fine with leaving those A and B options for now, but ultimately, just like you were saying, I would like to make a motion that we meet, the Mackerel Committee from the Gulf Council and the South Atlantic Council, after those public hearings to try to work out some of those differences so that we're not at an impasse and this isn't delayed any further. I think that needs to be done for both 19 and 20.

MR. HARTIG: Well, can we get that at the end of all of it?

MS. McCAWLEY: Yes.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, thank you, I appreciate that. **All right, we have got a motion that has been forwarded by the committee. We have had discussion; is there anymore discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

All right, under the sale of cobia under Action 2, we had a motion to add another alternative and that would be Alternative 5. That would be to prohibit sale of cobia caught

under the bag limit, for-hire and private recreational, similar to what we did before. On behalf of the committee I would so move. Discussion? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I was just going to ask if the same thing applies to that parenthetical as to the last one?

MR. HARTIG: And it does. Go ahead, Kari.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Just to be clear and have it on the record, the intent of the committee, the recreational bag limit and the commercial possession limit are both two per day per person, and so I just want to make sure that this is talking about the – this refers to the recreational bag limit, private recreational and anyone operating as a charter or headboat – just to specify and then the document will be very clear about recreational bag limit and commercial possession limit are different.

DR. CRABTREE: And to me implicit in this is that we're going to require some sort of a permit to sell cobia. That has been a source of some debate at the Gulf. There was opposition to that, but I don't think there is any way to really do this one unless you have a permit so they can tell who is fishing under the bag limit and who is fishing under the trip limit or whatever we want to call that.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, are we clear? Any more discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Okay, that brings us to Action 3, tournament sales of king mackerel, and a motion to add the wording recommended by the AP to new Alternative 5. Alternative 5 reads, "Create a set-aside from the recreational king mackerel ACL for tournament sales. Tournament organizers would be required to report all king mackerel harvested during the tournament and any sale provision for these fish should be left up to the state." On behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I brought this up in the committee meeting. I don't think a sale provision should be left up to the state. I don't really know what that means or how that works.

MR. HARTIG: We have one further along that talks about comparable federal and state –

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I remember that.

MR. HARTIG: It's two down; well, we'll get to it; how is that?

DR. CRABTREE: Ben, if we have that later on, do we need this that has ill-defined language that I don't know what it means?

MR. HARTIG: Good question. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to presume that the tournament organizers, when they report the king mackerel harvested, will split out what portion was sold and what portion might

have been kept for their fish fry or whatever else. Just because they landed them all, that doesn't mean they were all sold. We need them to understand we need the breakdown.

MR. HARTIG: That is a good point. Mel.

MR. BELL: Just to create a set-aside, so what we're in essence doing is creating a new sort of sub-sector or hybrid little mini-sector or something here. How do you figure that out, how much you're going to set aside?

MR. HARTIG: Well, I think it can be done based on the number of tournaments. I'll let the committee discuss that. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, Mel, that what I was talking about, the analysis that I would want to see looking at – I mean, we do have some numbers; at least North Carolina does with regard to tournament sales. It doesn't capture obviously fish that were kept by tournament participants and not entered or sold.

What I had suggested terms of trying to get to creation of this sub-ACL was a historic analysis of both permitted versus unpermitted sales of king mackerel so you've got the people who hold the permit plus those who made bag limit sales, which has contributed to establishment of the recreational and commercial ACL split as well as all the recreational landings.

If you can have a historical analysis of that and roughly figure out I think what overall percentage were permitted sales, unpermitted sales, your recreational landings and you can use that to help inform. Again, I realize Roy mentioned this would have to be down the road if you're going to change the ACL, take those unpermitted landings that could be moved over to the recreational ACL, if we go down the road of not allowing those bag limit sales anymore.

And then from that recreational ACL you could create a sub-ACL strictly for tournaments. It could be based on input from tournament organizers' existing information that we have with regard to tournament sales. That was what we had talked about in March was creating some kind of set-aside. Whether it would be from the recreational ACL or the commercial ACL had not been decided, but that was my thinking when I proposed that analysis as a way to try to really get at this fairly. I realize that is complicated.

MR. HAYMANS: And, Mel, I was just going to mention that we had the presentation in March. Two tournament directors were there and gave us a fairly decent estimate of what most of the tournaments provided. Jack Holmes from SKA gave us a huge inflated number; however, that huge inflated number still fit well within where the current landings are. Even if we went with a huge inflated ACL for tournaments to begin with, there is room for it and we could adjust it after the first couple of years of reporting.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, that is a good point, Doug. Why don't we do this; why don't we remove the last sentence that is annoying Roy because it is actually incorporated in that alternative down where you talk about – and the state's permit could serve in lieu of the federal permit. Does that solve it or not?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: If you take out the last sentence, it's Alternative 4, it's an existing alternative, so the council could just not approve creating a new alternative, but I think that was the recommendation by the AP. The reason they wanted to have that sentence in there is so that the states could prohibit, if they wanted to, or they could, I don't know, maybe require some kind of fee or something like that. You know, so leave the sale up to the state.

MR. HARTIG: I understand where the AP was coming from. They wanted to make sure South Carolina could still prohibit sales of bag limit fish. I understand that part of it. Do you want to just get rid of this option? We haven't approved it yet; we're still in discussion.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't necessarily have a problem with what you're trying to do. I'm just not clear on what it is this is trying to do. This whole action is going to need a huge amount of work because you're going to have to define the terms of the permit, can it be renewed, is it one year, how long is it for, who is it issued to, is it transferable or not? You're going to have to establish all the reporting requirements.

Are you going to allow an unlimited number of these permits to be created or do you want to put limits on it? And then if you're going to do a set-aside, you're going to have to decide how much is that set-aside and whose quota does it come out of and a whole – this is going to be very complicated and it may well turn into taking a lot more alternatives.

This is akin to creating a whole permitting system in any fishery. There is an awful lot that goes into it and thought behind it. There may be ways for it to recognize states and state rules and things. It is just not totally clear to me what it is here; but I think if staff understands what the intent is, then I guess staff could go back and figure out how to make that happen. I don't know that we will today.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, the intent of the committee – well, we could find out by voting on it.

MR. HAYMANS: Would it be preferable to provide guidance to staff to go back and bring us back that whole suite that Roy was just talking about?

MR. HARTIG: Well, we're trying to go to public hearing in August, which would make that pretty difficult, so that leaves us kind of how do we want to dispense with this motion. **Okay, anymore discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion is approved. All right, the next motion under Action 3 was to select Alternative 2 as the preferred. Discussion?** Mel.

MR. BELL: I wasn't on that committee and I'm not objecting but I have some basic issues with this. Obviously you all don't agree with that, but that is okay. It has to do just with the sector allocation. Look at the complexity and what we're having to kind of go through to force this to work. I do appreciate the value of tournaments and all, but I think it's kind of a – you're allowing this sort of sliding across these sector boundaries, and I think it's going to create more problems down the line than it is worth. I also have some resource conservation issues and stuff, but that is just my opinion right now.

MR. HARTIG: **I appreciate that. Any other discussion? Objection to the motion? We better vote by hand. All those in favor of the motion signify by raising your hand – how many people do we have on the committee? How many of those people were allowed to vote? We are as the Committee of the Whole? Okay, I stand corrected. All right, all those opposed, 4 opposed.**

MR. CURRIN: A point of order, Mr. Chairman, just because John Jolley recognized himself twice in a roll call today, it doesn't mean he gets to vote twice. (Laughter)

MR. HARTIG: **That motion is approved. Okay, the motion is to add Alternative 5 and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Okay, that will actually be Alternative 6 because we added another alternative, so it will be Alternative 6 in the document. Doug.**

MR. HAYMANS: I would just think that if we do wind up with a federal permit that a state permit would have to have the same exact data elements, minimum.

DR. CRABTREE: After we figure out what the federal permit is like, then I think in this alternative you're going to have to describe some process by which the state would apply for the exemption or whatever and how we would determine those kinds of things, et cetera, et cetera.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Doug, Georgia issues permits right now, tournament?

MR. HAYMANS: North Carolina.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: North Carolina, so it would probably be helpful to at least know what all you require. What North Carolina requires, it could be helpful for the Fisheries Service if we go down this route and what you're choosing.

DR. DUVAL: The requirements are not extensive. As I mentioned in committee, the permit is required for a tournament if your intent is to sell fish; so pretty much the only tournaments that get these permits are king mackerel tournaments, and that requires sale of the fish only to a licensed dealer. It has to be registered to a single entity. It is one trip ticket with a single poundage limit on it.

MR. HARTIG: **Anymore discussion on that? Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Okay, under Action 4, elimination of latent endorsements in the Gulf Group King Mackerel Gill Net Sector, there was no committee action on that. Action 5, elimination of latent permits in the King Mackerel Hook-and-Line Sector, there were several motions under that item.

The first one is to track Gulf actions to eliminate the option to consider minimum landings from 2005 through 2009 and move the action for passive two-for-one reduction to the considered but rejected, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved. All right, the next motion was to add new Alternative 4 as recommended by the advisory panel. Discussion?

DR. CRABTREE: Before we get too far away from the tournament, like there is an alternative here, tournament sales, create a set-aside. To me create a set-aside for tournament sales, that probably needs to be an action and not just an alternative. You'd have to have alternatives under that action; how much is the set-aside, where does the set-aside come from, all those kinds of things. I think that is what staff needs to start really getting into because this is going to become a number of different actions and not just create a permit and you're done. I think it is going to be a whole more than that.

MR. HARTIG: Okay. Where were we in the voting process? Were we still on discussion or objection? Okay, we're on discussion; I remember now. **That was to add new Alternative 4 as recommended by the AP, and I will read it; "Do not allow sale, allow transfer to family members of latent permits but do not eliminate them. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

The next motion we had under that action item was to accept the IPT recommendations to remove Suboptions ii, iv and v under Alternative 2, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion? Is there an objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.

Under Action 5, establish an appeals process similar to the appeals process in other plans, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved. The next motion was change the dates in Alternative 3 to September 17, 2010, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Discussion on that?
Tom.

MR. BURGESS: Were we going to get some information on how that affects the outcome of this?

MR. HARTIG: I think we asked for that but I don't know that it was supposed to come to us now. Kari.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Some other comments that came from the regional office about this – yes, the control date – is that there is concern on the Gulf side because of the oil spill was in 2010 and so I think, for example, the fishing year ending with ours, there may be fishermen there that would have fished, so I guess they just wanted me to bring that up; and then also a request to let staff use landings through the end of September for analysis instead of September 17th.

MR. HARTIG: All right, with those explanations what does the committee – Mac.

MR. CURRIN: I don't know what the solution is, Ben. We talked about it yesterday. I am very uncomfortable with telling the South Atlantic fishermen that they're not going to potentially be included because they didn't meet a control date that was set by the Gulf Council, and we haven't notified them of any of that. I don't know how to get out of the box, but I see it as a problem.

MR. GILL: I, of course, don't know the answer, but my sense is that the difference between our date and your date being, what, 15 months is probably not significant in terms of number

differences, and so my best guess is that the Gulf Council won't have a problem with it, but we will see next week.

MR. HARTIG: And we will also see if there is any difference, right. Okay, any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. All right, under Action 6, federal regulatory compliance, we didn't have a motion there, but there is a note that the council needs to approve the language in this alternative. Kari, do you have the suggested language change.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Yes, I have it up here and it is in the report, the suggestion for this alternative in which the federal commercial king and/or Spanish mackerel permits – vessels with these permits as well as the CMP charter and headboat permits must comply with the federal CMP regulations when fishing in state waters if the federal regulations are more restrictive.

MR. HARTIG: Is that wording the same as we usually use? It seemed a little bit different, but if everybody is good with it, I'm fine. I need a motion. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion regarding Action 6, Alternative 2, all vessels with federal commercial king or Spanish mackerel permits as well as CMP charter permits must comply with federal CMP regulations when fishing in state waters if federal regulations are more restrictive.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Mac Currin. Discussion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Under Action 7, to modify or eliminate income requirements for Gulf and South Atlantic commercial coastal migratory pelagic permits; no committee action.

Action 8, Atlantic Group Spanish Mackerel Gill Net Endorsement, there was no committee action, but there was direction to staff to add options for qualifying periods five years prior to 9/17/2010 and ten years prior to 9/17/2010 and add another option for qualifying of 5,000 pounds. **That brings us to the motion to approve Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 19 for public hearings.** David.

MR. CUPKA: It is obvious from the discussions that we've had here today there is an awful lot of work that still needs to be done on this amendment, and I would suggest that we do not approve it for public hearing at this time, that we let staff work on it and bring it back to us in September to see how this all shakes out. It seems to me there is a lot of work that needs to be done on this before we take it to public hearing. **I guess I need to offer a substitute motion if I want to do that so I'd offer a substitute motion that we don't approve CMP Amendment 19 for public hearings at this time.**

MR. HARTIG: **Second by Charlie.** Discussion? Jessica.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I agree with this and this brings me back to if we're going to bring this back in September I'd like for the two committees to meet prior to bringing this back.

MR. HARTIG: Well, that's a suggestion. **Okay, anymore discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Bob.

MR. GILL: Mr. Chairman, a somewhat tangential issue; I am wondering how this is going to work. We're going to get into this very amendment as well as Amendment 20 next week. The Mackerel Committee meets on Wednesday morning. Given all the changes that you have had, I'd hate to be peppering Chairman Cupka with what the heck do you guys mean with this.

The question I've got is how are you going to transmit this in a timely fashion – and I don't mean to pressure anybody – so that we can absorb it and incorporate thoughts as many changes as you have made into our discussion on Wednesday morning. It seems to me that it is going to be a toughie but I would like to ask that as soon as you can reasonably do so transmit it to the Gulf Council staff so they can get it out to the Mackerel Committee so we can start to try and incorporate that in our discussions.

The intent here is clearly that we're trying to dovetail and come up with the same answers. Well, to do that we need to understand what you've done. I'm not the one that is going to be able to explain it, I can tell you that right now. I would ask your indulgence and as early as possible to transmit this in some form to staff so that we can try to get our arms around it. Thank you.

MR. MAHOOD: If you'll give us a list of your Mackerel Committee members and we've got your council members, we can send them each an audio file and they can listen to it over the weekend.

MR. GILL: Normally, Bob, I like your ideas; however, that one has no merit whatsoever. (Laughter)

MR. HAYMANS: I guess this wasn't apparent but if we do create a federal king mackerel permit, that would include the Gulf, right?

MR. HARTIG: Unless it was A or B, yes.

DR. CRABTREE: Are we contemplating a joint committee meeting with the Gulf?

MR. HARTIG: Well, we're getting closer to that all the time.

DR. CRABTREE: I don't know how to solve Mr. Gill's problems. I guess you will figure that out, Bob, but it seems to me a joint committee meeting is where we're going to end up. Of course, I would offer Tampa as a good place to have it.

MR. CURRIN: In thinking about it, Bob, I'm not sure the changes are as significant as the holes that are left. We still have questions about them. Roy's suggestion about pulling that set-aside out as an action is probably a very good suggestion; and not knowing what that was, there is certainly no progress that you guys can make or we can make until we get some suite of alternatives set up under that.

I think the deal is it is probably going to come back to you guys again and it is certainly going to come back to us again. I don't know; I wonder about the need for you guys to spend a lot of time on this at your meeting next week on Amendment 20. I don't know how much progress you can make.

MR. GILL: I didn't think Mac was going to go there. I was thinking more about if we're going to address it, it would be better if we tried to absorb the things that you have done into our considerations so that we could get closer and closer. Of course, Mac brings up another point. I will have to ponder that one a little bit, but that might well have some merit, Mac. Thank you.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Rick, Sue and I have all of this worked out and you don't need to talk about it.

MR. GILL: Wonderful, thank you.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: You will get it very quickly.

MR. HARTIG: All right, great. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: Bob, when is your August meeting?

MR. GILL: I believe it is August 18th, but I can check real quick and confirm. It is the week of the 20th I am instructed by Gregg.

MR. MAHOOD: I was just thinking to save us all costs, I don't even know where you're meeting but –

MR. GILL: New Orleans.

MR. MAHOOD: – per chance we could have the joint meeting there.

MR. HARTIG: All right, anything else on 19? All right, we are on to 20 as a committee of the whole; Amendment 20, Attachment 8B; the decision document for Amendment 20. Kari is going to take us through the options and actions we have in that. David.

MR. CUPKA: I was just going to ask our resident parliamentarian since that was a substitute motion, doesn't that become the main motion and we have to vote on it again?

MR. HARTIG: Thank you; that is why I asked if there was anything else on 19. **Okay, the substitute motion becomes the main motion. Is there any discussion on the main motion? Any objection on the main motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Okay, now we are moving to Amendment 20. Kari.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, Attachment 8B and there are ten actions in this. The first three are Gulf Group King Mackerel, talking about subzones and allocations. Do you want to go through these?

MR. HARTIG: Well, some of these are going to have an impact on our fishermen, and I have to look at which ones. Okay, why don't see what the Gulf comes up with theirs at the next meeting and bring them back in September, these options especially, and then we will go over them then; how does that sound? Does that sound better?

DR. MacLAUHLIN: For the first three?

MR. HARTIG: For the first three.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, Action 4 establishes a transit provision for king mackerel harvested in the EEZ off Monroe County when the rest of the west coast of Florida is closed. There are three alternatives; no action; Alternative 2 establishes the transit provision for fish harvested in the EEZ off Monroe County when the rest of the west coast of Florida is closed; and Alternative 3 establishes the transit provision and the fish have to be landed in Collier County when the rest of the west coast of Florida is closed. The Mackerel AP recommended Alternative 2 as the preferred. The Gulf scoping meetings, all of the commenters that spoke about this supported a transit provision.

MR. HARTIG: What is the intent of the committee?

MR. HAYMANS: **I would make a motion that we select Action 4, Alternative 2 as our preferred.**

MR. HARTIG: **Second by Charlie. Discussion?** Otha.

MR. EASLEY: Well, purely from an enforcement perspective, which is not reality, but Alternative 1, of course, is the preferred. Any of the others is second or Alternative 2 or 3. The majority of this enforcement will be done at the dock. In effect it is similar to one of the situations where a fishery is allowed in state waters and not in federal waters.

If they come into Monroe or any other county north of that with their catches prohibited in the Gulf, they can just tell us, yes, I caught it over in the South Atlantic, in Monroe or further over, and there is little chance where we would have any rebuttal to that. I just wanted to share that with you.

MR. HARTIG: There is nothing in here that would change any of that, in any of these options.

MR. EASLEY: Other than Alternative 1, that's it.

MS. McCRAWLEY: I need to go back and look at the language that the commission just adopted, but I think that the commission adopted something that is more like Alternative 3. I'm going to vote against this motion because I think that Alternative 3 is more what we want because we just made it so that people could do this in state waters. I thought that this action was to complement what we were in the process of doing.

MR. HAYMANS: Doesn't that force landings into just a handful of dealers if you're only in Collier County?

MR. HARTIG: I don't know. This was to really fix a specific problem in the Gulf. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I think Jessica is right that Alternative 3 is what the FWC took action to fit. I don't know what to do with Otha's comment that it is going to create enforcement problems.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I think it solves an enforcement problem and creates one at the same time.

MS. McCAWLEY: In order to fix the problem for the fishermen, yes, it does create an enforcement problem, but there is no other way to help these fishermen that are having to travel a hundred miles or more to get to a dealer and an area that is open. This was the only way to do that. **I would like to make a substitute motion that we select Alternative 3 as the preferred.** When I come back the next time, I'll have the specific language for what the FWC adopted.

MR. HARTIG: **Motion by Jessica; second by Michelle. Further discussion?** Otha.

MR. EASLEY: If you have to pick between 2 and 3, enforcement would prefer 3.

MR. HARTIG: **Anymore discussion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Okay, that motion becomes the main motion. Is there any discussion on the main motion? Any objection to the main motion? Seeing none, the main motion is approved.**

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, moving on to Action 5, these are restrictions on fishing for king mackerel in multiple zones. From my understanding, this is more on the Gulf side in which a permit holder would either have to be assigned or they would select a zone or subzone, and that is the fishing area they would fish in and the quota they would fish under. Do you want to do this one?

MR. HARTIG: Do we really want to get into the weeds on this one?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Yes, the only thing I want to know on this is from the Gulf, when you guys discuss it, Bob, is how many zones are you all married to in this one; how many zones are you defining under this option? I don't need to know it now. You guys need to decide in the Gulf. Are you going to include the zones on the Atlantic, also? That wasn't clear to me.

MR. GILL: My sense from the buzz is that it would be no more than one and it is likely not to pass at all. It is in there because it was requested by various fishermen as what they perceive as a solution to some of the problems, but I don't see a whole lot of support for it. I think it will be at best one but maybe not supported.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, Action 6. Thank you, Bob.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: I just wanted to point out that I did put in like all the questions. This is another one that is actually really complicated and there are a lot of questions. In the decision document these are all the questions that at least the Gulf will have to think about. This one Gregg may have to come up to talk about the cobia ACLs for Action 6. The boundary for the stock assessment is different from the boundary used to set the ABC and the ACL. These are alternatives to change those based on the boundary. I'll let Gregg get into this.

MR. WAUGH: We set in Amendment 18 the council boundary as the boundary between these two migratory groups. The stock assessment is still ongoing but it looks like they're going to use a biological boundary at the Florida/Georgia Line. That is not final yet, but we tried to build in some alternatives here that would allow us to deal with that event.

Now, whether we set an ACL that applies to our council area and the Gulf sets one that applies to their council area or we do similar to mackerel where they will be getting an ABC – if it goes as it is indicated now, they will be getting an ABC for the Gulf stock that includes the entire state of Florida, so they could then allocate a portion of that to the Florida east coast and Keys, essentially our area or jurisdiction for us to manage. We tried to build in alternatives to cover whatever might come out of the stock assessment.

MR. HARTIG: So basically just like you said, it would just be like mackerels; we split up whatever the ACL – the total ACL was for the Gulf, we would split that up between the Gulf and the east coast of Florida from our council jurisdiction to the Florida/Georgia Line? Okay. Now the method of determining that value, would you just use the average, would you go to Boyles' Law? Have we used Boyles' Law in the past to separate some of our snapper grouper species? I thought we did at least in one of them. David.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, we used Boyles' Law when we figured out the interjurisdictional allocation on black grouper, I think it was, when we got the assessment on that.

MR. HARTIG: So what you suggested is incorporated in one of these options; do we want a preferred or do we want to just leave it to go out to public hearing as is with the description that at least for black grouper we have done it by Boyles' Law. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: It would seem to me that it would make the most sense to not pick a preferred just because we don't have the information to go into this, and let's hope the stock assessment is completed and we have the results. People really aren't going to have a sense of how they're going to be affected.

MR. HARTIG: Good point. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: If you all want us to look at Boyles' Law, then you should add that because we've got Option D there, and I think that is under Alternative 3 as well; isn't it? So what you would be giving us guidance is to add applying Boyles' Law similar to what was done for black grouper, and that could be analyzed.

MR. CURRIN: I would make that in the form of a motion, Ben. I think it would worthwhile looking at Boyles' Law as an alternative under these allocations.

MR. HARTIG: Second by Doug Haymans. Discussion?

MR. HAYMANS: And then just a question, I guess, let's just say Alternative 1 became the preferred, which is no action – well, no, that is not right. If Florida east coast wound up having a separate ACL with the Gulf; does that mean that the rest of the Atlantic Group, the 1.4 million pounds recreational would be split Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina?

MR. HARTIG: We would get the different area allowable harvest out of each migratory area and then we'd have to deal with that, and we don't have that yet. This isn't based on the stock assessment. This is based on the numbers we had from the ABC from the SSC, both SSCs actually, I think. **The motion was to add as Option D the use of Boyles' Law for the allocations. Anymore discussion? Is there any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Kari.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, this is Action 7, establish state-by-state or regional quotas for Atlantic Migratory Group King Mackerel, Spanish Mackerel and Cobia. This is another actually really complicated with lots of questions that you guys would have to answer. We have a couple of alternatives.

One is a commercial quota for each South Atlantic state for king mackerel, Spanish mackerel and cobia or any combination of that under those options; and then a commercial quota for the Mid-Atlantic area. Alternative 3 would separate it into North and South Carolina would get a quota; Georgia and Florida would get a quota; and then the Mid-Atlantic area; and, 4, it would be North Carolina would have a quota; South Carolina, Georgia and Florida would share a quota; and the Mid-Atlantic would have a quota.

The Mackerel AP recommended Alternative 1 as the preferred. They felt that if a quota was tight, this may be a good option. North Carolina supports this more so than the other states. At the Gulf scoping meetings there were just three commenters who spoke on this who did not support state quotas. One commenter supported state quota using historical catch to allocate.

If the zone designations affect the South Atlantic side, it is going to be even more complicated than it already is; so just to keep that in mind. I just have some questions that you guys would have to think about. First of all, if you want to look at are the quotas tight and so I put this table together. It is in the decision document. This is the percent of king mackerel quota landed, and so not always going over Spanish mackerel to go over.

And then I added in the commercial cobia landings and then the percentage of the landings that we have and then the percentage of the current ACL; so getting close, 85 percent except in 2010 it was 125 percent of the current ACL. There wasn't an ACL I don't think at that time. There is actually lots to consider and be very clear about – we want to be very clear about when you're discussing and considering state or regional quotas, you know, what would count towards a

state's quota; would it be the landings by some kind of like designated permits or the landings in a state based on the dealer.

If it is designated permits, then how would the fishermen be assigned to that quota; and if you're going to do that, would it be based on their home address or their home port or how many landings they had in that state. Could they select what state or region they wanted to be tied to or would they be assigned to them and then can they change that or is it permanent, forever; once you are affiliated with the North Carolina quota, that is all you can fish on.

If it is landings in a state, so just the landings are counted along the way; you know, you would have to talk about the likely problem of fishermen coming from another state, so if Florida shut down, maybe everybody would move up to an open quota state. Then how would you allocate the quotas, probably based on some kind of historic landings proportion.

What years would you use and whose landings; of the fisherman with the permit associated with that state or would you use the dealer landings; so just lots of things to think about. Could the states or regions transfer quota among themselves? I don't know how that would work or if you would just want to let them work it out themselves.

These are some things to think about; and if this is something that the council wants to consider at this time for this amendment, then you at least need to kind of discuss all of these questions so the IPT has an idea of what kind of options and alternatives to put in. But if this is not something you want to talk about now, then let's not get in the weeds with it.

DR. DUVAL: Obviously, I have a few things to say about this action of state-by-state quotas. I think just given the issues of cobia, I would not suggest – if we were to move with this action right now or taking it out to public comment, my suggestion would be to leave cobia out of it because it would seem to create a pretty big mess just given that we're looking at having to do something similar with cobia like what we're doing for king mackerel on the Gulf and then some of the questions that Kari brought up.

Given that we don't require permits for landing and have not as of now for either king or Spanish mackerel, I would say state quotas – if we were to do state-by-state or regional quotas, that they be based on landings. This is how it has worked in the Mid-Atlantic, so I wouldn't necessarily recommend going with permits.

Again, the way this has worked in the Mid-Atlantic and at the ASMFC is fishermen are not assigned to a state or a region. I think it is just something that everyone accepts is that fishermen move around all over the place. We have guys from New Jersey and even Maine that are fishing on North Carolina summer flounder quota.

I think that is just something that we would all just have to accept as – I don't know if you want to call it a risk but that is just the nature of it. Right now, I think with our fisheries we already have people moving around from other states. There are guys from South Carolina and North Myrtle Beach who come and fish off North Carolina and vice versa.

It is all just regional proximity. Personally I think trying to assign fishermen to a state or region would overly complicate something like this. The way quotas have been established in the past has been based on historic landings; and again like I said not based on permit holders but I think just by going with dealer landings. Certainly, the years, that is a discussion. I'll stop.

MR. HAYMANS: Ben, this is a question I guess for you, but we heard Mr. Snead say last night that king mackerel was lower than it has been in the 31 years that he has been fishing it. If you look at the percentages from the last decade, it is not necessarily that because we have had them just as bad, but have you seen the downturn in king mackerel in South Florida?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I was going to save it for after we got through with these amendments, but I can answer it now or answer it later. But, yes, there is concern, there is room for concern. Mel.

MR. BELL: For two years now we have been getting these calls about where are all the kings, where are all the kings. His comments last night kind of hit home.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess I have a couple of questions. If the fishermen are going to be able to move around and all that and we're going to use dealer reports and everything, I guess one thing that is not entirely clear to me is why do this, then? But, the other bigger question is if we're going to go state by state, that means each state is going to have to take responsibility and monitor their own quota and close the fishery down.

My impression from previous discussions is that North Carolina is the only state that wants to do that, and it may be the only one. I think Florida could do it, but I'm not sure if South Carolina and Georgia have the capabilities, and they're shaking their head no. I know Florida could do it but I don't know if they want to.

It seems to me if all the states aren't interested, then we're not going to have state-by-state quotas, and we ought to strike that from this title and remove the alternative that would go state by state. Where that leaves us then is potentially regional quotas or something like that. It's not entirely clear to me what we gain from this.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Roy, it would be different to monitor the landings in a state and be able to, for example, shut that state down – that is different from the subzones and like monitoring the quotas in the subzones and the zones for these fisheries?

DR. CRABTREE: But then it seems to me Alternative 2 ought to be removed because that would establish quotas for each state and we're clearly not going to do that because at least Georgia and South Carolina aren't going to do it and can't monitor the quotas and deal with it all. It seems to me then that leaves us with we're talking regional quotas but not state-by-state quotas.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Why can't you monitor state quotas?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, number one, how many mackerel fishermen are landing in Georgia? Is it going to be confidential data? That is going to just not be a desirable way to go. It's not that

we are not capable of doing that, but why? I don't know anybody who wants to do that. I know North Carolina wants to monitor their own quota, but the other states aren't wanting to do it that way so why talk about breaking it down like that?

It seems to me this is about letting North Carolina monitor their quota; and so if want to have a quota for everyone else and then a quota for North Carolina, that is one situation, but I'm trying to figure out what it is we're trying to do here because I don't get the sense that this is an issue with any other state. It seems to just be a North Carolina thing.

MR. CUPKA: I think we got here because it is a North Carolina issue. There was a lot of concern about the fishery closing early before the fish got up there so let's take part of the quota and set it aside to make sure they have an opportunity to fish. That is what I recall as the reason why we started considering it.

DR. CRABTREE: So my point is that is not state-by-state quotas. That is I guess a North Carolina and the rest of the region quota. If that is what we're talking about, then we ought to simplify this down to get to that.

MR. HARTIG: And functionally that is how it works. You include Georgia and South Carolina but the landings for those two states are so small commercially that it is essentially a North Carolina and Florida problem. The only alternative in here that would work because of the infrastructure of the other states would be North Carolina and then the other three states combine together. I think we could do that because North Carolina wants to have separate quotas and they want to monitor them and things of that nature. The way it works, like I said, it's only two states that have most of the landings.

DR. DUVAL: Right now North Carolina monitors our own Mid-Atlantic quotas. The Fisheries Service has nothing to do with it. They receive the landings through the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, but we're the ones who are opening and closing the fishery and monitoring the quota and the Fisheries Service doesn't really have anything to do with it. I realize that other states don't necessarily have that capacity; and if we want to remove a few of these alternatives, that's fine.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think we ought to parse it down to what we're really talking about and what is really doable. I don't want to monitor state-by-state quotas, and I'm fine with figuring out a way to let North Carolina monitor their own quota and that's fine by me. It seems to me if really what we're talking about is no action or split off a North Carolina quota and have that and then the rest of the states, then that's what we have.

Then we are going to need to develop some allocation alternatives I guess with a different series of years under it. It seems to me that then becomes – and I agree with you, Michelle, about cutting out cobia, but are we just talking king mackerel or king and Spanish?

DR. DUVAL: I think this originally came up really more for Spanish mackerel. I think that was the discussion that we were having.

MR. CURRIN: Mr. Chairman, I think it was kings as well –

MR. HARTIG: Yes, it was kings as well.

MR. CURRIN: – and that has always been an issue. I mean early on, and I don't know about now whether the state and the fishermen have changed their minds, Michelle, but early on king mackerel was one of the drivers here as well.

DR. DUVAL: I stand corrected and glad that Mac is still around.

MR. HAYMANS: A question to Roy; if a state did have a separate quota, monitored that quota, they still can't close the fishery, right? They have to request NMFS to close it, yes, or would you be giving them that authority as well?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, to be honest, I'm not sure. We could look if there is a way to delegate authority to close the EEZ off the state. Otherwise, they would notify us when – what do you do in the northeast or Mid-Atlantic?

DR. DUVAL: Louis issues a proclamation closing – so for summer flounder he issues a proclamation closing the fishery.

DR. CRABTREE: Including the EEZ?

DR. DUVAL: Well, not including the EEZ, but those state-by-state quotas are set up in the federal plan for summer flounder, and so it's my understanding – I would have to go back and check, but the states are responsible for monitoring those quotas. We don't issue any kind of closure in the EEZ, but we also have a limited entry fishery for summer flounder whereby you need a license to land flounder in North Carolina. If you don't have that license you can't come in and land your fish here.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I guess the bottom line, Doug, is I'm not sure exactly administratively how it would work. We'd just have to figure that out.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm just wondering if there would be a problem with, say, North Carolina boats catching fish, they are unloading them in South Carolina and saving their quota and then moving back to North Carolina. I don't know if that is a possibility, but I could see people sandbagging on somebody else's quota until they needed theirs.

DR. DUVAL: That is certainly a possibility. With Virginia and North Carolina having their own state quota shares of summer flounder, most vessels in the fleet are permitted to land in both states. They will go out and load up the boats with their Virginia quota first and their North Carolina quota and drop it off in Virginia and keep on steaming down to North Carolina. Depending on which state is open at which time, I wouldn't call it sandbagging but, yes, there is a possibility of vessels landing catch in South Carolina and then going up to North Carolina and fishing that.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, I just see us heading down to where the Gulf is where then they will to make people declare a zone because everybody will be mad because all the fishermen are coming in and catching up their quota and all that. I guess the thing is if you really feel like this is somewhere you want to go and you think there is a good chance there is a majority vote on the council to go down this path, then, okay, let's develop all this; but if this just isn't going anywhere, it's going to be a lot of work to develop it.

MR. CURRIN: Clearly, the states' interest, Ben, and the rest of the council members is to carve out some quota to be managed by the state of North Carolina for the fishermen there inherent with all the problems that you guys have identified, and, of course, that will come out during the discussion for everyone to consider. but the one thing I haven't heard before is the comparison to the zones in the Gulf.

It's not something that I have thought about before and not aware of most of the problems, but that certainly ought to enter into that discussion and I'm sure will shape the decision here. My suggestion would be to restructure this action such that it carves out a quota regionally with North Carolina being a separate region and all the other states being the other region. Clearly, several of the other states aren't interested in their own individual state-by-state quota. Let's look at it and see where it ends up.

MR. HAYMANS: If we have to monitor it for in-season landings and close it, we're not able to do that because we don't have the resources to put into developing the system to do that. If all things equal, then maybe we would be interested, but we're not at this time.

MR. CURRIN: If I might, my intent there, Doug, with the previous comments was that North Carolina would monitor its quota and NMFS would monitor the quota of the other three states just the way it is done right now. I wasn't trying to get you guys to individually monitor your quotas and then add them up at the end of the month or anything.

MR. HARTIG: Right and that is the only way I see it working. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I'm fine with restructuring this alternative and only having no action or an alternative that would establish a commercial quota for North Carolina and then the rest of the South Atlantic and the Mid-Atlantic Region with only Option A and Option B for king mackerel and Spanish mackerel; take it out; if people don't like it and there is a huge opposition, it doesn't mean we have to do it. I guess from a philosophical standpoint, obviously we have worked within state-by-state quotas.

They are incredibly advantageous when it comes to some of the regional issues of disparity with things like black sea bass and golden tilefish and the resource being available at different times to different people. I could certainly see us considering down the road state-by-state quotas for black sea bass. Somebody correct me if I'm wrong but I think we did scope this issue of regional or state quotas within CE-BA 3, and there were positive comments in support of it. My feelings aren't hurt, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, don't get me wrong, I don't have anything necessarily against it. It is just if the other states don't have the capacity to do it, it doesn't seem to work. Now I'm okay if you want to restructure this so that it sets up North Carolina and the other states and you have options for king and Spanish.

I think you need to put another alternative or some options in here that would address the allocation because we're going to have to – with some years and things because I think your North Carolina fishermen need to understand there is going to be North Carolina versus the other states in setting the allocation, and then they ought to think about where the votes lie on that and look at some of the consequences.

DR. DUVAL: I know those people.

MR. CURRIN: Michelle, I thought you had made a motion to effectively do that, to restructure this, and I was prepared to second that motion.

MR. HARTIG: She hasn't yet but I think she will.

DR. DUVAL: I'm just trying to get straight what we're going to here. **I would move that we remove Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 under Action 7 to the considered but rejected.**

MR. HARTIG: **Seconded by Doug. Discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.**

DR. DUVAL: **Now I would like to make a motion to restructure Alternative 4 such that it establishes a commercial quota for North Carolina versus the rest of the South and Mid-Atlantic for Atlantic Migratory Groups of king mackerel and Spanish mackerel. I would like to remove cobia from that; for king and Spanish mackerel only.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle; second by Jessica. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: In doing that, does that include the South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and the Mid-Atlantic, because right now Alternative 4 has three regions?

DR. DUVAL: Right, right now we have no – it is all one quota. The Mid-Atlantic states fish off the same quota for Spanish mackerel; so if we're just looking at allocation options to see what a North Carolina share might be, then it's just everybody else is fishing on all the rest of it.

MR. HAYMANS: So the southern states and the Mid-Atlantic states and a hole in the middle?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, doughnut hole.

MR. HARTIG: Roy, the question was we have got North Carolina and then we've got all the other areas so you would have South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and the Mid-Atlantic all monitored under one quota?

DR. DUVAL: Don't you guys get those landings?

MR. HARTIG: You get Mid-Atlantic landings, correct?

DR. CRABTREE: I think so.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I think you do. Charlie, what was your question?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I think I heard the answer but just to make sure I heard the answer, so it is not going to be a Mid-Atlantic and then a North Carolina and then Georgia down. It is just going to be two quotas instead of three; so if the Mid-Atlantic gets happy with their landings, I'm not so sure I like that.

DR. DUVAL: Charlie, that is the way it is now. The states are allowed to land in the Mid-Atlantic whatever they want. There is no set-aside right now or separate allocation.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, but I think Charlie's concern is North Carolina vessels could then go into the Mid-Atlantic and unload their catches and not impact North Carolina's quota.

DR. DUVAL: I see, okay, I understand.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I think from this discussion staff gets the sense of what is feasible and not, and I would suggest that you guys just get together and come up with a range of reasonable alternatives that meet this more tailored need that we're talking about right now.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, that sounds good. **We have got a motion; we've had discussion. The motion is to restructure Alternative 4 such that it establishes a commercial quota for North Carolina and another for the rest of the region for Atlantic Group King Mackerel and Spanish Mackerel. Anymore discussion? Is there any objection? Okay, the motion is approved with two objections.** All right, we're going to take Roy's suggestion and staff is going to flesh this out more and it will come back to you.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Action 8 is to set an ACT by subzone for Atlantic Migratory Group Cobia. There are two alternatives; no commercial sector ACT; and then the recreational ACT you can see there; or, Alternative 2, commercial ACT is 90 percent of the subzone ACL and then the recreational ACT is the sector ACL.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, any discussion on this item? Any problems with it? It's pretty straightforward.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: The Mackerel AP recommends Alternative 1 as the preferred so this would basically just not establish the commercial ACT.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, do you want a preferred here or not? Seeing none, moving right along.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Okay, Action 9 is the AMs for the subzones in Atlantic cobia. Alternative 1 is no action, and so the commercial AM is to prohibit the harvest, possession and sell when the commercial ACL is met or projected to be met. The recreational AM is reduce the length of the following fishing year, so a payback when the recreational sector quota is exceeded.

And then compare the recreational ACL with the landings over a range of years, which is described here – this is what is in existence – and then only adjust the recreational season length if the total ACL is exceeded; a commercial payback of any overage, so pay back only if it is overfished; recreational payback if any coverage from one year to the next only if overfished.

Then Alternative 2, the commercial and recreational AMs for Atlantic Group Cobia applies separately to each of the Atlantic Migratory Group Subzones as determined by the previous action with the ACLs. Alternative 3, the current commercial and recreational AMs for the Atlantic cobia applies separately to each of the Atlantic Group Cobia Subzones as determined, except that the three-year moving average is replaced by the most recent year's landings. This may be something that Gregg would have to speak on again.

MR. HARTIG: Those are pretty normal AMs for the recreational fishery and for the commercial fishery. Discussion? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Just a real quick question; Action 7, although it doesn't state it in the title of the action, each of the alternatives deals specifically with the commercial quotas. Then Action 9 references Action 7, but we're talking about commercial and recreational ACTs so a question on that.

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: That's a typo. However, it is just talking about Action 6, which is the cobia ACL action and not the state quota.

MR. HARTIG: Well, it still doesn't solve the problem that you had of the discussion or does it?

MR. HAYMANS: That is setting the ACL for the whole fishery, so, yes, and it has got the mention of the recreational and commercial sectors there in Alternative 1. I guess it would be the ACTs would be applied to those ACLs, so, yes, I guess it does make sense by going back to 6.

MR. HARTIG: Is everyone comfortable with those?

DR. CRABTREE: May I ask a question? If we set up these quotas in Action 7, would we need a similar sort of action; does it modify the AMs and all for those separate zones?

DR. MacLAUCHLIN: Well, as it is now cobia is not one that is – and this is specifically for cobia.

DR. CRABTREE: Would we need them for king and Spanish? I guess that would be done in the action itself. Like of North Carolina went over their quota, the payback would be just North Carolina and that kind of stuff.

DR. DUVAL: I think you could specify in the action that the accountability measures that the council has established would apply to any sub-regional quota.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, we've got that straight. Anything else in this action? All right, that brings us to modifying the framework procedure.

DR. MacLAUHLIN: Okay, Action 10 is the framework procedure. The modified procedure was adopted in Amendment 18, so there are a few alternatives. One would allow changes to the AMs under the standard documentation process for open framework actions. You see under Alternative 2 the list of AMs; in-season and post-season AMs that could be changed under Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 is similar but it has just two items under each of the in-season and post-season AMs. Alternative 4 would modify the procedure to include designation of responsibility to each council for setting regulations for the migratory group of each species. Alternative 5, make editorial changes to the procedure to reflect changes to the council, advisory committees and panels. Alternatives 4 and 5 could be selected in addition to 2 and 3.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, are we straight on that? Go ahead, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I just want to question – and maybe this is for Gregg because it was something that he and I had talked about and I thought it was going to be included in the list of framework things, and I didn't see it in here. Okay, so this is just modifications to the framework so there is already a provision in the framework for like a seasonal exemption from the size limit. The first thing I see on the framework alternatives is a change in the king mackerel. Okay, I just wanted to make sure that was one of the things that was allowed under framework; that's all.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: What specifically would be allowed under the framework, Michelle?

DR. DUVAL: I was just asking if an exemption from the size limit is allowed under a framework or changes to the size limit are allowed under the framework procedure. I was confusing myself because it has been a long week that this is to modify the existing framework procedure and these are not all the things that are in the framework right now. I just answered my own question.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right, it has been a long week and it's mackerel on top of it. Yes, you can change size limits right now.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, are we comfortable with this then for now? This one is not going to hearing I wouldn't – go ahead.

MR. CUPKA: This one is not going to be ready to go to public hearings obviously, and I would also suggest that the other item under mackerel framework, that we just let staff bring that back at the September meeting and that we don't go over it today since 19 and 20 is going to come

back to us in September. It has been a long week and a long day, so that would be my suggestion to you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, Mr. Chairman, that is the way we will do it. We are done with 19 and 20. The only other action that I have to come before you is to talk about the Atlantic Group King Mackerel stock and the state of what the fishermen are experiencing. For the last three years in the area where we fish in South Florida where most of the spawning stock comes to spawn we have a significant decline in the fish that show up in that area.

Having said that, there are also extreme environmental differences, oceanic conditions between cold water and then not having any Gulf Stream influence this year for almost a month, which I have never seen before for that long and that time period my entire life. There are other things that are working here, but there is some concern – fishermen have been coming to me for the last two years.

Not only that but I have been approached by people from South Carolina, as you have, Mel, tournament guys last year, they were calling me where is the kingfish, where is the kingfish. We've gone ahead and looked at some of the data and the North Carolina catches are trending down, the recreational catches are trending down.

The east coast catches are trending down, but there is a portion of two years of landings that we've got to look at that were actually late-returning mixing zone fish that will make the story a little more clear for at least the area that we fish in. We catch about a million pounds of fish there in a normal season, so that's a big contributor to this.

We want to go in there and look at those and then have a more true picture. Now, I was going to come to you with some framework actions like David said, but we're not going to do that at this time. What we want to do is have a meeting after August with our fishermen and sit down and have an industry meeting where we bring the landings to them and then have a discussion of how they want to proceed to move forward; bring those recommendations back to you in September and possibly do an emergency action for king mackerel that would be in place for the next season.

That's what we're thinking about now and we'll see how it goes in that meeting in August. August is one of the telltale times because those are the youngest spawners that we see, and August last year was pretty insignificant. Two August's in a row that are insignificant means there is probably not anything coming up in the pipeline in that spawning group of fish that we can rely on for the future. August is going to be the real determinate; it will be the month to really look at in this question. We will bring that back to you in September. That concludes my report. Jessica; that doesn't conclude my report because she has got an option to bring to you.

MS. McCAWLEY: I would like to make a motion to request that the Mackerel Committee from both the Gulf Council and the South Atlantic Council meet – and I'm open to suggestions on the timeframe. Do we want to try to meet in between now and the September council meeting? That would be my preference.

DR. CRABTREE: I would suggest August and meet with the Gulf Council.

MS. McCAWLEY: Possibly in August at the Gulf Council meeting.

MR. HARTIG: Well, that is a motion and let's get a second. David seconded. Okay, discussion. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: What are those dates of the Gulf Council meeting?

MR. GILL: It starts the 20th of August. It hasn't been scheduled and agendaed so I can't tell you when committee is meeting yet. We'll do that later.

DR. DUVAL: That would be difficult for me because our commission is meeting the 22nd, 23rd and 24th, so I would say I think that is great because you are all going to be gathered together. I think if there would be an option for me to participate by webinar or something like that, I would just ask that be considered.

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm also fine with meeting in Tampa in a different week and a different time, which is what Roy had suggested offering their office for a meeting. That might be easier and I think it might be easier if people have to participate via web.

DR. CRABTREE: In our office we have a conference room that could easily accommodate us. I don't think we'd have a large number of the public show up, but we'd have room for some.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, we've got a motion and we have got a way to get at it if we look at a couple of different dates. **Anymore discussion on this motion? Any objection to this motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** We will get together and look at the August meeting, see what the ability is of the committee members from the South Atlantic is to attend your meeting. In lieu of that we may schedule a Tampa meeting in Roy's conference room at another date.

MR. GILL: And if they all fail, you may consider that the Gulf Mackerel Committee go to your September meeting as another possibility, if all else fails.

MR. HARTIG: Thanks, Bob. That concludes my report.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, we do have one item that we need to go back to on the Ad Hoc Data Collection Committee Report. Staff was checking that. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: When I was giving the report from the workgroup that got together to look at Action 7, which was modify permits and data reporting for commercial vessels – and these were the data collection items within CE-BA 3 – I failed to include a recommendation from that workgroup to the committee to add a new Alternative 4 to Action 7, which would read, "Require all commercial snapper grouper vessels to be equipped with VMS. The purchase, installation and maintenance of VMS equipment must conform to the protocol established by NMFS in the Federal Register. The purchase of VMS equipment will be reimbursed by the National OLE

VMS Reimbursement Account if funding is available. Installation, maintenance and communication costs will be paid for or arranged by the shareholder.”

I know that we some discussion of this when we were talking about marine protected areas and the motion was made to include VMS as an option for enforcement and I think that the workfolk folks felt that maybe since we were dealing with data collection items in CE-BA 3, that this might be an appropriate alternative to consider, and so I would entertain a motion from someone to include this as a new Alternative 4 under Action 7. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Madam Chair, I would make a motion to include new Alternative 4 under Action 7.

DR. DUVAL: Seconded by Tom Burgess. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. I guess this was also a recommendation that came out of the Snapper Grouper Committee to look at VMS on – they said all vessels harvesting snapper grouper, but obviously you have to start somewhere. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I think I am done.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Michelle. Okay, that brings us down to the Advisory Panel Selection Committee Report. Doug, are you ready to give that?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, sir, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Advisory Panel Selection Committee met on June 14, 2012 and reviewed applications for the seats on the following advisory panels; coral, dolphin/wahoo, golden crab, habitat and environmental protection, king and Spanish mackerel, law enforcement, deepwater shrimp, shrimp, and the SEDAR Pool. The committee approved the following motions as recommendations to the council:

Motion 1; readvertise for coral scientist seat on the Coral AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion carries. Motion 2; appoint Christopher Burrows to the North Carolina charter seat on the Dolphin/Wahoo Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion? Objection? Seeing none, that motion is carries.

Motion 3; appoint Robert Johnson to the Florida charter seat on the Dolphin/Wahoo AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any opposition? Seeing none, that motion carries. Motion 4; readvertise for the NGO seat on the Dolphin/Wahoo AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, that motion carries.

Motion 5; appoint Nuno Almeida, Theresa Copa, Robert Palma and Bradford Whipple to the Golden Crab AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion carries. Motion 6; reappoint Glenn Ulrich to the Golden Crab AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion? Objection? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Motion 7; readvertise for the Georgia commercial seat on the Habitat and Environmental Protection AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, that motion carries. Motion 8; readvertise for the North Carolina commercial seat on the King and Spanish Mackerel AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Motion 9; appoint Bill Kelly to the King and Spanish Mackerel AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, that motion carries. Motion 10; readvertise for the open seat on the Law Enforcement AP and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, that motion carries.

Motion 11; appoint Brent Zirlott to the Deepwater Shrimp AP contingent upon the law enforcement background check. As a side note that background check has come through and there was nothing to report. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion or objection? Seeing none, that motion carries.

Motion 12; remove Jake Flowers from the Deepwater Shrimp AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, that motion carries. Motion 13; readvertise for the open seat on the Deepwater Shrimp AP. On behalf of the committee I so move. Any discussion or objection. Seeing none, the motion carries.

Motion 14; readvertise the open NGO seat on the Shrimp Advisory Panel. On behalf of the committee I so move. Is there any discussion or objection? Seeing none, that motion carries. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the AP Selection Committee's Report.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Doug. Next up is our SSC Selection Committee Report, Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: The committee reviewed SSC membership applications and discussed public comment policies for the SSC meetings. Staff was instructed to include public comment times on future SSC meeting agendas with one at the start of the meeting and an additional opportunity prior to the review of consensus statements.

A process for submitting written comments to the SSC was also discussed. It was agreed that written comments should be submitted to the council office one week prior to SSC meetings for distribution to the SSC and that the public should be notified of policy changes. The following motions were made:

Motion 1 to reappoint Carolyn Belcher, John Boreman, Chip Collier, Sherry Larkin and John Whitehead to the SSC, and I so move. Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion carries. There was a motion made to appoint Dr. Doug Vaughan to the SSC, and I so move. Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, the motion is approved. That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Roy. Law Enforcement; Duane.

MR. HARRIS: The Law Enforcement Committee met on June 14th in Orlando. Minutes of the March 2012 Law Enforcement Committee were approved. The committee received several presentations. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement Special Agent Otha Easley and United States Coast Guard Lieutenant Robert Foos presented data and related information on law enforcement efforts in the Deepwater Shrimp MPAs.

During the briefings, data were also presented on the number and types of cases made in the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction. NOAA General Council cases, Karen Raine presented information on a number of cases that have been handled in the Southeast Region. She discussed a number of different cases indicating fines and/or NOVA associated with these cases.

With respect to the selection of the 2011 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year, I indicated how the selection of the 2011 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year would proceed. I indicated that a ballot would be provided to each voting member of the council during the committee report at full council. The members would vote at that time and the winner would be announced.

The presentation of the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year will be made at the September 2012 council meeting. I read a summary of each of the nominee's accomplishments and encouraged the council members to read the detailed nomination material in the briefing book. At this time it is my pleasure to announce that Officer Jonathon Hall from North Carolina was selected as the 2011 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year. Congratulations to Officer Hall.

As Bob said, the vote was very close. All of these three officers were very deserving, and I will include those that were not in the top three as well as being deserving. Thank you for that. The last item we discussed was a mutton snapper spawning issue. We discussed the excessive harvest of mutton snapper during the spawning season from sites off Key West, Florida.

These sites are close to shore and both NMFS and Florida Wildlife Officers have indicated that abuses of the mutton snapper trip limits are taking place. The committee discussed this issue and determined that the Snapper Grouper Committee should address the harvest of mutton snapper during the spawning season.

There was a motion made to refer the mutton snapper spawning issue to the Snapper Grouper Committee, and on behalf of the committee I so move. Is there discussion of that issue? Is there objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved. Mr. Chairman, that completes my report.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Duane. Next is the SEDAR Committee. The SEDAR Committee met earlier today and received a progress report on ongoing SEDAR assessment projects; an update on the recently completed MRFSS/MRIP Calibration Workshop; and discussed future assessment priorities.

Objectives and outcomes of the upcoming SSC ORCHS Workshop were discussed. The committee provided guidance on the workshop. The committee reviewed and approved the council's research prioritization plan for 2012 through 2016. The committee discussed

assessment priorities and indicated that 2013 updates could be modified with the red snapper evaluation replacing red grouper and a possible update of black sea bass replacing gag.

The committee did not identify any stocks to drop to enable further work on Gulf menhaden. The following motion was made. **The motion was to move to approve the 2012 through 2016 council research prioritization and monitoring plan. On behalf of the committee I would so move. Is there any discussion on the motion? Any objection? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** The next agenda is a presentation by NOAA Fisheries on Highly Migratory Species.

MR. MAHOOD: Brad McHale, who is the Northeast Branch Chief of the HMS Management Division is here to give us a little orientation and consultation on Amendment 7 to the HMS Fishery Management Plan.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, five-minute break while he gets set up.

MR. CUPKA: If everyone will take their seat, we will go ahead and get started.

MR. McHALE: I wanted to thank the council for carving out some time here in this busy week's agenda to allow myself to give a very, very brief briefing regarding a scoping endeavor we're currently embarking on regarding an amendment to the Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; hence, Amendment 7.

Also given the time constraints we're underneath, I know that there were some members of the public that have joined to see this. I'll be making myself available to anyone on the council as well as those members of the public to talk about this in more detail because I'll be running through it quite rapidly.

In essence we're at the scoping phase. The last time we did a fishery management plan amendment as it pertained to bluefin tuna was back in 2006, and so we thought it was ripe to assess all the issues and items we had heard or observed and start to embark on a new FMP amendment.

In essence we're doing an assessment of our current management measures within the FMP and implementing that FMP and determining whether or not they give us the maximum flexibility as we move forward given some of the uncertainty that resides in this fishery. We have seen a lot of fluctuations just in the last ten years and want to provide ourselves the ability to react to those in a framework action, per se, as we move forward in time.

In addition, as we all I think are acutely aware of what is in our fishery management plans, in essence trying to prevent overfishing, rebuilding overfished stocks, monitoring and controlling mortality. One item in particular that we in the Highly Migratory Species Management Division are contending with is accounting for all of our catch, not only landings but as well as document the dead discards; and as this is a quota-managed species not only on the domestic front but as well as international, remaining within our annual allocations.

All that being said, some of the other reasons we're considering amending our fishery management plan at this point in time are the more specifics of some of the changes we're experiencing not only on the management side of the house but as well as those fishers both on the commercial as well as the recreational side.

Recently we have been having an increasing trend in our landings from, say, the mid-2000's. I have a subsequent slide that will kind of show this. Some our international allocations have been coming down and trying to rebuild the stock as a whole and then trying to gather as much information as we can regarding all of the sources of mortality and then figuring out how to account for that underneath the fishery management plan itself.

To just kind of show a graphic to that effect, we're looking at a chart here from 1996 through last year; and if you kind of focus on the year 2002 in the blue bar you can kind of see how our landings, both commercial and recreational collectively, had dropped off quite precipitously and in turn where some of the recommendations and management that we were allowed for carryover from one year to the next with unharvested quota is getting somewhat of control both on a domestic and international front.

Both domestically and internationally we had implemented some carryover restrictions and then kind of starting there in 2006 we started to see our catch increase and therefore that delta start to diminish. In regards to how we've allocated bluefin tuna to the various user groups, prior to 2007 the larger pie there on the left-hand side depicts all the allocation percentages issued to the various user groups, and all of those numbers are kind of based upon some historical participation.

But prior to 2007 we also had an international separate allocation to cover dead discards to the tune of just shy about 68 metric tons. Historically, this is how we managed it so those percentages on the left-side were all attributable to the landings, and then we would handle our discards in that separate piece of pie on the right-hand side.

But since 2007 that separate allocation has gone by the wayside and was discontinued, and so the division has been struggling with how to account for these dead discards within our landings quota for a number of different years. For those years where participants aren't harvesting their entire allocations, it becomes less of an issue in balancing the books at the end of the year.

However, as we kind of migrate from these pie charts to a bar chart and look more specifically at, say, 2011, again if there is this delta between our adjusted quotas on an annual base and then our landings plus these dead discards, there really isn't much of an issue; we're able to balance the books during some of our annual adjustment processes.

However, if you were to take another hypothetical look at this same scenario, that if all of the Atlantic bluefin tuna user groups were to harvest their respective allocations and the dead discards were to remain at consistent levels that we have observed, we're instantly in a potential situation where we could be exceeding our U.S. allocation when we're accounting for all these sources of mortality.

This is something that we have been struggling with for a few years and are hoping to resolve at the conclusion of this fishery management plan amendment. So where that is the main short-term thrust, we're also trying to balance, just as you all do with within the various FMPs, optimizing fishing opportunities, accounting for those sources of mortality and then essentially how that ripple effects into some of the other requirements that we have on the book.

For instance, reporting not only of landings but those interactions that are resulting dead discards, to get a full assessment of those numbers; but also once they are assessed or in parallel with them being assessed, how then in turn do you reduce them to mitigate some of the impacts that these interactions are having on our landings quota, essentially putting fish back over the side in somewhat of a wasteful practice.

We have been kind of bouncing around this triangle for some time trying to figure out where is the actual starting point. Essentially you need to account for these interactions across all the various user groups. Right now there are different reporting requirements based upon the gear types that individuals are using or fisheries they're participating in to get a sense of how do you reduce them and for those interactions that are documented now in further detail; in essence, how do you reduce those and then kind of continue through this cycle of assessing, refining, assessing, refining, and so on; ultimately with the goal that we need to remain compliant with our internationally obligated quotas.

One of the items, because we do have a very sound data set for our pelagic longline fleet, is looking at certain management measures to reduce dead discards, whether it be through a whole suite of options that I'll touch on here in a moment briefly; and for those fishery segments, how do get at their interaction rates above and beyond just landings?

Right now we have a very strong handle on all bluefin tuna that come to the dock; but for those that are being caught and released and then in turn those that are being released dead boatside, we are finding some gaps in our data streams there that we want to bolster. This chart essentially just shows that on the far left-hand side, that longline category, we do have a sound data stream coming in for that sector of the fishery; but for a lot of these others there are substantial gaps that we will be looking to rectify.

For that data stream that we do know, some of the ways that we're looking at addressing that are potentially implementing a bluefin tuna bycatch cap. Right now the HMS regulations play out is that we can – when the bluefin tuna incidental quota is reached for that longline sector, we can prohibit the retention of those fish, but they're still actually able to go out and target whether it be swordfish or other Atlantic tunas and therefore interactions and potential dead discards can continue.

We're looking at ways to implement a ceiling on that, whether it be at a regional cap basis or an individual cap basis with potentially the result being that gear type can no longer be used in that area or by that vessel. We're also looking at either modifying or implementing some closed areas where we're seeing high levels of interactions take place.

We're trying to do this at a fine resolution versus just closing large swaths of ocean to this particular gear type because there are currently a number of closed areas already in existence, and that particular management tool is kind of running its course in regards to its effectiveness. We're also looking at potential gear solutions, swapping out different gears versus the use of longline either when a closure takes place or there is a number of different voluntary programs currently taking place right now, especially with greenstick and buoy gear; whether or not some of the rules that limit the amount of fish longliners can keep; whether or not we should essentially implement you keep all fish that are interacted with that are dead, so you require the legal retention of those fish; and then for those that may be above or beneath the commercial minimum size, trying to figure out what you would actually do with those landings.

Some of the other items that we're entertaining comment on is reducing minimum sizes for some or all of our commercial categories to see if that tackles some of these discard issues; liberalizing some of the rules that apply to the purse seine category or harpoon categories where the regulations are they're targeting much larger fish so maybe enhancing some of their tolerance limits on small fish is worth entertaining; looking at some ways to minimize any sort of post-release mortality or discards associated with our recreational fishery, very difficult to get at especially with these bluefin, if they're not properly fought on gear that is classed at the same size of the fish they're interacting with; kind of essentially getting the six-hour fight brag time minimized; seeing that those fish usually don't survive those interactions.

And the last item here which is starting to gain some traction, which actually to my benefit doesn't require any regulations, but help facilitating communication amongst the fleet of where these bycatch interactions are taking place and getting that communicated back out to the fleet so they can avoid those specific areas.

There are a number of different case studies where that has been proven as an effective tool provided there is buy-in on the industry and then whatever the academic or third party facilitating it to ensure confidentiality. I had already kind of mentioned we're looking to enhance reporting and looking at the needs for all the different categories.

We're not necessarily also looking to slap a new logbook on top of all the other logbooks that exist, and so here I expect we'll be doing a rather thorough inventory of all our user groups that have HMS permits, seeing what other fisheries, both at a state and federal level, that they're participating in and trying to see how we can build off of those pre-existing data streams versus just having to throw some additional burden at these users.

Some other issues that we've been hearing through the scoping processes and even prior is that we need to refine how we account for these dead discards that are occurring. Currently we essentially have been taking them off the top of the U.S. quota where there have been a lot of recommendations that we refine it to hold those categories that are contributing to those dead discards accountable in the subsequent years.

Obviously, that has a few tendrils back into supplementing our reporting requirements so we have a level playing field as far as the data we're collecting from all the various bluefin users.

Some folks have also suggested that we revise our allocations in general, essentially blow up our current scheme and revisit it, trying to balance historical catch with current catch.

That has gotten various levels of support, but everybody knows that allocation is a four-letter word no matter what the fishery is and are somewhat hesitant to open that Pandora's Box at this point if other management measures can be used to address the issues we're contending with; and then how that would ripple down into some of our subquota rules over time and spatial allocations.

Again, this was very cursory. I think the full-blown scoping document has been sent out electronically and it's available online. I know that there are about 20 hard copies available here at the meeting for those that are having problems falling asleep. Our next consultation is with the New England Management Council next week.

The comment period is actually open until July 15th, so I look forward to any written or electronic comments or folks can feel free to contact my office and my staff. We look forward to getting input up and down the coast on all these various issues as we embark on the next stage to develop a pre-draft and then in turn a proposed rule that actually would be fully analyzed with an environmental impact statement.

Ultimately, given the timeframes and scrutiny and review and getting back out for public comment, we're not anticipating any of this going live probably until some time in early 2014 given the breadth of issues that we're touching on in the full-blown document. At that point, I would just like to reiterate that I'll make myself available for any comments or questions either here or via the telephone or via e-mail or through those other comment-receiving portals. Thank you.

MR. CUPKA: Thank you, Brad. Are there any questions relative to Brad's presentation? He will be available after our meeting if anyone wishes to discuss any of this with him in greater detail. Bob.

MR. MAHOOD: Brad, which category do most of the dead discards come from?

MR. McHALE: Currently the documented dead discards are occurring in our pelagic longline fleet as bycatch in our directed swordfish and our directed yellowfin fisheries. Now, that being said, that particular user group has the most reporting requirements placed upon it whether it be through logbooks not only for trip summaries, set summaries, and they're also carrying observers.

A lot of our other fisheries are commercial hand-gear fisheries, whether they be harpoon fishermen, rod and reel, charter fishermen, we don't have the same level of coverage, whether it be a specific logbook for HMS or them carrying observers. It's the longline fleet that has the most discards, but they are also the most heavily monitored.

MR. CUPKA: Other questions for Brad? Seeing none, thank you, Brad. We appreciate you coming down. All right, that brings us up to the Southeast Regional Office issues. I know there

are at least two experimental fishing permits that we need to review, but I'll ask Roy if he has anything he wants to add on any of these other topics.

DR. CRABTREE: I need to let you know that the commercial jacks complex, which includes lesser amberjack, banded rudderfish, and almaco jack, their ACL has been caught and that fishery will close on July 2nd. The notice should be filed in the Federal Register about now, and I guess the Fish Bulletin will go out later today, Jack, or tomorrow. Otherwise, I think given the time, all we need to go over is there is a South Carolina Aquarium EFP and a Goliath Grouper EFP.

DR. McGOVERN: I'll cover that. The issue with the South Carolina Aquarium EFP – that is Tab 13, Attachment 2A – this EFP request was approved by the council at your December 2011 meeting. The purpose of the EFP is to collect snapper grouper, coastal migratory pelagic, lobster, shrimp, golden crab for the purposes of public display.

We've processed the request and announced the application in the Federal Register in April of this year. After it was published, it was pointed out to us that the number of fish to be collected was on an annual basis rather than on a five-year total, which is what we had in their. We published a correction on June 1st, and we just wanted to clarify with the council the conditions of this EFP request just to make sure the council was okay with that.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, everyone should have had a chance to review that; are there any problems with that? I guess it's a done deal and it's more for information.

DR. McGOVERN: The second EFP request was e-mailed out earlier this week. It's on Goliath grouper. The request is from Dr. Chris Stallings and Dr. Chris Koenig. They are requesting the exempted fishing permit to address objectives of a MARFIN Study to non-destructively sample Goliath grouper, to get samples for tissue samples, spines and data for stock assessment purposes.

They're going to sample on natural and artificial reefs in Florida state waters and adjacent federal waters from Georgia to Alabama. The vast majority of sampling is going to occur in the southern portion of Florida where the populations are the highest. The research is going to take place from the time that the EFP is approved until the end of the study in August of 2014. As I said, this is a non-destructive proposal, but if any mortalities do occur they would like to be able to provide those fish to Dr. Stallings and Koenig to work up for life history studies.

MR. CUPKA: If you recall, recently we passed a motion that would require information to come to this council like two weeks before we meet so that staff would have a chance to give it out unless the council chairman approved putting something in at the last minute. This did come in late but I approved it for one reason in particular.

You may recall that earlier this year we had a joint meeting between our council and the Gulf council to try and get a better handle on the status of Goliath grouper and what could be done to improve our knowledge of these. I felt like this proposal fit into some of the things that came out of that one-day meeting and it would help give us a better handle on just what is going on with

Goliath grouper, so I allowed it to be put on the agenda. Duane, are you ready to make a motion?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, I move that the South Atlantic Council recommend to the Regional Administrator that he approve the EFP request for Goliath grouper.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, second by John. Discussion on the motion? Is there any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved. Anything else, Roy?

DR. CRABTREE: No, I think that is the highlight.

MR. CUPKA: Bonnie, do you have anything else you want to bring up?

DR. PONWITH: I do; just to reiterate that we're working on the science plan in the Center and that we will be running that through the SSC and ultimately to you once SERO has had a chance to review it. For the headboat update, the data were keypunched and estimates were generated by the 6th of March. That is the earliest that the estimates have been made since 1972.

The things contributing to that ability was an increase in the reporting compliance of the people that are submitting those reports, which is actually a really good news thing, and also some increases in efficiency on the Science Center side in Beaufort for the program. Another update for the headboat is that at the data workshop for SEDAR 28 a decision was made to develop an index of abundance using the headboat data for cobia.

Last, just to report that we've had a couple of successes in proposal writing; and through the MRIP Program we have got two headboat-related projects funded. One is a validation study for the headboat logbook and the other one is a survey-wide implementation of electronic logbook reporting for headboats, and that is for both the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. That is going to really dramatically improve our flexibility and we think our efficiency of being able to gather those data.

Just to reiterate figures that Marcel brought up in his presentation is that collectively MARMAP, SEAMAP, and SEFIS continue the video trap sampling. I have been giving kind of updates on that fishery-independent work. We anticipate that in the year 2012 we will have greater than a thousand trap surveys that are conducted. That is my report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: All right, agency and liaison reports; we will start with Doug for Georgia; short and sweet, hopefully.

MR. HAYMANS: I've reported this twice or three times before, but we finally have legislation that was passed and signed by the governor May 2nd which would transfer a lot of authority over to the Board of Natural Resources, including the ability for the Board of Natural Resources and/or the commissioner to be able to close seasons and whatnot to match up with federal regulations. That passed May 2nd and I just sent it to the board. We will be presenting that at the end of the month. Hopefully, that will all go online January 1st and we'll be good to go.

MR. BELL: The only thing of interest remember sheepshead was removed from the snapper grouper complex. We passed legislation and Governor Haley signed it and it went into effect this week, so South Carolina now has sheepshead laws in place for sheepshead.

DR. DUVAL: I think probably the most significant thing is that our commission voted to disallow any menhaden reduction fishing within state waters. There was already a bill as a result of a legislative study committee that was going to be introduced but our commission went ahead on that.

Obviously, the industry is not pleased about that and they have requested a declaratory ruling, so we're actually having a special commission meeting next week to deal with that issue. With the legislature being in session now, we should have some I guess answer by the time of our September meeting as to what agency or department we will be in or if we will be splintered or what folks have decided to do with us. That's it.

MR. DUVAL: While I think about it, Wilson said to let you know that he was going to e-mail his agency report to all of us so be on the lookout for Wilson's report. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I don't really have too much to report. We have two new commissioners, Commissioner Lisa Purdy who is from Immokalee, Florida; and Chuck Roberts who is from Tallahassee. By the time council meets again, we will have the possibility of three new commissioners and a new chairman.

MR. CUPKA: Monica, do you have anything you wanted to bring up? Bob, any greetings from the Gulf.

MR. GILL: No, just the likely event, farewell, thank you. I thoroughly enjoy and will miss you all, but thank you very much for your hospitality.

MR. EASLEY: Just one quick one, and that is enforcement has a new staffing allocation plan that has been released and the changes, in a nutshell, are such that enforcement will be more favorable towards getting compliance in area of fisheries versus some of the other areas we might have been concentrating in. Other than that, I have done enough damage this week, so that's my report.

MR. CUPKA: All right, here is your swan song opportunity.

LT. FOOS: Mr. Chairman, I have further Coast Guard matters to report on, but I did want to express my deepest gratitude to the council and the council staff for welcoming me for the past year. I have certainly learned a lot and I will take this forward with me as I get back out on the water hopefully in the next couple of years and throughout my Coast Guard career. I wanted to express my deepest gratitude. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. CUPKA: All right, that brings us down to other business and upcoming meetings. Is there any other business to come before us? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Mr. Chairman, we heard in the public hearing last night that an amberjack fishing year change is needed at least for the fishermen in the southern areas. I would like to make a motion that we bring the fishing year change as a framework action before the Snapper Grouper Committee.

MR. CUPKA: Second by Doug.

DR. CRABTREE: I would like to suggest that we include a few other things in it. We talked about a triggerfish issue on the east coast in terms of fork length versus total length that is creating confusion. I think we ought to address that. We heard public comment on potentially increasing the amberjack trip limit last night or decreasing it. We've also heard some concerns about mutton snapper and some potential bag limit changes or spawning season things. I wonder if we couldn't ask staff to take a look at all those issues in a possible snapper grouper framework.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, is that a friendly amendment?

DR. CRABTREE: That's a friendly amendment.

MR. CUPKA: Are you okay with the friendly amendment?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, I certainly am.

MR. CUPKA: Is the seconder okay?

DR. CRABTREE: Okay, let me get Gregg to get them; triggerfish size limits, amberjack trip limit, mutton snapper bag limit during the spawning season and potential mutton snapper spawning season closure.

MR. HARTIG: Gregg, would it be appropriate for the Snapper Grouper Committee to address that transit issue that I broached with you on the Oculina Bank in that same venue?

MR. HAYMANS: Could we also address black sea bass season, fishing year?

MR. CUPKA: Yes, we can throw it all in there. Does that reflect all of your things, Roy?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and mutton snapper had to do with additional protections during the spawning season, either reduce the bag limit during the spawning season or some sort of spawning season closure of an area, something like that.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, or just close those areas that is happening in.

MS. McCAWLEY: I think what Roy said was the gray triggerfish, the size limit as well as the measurement.

MR. BURGESS: Well, in relation to Doug's motion I would like to put up there black sea bass regional management.

MR. CUPKA: I don't think we can do that through a framework. It would take an amendment. Anybody else want to get in on this? Do you have something else, Jessica?

MS. McCAWLEY: It wasn't on this; I don't know if we need to vote on this first.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, we do. **All right, the motion is develop a snapper grouper framework to; one, in regard to amberjack, look at the fishing year and reduce the trip limit; in regard to mutton snapper, look at providing additional protection during a spawning season; and gray triggerfish size limit and measurement, fork length versus total length; and the black sea bass fishing year. Is there any further discussion on the motion?** Tom,

MR. BURGESS: Could that be black sea bass fishing year; is an analysis going to be done on this or is it just coming before the Snapper Grouper Committee and then working – the reason I was going to say this is the black sea bass fishing year may be commercial/recreational; would that be appropriate? If not, that's fine.

MR. CUPKA: It would be a change that is allowed in the framework. Do we need to put that there, Gregg, or do you understand it would be for both sectors? **Okay, further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.** All right, other business. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I don't think this one will precipitate as long a discussion, but I did have one pressing thing that has been brought to my attention a number of times, and it was mentioned by the AP. Whichever committee is appropriate, we need to change the transit regulations pertaining to the Oculina Bank to reflect the transit regulations that we have in our MPAs, and whichever committee –

MR. CUPKA: Is that a motion?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, specifically for Oculina Bank, to bring them in line –

MR. WAUGH: The only thing in CE-BA 3 now is the data collection issues.

MR. CUPKA: **Okay, we have a motion to change the transit regulations in the Oculina Bank HAPC to track the transit regulations in other MPAs. Second by Tom Burgess. Discussion on the motion? Again, that is with the understanding this would be addressed I guess as part of CE-BA 4. All right, any other further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion is approved.** Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: I think it was at the June meeting last year there was the motion to put together, whether it was a Florida Committee or Florida Advisory Panel that was between the South Atlantic and Gulf Council, and I haven't heard anything else about that. The stakeholders have been asking about it, and I was just wondering where we were on that item.

MR. CUPKA: That is a good question.

MR. MAHOOD: Steve Bortone and I have talked about it on several occasions, but we really haven't got anything put together yet. If there is urgency, we'll get on it.

MS. McCAWLEY: Well, the stakeholders are definitely asking and I think that it could take care of a lot of the issues that are coming before us, whether it has to do with mackerel or some of the reef fish issues, because it partly has to do with where the line is and we would like to change some state rules and we have the whole Monroe County included, Monroe County excluded. I just think it would really help us and the FWC is certainly willing to help both the councils put that group together.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, and as you recall there were two items. One dealt with the Goliath grouper and that group I think has met, so we just need to follow up on that second one.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, any other business. Bob, do you want to mention anything about our upcoming meeting in September.

MR. MAHOOD: Yes, the next meeting is the week of September 10th through the 14th in Charleston, South Carolina, and we will see everybody there. We hope to see you there, also, Bob.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, other business? All right, then we are adjourned and wish everyone a safe trip home.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 o'clock p.m., June 15, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
June 25, 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2011 - 2012 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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

~~**Robert H. Boyles, Jr.**~~ **MEL BELL**
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9304 (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

Dr. Michelle Duval
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell St.
PO Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

LT Robert Foos
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)
Robert.W.Foos@uscg.mil

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

John W. Jolley
4925 Pine Tree Drive
Boynton Beach, FL 33436
561/346-8426 (ph)
jolleyjw@yahoo.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

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

Jessica R. McCawley
Director,
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

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

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

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

Fishery Scientist

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Coral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin
anna.martin@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

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

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@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
Kari Fenske - kari.fenske@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

OTHA EASLEY
BOB GILL
BONNIE PONWITH
PHIL STEELE
JACK MCGOVERN
ANDY STRELCHECK
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
MARTHA
RADM BAUMGARTNER
BRAD McHALE

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: June 2012

Meeting Location: Orlando, FL

Issue: RED SNAPPER EMERGENCY ACTION

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
CUPKA	X		
HARTIG	X		
BELL	X		
BURGESS	X		
CRABTREE		X	
CURRIN	X		
DUVAL	X		
HARRIS	X		
HAYMANS	X		
JOLLEY	X		
MCCAWLEY	X		
PHILLIPS	X		
SWATZEL	X		

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: June 2012

Meeting Location: Orlando, FL

Issue: SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 18B AN CODIFIED EST

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
CUPKA	X		
HARTIG	X		
BELL	X		
BURGESS	X		
CRABTREE	X		
CURRIN	X		
DUVAL	X		
HARRIS	X		
HAYMANS	X		
JOLLEY	X		
MCCAWLEY	X		
PHILLIPS	X		
SWATZEL	X		

FULL COUNCIL - ROLL CALL VOTE

Date: June 2012

Meeting Location: Orlando, FL

Issue: SNAPPER-GROUPER AMENDMENT 18A & CODIFIED TEXT

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
CUPKA	X		
HARTIG	X		
BELL	X		
BURGESS	X		
CRABTREE	X		
CURRIN	X		
DUVAL	X		
HARRIS	X		
HAYMANS	X		
JOLLEY	X		
MCCAWLEY	X		
PHILLIPS	X		
SWATZEL	X		

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.

FULL COUNCIL MEETING
 June 15, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

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

EMAIL
ADDRESS

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

<u>NAME & ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP</u>
Kate Quigley	303-216-9476	beammads@comcast.net	16311 W. Ellsworth Ave. Golden, CO 80401
Dale Beamanidge (Seaford Consumer)	(386) 4791529	hellis@orlandoatv.net	251 Bimini Tr Per 34545
Ludi Lellis	772 461 0499	GERJRK@AOL.COM	Southport SC SSI, 6A
Joe Klosterman	910-600-5817	KusurEraguani@comcast.net	
Kenny Fox	912-222-9206	hbrians@panhusts.org	
Diana Shipman	856-322-7345	1Dunnive@panhusts.org	
Holly Binn	305 395 0931	hbeanna@nrcs.org	
Leza Dunne	212 727 4557		
David Newman			

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

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.

FULL COUNCIL MEETING
 June 15, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

NAME & ORGANIZATION	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE & ZIP
Annabeth Sgt. Munn	910-855-575	449 Central Ave, Suite 200, St. Petersburg, FL 33701	
Sera Neveval (Pen)	321-268-5000	NC 28713	
Lusky			
Laurie Thompson	321-269-1116		
Sherril McCoy	321-383-8888		
Jessie Neveval	772-221-4201		
Mike Merrill			
ED KILLER			

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

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.

FULL COUNCIL MEETING
 June 15, 2012
 Orlando, FL 32812

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

NAME & ORGANIZATION AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER EMAIL ADDRESS

Cameron Sargent, The Reef Environment Group (202) 590-8054 cjsargent@peanutrusts.org 1310 W. Silk St Tampa, FL 33609

Tom Weatherly, Reef Environment Group (202) 638-8316 willweather@yahoo.com FL 33702

Will Ward, Seiner 727-522-6183 1860 Tankwood Dr NE ST Pete, FL 33702

Diane Maidor, Seiner " 727-525-5819 1799 Tankwood Dr NE ST Pete, FL 33702

Sai IDEBRAND, " 727-420-7836 SAMIRMS@TAMPabay, FL.com ST PETERSBURG, FL 33702

Ellen Curvato, Purse Seiner 727-526-0729 1819 Tankwood Dr NE ST PETERSBURG, FL 33702

LEONARD IDEBRAND, Purse Seiner - 727-522-6183 1819 Tankwood Dr NE ST PETERSBURG, FL 33702

Sam MAIORO - Purse Seiner - 727-526-3537

Bob ALTA - Purse Seiner - 727-526-3537

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

Generated

Jun 18, 2012 06:18 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar Name
SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 5 of 5 (Friday)

Webinar ID
650904586

Actual Start Date/Time
Jun 15, 2012 07:17 AM EDT

Actual Duration (minutes)
532

Clicked Registration Link
106

Opened Invitation
35

Total Attended
51

Session Details

stephen,jessica		jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 15, 2012 08:50 AM EDT	
City	st petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:50 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:33 PM EDT	403.37

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Clemens,Anik		anik.clemens@noaa.gov
Attended	Yes	
Registration Date	Jun 12, 2012 12:36 PM EDT	
City	Saint Petersburg	
State	FL	
Unsubscribed	No	

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:50 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:38 PM EDT	229.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Witzig,John john.witzig@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 11:36 AM EDT

City Gloucester

State MA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 11:37 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:15 PM EDT	38.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Takade-Heumacher,Helen htakade@edf.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 07:59 AM EDT

City Raleigh

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:00 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	459.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 33

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

holiman,stephen **stephen.holiman@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:04 AM EDT

City st. petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:09 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 02:35 PM EDT	335.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 51

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

amick,steve **steveamicks@aol.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:54 AM EDT

City savannah

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:54 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:12 AM EDT	137.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

larrison,john **john@beachmarineservice.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:07 AM EDT

City port canaveral

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:07 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	421.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

linville,mike **whateversbitin03@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 01:16 PM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 01:17 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:18 PM EDT	102.03

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 68

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Lloyd,Vic vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:13 AM EDT

City Atlantic Beach

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:14 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:19 PM EDT	305.23

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 50

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

holland,jack jack.holland@ncdenr.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:40 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:40 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:03 PM EDT	202.95

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Knowlton,Kathy kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:12 AM EDT

City Brunswick

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:13 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	476.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Fitzpatrick,Eric eric.fitzpatrick@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:13 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:14 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 10:32 AM EDT	138.62

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 66

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Mahood,Robert **robert.mahood@safmc.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:22 AM EDT

City N. Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:22 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 08:27 AM EDT	5.12

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 65

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Coggins,Lew **lew.coggins@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:34 AM EDT

City Beaufort

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:34 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	454.35

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

DeLancey,Larry **delanceyl@dnr.sc.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:59 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:59 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:40 AM EDT	100.4

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 65

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Mehta,Nikhil **nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 10:56 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 07:40 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	508.72

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 72

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

levy,mara **mara.levy@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:08 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:08 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:18 PM EDT	189.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

c,mike **mec181@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 07:40 AM EDT

City mtp

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 07:40 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:59 PM EDT	498.93

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Michie,kate **kate.michie@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date May 25, 2012 11:05 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:19 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	471.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

sergent,richard **richiebagman@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 12:28 PM EDT

City jupiter

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 12:31 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:09 PM EDT	41.08

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Eich,Anne Marie **annemarie.eich@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 09:29 AM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:23 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:42 PM EDT	439.1

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 37

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Package,Christina **christina.package@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:43 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:44 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:26 PM EDT	182.5

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 36

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

vondruska,john **john.vondruska@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:11 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:14 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:51 PM EDT	397.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 37

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Port-Minner,Samantha **sport-minner@oceanconservancy.org**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:45 AM EDT

City Saint Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:45 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:14 PM EDT	148.48

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Chala,Liliana **lchala@hotmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 03:30 PM EDT

City Melbourne

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 03:32 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:07 PM EDT	35.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 60

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Byrd,Julia **byrdj@dnr.sc.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:12 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:12 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:59 PM EDT	286.85

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Barile, Peter abaco711@hotmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 08:25 PM EDT

City Melbourne

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:20 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:35 AM EDT	195.27

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 52

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Reichert, Marcel reichertm@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:21 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:21 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	358.17

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Williams,Erik erik.williams@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 11, 2012 03:31 PM EDT

City MHC

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 07:47 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 09:49 AM EDT	122.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 22

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Player,David playerd@dnr.sc.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 10:57 AM EDT

City Myrtle beach

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:59 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:32 AM EDT	33.02

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 38

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Miller,Janet janet.l.miller@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 10:34 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:35 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:34 AM EDT	59

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

gerhart,susan susan.gerhart@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:11 AM EDT

City st. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:12 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:22 PM EDT	265.6

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 41

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Woodward,Chris **chris.woodward@bonniercorp.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 12:18 PM EDT

City Brunswick

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 12:20 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:29 PM EDT	69.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 32

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Baker,Scott **bakers@uncw.edu**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:31 AM EDT

City Wilmington

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:32 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:14 PM EDT	221.45

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 27

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

beckwith,anna **anna@pamlicoguide.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 07:44 AM EDT

City morehead city

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 07:45 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	503.62

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 76

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Turner,Steve **steve.turner@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:28 AM EDT

City Miami

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:29 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:15 PM EDT	226.32

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Larkin,Michael michael.larkin@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 01:25 PM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 01:26 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:52 PM EDT	146.3

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Locke,Melissa mlocke@edf.org

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 13, 2012 11:53 AM EDT

City Raleigh

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:10 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:39 AM EDT	148.92

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 44

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

MacLauchlin,Bill **billmac@charter.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:16 AM EDT

City Stockbridge

State GA

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:17 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	413.38

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 47

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

DeVictor,Rick **rick.devictor@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:45 AM EDT

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:45 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	200.58

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 29

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

p,b **bprewittjr@hotmail.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 01:37 PM EDT

City day

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 01:40 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	149.67

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 71

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Malinowski,Rich **rich.malinowski@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:46 AM EDT

City St Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:46 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 02:53 PM EDT	306.47

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 35

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

izsak,jill **jnisak@yahoo.com**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 02:24 PM EDT

City jacksonville

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 02:26 PM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	103.12

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 23

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

branstetter,steve **steve.branstetter@noaa.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:03 AM EDT

City st pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:04 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:17 PM EDT	323.42

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 46

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

burford,marcy **marcyburford@comcast.net**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 10:31 AM EDT

City stuart

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:32 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 03:11 PM EDT	105.2

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 57

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Ballenger,Joseph **ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov**

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:17 AM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 09:17 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:24 PM EDT	247.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 25

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

DeVictor,Rick rick.devictor@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 10:02 AM EDT

City St Pete

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:02 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 12:21 PM EDT	139.07

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 45

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

travis,michael mike.travis@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 09:59 AM EDT

City St. Petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:01 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 01:34 PM EDT	213.05

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 28

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Gore, Karla karla.gore@noaa.gov

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:15 AM EDT

City Sarasota

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:16 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:10 PM EDT	473.83

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 31

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

thompson,mary jean mjthompson860@gmail.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 07:54 PM EDT

City titusville

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 10:33 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 04:09 PM EDT	157.43

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 60

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Barber,John johnb@revcmpsys.com

Attended Yes

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 08:46 AM EDT

City longwood

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
Jun 15, 2012 08:46 AM EDT	Jun 15, 2012 11:12 AM EDT	145.37

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest: 26

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

sandorf,scott scott.sandorf@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 14, 2012 03:02 PM EDT

City st petersburg

State FL

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time	Leave Time	In Session Duration* (minutes)
-----------	------------	--------------------------------

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

Daniel,Louis **louis.daniel@ncdenr.gov**

Attended No

Registration Date May 25, 2012 02:00 PM EDT

City Morehead City

State NC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

Pugliese,Roger **roger.pugliese@safmc.net**

Attended No

Registration Date Jun 15, 2012 12:03 PM EDT

City Charleston

State SC

Unsubscribed No

[In Session](#)

Join Time **Leave Time** **In Session Duration* (minutes)**

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.

FARMER,NICK

nick.farmer@noaa.gov

Attended No

Registration Date

May 25, 2012 10:59 AM EDT

City

ST PETERSBURG

State

FL

Unsubscribed

No

[In Session](#)

Join Time

Leave Time

In Session Duration* (minutes)

Interest Rating

Attendee's In-Session Level of Interest:

[Registration Q & A](#)

[Questions Asked by Attendee](#)

[Poll Questions](#)

[Post Session Survey Questions](#)

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first visit.